

SENATE MEETING

THURSDAY, NOVEMBER 3, 1960

3:30 P. M.

MURPHY HALL AUDITORIUM

The membership of the Senate totals 168 including 128 elected members and 40 ex officio members (32 Administrative Committee and 8 Faculty Consultative Committee). For a quorum, a majority of the membership (85) must be present.

Faculty members entitled to vote for Senate members may be present at Senate meetings but shall not be entitled to vote or make motions. Such faculty may, at their request and with the approval of the Senate, be given the privilege to speak on matters under consideration in which they have an interest.

Members of standing committees who are not members of the Senate, including student members, may be present at a meeting of the Senate during such time as a report of their committee is under discussion and may participate in such discussion, but shall not have the privilege of making motions or of voting.

A special section will be provided for the seating of such faculty and such members of standing committees.

ATTENDANCE RECORD

A roll of elected and ex officio members will be circulated during the meeting. Members will please check their names to indicate their presence. If the list misses you please stop afterward to check your name. The roll, after adjournment, will be on the rostrum.

An attendance record for nonmembers will also be circulated and will be on the rostrum after the meeting.

As voted by the Senate, a summary of the attendance of members elected for the current academic year will be included in the June minutes.

Year 1960-61

No. 1

UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA THE SENATE DOCKET November 3, 1960

Your Committee on Business and Rules respectfully presents the following matters for consideration:

I. MINUTES OF JUNE 2, 1960 Reported for Action

II. SENATE ROSTER FOR 1960-61 Reported for Information

1. Elected Members

	Unit*	Group**		Unit*	Group**
Ernst C. Abbe.....	14	1	James Kingsley, Jr.....	14	2
Edward E. Anderson.....	4	2	Stanley V. Kinyon.....	9	1
Gaylord W. Anderson.....	10	1	Virginia M. Kivits.....	8	2
Robert K. Anderson.....	3	1	Jean W. Lambert.....	1	1
Woodrow J. Aunan.....	1	1	Maxine A. Larson.....	1	2
Cyrus P. Barnum, Jr.....	10	1	Walter M. Lauer.....	15	1
Donald W. Bates.....	1	1	Benjamin J. Lazan.....	15	1
Frank T. Benson, Jr.....	8	2	Herman C. Lichstein.....	10	1
Werner W. Boehm.....	14	1	B. E. Lippincott.....	14	1
David R. Briggs.....	1	1	Ellis N. Livingston.....	5	1
Ernest B. Brown.....	10	1	Charles W. Martin.....	1	2
Dorothy M. Burrows.....	8	1	William P. Martin.....	1	1
Alfred C. Caldwell.....	1	1	Hugh J. McCauley.....	6	2
Paul Cartwright.....	15	1	William A. McDonald.....	14	1
Clarke A. Chambers.....	14	1	David J. Merrell.....	14	1
Warren B. Cheston.....	15	1	Philip T. Meyers.....	2	2
Jonas Christensen.....	1	1	William J. Micheels.....	6	1
O. T. Clagett.....	16	1	R. Drew Miller.....	16	2
John W. Clark.....	14	1	Clarence E. Mueller.....	12	2
Donald H. Clifford.....	3	2	Marion J. Nelson.....	14	2
K. B. Corbin.....	16	1	Edward P. Ney.....	15	1
Mary E. Corcoran.....	6	2	Alfred O. C. Nier.....	15	1
Laurence K. Cutkomp.....	1	1	Isabel Noble.....	1	1
Don Davies.....	6	1	Truman Nodland.....	1	1
James R. Dawson, Jr.....	10	1	Paul R. O'Connor.....	15	1
Harold C. Deutsch.....	14	1	William V. O'Connor.....	14	1
Norman J. De Witt.....	14	1	Theron O. Odlaug.....	5	1
Richard J. Donnelly.....	12	1	Charles K. Otis.....	1	1
Donald P. Duncan.....	1	1	Walter T. Pattison.....	14	1
Ruth E. Eckert.....	6	1	Harold C. Pederson.....	1	1
William H. Edson.....	6	1	Ralph A. Piper.....	12	1
Marcia Edwards.....	6	1	Robert Randleman.....	6	2
Henry J. Ehlers.....	5	1	Ralph E. Rapson.....	15	1
Herbert Feigl.....	14	1	Maynard C. Reynolds.....	6	1
Stuart W. Fenton.....	15	1	William C. Rogers.....	7	1
Richard Fitzgerald.....	9	2	Eleanor Salisbury.....	7	1
Roy G. Francis.....	14	1	Hubert H. Serr.....	4	1
Ivan D. Frantz.....	10	1	Mulford Q. Sibley.....	14	1
Edna L. Fritz.....	10	1	Dorothy Simmons.....	1	1
Richard K. Gaumnitz.....	2	1	Robert C. Slater.....	7	2
Frederick C. Goetz.....	10	2	Nelson T. Spratt, Jr.....	14	1
Robert A. Good.....	10	1	G. Robert Stange.....	14	1
Henry J. Griffiths.....	3	1	Burton Stein.....	14	2
Glenn Gullickson.....	10	2	Warren Steinmann.....	14	1
Merle V. Halverson.....	1	2	Marvin Steinberg.....	15	2
J. Merle Harris.....	8	1	Holger R. Stub.....	5	2
Donald W. Hastings.....	10	1	Thomas G. Sturgeon.....	5	1
Robert L. Heller.....	5	1	W. A. Sullivan, Jr.....	10	2
Alexander C. Hodson.....	1	1	Roy A. Swanson.....	14	2
Fred W. Hoffbauer.....	10	1	Elmer L. Thomas.....	1	1
Mellor R. Holland.....	4	1	David S. Torbett.....	14	2
James Holte.....	15	2	John G. Turnbull.....	2	1
William S. Howell.....	14	1	John E. Turner.....	14	1
Harvey H. Hoyt.....	3	1	Hugh L. Turrittin.....	15	1
Leonid Hurwicz.....	2	1	Richard L. Varco.....	10	1
Warren E. Ibele.....	15	1	John E. Verrill.....	5	2
Herbert S. Isbin.....	15	1	Maurice B. Visscher.....	10	1
Victor Johnson.....	16	1	S. E. Warschawski.....	15	1
Herbert Jonas.....	11	2	Thomas L. Waterbury.....	9	1
Richard Jordan.....	15	1	Wallace F. White.....	11	1
Gerhard K. Kalisch.....	14	1	Frank Whiting.....	14	1
Robert J. Keller.....	6	1	Albert Wickesberg.....	2	1
Harold H. Kelley.....	14	1	Julius F. Wolff, Jr.....	5	1
John C. Kidney.....	14	1	Donald H. Yardley.....	15	1

* Unit code: (1) Agriculture, (2) Business Administration, (3) Veterinary Medicine, (4) Dentistry, (5) Duluth, (6) Education, (7) Extension Division, (8) General College, (9) Law, (10) Medical Sciences, (11) Pharmacy, (12) Physical Education for Men, (14) Science, Literature, and the Arts, (15) Technology, (16) Mayo Foundation.
** Group code: (1) Professor and associate professors, (2) assistant professors (including research associates), and instructors (including research fellows).

2. Ex Officio Members

Administrative Committee: Membership of the Administrative Committee is reported in item IV.

Faculty Consultative Committee: Will M. Myers (1957-58, 1960-61) designated by the President as chairman June 2, 1960, Cyrus P. Barnum, Jr. (1958-61), Robert H. Beck (1957-60, 1960-63), Sherwood O. Berg (1960-63), John R. Borchert (1959-62), Walter W. Heller (1960-62), William G. Shepherd (1959-62), William Rosenthal (1957-58, 1958-59, 1959-60, 1960-61).

3. Graduate School Representatives

Dean Bryce L. Crawford, Jr. reports that the Executive Committee of the Graduate School has designated the following seven elected members of the University Senate as concurrent representatives of the Graduate School:

- | | |
|-------------------|------------------|
| David R. Briggs | G. Robert Stange |
| Warren B. Cheston | John E. Turner |
| Marcia Edwards | One to be named |
| David J. Merrell | |

III. ELECTION OF VICE CHAIRMAN Reported for Action

The constitution provides that a vice chairman shall be elected by the Senate at its first meeting of the academic year from among its members for a term of 1 year. He shall be eligible for re-election.

IV. SENATE COMMITTEES FOR 1960-61

1. Reported for Action

The Presidents reports additional appointments as follows:

Administrative Committee: Willard L. Thompson (Assistant to the President)

Institutional Relationships: Acting Dean Rodney A. Briggs (Morris)

Intercollegiate Athletics: John Williams to replace Adamson E. Hoebel (on leave); Russell E. Backstrom, Dr. Leif R. Strand, alumni.

Printing and Publications: Carol Ann Johnson, student.

Reserve Officer Training Corps: James H. Myers, Robert L. Stuebing, alumni.

Student Affairs: Mrs. M. D. McVey, Victor S. Rotering, alumni.

2. Reported for Information

The President reports the membership of the Administrative Committee of the Senate for 1960-61 as follows:

Administrative Committee: President O. Meredith Wilson, Professor Ray M. Amberg (Hospitals), Professor Ike J. Armstrong (Athletics), Dr. Ruth E. Boynton (Health Service), Acting Dean Rodney A. Briggs (Morris), Dean J. William Buchta (University College), Dean Walter W. Cook (Education), Dean Bryce L. Crawford, Jr. (Graduate School), Dean William H. Crawford (Dentistry), Provost Raymond W. Darland (Duluth), Colonel Arthur W. Dern (ROTC Units), Dean Paul V. Grambsch (Business Administration), Dean George P. Hager (Pharmacy), Professor Edwin L. Haislet (Alumni Relations), Dean Robert B. Howard (Medical Sciences), Dean William B. Lockhart (Law), Vice President Laurence R. Lunden (Business Administration), Dean Harold Macy (Institute of Agriculture), Dean Errett W. McDiarmid (Science, Literature, and the Arts), Assistant Dean Keith N. McFarland (Agriculture, Forestry, Home Economics), Dean Horace T. Morse (General College), Dean Julius M. Nolte (Extension), Mr. William L. Nunn (University Relations), Dean Athlestan F. Splihaus (Institute of Technology), Professor Edward B. Stanford (Library), Dean R. E. Summers (Admissions and Records), Willard L. Thompson (Assistant to the President), Dean William T. S. Thorp (Veterinary Medicine), Vice President Stanley J. Wenberg (Vice President and Administrative Assistant), Vice President Malcolm M. Willey (Academic Administration), Dean Edmund G. Williamson (Dean of Students), and Dean E. W. Ziebarth (Summer Session).

V. NON-SENATE COMMITTEES AND BOARDS FOR 1960-61

Reported for Information

The President reports non-Senate committees and boards and their membership for 1960-61 as follows:

Admissions, Board of: Robert Edward Summers (chairman), Ralph F. Berdie, H. Mead Cavert, Herbert G. Croom, William H. Edson, Robert J. Falk, Theodore E. Kellogg, Keith N. McFarland, Horace T. Morse, Roger B. Page, John E. Stecklein, Frank Verbrugge.

Art Collections, Advisory Committee on University: H. Harvard Arnason (chairman), Winston A. Close, R. Dale Miller, John Parker, Ralph E. Rapson, John Rood, Sidney Simon, Arthur E. Smith, Donald Torbert, Malcolm M. Willey.

Band Committee: Paul M. Oberg (chairman), Ike Armstrong, Frank P. A. Benciscutto, Walter W. Cook, Edwin L. Haislet, L. R. Lunden, Errett W. McDiarmid, Keith N. McFarland, William L. Nunn, Frank Verbrugge, Stanley J. Wenberg, Malcolm M. Willey, Edmund G. Williamson—Students: Frederick A. Nylina, Ronald J. Smallidge.

Civil Service Committee: James W. Stephan (chairman), Ray F. Archer, Clarence L. Cole, Richard C. Jordan, John G. Turnbull, Hedwin C. Anderson, Executive Secretary.

Computer and Tabulating Facilities, University Advisory Committee on: William G. Shepherd (chairman), Warren B. Cheston, acting chairman, Neal R. Amundson, Francis M. Boddy, Kenneth E. Clark, Ralph E. Comstock, Paul V. Grambsch, C. T. Johnson, Nathan Lifson, Warren S. Loud, Marvin L. Stein, Secretary, S. E. Warschawski.

Conference Center Committee, All-University: Donald P. Duncan (chairman), Frederick E. Berger, Joseph Davidson, Gerald Fitzgerald, Laurence R. Lunden, C. E. Mueller, Martin Snoke, Gordon Starr, Malcolm M. Willey—Students: Ellen Jean Fitzgerald, Gary J. Grimm, 4 students to be appointed—Alumni: Robert P. Provost.

Convocation Advisory Committee: James S. Lombard (chairman), Robert H. Beck, Charles H. Foster, William S. Howell, Gordon Starr—Students: Ellen Jean Fitzgerald, Ronald Albert Johnson, Ronald J. Moe, Clarence Ellis Taylor.

Dight Institute Advisory Committee: Bryce Crawford, Jr. (chairman), John A. Anderson, John J. Bittner, Robert B. Howard, Gardner Lindzey, Elio D. Monachesi, Sheldon C. Reed, Nelson T. Spratt, Mildred Thomson.

Fees, University Committee on: Willis E. Dugan (chairman), Alexander C. Hodson, Robert L. Jones, Laurence R. Lunden, True E. Pettengill, Malcolm M. Willey.

Foreign Students, Committee on: Bryce Crawford, Jr. (chairman), Sherwood O. Berg, Francis M. Boddy, Donald W. Cowan, Forrest G. Moore, Alfred O. C. Nier, Robert F. Spencer, Louise A. Stedman, Barbara J. Stuhler, Robert Edward Summers, Malcolm M. Willey, Edmund G. Williamson, Chester W. Wood (Duluth)—Students: Richard C. Harmon, Marianne S. Sundholm.

General Research Fund Advisory Committee, (including the Minnesota Institute of Research): William G. Shepherd (chairman), Warren B. Cheston, Kenneth E. Clark, Secretary, Stuart W. Fenton, Will M. Myers, Nelson T. Spratt, Dimitri T. Tselos, John G. Turnbull.

Greater University Fund, President Project Advisory Committee: Bryce Crawford, Jr. (chairman), Thomas W. Chamberlin, Joseph Davidson, ex officio, John K. Fesler, Louis Gross, Edwin L. Haislet, Laurence R. Lunden, Harold Macy, Stanley J. Wenberg, Malcolm M. Willey.

Group Insurance and Retirement Committee (advisory to Vice President, Business Administration): William B. Lockhart (chairman), Ray M. Amberg, Thomas W. Chamberlin (Duluth), Marcia Edwards, Gerald K. Kalisch, E. Fred Koller, Roy V. Lund, Paul R. O'Connor, Glen V. Taylor, John G. Turnbull, C. Arthur Williams, Jr., Malcolm M. Willey.

Honors, Committee on University: Horace T. Morse (chairman), John W. Clark, Raymond W. Darland (Duluth), Marcia Edwards, Edwin L. Haislet, Walter M. Lauer, Harold Macy, Errett W. McDiarmid, C. J. Watson, Malcolm M. Willey.

Hormel Institute Board: Bryce Crawford, Jr. (chairman), John H. Grindlay, J. G. Huntingt, Walter M. Lauer, Harold Macy.

Industrial Relations Center Faculty Committee: Paul V. Grambsch (chairman), Herbert G. Heneman, Jr., John C. Kidneigh, William B. Lockhart, Lloyd H. Lofquist, Gayle W. McElrath, Lloyd M. Short, Stanley J. Wenberg, Albert K. Wickesberg.

Industrial Safety, All-University Committee on: Ray F. Archer (chairman), Hedwin C. Anderson, Robert C. Brasted, Robert W. Bridges (Duluth), William O. Cook, Gertrude M. Gilman, Andrew Hustrulid, Leonard M. Kaercher, Philip D. Kernan, Warren E. Soderberg, Kenneth T. Whitby.

Itasca Forestry and Biological Station Advisory Committee: E. W. Ziebarth (chairman), Randolph M. Brown, Raymond W. Darland (Duluth), Richard L. Evans (University of Wisconsin), Theodore H. Fenske, David W. French, A. C. Hodson, Frank H. Kaufert, R. E. Norris, Gerald B. Ownbey, Nelson T. Spratt, Jr., James C. Underhill.

Judiciary Council, All-University: Donald P. Duncan, James F. Hogg, Richard D. Springer, John G. Turnbull, LeVerne F. Snoxell, secretary, ex officio—Students: John M. Alexson, Elliot C. Rothenberg, Gerald W. Zamber, 2 students to be appointed.

Korean Advisory Committee: Malcolm M. Willey (chairman), Gaylord W. Anderson, Robert B. Howard, C. T. Johnson, John C. Kidneigh, L. R. Lunden, Harold Macy, Lloyd M. Short, A. F. Spilhaus, William T. S. Thorp, Tracy F. Tyler, ex officio, secretary.

Memorial Fund Committee, University of Minnesota: Mrs. Ralph F. Berdie (chairman), Mrs. Harold B. Allen, J. I. Brown, Thomas W. Chamberlin (Duluth), Joseph Davidson, ex officio, secretary, Mrs. Frank Hansen, Miss Ethel Harrington, Horace T. Morse, Frank F. Pieper.

Minnesota Center for the Philosophy of Science-Advisory Board: Paul E. Meehl (chairman), Robert H. Beck, Alan Donagan, Helmut G. K. Heinrich, Edward L. Hill, Gerhard K. Kalisch, Harold H. Kelley, Gardner Lindzey, Don A. Martindale, Richard B. McHugh.

Minnesota Program of Continuing Education for Women-Advisory Committee: E. W. Ziebarth (chairman), Elizabeth L. Cless, Errett W. McDiarmid, Julius M. Nolte, Virginia L. Senders, Edmund G. Williamson.

Minnesota Rhodes Scholars, Committee for: Edmund MacCorquodale (chairman), Eugene H. Falk, William A. McDonald, David H. Willson.

Parking Advisory Committee: Elio D. Monachesi (chairman), Harold Allen, C. Luverne Carlson, Frank E. DiGangi, Marcia Edwards, Theodore H. Fenske, Robert Hebbel, Glen V. Taylor—Students: Thomas R. Ringhofer, John H. Werner.

Placement Committee, All-University: Arnold Woestehoff (chairman), Clifford P. Archer, Edwin Emery, Gerald T. Evan, John C. Kidneigh, G. Gordon Kingsley, Keith N. McFarland, O. William Muckenhirn, Charles V. Netz, Roger B. Page, George Seltzer, Lloyd M. Short, Stanley J. Wenberg, Edmund G. Williamson.

Press Committee, University: Malcolm M. Willey (chairman), Bryce Crawford, Jr., John Ervin, Jr., Robert B. Howard, Harold Macy, Errett W. McDiarmid, Julius M. Nolte.

Public Administration Center Advisory Committee: Lloyd M. Short (chairman), Gaylord W. Anderson, Bryce Crawford, Jr., Kenneth C. Davis, Otto E. Domian, Paul V. Grambsch, James A. Hamilton, John C. Kidneigh, Errett W. McDiarmid, Keith N. McFarland, Julius M. Nolte, Orville C. Peterson, George J. Schroepfer, Edward B. Stanford, George A. Warp, Secretary.

Radiation Hazard Control Committee, All-University: W. D. Armstrong (chairman), Ruth E. Boynton, Norton M. Hintz, Herbert S. Isbin, C. T. Johnson, Roy V. Lund, Donn G. Mossler, Paul R. O'Connor, A. Glenn Richards, Francis A. Spurrell, Cecil J. Watson.

Radio Advisory Committee for KUOM: Julius M. Nolte (chairman), Mitchell V. Charnley, Norman J. DeWitt, Paul F. Dwan, Otis J. Dypwick, Marcia Edwards, Robert B. Howard, Richard L. Kozelka, Werner Levi, Don A. Martindale, Allen H. McCoid, Errett W. McDiarmid, Paul E. Meehl, Huntington Miller, William L. Nunn, Paul M. Oberg, Luther J. Pickrel, William C. Rogers, Skuli Rutford, Robert F. Spencer, Edward B. Stanford, Willard L. Thompson, Tracy F. Tyler, E. W. Ziebarth.

Radio-Television Policy Committee: Raymond B. Nixon (chairman), Ike Armstrong, Ernest G. Bormann, Asher N. Christensen, Roy G. Francis, Julian B. Hoshal (Duluth), James R. Jensen, Harold H. Kelley, L. R. Lunden, Julius M. Nolte, William L. Nunn, Burton Paulu, Skuli Rutford, Willard L. Thompson, Stanley J. Wenberg, Malcolm M. Willey, Edmund G. Williamson.

Residence Status, Board of Review on: Robert Edward Summers (chairman), Harvard W. Archerd, ex officio, David R. Briggs, Herbert G.

THREE—Senate Dockets—6004

Croom, ex officio, William Fleeson, Walter T. Graves, Theodore E. Kellogg, Robert C. McClure.

Schedule Committee, University: True E. Pettengill (chairman), Vernon L. Ausen, secretary, Steve S. Barich, Rodney A. Briggs, J. William Buchta, Thomas W. Chamberlin (Duluth), Wendell J. DeBoer, Richard J. Donnelly, Marcia Edwards, Richard Fitzgerald, J. Francis Hartmann, Mellor R. Holland, Ralph L. Kitchell, Reuel I. Lund, Shirley McDonald, Huntington Miller, Charles V. Netz, Roger B. Page, Leon Rottman, Robert C. Slater, Frederick D. Stockdale, Alfred L. Vaughan, E. W. Ziebarth—Students: Herman Frismanis, John A. Marshall, 1 to be appointed.

Scholarship Committee, University: Nolan C. Kearney (chairman), William S. Howell, Mrs. V. L. Peterson, Charles Judd Ringer, George B. Risty, executive secretary, Roy M. Stensvad, Robert Edward Summers, Edmund G. Williamson, Ray H. Witt.

Single-Quarter Leave Committee: George A. Thiel (chairman), Sherwood O. Berg, Bryce Crawford, Jr., Marcia Edwards, Stuart W. Fenton, William G. Kubicek, Tracy F. Tyler, Secretary, Malcolm M. Willey.

Space Allocation and Use, Advisory Committee on: Robert Edward Summers (chairman), Richard G. Bond, Winston A. Close, Reuben L. Hill, Jr., Arnold Lazarow, Roy V. Lund, Laurence R. Lunden, Horace T. Morse, Ralph G. Nichols, Eugene P. Pfeider, Willard L. Thompson, Malcolm M. Willey.

Span Committee, University: Mitchell V. Charnley (chairman), James I. Brown, Asher N. Christensen, Martin Snoko, Gerhard H. Weiss.

Staff Welfare Fund Committee: Cecil J. Watson (chairman), Ray F. Archer, Werner V. Boehm, William H. Edson, Marjorie J. Gerlich, Roy V. Lund, L. R. Lunden, Keith N. McFarland, O. William Muckenhirn, Will M. Myers, Sheldon C. Reed, George Seltzer.

State Organization Service Advisory Committee: Julius M. Nolte, (chairman), J. William Buchta, Mitchell V. Charnley, Walter W. Cook, Bryce Crawford, Jr., Stuart W. Fenton, Richard L. Kozelka, Harold Macy, Robert C. McClure, Errett W. McDiarmid, C. H. McLaughlin, Orville C. Peterson, William C. Rogers, Arnold M. Rose, Ralph G. Ross, Skuli Rutford, Lloyd M. Short, W. Albert Sullivan, Stanley J. Wenberg, Edmund G. Williamson, E. W. Ziebarth.

Student Behavior, Committee on: William J. Micheels (chairman), Sherwood O. Berg, John J. Cound, Frank E. DiGangi, William W. Fletcher, Charles Hatfield, G. Gordon Kingsley, Thomas E. Murphy, Ephraim Rosen, Martin L. Snoko, LeVerne F. Snoxell, secretary, E. Paul Torrance—Students: Ross W. Olmsted, Gary A. Ordfield, Susan F. Rhame, Clarence E. Taylor, Mary J. Woestehoff.

Summer Research Appointments, Committee on: Bryce Crawford, Jr. (chairman), Marcia Edwards, Stuart W. Fenton, Roxana R. Ford, Paul V. Grambsch, George P. Hager, Errett W. McDiarmid, George A. Thiel.

Summer Session Advisory Committee: E. W. Ziebarth (chairman), David K. Berninghausen, Marcia Edwards, Keith N. McFarland, Valworth R. Plumb (Duluth), William G. Shepherd, Donald Smith, Frank Verbrugge, Albert K. Wickesberg, C. Gilbert Wrenn.

Television Program Advisory Committee: Burton Paulu (chairman), Robert H. Beck, John R. Borchert, Ernest B. Brown, Jr., Mitchell V. Charnley, Norman DeWitt, Roy G. Francis, James R. Jensen, Benjamin J. Lazan, William P. Martin, Raymond B. Nixon, Julius M. Nolte, William L. Nunn, Donald K. Smith, Harold B. Swanson, Willard L. Thompson, E. W. Ziebarth.

Tenure Advisory Committee: Malcolm M. Willey (chairman), Harold W. Chase, Theda Hagenah, Nathan Lifson, Arthur J. Madden, Robert C. McClure, Tracy F. Tyler, ex officio, secretary, Roy D. Wilcoxson, Donald L. Winkelmann.

University College Committee: J. William Buchta (chairman) W. D. Armstrong, Francis M. Boddy, Mitchell V. Charnley, Bryce Crawford, Jr., Marcia Edwards, Robert J. Holloway, James J. Jenkins, Richard Jordon, Helen A. Ludwig, Keith N. McFarland, Morris E. Nicholson, Maynard E. Pirsig, Robert Edward Summers, Donald R. Torbert, Alfred L. Vaughan.

VI. STUDENT ORGANIZATION STAFF REPRESENTATIVES OR ADVISERS FOR 1960-61

Reported for Information

The President reports student organization staff representatives or advisers for 1960-61 as follows:

Board in Control of Student Publications, Staff Representatives on: David K. Berninghausen, J. Edward Gerald, Clifford I. Haga, George S. Hage, Martin L. Snoko, Harold P. Strom, financial adviser.

Minnesota Student Association, Staff Representatives: Paul H. Cashman, Kenneth E. Clark, Robert H. Miller.

Social Service Council, Staff Advisers: Edward J. Dvorak, Rodney C. Loehr, Robert P. Marvin, Howard A. Morris, Valatrice E. Shrimpton.

Technolog Board, Staff Representatives on: Paul A. Cartwright, Jesse E. Fant, Eugene Stolarik.

Union Board of Governors, Staff Representatives on: David L. LaBerge, Forrest G. Moore, Walfred L. Pedersen, Elmer L. Thomas, Douglas Wolf-angle (alumni representative).

Union Board of Governors, St. Paul Campus, Staff Representatives on: Selmer A. Engene, David N. Kanatz, Paul W. Larson, Donald Low, Helen A. Ludwig, Keith N. McFarland, Mrs. Keith N. McFarland (alumni representative), Gordon L. Starr.

Union Board of Governors, University Village, Staff Representative on: Harold P. Strom.

Staff representatives and advisers to other student organizations are listed in the Student Organization Roster, available at the Student Activities Bureau.

VII. UNIVERSITY CALENDAR, 1960-61

Reported for Information

The Clerk of the Senate reports the following change:

Cap and Gown Day from May 18 to May 25 to avoid conflict with the Metropolitan Opera which is scheduled to be on campus from May 17 through May 21.

VIII. REPORT OF THE ADMINISTRATIVE COMMITTEE

Reported for Information

1. *Meeting Schedule and Responsibilities of the Administrative Committee.* In opening the first meeting of the Administrative Committee at which he presided, July 15, 1960, President O. Meredith Wilson referred to the work and meeting schedule of the committee and called for discussion of these matters. It was proposed that there be established a tentative schedule of meetings on the second Wednesday of each month. Whenever possible, the agenda will be made known to the membership in advance of each meeting. The President invited the members to submit items for consideration, normally 10 days before the meetings at which they should be presented.

Attention was turned to the functions of the Administrative Committee, both as an official action group and as a body to help and support the President as he presents the unified voice of the University. The real resolving body of the University is, of course, the faculty. The President asked for identification of the areas in which the committee has responsibility for formal action and Dean Lockhart was requested to advise him on this, after referring to the Constitution of the University Senate and to other rules of the University.

At the August 1960 meeting Dean Lockhart described two functions which might call for formal action by this committee: (1) budget recommendations affecting the University as a whole and (2) approval of teaching materials prepared by staff members for sale to students (when questions on approval are referred by the secretary). Additionally, by long established custom, the committee has acted on proposals for the awarding of University honors and on the University calendar. It was therefore suggested that it might be desirable to continue formal action on these last two matters. The committee gave tacit approval to the substance of Dean Lockhart's report after having discussed the subjects of past action.

2. *Information on Major Conferences at the University.* Many off-campus groups meet on campuses of the University and these, particularly when they involve large numbers of people and extensive use of facilities, seem to call for administrative notice and effective co-ordination of the use of rooms, housing, dining facilities, and the like. A form for gathering information on such conferences had been prepared by Vice President Willey and Director Nunn, in collaboration with service and scheduling agencies of the University. Copies of that form were distributed to the committee and were incorporated in the secretary's minutes.

No action was called for, or was taken, and it was indicated that use of the form is not a requirement for administration approval, but rather a means of providing the co-ordination necessary to serve our visitors effectively without interfering with the regular work of the University. The President remarked that he would not only use this means of learning of major conferences but would also like to hear of other important meetings on campus. He therefore invited the deans and directors to advise him by letter of significant small conferences which they think should be brought to his attention.

3. *Fund Drives on Campus.* The President read a letter from Mr. William O. Cook, director, and Professor Samuel H. Popper, assistant director of our 1961 Consolidated Drive for United Fund and Voluntary Agencies. The letter stressed the importance of this year's on-campus drive and of the manner of solicitation and the support obtained from a consolidated drive. It called attention to the availability of payroll deduction procedures and suggested that staff members make full use of these in providing a generous response. No action was taken or requested.

On the St. Paul Campus the fund drive will be conducted as usual, in conjunction with the St. Paul Community Chest. Possible inconsistencies and unanswered questions remain in the co-operation which the University extends to fund drives, on its several different campuses.

4. *Periodic Medical Examinations for Major Administrative Personnel.* There was a review, by Vice President Willey, of the earlier discussion in the Administrative Committee and in recent meetings of the Regents of a proposal for periodic medical examinations for major administrative personnel. President Morrill had reported informally to the Regents on the expression of the Administrative Committee (as recorded in the minutes of March 16, 1960) and had raised questions on compulsory examinations and regarding the possible administrative uses of examination results. The consensus of the Regents was that the best interest of the University would be served by requiring some form of examination.

Vice President Willey had then assembled a group of consultants for revision of the sections of the proposed statement which had evoked questions. In brief, it was agreed that the plan might call for general and descriptive reports of examination results to the President, along with medical interpretations. In those cases in which the results are unfavorable, there would be conference among interested individuals and review as necessary by a special committee of physicians set up by the Health Service.

Questions were asked concerning the responsibility and practices of the University in dealing with ill or incapacitated members of the faculty

and the time limits which might apply before retirement or replacement action would be taken. It was remarked that in the absence of a clear means of providing relief in certain cases of incapacitated staff, little or nothing is done administratively. The Regents might like to define what they would do in extreme cases, it was suggested.

Discussion in the Regents' meeting had to do particularly with the hiatus resulting from sudden loss of key people and it was said that the Regents were perhaps thinking of the need for continuity of University operation where as this committee has understandably focused its attention on the welfare of the individuals. It appeared as the sense of the discussion in the Administrative Committee that the deans accept the proposal of the Regents, in principle. They believe that it now requires the drafting of a statement of exact procedures for implementation of such a plan, assuming that the Regents will open this issue to broader consideration.

5. *Procedure for Review of Medical Data on Human Volunteers in Certain Research Projects.* The Health Service had been asked to do physical examinations on certain research subjects (human volunteers) who might incur unknown illnesses or disabilities as a result of scientific experiments. Dr. Boynton had considered one such request with Dr. Howard and his associates, since the Medical School has a committee to deal with problems growing out of medical research. It was asked if the University should make use of this committee for the purpose of obtaining advance approval for involvement of human subjects in research which might affect the health of the individuals. Since there appeared to be agreement concerning the need for this work, and on the appropriateness of the referral made, the President asked that the Medical School committee assume the responsibility, at least until there is reason to review the matter.

6. *Recommendations on University Honors.* The Committee on University Honors had recommended the outstanding achievement award for a nominee of the College of Agriculture, Forestry, and Home Economics. After brief review of the several types of University honors, it was moved, seconded, and voted to endorse this recommendation. Further action was taken on award of an honorary degree.

7. *Election of the President's Assistant, Willard L. Thompson, to Committee Membership.* At the September 1960 meeting, President Wilson introduced Willard L. Thompson, his assistant, and asked that Mr. Thompson be made a member of this committee. It was moved, seconded, and voted to grant membership to Mr. Thompson.

8. *Legislative Requests for the 1961-63 Biennium.* In the July 1960 meeting Vice President Lunden discussed background for the new Legislative request. He mentioned how University needs had been related to programs in the presentation to the Legislative Building Commission.

The President asked for views of the committee on compensation matters and on the comparative salary position of the University and inquired as to the development of a long-range program for staffing and financing the University for its expected growth. There was reference to the competition that the institution faces in recruiting and retaining staff.

The business vice president was asked to obtain an expression of needs from the several deans and directors, these statements to be genuine and responsible requests setting forth optimal requirements. Included would be judgments on the staff compensation gains which would enable the colleges not only to hold their own but also to provide justifiable and better services to the state. There should be a re-examination of our goals, and attention given to redistribution of present resources to do different things while enrollment may be on something of a plateau. These new or different things might involve new research as well as better staffing or new teaching.

There was a request that internal budgeting of the University be done earlier, especially for the second year of any biennium. The President promised that central offices would do all possible to get budgets out early or to make clear how departments might proceed in necessary early hiring of staff.

At the August meeting President Wilson commented on the problem which most colleges and universities face in forecasting their size and work load and emphasized the importance of aid from all teaching units in the gathering of data pertinent to college populations. He asked that each college budget officer make a judgment on fall 1961, 1962, and 1963 attendance, based on the most complete educational plans and experience available. These estimates should be made class by class and should define trends which will be most apparent to the teaching units themselves. They were to be available for summarization and review by Dean Summers not later than September 1, 1960. Reference was made to various research studies and to current experience with admission and registration of students.

There was extensive discussion of a program for faculty salary improvement, extending not only through the 1961-63 biennium but perhaps through about the next three bienniums. There appeared to be agreement that approximately equal yearly increments of percentage salary would be best for the state and for the University, within any single biennium.

In the discussion of increases in academic staff which should be forecast and provided for, it was clear that certain professional colleges with largely fixed student populations will present program-based justifications, unrelated to their enrollments, if they are to provide for development or for new responsibilities which cannot be financed out of reallocation of present funds. The President will need, and expect, persuasive arguments for new or nonenrollment related staffing. Colleges and universities, everywhere, must be markedly vigilant in maintaining the best balance of functions and objectives, it was said. For us to accept this challenge is, it seems, in the University's tradition of doing new and better things and is a responsibility of the various teaching units.

Supply and equipment budgets were referred to as in desperate need of being increased, especially for the purposes of undergraduate teaching. This situation is to be taken into account in the legislative planning.

By the time of the September meeting the deans had prepared Legislative requests, 1961-63, dealing with costs over and above the items in the current printed budgets. These requests were totaled and summarized and Vice President Lunden passed out three schedules which gave gross figures for the University. In general, the expense items fell into the categories of those related to the present program and those to be encountered if programs are changed or services added.

There followed extensive examination of the schedules. The President expressed his belief that much of the additional staff indicated was surely not intended solely for use in present activities or to provide for a lower student-teacher ratio. Applied to present work, this staff addition would result in marked reduction of the ratio, across the University. It seemed that the colleges had perhaps expected to establish additional functions with some of the staff, and several of the deans indicated that new programs or curricular changes were, in fact, to be dealt with. On the contrary, certain members stated that a catch-up job is to be done in the provision of faculty, as in staffing for research or increase of supply and equipment resources for the present work. The President said that he hoped to identify the deferred needs, especially in undergraduate instruction, and to set goals for related more adequate staffing, perhaps over a period of about three bienniums. This, it seemed, might be done without lowering student-teacher ratios.

Discussion turned again to the salary improvement needs of the University, a matter which the deans had been invited to deal with in special letters to the President. There was discussion of the percentages of increase in salary budget money which might reasonably be applied directly to salaries or indirectly to staff benefits (insurance, retirement, and the like) to enable the University to occupy a place of distinction among comparable universities. Consideration was given to the use of salary improvement money in across-the-board vs. discretionary allocations, and to the problems created by either plan. Civil Service salary rate changes were discussed.

In preparing for the next legislative request, the Regents had approved certain principles, the President reported. These were (1) that there be a salary improvement program, as described by the President, this to provide for approximately equal yearly growth in the total of new salary and staff benefits, (2) that a suitable factor should be incorporated in the requests for funds to provide for the obsolescence and depreciation of academic equipment, (3) that there be introduced into budgeting a per-student unit for the consumable goods (supplies and expenses) of instruction—the actual unit to be determined through further analysis, and (4) that in its budgeting the University not necessarily relate its costs directly to student numbers, at least not overall. The last principle would provide for programmatic changes and for differences between major segments of the University. All of these principles the Regents endorsed on a permissive basis, without restriction as to the methods of calculation which will apply in some cases.

The President indicated that application of the principles to budgeting for 1961-63 would result in a projection of very large needs. He called for discussion of the methods which might be invoked, and particularly those to substantiate the request for additional faculty members. There was consideration of the estimated and actual student attendance of recent years and inquiry into the student-faculty ratios prevailing or to be maintained. The President gave his support to methods which would depict the various functions of the University and show it to be an institution dealing with different kinds of students under various types of instruction. Internal deployment of resources would need to be consistent with encountered staff requirements and the distribution of teaching loads.

After extensive discussion in which a number of college questions were raised, the President suggested the use of several ratios of students to faculty, rather than a single over-all ratio. This, it seemed, would better justify the true faculty needs and suggest the multiple and special purposes of the University. Several members of the Committee expressed themselves as enthusiastic about the proposal; others had reservations growing out of such things as definition of a faculty member, how service teaching loads would be provided for, variable program lengths, and the risk inherent in use of any formula for staffing. There developed a consensus that the University could proceed in estimating staff needs by the method discussed, assuming that there would be refinement in the details.

Reference was made to the larger-than-forecast attendance just reported for the Fall Quarter 1960. The President indicated that the student estimates for the next biennium might now seem to be too small, but that it seemed wise to proceed with these inasmuch as they would support modest claims and since much of the work of preparing the legislative request had already been based on the early figures. The principles on which the University would make its request would in no case be altered by small changes in the student forecasts. Vice President Lunden placed before the Committee preliminary estimates for the elements of a legislative request.

Discussion followed, in the course of which reference was made to staff benefits, such as insurance, medical coverage, and the retirement provision; to the known program changes planned; and to various salary and supply items. Preliminary totals were derived. These were considered in relationship to the work of the University, as were ways in which costs might be reduced or activities eliminated.

IX. REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE ON BUSINESS AND RULES

1. Reported for Action

Elections Units. The present By-Law on election units reads as follows:
By-Laws, Article I, Section 1.

For the purpose of electing members to the Senate, qualified faculty members shall vote as members within each of the following units of the University: (1) Agriculture, (2) Business Administration, (3) Veterinary Medicine, (4) Dentistry, (5) Duluth, (6) Education, (7) Extension Division, (8) General College, (9) Law, (10) Medical Sciences, (11) Pharmacy, (12) Physical Education for Men, (14) Science, Literature, and the Arts, (15) Technology, and (16) Mayo Foundation.

During the past year the University of Minnesota, Morris was established as a separate collegiate unit. In recognition of this development the following action is recommended:

PROPOSED

That By-Laws, Article I, Senate Membership, Elections, and Officers, Section 1 be amended to add Morris as a voting unit.

2. Reported for Information

1. Review of Article III, Section 4(a), Constitution.

Your committee on February 5, 1959 reminded the Senate that in June 1959 5 years will have passed since the June 13, 1954 effective date of the Senate Constitution and called attention to By-Laws, Article I, Section 6 which reads as follows:

By-Laws, Article I, Section 6

The Senate shall review the provisions of Article III, Section 4 (a), of the Constitution of the Senate at the end of five years following the effective date of the Constitution, in order to determine whether changes should be made in the formula utilized in the election of members of the Senate.

The section of the Constitution referred to in the above by-law reads as follows:

Constitution, Article III, Section 4 (a)

The elected members of the Senate shall be chosen by secret ballot by the faculties of the several institutes, colleges, or schools of collegiate rank as follows: The regular members of each faculty who are professors or associate professors shall jointly elect from their rank (professors and associate professors) one Senate member for each ten of their regular members or fraction of that number holding such rank. The regular members of each faculty who are assistant professors (including research associates) or instructors (including research fellows) shall jointly elect from their ranks one Senate member for each forty of their regular members or fraction of that number holding such rank. The provisions hereof shall not apply to the election of the representatives of the Mayo Foundation.

The Senate took the following action.

Action: It was voted to request the Senate Committee on Business and Rules to review this section of the Constitution, obtain the opinion of the faculty, and bring a recommendation to the Senate.

The committee then considered various procedures and voted, as a means of obtaining the opinion of the faculty, to include in the docket of the March 12, 1959 Senate meeting a call for suggestions. This was done. No recommendations for change in Article III, Section (4)a of the Constitution were received and your committee sees no reason to change the formula.

2. Suggestions Regarding Article III, Section 4(e).

Your committee has received some suggestions with respect to Article III, Section 4(e). These suggestions came from two sources, namely, May 1, 1959 from a member of the Senate, and April 20, 1960 from the Advisory Committee of the College of Science, Literature, and the Arts. In general, the suggestions center upon length of term of senators and the composition of Senate committees. Your committee has also given consideration to a possible change in the date of election.

Your committee has been hesitant to proceed because it believes that under the Constitution and By-Laws it lacks the power to originate amendments to the Constitution unless directed by the Senate to consider such matters. If the Senate desires the committee to consider possible amendments to Article III, Section 4(e) or other parts of the Constitution the Senate should ask the committee to do so.

The section of the Constitution referred to reads as follows:

Constitution, Article III, Section 4(e)

Annual elections to the Senate shall be held no later than the 20th day of October. Faculty members elected to the Senate shall serve for one year and/or until their successors shall be elected and qualified. They shall be eligible for re-election.

ELIO D. MONACHESI, Chairman

X. REPORT OF THE FACULTY CONSULTATIVE COMMITTEE

Reported for Information

The Faculty Consultative Committee believes that the Senate Forum, established a year ago, has performed a valuable function in fostering better communication among members of the University community and that its importance will grow. We are, therefore, proposing that the Forum be continued. The membership of the Editorial Board, a subcommittee of the Faculty Consultative Committee, will be announced.

A brief account of the Forum through its first year, prepared by the editorial board, follows:

"Three issues of the Senate Forum appeared, containing 20 articles, 4 letters, and 2 editorials. These covered a wide range of topics, and represented an attempt by the editors to have expressions from diverse interests on important issues. The editors did not receive an abundance of pertinent material for consideration, and recommend more active faculty participation in the Forum."

Your committee is aware of the need for maintaining contact with the faculty so that it can perform properly its function of communicating faculty viewpoints to the President and presidential comment to the faculty. We have discussed various ways of keeping ourselves informed of faculty problems and opinions. The most effective means by which faculty members can be sure that we are aware of matters of concern to them or of their reactions to important issues is by direct communication, preferably in writing, to a member of the committee. We solicit such communications from you. The Senate Forum, mentioned above, is a medium for airing the pros and cons of issues of concern to the faculty. We urge faculty members to make use of the Forum.

Plans have been made for a visit of your committee to the new campus at Morris on October 26 where we will meet with members of the faculty. During the winter term we expect again to go to Duluth for a meeting with our colleagues of the Duluth Campus. Consideration is being given to one or more evening meetings on the Twin Cities campuses at which there can be an open discussion of topics of current interest. The committee would appreciate comments regarding the merits of such meetings.

The Faculty Consultative Committee has noted with satisfaction the positive steps taken by the Administration and the Board of Regents in improvement of "fringe benefits" for the faculty. This is a matter of prime importance in maintaining the strength of the University through attraction and retention of a superior faculty. In connection with this topic, the Senate is urged to familiarize itself with the report of the Subcommittee on Faculty Attraction and Retention of the Senate Committee on Education, and the supporting research study by the Bureau of Institutional Research which has been circulated to the faculty. Significant improvements have already been made, for example, making available major medical expense insurance through payroll deduction. However, because retirement, insurance, and other fringe benefits are so important to the faculty, continuing intensive study of means for further improvements is imperative.

W. M. MYERS, Chairman

XI. REPORT OF THE SPECIAL COMMITTEE ON THE ROBBINSDALE PROPOSAL

Reported for Action

On January 11, 1960, the School Board of Independent School District No. 281 adopted the following resolution, which was then transmitted through the President of the University to the Board of Regents:

"Resolved, That we, the School Board of Independent School District No. 281, respectfully request the University of Minnesota to establish University classes in the Robbinsdale Senior High School beginning with the fall term of 1960-61."

When this resolution was received by President Morrill, he considered alternatives for handling it. Since this was a formal action by a school board and addressed to the Regents of the University, it was the President's judgment that it merited special attention. Moreover, it appeared to involve proposals that could have wide ramifications with respect to the University's instructional program. Accordingly, on March 15, 1960, President Morrill created a special committee on "The Robbinsdale Experiment in University-High School Relationships," and to this committee he named:

- Vice President Malcolm M. Willey, *chairman*
- Associate Dean Marcia Edwards
- Professor Reuben L. Hill
- Professor Robert J. Keller
- Dean E. W. McDiarmid
- Dean Julius M. Nolte
- Professor Lloyd M. Short
- Professor Donald K. Smith
- Professor John E. Stecklein
- Professor Martin Steinmann, Jr.
- Dean R. E. Summers
- Associate Dean Frank Verbrugge
- Vice President Stanley J. Wenberg

In establishing this committee, the President had in mind that the Robbinsdale proposal might be a useful experiment and present unique opportunities (a) to identify and motivate superior high school students, and (b) to help students make the transition from high school to college less painfully. Informal conferences with representatives of the Robbinsdale School system had suggested that consideration of these two opportunities lay behind the board's action.

Subsequently the University Senate, after expressing its conviction that action on the Robbinsdale resolution would affect University educational policy and, therefore, was the business of the Senate as a whole as well as of its Committee on Education and its Committee on Institutional Relationships, on June 2, 1960 voted that "The question of whether the University of Minnesota should this fall establish university classes at the Robbinsdale Senior High School be referred to the appropriate committee or committees of the Senate for recommendation and Senate action." It was then voted that the presently constituted special committee on the Robbinsdale Experiment on University-High School Relationships be designated a special committee of the Senate.

The Robbinsdale Committee had devoted its first meeting, on March 25, 1960, to a general discussion of the relationship the proposal might have to the general educational policy of the University. Questions were also raised about operating problems, such as staffing, transportation, library and other facilities, and with special concern about the University's ability to keep standards high should this pattern of educational activity include other school systems. It was taken for granted by the committee that expansion to other schools would follow any successful experiment at Robbinsdale. The committee's concern from the outset was not so much with Robbinsdale *per se*, as with (so to speak) many Robbinsdales. The discussions of this meeting and of other meetings of the committee have been summarized in comprehensive minutes.

In concluding its discussion on March 25, 1960, the committee requested its chairman to arrange conferences which it believed would be helpful in further consideration of the Robbinsdale proposal: with the State Commissioner of Education to obtain his general reaction to the proposal and to raise certain questions regarding relationships between the State Department of Education and the Independent School District No. 281 (regarding, for example, the school's eligibility for state aids, on the assumption that the contemplated courses of the Robbinsdale plan would fall within the regularly scheduled high school day) should the proposal in some form be accepted; and with representative secondary schoolmen to get their reactions.

On April 28, 1960, the chairman met with Commissioner Dean Schweickhard and Assistant Commissioner Farley Bright. Commissioner Schweickhard said that consideration of any proposals looking toward early identification of superior students, the betterment of their education, and an easier transition from high school to college merited careful study. Regarding school-aid allotments, the commissioner categorically stated that, if the Robbinsdale High School observed the minimum requirements for high school graduation, no problem of state aid would be involved. He said also that he could think of nothing about the proposal that would adversely affect the relationships between the Robbinsdale High School and the State Department of Education.

Two conferences with secondary schoolmen were held: the first on May 19, 1960 with members of the Hennepin County School Study Council; the second, on June 3, 1960, with superintendents and principals from Ramsey, Anoka, Washington, and Dakota counties. At both of these meetings, Dr. Robert J. Keller, chairman of the Senate Committee on Institutional Relationships, presided. Extensive summaries of these two meetings were prepared and distributed to members of the committee to help them in further consideration of the original proposal. Copies also were sent to the conference participants.

In these two conferences, while there was careful attention to the Robbinsdale proposal, great emphasis was also placed upon acceleration programs. Discussions of them were partly on the Advanced Placement Program of the College Entrance Examination Board, and partly on devices that the University of Minnesota might itself introduce, or already has introduced, to advance superior students more rapidly. Indeed, there were times during the discussions when it was difficult to say whether the meeting was primarily concerned with the Robbinsdale proposal or with advanced placement programs generally. These discussions served to make the members of the committee realize more clearly the close relationship between the Robbinsdale proposal and programs of advanced placement, and also make clear the earnest concern of the participating schoolmen both with improving the high school curriculum and with identifying and stimulating abler students.

Careful review of the minutes of these conferences suggests a high degree of agreement on the following:

1. There is need, before introducing new devices and new machinery, to take full advantage of the possibilities that the Advanced Placement Program and existing University programs already offer in achieving the purposes that appear to constitute the premises of the Robbinsdale resolution.
2. Enrichment of high school instruction is primarily a responsibility of the high schools and not of the colleges. This position was forcefully put by one superintendent who said that the need is to bring high school instruction up to the level of collegiate instruction so that transition will be easy, not to bring collegiate instruction down to the level of the high school. Responsibility for enrichment of high school instruction, it was repeatedly stressed, is a responsibility of the high schools, not the colleges. Interesting superior students is a problem for high schools and solutions found by some of them were described and discussed.

The high school student, moreover, often has a difficult problem as he moves from high school to college, but the Robbinsdale proposal seemed to offer no general solution.

3. A problem intensified by the recent population growth and likely to worsen is that of providing educational opportunity to suburban youth. There is no doubt that schoolmen have this much on their minds.

The committee, having reviewed all these materials, reached the conclusion that, whatever opportunities acceptance of the Robbinsdale proposal might provide for one group of high school students, both practical and educational considerations strongly argue that the University should not accept it. The implications are so far reaching, and would impose upon the University educational commitments so extensive, that it was seriously questioned by a majority of the committee whether the University could introduce any staff projects of this kind without undercutting the integrity of its existing collegiate activities. Clearly one could not stop with a single school district.

Furthermore, a proposal such as Robbinsdale's does so centrally touch upon educational policies regarding improvement of high school instruction, that the University should think most carefully before approving even a single experiment. In brief, acceptance of the Robbinsdale proposal, whatever good it might do for Robbinsdale, would have other now-unknown effects elsewhere. These need to be analyzed and considered.

The committee, as well as the schoolmen with whom conferences were held, do regard the Robbinsdale proposal as a valuable stimulus to further analysis of the larger problems of which it is one manifestation. The analysis thus stimulated, it is a unanimous conviction, cannot be permitted to end here. The committee agrees unanimously that the action of the Robbinsdale Board imposes upon the University the obligation of immediate and intensive study of some of the larger questions that have emerged from its discussion of the Robbinsdale resolution. The committee therefore recommends:

1. That the Senate recommend to the President and the Regents that the University decline the request of the School of Independent School District No. 281 to establish classes in the Robbinsdale Senior High School.
2. That the Senate request its Committee on Education and its Committee on Institutional Relationships to create a subcommittee with joint membership from these two committees, to study the University's participation in the national Advanced Placement Program, including its credit aspects, and also review and evaluate present or proposed University policies that look toward similar objectives through credit by examination, the development of advanced standing tests, etc. It is further recommended that there be on this committee representation from the Committee on Admissions and Orientation Testing. The Committee was impressed by a review of what the University already has to offer, but it likewise believes that the present advanced placement programs of the University are not fully understood, and that there are possibilities for stimulating the interests and abilities of able students which have not yet been fully explored.
3. That the Senate request its Committee on Education, its Committee on Institutional Relationships, and its Committee on General Extension, or a subcommittee drawn from them, working with the General Extension Division, to enter immediately upon exploratory studies to appraise the desirability of developing in the metropolitan area, or even elsewhere, University Extension Centers which might offer educational opportunities for high school students as well as high school teachers and other residents in their vicinities.

The recommendations made above, the committee believes, have the merit of relating the University not just to a single school district, but to the metropolitan area.

The committee believes that vigorous pursuit of its recommendations by the appropriate committees would serve a further useful purpose of strengthening the relationships between the University and the secondary schools of the area. The desire for such intensified contact was expressed in various ways by the schoolmen in the conferences that were initiated by the committee.

MALCOLM M. WILLEY, Chairman

XII. REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE ON SENATE COMMITTEES

Reported for Information

1. The Committee on Senate Committees has received suggestions occasionally to propose the establishment of a new standing committee—a Committee on Faculty Welfare. Although there are various special committees in the University concerned with such matters as insurance and retirement, hospitalization, medical care, housing for new faculty members, and similar matters, it has been pointed out that there is no direct Senate contact with these committees, and furthermore that there is no single committee which is immediately concerned with over-all faculty welfare.

The Committee on Senate Committees accordingly invites additional suggestions from all members of the faculty concerning the scope of topics and activities of such a committee, if it should be established, and a further expression of the desirability of recommending the establishment of a Committee on Faculty Welfare. Suggestions may be made orally or in writing to any member of the Committee on Senate Committees.

2. At intervals over the last few years, since the new constitution of the University Senate went into effect, proposals have been submitted to the Committee on Senate Committees suggesting changes in the way in which members of standing committees of the Senate are appointed. The present method, according to the constitution, is for members of all standing committees (with the exception of the Faculty Consultative Committee) to be appointed by the President with confirmation by the Senate.

Among proposals submitted to the Committee on Senate Committees for changes in procedure are the following: Election of membership to the Committee on Senate Committees by the Senate itself; recommendation of membership in standing committees by the Committee on Senate Committees with confirmation by the President and Senate; nomination to standing committee membership by the President to the Committee on Senate Committees, with subsequent confirmation by the Senate; and a suggestion that membership on all standing committees be limited to members of the Senate.

The Committee on Senate Committees wishes to have a further expression of faculty opinion on the desirability of proposing a change in the method of appointing Senate committees, and also further suggestions as to the direction which such a change might take. Your committee accordingly invites comments from faculty members on these points to any member of the Committee on Senate Committees. The membership of the committee is listed below.

David Berninghausen
William Martin
William McEwen (Duluth)
Clifford N. Wall
H. T. Morse, Chairman

(There will be a pause in the proceedings to permit the seating of the non-Senate members of the Committee on Education, Committee on Institutional Relationships, and Committee on Intercollegiate Athletics for the discussion of their reports.)

XIII. REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION

Reported for Information

The Committee on Education takes pleasure in transmitting to the Senate the report of its Subcommittee on Faculty Attraction and Retention. The report, as revised, has the endorsement of the Committee on Education. This report, and the research report which preceded it, deal with matters of major concern to the entire University. We commend the findings and recommendations in the report to the appropriate administrative officers, faculty committees, and other staff units in the University. Since many of the matters dealt with in the report are somewhat peripheral to the jurisdiction of the Committee on Education, we recommend that the Senate consider the creation of one or more special or standing committees to which these matters may more appropriately be referred for implementation.

LLOYD M. SHORT, Chairman

Final Report of the Subcommittee on Attraction and Retention of Faculty, Senate Committee on Education, University of Minnesota

FACTORS INFLUENCING THE ATTRACTION AND RETENTION OF FACULTY AT THE UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA

I. Introduction

This report grows out of 3 years of work by the subcommittee, following its creation by the Senate Committee on Education in February 1957. It is designed to supplement the published report entitled, *Faculty Attraction and Retention—Factors Affecting Faculty Mobility at the University of Minnesota*, by John E. Stecklein and Robert L. Lathrop, Bureau of Institutional Research, University of Minnesota, February 1960.

Following organizational meetings in the spring of 1957, it was decided that the principal focus of the subcommittee's activity should be upon a research study of individuals who had recently faced the complex issues involved in a decision to join, remain with, or leave the University of Minnesota faculty. To permit adequate statistical coverage it was decided to base the study on a 2-year period beginning July 1, 1956. The focus of this report is on data provided by the following four groups:

1. Individuals who recently came to the University from other employment.
2. Individuals who received but rejected offers to join the University faculty.
3. Individuals who left the University during the period in question but prior to retirement, and whose retention was desired by their departments.
4. Individuals who received firm offers of employment outside the University but rejected them, choosing to remain on the Minnesota faculty.

The principal effort of the research was directed toward identifying reasons for the decisions of these four faculty groups. The records of 573 individuals were initially involved in the study. Of this number a total of 260 interview schedules and 151 mail questionnaires were included in the final tabulation.

Study Group	Total Number in Group	Number of Completed Schedules Included in the Study
1. Accepted Minnesota offer	150	
Personally interviewed		150
2. Rejected Minnesota offer	110	
Returned completed mail questionnaires.....		94
3. Left Minnesota	116	
Departments wanted to keep	67	
Returned completed mail questionnaires.....		57
4. Rejected outside offers	197	
Personally interviewed		110 ^a
TOTALS	573	411

^a A 60 per cent stratified sample of the population was drawn and interviews completed with 110 persons.

A detailed explanation of procedures followed, problems of definition and measurement, and forms and questionnaires used will be found in the published report by Mr. Stecklein and Mr. Lathrop. The report, as published, passed through several revisions in which subcommittee members actively participated. The published report meets with the subcommittee's approval and carries its strong endorsement. The subcommittee wishes at this point to record its admiration for the high level of professional skill and research talent contributed by Mr. Stecklein and Mr. Lathrop. Primary credit for execution of the study and preparation of the published report rests with them. Responsibility for initiation of the study, responsibility for the definition of the study groups, and in broad outline, the questions to be asked rests with the subcommittee.

In presenting the published report to the Senate Committee on Education and to the University faculty, the subcommittee felt that it should be reproduced in sufficient quantities to be readily available to all interested University staff members and to interested officials in other educational institutions. This feeling reflects the subcommittee's belief that this study constitutes a pioneering undertaking in empirical research into the academic labor market, about which there are many and varied opinions but virtually no solid research data.

After examining the research report, the subcommittee concluded that the University has been reasonably successful in attracting and maintaining a top quality faculty. The situation is, however, not perfect; some improvement can be made. Because the subcommittee believed that interpretive observations and recommendations related to such improvement might be subject to misinterpretation by the non-University reader and out of place in a widely circulated report, it submits this supplemental report to the University Senate through the Committee on Education. *It must be made clear that this supplemental report is not intended to provide the reader with a balanced synopsis of the research findings. Rather, it is written to focus attention upon areas in which the University can and should increase its attractiveness both to present and prospective faculty members.*

II. The Cumulative Effects of University Reputation and Prestige

One of the conclusions that emerges with particular force from this study is that university prestige is a global concept, not easily parcelized or subdivided, and is pervasive in its influence even in highly specialized and technical fields. The contribution that strong individuals and strong departments make to a strong university cannot and must not be minimized. Many individuals choose to join or to leave a university with the specific prospect of working with other key colleagues. The attractive power of these individuals is a very valuable asset for an institution. Out of these personal relationships are built the reputations of departments and their relative drawing power in attracting or holding faculty.

At the same time, it is important to understand that the impression made by a university as a whole upon the national academic community carries a decisive weight in faculty decisions. Individuals who lacked specific details about internal operations of departments or schools at this University were, nevertheless, found to have distinctly favorable overall impressions toward the University of Minnesota. This global prestige can be compared with a similar phenomena observed in the business world in the form of reputations established by leading firms or products. In an accounting sense, it can be compared to the "good will" of a commercial firm in a field in which the honesty, integrity, and professional competence of the individuals in the firm are of paramount importance. This attribute of global reputation is a priceless asset of the University of Minnesota. It has been built up over time, it could not easily be re-established if it were lost, and its maintenance must be one of the principal concerns of those persons who are charged with the responsibility for faculty recruitment.

III. The Central Importance of Salaries

With few exceptions, University faculty members find it difficult to talk freely about salary matters, or to evaluate readily the importance of salary in their professional and occupational decisions. Although difficult to document, those of us responsible for the planning and conduct of this survey are convinced that there was a tendency to understate the importance of economic considerations in academic motivation. This can be determined, in part, by certain inconsistencies in the order in which individuals ranked their reasons for coming to the University and the reasons why they were tempted to remain where they were. For example, among the individuals who received but rejected an offer from the University of Minnesota, only 9 per cent received salary offers that were 20 per cent or more above their current salaries. Half of the faculty members who left the University to take other jobs received salary increases of over 20 per cent; one-fourth of the former faculty reporting increases of 30 per cent or more. In terms of rough averages, it took salary increases of at least 10 per cent to move incoming faculty to the University of Minnesota; half of those who left received salary increases of over 20 per cent.

The subcommittee is convinced that salaries alone will not guarantee excellence in the academic faculty. Some illustrious members of the staff have repeatedly put other considerations above salary in their decision to remain with the University of Minnesota. It is also true, however, that inadequate money rewards can eat away at faculty morale in a corrosive fashion that will ultimately defeat any pursuit of top quality in teaching, research, and public service. Money alone cannot buy a great university; inadequate financial support could, if permitted, wreck one.

IV. Recruitment Policy: The Key Role of Department Heads

The men who play the dominant role in the establishment and maintenance of the University's reputation are department heads and chairmen. These men may or may not be the leading technical specialists or scholars in their department, and their personal attractive power may be modest or great. They are, however, the personification of the department to the prospective employee. They are the contact men and their voice is the voice of the University. Their manners, their attitudes and their personalities are typically the first and most lasting forces influencing the attitude of a prospective faculty member.

A careful reading of the published report will disclose numerous instances where individuals, who decided not to come to the University, or decided to leave, attributed much of their lack of enthusiasm or their dissatisfaction to personal contacts with departmental chairmen. The University of Minnesota is a large institution with well over a hundred different

departments. Naturally, there will be found differences in personalities, approaches to the problems of recruitment, and attitudes toward the "gamesmanship" of making offers and counter offers. This is as it should be. At the same time, it does not follow that the range in effectiveness of departmental recruitment practices need be as great as it now is.

The recruitment or replacement of faculty is a costly process, both to the individuals involved and to the institution. It is typically the best trained, most highly placed, and most valuable departmental members whose time must be spent in negotiations with prospective faculty. Some departments now bring all leading prospects to the University for an interview; other departments have never done this. Even though the practice of bringing a prospective faculty member to the University is expensive, it should be encouraged. Time and effort spent in careful selection are always much less costly than are the consequences of a poor faculty appointment.

At the time of the interview, or shortly thereafter, a clearly defined offer should be available and the chairman should avoid "bargaining" or "haggling" over salary. (See pp. 31-32 of the published report for an elaboration of this point.) This is not to say that salary offers may not be adjusted; it means that initial offers to potential faculty should be reasonable and the practice of trying to attract faculty with the lowest possible offers should be strongly discouraged.

Some departments now follow the practice of dating appointments 1 month before the new employee is expected to arrive, thus enabling the first month's salary to be applied toward moving expenses. Offsetting the cost of a job change to the individual is often a very effective technique in faculty recruitment. The practice of pre-dating appointments should be reviewed and, if found desirable, standardized.

In a small but not unimportant number of cases, departments have been handicapped in recruitment by the fact that a wife or husband with professional training was unable to look to the University as a possible employer. The present "anti-nepotism" policy reflects, in part, the "work-spreading" psychology of the depression years, and dates from a period in which the professional training of women was in its infancy. By holding to present policy, the University restricts itself unnecessarily in bidding for some key staff, and denies itself the services of some ably trained men and women. The subcommittee urges that this restriction be liberalized.

The study has disclosed examples of lack of communication between department heads and faculty. Although frequent staff meetings can become a burdensome method of making decisions, no one interviewed in this study listed too many meetings as a reason for deciding to leave. Examples were found, however, of cases where the absence of internal departmental contact contributed to the sense of neglect and disinterest that resulted in a decision to accept another offer. Of those who left the University in the 2-year period studied, 37 per cent reported that inadequate or unsatisfactory contacts with their department chairmen contributed to their reasons for leaving. Only 10 per cent listed their contacts with the chairmen as an inducement to remain. (See p. 52 and pp. 83-85 of the research report.)

Although not discussed in the research study, the subcommittee feels that one factor contributing to poor internal departmental communication is the present variation in the duration of appointments of department heads or chairmen. In some departments the role of spokesman is rotated at specified intervals. Other departments operate on the tacit understanding that the appointment of a chairman is for a specified number of years, subject to renewal. It is not necessary that any hard and fast rule exist for all departments. The mere knowledge that change is possible and sanctioned tends to work against the growth of long term dissatisfaction with current departmental practices and encourages good internal communications.

Problems of recruitment would not be solved by the removal of responsibility from the departmental level. Steps in this direction have been taken by some sister universities through the introduction of super departmental or university-wide screening and appointment committees. Uniformity and standardization achieved in this fashion are certainly undesirable, although persons beyond the departments and sometimes beyond the institution itself may profitably be consulted on major appointments. It is obviously undesirable to pursue the haphazard, amateurish, and ineffective recruitment practices sometimes found in University departments. Minnesota can greatly strengthen its recruitment and retention performance by paying increased attention to the key role played by its departments and departmental spokesmen. In the view of the subcommittee this is one of the most important conclusions to be drawn from the current study.

V. Housing

One of the problems that looms large to many faculty members considering a move from one community to another is the question of family housing. Some years ago Minnesota was one of the pioneers in developing attractive housing arrangements for both junior and senior faculty members. Thatcher Hall once played a key role in enabling the University to bring promising new faculty members to the Twin Cities without the plaguing question of where to live during the first year. For senior faculty wishing to build a home, the University, until recently, made available a track of land and generous financial arrangements in the University Grove area near the St. Paul Campus. At the time of the study, both of these attractions were gone.

Since the completion of the research, the University has announced an eastward expansion of the University Grove. Although still not widely publicized, the first new lots will probably be ready for construction in the spring of 1961, and a 4-year schedule will eventually make available an area about equal to that of the present Grove. The subcommittee strongly commends the expansion of the University Grove. It also encourages the University to consider some plan to help new nontenure faculty members solve their housing problems. At the present time, the University is unable to offer any significant assistance to a prospective nontenure faculty member concerned with the problem of housing.

A second concern, directly related to housing near the Minneapolis Campus, is the University's lack of leadership in the urban renewal of the campus fringe districts. Housing in the University area, like the campus itself, needs constant maintenance and new capital if its physical appearance, amenity, and efficiency are to be maintained. The University should not only follow the lead of other agencies but also actively encourage and assist others in both the maintenance and renewal of the surrounding residential districts.

VI. Parking

Without question, a major source of annoyance to the faculty is the problem of parking. In no case did the study disclose that this had played an important role in a decision to join, remain with, or leave the University. The frequency with which this problem was mentioned, however, indicates that its importance may be seriously underrated as a factor in undercutting faculty morale.

The parking situation is particularly annoying to the junior and incoming faculty member who must often wait 2 or more years before he can obtain a parking contract for space in one of the lots on the perimeter of the campus. An additional source of irritation to all faculty members is the extra charge made for evening and week-end parking. Some faculty have reached the point of refusing to come back "after hours" if they have to pay to park their car.

Unfortunately the parking problem, unless approached on a long term basis, will certainly grow much worse in the years ahead. With the anticipated growth in student enrollment and size of the faculty the already overcrowded parking facilities will become completely inadequate. This fact, complicated by the shortage of housing near the campus, will surely increase the number of cars which will have to be accommodated in the next few years. Parking is not a problem which can be adequately solved by individual faculty action. The University has reached the point where clear policies should be established that take into account the special parking needs of the faculty.

An air of resentment and hostility has pervaded the relations between faculty and those responsible for the enforcement of parking regulations. This may be an understandable reaction but certainly not a healthy relationship. A simple extension of courteous understanding on the part of both faculty and enforcement officials, as well as a continuing effort to inform the faculty of steps being taken to remedy parking annoyances, would do much to relieve the problem. Although seemingly minor, the importance of the parking problem should not be underrated.

VII. Retirement, Insurance, and Medical Care

The University's early performance in offering retirement and insurance benefits was a major step forward in improving faculty conditions. Among state universities, Minnesota had one of the early and adequate programs of faculty insurance and retirement benefits. In more recent years, a comparison with 9 leading state universities (the University of California and 8 other state universities in the Big Ten) Minnesota ranked ninth in retirement benefits. When made with respect to the major privately endowed universities with which Minnesota frequently competes for senior staff, the comparison is even more unsatisfactory.

One of the findings of the research study was that insurance and retirement benefits are of relatively minor importance to faculty who are just entering their academic careers. Although new recruits to the University faculty did not rank benefit programs highly in explaining the reasons for their decisions, one-fourth of them did express surprise and disappointment at the inadequacy of the programs after their arrival. See Table 4, p. 24 of the published report.) For the older faculty members, the situation is reversed. Over one-fourth of those above age 50 who received offers from other universities listed improved fringe benefit programs as one of the major attractions of the offer (See Table 19, p. 65).

Several persons interviewed pointed out that reports by the Minnesota chapter of the AAUP have recently provided data on the inadequacy of present retirement programs. To cite one example, at the time of the study, a full professor retiring at age 65 with an average salary of \$12,000 over his last 5 years would have been entitled to an annual retirement benefit of only \$4,660. Recent action by the Board of Regents has now increased the number of annuity units to 30 (to be purchased on an accelerated basis) bringing the total retirement income to approximately \$5,500 for full professors, \$5,000 for associate professors and \$4,500 for assistant professors and instructors.

For the top 5 sister universities (among the 9 covered in the May 1959 AAUP report) the average retirement benefit in the case cited above would have been well above \$6,500 (and for the top 2, above \$7,000). Since the Minnesota benefit is not tied to salaries, it would have been the same dollar amount whether the retiring faculty member had earned \$3,000 or \$18,000 during each of his last 5 years. While the recent action by the Board of Regents is encouraging, and has helped close the gap between Minnesota and other competing institutions, the University cannot rest long on these laurels.

Minnesota's position in regard to medical insurance and care has been defective in at least two respects: medical care for dependents, and insurance against major medical expenses. Prepaid hospitalization and surgical insurance plans have been available, on a group basis, to the University staff and their dependents. In addition, staff members, but not their dependents, could elect to join the University Health Service for an annual fee of about \$30. Together, these provided what may have been considered a minimum level of medical care benefits. They have not contributed appreciably to the bargaining position of Minnesota in competing for staff. Similar benefits are available in virtually all major universities and in some they are more attractive. Since the completion of the research study, the University has announced a major revision in its medical insurance program. The new program will provide not only more extensive coverage but will also incorporate a major medical expense provision. Some plan for nonhospital medical care for dependents of staff members is a goal for the future.

Another fringe benefit of concern to faculty members is Minnesota's current term life insurance program. The present \$10,000 term policy has been unchanged since the 1930's and has depreciated severely as an attraction to current or prospective faculty. Since the purchasing power of the dollar, in consumer prices, has declined from an index of 170 in 1935 to 80 in 1960 (1947-49 = 1900), it would require a \$21,000 policy today to maintain the purchasing power equal to a \$10,000 policy in 1935.

The deterioration of the value of this benefit as an attraction is obvious. At the time of this writing there is no formal indication of any change in the University's term insurance program.

Currently, Minnesota's retirement and insurance benefits must be considered a handicap, rather than an aid in the recruitment and retention of staff. The subcommittee recommends that continuing steps be taken to restore Minnesota to a competitive position in this increasingly important area of fringe benefits.

VIII. *The Costs of Travel to Professional Meetings*

At the present time, there are no clearly established provisions whereby the University can aid in supporting the costs of faculty travel to professional meetings. Support of this nature is currently available to faculty members in many other institutions. At Nebraska, for example, each faculty member is entitled to reimbursement up to \$150 in any 3-year period, to defray travel costs to professional meetings. At Michigan State, each faculty member is entitled to reimbursement for the equivalent of round-trip rail coach fare to one professional meeting a year. If a person is on the program for a national meeting, Michigan State will reimburse him for first-class rail or air travel.

The subcommittee is strongly in favor of the steps being taken by the Senate Committee on Education to study the merits of alternative arrangements that might be developed to provide reasonable travel aid to professional meetings. Some episodic aid is now provided from "supply budgets" in certain departments. These funds, however, are severely limited and there appears to be little or no policy to guide the use of such funds for this purpose. A study of this problem is dictated by the location of the University, at the western fringe of the Midwest and Atlantic-Seaboard concentration of population and educational institutions. Minnesota's location creates a professional disadvantage that is particularly felt when competing with more centrally located Midwest schools. (See pp. 87-88 of the research report.)

Attention to this area of potential improvement in recruitment and retention policies is called for by another consideration. Currently, great differences exist both within and among departments with regard to professional travel. Under some forms of contract research grants, a portion of the funds may be allocated for travel expenses. As a consequence, some faculty within a department may travel to professional meetings with all expenses paid by the University, while other colleagues traveling to the same meetings must meet all costs from their own pockets. It may not be possible, or even desirable, to equalize the funds available for travel to all faculty members. The problem is, however, a source of internal friction in some departments and clearly warrants further study.

IX. *Time and Money for Research*

With the prospect of heavier teaching loads, a concerted effort will be needed to preserve a part of faculty time and departmental budgets for research. In some departments, there is a tendency for research funds to be preempted by the senior faculty. This often leaves very modest amounts for the younger men who may, in many cases, be the ones best able to pursue a vigorous research program, but least able to secure outside support. In this case, a question of balance is involved that should be of immediate concern to deans, directors, and department heads.

Another question of balance involves the provision of research budgets to areas of the University that are at a disadvantage in applying for currently available private and public research moneys. In some areas of study, money for research is available on a scale that makes it reasonable to leave the initiative for securing funds to individual faculty members or departments. In other areas vigorous effort will be required on the part of the University administration to mobilize research funds and to prevent heavy teaching loads from destroying effective capacity for research.

The availability of research time and money is an important factor in the recruitment and retention of a superior staff. Among those who left the University to accept other offers, 43 per cent went to positions in which more time and money were available for research (See p. 102 of the printed report). This should be read as a clear warning. One of the principal challenges facing Minnesota in the years ahead will be to insure adequate research time and funds to the many disciplines represented in its faculty.

X. *The Decisive Importance of Holding-Power*

A necessary condition for faculty quality is the University's ability to attract promising young men and women for staff replacement and expansion. This condition is, however, only part of building a quality faculty. Wise recruitment is important; the selective ability to retain key individuals is decisive. Here, too, the key role is played at the department level. As was true of faculty attraction, there are few clear-cut guides for holding faculty against outside competition. One point that does emerge sharply from the current study involves the importance of University concern for the continued professional advancement of faculty after they have joined the staff.

It is clear from the text of the research report that faculty members in the age groups 35-50 are in what might be called the "years of unrest." These are the crucial years in terms of the formation of attitudes toward the University, decisions to "look around" and solicit outside offers, and a general reappraisal of the individual staff member's position in the University community. One way to generalize this is: faculty members in these "middle years" do not want to be taken for granted. They have put down some roots but not so deeply that they cannot be withdrawn if the right attraction develops. It is this group in particular that seems most influenced by attitudes, and the intangible but important relations with colleagues, department heads, and students.

Faculty in these middle age groups may begin to feel the burden of heavy teaching obligations, and the lack of time for research. They may also feel some insecurity with respect to financial support for future research, or lack of equal opportunity with older faculty members to work with promising graduate students. It is at these ages that questions of status, attitude, and communication among individuals are of particular importance in retaining desirable faculty members. The greatest defense against outside offers is an awareness on the part of the individual faculty member that the University is interested in his hopes, ambitions, aspirations, and growth. Reducing receptivity to outside offers will almost always be found less expensive than trying to match offers after they have been extended.

The research study disclosed that, in the age group 39-50, 84 per cent of those who left the University (and whom departments wanted to keep) gave lack of professional advancement or dim prospects for future growth at Minnesota as their primary reason for leaving (See Table 15, p. 49). This was roughly double the frequency with which this reason was listed by persons below or beyond this age group. It is to this age group that the departments should look with special interest if they wish to keep alive the enthusiasm for professional growth which new recruits mention as important when they enter the academic profession and join the Minnesota faculty.

It is difficult to say when a decision is actually made to leave the University. It was clear from the study of faculty members who left that the decision was often made several months before actual departure. Most decisions to leave are not outwardly dramatic, although the events surrounding a final offer and counter-offer may be. The roots of the decision often trace back to an accumulation of rebuffs, frustrations, or unsatisfactory personal relations that cannot be individually isolated but which in their cumulative effects are decisive.

The University should not expect to retain all faculty members who receive attractive outside offers. Some movement of faculty among universities is a healthy thing. The institution that does not occasionally lose a valued staff member to another institution should look at itself very carefully and beware of academic atrophy. In recent years, Minnesota's performance in holding the men it wants to keep has been reasonably good. On the other hand, faculty losses are always costly, both in terms of money and disrupted programs of teaching and research. If they occur too frequently they can permanently damage faculty morale and standing. The subcommittee urges that a continuing effort be made to alert deans, department heads, and senior faculty to the need for sustained and sincere interest in the plans, aspirations, and development of their individual staff members.

XI. *Affirmation of the Primary Focus of the University on Its Educational Tasks*

Faculty comments in the research study stress the principle that the university's primary function is *education*, that the chief agents in performing this task are the teaching and research faculty, and that all units of the university exist for the purpose of serving this aim.

The present study provides ample evidence that relations between the academic faculty and the maintenance and administrative staffs have been, at various times, a source of frustration and irritation. It is a prevalent belief, for example, that some decisions on academic matters have been made as "administrative" decisions without adequate faculty consultation. In addition to the lack of an adequate "policy voice," many faculty members have felt that they have been subject to distressing and petty harassment by non-academic staffs and service units (see especially, pp. 80-82 of the research report). These attitudes can often be summarized as a belief that "the business office carries too much weight."

The University's commitment to its educational task must take precedence over all other activities. It is such a commitment from the entire University community that attracts and holds a top quality faculty.

John Borchert
Asher Christensen
Ruth Eckert
James J. Jenkins*
Reynold Jensen**
Benjamin Lazan, Vice Chairman

Alfred O. C. Nier
Ruth Palmer
John Turner
Philip M. Raup, Chairman
Robert L. Lathrop, ex officio
John E. Stecklein, ex officio
C. Gilbert Wrenn, ex officio

* On leave, 1958-59.

** On leave, 1959-60.

Note: Although participating actively in the work of the subcommittee for the years indicated, Mr. Jensen and Mr. Wrenn did not have an opportunity to review this subcommittee report in its final draft.

XIV. REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE ON INSTITUTIONAL RELATIONSHIPS Reported for Action

University Policy on Relationships with Prospective Students

During 1959-60 the Committee on Institutional Relationships made two reports to the Senate on matters pertaining to the University's relationship to prospective students. The first of these, accepted by the Senate on March 10, 1960, dealt with the problem of University Credit for Advanced Study in the High School, a joint report with the Senate Committee on Student Scholastic Standing. The second report, presented to the Senate for information on June 2, 1960, summarized existing policies and practices on relationships with prospective students and presented recommendations of a subcommittee chaired by Professor Keith McFarland. Reactions, recommendations and suggestions on the report and its recommendations were sought from faculty so that this matter could be brought to the Senate for action at the first fall meeting of that body.

The present report is a final report of this Senate Committee. It abstracts the findings of the subcommittee and restates recommendations in full. The present statement takes account of faculty suggestions to this committee and includes additional reactions and revisions of that parent body. The complete text of the subcommittee report appears in *Senate Minutes* for June 2, 1960 (pp. 75-80).

The Administrative Committee of the University Senate reported on February 4, 1960, that the President of the University requested the Committee on Institutional Relationships to conduct a review of procedures used in contacting prospective students. Discussion on the floor of the University Senate noted the added concern that many superior students in Minnesota high schools not as fully aware as they might be of opportunities available to them within the University.

On February 9, 1960, the chairman of the Committee on Institutional Relationships appointed a subcommittee of three, Keith McFarland, Samuel H. Popper, and Theodore Kellogg, to evaluate current Senate Policy on relationships with prospective students. This subcommittee was also asked to recommend necessary modifications to this policy.

The subcommittee reviewed the present policy, adopted by the Senate on November 20, 1952, and expressed its view that this policy is positive and broadly permissive and that it is sufficiently inclusive to make possible several courses of action. This policy statement defines with considerable care the responsibilities of the University for interpreting its programs to the people of the State of Minnesota generally and to prospective college students particularly.

Indeed, with but one minor exception, one which presupposes that an invitation is to be tendered staff or alumni before they speak to student groups, high school faculties, parents, and alumni (Senate Policy Statement, 7a(3)), no limitations appear to have been placed upon contacts with prospective students that constructively seek to interpret the programs of the several units of the University.

This committee concurs with the subcommittee on this finding and also agrees that implementation of the Senate Policy on Relationships with Prospective Students would be enhanced by some definition of the machinery to be used in establishing these relationships. It is the intention of this statement to focus attention upon possible ways in which this can be accomplished.

Since participation in contacts with prospective students is diffused, effective co-ordination requires adequate communication with persons having central co-ordinative responsibility. Furthermore, since contact with prospective students represents only one facet of University relationships, all phases of such relationships need to be administratively co-ordinated and supported. The 1952 Senate policy statement made no suggestions regarding financial support of activities pertaining to relationships with prospective students.

Current activities of University units in this area provide an impressive array of effort. However, the colleges and other administrative units vary in their information-giving efforts and the extent of their contacts with prospective students. They include University leadership in the statewide testing program for high schools which has been centered here for more than 30 years. They range from participation at "college days" or "career days" in high schools to preparation and distribution of special brochures. They include high school-university transition conferences and visits to high schools by several University student groups. They undoubtedly represent varying degrees of effectiveness in what they actually accomplish in letting high school students know what they should about this University.

Certain needs are apparent.

1. There is need for further administrative development of these activities.
2. The cost attendant to representing the University at contact functions should be borne by a central budget.
3. Provision should be made for establishing contacts with all high schools and all institutions of higher learning in the state.
4. A more aggressive program of publishing informational materials should be considered.
5. Effort should be made to capitalize upon the opportunities coming from contacts by University personnel in the course of carrying out other responsibilities that place them in contact with the public in various Minnesota communities.

RECOMMENDATIONS

1. The Senate Policy on Relationships with Prospective Students (See University *Senate Minutes*, November 20, 1952) should be reaffirmed and continued in force, with one minor modification, as fully adequate to guide the University in its relationships with prospective students. The phrase "when invited," Item 7a(3), p. 35, should be deleted. The item is presently worded, "(3) appearing before and speaking to student groups, high school faculties, parents, and alumni, *when invited*, for purposes of informing them about the University." This deletion makes clear that the University of Minnesota "has responsibility for providing to every citizen in the state information about the facilities available at the University and the means whereby these facilities can meet the needs of individual citizens. To fulfill this responsibility, the University is obligated to publicize, through appropriate and effective channels, the various educational programs and types of services offered by the University" through self-initiated contacts as well as invited contacts.

This effort to give high visibility to University programs recognizes that:

(a) The quality of the University's graduates is affected by the quality of the incoming students. Therefore, every effort, in good taste and consistent with University policy, should be made to acquaint academically talented and gifted students in the public and private secondary schools, junior colleges, and other institutions of learning in Minnesota with the diverse opportunities University programs make available to accommodate the education and intellectual nourishment of such students. Moreover, every effort should be exerted to make known to such high quality students the University policies regarding advanced standing, advanced placement, scholarship opportunities, work opportunities, student loan assistance, etc.

(b) The organized effort to interpret University programs for the college-bound youth of Minnesota should reach all segments of Minnesota youth who can profit from a collegiate-level experience.

2. A central agency should be identified and charged with responsibility for initiating contact programs as well as co-ordinating existing activities. The Senate Committee on Institutional Relationships will continue to carry responsibility for reviewing University progress and programs in this area including the efforts of this designated central agency.

The responsibilities of this central agency will require that:

(a) A minimum of two informational representatives should be employed to maintain constant contact with public and private high schools, public and private junior colleges, and other public and private institutions of higher learning in Minnesota. These informational representatives shall seek to explain and interpret the programs of the University of Minnesota and the opportunities which they hold for all students, including those academically talented and gifted. They should actively work to co-ordinate their efforts with those of the various colleges of the University, to supplement the contacts of the several colleges, to service promising programs not directly managed by the colleges, and to initiate contacts where such initiative might be required.

(b) A budget should be allocated in support of such informational representatives as well as for travel, food, and lodging of faculty engaged in off-campus programs leading to improved relationships with prospective students.

3. The colleges should continue contact and information programs now in progress. The central agency should assist them in these efforts in every way possible. When members of the teaching staff are used in such programs, adequate provision should be made for their orientation to the functions of the entire University, as well as to their particular college. Recognition should be given to this added responsibility in the assignment of teaching and research loads. There should also be additional exploration of the manner in which University staff, students, and alumni could contribute to this program. The staff of the Bureau of Field Studies and Surveys, supervisors of student teachers in the College of Education, Agricultural Extension Service personnel, and others constitute potentially useful agents for establishing contact with prospective students.

4. The existing central printing budget should be enlarged to include the cost of preparing interpretive literature, similar to the procedures now used for printing the college bulletins. The manner of allocating this budget to the several units of the University should be left to administrative determination. Responsibility for developing copy and for keeping materials current should rest with the respective units. The central agency should be of assistance to the various units in preparing publications to insure that critical attention is given to the attractiveness, readability, and content of all University publications designed to describe and interpret course offerings, programs, and the wide range of opportunities available at the University of Minnesota to the people of the state.

5. In the event current budgetary limitations will not permit the implementation of all recommendations herein, the University administration

should endeavor, nonetheless, to activate those portions of the report that available resources do make possible.

ROBERT J. KELLER, Chairman

XV. REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE ON INTERCOLLEGIATE ATHLETICS
Reported for Information

1. Approved Schedules

		Cross Country 1960
October	1	Drake University
October	8	University of Wisconsin at Madison
October	15	Marquette University
October	22	South Dakota State University at Brookings
October	29	Iowa State University at Ames
November	5	State University of Iowa
November	11	Conference Race at Chicago
November	21	N.C.A.A. Race at East Lansing
Gymnastics 1960-61		
December	3	Midwest Open Meet at Chicago
January	7	University of Illinois
January	13	Western Illinois at Macomb
January	14	State University of Iowa and Michigan State University at Iowa City
January	28	Southern Illinois University
February	4	Indiana University
February	11	U. S. Air Force Academy, University of Illinois (Chicago) and Northwest Open Meet
February	17	University of Michigan at Ann Arbor
February	18	Michigan State University at East Lansing
February	25	University of Wisconsin and Ohio State University at Madison
March	3, 4	Conference Meet at Ann Arbor
March	6-8	N.C.A.A. Meet at Urbana
Ice Hockey 1960-61		
November	26	Alumni
December	2, 3	Michigan State University at East Lansing
December	16	U. S. National team
December	22	U. S. National team at Hibbing, Virginia or Eveleth
December	28	U. S. National team at Duluth
December	30	U. S. National team
January	2	Visiting team from Russia
January	6, 7	Colorado College
January	13, 14	University of Michigan
January	20, 21	University of Michigan at Ann Arbor
January	27, 28	Michigan State University
February	3, 4	University of North Dakota at Grand Forks
February	10, 11	Michigan Tech. at Houghton
February	17, 18	Michigan Tech.
February	24, 25	Colorado College at Colorado Springs
March	3, 4	University of North Dakota
March	6, 7	W.C.H.A. play-off, if Minnesota qualifies, location not determined
March	16-18	N.C.A.A. Tournament, Denver
Swimming 1960-61		
January	7	University of Nebraska and Gustavus Adolphus College
January	14	University of Chicago
January	20	Michigan State University at East Lansing
January	21	University of Michigan at Ann Arbor
January	27	Northwestern University
January	28	Iowa State University
February	4	University of Wisconsin
February	10	State University of Iowa
February	11	Ohio State University
February	18	University of Illinois at Champaign
February	20	Purdue University at Lafayette
March	2-4	Conference Meet at Ann Arbor
March	23-25	N.C.A.A. Meet at University of Washington

2. Statistics on Intercollegiate Athletics 1959-60

STATISTICS ON INTERCOLLEGIATE ATHLETICS FOR 1959-60

Sport and Head Coach	TOTAL NUMBER GAMES												
		No. Conference Games	No. Non-conference Games	Total No. Receiving Athletic Instruction Including Freshmen	No. Varsity Candidates	No. Varsity Candidates Eligible for Intercollegiate Competition	No. Having Competition	No. "M" Awards	No. Freshmen Candidates	No. Freshman Numerals Awarded	No. Games Won	No. Games Lost	No. Games Tied
Baseball* Siebert	33	15	18	116	47	34	23	18	69	28	26	6	1
Basketball Kundla	24	14	10	37	18	12	12	11	19	14	13	11	0
Cross Country Kelly	6	2	4	21	15	12	9	5	6	2	4	2	0
Football Warmath	9	7	2	128	58	55	39	32	70	52	2	7	0
Golf Bolstad	10	6	4	48	27	13	9	9	21	8	7	1	0
Gymnastics† Piper	15	8	7	40	26	14	13	9	14	5	10	5	0
Hockey Mariucci	28	24	4	94	33	21	23	19	61	18	10	16	2
Swimming Heusner	12	8	4	60	28	21	21	17	32	16	7	5	0
Tennis Lewis	14	7	7	25	13	7	6	6	12	6	8	6	0
Track‡ Kelly	8	6	2	70	37	29	23	19	33	12	10	0	0
Wrestling Johnson	18	11	7	31	24	19	14	8	7	6	13	5	0
TOTALS	177	108	69	670	326	237	192	153	344	167	110	64	3

* Conference, Region IV and NCAA champions 1960
† One individual Conference championship
‡ Two individual Conference championships

M. O. SCHULTZE, Chairman

(There will be a pause in the proceedings to permit the withdrawal of non-Senate committee members.)

XVI. NEW BUSINESS

XVII. NECROLOGY

GEORGE P. CONGER
1884-1960

George Perrigo Conger, professor emeritus of philosophy, died in Minneapolis on August 14, 1960. He is survived by his wife, Agnes.

Professor Conger was born in Genoa, New York on May 18, 1884. Following graduation from Cornell University in 1907, he went on, like many incipient philosophers of his generation, to train for the ministry. He received a B.D. from Union Theological Seminary in 1910 and, as a fellow of that institution, went on to do advanced research at various universities in Europe. He received his Ph.D. in philosophy from Columbia University in 1922. Ordained a Presbyterian minister in 1913, he participated in the war prisoners' aid in Eastern Siberia during 1916-17.

After serving as a pastor for a few years, he began his career in philosophy as an Assistant Professor at the University of Minnesota in 1920. His major interest was in the philosophy of religion, particularly in those elements common to all the world's religions. Never a doctrinaire in matters of either belief or faith, he felt that all the various religions were relevant to the facts of human experience. *Towards the Unification of the Faiths*, the title of a book he published in 1951, tells the story of his outlook. He was one of the first American philosophers to take a strong and abiding research interest in Oriental, particularly Indian, philosophy. Up to just before his death, he remained an intrepid traveller, never daunted by out of the way places or difficult terrain. He knew the Orient, especially India, intimately and was Ghosh lecturer at the University of Calcutta, during 1954-55. On campus, as well as in town, he was well-known and loved as a friend of all, and benefactor of many, students from the Far East. His interest in the unification of diverse ideas extended beyond religion to all domains of philosophy and science. The results of this constant concern were presented in his 1931 book, *A World of Epitomizations*. The book appeared in revised form as *Synoptic Naturalism* in 1960. Among Conger's earlier books are: *A Course in Philosophy* (1924); *New Views of Evolution* (1929); *Horizons of Thought* (1933); and *The Ideologies of Religion* (1940). He was a co-author of *Philosophy, East and West*, 1944; and contributor to many volumes, including *The Philosophy of Sarvepalli Radhakrishnan*, 1952.

He served as President of the Western Division of the American Philosophical Association during 1944-46 and was Chairman of that Association's national board of officers during the same period. Upon retirement from the University, he taught at Ohio Wesleyan University from 1952-54.

During his travels in Europe and by mail from home, he was constantly on the look-out for first editions of classical philosophical works. Through a life-time of discriminating collecting, he had built up a fabulous philosophical library, covering all periods and places.

He was made Professor of philosophy here in 1937 and served as Chairman of his department from 1940 until his retirement in 1952. He was as kind, gentle, and patient with his colleagues, as with all his countless friends. Infinitely tolerant of divergent points of view and personal idiosyncrasies, his sense of fairness and justice never faltered, except in the direction of mercy. He had boundless dedication to the scholar's task, no matter where it might lead, and continued his research and writing up until his death.

His open-mindedness, personal goodness, and professional integrity will remain an example to all of us.

FORDYCE R. HEILMAN
1905-1960

Dr. Fordyce R. Heilman, head of the Section of Bacteriology of the Mayo Clinic, Rochester, Minnesota, since October 1, 1944, and professor of bacteriology in the Mayo Foundation, Graduate School, University of Minnesota, died at his home in Rochester on August 15, 1960. Death was the result of hemorrhagic edema of the lungs caused by suffocation.

Dr. Heilman, well known in the field of bacteriology in medical circles in the United States, was born in Austin, Minnesota, on June 16, 1905, the son of Emma Larson Heilman and Oliver Charles Heilman. He attended the elementary schools in Austin and in Fargo, North Dakota, and in 1923 became a student in the North Dakota Agricultural College at State College. He remained there until 1926, going next to Northwestern University. He obtained the degree of bachelor of science in 1930 and that of doctor of medicine in 1931. He was a research assistant in surgery at Northwestern University as an undergraduate, and from April 1930 to April 1931 he was an intern in St. Luke's Hospital in Chicago. From April 1931 to April 1932 he was resident physician in that hospital.

Dr. Heilman came to Rochester, Minnesota, on July 1, 1932, as a fellow in surgery of the Mayo Foundation, and his graduate studies included a considerable amount of work in bacteriology and experimental bacteriology. On April 1, 1935, he was appointed a first assistant in experimental bacteriology in the Mayo Foundation, and in 1938 he received the degree of master of science in bacteriology from the University of Minnesota. In 1940 he received the degree of doctor of philosophy in bacteriology from the same university.

Dr. Heilman was appointed to the staff of the Mayo Clinic on April 1, 1939, as a consultant in what was then the Section of Bacteriology and Parasitology. He became head of this section on October 1, 1944. The name of the section was changed to the Section of Experimental Bacteriology on January 1, 1945, and since October 1, 1947, it has been known simply as the Section of Bacteriology.

Dr. Heilman was appointed an instructor in bacteriology in the Mayo Foundation, Graduate School, University of Minnesota, in 1939, and he was advanced to assistant professor in 1941, associate professor in 1945, and professor in 1946.

Dr. Heilman early in his career at the Mayo Clinic carried out laboratory studies upon poliomyelitis and myasthenia gravis, but subsequently became known for his work on the chemotherapy of infectious diseases. He contributed a number of papers on this subject to the medical literature, and he was interested in research on cancer. He also investigated the effects of penicillin upon tularemia, psittacosis, swine erysipelas, anthrax, and relapsing fever when penicillin was first introduced, and he studied the effects of terramycin when that drug first came into use.

Dr. Heilman was made a charter fellow of the American Academy of Microbiology in 1957 in recognition of his position as "distinguished in the field of microbiology, with wide training and experience." In 1953, with Dr. W. H. Dearing and Dr. W. G. Sauer, of the Mayo Clinic, he received the first annual B. B. Vincent Lyon Award of the American Gastroenterological Association for a paper on micrococcic (staphylococcic) enteritis after the use of terramycin.

Dr. Heilman was a fellow of the American Medical Association and the American Public Health Association, and a member of the Zumbro Valley Medical Society, the Minnesota State Medical Association, the Society of American Bacteriologists, the American Association for the Advancement of Science, the American Society of Clinical Pathologists, the American Association for Cancer Research, the Society for Experimental Biology and Medicine, the Society for General Microbiology, the New York Academy of Sciences, the Society of the Sigma Xi, the Alpha Omega Alpha honor society and the Phi Rho Sigma professional medical fraternity.

Dr. Heilman was married to Dr. Dorothy Henderson, of Pendleton, Oregon, on August 10, 1934. They were divorced in 1953.

CLINTON RAYMOND STAUFFER
1875-1960

Clinton Raymond Stauffer, professor emeritus of geology, died July 11 at Pasadena, California, where he had made his home since his retirement in 1944. He is survived by his wife Eva and a son, Robert.

Professor Stauffer was born in Polo, Illinois, October 2, 1875. Upon completion of his preparatory school education he entered Ohio State University where he received the bachelor of science in 1903 and a master of science in 1906. He received his doctorate degree in geology and paleontology from the University of Chicago in 1909. Before coming to the University of Minnesota in 1914, he taught at Queens University in Canada, Western Reserve University, and Ohio State University. After his retirement he held the position of research associate at the California Institute of Technology.

When he came to Minnesota he was well prepared to follow a steady course of a purposeful life which led him to success in teaching and eminence in his chosen profession. Over all the years of his professional life, Mr. Stauffer maintained high productivity in research and writing. He made numerous contributions to paleontologic literature dealing with a great variety of forms of ancient life, from minute, microscopic forms such as conodonts and foraminifera to giant vertebrates such as the ancestral forms of the elephants. His manuscript on "Some Pleistocene Mammalian Inhabitants of Minnesota" published in 1950, was the first comprehensive summary of extinct ice-age mammals of the state. His scientific writings were not limited to detailed reports on paleontological research. He was co-author of a widely used textbook on "Geology—Principles and Processes" first published in 1932 and now in its fifth edition.

During his period of tenure from 1914 to 1944 he was also a member of the Minnesota Geological Survey and in that capacity did extensive field research and geologic mapping of the Paleozoic sedimentary rocks of the southeastern counties of the state. The results of these studies are incorporated in Bulletin No. 29 of the Minnesota Geological Survey, published in 1941 under the title "The Paleozoic and Related Rocks of Southeastern Minnesota."

During his professional career, he was an active member in a number of professional and scientific organizations including the Geological Society of America, the Paleontological Society, the American Institute of Mining Engineers, the American Association of Petroleum Geologists, and the American Association for the Advancement of Science.

Professor Stauffer possessed many admirable personal qualities which made him a pleasant, stimulating companion both on the campus and in the field. Such qualities as kindness, tact, sociability, sincerity, and respect for the opinions of others. There was a certain dignity and courtliness about him which might be described as a refinement which instinctively expressed itself in good taste and courtesy. We who survive him feel the loss of a highly respected associate and, more than all else, a greatly valued friend who commanded our warm affection and high esteem.