



5-6-1971

## May 6, 1971

University of North Dakota

[How does access to this work benefit you? Let us know!](#)

Follow this and additional works at: <https://commons.und.edu/und-senate-minutes>

---

### Recommended Citation

University of North Dakota. "May 6, 1971" (1971). *University Senate Meeting Minutes*. 204.  
<https://commons.und.edu/und-senate-minutes/204>

This Minutes is brought to you for free and open access by the UND Publications at UND Scholarly Commons. It has been accepted for inclusion in University Senate Meeting Minutes by an authorized administrator of UND Scholarly Commons. For more information, please contact [und.common@library.und.edu](mailto:und.common@library.und.edu).

May 6, 1971

1.

The May meeting of the University Senate was held at 4:00 p.m. on Thursday, May 6, 1971, in Room 1, Gamble Hall. Mr. Penn presided.

2.

The following members of the Senate were present:

Alberts, Earl	Hanson, Roger K.	Omdahl, Lloyd
Apanian, Ronald A.	Harwood, Theodore	Oslund, Valborg
Bertsch, Pat	Heyse, Margaret F.	Owens, Thomas C.
Boehle, William	Jacobson, Harvey	Penn, John
Brumleve, Stanley	Johnson, A. William	Peterson, John C.
Bzoch, Ronald	Joraanstad, Mark	Peterson, Russell
Caldwell, Robert	Kannowski, Paul	Peterson, Stefan
Cushman, Martelle	Karabus, Alan	Reiten, Palmer
Englestad, Jerry	King, Robert W.	Rowe, John L.
Facey, Vera	Koenker, William E.	Rushing, Robert K.
Fletcher, Alan G.	Kraus, Olen	Russell, LaVonne J.
Flynn, Bill	Krueger, Ken	Stenberg, Virgil
Ford, Donald	Lewis, Robert W.	Thomforde, C.J.
Fruhworth, Lowell	Marti, Leonard R.	Tweton, D. Jerome
Golseth, Anne E.	McKenzie, Ruby M.	Ulven, Milford T.
Hankerson, Kenneth L.	Morgan, William	Wasinger, Gordon B.
Hansmeier, Thomas W.	Naismith, Donald	Wynne, John T.
	Nelson, Edward	

The following members of the Senate were absent:

Starcher, George W.	Kulas, Ludwik	Perrone, Vito
Clifford, Thomas J.	MacKichan, Ruth	Robertson, Donald J.
Cornatzer, William	O'Kelly, Bernard	Sturges, A.W.
Facey, Betty M.	Ollerich, Dwayne	Wright, Paul

3.

There being no corrections, the minutes of the meeting of April 1, 1971, were ordered approved as submitted.

4.

The Chair asked if there be any objection to considering items number 7 and 8 on the agenda next after item number one. There being no objection, the Senate proceeded with item number one.

5.

Mr. Ulven presented the attached list of Candidates for degrees in May, 1971, and moved that they be approved for recommendation to the State Board of Higher Education for the awarding of the degrees indicated, upon satisfactory completion of the work of the present semester. Mr. Apanian moved to include the name of William Aldcorn for a B.S. degree in Engineering. The motion was voted upon and carried. (See Attachment #1). The amended motion was voted upon and carried.



6.

In its second reading, Mr. King moved the adoption of the following change in the Senate By-Laws:

Resolved: That the Senate Agenda be prepared one full week before each Senate meeting and distributed to all faculty and student body representatives.

The motion was seconded and discussion followed. The motion was voted upon and carried.

7.

Reporting for the Committee on Committees, Mr. Kraus presented the attached nominations for Faculty Committees. Mr. Omdahl moved that the Senate proceed to ballot on the Committees and that vacancies which result from faculty resignations should be filled in the Fall. The motion was seconded, voted upon, and carried. The Chair then called for nominations from the floor. Mr. King was nominated for membership on the Academic Policies Committee. Mrs. Owens was nominated for membership on the Library Committee. Miss Rykken was nominated for membership on the Student Policy Committee. Mr. Thorson was nominated for membership on the Student Activities Committee. There being no further nominations, the Senate proceeded to ballot. The results of the election are indicated on the attached listing. (See Attachment #5).

8.

Mr. Koenker, reporting for the Academic Policies Committee, moved the deletion of "superior" and the substitution of "satisfactory" in line 7 of the following Senate legislation. The last clause then would read "provided that, following admission or readmission, such students have demonstrated satisfactory academic achievement for two semesters."

"That students who, because of a poor academic record, were suspended or voluntarily withdrew from a college or university, and who did not enroll in an institution of higher education for a minimum of two years subsequent to leaving, may be allowed by the Student Academic Standards Committee to have a limited number of hours of below C grade disregarded for purposes of graduation, provided that, following admission or readmission, such students have demonstrated superior academic achievement for two semesters."

The motion was seconded and discussion followed. Mr. Rushing moved that the original motion be indefinitely postponed. This motion was seconded, voted upon, and lost. Mr. Omdahl moved that the motion be re-referred back to the Academic Policies Committee, and that that Committee report to the Senate by the November, 1971, meeting. The motion was seconded, voted upon, and carried.

9.

Mr. Marti moved to amend the Athletic Constitution in Article III, Section 1, *May 8, 1971* by striking out "The Assistant Athletic Director shall serve as the secretary of the Athletic Board and shall be a non-voting member of the Athletic Board" and inserting in its place the following, "The secretary of the Athletic Board of Control shall be appointed annually by said Board from a regular member of the athletic staff, and shall be a non-voting member."

The motion was seconded, voted upon, and carried.



10.

Mr. Johnson moved the approval of the Master's Program in Educational Measurement and Statistics and the Master's Program in Reading Education. The motion was seconded and discussion followed. The motion was voted upon, and carried. (See Attachments Numbers 2 and 3).

11.

Mr. Ring reported for the Curriculum Committee. (See Attachment Number 6) Mr. Hansmeier moved the approval of the following recommendations of the Curriculum Committee.

The Curriculum Committee recommends that the Senate create a University Senate Standing Committee on the R.O.T.C. to be elected annually by the Senate (nominated by the Committee on Committees or from the floor). The Committee shall consist of three faculty members elected by the University Senate, one person appointed by the President, three students elected by the Student Senate and the two Commanding Officers of the R.O.T.C. Units as ex-officio members. This Committee would exercise continual review of the University of North Dakota R.O.T.C. programs and report to the University Senate at least annually. It would approve or disapprove the military personnel assigned to the University Instructional Staff, in the rank of Visiting Professor or Visiting Instructor, as appropriate. It would carry out a continuing review and evaluation of the R.O.T.C. Curriculum (courses) as to content, semester hours of credit, and instructional staff. As a general policy, the Curriculum Committee recommends that whenever possible courses in the R.O.T.C. program be taught by regularly assigned permanent civilian faculty of the University of North Dakota, in areas of their competence. It also recommends that when possible and when in keeping with the fundamental purpose of R.O.T.C. the practical aspects of the military program be carried out in field exercises or appropriate summer programs.

The motion was seconded and discussion followed. The motion was voted upon and carried.

12.

Mr. Morgan moved that the meeting adjourn to an adjourned meeting at 4:00 p.m. on May 13, 1971. The motion was voted upon and carried.

13.

The adjourned meeting of the University Senate was held at 4:00 p.m. on Thursday, May 13, 1971, in Room 7, Gamble Hall. Mr. Penn presided.

14.

The following members of the Senate were present:

Alberts, Earl  
Aldwell, Robert  
Bushman, Martelle  
Englestad, Jerry

Facey, Vera  
Golseth, Anne E.  
Harwood, Theodore  
Heyse, Margaret

Jacobson, Harvey  
Joraanstad, Mark  
Karabus, Alan  
Lewis, Robert W.



Rushing, Robert K.  
Russell, LaVonne J.  
Stenberg, Virgil  
Ulven, Milford T.  
Wynne, John T.

## 15.

Hansmeier, Thomas W.  
Hanson, Roger K.  
Johnson, A. William  
Kannowski, Paul  
King, Robert  
Koenker, William E.  
Kraus, Olen  
Kulas, Ludwik  
MacKichan, Ruth  
Marti, Leonard  
Nelson, Edward  
Ollerich, Dwayne

Omdahl, Lloyd  
Owens, Thomas  
Perrone, Vito  
Peterson, Russell  
Reiten, Palmer  
Robertson, Donald J.  
Sturges, A.W.  
Thomforde, C.J.  
Tweton, D. Jerome  
Wasinger, Gordon  
Wright, Paul

Mr. Morgan moved and the motion was seconded to adjourn. It was voted upon and carried.

Secretary



## TENTATIVE

NOT FOR PUBLICATION

University of North Dakota  
Office of the Registrar

## LIST OF CANDIDATES FOR DEGREES

May 23, 1971

UNIVERSITY COLLEGE  
Dean D. J. Robertson

ASSOCIATE OF ARTS DEGREE

Norma Kay Altendorf	Susan Denise Littlejohn
Joanne Mildred Benson	Marian Anina Nogosek
Eileen Gail Bloms	Carol Jean Ordahl
Jean Mary Collette	Douglas Gerald Quesnell
Catherine Marie Cronin	Donald Edwin Rogalla
Charles Roger Eberhard	Rosanna Sparrow
Diane Lorene Johnson	Cynthia Ann Thomas
Kathy H. Wilhelmi	

COLLEGE OF ARTS AND SCIENCES  
Dean Bernard O'Kelly

DEGREE OF BACHELOR OF ARTS

Andrew Timothy Anderson	Jerome Allen Chaussee
Collin Bernard Anderson	Dale Ernest Christopher
Kaye Lucille Anderson	Carroll Kathryn Clark
Owen Lee Anderson	Frederick Ward Cockriell
Jack Joseph Antonicci, Jr.	Larry Allen Colson
Bruce Allan Arneson	Ronald Arthur Cratty
Mary Carol Austin	Francine Barbara Cronshaw
Suzanne Marie Bach	Gene John Daschendorf
Gary Dean Barden	F. Larry Dominick
Melvin Vernon Barnett	Sara Ann Dorsher
Cynthia Faye Bates	Danny John Dybwad
Donald F. Bayer	Diana Lyn Elspenger
Tomas Belcik	Linda Ruth Engelman
Kathryn Ann Blecha	Allen LeRoy Erickson
Linda E. Blomquist	Robert John Erickson
Dulcy Jean Boehle	James Robert Ermer
Thomas Charles Boyle	Stephanie Suzanne Evans
Nancy Lee Brand	Jerry W. Evenson
Gail Louise Brekke	Terrance Michael Feay
William Lloyd Brewer	Robert Ernest Feidler
Camille Annette Brovold	Vince H. Ficek
Grant Lawrence Bushaw	Robert Ray Flohr
Kathleen Midge Butler	Edward Duane Forde
Stewart P. Cameron	Linda Lou Fossum
Jinnelle Kay Campbell	Janice Ruth Fraser
Kay Charbonneau	Diane Elaine Freeman
James MacRae Charlesworth	Jane Miriam Freeman
Thomas William Chase	Harlan Gene Fuglesten
	Kathleen Joy Furst
	Steven F. Furst



TENTATIVE - NOT TO BE RELEASED

-2-

Degree of Bachelor of Arts (Continued)

Raymond Henry Gerszewski  
 Shahin Ghazi-Tehrani  
 Keith Alvin Gohdes  
 Robert George Goossen  
 John Edward Greenwood  
 Mary Elizabeth Griffin  
 Clarice Marian Hackman

Robert Durnin Harris  
 John Michael Haun  
 Gary Roland Hedman  
 Charlene Zipporah Heidinger

Patricia Kay Henderson  
 Sally Jean Henderson  
 John Anthony Herrick  
 James Stuart Hill  
 Takafumi Hirose  
 Edith Ann Hodek  
 Hollys J. Howard  
 James Herman Huesgen

Margaret Stewart Ingalls  
 Sharon Kay Jahner  
 Jeffrey Michael Jandura  
 Elizabeth Mary Johnson  
 Julie Marie Johnson  
 Mary Ann Johnson  
 Terry Lloyd Joos  
 Mark H. Joraanstad  
 Marit Ann Kana  
 Judith Irene Karas  
 Beatrice Ann Kasprovicz  
 Guy O'Gorman King  
 Mia Gray King  
 Kendall Celeste Kleen  
 Carol Ann Kleinschmidt  
 Carol Jean Knudson  
 David A. Kolstoe  
 Alix Renee Kraft  
 Kathleen Ann Krauter  
 Anne Merete Kruge  
 Celia Marie Kuitunen  
 James O'Dell Kusler  
 Daniel Lloyd Larsen  
 Patricia Alice Lee  
 Cathy Kay Lerberg  
 Peter Jeffery Levasseur  
 Jay Donovan Lewis  
 Alan R. Lindemann  
 Holly Anne Lindsay

Christie Ann Logan  
 Lynn Daryl Luckow  
 Herbert Arnold Maas

Catherine Louise Machau  
 Randy George Makarenko  
 Edie Alizabeth Marcks  
 Frank W. Matejcek  
 Marcy-Jean Mattson  
 Michael J. Maus  
 Yolanda Horgan McAllister  
 Paul Edward McFarlane  
 Carl Russell McKay  
 George Robert McLeod  
 Susan Jane McWethy  
 Robert H. Medhus  
 William Arthur Mehojah, Jr.  
 Edmond Joseph Mielczarek, Jr.  
 Bruce Allen Miller  
 B. Aaron Monson, Jr.  
 Adele Ann Moreland  
 David Leland Nelson  
 Patricia Helen Nolan  
 Melinda Allen Nordwall  
 Gerald Dean Olson  
 David A. Oster  
 Bruce Eugene Pallansch  
 Sandra Marie Paraskeva  
 Jeffrey John Parker  
 Phyllis Miriam Pederson  
 Daniel Clifford Peterson  
 Norris Dean Pfeifer  
 Michael Lynn Pratt  
 Lynn Louise Prochaska

Georgia M. Reimers  
 Joseph Arthur Rizzo  
 Michael Lee Rustad  
 Robert Charles Rutten  
 Dolores Jean Ruvalo  
 Mahlon Sanders  
 Richard Merrill Sanders  
 Alice Rae Sanderson

Colleen Rose Schmaltz  
 Gregory Linn Schmidt  
 Dave Ray Schmitz  
 Mary E. Seaworth  
 Cheryl M. Senecal  
 Donald Paul Sessions  
 Randall Craig Severson  
 David Norris Shawhan  
 Steven Michael Shermoen  
 Linda Shockman  
 Lynn Vina Shouse  
 Mary Jean Skorheim  
 Sharon Dianne Skrogstad  
 Marcia Kay Skurdal  
 Michael Francis Slag  
 Terrance Eugene Smith



Degree of Bachelor of Arts (Cont.)

Mark Gyle Spitler  
Sandra Lee Stauff

Virgil Arthur Stern  
Curtis Wayne Strode  
Stephen A. Stromstad  
Elizabeth Ann Super  
Kristin S. Sutro  
Susan Elaine Swanson  
Kay Lynn Swartz  
Calvin Douglas Taillefer  
C. Mark Tandberg  
Sheldon Kermit Thompson  
Virginia Ann Thomson  
Dorothy M. Torblaa  
Steven Mark Trandem

Linda Kay Turner  
Donald Leon Unruh  
Jill Elaine Vig  
Beverly Ruth Volker  
Mark Jan Vrem  
William Stuart Wahlund  
William Francis Wakefield  
Robert Edward Walter  
Susan Kay Wanberg  
Virginia Juanita Wehrung  
William G. West  
David Owen Wilson  
Keith A. Wolberg  
Mary Margaret Wright  
Paul Joseph Wysynski  
Ann Irene Zuger

Degree of Bachelor of Science

Gary Edward Allard  
Scott Dodd Anderson  
Dean Lowell Arneson  
Ronald Dennis Baesler  
Timothy Warner Baumann  
Steven Charles Beck  
Barbara Jean Behsman  
Robert William Bethke  
Robert Lee Boehmer  
Dennis Errol Branvold  
Michael L. Cavanaugh  
Michael Frederick Cerkovnik  
William Charles Darner

James Allan Lessard  
Mark Scott Lian  
James Joseph Lobsinger  
Patrick Francis Majors  
Jeffrey Howard Mandel  
Joseph Howard Marshall  
Sherman Myron Maurseth  
Terry Duane McGillivray

Monte Dennis Mehring  
Lynn Bernard Meier  
Michele Colleen Milinovich  
Kurt Barry Modahl  
Wayne Steven Mohr  
Michael Richard Moum  
Bruce Allen Nelson  
Aaron Carroll Olson  
James Harold Olson  
Ali Orandi  
Warren William Pagel

Bruce Michael Samson  
Jerome Keith Sanders  
James Schafer  
Jeffrey Floyd Schlameus  
Georg Christian Schultz  
Tom M. Senger  
Gerald Ned Severson  
Gale Eugene Smith  
Gordon Arthur Staff  
Peggy Jane Stupca  
Gerald Wayne Sundby  
Gary Lee Sunderland  
John J. Tsoumpas  
Myron Joseph Veenstra  
Donald Wayne Wenker

Donella Mae Domine  
Michael Joseph Donegan  
Vernon John Dosmann  
Kenneth Edwin Etterman  
Michael Lawrence Fix  
Carolyn Leah Folden  
Roger Milton Fossum  
Ronald Duane Gette  
Hubert Gerald Grandbois  
Jeffrey Scott Hanson  
Gordon Bradford Hazen, Jr.  
John Ingmen Hensrud  
Harold Paul Hjalmarson  
David John Hodny  
Holly A. Holmes  
Grover Parks Icenogle

LeMont William Jahn  
Phyllis Elaine Johnson  
John Peter Kjelmry  
David Newell Knapp  
Robert F. Kurle



Degree of Bachelor of Science (Continued)

Fred Charles Wirth

Kathleen Ann Wood  
Jan Groves WylieDegree of Bachelor of PhilosophyJames Michael Bennington  
David E. Buringrud  
James Austin Davis  
Dennis Marvin Gad  
Sheldon Ward Green  
Lynn Vincen Jaehning  
David Paul Kjelstrup  
Duane Arlen Larson  
Peter Wayne LoydJames Joslyn Moses, Jr.  
Ronald William Norton  
Bruce Wayne Ritter  
Robert Brian Rubin  
Walter Louis Schefter, Jr.  
Herbert Laverne Schultz  
Lynn Anthony Soiseth  
Eldon Murray TroftgrubenDegree of Bachelor of Science in Chemistry

Deane Leif Johnson

Degree of Bachelor of Science in Geology

Daniel James Ackerman

David James Mathison

Degree of Bachelor of Science in Home Economics

Bonita Marie Malsam

Sharon Spicer Stewart

## COLLEGE OF EDUCATION

Dean M. L. Cushman

Degree of Bachelor of Science in Education and  
Bachelor's Diploma in Teaching

Jane Aakhus

\*Rebecca Jean Bleecker  
\*William Frank Bodelson  
\*Dorothy H. Bohlman  
Janet A. Bohlman  
\*Sophine Mary Bohm  
Joan Heyne Boschee  
Milton Roger Brandson  
Margaret P. Breivik  
Kathleen Ann Broden  
\*Connie Rae Buck  
Barbara Marie Burckhard  
\*Susan M. Bushaw  
Kenneth Murray Butler  
Elizabeth Ann Chale  
Gary Alan Chepulis  
\*Julia Berget Christenson  
Karen Ann Clausen  
\*Margaret Anne Close  
Darlene Marie Collins  
Connie Elaine Johnson Corbin  
Kristie Lynn Davis  
\*Lenora Fay Davis  
Nancy Ann Demmers\*Marilyn Ruth Adsem  
Thomas Donald Aird  
Valerie Jean Allen  
Elizabeth Fay Allmaras  
Nancy Jane Amann  
A. Dennis Anderson  
\*Jane Suzanne Anderson  
Julene Marie Anderson  
LaVonne Lou Anderson  
Donald Russell Bakke  
\*Bonnie Kay Bakkegard  
\*Richard James Barrett  
Robert Byron Barton  
Mike Edward Baumgartner  
\*Ethel Mae Beaver  
Gerald S. Beck  
John Joseph Becker  
Joyce Gayle Becker  
\*Ida LaVerne Belcher  
Sheila Rae Berg  
\*Mary Ann Bjorneby



Degree of Bachelor of Science in Education and  
Bachelor's Diploma in Teaching (Continued)

Audrey Dianne Dix  
 Corrinne Hazel Dolalie  
 \*Trisha Anne Dominick  
 \*Susan Kay Donegan  
 Joanne Marie Douts  
 James Michael Drake  
 \*George Robert Dunbar  
 Robert Ross Duncan  
 Bryce Richard Eaton  
 \*Beth Einhorn  
 Cheryl Ann Enderud  
 Mary Kay Engebretson  
 Kathleen Ann Engh  
 Emma Lou Darling Evanson  
 Darrell W. Farland  
 \*Marian Katherine Fay  
 Patricia Ty Fenimore  
 Beverly Ann Flicek  
 William Roger Franke  
 \*Lynnette Jessen Frazer  
 Mark C. Fredricksen  
 Linda Mae Gallagher  
 Cheryl Lynne Gard  
 Elizabeth Dorlee George  
 \*Kaylynn Bett Gibb  
 Patricia Katherine Gilmore  
 Mary JoAnn Glynn  
 Allen Robert Goletski  
 Luis Gustavo Gonzalez-Hernandez  
 Virginia Margaret Gorder  
 Gary Lee Gorman  
 \*Marion L. Gornowich  
 Jacqueline Dee Gray  
 \*Jeanne P. Gustafson  
 Delby Rey Hager  
 Patricia Lee Hager  
 Michael John Hammerberg  
 Katherine Marie Hanish  
 Betty Jean Hanson  
 Bruce Carol Hanson  
 \*Diane Irene Hanson  
 \*Doris Emma Hanson  
 Jane D. Hardmeyer  
 \*Dale LeVern Harmeson  
 Janet Lee Hatfield  
 Diane Rae Hatzenbihler  
 \*Esther May Hauge  
 John Earl Healy  
 \*Diane Irene Heck  
 \*Connie May Heine  
 Karen Marie Helling  
 Terrell John Henderson  
 \*Kathy G. Henschel

Glenn Arvie Herreid  
 Kathleen Lois Wilde Hess  
 Sally Kathleen Hill  
 Deborah Sue Hillier  
 Delanda Roseina Hillius  
 Jane Frances Hoffmann  
 Glenda Marie Hokana  
 Pamela Jane Holen  
 Steven Nord Honebrink  
 Patricia L. Hooper  
 Jo'an Laurella Heyne Huber  
 Morgan John Huset  
 Karen Lee Hussong  
 Cheri Y. Inomoto  
 \*Jacqueline Patricia Iverson  
 Janet L. Jacobson  
 \*Terry Carl Jacobson  
 Rhonda Jean James  
 \*Barbara Jane Jensen  
 \*Carol Jean Jensen  
 Aaron Joel Jermundson  
 Alan Roger Johnson  
 \*Diane Renée Johnson  
 Nora Louise Kane  
 Dennis Edwin Kastendiek  
 Gary Arlynn Kelsch  
 \*Janette Mary Kettleson  
 Ronald Allen Kettleson  
 Gary John Kirkeby  
 John Wayne Kirkelie  
 Harold R. Kirmis  
 Rosemary Ione Klatt  
 Kathryn Dorothy Kline  
 Loretta Ann Karel Knudsvig  
 Caryn Mae Knutson  
 Kathleen Ellen Koch  
 Mark Lee Koppelman  
 Robert John Kowalchuk  
 Gerald Joseph Kram  
 Dwight Eugene Krapp  
 Paula A. Kreitinger  
 Kathleen Marie Kruse  
 Renée Marie LaBarre  
 Vicki Lynn Lagow  
 Rita Sue LaMoine  
 Christopher Griggs Lander  
 Gary Merle Langheid  
 \*Kenneth Mark Langton  
 \*Diane Inez Larson  
 \*Diane Martha Larson  
 Gary Morrell Larson  
 Janice Eileen Larson



Degree of Bachelor of Science in Education and  
Bachelor's Diploma in Teaching (Continued)

Mary Forster LeBrun	Rosine Ann Quam
Katherine Louise Lee	Sandra Fay Quam
Rebecca Dianne Lee	Donald Verne Raaum
Timothy Allen Lee	Letitia Joyce Ramsey
Nancy Lee Lein	Lynnette Karen Olson
Elizabeth Jane Lewthwaite	Richard Lloyd Olson
*Jennifer Arlene Lien	Mary Helen Orth
*Sylvia G. Likness	Gary Nyles Ostrom
Jane Claire Lillestrand	Lynnett Louise Otterson
*Carol M. Lindemann	Cynthia Jean Ozbun
Carol Sue Lindner	Donald Michael Palmiscno
Lynn Lee Lindseth	Chris Albert Paustian
Gordon James Link	*Harriet Hemmer Peterson
Alison Margaret Lyngby	Leon Kenneth Peterson
*Jeanne Marie Maack	*Lloyd Arthur Petri
*Walter Scott Mabree	Barbara Grace Pihlgren
*Linda Michele Marelocke	Mary Frances Pokrzywinski
*Stefanie Ballin Marks	Philip Craig Raney
Magdalene Ann Martin	Lydia Paulette Ravnaas
Melinda Ann Martin	Elsie Reichert
Marcia Youngquist Mattson	*Jean Marjorie Reiten
Mary Helen Maus	Philip Frederick Richmond
Brenda Elaine McCormick	*Phyllis J. Rinas
John Carroll McDermid	Kathleen Rose Risdal
*Deborah Lee McDonald	Susan Elaine Robertson
*Nancy Louise McDonald	Monica Jean Rosland
Sue Ann McLaughlin	Karen Louise Ruefle
William Duncan McPherson	Kathy Marie Schlueter
*Barbara Jennifer Mehlhouse	Alice Kaye Schmidt
Margaret Ann Miller	Jacque Irene Schmidt
Phyllis Elkins Moen	Lorne Arthur Schram
Dianne L. Mondry	Norma Jean Schulz
Linda Jo Moses	Leslie A. Schumacher
Leo James Naaykens	Barbara Gail Seibel
Dale Victor Nabben	
Craig Elliot Nansen	Jenine Kay Selander
Mary Ellen Narlock	*Darlene Rae Selk
Sheryl Sue Narum	*Gloria Jean Selk
*Connie Marie Nelson	Judy A. Semmens
*Eva Gunderson Nelson	Karla S. Severson
Jenny Debra Nelson	*Catherine Alice Sheridan
James Oliver Nickels	Douglas Scott Sherman
Maryanne Carol Nilson	Dorothy L. Shermoen
Mary Lee Nordby	Waldo Guy Shupe
Jerry Lynn Nowlin	*Ruth Virginia Sitzler
Lester Jack Obrigewitsch	*Lois Elsie Skaro
Claudia Lee Odden	Colleen Audrey Smith
Jerome Paul Odette II	Eloise Marie Soderfelt
Bonnie Lee Olson	Roger Francis Specht
Jennifer Lynne Innes Olson	Elaine Elsie Spicer
*JoAnn E. Olson	*Mary Catherine Stahlecker
Barbara Grace Pihlgren	Robert Dennis Stechisen
Douglas David Pottenger	Diane Marian Stempson
Glenson Leigh Price	Kathleen Ann Stenberg



TENTATIVE - NOT TO BE RELEASED

-7-

Degree of Bachelor of Science in Education and  
Bachelor's Diploma in Teaching (Continued)

*James E. Stewart	*Jane Suzanne Ujka
*Peggy Will Stewart	Paul LaVance Upsahl
*Mona Louise Streyle	John Patrick Verwey
Karen Ann Svor	Deborah Kay Wade
Jerald C. Swenson	Walter Stephen Wagner
Lynette Kaye Swenson	Connie Ellen Walter
Carolyn Hetzel Swinney	Ruth Marthene Washburn
Lanae Julianne Tande	Bruce Orville Wegley
Lois Marie Thompson	Linda Lou Weigel
Ellen Carol Thomte	Patrick Leo Welch
Gayle Lynn Thurn	*Helen Yvonne Wheeler
Linda Carol Timm	Dennis Gordon Wiebe
Jane Ellen Trangsrud	*Deborah Joy Williams
Judith Mason Travis	Marjorie Ann Winger
Jerry Andrew Tretter	Deborah Louise Wall Wittmann
Calvin Lynn Turner	Jane Elizabeth Wold
*Nolan Charles Tveter	Susan Kay Wood
*Adeline S. Tweed	Warren Steve Young
	Roberta McKinnon Zahradka
*New School of Behavioral Studies	

COLLEGE OF ENGINEERING

Dean Alan G. Fletcher

Degree of Bachelor of Science in Chemical Engineering

Harnarayan Hanumanji Ahir	Kenneth James Gothberg
Gene Geard Baker	Jay Robert Kauphusman
Floyd Vernon Burton	Rayton Dale Nies
Bobby Albert Doughman	Michael J. Pedersen
	Anop Kumar Shah

Degree of Bachelor of Science in Civil Engineering

Gary John Hartz	Wally Dean Koch
	Lloyd Robert Lasham, Jr.
	James Dean LeQuire
Donald Lanny Hynek	James Walter Mellem
Mehmet Ali Kantar	Randall Anthony Pope
Omer Ali Karagozoglu	Rick J. Thompson

Degree of Bachelor of Science in Electrical Engineering

Kenneth Brehnan	Robert Bruce Perry
William Henry Dittmer	Charles Lynn Pfau
Darrel Rueben Gunst	Curtis Lee Schacher
James Allen Harlow	Stephen James Senger
Sharad Kamdar	Alan Richard Severson
Douglas Frithjof Lunde	Dennis Lee Simpson
Dennis Lawrence Marek	Don Albert Swartz
Roger James Nies	Sheridan Bertram Vogel
Keith Glenn Olson	Philip Jacob Weber
	Larry Allyn Zimmerman



Degree of Bachelor of Science in Industrial Engineering

Allen Lee Geisen  
James Bradley O'Grady

Terrence Paul Olson  
Kathleen Ann Scheel

Degree of Bachelor of Science in Mechanical Engineering

James Raymond Ahmann  
Charles Berkley Bowman  
Bryan Joseph Dietz  
Mark Jay Goebel  
Wally Lee Kaczmariski  
Kenneth Allen Krueger  
Charles Alvin Lofquest

Gerald Allen Majkrzak  
Richard Jondall Mehus  
Randy Guy Renfandt  
William George Ruzicka  
Mark William Thompson  
Dwight Dale Wendschlag  
John Henry ZumBrunnen

## COLLEGE OF BUSINESS AND PUBLIC ADMINISTRATION

Dean T. J. Clifford

Degree of Bachelor of Science in Business Administration

Jerome Theron Albus  
Robert James Allan  
Gary Wayne Anderson  
Kevin Warren Austin  
Thomas Guy Bailey  
Richard Francis Baker  
Kevin Bradford Bauer  
Judy Lynn Berg  
Leslie Neil Berg  
Robert Owen Black  
Allan M. Bosch  
Nancy Jean Bossman  
Robert Craig Brown  
Timothy Allan Bruce  
James Gregory Bucher  
Raymond Dale Buchli  
George Allen Cariveau  
Richard Wayne Carl  
Lloyd George Case  
Jesus Castillo  
Stanley Henry Chaput  
Cheryl Renae Chase  
Gerald Keith Clancy  
Connie Mercedes Corcoran  
William Wayne Cormylo  
Douglas Wesley Crosby  
Howard Alan Dahl  
LaRay Adaire Davidson  
Donald Edward Dickson II  
Leonard John Didier  
Patrick Joseph Dirk  
James Emil Divita  
Robert Lee Edwardson  
Rick Lee Elofson  
Dallas Herman Enger  
Bernard Allen Feland  
Denis Gene Fetsch

Timothy James Fischer  
Gary Lee Flagg  
William Edward Flynn  
Andrew Laurus Freeman, Jr.  
Jack Gerald Fugere  
Wayne James Fuhrman  
Michael John Gaddie  
Ronald Dean Gardner  
Wayne Olaf Glemming  
Bruce William Grundei  
Paul David Gunville  
William Ross Gustafsson  
Ronald Gary Hall  
Rodney Philip Hamblin  
Eugene Kenneth Hamilton  
Vernon Russell Hanson  
Robert Allan Haukness  
Kathlyn Bymers Heaton  
Warren Dean Helstrom  
Jay Arthur Henrickson  
Edward Charles Herda  
Roscoe Phillip Herseth  
Mary Elizabeth Hertsgaard  
Bruce Eugene Hoekstra  
Harold David Huber  
Michael John Hughes  
Steven Richard Hunter  
Walter B. Hurst, Jr.  
Tom Eugene Ingstad  
Ronald Wayne Irwin  
Nodean Gaylen Jelsing  
Donald Roy Johnson  
Jerome Warner Johnson  
Timothy Ray Johnson  
Gary M. Joraanstad  
Douglas Erroll Jorgensen  
Douglas Carl Kane



Degree of Bachelor of Science in Business  
Administration (Continued)

Patrick Clement Kartes  
Michael Lee Kemnitz  
James Kirk Kennedy  
Ronald Gene Kleingartner  
James Lyle Knecht  
Roy Edward Knudson  
Gordon Elling Knudsvig  
Donald Richard Koetter  
Norman Joseph Korb  
Benedict James Kosteletzky  
Robert James Kraft  
Steven Alan Krantz  
Wayne Brian Krause  
Robert C. Larimore  
Alan Joseph Larivee  
Barry James Larson  
Carol Jean Larson  
Dennis W. Larson  
Victor Nelson Lee  
Dennis Duane Leiphon  
Evan William Lips  
Richard Wayne Lockner  
Gary H. Lybeck  
Karen Lee Lynch  
Richard Butler Mahowald  
Michael Dennis Mahrer  
Bernard Don Marquart  
Judy Ann Martinson  
Gary Lee Mayer  
Robert Brandt McMeekin  
David James Melroe  
Larry L. Merwin  
Mark Richard Metzger  
Ronald Glenn Miller  
Ivan Stanley Monk  
Gregory Alan Monshaugen  
Curtis Wayne Mowm  
Mark W. Mowery  
Patrick Joseph Neary  
Allan Raymond Nelson  
Paul C. Ness  
Richard Walter Nolan  
Bruce James Nordstrom  
Wayne Warren Olney  
Dean Michael Olson  
Jeff Lowell Paffrath  
Robert John Paul  
Charles Edward Peck  
Richard Paul Pederson  
Richard Harry Pickett  
Thomas Allen Pierce  
Bruce Lynn Ranstrom  
Gerald Dennis Ray  
John L. Reha

Dale Lambert Reilly  
Duane Dale Reiswig  
Thomas Peter Restad  
Halloway Clifford Reynolds  
Robert Don Robinson  
Marvin Alan Rockstad  
Richard Herold Rolfstad  
Dennis John Rowe  
Michael Lewis Rystedt  
Danniel James Schmaltz  
John Irvin Schmidt  
Gary August Scholand  
Vernon Kermit Schroeder  
Lawrence Henry Schwartz  
Heinz Don Sczygiel  
Douglas Vernon Seiler  
Gary Horst Sentek  
John Kenneth Shields  
Margaret Twitchell Shields  
Thomas James Snyder  
Craig T. Sobolik  
Ronald Allen Solberg  
Steven Berg Spiss  
Richard Arthur Stephan  
Cecil Francis Strande  
DeWayne Dale Streyle  
Curtis Wayne Strobe  
Larry John Strup  
Kenneth Duane Svedjan  
Terry K. Swartz  
John David Sylvester  
Mary G. L. Teevens  
Daryl Kent Thompson  
Gerald Joseph Ustanko  
Gary John Valiquette  
Ronald J. Vanyo  
Rodney Roy Voeller  
Cyril A. Votava  
Delane Darwin Wagner  
Alexander Wakal  
Dale Louis Waltz  
Larry Allan Wandschneider  
David N. Wanner  
Gary Lee Warnke  
Gary Earl Weber  
John Mark Weed  
Wayne Robert Weeda  
Parker Wellington, Jr.  
Milbert Steve Weninger  
Robert Walter Wermager  
Irve David Wickham  
Donald Michael Wieber  
Daniel Edwin Will



Degree of Bachelor of Science in Business  
Administration (Continued)

Robert Franz Wood

Lyle John Wysocki

Terence Mark Zeltinger

Degree of Bachelor of Science in Public Administration

Kenneth P. Bachman

Mark Louis Scipioni

David Louis Jeffrey

Richard Eugene Stephens

Ronald Lee Taylor

COLLEGE OF NURSING

Dean Margaret F. Heyse

Degree of Bachelor of Science in Nursing

Lois Joanne Amundson

Deborah Kay Onstad

Ramona Jane Anderberg

James Leason Poling

Kalyn Jana Anderson

Joy Clarine Rickert

Linda Carol Blaisdell

Dee Ora I. Rosin

Diana Lynn Corbit

Bev Ann Ruff

Donna Rae Dunlop

Sheila Renee Sannes

Sharleen Marie Erbele

Claudia Elizabeth Schmalenberg

Joyce Ann Golden

Dawne Elizabeth Skjerven

Karin Jean Hangsleben

Kathy Ann Sorenson

Beverly Jean Hanson

Sheryl Fay Speare

Nada T. Hanson

Donna Jean Spooner

Ruth Bredlie Hanson

Sharon Lynn Elaine Sprunk

Karen Aileen Hird

Margaret Rose Amundson Stai

Katherine Mae Jacobson

Nioma Faye Storlie

Darlene Marie Kahl

Kathrine Ann Thorlakson

Kathleen Cheryl Koepplin

Corinne Ragna Thorson

Valerie R. Laney

Linda Eleanor Tice

Susan Jane McMillan

Christine Joy Jones Tveter

Joyce Faye Moberly

Thomas James Van Hook

Deborah Roxanne Monicken

Cheryl Anne Watkins

Allan Maurice Olson II

Marcia Jane Wicklander

Nancy Lu Wilson

SCHOOL OF MEDICINE

Dean T. H. Harwood

Degree of Bachelor of Science in Medical Technology

Arlene Ann Althoff

Arlene Bratland Fuhrman

Jean Cook Bitney

Sarah Jane Hausauer

Karen M. Bjornstad

Peter Charles Holiday

Janice E. Brentrup

Robertta Ann Johnson

Carolyn A. Foley

Cathy Lynn Knudson

Sue Carol Lee

Degree of Bachelor of Science in Occupational Therapy

Gary Oliver Camp

Marjean Ann Kuchenmeister

Carolyn Grace Pierce



Degree of Bachelor of Science in Physical Therapy

Sharon Ann Cummings  
Joan Sue Dick  
Janet K. Ellingson  
Kenneth Joseph Fisher  
Lynn Marie Gaebe  
Stonewall Edward Gessner

Max L. Long  
David Wesley Severson  
Susan Jane Sheldon  
Charlene Kay Siepel  
Richard Paul Swenson  
Mark Curtis Vibeto

Degree of Bachelor of Science in Medicine

Thomas D. Ahlin  
Joe Bob Alexander  
Darrel John Aleson  
Dennis Wayne Berge  
Kris M. Bjornson  
Jerome Martin Blake  
George Milton Blatti  
Walter Michael Callan  
John Corrie Callenbach  
Steffen Peter Christensen III  
William Edwin Code  
Theodore Lawrence Crandall  
George Robert Diayer  
Diane Lohse England  
William Wesley Finch  
Thomas Oakley Flath  
John Douglas Fremstad  
Alan Joseph Frueh  
Robert Edwin Grossman  
Frederick R. Haller  
Sam J. Hardy  
Gale Arlon Hazen  
William Arthur Himango  
Glen R. Hyland  
Lynn James Hyland  
Terrance Lee Johnson  
Paul E. Kaldor  
John Joseph Knox

James Lawrence Kwako  
Edward Peter LaMotta  
Tyrone O. Langager  
Calvin Cordin Loken  
Mark Clifford Moore  
Dale Clifford Moquist  
Donald Gene Nordstrom  
Daniel John Ostergaard  
Thomas Jay Quam  
John D. Rhoades  
Timothy Charles Rietz  
Manuel Alvarez Rodriguez  
William Oscar Sarette  
David Michael Scollard  
Stuart James Sherry  
Richard Joseph Smith, Jr.  
James Raymond Spenningsby  
Robert James Tello  
Robert Grant Thornburgh, Jr.  
Louis William Traverso  
David Martin Uthus  
Robert LaVerne Van Dyken  
Robert Eugene Vigesaa  
David Allen Watkin  
Charles George Weispfenning  
Lawrence Joseph Wieland  
Thomas Horsley Winters  
Howard Randal Woodward

## SCHOOL OF LAW

Dean Robert K. Rushing  
Degree of Juris Doctor

Thomas Harold Allison  
Terry Michael Anderson  
Nicholas A. Barna  
William Walter Binek  
Douglas Albert Christensen  
Clemens Joseph Cieminski, Jr.  
Dwight S. Cuffe  
Robert Boyd Griffith  
F. Gene Gruber  
William Alexander Hill  
Robert Wallace Holte  
Gary Alden Holum  
Jerry Wayne Huizenga

Dwight Francis Kalash  
Dwight C. H. Kautzmann  
Robert Allen Keogh  
Eddie Gordon Kopperud  
Randall Harrison Kramer  
Linda Mabry Little  
Salvatore Frank Lorello  
Terrence James Maddock  
David Orin Markert  
Michael Owens McGuire  
William Daniel Muldoon  
Mervin D. Nordeng  
Marcia O'Kelly



Degree of Juris Doctor (Continued)

Barry Thomas Olson  
David Vermont Opland  
Henry Franklin Rompage  
Mark James Thomason

Charles M. Travis  
Gregory William Tschider  
David William Viker  
John Earl Widdel, Jr.

## GRADUATE SCHOOL

Dean A. William Johnson

Degree of Master of Arts

Nancy Jo Albers  
Max Ernesto Anadon  
Beatrice Kay Anderson  
Sam L. Anderson  
Carol Anne Aso  
Takenori Aso  
James Louis Baum  
Ralph Norman Campbell  
Jeffrey Lawrence Delmore  
James Murray DeMott  
Daniel Arthur Doucette

Gregory Stephen Kowalski  
Yui Huen Kwan  
Cathryne Christine Lalim  
Barbara M. Lee  
Gregory Kinn Lee  
Milton LeRoy Leiran

Barbara Maria Engle

Curtis Glenn Eriksmoen  
Paul Felter  
James Edward Genereux  
Jessie Gray Goddard  
Thomas Arthur Haller  
Charlene M. Heinecke  
Janelle Elizabeth Hongess  
Robert Joseph Hromyak  
Bernard Floyd Hyatt  
Timothy Charles Kavaney  
Lawrence Wayne Knutson  
Benedict Marcel Kohler

David Arthur Lysne  
Kenneth Michael Maciula  
Gary Karl Malm  
Daniel Louis Morgan  
Howard Joseph Morgan  
Robert Mathew Novak  
John Francis O'Leary  
Cynthia Ann Phillips  
Robert Resnick  
Lawrence Francis Shepel  
L. Ray Uloth  
Mary Kay Uloth  
Raymond Frank Venzke  
David Calvin Waldron  
David Frank Wedeking  
Irvin John Weeks  
Janet Marie Wilcox  
Dennis David Williams  
William Douglas Wittman

Degree of Master of Science

Joel Edward Adkins  
Dale Allen Anderson  
Mukarram Mustafa Al-Omari  
Warren Frederick Bartz, Jr.

Wilfred Johannes Bertelt  
Emanuel E. Bingaman  
Ronald Marvin Block

William Prosper Capozella  
James Neil Carlisle  
Joanlee Brunet Childers  
Ralph Larry Crutchfield  
David Lynn Decker  
Joe Sheldon Downey

Charles Edward Durbin  
David Frederick Ehren  
William George Ellis  
Dinker Fatterpaker  
Herman Michael Few  
Sharyn Lee Fullerton  
Paul Livingstone Griffiths III  
Gerald Henry Groenewold  
Stephen James Haire  
Sally Van Valkenburg Hirsh  
Donald Lee Homrighausen  
Roger Norman Hooker  
John Izzo  
Roger Leslie Jenkins  
Dwight Richard Jennison  
Gregg Allen Johnson  
Jerold Rexford Johnson



Degree of Master of Science (Continued)

John Lamar Johnson	Richard Dale Rottschafer
Kent Allan Johnson	Luis Nemesio Saldaña Contreras
Paul Dean Johnson	John Joseph Schonberger, Jr.
	Frank Joseph Schulte
Francis Edward Kane	Mary Woods Scott
John Francis Karst	Kenneth Edward Self
Marilyn Louise Kent	Daniel Eugene Sipes, Sr.
Louis Henry Kermott III	Juan Carlos Siska
Mohammed Hasan Khalil	Harold Charles Snedker
Jeffrey William Lang	Michael Dennis Snyder
Carl Donald Lawson	Lyle Curtis Sorum
Curtis Don Lee	Herman Clifton Sylvester
James Charles Lenehan	Donald Everett Tillson
Culberto Maldonado	Charles Vincent Tookey
Marlene Eva McGuire	Brian Neil Turner
Patricia Lynn Heyne Monson	Norman Dale Urquhart
Susan Ann Morgan	Guy Richard Velardi
Don Elroy Mullins	Lothar August Voller
Richard Nels Nordin	Hudson A. Washburn
Charles Richard Patrick	Lonnie Earle Weaver
	Jerome Irwin Weiss
Jerry Allan Pope	Jerry Lynn Wetherbee
Elizabeth Blackmon Proctor	Robert James Wilcox
Robert Kenneth Rendall	Shen-Jyh Wu
George Louis Rohde	James Baskin Young

Degree of Master of Education

Carolyn Bamber Allured	Martin Michael Koller
Ronald Lorin Biberdorf	Carol Mae Lange
Richard Darrell Bushaw	Goeffrey Stuart Law
Robert Eugene Campbell	Obert Edward Moen, Jr.
Glen William Engle	David Andrew Quam
John Fredric Gasparini	Gary Lamar Schneck
Jean Marie Griffith	Elynor L. Schue
Neil William Heringer, Jr.	Wilma Roberta Stinar
	Forrest Bruce Walker

Degree of Master of Science Teaching

Bruce Allen Johnson	Charles Donald Rantala
Douglas E. Osgood	Lloyd G. Tofte

Specialist Diploma

Donald Eugene Rey

Degree of Doctor of Education

Beverly Wade Brekke	Edward B. Lasher
Lloyd LeRoy Fezler	Gale Gordon Lennon
Erich Hugo Heintzen III	G. Dean Miller
Peter James Johnson	Robert Charles Volker
	Gordon Leigh York



Degree of Doctor of Philosophy

Nadine Taylor Ashby  
 Donald Arne Berntsen  
 Gary Eugene Bryngelson  
 Jonathan E. Craine  
 Audrey E. Bell Donley  
 Donald Earl English  
 Andrew Paul Evan

Allen Blaine Koss  
 Richard Lance Listiak  
 Gene Charles Ness  
 James Morgan Olson  
 Darryll Thoralf Pederson  
 Spencer Alan Peterson

Adelaide Delores Johnson  
 Kenneth Robert Keefner  
 Marcella J. Kocar

Robert Eugene Thompson  
 Sandra Doris Ubelacker  
 Richard Dean Urban  
 Patricia Ann Wells

A Minimum of 6 credits from the following:

Ed 510	Educational Theory and Research	2 credits
Ed 511	Educational Statistics	2 credits
Ed 512	Educational Psychology	2 credits
Ed 513	Advanced Topics in Educational Research	2 credits
Ed 514	Non-graduate level	2 credits
Ed 515	Non-graduate level	2 credits
Ed 516	Non-graduate level	2 credits
Ed 517	Non-graduate level	2 credits
Ed 518	Non-graduate level	2 credits
Ed 519	Non-graduate level	2 credits
Ed 520	Non-graduate level	2 credits
Ed 521	Non-graduate level	2 credits
Ed 522	Non-graduate level	2 credits
Ed 523	Non-graduate level	2 credits
Ed 524	Non-graduate level	2 credits
Ed 525	Non-graduate level	2 credits
Ed 526	Non-graduate level	2 credits
Ed 527	Non-graduate level	2 credits
Ed 528	Non-graduate level	2 credits
Ed 529	Non-graduate level	2 credits
Ed 530	Non-graduate level	2 credits
Ed 531	Non-graduate level	2 credits
Ed 532	Non-graduate level	2 credits
Ed 533	Non-graduate level	2 credits
Ed 534	Non-graduate level	2 credits
Ed 535	Non-graduate level	2 credits
Ed 536	Non-graduate level	2 credits
Ed 537	Non-graduate level	2 credits
Ed 538	Non-graduate level	2 credits
Ed 539	Non-graduate level	2 credits
Ed 540	Non-graduate level	2 credits
Ed 541	Non-graduate level	2 credits
Ed 542	Non-graduate level	2 credits
Ed 543	Non-graduate level	2 credits
Ed 544	Non-graduate level	2 credits
Ed 545	Non-graduate level	2 credits
Ed 546	Non-graduate level	2 credits
Ed 547	Non-graduate level	2 credits
Ed 548	Non-graduate level	2 credits
Ed 549	Non-graduate level	2 credits
Ed 550	Non-graduate level	2 credits
Ed 551	Non-graduate level	2 credits
Ed 552	Non-graduate level	2 credits
Ed 553	Non-graduate level	2 credits
Ed 554	Non-graduate level	2 credits
Ed 555	Non-graduate level	2 credits
Ed 556	Non-graduate level	2 credits
Ed 557	Non-graduate level	2 credits
Ed 558	Non-graduate level	2 credits
Ed 559	Non-graduate level	2 credits
Ed 560	Non-graduate level	2 credits
Ed 561	Non-graduate level	2 credits
Ed 562	Non-graduate level	2 credits
Ed 563	Non-graduate level	2 credits
Ed 564	Non-graduate level	2 credits
Ed 565	Non-graduate level	2 credits
Ed 566	Non-graduate level	2 credits
Ed 567	Non-graduate level	2 credits
Ed 568	Non-graduate level	2 credits
Ed 569	Non-graduate level	2 credits
Ed 570	Non-graduate level	2 credits
Ed 571	Non-graduate level	2 credits
Ed 572	Non-graduate level	2 credits
Ed 573	Non-graduate level	2 credits
Ed 574	Non-graduate level	2 credits
Ed 575	Non-graduate level	2 credits
Ed 576	Non-graduate level	2 credits
Ed 577	Non-graduate level	2 credits
Ed 578	Non-graduate level	2 credits
Ed 579	Non-graduate level	2 credits
Ed 580	Non-graduate level	2 credits
Ed 581	Non-graduate level	2 credits
Ed 582	Non-graduate level	2 credits
Ed 583	Non-graduate level	2 credits
Ed 584	Non-graduate level	2 credits
Ed 585	Non-graduate level	2 credits
Ed 586	Non-graduate level	2 credits
Ed 587	Non-graduate level	2 credits
Ed 588	Non-graduate level	2 credits
Ed 589	Non-graduate level	2 credits
Ed 590	Non-graduate level	2 credits
Ed 591	Non-graduate level	2 credits
Ed 592	Non-graduate level	2 credits
Ed 593	Non-graduate level	2 credits
Ed 594	Non-graduate level	2 credits
Ed 595	Non-graduate level	2 credits
Ed 596	Non-graduate level	2 credits
Ed 597	Non-graduate level	2 credits
Ed 598	Non-graduate level	2 credits
Ed 599	Non-graduate level	2 credits
Ed 600	Non-graduate level	2 credits

II. Foundations of Education (6 hours minimum)

Ed 500 Introduction to the Graduate Study in Education 2 credits

4 additional credits should be selected in the foundations area

III. Cognate (6 hours minimum)

Preferred areas for cognate work would be mathematics, psychology, biology, and counseling and guidance.

Total 32 credits

In addition to the usual admission requirements for the Graduate School and the Education Department, some minimal quantitative background is required. This background must include course work that covered topics in differential and integral calculus. If the student has not already completed coursework in either linear algebra or matrix algebra in his undergraduate program, then coursework in one of these areas must be included in his master's degree program.



APR 13 '71

## Master of Education

## EDUCATIONAL MEASUREMENT AND STATISTICS (20 hours)

I. Major:

Required (or the equivalent)

Ed 513	Basic Computer Programming and Techniques	3 credits
Ed 515	Educational Statistics I	3 credits
Ed 516	Educational Statistics II	3 credits
Ed 510	Educational Testing and Evaluation	2 credits
	or	
Ed 517	Non-parametric Statistics	2 credits
Ed 584	Internship in Educational Research	1 credit
Ed 977	Independent Study	2 credits

A Minimum of 6 credits from the following:

Ed 510	Educational Testing and Evaluation	2 credits
Ed 511	Educational Measurement I (Psychometric Theory)	3 credits
Ed 512	Educational Measurement II (Scaling)	3 credits
Ed 514	Advanced Computer Programming and Techniques	3 credits
Ed 517	Non-parametric Statistics	2 credits
Ed 518	Multivariate Analysis	3 credits
Ed 519	Research Seminar (Experimental Design)	3 credits
Ed 584	Internship in Educational Research	1-3 credits
Ed 592	Individual Research	1-4 credits

II. Foundations of Education: (6 hours minimum)

Ed 500	Introduction to Graduate Study in Education	2 credits
--------	---	-----------

4 additional credits should be selected in the foundations area

III. Cognate: (6 hours minimum)

Preferred areas for cognate work would be mathematics, psychology, biology, and counseling and guidance.

Total 32 credits

In addition to the usual admission requirements for the Graduate School and the Education Department, some minimal quantitative background in required. This background must include coursework that covered topics in differential and integral calculus. If the student has not already completed coursework in either linear algebra or matrix algebra in his undergraduate program, then coursework in one of these areas must be included in his master's degree program.



APR 15 '71

## Master of Education

## READING EDUCATION

## I. Area of Concentration

Required or the equivalent (16 - 20 credit hours)

Ed 530	Foundations of Reading	2 credits
Ed 534	Basic Reading Diagnosis and Correction	2 credits
Ed 535	Advanced Reading Diagnosis and Remediation	2 credits
Ed 591	Reading Clinic (may be taken for two semesters)	2-4 credits
Ed 997	Independent Study	2 credits
	or	
Ed 531	Teaching of Reading in the Primary Grades	2 credits
Ed 532	Teaching of Reading in the Intermediate Grades	2 credits
Ed 533	Reading in the Secondary School	2 credits

Related Coursework in the major area of concentration may include:

Ed 415	Education of Exceptional Student	3 credits
Ed 539	Seminar in Special Education	2 credits
Ed 529	Seminar in Early Childhood Education	2 credits
Ed 510	Educational Tests and Measurements	2 credits
Ed 552	Organization and Administration of the Elementary School	2 credits
Ed 520	Curriculum in the Elementary School	2 credits
Ed 521	Supervision of the Elementary School	2 credits
Ed 522	Arithmetic in the Elementary School	2 credits
Ed 523	Social Studies and Science in the Elementary School	2 credits
Ed 553	Secondary Education Organization and Administration	2 credits
Ed 542	Improvement of Instruction in the Secondary School	2 credits
Ed 540	Secondary Education Curriculum	2 credits
Ed 541	Secondary Education Supervision	2 credits
Ed 543	The Junior High School	2 credits
Ed 549	Seminar in Secondary School Education	1-4 credits

## II. Cognate Area (6 - 10 credit hours)

Preferred areas for cognate work include Library Science, Counseling and Guidance, Speech Pathology and Audiology, and Psychology

## III. Foundations of Education (6 credits)

Ed 500	Introduction to Graduate Study	2 credits
--------	--------------------------------	-----------

Four additional credit hours should be selected in the foundations area

Total 32 credits



## ATTACHMENT #4

(Held over for discussion until the  
first meeting in the 1971-72 year)

Communication on Code of Student Life.

At its meeting of April 19, 1971, the UND Chapter of AAUP heard a report from its representatives on the Student Policies Committee that that Committee plans to present the current Code of Student Life to the University Senate for its approval.

A motion was made and unanimously approved by the Chapter that there should be conveyed to the University Senate the AAUP's concern that the Code should not be approved in its present form. The Chapter does not wish to imply any criticism of the work of the Student Policies Committee in this respect. It realizes that much time and effort have been put into the composition and revision of the Code.

The Chapter does, however, wish to point out to the University Senate that the Code, as presently constituted, is at variance with the Joint Statement on Rights and Freedoms of Students, which is itself contained in the Code. A detailed report on the discrepancies was submitted to the Chapter and subsequently to the Student Policies Committee and to the Vice-President for Student Affairs by an ad hoc committee specially appointed by the UND Chapter of AAUP.

A copy of that report is appended and Mr. Thorson, incoming Vice-President of the AAUP Chapter, is available to speak to the question if the Senate desires it. The Chapter's overriding concern is that any Code approved by the Senate be in conformity with the Joint Statement on Rights and Freedoms of Students. Mr. Pearce.



## Election Ballot for 1971-72

Committee	Present Members (terms)	Nominees (terms)
Academic Policies Committee	S. Markovich (71) G. Smith (71) V. Stenberg (72) S. Norton (72)	<u>Vote for two (2)</u> T. Owens (73) <u>Elected</u> J. Quaday (73) <u>Elected</u> G. Smith (73) <u>Elected</u> R. King (Floor)
Athletics	D. Beach (71) E. Alberts (71) K. Hankerson (72) D. Wacker (72) R. Apanian (73) S. Murray (73)	<u>Vote for two (2)</u> R. Apostol (74) <u>Elected</u> P. Ray (74) <u>Elected</u> W. Weisser (74) <u>Elected</u>
Board of Publications	H. Strentz (71) P. Blackman (71) A. Karabus (71) S. Markovich (71) R. King (71)	Three (3) <u>Vote for <del>XXXXXX</del> (3)</u> H. Strentz (72) <u>Elected</u> P. Blackman (72) <u>Elected</u> Larry Kraft (72) <u>Elected</u> J. Kushner (72) <u>Elected</u> R. Medalen (72) <u>Elected</u> J. Smeall (72) <u>Elected</u>
Continuing Education	R. Caldwell (71) L. Kulas (71) O. Manz (72) P. Cory (73) W. McBride (73)	three <u>Vote for <del>two</del> (3)</u> Q. Brunson F. Howell <u>Elected--3 Years</u> W. Schmid <u>Elected--3 Years</u> L. Thompson <u>Elected--1 Year</u> 1 for one year 2 for three years
Curriculum	E. Gade (71) W. Bares (71) I. Jensen (71) B. Ring (72) T. Robinson (72) G. Smith (72)	<u>Vote for three (3)</u> E. Alberts (74) <u>Elected</u> I. Dahl (74) <u>Elected</u> I. Jensen (74) <u>Elected</u> A. Rudisill (74) <u>Elected</u>



Committee	Present Members (terms)	Nominees (terms)
Faculty Research	C. Libera (71) W. Kube (71) G. Kemper (72) R. Wilkins (72) T. Akers (73) R. Lewis (73)	<u>Vote for two (2)</u> E. Gade (74) <u>Elected</u> G. Lykken (74) <u>Elected</u> F. O'Brien (74)
Library	D. Khactu (71) G. Iseminger (71) A. Brekke (71) A. Cooley (72) P. Cory (72) T. Messenger (72) B. Childers (73) A. Cvancara (73) O. Kraus (73)	<u>Vote for three (3)</u> M. Caldwell (74) <u>Elected</u> J. Hart (74) T. Pedeliski (74) <u>Elected</u> S. Schmidt (74) <u>Elected</u> L. Owens (Floor)
Student Academic Standards	R. Hampsten (71) A. Cvancara (71) R. Burrage (72) R. Kestler (72) D. Anderson (73) W. Koenig (73)	<u>Vote for two (2)</u> T. Clark (74) W. Kube (74) <u>Elected</u> P. Wright (74) <u>Elected</u>
Student Policy	R. Seabloom (71) A. Lind (71) G. Schubert (71) E. O'Reilly (72)	<u>Vote for three (3)</u> R. Bloomquist (74) <u>Elected</u> G. Iseminger (74) <u>Elected</u> R. Miller (74) H. Wing (74) <u>Elected</u> M. Rykken (Floor)
Summer Session	J. Rowe (71) J. Quaday (71) V. Facey (72) R. Koppenhaver (72) P. Reiten (73) A. Sturgis (73)	<u>Vote for two (2)</u> L. Eichoff (74) <u>Elected</u> R. MacKichan (74) <u>Elected</u> G. Lawrence (74)



Committee	Present Members (terms)	Nominees (terms)
Student Activities (SAC)	C. Whalen (71) J. Rowe (72) R. Snortland (72)	<u>Vote for two (2)</u> D. Beach Elected--1 Year V. Oslund Elected--3 Years J. Torian P. Thoreson (Floor) 1 for one year 1 for three years
University College	O. Hager (71) G. Lawrence (71) H. Auer (71) B. Brommel (72) W. Moore (72) L. Russell (73) V. Oslund (73)	<u>Vote for three (3)</u> H. Boswau (74) <u>Elected</u> J. Hootman (74) L. Jarman (74) <u>Elected</u> N. Kinghorn (74) <u>Elected</u>
Honorary Degrees Committee	New Committee	<u>Vote for five (5)</u> W. Boehle C. Bullard <u>Elected-2 Yr.</u> R. Caldwell W. Cornatzer <u>Elected-1 Yr.</u> V. Facey D. Naismith <u>Elected-3 Yr.</u> T. Snook R. Tisdale H. Tomasek <u>Elected-4 Yr.</u> J. Tweton <u>Elected-5 Yr.</u>



Report of the Curriculum Committee  
To the University Senate  
On the R. O. T. C. Program

The Curriculum Committee was charged by the University of North Dakota Senate with evaluating the proper place of the R. O. T. C. at the University of North Dakota. Two questions were involved in the Senate charge to the Curriculum Committee:

1. The question of Academic Rank and status of the military personnel assigned to the R. O. T. C. program at the University, and
2. The question of academic credit and nature of courses taught in the R. O. T. C. Program at this University.

The place of R. O. T. C. on college and university campuses has been the subject of sharp debate for the past several years. The quality of that debate has been inflamed by the deep divisions in this country over the conflict in Indo-China and over the role of the military in the determination of national policy. More recently, this problem has been exacerbated by charges that the armed forces have been guilty of condoning, or at least concealing, war crimes.

The charge to this committee, while limited to the precise questions of the appropriateness of academic credit for R. O. T. C. courses and of academic rank for R. O. T. C. staff, cannot be isolated from this background.

It is the position of this committee that the R. O. T. C. can and should be an important instrument in maintaining the traditional American position that our armed forces should be the instruments of civilian policy and that they should be subjected to heavy civilian influence. In accord with this position, it is our conviction that one of the major roles of an R. O. T. C. program should be to insure a civilian input into the military. This should mean that officers who enter the services via R. O. T. C. programs bring a broader background to their military careers than do those recruited from either military academies or special officers' training programs. Most particularly the R. O. T. C. should represent the best traditions of our academic cultivation of critical and informed intelligence. During their military career, R. O. T. C. trained officers will be subjected to the full rigors of military discipline and indoctrination. Therefore, they are to fulfill the role of bringing a mitigating civilian influence to bear in our military organizations something other than simple military training and indoctrination must constitute their university training phase.

With these considerations in mind serious questions must be raised about the nature of the R. O. T. C. program. The staff of this program, while subject to the approval of the university administration, owes its direct allegiance to an agency external to the university. It is deprived of any of the usual protections which guard academic freedom in other areas of the academic



world. While this staff appears to be quite competent and while the services are concerned with upgrading the training of R. O. T. C. staff, it must be pointed out that many areas of subject matter considered under existing R. O. T. C. programs are areas in which the staff can claim no particular expertise. In terms of the courses themselves, we have heard varying reports. Some consider the courses highly informative, well organized and utilizing excellent material, others report that they are well below the academic standards of the rest of the university, and still others regard them as adequate but simplistic and uncritical. We are in no position to make a final judgement on this but we do feel that continuing critical evaluation of these courses should be undertaken by competent members of our faculty. Some of the members of the committee are also seriously concerned that the standards of academic freedom for students which apply elsewhere on campus are not integral to the R. O. T. C. programs. While this is a moot point, it is so essential that we believe it is especially important that this aspect of the program should also be kept under continuing surveillance.

In view of these considerations, the Curriculum Committee makes the following recommendations:

The Curriculum Committee recommends that the Senate create a University Senate Standing Committee on the R. O. T. C. to be elected annually by the Senate (nominated by the Committee on Committees or from the floor.) The Committee shall consist of 3 faculty members elected by the University Senate, 1 person appointed by the President, 3 students elected by the Student Senate and the 2 Commanding Officers of the R. O. T. C. Units as ex officio members. This Committee would exercise continual review of the University of North Dakota R. O. T. C. programs and report to the University Senate at least annually. It would approve or disapprove the military personnel assigned to the University Instructional Staff, in the rank of Visiting Professor or Visiting Instructor, as appropriate. It would carry out a continuing review and evaluation of the R. O. T. C. Curriculum (courses) as to content, semester hours of credit, and instructional staff. As a general policy, the Curriculum Committee recommends that whenever possible courses in the R. O. T. C. program be taught by regularly assigned permanent civilian faculty of the University of North Dakota, in areas of their competence. It also recommends that when possible and when in keeping with the fundamental purpose of R. O. T. C. the practical aspects of the military program be carried out in field exercises or appropriate summer programs.

substantial influence on rules and procedures have been adopted. For this reason, the Committee chose to focus its study on the Code.

In evaluating the Code of Student Life the Committee has adopted five basic premises:

1. It is essential for the university to have clearly formulated and readily ascertainable disciplinary rules and procedures.
2. Informality and flexibility in handling disciplinary matters in a university context is often desirable, and the university should not



REPORT OF THE UNIVERSITY OF NORTH DAKOTA AAUP AD HOC COMMITTEE  
ON STUDENT DISCIPLINE

Richard Kuhns, Chairman  
George Frein  
Eldon Gade  
Ralph Kolstoe  
Ross Tisdale

Last spring this Committee was appointed by the President of the University of North Dakota chapter of the AAUP to investigate student disciplinary policies and procedures at the university to determine whether they conform to AAUP standards as set forth in the Joint Statement on Rights and Responsibilities of Students.

The Joint Statement requires that university disciplinary procedures be clearly formulated and set forth so that students will know their rights. At the time this committee was established, the university's official policies and procedures, if they existed at all, were not clearly formulated and communicated to the students.

Last August, the university published the Code of Student Life. Although the Code has not yet been officially adopted, the Committee anticipates that it will be adopted, or at least that it will have a substantial influence on rules and procedures that are adopted. For this reason, the Committee chose to focus its study on the Code.

In evaluating the Code of Student Life the Committee has adopted five basic premises:

1. It is essential for the university to have clearly formulated and readily ascertainable disciplinary rules and procedures.
2. Informality and flexibility in handling disciplinary matters in a university context is often desirable, and the university should not



attempt to handle all disciplinary matters with the same formality that would be required in a court of law.

3. The requirements of due process by which courts have held that universities must abide in disciplining students are only minimum standards for fairness, not necessarily optimal standards.

4. Students' rights should be protected as fully as possible without unduly interfering with or making unduly burdensome other legitimate functions of the university.

5. Any student code should include not only specific rules and procedures, but should attempt to express the highest goals and aspirations of the university.

Each of these premises is consistent with the Joint Statement.

On the basis of its study the Committee has reached the following conclusions:

1. The individuals who were responsible for drafting the Code are to be commended for their efforts. The publication of the Code represents a significant step forward to meet the AAUP Joint Statement requirement that "... procedures be clearly formulated and set forth...." Now that a published Code exists, immediate action is needed to revise and officially adopt the Code to bring it into full agreement with the provisions of the Joint Statement.

2. The sections of the Code which outline students' rights at Student Relations Committee hearings and which set forth limitations on the rights of university personnel to search rooms are for the most part adequate and in substantial conformity with Joint Statement standards.

3. The Code's provisions dealing with the powers and jurisdiction of lower judicial bodies and personnel deans are confusing and sometimes contradictory; and the students are offered inadequate procedural protection in all of these situations. These sections of the Code will have to be



entirely redrafted in order to conform to Joint Statement standards.

4. The Code is poorly organized. Rules and regulations are scattered indiscriminately throughout the document in such a manner as to require burdensome cross-referencing. More important, however, is the generally negative impression that the Code provides. Although the Code begins by quoting the Joint Statement, it moves immediately to a list of specific prohibitions. The Code does not set forth a statement of this university's own commitment to learning and freedom of expression, and the incoming freshman who reads the Code might will believe he is entering a repressive environment rather than a university. The virtues of the present Code are administrative; the virtue of a revised Code should reflect the tasks of teaching and scholarship.

5. There are a number of other specific Code provisions that are inconsistent with the Joint Statement. These inconsistencies are pointed out in the Appendix to this report.

The Committee recommends that the appropriate individuals and committees in the university reexamine and revise the Code in accordance with the suggestions set forth here and in the Appendix in order to make the Code consistent with the Joint Statement, and the Committee strongly urges those who reevaluate the Code to consult with members of the law school faculty.

October, 1970



## APPENDIX

### INTRODUCTION

In this Appendix the Committee will examine in detail the Code of Student Life in conjunction with the AAUP Joint Statement, with a view toward pointing out areas where the Code is inconsistent with the letter or spirit of the Joint Statement. The Appendix is organized according to the provisions of the Joint Statement, and all page references are to the Code. One who wishes a thorough understanding of the Appendix should have a copy of the Code to which he can make reference.

#### I. PREAMBLE

No specific rules or regulations are necessary for the university to comply with the provisions of the Preamble, and the fact that the University Senate has "adopted" the Joint Statement (See p. 10) is perhaps a sufficient expression of the university's commitment to the principles there set forth. Nonetheless, there are three respects in which the Code could be altered to more fully comply with the spirit of the Preamble:

1. The entire Code should be reorganized, if not rewritten, to emphasize the positive aspects of academic freedom. The Joint Statement, after discussing the nature of academic institutions, proceeds to the question of freedom of access to higher education. The Code, however, in a manner that is truly disturbing, takes as its second order of business a verbatim quoting of the law and order policy of the State Board of Higher Education and the law and order Act of the State Legislature. Shortly thereafter, the Code again contains an extended policy statement on disruptions. Important as good order is to academic life and freedom, it ought not be so prominently displayed that the Code is unbalanced by it.



While it is important for the Code to include specific rules and regulations governing student conduct, the lengthy policy statements and federal and state statutes dealing with disruptions would be more appropriate in an appendix. Furthermore, specific prohibitions should not be the principle concern of the opening sections of the Code.

2. The Code's internal organization is confusing, and a thorough understanding of the Code requires making constant cross-reference to various sections. The Code should be revised to minimize this problem.

3. Except for indicating that the Joint Statement has been approved by the University Senate, the Code contains no statement of the university's commitment to academic freedom and students' rights. It would be desirable for the Code to contain a statement of the university's commitment to these principles in the form of a preamble to the Code. This would not only help to alleviate the problem indicated in point #1, supra, but also such a preamble would be a valuable guide for the interpretation of specific Code provisions.

## II. FREEDOM OF ACCESS TO HIGHER EDUCATION

The Committee is aware of no university admissions policies or regulations that are inconsistent with the Joint Statement.

In addition to providing freedom of access to education, the university, according to the Joint Statement, should use its "influence to secure equal access for all students to public facilities in the local community." (p. 3). Whether or not the university does this is beyond the scope of this report. However, we suggest that compliance with the spirit of the provision would be fostered by including in the Code or some other well publicized document a statement (1) indicating that the university is committed to this goal and (2) informing students of various individuals and groups that will assist them in securing equal access to various community facilities.



### III. IN THE CLASSROOM

#### A. Protection of Freedom of Expression.

The Code does not address itself specifically to this issue. The University Senate's adoption of the Joint Statement is a sufficient indication of the university's commitment to protecting freedom of expression, and it is probably not necessary to have specific rules and regulations dealing with this issue. Nonetheless, it would be desirable for the university to make its own explicit commitment to freedom of expression and to include such a statement in the Code or some other well publicized document.

#### B. Protection Against Improper Academic Evaluation.

This is a most serious and delicate problem, for the legitimate interests of students may conflict with the legitimate interests of faculty members. How these conflicting interests should be reconciled is a question largely beyond the scope of this Committee's report; however, the Committee feels compelled to make the following observations:

1. At the present time the Code does not give SRC jurisdiction over academic questions (See pp. 27-8), and this limitation on SRC's jurisdiction is not inconsistent with the Joint Statement. However, the Code's complete failure to provide protection against improper academic evaluation is inconsistent with the Joint Statement. At the very least, procedures must be established that will allow students to challenge what they consider to be improper academic evaluations, and these procedures must be set forth in the Code or in some other well publicized document.
2. The only reference to academic evaluation problems in the Code is at page 18 where the academic dean is given the authority "to act" in cases of cheating and plagiarism. That specific provision is inadequate in that (1) it assumes the student is guilty, (2) it does not define the student's rights, and (3) it gives no guidelines for and sets no limits on



the academic dean's authority to act.

3. In view of the complexity of the issues raised when academic evaluations are challenged and in view of the apparent lack of established procedures to deal with this problem, the Committee suggests that an ad hoc university committee be established to study this problem and make recommendations for establishing a procedure for dealing with these questions.

#### C. Protection Against Improper Disclosure.

The comments in Section III, A are applicable here.

### IV. STUDENT RECORDS

The primary concerns of the Joint Statement provision are the risk of improper disclosure and the complete avoidance of including in student records indications of students' political beliefs.

With regard to the first point, the Code has some specific provisions to insure confidentiality of records, but the provisions are not completely adequate in the following respects:

1. The Code provisions for disclosure of academic records (p. 55) indicate that "normally" the information is disclosed at the student's request. In the case of supplying information to the Selective Service System, the word "normally" may refer only to the method by which the student requests that the information be given. In the provision for issuing copies of transcripts, the word "normally" implies that there are abnormal situations where the information is given even if the student has not made a request. Unless the university is responding to a valid subpoena, the Committee can conceive of no reason for the university ever to disclose information from a student's records without his permission. Thus the Committee recommends that an explicit statement to this effect be included in the Code and that any inconsistencies or ambiguities in the current provisions be amended. If the university feels that there are or should be legitimate exceptions to this



general rule, the exceptions should be explicitly set forth.

2. The Code provides that verbatim (i.e. taped) records of SRC proceedings "shall be destroyed upon the request of the accused student," and that "a written record of the proceedings will be filed with the Student Relations Committee." (p. 29). Since taping and transcribing the hearing appear to be alternative methods of making a record of the proceeding, it is unclear why the provisions for maintaining these records are different. The Committee recommends that the practices be uniform for recordings and transcripts.

3. At page 66 the Code provides for destruction or removal of old disciplinary records. The provision for destruction of old records is excellent, but the Committee is confused as to the meaning and purpose of providing for the "removal" of records. If "removal" is merely another word for destruction, the Committee suggests that the word be deleted or that the provision read "removed and destroyed" rather than "removed or destroyed." If the records are removed and not destroyed, there should be specific provisions dealing with the placement of removed records and the circumstances under which records will be removed rather than destroyed.

4. The Code provides for the confidentiality of the records of SRC proceedings (p. 29), but there are no similar provisions for the confidentiality of other disciplinary records. The Code should make explicit provision for confidentiality of all disciplinary records, and it should charge all judicial officers with the duty of keeping information learned in closed judicial proceedings confidential. Either the Code or some other official university document should set forth in detail where all such records are to be kept and who may have access to them.

5. Since there is always the possibility that some individual will misuse confidential records or that those records may be subpoenaed by a court



or legislative committee, the university should strive to include as little incriminating information as possible in its disciplinary records. While there obviously will have to be some incriminating information in disciplinary records, the Code or some other document should set forth in detail the type of information that will be kept on record, and should limit the records to inclusion of only that information.

With regard to the Joint Statement provision that "no records should be kept which reflect the political activities or beliefs of students," (p. 4), the university should reconsider the Code provision requiring student organizations to submit lists of officers. (p. 33). While the Joint Statement explicitly provides that student organizations may be required to submit lists of officers (p. 5), such a requirement may conflict with the requirement to avoid keeping records of students' political beliefs. The problem, of course, arises when any student organization is essentially political in nature, and the problem becomes acute when a court or congressional committee attempts to subpoena university records concerning controversial political organizations. In order to avoid the necessity of keeping a list of the officers of political organizations, the university should consider alternative methods of accomplishing whatever ends are achieved by having organizations submit lists of officers. For example, if the primary purpose of such a requirement is to give the university the names of people to contact when the university wishes to contact the organization, this end could be achieved by requiring that the organization submit the name of its faculty advisor. Perhaps all organizations should have the option of submitting either a list of officers or the name of a faculty advisor.

## V. STUDENT AFFAIRS

### A. Freedom of Association.

The Code provisions for student organizations substantially comply



with the AAUP Joint Statement standards. The only questionable provisions in the Code are those dealing with the exceptions to the general provision that all student organizations must file their constitutions with the Student Activities Committee. (See p. 34). While there may be legitimate reasons for exempting social fraternities and sororities from this requirement, one undesirable consequence of this exemption is that the university does not have the same opportunity that it has with other organizations to determine whether or not the constitutions of the organizations contain racially restrictive clauses. Since a number of social fraternities and sororities have had and some still do have racial covenants, and since the AAUP Joint Statement provides that campus organizations should be open to all students without regard to race, creed, or natural origin, (p. 5) the exception for social fraternities and sororities is troublesome. In order to solve this problem, the university should require each student organization either to file a copy of its constitution with some university official or group or to file a statement that it does not have a racially restrictive covenant in its constitution. Whenever a student organization is affiliated with some non-university organization, it should have similar requirements for the parent organization. The Code should further provide that any student organization that has a racially restrictive clause in its or the parent organization's constitution or that practices racial discrimination will not be eligible for recognition as a student organization.

One further problem exists with regard to the Code's provisions for student organizations. Exception "b" on p. 34 appears not to be an exception but a restatement of the general rule. Perhaps it is intended as an exception to exception "a." In any event, the provision is ambiguous and should be clarified.



B. Freedom of Inquiry and Expression.

There appear to be no conflicts between the Joint Statement and the Code provisions. The comments in Section III, A, supra, are applicable to the university's compliance with the first paragraph of this section of the Joint Statement.

C. Student Participation in Institutional Government.

Although the Code does not address itself to this point, the existence of the Student Senate and the student participation in the University Senate and on university committees probably satisfies this Joint Statement requirement. It would be advisable for the Code or some other document to state specifically the nature and extent of student participation in the governance of the university.

D. Student Publications.

Since the Code does not deal with student publications and since there is no reason for the Code to deal with this subject, the Committee views this area as beyond the scope of its jurisdiction.

VI. OFF CAMPUS FREEDOM OF STUDENTS

A. Exercise of Rights of Citizenship.

The comments in Section III, A, supra, are applicable here.

B. Institutional Authority and Civil Penalties.

The Code agrees with the ideal of the Joint Statment that there shall be no "double punishment" for off-campus crimes. (pp. 7,24). However, the Code also provides that in exceptional cases university disciplinary action may be taken in cases where civil penalties are imposed. (p. 24). This "double punishment" would occur only when "the circumstances of the crime suggests the possibility of repetition involving the risk of injury to persons or property within the university community." (p. 24). While there may be exceptional circumstances where the university's distinct interest



would justify disciplinary action even though the civil authorities are also disciplining the students, the above standard is not an appropriate expression of those exceptional circumstances. The Code's statement contemplates making a prediction that would be difficult if not impossible: Who is to decide whether the activity is dangerous? By what criteria is he to decide? Without answers to these questions there is opportunity for arbitrary determinations. But even if these questions are answered, one is faced with the more fundamental question as to whether it is ever appropriate to take disciplinary action on the basis of the supposed dangerousness of an individual. The Committee believes that imposition of university penalties on the basis of such a prediction is not the type of situation contemplated by the Joint Statement provision for imposition of institutional in addition to civil penalties, and that using this standard as a basis for disciplining students would be inconsistent with the Joint Statement.

With regard to student violations of the civil law, the Joint Statement provides that "institutional officials should be prepared to apprise students of sources of legal counsel and may offer other assistance." (p. 7). In order to comply with this provision of the Joint Statement, either the Code or some other well publicized university document should at the very least apprise students of various sources of legal counsel. At the present time, for example, this is especially important with regard to selective service problems.

With regard to the Joint Statement's provision that "institutional action should be independent of community pressure," (p. 7) the university should reconsider the Student Policy Committee statement that was drafted to implement compliance with federal legislation which restricts federal funds to students involved in campus disruptions. (See pp. 20-22). Since



the federal legislation does not add any disciplinary powers to the university but only restricts them by requiring the university to invoke a particular sanction in certain instances, the university, in order to minimize the outside pressure of the statute, should interpret and apply that statute in the narrowest possible sense. Presumably this was the objective of the Student Policy Committee as evidenced by its narrow and reasonable definition of the terms "substantial disruption" and "serious refusal to obey." In one respect, however, the Student Policy Committee has sanctioned much broader application of the federal legislation than is necessary. Public Law 90-575 defines one category of persons who will be denied federal funds as those who, after notice and hearing, have been found to have committed certain crimes that contributed to a substantial disruption of the university. (p. 20). The Student Policy Committee statement apparently contemplates that such findings will be made (See p. 21), but in the normal course of university disciplinary proceedings it is hard to imagine that any judicial body would ever make a finding that an individual committed a certain crime. There is no statutory requirement for the university to attempt to make such a finding, and without the finding the university is not compelled by federal legislation to deny the funds to that category of students.

## VII. PROCEDURAL STANDARDS

### A. Standards of Conduct.

Neither the Code nor any other document of which the Committee is aware specifies the rule making powers of various individuals and groups in the university. If these powers are adequately defined in some document, it should be generally available to the university community. If they are not, a university committee should be established to study the problem



and define the rule making authority of various individuals and groups. It is beyond the scope of this committee's work to make specific suggestions in this regard, but it is appropriate to set forth certain guidelines about rule making as they relate to the university's power to discipline students for alleged infractions of the rules:

1. The Code should not only give students notice of various rules and regulations, but it should also provide them with an indication of the probable sanction for various violations. Thus, each disciplinary rule should set forth the range of probable sanctions that may be imposed for its violation; or at the very least, the Code should attempt to indicate which infractions may result in the more serious penalties. Unless the students have some reasonable notice that their alleged misconduct may result in serious penalties, they should not be subject to serious sanctions.

2. Students should not be subject to any disciplinary action unless the rule or regulation allegedly violated was enacted by a body with the authority to enact the rule and unless the rule was publicized in such a manner as to give reasonable notice of its existence to students.

3. No body that does not have significant student representation should be empowered to enact rules and regulations. (See Joint Statement, p. 8). A fortiori, an individual administrator should not be empowered to make rules and regulations unless that power has been specifically delegated to him by a legislative body with significant student participation that has the authority to enact the legislation itself.

The Code clearly does not conform to this first requirement, and the Committee has no way of knowing whether the rules and regulations set forth in the Code conform to the last two requirements. Approval of the Code by the University Senate would probably satisfy the last two requirements for provisions currently in the Code.



### B. Investigation of Student Conduct.

The Code's provisions dealing with room inspection are for the most part satisfactory (See pp. 70-71); however, the Committee feels that two amendments are necessary in order to make the provisions conform completely to Joint Statement standards:

1. The Joint Statement provides that rooms should not be searched unless appropriate authorization has been obtained from a designated responsible authority, and that authorization is to be obtained from that authority by presenting him with an application specifying the reasons for the search and the objects or information sought. (p. 8). In order to comply with this provision, the head resident or resident assistant seeking authorization from a personnel dean should seek that authorization by means of a written application setting forth the information called for in the Joint Statement. If the personnel dean approves the search, the authorization should also be in writing.

2. Although the Joint Statement does not explicitly sanction any other types of searches (except in emergencies), the Code provides that a head resident or resident assistant may conduct a search if he first receives permission to enter the room. (p. 70). If these searches are made with the consent of the student, they would not be inconsistent with the Joint Statement. However, the Committee feels that careful attention should be given to the question of whether the consent is a knowing one. Since head residents and resident assistants are likely to visit students' rooms for social and other nondisciplinary reasons, a student's permission for the head resident or resident assistant to enter may not be a knowing consent to a search. If the resident assistant or head resident is seeking permission to enter the room in order to make a search, he should make that fact known to the student before he enters



the room. In short, he should be required not merely to ask permission to enter but to ask permission to enter for the purpose of making a search.

### C. Status of Students Pending Action.

At page 28 the Code provides that "pending action on charges of violating a University regulation, the status of the student shall not be altered, nor shall his right to be present on the campus and to attend classes be suspended, except for reasons relating to the safety of others." Although this language is quite similar to the Joint Statement provision regarding the status of students, both the general rule and the exception in the Code need modification.

The Code's rule is set forth in the section dealing with procedural standards in SRC hearings. Apparently there is no similar regulation regarding the student's status when he is not before the SRC, and arguably the SRC rule does not apply when the alleged violation is not of a university rule. (i.e. it might not apply in the case of an alleged violation of a dormitory rule). Both of these limitations on the status rule are inconsistent with AAUP Joint Statement.

Another problem, which is common to the Joint Statement provision and the Code, is that the word "action" is not defined. Does it mean action by the individual or body exercising original jurisdiction, or does it mean action by the appellate bodies that may review the case? For example, under the Code provisions, a personnel dean, upon recommendation of the Student Conduct Committee or head resident, may take action to dismiss a student from a hall or the residence hall system. (p. 64). If the personnel dean decides to take this action, must the student move immediately or may he remain until the SRC has heard his appeal?

While it obviously would be in the student's best interest to postpone taking any action until all appeals have been exhausted, the university, at least in some instances, may have legitimate interests in taking more speedy action. Perhaps the best solution would be to invest



some individual or body with the discretionary power to decide whether it is appropriate to stay action pending appeal. However, if this is done, guidelines should be set for the exercise of that discretion, and perhaps a decision to take action immediately should be appealable to the SRC if that is not the body making the determination in the first instance.

Regardless of what guidelines are set for the exercise of this discretion, there should be a rule clearly stating that action may not be taken until the student has had an opportunity for a hearing on the matter. In the above example the personnel dean would have the authority to act even though the student may not have had a hearing. As long as the power to make disciplinary decisions is vested initially in some individual or body that can act without giving the student an opportunity for a hearing, implementation of the decision should be stayed until the student has had a hearing. Of course, if the student does not take the appropriate steps to perfect his appeal, the action may be taken as soon as the time to appeal has run.

A footnote to the exception, which allows action to be taken immediately for reasons of the safety of others, refers to the Code's emergency provisions at p. 19. Presumably the exception is not intended to be any broader than the exception set forth at page 19, and probably it should be redrafted to more clearly reflect this.

The emergency provisions on page 19 authorize the President in certain extreme circumstances to suspend or expel students. The suspensions or expulsions must be referred to the SRC within five days, and if they are not so referred, they will be automatically rescinded. The Committee believes that the existence of this type of emergency power is not necessarily inconsistent with the Joint Statement; however, there are two respects in which the Code's emergency provisions are inconsistent with the Joint Statement:



1. While temporary summary suspension may be a necessary emergency power, there is no reason to give the President the power to summarily expel students. If the situation warrants expulsion, the SRC at its hearing may expel the student. In the meantime, temporary suspension accomplishes all of the immediate needs to which the emergency provisions are directed.

2. Although the summary suspensions must be referred to SRC within five days, there is no requirement for the SRC to act within five days. In fact, if the emergency involved large numbers of students, it might be impossible for the SRC to act on all of the cases within five days; and in any given situation five days may not be an adequate time for a student to prepare his defense. For these reasons the summary suspensions should be limited to a specified number of days--five is probably the maximum--regardless of the action of SRC.

Particularly in situations where the summary suspensions are invoked against large numbers of students, but also in any situation which requires numerous SRC hearings, the Code's judicial structure will be severely strained. SRC members will be required to devote a great deal of time to handling the disciplinary cases, and as a result their academic pursuits may suffer. The Committee recommends that a special university committee be created to study this problem and to make recommendations for special judicial machinery that may be put into operation in such situations (e.g. campus disturbances).

#### D. Hearing Committee Procedures. (With reference to the SRC)

For the most part the procedures for SRC hearings conform with the Joint Statement. There are, however, several ambiguities and omissions that deserve comment:

1. At least in situations where the SRC is exercising original jurisdiction, the student should as a matter of course have the right to a



hearing before the SRC. Although the specific SRC procedures seem to contemplate a hearing, the Code states that a student "shall be granted, on request, the privilege of a hearing." (p. 28). There appears to be no reason why a student should have to request a hearing, but if he does, the Code should at least inform the student to whom and in what manner the request should be made.

2. The Code provides that SRC has original jurisdiction in cases "involving serious violations of all-university rules and regulations," (p. 27 ; see also statement at p. 28: "When the misconduct may result in serious penalties...[the student] shall be granted...a hearing.") While it may be appropriate for SRC to hear cases involving only more serious infractions, it is not appropriate for the SRC's jurisdiction to be defined by such a vague concept. The above provisions give no guidelines for determining what is serious, and few of the university regulations indicate what sanctions will be imposed for their violation. This means that any individual--or at least a personnel dean--may determine for himself what is serious and refer the case to SRC. As a result of this ad hoc and perhaps arbitrary determination of seriousness, a student, with no prior notice of the seriousness of his conduct, may find himself subject to suspension or expulsion. Even though the SRC does not have to impose one of the more serious sanctions, the existence of this broad discretionary power is unwarranted and inconsistent with the Joint Statement.

3. The Committee feels that it would be advisable for the Code to provide that personnel deans, at the request of the student, have the option of handling any disciplinary matter. This option would be provided with the understanding that the personnel dean would take the case only in situations where the misconduct involved embarrassing circumstances that a student might feel reluctant to have brought to the attention of fellow



students on the SRC. Under no circumstances would the personnel dean have the power to exercise this option without the request of the student.

4. The Code contemplates that evidence against a student may be presented in the form of written statements by persons who are not actually present at the hearing. (See p. 29). This is not at the present time a violation of due process as the courts have applied that concept to university disciplinary proceeding, and it is apparently not inconsistent with the Joint Statement, which, like the Code, provides that "in no case shall the committee consider statements against him (the defendant) unless he has been advised of their content...." (p. 9). Both the Joint Statement and the Code, however, provide that the student "should have an opportunity to hear and question adverse witnesses." (pp. 9, 28-9). The Committee feels that this inconsistency in both the Joint Statement and the Code should be resolved in favor of the student, by providing explicitly that the student shall have the opportunity to question all adverse witnesses. Especially if serious consequences may flow from the alleged misconduct, the right to confront and question adverse witnesses is essential.

5. In cases that may involve serious penalties the student should be informed not merely of his right to counsel, but he should be advised that it would be desirable for him to have adequate representation, and he should be told where he can obtain such representation. If the case may involve suspension or expulsion, the university should not proceed against a student who desires but is unable to obtain adequate representation.

6. One of the greatest deficiencies in the SRC procedures is the omission of a statement giving the accused student the right to remain silent. Although neither the Joint Statement nor the courts to date mention this right as fundamental to university judicial proceedings, it



is, the Committee feels, particularly important for two reasons:

a) Without the specific enumeration of this right, a student's silence may be interpreted as implying guilt; and

b) In situations where a student may be subject to potential civil sanctions, his statements at an SRC hearing could be used against him in court. While there are some recent decisions indicating that a student's statements in a university disciplinary proceeding may not be used against him in a court of law, the question is by no means settled. Until the question is settled, the student should be under no pressure to testify himself.

7. One final problem with the Code provisions for SRC hearings is a loophole that may operate in favor of uncooperative students. The Code provides that charges shall be presented to the student in written form, and that he "shall sign this form acknowledging the fact that he has been presented with the charges against him." (p. 28). While this procedure is desirable to insure that the student is adequately informed of the charges, what happens when a student refuses to sign the paper? Perhaps the Code should provide for some alternate form of notification (e.g. notification by registered letter), or some specific sanction for this particular type of non-cooperation.

#### E. Hearing Committee Procedures. (With reference to lower judicial bodies)

While the Code's provisions for SRC procedures are for the most part adequate, the Code's provisions for lower judicial bodies are inadequate in a number of respects. The first problem that one necessarily encounters in attempting to ascertain whether the provisions for lower judicial bodies comport with AAUP standards is that it is virtually impossible to ascertain from the Code how the system does or is supposed to operate. Several hours of one law professor's time were required just to attempt



to figure out the system! Regardless of the adequacy of the system in practice or as set forth in the Code, the manner in which the provisions for lower judicial bodies are set forth is inconsistent with the AAUP

Joint Statement which provides, inter alia:

The jurisdictions of faculty or student judicial bodies, the disciplinary responsibilities of institutional officials and the regular disciplinary procedures, including the student's right to appeal a decision, should be clearly formulated and communicated in advance. (p. 8)

The Code's provisions for lower judicial bodies are not clearly formulated.

Any further inquiry into the adequacy of the provisions for lower judicial bodies necessarily requires interpretation of sometimes vague and conflicting provisions in the Code, and given the present state of the Code, such an attempt may be futile. Yet, in the interests of providing some suggestions and guidelines for the redrafting of the provisions for lower judicial bodies, the remainder of this section will be devoted to setting forth what appears to be the most reasonable interpretation of those provisions with suggestions about some of their inadequacies.

#### Judicial System Structure

In addition to the SRC, the following individuals and judicial bodies have power to discipline students: various University Center personnel, academic deans, resident assistants (RAs), head residents, personnel deans, Student Conduct Committees (SCCs), and Inter-Hall Conduct Committees (IHCCs). This section of the report will discuss the powers and functions of each of these individuals or bodies. First, however, it is important to note one basic inadequacy in the Code's provisions for lower judicial



bodies: The Code fails to define the make-up of any of the lower judicial bodies, and merely assumes their existence.

1. University Center Director and designated Center personnel. The powers of the Director with regard to disciplinary matters seem reasonably well defined and it is commendable that only specified personnel have the power to deal with student discipline problems in the Center. The only problem in this area is with regard to the provision giving the Director authority to ask students to identify themselves and then to transmit this information to a personnel dean. Since there is no specific provision for the personnel dean to act on the information received from the Center Director, apparently the sole purpose of this provision is to inform the personnel dean so that he can decide if disciplinary proceedings should be commenced. Why this should be necessary is unclear, since the Center Director on his own presumably may file charges against the student before the SRC. (See pp. 27-8). Of course, if the purpose of the report to the personnel dean is only administrative, there appears to be no reason to object to the procedure. However, if the report becomes a part of the student's record or if a notation of the alleged incident is officially recorded anyplace, the procedure is objectionable because the student has no opportunity to defend himself.

2. Academic Deans. There is one reference in the Code to what is apparently the disciplinary power of an academic dean. (See Sec. III, B, 2, supra).

3. The RA. If an RA is unable to resolve a discipline problem informally, he may refer the matter to the head resident (p. 63), or presumably he may file charges before the SRC (See pp. 27-8). Since



the Code does not give the RA authority to discipline students, he apparently does not have any such power. This being the case, the provisions regarding the powers of the RA to discipline present no problems. There is, however, some question with regard to the disciplinary records which the RA is authorized to maintain. The Code authorizes the RA and/or head resident to "maintain a written record of misconduct by students." (p. 64). In order to insure the fact that the RA or head resident has discussed the incident with the student and to "protect the students from generalized, unsubstantiated statements of misconduct," (p. 65) the student is to initial the statement on the RA's or head resident's record. While the purpose of this procedure is laudable, the procedure itself is fraught with danger. The student has no protection against coercive pressures to initial the statement, and he has no right to have his version of the incident recorded. If the incident is serious enough to require an official notation, the student should have a better opportunity to respond to the charge and clear himself. This is especially important since the Code recognizes that these notations will be used "to identify patterns of behavior." (p. 65). (With regard to this provision of the Code another problem exists because there is no provision for the confidentiality and eventual destruction of the records. These records do not seem to be covered by the provision for destruction of records on p. 67).

4. The Head Resident. When the head resident becomes aware of an alleged infraction of the rules, he has at least four and probably five options. He can give the student allegedly involved a verbal reprimand or written warning (p. 63); he can make a notation of the incident and have the student initial the notation (p. 65); he can



refer the case to a personnel dean (p. 64); he can invoke the jurisdiction of the SCC (p. 63) or IHCC (p. 65); or presumably he can file charges before the SRC (See pp. 27-8). While it may be reasonable to give the head resident these various options, there are several problems with the Code's provisions. There are no standards or criteria to indicate under what circumstances a particular option is to be chosen. Since the last three options are only referrals, the lack of guidelines for selecting one of these options does not endanger the student's procedural rights in any disciplinary action that may be taken. Those rights can be adequately protected by the person or body that has the power to discipline. However, since the individuals or bodies to whom referral may be made have different procedures and powers, the initial referral decision may significantly effect the student. This may be appropriate since the matters that come to the attention of the head resident will involve varying degrees of seriousness, but there should be some standards to guide the head resident's exercise of discretion in order to insure that similar situations will be treated in a similar manner. (The comments in Section VII, D, 2 are also relevant here). This is especially important in view of the fact that there are a number of head residents, each of whom may have different ideas about the seriousness of a particular type of conduct. Of course, these dangers increase when the options extend beyond more referrals.

The power of a head resident to issue a verbal reprimand or written warning creates special problems. While neither of these sanctions in and of itself necessarily imposes a serious restriction on a student's



freedom, the mere fact of the warning often may tend to discourage the student from engaging in a particular type of conduct; and in the case of the written reprimand, the letter apparently becomes a part of the student record (See pp. 66-7) and presumably will influence the seriousness of a disciplinary sanction for future misconduct. In short, the consequences of the warnings may be severe, and this is especially so in the case of written warning. The student, however, has no opportunity to exculpate himself or explain mitigating circumstances. This complete lack of due process is not consistent with the AAUP Joint Statement.

The option of making a notation of the incident for the student to initial creates the same problems whether the notation is made by the RA or head resident.

5. Personnel Deans. The personnel deans have authority "to exercise original and appellate jurisdiction in cases of student misconduct." (p. 64). Presumably this broad grant of authority is circumscribed specifically or implicitly by various provisions of the Code. For example, the Code provides that "the more serious disciplinary actions--Conduct Probation, Final Warning, or dismissal from a hall or the residence hall system--may be imposed only by the personnel dean upon the recommendation of Student Conduct Committee, Inter-Hall Conduct Committee, or of a head resident." (p. 64). Implicitly then, a personnel dean cannot impose these sanctions without such a recommendation, and he has no authority to suspend or expel students. Assuming that this interpretation is correct, there are still serious problems with the grant of power to the personnel deans. With regard to the less serious sanctions (e.g. verbal warning or written reprimand), the same problems exist that were mentioned above



with regard to head residents. There is no problem with regard to the imposition of the "more serious disciplinary actions" upon recommendation of the SCC or IHCC if the student's procedural rights are adequately protected in the hearing before those bodies (a problem that will be discussed infra). However, the authority to take "more serious disciplinary action" upon the recommendation of a head resident is especially troublesome. The head resident, it will be recalled, may refer a case to a personnel dean rather than to the SCC or IHCC. If he makes this referral with a recommendation for "more serious disciplinary action," which he presumably can do, the personnel dean can invoke one of the more serious sanctions, and the student will be disciplined without ever having had an opportunity to defend himself against the charges. The student's right to appeal to the SRC in such a situation is not a sufficient safeguard of his rights. The SRC would be acting in its appellate capacity and would not have to hear the matter de novo. Thus, a student could be given any of the more serious sanctions mentioned at p. 64 without ever having an opportunity to hear the evidence against him, present evidence on his behalf, or exercise any other procedural rights. This is flagrantly inconsistent with the AAUP Joint Statement.

Finally, the statement that "the more serious disciplinary actions . . . may be imposed only by the personnel dean upon recommendation . . ." presents a problem with regard to SRC's jurisdiction. Does the statement mean that SRC cannot impose those penalties, in which case the statement is inconsistent with the Code provisions on p. 30, or does it mean that the personnel dean may impose the more serious sanctions only upon recommendation? If the latter is the intended meaning, which presumably it is, the word "only" should be placed after "personnel dean" not after "imposed."

6. SCC. The SCC has original jurisdiction over cases involving vio-



lations of residence hall regulations, and apparently it can exercise its jurisdiction only at the request of the head resident. (p. 63). Apparently the SCC has the power to impose certain sanctions and not merely to make recommendations. (See p. 63). The sanctions it can impose (or recommend) are quite severe (See pp. 63-4); there is nothing in the Code indicating the procedures to be followed in SCC hearings; and the students' procedural rights appear to be minimal. Particularly in view of the potential severity of the sanctions, the Code's failure to set forth students' rights and procedural safeguards is inconsistent with the Joint Statement. There is no indication of what records of disciplinary action are made.

7. IHCC. The IHCC exercises original jurisdiction over cases "which occur within the residence hall system but which are not within the jurisdiction of a single hall" and appellate jurisdiction over decisions of the SCC. All comments about the SCC are equally applicable to the IHCC in its exercise of original jurisdiction. In addition, the precise extent of the IHCC's original jurisdiction seems somewhat unclear from the above statement, a problem that could be solved by more precise wording or perhaps by reference to several hypothetical situations. The manner in which appellate review is invoked and exercised needs to be clarified. (e.g. Must the IHCC hear all appeals from the SCC?), and the relationship between the appellate powers of SRC and IHCC must be spelled out. (e.g. Can a student appeal an SCC decision directly to SRC, or must he make his appeal to the IHCC?) Finally, the provisions describing the IHCC present some confusion as to the powers of that body especially when read in conjunction with the provisions regarding the SCC. For example, the SCC has "the authority to impose the less serious University disciplinary actions," (p. 63) but no similar authority is expressly conferred on the IHCC. The IHCC provisions merely attempt to define that body's jurisdiction



and then provide that its "decisions and recommendations are transmitted to the Personnel Deans." (p. 64). Does the IHCC have the authority to impose sanctions or may it only make recommendations? In situations where both bodies are exercising original jurisdiction the factors that determine which body will hear the case have nothing to do with the seriousness or substantive nature of the misconduct, and thus there appears to be no legitimate reason for these differences. Until these matters are clarified, more specific suggestions and criticisms would not be appropriate.

#### Procedural Safeguards

The students' procedural safeguards in all disciplinary cases handled below the SRC level are wholly inadequate. When an individual (e.g. head resident or personnel dean) has the authority to discipline, the student has no rights at all. When a student is summoned before one of the conduct committees, he has a few specific rights (See p. 65), but they are inadequate.

The notice requirements set forth on p. 65 are reasonably comprehensive, but it would be preferable to require the notice to be in writing. The provision for including in the notice a statement of the procedures to be followed before a conduct committee is desirable, but unfortunately the Code itself gives no indication as to what the procedures should be or what rights the student has in a conduct committee hearing. In fact, with the exception of the notice requirement, the Code does not provide any procedural safeguards for students summoned to appear before conduct committee.

Since the conduct committees can impose only less serious sanctions, it may be appropriate for the proceedings before that body to be less



formal than SRC hearings, and it may not be necessary to give the student all of the procedural safeguards he would enjoy in an SRC hearing, if it would be administratively burdensome to do so. This, however, should be the only reason for not extending the fullest possible procedural protection to students. If complete procedural safeguards are not required in conduct committee hearings, students on appeal should be entitled to a de novo hearing where procedural rights will be fully protected.

The provisions for perfecting appeals from conduct committee hearings are, to say the least, confusing. At one point the Code provides that "all appeals must be in writing and presented within forty-eight (48) hours after notification of the decision." (p. 25). At another point the Code provides for appeal to the SRC "within five school days of the decision." (p. 27). And finally the Code provides for appeal from conduct committee hearings "within forty-eight (48) hours after the hearing." (p. 65). These inconsistencies as to time periods as well as to when the time for appeal begins to run must be clarified. Whatever the time period is, it should run from notification of the decision. Since there is no requirement for a decision to be reached within any specified time, it is ridiculous to have the time run from the time of the hearing; and since immediate notification may sometimes be impossible, it is not appropriate for the time to run from the date of the decision. Finally, in the case of hearings before the SCC, the Code must clarify which body is to consider appeals. (See discussion of IHCC, supra).

These problems may to some extent be alleviated in situations where initial action is taken by a conduct committee since the head resident, when he gives the student notice of the charges against him, must also inform the student of the procedures to be followed and of the way in which he may perfect an appeal. However, the Code is not sufficiently



clear to enable the head resident to fulfill this responsibility, and there is no reason to allow the head resident to exercise discretion in these matters. The procedures must be specified in the Code.

In reevaluating the redrafting the Code's provisions for appeals the university may wish to limit the number of appeals available to a student, for example, by providing for appeal from the SCC directly to the SRC. Although an intermediate appeal to the IHCC would not in itself be inconsistent in any way with the Joint Statement, the intermediate appellate process may create too much of an administrative burden for both the judicial structure and the student. Furthermore, if action may be taken against the student before he has exhausted his rights to appellate review, the more time consuming process of making two appeals may be inconsistent with the Joint Statement. (See section VII, C, *supra*).

#### Conclusion

As indicated at the outset of this section, the first major problem with current Code provisions for lower judicial bodies is that they are extremely difficult to understand. Despite this basic inadequacy, an attempt has been made to point out a number of specific problems. Most of the problems discussed arise from the fact that the Code does not meet the AAUP Joint Statement requirement that "the administration of discipline should guarantee procedural fairness to an accused student." (p. 7). There may well be deficiencies in the Code provisions for lower judicial bodies that have not been dealt with, and the mention of specific deficiencies should not be interpreted to imply that there are not other provisions that are inconsistent with the AAUP Joint Statement. The Code in its present state is so confusing and inadequate in this area that it would be foolhardy to suggest that all of the specific problems have been dealt with here.



Finally, it should be noted that the AAUP Joint Statement contemplates that less formal procedures may be used in dealing with less serious incidents of misconduct. This report should not be read as implying that all disciplinary matters must be handled in the same manner. Rather, the premise of the above criticisms is that there must be specific procedures that are clearly set forth for handling all disciplinary cases. (See AAUP Joint Statement p. 8: "Minor penalties may be assessed informally under prescribed procedures." (Emphasis added). Without this specificity and clarity, there is unchecked opportunity for the arbitrary exercise of power, and under these circumstances, it is impossible for students' rights to be adequately protected. Only after the procedures are clarified and specifically articulated will it be possible to examine in detail the question of whether the specified procedures adequately safeguard students' rights.

University of North Dakota AAUP  
Ad Hoc Committee on Student Discipline

Richard Kuhns, Chairman  
George Frein  
Eldon Gade  
Ralph Kolstoe  
Ross Tisdale

October, 1970