

JOURNAL OF THE UNIVERSITY SENATE
Regular Session, May 31, 1954, 4:10 P. M.
Monnet Hall, Room 101

The University Senate, meeting in regular session, was called to order by the Chairman, Dr. Joseph C. Pray.

Present

Bavinger, E. A.
Bell, R. E.
Bernhart, Arthur
Bruce, J. B.
Comp, L. A.
David, Paul R.
Duncan, J. P.
Farrar, Clyde L.
Fraser, George
Goodman, G. J.
Hall, Rufus G.
Harvey, Harriet
Leek, J. H.
McFarland, Dora
Mertes, J. E.

Present

Olson, Ralph E.
Poston, Lawrence, Jr.
Pray, J. C.
Ragan, W. B.
Raines, J. M.
Reese, J. E.
Ruggiers, Paul G.
Scatori, Stephen
Self, J. T.
Stanley, A. J.
Tuma, Gerald
Westfall, O. D.
Wiley, J. B.
Wilson, M. O.

Absent

Cross, George L.
Ewing, Cortez
James, R. V.
Kelly, Florene C.
Kerr, Harrison
Lane, Willard R.
Livezey, W. E.
Monnett, V. E.
Moorhead, M. L.
Morris, Virginia
Peach, W. N.
Sears, A. B.
Wardell, M. L.
White, R. R.
Winfrey, Lewis E.

APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES

Correction

Dr. Reese called attention to errors in the listing of Nominations for University Committees and Councils. Two errors occurred on Page 4 of the April Journal of the Senate in connection with the STUDENT CONDUCT COMMITTEE. The correct nominations for that committee are:

Lowry A. Doran -- Government
William Tongue -- Classical Language

With attention called to these errors, the Journal of the University Senate for the meeting held on April 26, 1954 was approved.

SELF-STUDY SURVEY OF THE UNIVERSITY

On May 19 Vice President McCarter sent the following note to the Chairman of the University Senate:

President Cross has approved the action of the Senate with regard to a self-study survey of the University. He will be glad to receive nominations from the Senate for a committee to coordinate the survey.

This message was called to the attention of the Senate by Dr. Pray. He indicated that the Senate could now submit a list of nominations for the committee. The action of the Senate in making the nominations is indicated in a later section of this Journal.

REORGANIZATION OF THE UNIVERSITY COLLEGE COUNCIL

Explanatory Comment

In a letter to the Chairman of the University Senate on June 11, 1953, President Cross requested the Senate to consider the matter of reconstitution of the University College Council. He suggested that the Senate study the reorganization of the University College Council in terms of membership and responsibilities. At the September, 1953 meeting of the University Senate this matter was referred to the Committee on University Organization, Budget, and Publications for study and a report.

Committee Report

May 15, 1954

This Committee recommends that the University Senate request a recommendation from the Council on Instruction concerning the development of two-year programs.

It is the opinion of this Committee that educational policy is involved in a reconstitution of the University College Council, if emphasis is to be placed on the development of short-term programs by that council.

A recommendation from the Council on Instruction should be considered by this Committee before it makes a proposal for the reconstitution of the present University College Council.

Respectfully submitted,

COMMITTEE ON UNIVERSITY ORGANIZATION, BUDGET,
AND PUBLICATIONS

R. E. Bell	A. B. Sears
George Fraser	Stephen Scatori
Willard R. Lane	E. A. Bavinger, Chairman

Senate Action

Professor Bavinger presented the report and discussed some of the background information concerning it. Dr. David moved that the recommendation of the Committee on University Organization, Budget, and Publications be approved by the Senate and that the Council on Instruction be requested to consider this problem. His motion was seconded and passed by the Senate.

ELECTION OF SENATORS

Explanatory Comment

At the March meeting of the University Senate, Dr. Pray called attention to the fact that in recent elections of senators Professor George B. Fraser, of the College of Law, was elected to serve from 1954-57, even though he is currently serving the unexpired portion of the term of Dr. Olin Browder.

The Charter of the University Senate States: "No member of the senate shall be eligible for re-election until one year has elapsed after the end of his term of office." Professor Fraser is not serving a three-year term to which he was elected; instead, he is completing the term of office to which another individual was elected. Dr. Pray asked the Senate for clarification of this matter.

Election of Senators -- continuedCommittee Recommendation

May 15, 1954

A faculty member who is elected to complete the unexpired term of a senator shall not be subject to the one year rule, unless the faculty member serves for more than one year.

Respectfully submitted,

Senate ActionCOMMITTEE ON UNIVERSITY ORGANIZATION, BUDGET,
AND PUBLICATIONS

Professor Bavinger moved that the committee recommendation be approved. His motion was seconded and passed by the Senate.

R. E. Bell
George Fraser
Willard R. Lane

A. B. Sears
Stephen Scatori
E. A. Bavinger, Chairman

ELECTION OF THE SECRETARY OF THE SENATE

Explanatory Comment

The Agenda for the February meeting of the University Senate contained an item in which it was suggested that consideration should be given to the possibilities involved in having someone serve as Secretary who is not already encumbered with a full load of teaching, advisement, committee, and other types of duties. This problem was referred to the Committee on University Organization, Budget, and Publications for consideration and a report.

Committee Report

May 15, 1954

Item A-3 of the University Senate By-Laws states: "A secretary, elected by ballot by the Senate at its first meeting after September 1 of each year and who shall hold office for one year. He shall not be a member of the Senate. He shall keep the Journal of the Senate and distribute it to the general faculty; he shall also be custodian of the committee reports and other records of the Senate.

Recommendations:

1. This Committee recommends that the second sentence of Item A-3 of the By-Laws of the University Senate be deleted; thereby permitting the election of a Secretary from the Senate membership.
2. This Committee further recommends that the Senate request secretarial help from the Office of the President for the purpose of taking notes during Senate meetings and for providing stenographic assistance to the Secretary of the Senate.

Respectfully submitted,

COMMITTEE ON UNIVERSITY ORGANIZATION, BUDGET,
AND PUBLICATIONS

R. E. Bell
George Fraser
Willard R. Lane

A. B. Sears
Stephen Scatori
E. A. Bavinger, Chairman

Election of the Secretary of the Senate -- continuedSenate Action

Professor Bavinger presented the foregoing report and moved that the first recommendation in it be approved by the Senate. His motion was seconded.

Following extensive discussion of the motion, Dr. Bernhart moved to table it. His motion was seconded but defeated. The motion by Professor Bavinger was then passed by the Senate. This by-law change will be considered in September, 1954.

Professor Bavinger moved that the second recommendation in the report by his committee be approved. His motion was seconded.

Dr. David moved to amend the motion to include a recommendation that the Senate investigate the possibilities in reducing the teaching load of future secretaries of the Senate. His motion was seconded. Dr. Wilson moved that the amendment and the motion be divided and considered separately. His motion was seconded. The Chairman of the Senate ruled that the amendment and the motion could not be divided. The amendment was voted on and defeated. The original motion by Professor Bavinger was passed by the Senate. Thus, both recommendations made by the committee were approved by the Senate.

NOMINATIONS FOR BUDGET COUNCIL

Explanatory Comment

At the April meeting of the Senate, the problem involved in the Senate nominating chairmen of departments and directors of schools to the Budget Council was referred to the Committee on University Organization, Budget, and Publications.

Committee Recommendation

May 15, 1954

This Committee recommends that chairmen of departments and directors of schools not be eligible for nomination to the Budget Council.

Respectfully submitted,

COMMITTEE ON UNIVERSITY ORGANIZATION, BUDGET,
AND PUBLICATIONSR. E. Bell
George Fraser
Willard R. LaneA. B. Sears
Stephen Scatori
E. A. Bavinger, ChairmanSenate Action

Professor Bavinger moved that the recommendation made by his committee be approved by the Senate. His motion was seconded. Following a lengthy discussion of the recommendation, the motion was defeated.

DEFINITION OF A NORMAL LOAD

Letter From President Cross

April 26, 1954

Dear Professor Pray:

The regulations of the University stipulate that anyone whose teaching is incidental to his administrative duties is not eligible for consideration of tenure.

In 1951 the Budget Council was requested to recommend a definition of "incidental teaching" for those full-time staff members who are engaged in administrative duties, and they made the following recommendations:

- "1. For the vice-presidents of the University, the deans of the University College and the degree-recommending colleges, teaching of less than one-quarter of the normal load as defined by the University Senate shall be considered incidental.
- "2. For all other full-time staff members who hold academic rank in any department, school or college, including directors of schools and chairmen of departments, teaching of less than one-half the normal load as defined by the University Senate shall be considered incidental."

This recommendation was approved and the policy thus established has been followed since 1951. I do not find, however, that the University Senate was asked to define "normal load" in this connection.

I am now requesting, therefore, that the Senate make a definition of "normal load" to be used in the application of this policy. Any other recommendations that the Senate may wish to make concerning the policy will be welcome and will be carefully considered.

Sincerely yours,

George L. Cross
President

GLC:lc

Senate Action

Dr. Goodman moved to refer the matter to the appropriate committee of the Senate. His motion was seconded and passed. The Chairman of the Senate referred the problem to the Committee on Faculty Personnel.

PROBLEMS RELATING TO THE OFFERING OF COURSES BY EXTENSION

Report of Committee on Courses and Curricula

April 27, 1954

The Committee on courses and Curricula wishes to report on the problem of the relationship between the Extension Division and the University. This matter was referred to the Senate by the chairmen of the University departments which are currently offering extension work in Midwest City and Oklahoma City. The chairmen request a consideration of several problems. The first problem concerned the maintenance of the same academic standards for off campus work as for work taken at Norman. The second problem was the fundamental one concerning the relationship of the teaching departments to the Extension Division in terms of budget and the appointment and assignment of teaching personnel.

Problems Relating to the Offering of Courses by Extension -- continued

The Committee came to the following general conclusions in regard to the first problem:

1. The maintenance of academic standards in extension work should be the responsibility of the teaching departments which offer the courses. The Committee feels that the action recently taken by the College of Business Administration should serve as a model for other university colleges. This action provided that course work at Midwest City-Tinker Field Center given through the Extension Division, would be acceptable for credit, provided the following conditions are satisfied:
 - a. That all students enrolled for credit be admitted to the University.
 - b. That all students shall have met all of the prerequisite requirements, for each course in which they are enrolled.
 - c. That the enrollment of persons employed on a full-time job be limited to six hours per term.
 - d. That the faculty of the respective departments determine each term which courses may be appropriately offered, considering the facilities available at the Center.

In order to see that these conditions are satisfied, the College of Business Administration will provide advisers. These advisers will go out to the Extension Centers at the time of enrollment and consult with students to see that course prerequisites are met and that library and other facilities are available. In this way, the standards laid down will be maintained.

2. The problem of/number of hours of extension work acceptable towards a degree or certificate is the responsibility of the college in which the course is offered. The Committee feels that the recent action taken by the College of Business Administration in regard to hours should be adopted by the other colleges on the campus. Their action was: "The total number of such hours acceptable for credit toward a degree or certificate shall not exceed sixty; however, none of these hours may be a part of the senior work, that is, thirty semester hours taken in at least two semesters or the equivalent, which must be completed in residence on the Norman campus."

The problem concerning the relationship of teaching departments to the Extension Division in terms of budget and the appointment and assignment of teaching personnel is one with which this Committee does not feel competent to deal. We recommend that these problems which involve such questions as method of pay, tenure, and promotion be referred either to a special committee which would include representatives of the Extension Division or to the Coordinating Committee to be established under the self-study survey program.

Respectfully submitted,

COMMITTEE ON COURSES AND CURRICULA

R. V. James	Harriet Harvey
Florene C. Kelly	J. E. Reese
Arthur Bernhart	R. G. Hall, Chairman
J. E. Mertes	

Problems Relating to the Offering of Courses by Extension -- continuedSenate Action

Dr. Hall presented the report of the Committee on Courses and Curricula. He discussed the information presented in the paragraphs 1 and 2, Page 6, as it pertained to academic standards. Dr. Hall moved that the committee recommendations in paragraphs 1 and 2 be approved by the Senate. His motion was seconded. After some discussion, Dr. Hall made a motion to amend paragraph 2 of the report to include a specific reference to the Midwest City-Tinker Field Center. Professor Farrar then moved to recommit the material in paragraphs 1 and 2 back to the Committee for clarification of phraseology. His motion was seconded and passed.

Dr. Hall discussed the last paragraph of the report on page 6 as it pertains to the relationship of teaching departments to the Extension Division. He made a motion that the problem concerning the relationship of teaching departments to the Extension Division in terms of budget and the appointment and assignment of teaching personnel be referred either to a special committee which would include representatives of the Extension Division or to the Coordinating Committee to be established under the self-study survey program. His motion was seconded.

Dr. Reese moved to amend the motion so that the problem would be referred directly to the Coordinating Committee of the self-study survey program. His motion to amend was seconded and passed. The motion by Dr. Hall as amended was passed by the Senate.

NOMINATIONS FOR THE SPECIAL COMMITTEE TO DIRECT A SELF-EVALUATION STUDY

At the April meeting of the University Senate, the following list of nominees was developed:

Arthur Bernhart -- Mathematics	William H. Keown -- Bus. Mgmt.
William S. Burgett -- Architecture	Pete K. McCarter -- Vice President
Carl B. Cass -- Drama	Frank C. Morris -- Engineering
Leon S. Ciereszko -- Chemistry	Joseph C. Pray -- Government
Cortez A. M. Ewing -- Government	John P. Pritchard -- English
Harriet Harvey -- Zoology	D. Ross Pugmire -- Education
H. H. Herbert -- Journalism	George W. Reid -- Engineering

Senate Action

Dr. Self nominated A. I. Ortenburger, Zoology, from the floor of the Senate. Following discussion of factors involved in the work of the special committee and nominations to it, Dr. Self withdrew his nomination. Dr. Duncan made a motion that the nominations be closed. His motion was seconded and passed. From the above list of nominees, President Cross will appoint seven persons to serve on the Special Committee.

UNIVERSITY LIBRARIES

Explanatory Comment

The Secretary of the Senate stated that he had received the annual report of the Committee on University Libraries. Dr. Duncan moved that the report be reproduced in this Journal and referred to the Committee on Teaching and Research for study. His motion was seconded and passed by the Senate.

University Libraries -- continuedCOMMITTEE ON UNIVERSITY LIBRARIESREPORT, 1953-1954

The Committee on University Libraries met in October, November, December, January, March, and May of the current academic year to discuss, formulate policy, and take action when deemed appropriate upon matters affecting the General and Branch Libraries of the University of Oklahoma. The administration of the library staff and its operations were not the immediate concern of the group. Its functions centered rather in those areas where the library interests of the various branches of the University were concerned and therefore dealt principally with fiscal matters (budgeting and the allocating of funds) and with policies regarding the development of the collections. Items of more general interest were:

A. Funds, 1953-541. Review of Book Funds

Since funds granted the libraries for 1953-54 fell considerably short of the sums requested, it became necessary in the fall to reduce the tentative book allocations for the instructional units. The tentative amounts had been assigned these units in the previous year, and were arrived at by study of statements of need submitted by the departments themselves. It was decided that a percentage decrease be applied to the tentative allotments but with the stipulation that no department be cut below the amount spent by that department in 1952-53 unless the Committee on University Libraries of the preceding year had already recommended a cut below that figure.

Toward the close of the current fiscal year, the Committee reviewed actual departmental spending. It was discovered that a number of departments had waited until comparatively late in the year to place substantial orders, and that some had failed to use their full allotments by amounts ranging up to several hundred dollars. There was evidence that within the departments there had been misunderstanding of, or lack of awareness of, unused balances.

Recommendation. The Committee recommends to the Senate that each department be encouraged to schedule at its monthly meetings a report on the status of its book funds. This should lead to better faculty participation, prevent needless delay in purchases, and result in more effective buying.

2. The General Research Fund

A fund of \$10,000 was available for the second year for the procurement of sets and files of scholarly journals and publications and for the rounding out of incomplete holdings of this kind. Departmental requests for materials indicated a much wider spread of interest than the year before, with some thirty departments preparing lists as compared to seventeen departments last year. Cost estimates for these priority items amounted to approximately \$60,000, a total which it is quite evident is only a fraction of the overall total needed in this area. This, in fact, is believed to be the area of greatest need in the library collections.

The Committee as a whole approved tentatively items suggested by each requesting department, with the aim of ultimately confining the purchases to the sum available. A subcommittee, with these approximations in mind and working with

University Libraries -- continued

library staff and with members of the departments concerned when needed, checked on availability, actual costs, etc., and approved final orders. A list of outstanding purchases made from the Fund was circulated in the January 15, 1954, New Book List.

Among working policies agreed upon in this connection by the Committee were: a) that the General Research Fund would not be used for the purchase of rare books; b) that duplicate journal files and larger sets would not be purchased; c) that inexpensive items which might easily be bought from departmental book funds should not be considered; d) that the purchase of incomplete sets would be avoided except in special circumstances.

B. Funds for 1954-55

It being understood that the total University budget for 1954-55 would be the same as that of 1953-54, the Committee decided not to ask for an increase for the coming year in book funds allocated to instructional and other units. An increase of \$15,000 in the General Research Fund was strongly urged, however, but was not approved. All book funds will therefore remain the same during 1954-55 as in the past year. The total budget for libraries represents 5.27 per cent of the total University budget.

Hearings were held on departmental requests for increases in their 1954-55 allocations. Since an increase in the funds of one department would necessitate a corresponding reduction in funds allocated to other departments, and since it seemed that those allotments could not be justifiably reduced, the requests were with regret denied.

C. Duplicate Subscriptions

In an effort to reduce substantially the large number of duplicate periodicals subscribed to by the University and to free funds for more effective use, the Committee approved certain policies for the control of duplication: a) that the number of duplicate subscriptions should be reduced drastically through consultation with the departments concerned; b) that no new duplicate subscriptions should be added without consent of the Director of Libraries, and in doubtful cases, the concurrence of the Committee; c) that the number of duplicate files to be bound be reduced still more drastically, again through conference; and d) that requests for a duplicate copy of a book be referred back to the department to determine whether the copy already on the campus will serve before an order is placed.

Some \$800-\$1,200 in savings have already been arranged for next year, representing a good beginning on the project, but considerably less than it is hoped eventually to realize.

D. Miscellaneous Items

The Committee also discussed a number of items, such as building plans for augmenting library space, the proposal to grant the non-clerical library staff academic status and staff privileges comparable to those of the teaching staff, the microfilm publication of dissertations, and the library situation at the Biological Station.

University Libraries -- continuedE. Committee Membership

The following persons served during the year as members of the Committee:

W. R. Bandy
Harlan Bryant
Ellen Kelly
William Keown
Arthur McAnally, ex officio

V. E. Monnett
Carlos Moseley, Chrm.
Winston O. Smith
A. O. Weese
W. A. Willibrand

Submitted by:

Carlos Moseley
Chairman
Committee on University Libraries

cm rcd

TWELVE-MONTH EMPLOYMENT FOR ACADEMIC PERSONNEL

Explanatory Comment

On May 18, 1953, President Cross requested that the appropriate committee of the University Senate consider the advisability of changing all academic personnel to a twelve-month employment basis. The matter was referred to the Committee on Faculty Personnel.

Committee Report

May 24, 1954

To: The University Senate
From: Committee on Faculty Personnel
Subject: Proposal for Twelve-Month Employment of Academic Personnel

The above proposal was referred to this Committee at the Senate meeting of May 25, 1953. The results of the Committee's deliberations and its recommendation are set forth hereafter.

It is understood that the proposal originated with the faculty representatives on the Budget Council rather than in the University administration. Apparently some faculty members favor the proposal because of the difficulty experienced in budgeting 9, or even 11, monthly salary payments to cover living expenses which continue throughout the year. Vice President Cate has informed this Committee that the proposal probably would not decrease, and might increase, the administrative work load of the University.

The problem which the proposal is designed to solve, therefore, is one which calls for 12 monthly salary payments per annum and not necessarily 12 months of employment per annum. The Committee has considered each of the following plans for 12 monthly salary payments:

- A. 12 monthly payments for 9 months' employment, with compensation for summer employment determined as at present and added to two of the 12 checks.

Twelve-Month Employment for Academic Personnel -- continued

- B. 12 monthly payments for 11 months of employment, the twelfth month being considered as annual leave. This might apply to all members of the faculty except those not on tenure and except for those taking summer leave without pay. Presumably those who took summer leave without pay would receive 10 checks instead of 12 (note that pay for 9 months at present is 10/12 of pay for 11 months).

The Committee is advised that Plan A is not lawful in Oklahoma. Each payroll must be certified to the effect that the pay claimants were either on official duties, in official travel status, or on authorized leave. Even if the plan were lawful it might make faculty salaries more vulnerable to drastic reduction in any future retrenchment of state expenditures. It might be a simple matter to popularize the view that faculty members were receiving 25% of their salaries for doing nothing. And if the University were the only state school on the plan, as the Committee understands that it would be, the situation might be even more precarious.

The faculty of the College of Education is already on a salary payment plan which is similar to Plan B above, by reason of the extraordinary demand for summer instruction in that discipline. This Committee is assured that no attempt would be made to inaugurate the plan, with respect to the remainder of the eligible faculty, until a sufficient additional appropriation could be obtained to pay each eligible faculty member the equivalent of what such member would earn for 11 months under the present salary plan. In other words, the annual salary would start at 120% of the existing salary for 9 months. Vice President Cate estimated roughly that such a plan would add perhaps \$200,000 to the annual budget. While such an increase could not be made for the coming year, for which the budget is already fixed, it would seem that such an increase would not be too much to expect at some future session of the Legislature. Although the plan thus seems to be possible of attainment, the Committee considers that it has the following weaknesses.

1. The increased appropriation needed to effectuate the plan presumably could be obtained without such a plan, on the basis that a salary raise is justifiable. In that case the increase would constitute a general raise in compensation for those who teach either for 9 months or 11 months, instead of going entirely to those who otherwise would not teach in the summer. The plan would thus penalize those taking the summer off for other employment or for other purposes.
2. Undoubtedly a substantial portion of the faculty being paid but not teaching during the summer would engage in worthwhile projects such as research. However, in view of the relatively modest compensation rates at the University, it is the view of the Committee that better results in teaching and research would follow if most of the amount available for compensation should be applied to the basic salary scale, and that any extra compensation available for special research activity should be allocated on a project basis.
3. Administrative difficulties might be encountered in selecting those to teach during the summer. Of course, this problem might be eased by a general policy of distributing the teaching load as evenly as possible among those not taking leave.
4. Plan B would be vulnerable to the same external pressure as Plan A, discussed above, although possibly to a lesser extent.

Twelve-Month Employment for Academic Personnel -- continued

The Committee has considered the results of a survey of faculty opinion on a similar proposal, which was made several years ago. At that time the faculty ranks below full professor were preponderantly in favor of employment for 12 months. That survey included faculty members without tenure who might not be eligible for twelve months employment. Also, Plan B would penalize rather than benefit younger faculty members who take summers off for work on advanced degrees. The Committee is also aware that opportunities for outside summer employment, including summer fellowships, have expanded in recent years. The Committee feels reasonably certain that opinion would now be less favorable to twelve-month employment than it was several years ago, and considers that a re-survey is not necessary.

In conclusion, the Committee feels that the financial difficulties experienced by faculty members are fundamentally due to inadequate salaries rather than to the number of installments in which those salaries are paid. The Committee recommends that the Senate disapprove the proposal for twelve-month employment of academic personnel.

Respectfully submitted,

COMMITTEE ON FACULTY PERSONNEL

George J. Goodman	Dora McFarland
Max L. Moorhead	Ralph E. Olson
Joseph C. Pray	Othel D. Westfall
Lewis E. Winfrey	Clyde L. Farrar, Chairman

CLF/ms

Senate Action

The foregoing report concerning twelve-month employment was not included in the Agenda of the May meeting of the Senate. Therefore, it was merely explained briefly to the Senate without intent that action for or against it be secured. Professor Farrar moved that the report be printed in the Journal and that the matter be taken up at the September, 1954 meeting. His motion was seconded and passed by the Senate.

FACULTY INTRAMURAL COMMITTEE

Professor Bavinger, as Chairman of the Committee on University Organization, Budget, and Publications, made an oral progress report on the matter of developing a Faculty Intramural Committee as a sub-committee of the recently reconstituted Athletic Council. He indicated that problems involved in working out specific details of the functions of such a committee have made it impossible to date to develop committee recommendations. There was no action taken by the Senate.

COMMITTEE ON COMMITTEES

Explanatory Comment

Dr. Reese, Chairman of the Committee on Committees, stated that his term in the Senate expires this year. Therefore, an individual should be elected to fill the vacancy on the Committee on Committees. Dr. Reese indicated that this person should be chosen from among those recently elected to the Senate.

Committee on Committees -- continued

The present members of the Committee are: J. B. Bruce, G. J. Goodman, J. E. Reese, J. B. Wiley, and L. E. Winfrey.

Senate Action

Dr. Duncan nominated Professor George Fraser, College of Law, to fill the vacancy on the Committee on Committees. Dr. Self moved that the Senate elect Professor Fraser by acclamation. Professor Fraser stated that circumstances were developing which might cause him to resign from the Senate to fulfill other duties. There was no second to the motion by Dr. Self.

Dr. Stanley nominated Dr. G. H. Daron, School of Medicine. Dr. Hall nominated Dr. A. O. Weese, Zoology. Dr. Poston moved that the nominations cease. His motion was seconded and passed.

In the voting which followed, one nominee received votes amounting to a plurality. The other two nominees received the same number of votes respectively. Dr. Olson moved that the nominee receiving the plurality vote be elected. His motion was seconded and passed by the Senate. Professor George Fraser thus was elected to fill the vacancy on the Committee.

FACULTY PARKING

This matter constitutes new business. It was not listed on the Agenda. Dr. Bernhart moved that the appropriate committee of the University Senate study the problems related to faculty parking and report on the matter. His motion was seconded and passed. The Chairman of the Senate immediately referred the matter to the Committee on Teaching and Research.

ADJOURNMENT

The University Senate adjourned at 5:55 p.m. The next regular meeting will be Monday, September 27, 1954, at 4:10 p.m. Material for the Agenda should be in the Office of the Secretary by Monday, September 20.

Gerald A. Porter, Secretary

Office: Room 306, Graduate Education Building
Telephone: Extension 308