

JOURNAL OF THE UNIVERSITY SENATE
The University of Oklahoma

Regular Session, February 23, 1970--4:10 p. m.
Student Union Building, Room 165

The University Senate was called to order by Dr. Duane Roller, Chairman.

Present:

Alley, John M.	Harden, Darrell	Pray, Joseph C.
Babb, S. E., Jr.	Heller, Ben I.	Roller, Duane
Bowen, Willis H.	Hilbert, Richard	Shepherd, Gene
Bruce, John B.	Hopla, Cluff	Smouse, A. D.
Christian, Sherril	Kendall, J. L.	Snow, James B., Jr.
Ciereszko, Leon	Kitts, David B.	Springer, C. E.
Doerr, Arthur	Lancaster, John	Weiss, A. Kurt
Elconin, Victor A.	Olkinetzky, Sam	White, Raymond R.
Enis, Thomas	Parr, Arnold	Zelby, Leon
Foote, B. L.	Potter, Emma	

Absent:

Abell, Creed	Hollomon, J. H.	Parker, Jack F.
Deckert, Gordon	Johnson, B. Connor	Root, Paul
Hall, Rufus G.	Lynn, Thomas	Tolson, Melvin
Henderson, George	Norton, Spencer	Williams, G. Rainey
		Wolf, Stewart

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

The Journal of the University Senate for the regular meeting on January 26, 1970, was approved.

ACTION BY THE PRESIDENT

Dr. Roller reported that President Hollomon has forwarded to the Student Congress the innovative University Calendar for 1971-72 that had been approved by the University Senate on January 23, 1970. The calendar has been slightly modified by the Admissions Office to include grade-reporting dates for the faculty.

REQUESTED ANNUAL REPORTS OF DEANS AND ADMINISTRATIVE OFFICERS

In accordance with the desires of the University Senate (see page 3 of the Journal of the University Senate for January 26, 1970), the Chairman of the University Senate met with the deans recently concerning annual reports to the respective faculties. Dr. Roller reported that his informal discussions covered the following main points:

- (1) The right of the University Senate to issue such a directive
- (2) The administrative channel for making such a request
- (3) The matter of cost of distribution, particularly if the reports are lengthy.
- (4) The question of context.

During the discussions, the University Provost, Dr. Pete Kyle McCarter stated that he would request deans to submit to the University Senate a copy of each annual report prepared for the President of the University, commencing with the next academic year. Inasmuch as there were no other comments and reactions from the University Senate, Dr. Roller stated that his oral report would be considered as the solution of this question.

CHAPTER IV: THE FUTURE OF THE UNIVERSITY ✓

Dr. Arthur Doerr, Chairman of the Ad Hoc Committee studying the detailed reports concerning the various chapters of The Future of the University, distributed copies of the Ad Hoc Committee's report regarding Chapter IV (graduate education). (For complete text of the original report, see either pages 11-13 of the University Senate Journal for January 26, 1970, or pages 5-7 of the University Senate Agenda for January 26, 1970.)

AD HOC COMMITTEE REPORT: CHAPTER IV

1. In order to achieve and maintain a high, uniform standard of graduate education at the University of Oklahoma, the committee vigorously supports the concept of a strong, centralized Graduate College at the University.
2. The qualitative and quantitative development of the overall graduate program of this University should be a major and persistent factor in shaping faculty and administrative policy pertaining to all major areas of University activity, e. g., faculty recruitment, student recruitment, budgeting, fund raising, curriculum, development of new programs, construction, publicity, etc.
3. We question the actuality of a common function for certain graduate and graduate professional programs (e. g., there is and probably always will be a fundamental difference between the purposes of programs leading to the Ph. D. degree in the area of humanities and those leading to a M. D. or a J. D. degree).
4. This University should not develop a planned program to attempt to retain our undergraduate students as graduates; rather we should develop sufficient quality in our graduate programs so that they will be attractive to students from many areas.
5. The University should make a concerted, thoughtful effort to develop a recruiting program designed to attract graduate students from all socio-economic backgrounds, especially minority and deprived groups. This should not be done by lowering standards for admission to or progression within the Graduate College but by the development of remedial and supplementary programs that would precede full admission. Financial aids in the form of assistantships, scholarships, and fellowships should be increased to facilitate such recruitment.
6. Faculty members with a significant involvement in the graduate program should have a teaching load which does not exceed six hours.
7. The Graduate College should develop an acceptable system for giving teachingload credit for the supervision of graduate students involved in

8. Centralized special research facilities, including both space and equipment, supplemental to those now existing, should be developed at the University.
9. We concur with the idea of easier integration of programs where such integration is needed and is academically sound.
10. Greater effort should be made to develop meaningful involvement of graduate and professional student in "in service" activities, provided that these activities are commensurate with the goals of the specific graduate program. Graduate programs should not become mission-oriented. Overemphasis on "in service" programs could destroy the graduate program. Mission orientation often opposes academic freedom.
11. In general we concur with the DIRECTIONS FOR DISCIPLINES (pp. 67-71) but we believe that the development of the many new programs suggested or implied should be expedited only after there is reasonable assurance that (1) the new programs fit the overall plan for expansion of the overall graduate program, (2) there is real need and adequate demand for the program, (3) adequate money is available to establish a strong program, and (4) its adoption will not dilute other important programs already in existence. There is great need to strengthen most of the existing programs which should, in general, take precedence over the establishment of new programs.

Some specific comments on DIRECTION FOR DISCIPLINES ARE:

- a. The pharmaceutical sciences should be included in Life Sciences and Medicine.
 - b. We question the development of a program in Marine Engineering and Marine Biology unless the University's financial base is greatly enlarged.
 - c. Emphasis on strengthening the program in Mathematics is enthusiastically supported.
 - d. The directions for disciplines of Social Sciences and Humanities, and Art, Language, and Communication are highly commendable and should be expedited in light of the admonition above; however, very careful thought should be given to the appropriateness of relocating existing departments to new and different colleges and programs before such relocation is attempted.
12. We support the "continuum concept" (p. 71) assuming that it does not imply duplication of courses in various areas of the University and that it incorporates the requirements of "outside" professional organization (e. g., accrediting agencies).
 13. We are not sure that we understand the statement, "It should be possible for the graduate student to change from one professional curriculum to another at a minimum cost in time and effort." The "in depth" nature of graduate studies virtually precludes easy interchange as does the specialization of professional studies.
 14. Much greater effort should be made by all departments with doctoral programs to provide teaching experience under regular guidance and evaluation for those students who are planning to become college teachers.
 15. Graduate programs should be continually reconsidered and evaluated with the goal of constant improvement of quality and, where academically feasible, increased flexibility to permit and encourage interdisciplinary programs.
 16. The University of Oklahoma should not introduce graduate programs in Law beyond that leading to the J. D. degree.

He called attention to the only major and very significant difference between the two reports. Item 16 of the Ad Hoc Committee's report recommends that the University should not introduce graduate programs in law beyond that leading to the J. D. degree, in contrast to the positive recommendation contained in the earlier report.

Dr. Doerr then moved that the Ad Hoc Committee's report, together with the earlier report made by the Graduate Council's study committee, be forwarded to the President of the University for his consideration in implementing the plan, THE FUTURE OF THE UNIVERSITY. The motion was approved in a voice vote without opposition.

REVISED CHARTER OF THE GENERAL FACULTY AND THE UNIVERSITY SENATE

Dr. Roller presented to the University Senate for formal ratification the revised Charter of the General Faculty and the University Senate as recommended by the University Senate Charter Committee.

Dr. Doerr moved that all references in the revised Charter to the office of Vice Chairman of the General Faculty and the University Senate be amended to read Chairman-Elect, in accordance with the changes in the University Senate By-Laws approved on January 26, 1970. (For complete text of the changes in the by-laws, see pages 6-7 of the University Senate Journal for January 26, 1970.) The Senate approved the motion.

Dr. Joseph Pray moved that the following clause be added to the second sentence in the second paragraph of the section entitled, "Composition" (The University Senate):

". . . which apportionment shall be made as nearly as possible in proportion to the members of each degree-granting division in the General Faculty."

In the ensuing discussion, Dr. Zelby called attention to the fact that in its deliberations the Committee intentionally avoided being specific with a reapportionment formula and preferred to leave the matter to subsequent discussion by either another committee or the University Senate. In a voice vote, the Senate rejected the proposed amendment.

Dr. Sherril Christian then moved the deletion of the entire second paragraph of the section entitled, "Powers" (of the General Faculty), as follows:

"Review of any University Senate enactment may be an item on the agenda of either a regular meeting of the General Faculty or of a special meeting convened by a petition signed by not less than 30 members of the General Faculty representing two or more degree-recommending divisions, provided that such petition shall be filed with the Chairman of the General Faculty within fifteen days after circulation to the General Faculty of the Journal of the University Senate in which the measure for review is published. If the General Faculty approves the protested measure, it shall be forwarded

by the Secretary of the General Faculty to the President of the University, who shall then submit it to the Board of Regents. The Secretary of the University Senate shall forward each unopposed Senate measure directly to the President at the expiration of the protest period. "

After a brief discussion, the Senate accepted the deletion motion with some opposition.

Dr. Babb moved the substitution of the following underscored words in the text of the first sentence of the second paragraph in the section entitled, "Liaison with the President (of the University Senate):

Original version: "The President shall within 30 calendar days after the end of the protest period inform the University Senate by written message of his disposition of a Senate measure. "

Substitution: "The President shall within 30 calendar days after receipt of the Senate action inform the University Senate by written message of his disposition of a Senate measure. "

The motion was approved by the Senate in a voice vote without opposition.

A short discussion followed concerning student representation on both the Senate and the Senate standing committees specified in the proposed Charter of the University Senate. Although several questions were raised and answered by various members of the Senate, no formal action was taken. The point was also made from the floor that the Charter as proposed makes no mention of representatives from the professional staff of the University.

Dr. Babb moved that the word agendums in the second paragraph, "Officers" (of the General Faculty), be changed to agenda. The change was approved in a voice vote without opposition.

Dr. Zelby moved acceptance of the Charter of the General Faculty and the University Senate as amended at this meeting. The Senate approved the motion in a voice vote without opposition.

As amended, the full text of the Charter is as follows:

CHARTER OF THE GENERAL FACULTY
AND THE UNIVERSITY SENATE

University of Oklahoma
February, 1970

The General Faculty

Composition

The General Faculty of the University is composed of all faculty members with the rank of instructor or above. (The General Faculty does not include

individuals designated by such qualifications of faculty ranks as "visiting," "adjunct," "special," and so forth. Any faculty member working on an advanced degree in the University shall be given the title of special instructor).

Powers

All legislative powers of the Faculty of the University relative to the University as a whole are vested in the General Faculty. These legislative powers shall be exercised either directly by the General Faculty or by the University Senate. The University Senate shall remain responsible to the General Faculty for all action taken in its behalf.

Officers

The Officers of the General Faculty shall be the officers of the University Senate--Chairman, Chairman-Elect, and Secretary.

The three officers shall constitute the Executive Committee of the General Faculty and shall develop the agenda for meetings and otherwise fulfill the duties which may be described in by-laws.

Meetings

The General Faculty shall meet at least once each semester (ordinarily on the third Thursday of October and the third Thursday of April) and at other times upon call by the Executive Committee. Such a call may originate from the President of the University or from a petition submitted to the Chairman of the General Faculty by 30 faculty members representing two or more degree-recommending divisions. A minimum of 20 percent of the General Faculty on the Norman campus shall constitute a quorum.

The University Senate

Composition

The University Senate shall consist of 50 members of the General Faculty. The senators shall be elected to three-year terms by written ballot in the degree-recommending divisions of the University. The electors shall consist of members of the General Faculty.

The allocation of senate seats shall include one for each degree-recommending division of the University of Oklahoma. The remaining senate seats shall be allocated to the degree-recommending divisions on the Norman campus according to a triennial apportionment proposed by the University Senate and approved by the General Faculty.

Five students, including both graduate and undergraduate, chosen by the University of Oklahoma Student Association, shall serve as official student representatives to the University Senate. Without voting privileges, these representatives will observe, participate in discussion, and maintain communication with the Student Association in regard to Senate Actions.

Election Procedure

Before the end of March each year, the Secretary of the University Senate shall notify the dean of each constituent faculty of the number of

senators which that faculty shall elect for the ensuing year. Those senators shall then be elected in April or May. They shall assume their duties in September and ordinarily will serve three-year terms.

The Secretary of the University Senate shall maintain the roster of senate membership. At any time that a vacancy occurs, the Secretary shall notify the appropriate dean so the immediate steps may be taken to elect a replacement to serve the unexpired portion of the three-year term.

Powers

The University Senate shall exercise the legislative powers of the faculty of the University as delegated by the General Faculty. The University Senate shall have the power to initiate any legislation requiring the Board of Regents approval in accordance with provisions of the University Constitution.

The University Senate shall determine its own time of meeting, its own rules of procedure, promulgate rules and regulations governing its internal affairs, and establish standing and special committees. The University Senate shall establish and publish its own set of Operational Procedures or By-Laws.

The University Senate shall elect a chairman, a chairman-elect, a secretary, and such other officers as it shall by its Operational Procedures provide. The Secretary shall not be a member of the Senate. Each standing committee of the University Senate is authorized to select non-senate members of the General Faculty. Students may be asked to serve and in such case will be appointed by the University of Oklahoma Student Association.

The University Senate may establish procedures to review the various functions of the University and any matter affecting the welfare of the University. Subjects for either review or legislation may be brought to the attention of the Senate by written communication either from any member of the University community or from any officially constituted agency.

Liaison with the President

The President of the University shall present to the first meeting of the University Senate in each new academic year a general message on the state of the University in which he shall give recommendations for the furtherance of the progress of the University.

The President shall within 30 calendar days after receipt of the Senate action inform the University Senate by written message of his disposition of a Senate measure. If he disapproves of the measure, the President shall in writing give the Senate the reasons for his action.

Faculty/student councils shall be utilized by the President of the University in the development of policies on matters of vital interest to the University. These areas include teaching and curriculum, research and public service, libraries, budgetary planning, faculty personnel, university relations, university community, athletics, university operations, and university projects. In order to give the faculty a voice in determining the faculty membership of major councils, which shall be named by the University Senate resolution, the University Senate shall each year provide a list of nominees/which the President will make his appointments for the ensuing year. from

Amendment of this Charter

This charter may be amended by a two-thirds vote of those present in any regular or special session of the General Faculty, provided that no amendment shall be effective until it shall have been approved by the Board of

A proposal to amend the charter may originate by action of the University Senate or by motion in a meeting of the General Faculty. In those cases in which the proposal originates through Senate action, the proposal must be submitted to the General Faculty; and consideration for the adoption of the proposal by the General Faculty shall not occur until the expiration of 30 days after the notification of the General Faculty through the Journal of the University Senate.

If the proposal originates in the General Faculty, it shall not be considered for adoption until the expiration of 30 and not more than 40 days after the members of the General Faculty have received copies of the proposal from the Secretary of the General Faculty (Secretary of the University Senate).

RATIFICATION OF THIS CHARTER

The Senate Charter Committee was appointed by the University Senate, and that body requested that a new charter for the General Faculty and the University Senate be prepared.

1. Consideration for the approval of the draft of the Charter shall begin in the University Senate in a regular or special session. Word changes or amendments shall be formulated by the University Senate as a whole. A two-thirds vote of the members present and voting shall constitute ratification.

2. The draft of the Charter shall then be considered by the General Faculty. That body may desire word changes or amendments requiring a return to the University Senate. If changes are not required, if changes are agreed upon in the meeting of the General Faculty, or when changes have been made and approved by the University Senate, a two-thirds vote of the General Faculty members present shall be required for ratification, provided the members present constitute a quorum.

3. When the draft of the Charter has been ratified by the General Faculty, it shall be submitted to the President of the University for his consideration and for presentation by him to the Board of Regents.

4. When approved by the Board of Regents, the Charter for the General Faculty and the University Senate shall take effect.

ACADEMIC APPEALS BOARD

Dr. Kitts, Chairman of the University Senate Committee on Academic Standards, moved that the Senate accept the Committee report as published on page 6 of the Agenda for this meeting and also recommend the establishment of such academic appeals boards in the various colleges.

In answer to a question from the floor, Dr. Kitts reported that the Committee's informal canvass of the Big Eight schools indicated that no such academic appeals boards are now in existence. Therefore, the purported establishment of such boards at Kansas State and Iowa State Universities (as reported in the Resolution of the Student Congress published on page 4 of the Journal of the University Senate for September 29, 1969) is erroneous. Dr. Kitts was also of the opinion that, after a possible flurry of appeals during the first year, the number of cases should be relatively small.

Dr. Zelby moved that the following sentence be deleted from paragraph II, C: "To this end all meetings of a board will be closed to the public." During the ensuing lengthy discussion, the consensus of the Senate appeared to be that closed meetings would not only ensure privacy but also protect the interests of all parties concerned. In a voice vote, the Senate subsequently rejected the proposed deletion.

Later, the Senate accepted without opposition Dr. Christian's motion to (a) delete the phrase, "To this end. . . ." in the last sentence of paragraph II, C; (b) designate the remaining sentence mentioned in (a) above as the new paragraph II, D; and (3) accordingly redesignate the original paragraph II, D as the new paragraph II, E.

Dr. Elconin then moved approval of the Committee report as amended. The Senate accepted the amended report in a voice vote without opposition.

At this point, speaking as an individual faculty member, Dr. Kitts moved that any decision of the appeals board not be subject to review by any body other than the faculty of the degree-granting college concerned. He also proposed that an appropriate new paragraph be added as paragraph III in the report of the Committee and further that the original paragraph III accordingly be redesignated as the new paragraph IV. The revised paragraph III would read as follows:

"III. The decision shall ultimately rest with the faculty of the degree-granting college concerned."

In a voice vote with some opposition, the Senate accepted Dr. Kitts' changes to the Committee report. As amended, the full report of the Committee reads as follows:

Report of the University Senate Committee on Academic Standards

Academic Appeals Board

The recommendations which follow are based upon these assumptions:

1. That the responsibility for academic evaluations rests with the faculty.
2. That nonetheless "students should have protection through orderly procedures against prejudiced or capricious academic evaluation" (Joint Statement on Rights and Freedoms of Students).
3. That at present formal procedure to ensure that protection does not exist at the University of Oklahoma.

Accordingly, the Committee makes the following recommendations with a view to establishing such formal procedures:

- I. In each college of the University there shall be established an academic appeals board consisting of an equal number of students and faculty.
 - A. Faculty members of the board will be chosen by the faculty of the college for a term determined by the faculty.
 - B. Student members of the board will be appointed for a term of one year by the dean of the college upon recommendations from the student President.
- II. Each academic appeals board will hear cases in which the issue to be resolved is that of prejudiced or capricious evaluation.

- A. A board will hear a case only after an attempt has been made by the student and the instructor to resolve their differences, if necessary in consultation with the departmental chairman. If in the judgment of the board the case has already been satisfactorily resolved in the department, it may refuse the student a further hearing.
 - B. It shall be the primary function of a board to mediate or adjudicate disputes which have not been satisfactorily resolved on the department level.
 - C. Each board shall be given the responsibility of establishing its own rules of procedure. Such rules as it establishes must be consistent with the full protection of the rights of all parties involved.
 - D. All meetings of a board will be closed to the public.
 - E. If a board fails to achieve a settlement mutually satisfactory to the parties involved, it will recommend a means of settling the dispute to the executive committee (or comparable body) of the college, where final disposition of the case will be made.
- III. The decision shall ultimately rest with the faculty of the degree-granting college concerned.
- IV. It is hoped that these procedures will eliminate all direct appeals of students to administrators and regents and ensure maximum protection to both students and members of the faculty.

Creed Abbell	Victor Elconin
Stanley Babb	Stewart Wolf
Willis Bowen	David Kitts, Chairman

REVISED ADMISSION STANDARDS FOR OUT-OF-STATE STUDENTS

Dr. Kitts, Chairman of the Senate Committee on Academic Standards, moved that the University Senate formally express its support of the following revised standards for the admission of out-of-state students that had been suggested by the Regents at their last meeting:

A first-time-entering freshman non-resident of Oklahoma must be a graduate of a high school accredited by the regional association or an appropriate accrediting agency of his home state, and must have participated in the American College Testing Program. In addition, he must meet the following requirements:

1. Have maintained an average of B- (2.5) or above in the four years of high school study or rank among the upper one-half of the members of his high school graduating class, and
2. Attain a composite score on the American College Test which would place him among the upper one-half of all high school seniors, based on twelfth grade national norms. No personal interview is required.

Students who fail to meet the above requirements may request special probationary summer admission by writing the Committee on Academic Regulations. If admitted for the summer term, the student must enroll in at least six hours of basic academic work and achieve a grade-point average of at least a 2.0 (C average) in order to be eligible for fall enrollment. No exception will be considered after April 15 prior to the summer term for which the student is applying.

The Committee will review only credentials for those non-resident students who do not meet both of the stated requirements for admission but who do meet at least one of the requirements and where extenuating circumstances seem to warrant an exception being made. In no instance, will a student be admitted on probation who does not meet at least the present minimum requirements for admission of non-resident students.

The number of exceptions in any one academic year will be limited to not more than 1% of the freshman class for the preceding fall.

He added that 30-40 per cent of those admitted this year would not have been accepted under the proposed new regulations. In a voice vote without opposition, the Senate approved the motion.

NATIONAL "THE QUALITY EARTH WEEK"

Dr. Roller read the following letter, dated February 18, 1970, from Dr. Geoffrey Marshall regarding the proposed national observance of "The Quality Earth Week":

A group of faculty and students have organized to coordinate activities at The University of Oklahoma in conjunction with a national event scheduled for Wednesday, April 22, and called, "Earth Day." The purpose of this day is to bring to widespread public attention the current crisis of the environment. Several hundred American universities are scheduling activities for that day.

Our committee has elected to plan for a series of activities--films, lectures, debates, and displays--for the week of April 20-25 under the general title, "The Quality Earth." We want to schedule special events on April 22 to coordinate with the national effort.

We would like to ask the Faculty Senate to consider formally recognizing the week of April 20-25 and the topic, "The Quality Earth." Further, we would like to request that the Faculty Senate announce Earth Day to the faculty and ask them if, when appropriate and possible, they would discuss the problems of environmental quality in their classes on April 22 or during the week of April 20-25.

Thank you for your consideration.

Dr. Foote moved that the University Senate formally recognize the national observance of the Quality Earth Week during April 20-25, 1970, and request through an official announcement in the Senate Journal appropriate faculty discussion and attention, throughout that week and on April 22 in particular. Without implying any disapproval of the project, Dr. Heller offered the casual observation

that his recent attempt also sought faculty expression concerning a moral and a political question. Inasmuch as the voice vote appeared indeterminable, the question was put to a show-of-hands vote. The motion to recognize Quality Earth Week was approved by a count of 17 affirmative and 5 negative votes.

ASSEMBLY FOR HIGHER EDUCATION: February 28, 1970

Dr. Christian announced that the Student Lobby for Higher Education has organized an Assembly for Higher Education at the State Capitol on February 28, 1970, at 2:00 p.m. Governor Bartlett and several gubernatorial candidates have agreed to address the group at that time. He then offered the following resolution for Senate consideration:

"The University Senate endorses the Assembly for Higher Education to be held on February 28, at the State Capitol and urges faculty and students to participate in it."

After some discussion of the question, Dr. Zelby moved that the resolution be reworded as follows:

"The University Senate urges faculty and students to participate in the Assembly for Higher Education to be held on February 28 at the State Capitol."

The Senate approved the amended resolution without opposition.

ELECTION OF CHAIRMAN-ELECT FOR REMAINDER OF 1969-70 TERM

Dr. Roller called attention to the fact that Dr. Cluff Hopla at present is the duly elected Vice Chairman of the University Senate. To provide for a smooth transition between Chairman of the University Senate and to take full advantage of the recently revised By-Laws of the University Senate, Dr. Roller suggested that the Senate consider renaming Dr. Hopla as the Chairman-Elect. Dr. Zelby then moved that the University Senate rename its current Vice Chairman as the Chairman-Elect with the understanding that he will succeed the present Chairman in May, 1970. The motion to rename Dr. Hopla as Chairman-Elect was approved in a voice vote without opposition.

REPLACEMENT NOMINATION--UNIVERSITY COUNCIL ON INSTRUCTION

Dr. Springer, Chairman of the University Senate Committee on Committees, moved acceptance of the following Committee nominations to fill the vacancy on the University Council on Instruction while Dr. Tom Smith is on a sabbatical leave of absence:

Mildred Andrews -- Fine Arts
Rudolph C. Bambas -- English
Willis Bowen -- Modern Language

The Senate approved the submission of these names to the President of the University.

NEW UNIVERSITY CALENDAR ✓

The Chairman expressed his feeling that he would most likely be asked for the opinion of the University Senate about shifting the new calendar to the fall of 1970, rather than waiting until 1971. After some discussion, the consensus of the University Senate was that, if the obvious administrative problems could be overcome, the new calendar should be put into effect in the fall of 1970.

ADJOURNMENT

The University Senate adjourned at 5:27 p. m. The next regular meeting will be held on Monday, March 30, 1970, in Room 165 of the Student Union. Items for the Agenda should reach the Office of the Secretary by Wednesday, March 11, 1970.

Anthony S. Lis
Secretary

