After further discussion Mr. Walter Freaufl moved the previous question. The motion was seconded, put to a vote by a show of hands, and defeated for lack of a two-thirds majority: yes, 201; no, 121. Mr. W. F. McNeil rose to suggest that, since the vote on Mr. Freaufl's motion had consumed four minutes of the time remaining for debate, four minutes be added to the debate period. The chairman ruled that such a motion would be out of order.

At 5:30 p.m. the chairman declared the debate closed. He pointed out that, with the aisles filled with visitors and some faculty members standing among the visitors, it would be difficult for the tellers to obtain an accurate count for the vote on Mr. Thompson's motion, and requested the cooperation of all persons in the meeting room to make possible a valid count.

At the chairman's request, the secretary read the definition of the voting faculty provided in faculty legislation: (1) all persons holding the academic rank of assistant professor or above; and (2) all persons holding the rank of instructor or senior instructor who are employed in the full-time teaching of courses, giving instruction exclusively in schools, colleges, and departments that offer work for University credit.

Mr. Aly rose to a point of information, whether the vote might be by ballot. The chairman stated that, in accordance with faculty custom, the vote would be by a show of hands. Mr. A. F. Rubin suggested that, during the period of voting, visitors seated in the last row of the faculty section relinquish their seats to members of the faculty. At the chairman's request, visitors moved out of the faculty section.

Mr. Thompson's motion was then put to a vote by a show of hands and defeated: yes, 172; no, 196. At the request of a member of the faculty, the chairman ordered a recount. On the recount, Mr. Thompson's motion was defeated: yes, 185; no, 199.

ADJOURNMENT. A member of the faculty moved that the meeting be adjourned. The motion was seconded. Mr. E. A. Cykler then moved that the meeting be adjourned, to reconvene at the discretion of the President. The motion was seconded. The chairman ruled that Mr. Cykler's motion had precedence. His motion was then put to a vote and carried.

George N. Belknap
Secretary of the Faculty

REGULAR MEETING OF THE FACULTY

May 6, 1970

At 3:30 p.m., when the faculty was scheduled to meet in 150 Science Building, visitors occupied nearly all seats in the room, and the aisles were filled with visitors; a nonfaculty meeting appeared to be in progress. President Clark found his way to the rostrum. The secretary of the faculty was unable to enter the room. The President stated that conditions in the room made it impossible to convene the faculty meeting, and announced that the meeting would be moved to McArthur Court. In McArthur Court, members of the faculty were seated in a separate section of bleachers; several thousand visitors were in attendance.

The President stated that, in this time of great crisis in national affairs, the University could not respond in a conventional manner. He then announced that he had asked members of the 1969-70 and the 1970-71 Advisory Councils and representatives of the Associated Students to meet tonight to plan effective campus-wide meetings and efforts to bring to the community an understanding of the depth of student feeling and despair over recent events--including the extension of the Vietnam War into Cambodia and events at Kent State University--and that, to provide uninterrupted time for these immediately pressing programs, the University would not hold regular classes as usual on Thursday and Friday of this week. These programs, however, would require serious and concentrated work on the part of faculty and students--for which the terms "holiday" and "strike" are clearly inappropriate.

The President pointed out that he had not yet called the meeting to order and that, before calling the meeting to order, he would recognize Miss Sonia Sweek, president of the Associated Students, and several other students.
The students having been heard, the meeting was called to order. The minutes of the meetings of April 8 and 15, 1970 were approved.

ADVISORY COUNCIL ELECTION. The secretary reported that, on a second ballot, the election of the 1970-71 Advisory Council was completed, with the election of the following members: Wendell M. Basye, Edwin R. Bingham, Paul Civin, Bernd Grasemann, Thomas Novet, Clyde Patton, Lloyd W. Staples.

RECOMMENDATIONS FOR DEGREES. The secretary announced that he had received a letter from Mr. D. E. Rhoades, University Registrar, certifying that the Official Degree Lists for the June 14, 1970 Commencement and the August 15, 1970 Graduation Convocation will include all and only those degree candidates who complete their degree requirements by the end of the respective terms. Mr. Paul Civin moved that the faculty of the University of Oregon recommend that the Oregon State Board of Higher Education confer on the persons whose names are included in the Official Degree Lists, to be compiled by the University Registrar after the June 14, 1970 Commencement and the August 15, 1970 Graduation Convocation, the degrees for which they have completed all requirements. The motion was seconded, put to a vote, and carried.

SUSPENSION OF RULES. Mr. J. M. Allman moved that the rules be suspended to allow the immediate consideration of matters of current moment. The motion was seconded, put to a vote by a show of hands, and carried by the required two-thirds majority: yes, 305; no, 80. Mr. R. L. Bowlin, Mr. Fred Mohr, and Mr. George Struble served as tellers for this and other divisions. The chairman ruled that the faculty was now resolved into a Committee of the Whole.

MILITARY INVOLVEMENT IN INDOCHINA. When the Committee of the Whole rose, Mr. R. M. Noyes moved to change the agenda to allow the immediate introduction of a resolution. The motion was seconded, put to a vote, and carried.

Mr. Noyes then moved the adoption of the following resolution: Be It Resolved: That the faculty of the University of Oregon regards American military involvement in Indochina as a tragic mistake and urges the government to terminate that involvement at the earliest practicable date.

The motion having been seconded, Mr. Clyde Patton, secretary of the Faculty Senate, reported that, at the proper time, he would move on behalf of the Senate that the motion be tabled. Mr. Noyes spoke to his motion and Mr. S. A. Pierson, Senate reporter at this meeting, summarized the Senate discussion. Mr. Patton then moved that Mr. Noyes' motion be tabled. The motion was seconded, put to a vote, and defeated.

Mr. Franklin Lowenthal moved to amend by adding the following sentence to Mr. Noyes' resolution: However, the faculty of the University of Oregon condemns, without qualification, any attempt to use either the Vietnam War or the vote on the R.O.T.C. as a justification for the recent violence on this campus. The motion was seconded.

The chairman ruled that Mr. Lowenthal's amendment was not germane to the subject or Mr. Noyes' resolution and was therefore out of order in this context; but that, since Mr. Lowenthal had given notice under the faculty's ten-day rule for resolutions of this nature, it would be in order as an independent motion at the proper time.

Mr. Lowenthal stated that he had several more amendments to propose, and then moved to add the following sentence to Mr. Noyes' resolution: What is particularly unfortunate about this war and the invasion of Cambodia is that they divert attention from the grave threat to American interests in the Middle East, where Russian intervention and aggression threaten the existence of the state of Israel.

The chairman ruled that the amendment was not germane and was therefore out of order. A member of the faculty moved the previous question on Mr. Noyes' principal motion; the motion was seconded. Mr. Lowenthal protested that he had further amendments to present; the chairman ruled that the motion for the previous question was in order.

Mr. A. P. Rubin moved that the meeting be adjourned; the motion was seconded. Mr. O. J. Hollis moved that the meeting be adjourned until 3:30 p.m. on Wednesday, May 13, to reconvene in executive session; the motion was seconded. The chairman ruled that Mr. Hollis' motion had precedence. The motion was put to a vote and defeated.
The motion for the previous question was put to a vote and carried. Mr. Noyes' motion was then put to a vote and carried. Mr. R. W. Leeper asked for a division on Mr. Noyes' motion. Mr. Ivan Niven protested that, in the present atmosphere, members who wished to vote against the Noyes motion might well feel intimidated or subject to recrimination if they were required to display their votes in a division. The chairman ruled that a division was unnecessary.

During the course of the meeting, and while the faculty was in a Committee of the Whole, visitors repeatedly commented on discussion and votes with applause or expressions of disapproval, and were repeatedly requested by the chairman to desist.

ADJOURNMENT. Following the vote on Mr. Noyes' resolution, Mr. C. T. Duncan moved that the meeting be adjourned, subject to the call of the President. The motion was seconded, put to a vote, and carried.

George N. Belknap
Secretary of the Faculty

ADJOURNED MEETING OF THE FACULTY
May 20, 1970

The meeting was called to order by President Clark. The chairman stated that the minutes of the May 6, 1970 meeting and this adjourned meeting will be before the faculty for approval at the regular June meeting of the faculty.

TRANSFER OF CREDIT. Mr. F. B. DeChaine, chairman of the Admissions Policy Committee, made the following statement to the faculty, on behalf of his committee and the Academic Requirements Committee: The Admissions Policy Committee, in agreement with the Academic Requirements Committee has determined to depart from the long-standing policy of accepting at point of matriculation only credits earned in institutions within the United States of America possessing full accreditation by the appropriate regional accrediting association. Instead, the Office of Admissions will be governed in the future by the recommendations of the various reporting officers in the several states of the Union as published in the Report of Credit Given, the official publication of the American Association of Collegiate Registrars and Admissions Officers. Credits earned in schools not accredited or recommended for transfer by the reporting officers will not be allowed at point of matriculation or later.

DEMONSTRATIONS AND VIOLENCE. Mr. R. H. Rodgers, rising to a point of personal privilege, read a statement concerning recent events on the University campus. In concluding his remarks, he addressed President Clark: "I think I speak for many faculty and students when I state that the handling of the events of the past two weeks by your administration has increased our feeling of confidence and support in you and your staff." This concluding statement was greeted by applause from the faculty.

NOTICES OF MOTION. The secretary of the faculty made the following statement: On May 7, 1970 a notice of motion by Mr. F. R. Lacy to amend the Code of Student Conduct was given through the campus mail, in accordance with the three-week rule. This motion will be on the agenda for the regular June meeting of the faculty. On May 15, 1970 three additional notices of motion were distributed to the faculty through the campus mail. Whether these notices were sufficient under the three-week rule is at least questionable. However, proper notice may be given at this meeting, as an adjourned session of the regular May meeting, for consideration at the regular June meeting.

The secretary then requested unanimous consent to record these three motions, by Mr. C. W. Curtis, Mr. E. F. Beal, and Mr. Paul Clevin, in the minutes of this meeting, without requiring the reading of the texts. No objections being heard, the chairman declared that unanimous consent was granted. The following notices are therefore recorded:

DEPARTMENT OF MILITARY AFFAIRS. By Mr. C. W. Curtis: That the faculty recommend to the administration that:

(A) A new department (or program) shall be established (tentatively called the Department of Military Affairs) to replace the present Department of Military Science and Aerospace Studies. The new department shall be in all respects on an equal
footing with other departments in the University. In particular, the new department shall have the following organization: (1) It shall be part of a college or school of the University. (2) The procedures for appointments shall be those normally used throughout the University. (3) The curriculum of the department shall be established by the normal procedures used in the University, with courses, credits, etc. approved by the Committee on the Curriculum. The possibility that courses in other departments (such as History, Political Science, etc.) carry joint credit in the new department is not excluded.

(b) The present R.O.T.C. arrangements with the Army and Air Force shall be renegotiated in order to establish new procedures to replace the present R.O.T.C. arrangements, so that students who wish to enter the R.O.T.C. program may be able to offer credits earned in the new department to satisfy all academic requirements in the R.O.T.C. program. All military training (distinct from academic study of military affairs) shall be done off campus, and will neither carry University credit nor count as a part of a student's course load.

PLAGIARISM. By Mr. E. F. Beal: The University expects that students will do their own original work in courses and seminars, and, in particular, that papers submitted for graduate credit shall adhere to accepted standards of scholarship, making full and accurate acknowledgment of sources, and differentiating quoted, paraphrased, or summarized material from the student's own contribution.

No college, school, or department of the University shall certify for a degree any student found to have submitted as his own work, for credit toward that degree, written material not his own, and not clearly and fully referenced in scholarly form.

Denial of a degree in the circumstances here outlined shall not be considered a penalty outside the Code of Student Conduct, which lists plagiarism as an offense and provides sanctions, but the withholding of an academic award that has not been earned.

SPECIAL STUDENTS. By Mr. Paul Civin, on behalf of the Academic Requirements Committee, the Scholastic Deficiency Committee, and the Admissions Policy Committee: That legislation of December 13, 1922 and May 21, 1924, pertaining to "rules governing special students who are not candidates for a degree..." shall be rescinded, and the following legislation adopted:

A special student is defined as an individual who does not hold a baccalaureate degree and who does not qualify or may not desire to qualify for regular undergraduate admission. The Admissions Policy Committee shall establish, and act as an appellate body on, policies governing the admission of special students. Each special student shall have his academic performance reviewed at least once each year by the Scholastic Deficiency Committee to determine whether he shall continue as a special student, be granted regular student status, be placed on academic probation, or be academically disqualified.

STANDING R.O.T.C. ADVISORY COMMITTEE. The secretary read the following passages from the minutes of the April 8, 1970 meeting of the faculty:

Mr. V. S. Sprague, chairman of the ad hoc Committee to Study the R.O.T.C. Curriculum, commented briefly on the report of his committee, which has been distributed to the faculty through the campus mail. He then moved, on behalf of his committee:

I. That a standing R.O.T.C. Advisory Committee be set up composed of faculty and students. The purpose of the committee is to be advisory to the President, the University faculty, and the military department on matters affecting the R.O.T.C. program at the University and to work cooperatively with the department in reviewing and making recommendations concerning the officer education program. Specifically, the committee shall have the following functions: (1) Advise the President, the faculty, and the military department on matters concerning military education on the campus. (2) Review and recommend to the institution's curriculum authorities all courses to be offered by the R.O.T.C., and recommend degree credit where appropriate. (3) Review and recommend on all proposed R.O.T.C. instructional appointments to the faculty appointing authority of the institution. (4) Hear appeals from students enrolled in R.O.T.C. on matters concerning their academic standing in R.O.T.C. and make recommendations in such cases to the appropriate authorities.

II. And that the proposed R.O.T.C. Advisory Committee require on-site interviews with all nominees to the position of senior officer in each division of the Department of Military Science and Aerospace Studies.
The motion having been seconded, Mr. Clyde Patton, secretary of the Faculty Senate, reported that the Senate recommended its adoption. Mr. Sprague spoke to his motion and Mr. Roland Bartel, Senate reporter at this meeting, summarized the Senate discussion...Mr. Andrew Thompson moved that further consideration of Mr. Sprague's motion be postponed until the faculty has considered a motion by Mr. Thompson, consideration of which was postponed at the December 1969 faculty meeting, pending the completion of the report of the ad hoc Committee to Study the R.O.T.C. Curriculum. ...Mr. Thompson's motion to postpone consideration of Mr. Sprague's motion was seconded and, after discussion, put to a standing vote and carried: yes, 95; no, 82.

The chairman stated that consideration of Mr. Sprague's motion would now be continued from the point at which consideration was terminated at the April 8 meeting. Mr. Sprague spoke to his motion. The motion was then put to a vote and carried.

AD HOC COMMITTEE TO STUDY R.O.T.C. CONTRACTS. Mr. J. T. Gange, chairman of the ad hoc Committee to Study R.O.T.C. Contracts, presented an interim report from his committee, and stated that a final report would be mailed to members of the faculty within a week.

EXECUTIVE SESSIONS OF THE FACULTY. Mr. E. A. Cykler, chairman of the 1969-70 Advisory Council, moved on behalf of the 1969-70 Council: That the faculty empower the President of the University to call the faculty in executive session at his discretion. Those representatives of the A.S.U.O. having privileges of the floor and, unless barred by the President's action, representatives of the press shall be admitted to such a session.

The motion having been seconded, Mr. C. P. Patton, secretary of the Faculty Senate, reported that the Senate recommended its adoption. Mr. Cykler then spoke to his motion, and Mr. Roland Bartel, Senate reporter for the meeting at which the Senate reviewed the motion, summarized the Senate discussion.

Mr. D. R. Stannard moved to amend by deleting the words, "and, unless barred by the President's action, representatives of the press." The motion to amend was seconded. In reply to an inquiry, the chairman stated that, if Mr. Stannard's amendment were adopted, representatives of the press would be excluded from executive sessions called by the President. The amendment was then put to a vote and defeated. The principal motion was then put to a vote and carried.

CONDITION OF THE UNIVERSITY LIBRARY. Mr. A. W. Urquhart, chairman of the Library Committee, moved on behalf of his committee the adoption of the following resolution:

I. Recognizing that the good health of the University Library is essential to the functioning of the University as an institutional and research institution, the faculty of the University of Oregon wishes to call attention to the deteriorating condition of the Library of the University of Oregon.

1. Demands on the Library have increased greatly. 2. The staff of the Library has become increasingly dependent on less-permanent and less-experienced staff. 3. Services have had to be curtailed greatly or performed inefficiently. 4. Acquisition of books and materials has fallen far behind established minimum goals. 5. Stated needs of the University faculty and students are not being met. 6. Comparisons with similar university libraries show the University of Oregon's Library to rank low and to have fallen substantially in relative ranking over the past five years.

II. Therefore, be it resolved that the faculty of the University of Oregon recommends to the President for transmittal to the State Board of Higher Education and to the Legislature of the state of Oregon that, to stop its further deterioration, the University Library be given highest priority in the allocation of funds and in the implementation of development planning at the University.

The motion having been seconded, Mr. Patton reported that the Faculty Senate recommended its adoption. Mr. Urquhart then spoke to his motion. After discussion, Mr. Civin moved to amend by changing the work "highest" in Sec. II to "high." The motion to amend was seconded and, after discussion, put to a vote by a show of hands and carried: yes, 110; no, 73. Mr. Fred Mohr, Mr. D. T. Smith, and Mr. G. W. Struble served as tellers for this and other divisions. The principal motion as amended was then put to a vote and carried.

INTERINSTITUTIONAL FACULTY SENATE ELECTIONS. Mr. Patton moved, on behalf of the Faculty Senate, the adoption of the following motion:
(A) Each year the Faculty Senate shall elect a member of the University of Oregon faculty to serve for a three-year term as a member of the Interinstitutional Faculty Senate of the Oregon State System of Higher Education. The procedures for nominating candidates and conducting the elections shall be devised by the Faculty Senate, and reported to the general faculty.

(B) The initial delegation of three University of Oregon representatives to the Interinstitutional Faculty Senate of the Oregon State System of Higher Education, who are to take office June 1, 1970, shall be elected at the May meeting of the Faculty Senate from a slate of nine candidates to be nominated by a nominating committee appointed by the chairman of the Faculty Senate. The lengths of the terms to be served by the members of the initial delegation will be determined by the Interinstitutional Faculty Senate at its first meeting.

It having been seconded, Mr. J. L. Hulteng spoke to the motion. The motion was then put to a vote and carried.

ENGLISH COMPOSITION REQUIREMENT. Mr. Roland Bartel moved: (1) That the requirements for a bachelor's degree, "English Composition, 9 term hours unless excused," adopted by the faculty on April 5, 1933; be amended to read, "English Composition, 6 term hours unless excused"; and (2) that the following courses be specified for the satisfaction of this requirement: WR 121. English Composition. 3 hours; WR 323. English Composition. 3 hours.

The motion having been seconded, Mr. Patton reported that the Faculty Senate recommend its adoption. Mr. Bartel spoke to his motion. It was then put to a vote and carried.

PRESIDENT OF THE A.S.U.O. SENATE AT FACULTY MEETINGS. Mr. H. W. Robinson, chairman of the Student-Faculty Council, moved on behalf of the Council: That the proceedings of the regular faculty meetings be amended to provide for reports from the president of the A.S.U.O. Senate, or his designee, concerning any matter coming before the faculty which has been discussed by the A.S.U.O. Senate. The president of the A.S.U.O. Senate, or his designee, would constitute an additional student representative at the regular faculty meetings and have the right to the floor granted to the two students presently attending the meetings.

The motion having been seconded, Mr. Patton reported that the Faculty Senate recommended its adoption, but that he would move an amendment on behalf of the Senate at the proper time. Mr. Robinson spoke to his motion. Mr. Patton then moved to amend by changing the word "discussed" in the first sentence to "acted upon."

The motion was seconded. Mr. S. A. Piersson, reporter for the Senate meeting at which Mr. Robinson's motion was reviewed, summarized the Senate discussion of the motion and the amendment.

After discussion, Mr. R. W. Leeper moved to amend by providing that all members of the A.S.U.O. Senate have the privilege of the floor and the right to vote on measures before the faculty. The chairman ruled Mr. Leeper's motion out of order. On an appeal from the ruling of the chair, the chair was sustained.

After further discussion, during which it was pointed out that the Faculty Senate amendment would not prohibit the president of the A.S.U.O. Senate from participating in the discussion of any measure as an individual, the amendment was put to a vote and carried.

Mr. Civin then moved to amend by providing that the chairman of the faculty be required to call on the president of the A.S.U.O. Senate for a report on each measure before the faculty. Mr. Civin's motion was seconded, put to a vote by a show of hands, and carried: yes, 103; no, 61.

Mr. Robert Campbell moved to amend by adding the following sentence: The A.S.U.O. Senate may, through its president or his designee, present notices of motion for faculty action. The motion to amend having been seconded, Mr. Patton reported that the Faculty Senate recommended that it be disapproved.

Mr. Robinson stated that the Student-Faculty Council believed that Mr. Campbell's amendment involved substantive matters not germane to the Council motion. He then suggested that the amendment was out of order. The chairman so ruled; on an appeal from the ruling of the chair, the chair was sustained.

Mr. Rodgers inquired whether--since Mr. J. N. Tattersall had informed the faculty, in a communication circulated through the campus mail on May 1, that this amendment would be presented at the regular May 6 faculty meeting--the proposal could
be considered at this meeting as an independent motion. Mr. O. J. Hollis stated
that he had been informed by the secretary of the faculty that Mr. Tattersall had
told the secretary that he did not consider the communication circulated through
the campus mail on May 1 to be a notice of motion under the rules of the faculty.
The secretary confirmed Mr. Hollis' statement. The chairman then ruled that the
proposal had not had proper notice as an independent motion and therefore could
not be considered at this meeting.

Mr. Robinson's motion, as amended, was then put to a vote and carried.

STUDENT CONDUCT CODE. Mr. Lacy, chairman of the Student Conduct Committee, moved
on behalf of his committee that Sec. I.B.2.j of the Code of Student Conduct be
deleted and that the following new section be added:

I.B.3.g. Participation in disruptive activity. Disruptive activities are those
which are intended to and do: block access to University buildings or rooms,
interrupt or prevent any activity or operation of the University, interfere with any
person's rights of free speech or assembly, or violate the confidentiality of
records of the University and its members.

The motion having been seconded, Mr. Lacy pointed out that the motion originally
sponsored by the Student Conduct Committee and reviewed by the Faculty Senate
provided for a new Sec. I.B.2.j, replacing the present section having the same
number; that both the present and the originally proposed section place participation
in disruptive activities within the class of major offenses; but that, after the
Senate review, the committee voted to change the number of the proposed section
to I.B.3.g, which would place such activities within the class of minor offenses.
He stated that he did not agree with this action of the committee, and that, at the
proper time, he would move on his own behalf to restore the section number I.B.2.j
and the classification of disruptive activities as major offenses.

Mr. Patton reported that the Senate has voted to recommend the adoption of the motion
as presented to the Senate, with disruptive activities classified as major offenses;
but that, at the proper time, he would move an amendment on behalf of the Senate.
Mr. S. B. Greenfield questioned whether the motion, as changed by the Student Conduct
Committee, was in order. The chairman ruled that the motion was in order.

Mr. Patton then moved, on behalf of the Senate, to amend by changing the period at
the end of the motion to a comma, and by adding the words: "to include failure
to comply when directed, by a person with authority to do so, to disperse, to leave
a University building, room, or other facility; or to cease the use of loud speakers,
amplifiers, or other forms of noise." The motion was seconded.

Mr. Ron Eachus, president of the Associated Students, stated that he had designated
Mr. Don Chalmers, a member of the Student Conduct Committee, as the second student
entitled to the floor at this meeting, and asked that Mr. Chalmers be recognized
to speak against the Senate amendment. After some remarks, Mr. Chalmers stated that
he wished to yield the floor to another student member of the committee. The chair-
man stated that, under the rules of the faculty, two students only have the privi-
lege of the floor at any one faculty meeting, that Mr. Eachus and Mr. Chalmers have
already exercised the privilege at this meeting, and that a third student could not
be recognized.

A member of the faculty rose to a point of order, suggesting that the Senate amend-
ment involved a substantive matter outside the scope of the principal motion, and
was therefore out of order. Mr. Hollis called attention to the ruling of the chair
that the change of disruptive activity from a major to a minor offense, after notice
and after review by the Senate, was in order--and suggested that this provided a
precedent for a ruling that the Senate amendment was in order. The chairman ruled
the Senate amendment in order.

Mr. Rodgers inquired whether the rule restricting the number of students having the
privilege of the floor could be suspended to allow additional students to speak on
the motion before the faculty. The chairman stated that the rule could not be
suspended, but that the faculty could, if it wished, resolve itself into a Committee
of the Whole for more informal discussion.

After further discussion of the Senate amendment, Mr. Bower Aly moved that the
principal motion, with its pending amendment, be referred back to the Faculty
Senate, with instructions to consider revision of the Senate amendment in the
interest of greater clarity. The motion was seconded, put to a vote, and carried.
GROUP REQUIREMENT. Mr. J. M. Allman, chairman of the ad hoc Committee on Undergraduate Education, moved on behalf of his committee that the group requirements be changed to read as follows:

(1) To insure breadth of liberal education, all candidates for a bachelor's degree are required to take work in each of three groups--arts and letters, social sciences, and science--as listed below, in courses numbered 100-499, exclusive of courses numbered 400-610.

(2) Majors in liberal arts: 18 hours taken in each of the three groups--arts and letters, social science, and science--for a total of 54 hours.

(3) Majors in professional schools: 36 total hours in arts and letters, social science, and science. At least 9 hours shall be taken in each of the three groups.

Arts and Letters Group

General Arts and Letters
Art: ArH 201,202,203,204,205,206,207,208,209
Classics, and Chinese and Japanese
English
German and Russian
Music: Mus 201,202,203,204,205,206
Philosophy, except courses listed under Social Science
Romance Languages
Speech

Social Science Group

General Social Science
Anthropology
Economics
Geography
History
Philosophy, except courses listed under Arts and Letters
Political Science
Psychology, except courses listed under Science
Religion
Sociology

Science Group

General Science
Biology
Chemistry
Computer Science
Geology
Mathematics
Physics
Psychology, except courses listed under Social Science

The motion having been seconded, Mr. Patton reported that the Faculty Senate recommended its adoption. Mr. Allman spoke to his motion, and Mr. Pierson summarized the Senate discussion.

After discussion, Mr. C. R. B. Wright moved to amend by adding to paragraph (1): "and subject to additional restrictions which may be imposed by the departments involved." The motion to amend was seconded.

After discussion of the amendment, Mr. Greenfield moved that the meeting be adjourned. The motion was seconded and put to a vote by a show of hands; the result was a tie: yes, 49; no, 49. The chairman cast the deciding vote, for adjournment.

George N. Belknap
Secretary of the Faculty
REGULAR MEETING OF THE FACULTY

June 3, 1970

The meeting was called to order by President Clark. The chairman asked if the minutes of the regular meeting on May 6 or the adjourned meeting on May 20, 1970 required any corrections.

Mr. R.S. Freeman pointed out that the May 20 minutes included no reference to remarks by Mr. Hans Linde concerning the Faculty Senate amendment to the motion on disruptive activities presented by Mr. F.R. Lacy on behalf of the Student Conduct Committee. The chairman instructed the secretary to consult with Mr. Linde and add to the minutes whatever reference to these remarks is needed for the record of the May 20 meeting. (The secretary, after consulting Mr. Linde, has added a sentence to the May 20 minutes, following the text of the Senate amendment: "Mr. Hans Linde, author of the Senate amendment, explained its intent.")

Mr. S.A. Bernhard stated that he believed that the seventh paragraph of the section of the May 20 minutes reporting consideration of Mr. Lacy's motion, though an accurate report, may suggest a doubtful precedent for future rulings in the conduct of faculty business; his reference was to Mr. O.J. Hollis' defense of the propriety of the Senate amendment to Mr. Lacy's motion. The chairman ruled that the minutes required no correction, but suggested that Mr. Bernhard might, if he wished, request the Faculty Senate to consider the question of precedent.

The chairman then declared the minutes of the May 6 and 20 meetings approved, subject to the addition of a proper reference to Mr. Linde's remarks at the May 20 meeting.


FACULTY SENATE BUSINESS. Mr. Hollis, chairman of the Faculty Senate, announced that the Faculty Senate and the A.S.U.O. Student Senate have established a liaison committee and that the Faculty Senate has voted to allow student members of the committee the privilege of the floor at meetings of the Faculty Senate; and that the Faculty Senate has, in accordance with faculty legislation, elected the following University members of the Interinstitutional Faculty Senate of the Oregon State System of Higher Education: Mr. Robert Campbell, Miss Grace Graham, Mr. Hans Linde.

ACADEMIC REGALIA AT COMMENCEMENT EXERCISES. Mr. Fred Mohr, being recognized, stated that he wished to yield the floor to a member of the senior class for a statement concerning the wearing of academic regalia at the 1970 Commencement Exercises. The chairman ruled that the student, under faculty legislation, could not have the privilege of the floor unless designated by the president of the A.S.U.O. as one of two students having the privilege at this meeting. Mr. Ron Eechus, president of the A.S.U.O., indicated that the representative of the senior class was not so designated. Mr. Mohr then stated that he has been informed that a poll of the senior class has resulted in a recommendation that members of the graduating class and members of the faculty not wear academic regalia at the 1970 Commencement Exercises, and that each student and faculty member participating in the exercises contribute the rental cost of regalia to causes designated by the class. In the course of his remarks, Mr. Mohr referred to a statement by President Clark in regard to this question. The President explained that, on learning of the recommendation, he informed the Academic Occasions Committee that he believed that Commencement was an important ceremonial occasion of which the wearing of academic regalia was an intrinsic part--though not a requirement for participation. He added that the Academic Occasions Committee endorsed this position, though not by a unanimous vote.

Mr. Bower Aly stated that he believed there was faculty legislation concerning the wearing of academic regalia by faculty members participating in the exercises, and asked if the secretary had this legislation at hand. The secretary replied that he did not. Mr. Aly than asked that the text of the legislation be sent to members of the faculty through the campus mail.

AD HOC COMMITTEE ON R.O.T.C. CONTRACTS. Mr. J.T. Gange, chairman of the ad hoc Committee to Study R.O.T.C. Contracts, called attention to the fact that his committee's final report has been mailed to the faculty, and moved that the committee
be discharged and its responsibilities be transferred to the standing Advisory R.O.T.C. Committee, established at the May 20 meeting. The motion was seconded.

Mr. Andrew Thompson questioned whether members of the faculty understood what they were voting on when the motion to establish the standing Advisory R.O.T.C. Committee was adopted at the May 20 meeting, and suggested that the legality of this action was uncertain. Mr. Gange rose to a point of order, inquiring whether the May 20 procedure was in order and the committee properly established. The chairman ruled that the procedure was in order and the committee properly established.

After further discussion, Mr. S.S. Tepfer moved the previous question. The motion was seconded, put to a vote, and carried by the required two-thirds majority. The principal motion was then put to a vote and carried.

REPORT OF STUDENT-FACULTY COUNCIL. Mr. H.W. Robinson, chairman of the Student-Faculty Council, read a report from the Council, including the following concluding remarks: "...I am convinced that the body can be an instrument for resolving many of the problems which confront the University today. However, this cannot be achieved without the full confidence and cooperation of the concerned bodies. The time of a dedicated and responsible group of students and faculty is not being effectively employed. The Student-Faculty Council should be used or discharged."

Mr. O.R. Stannard stated that he believed that the Student-Faculty Council has generally taken a narrow and restricted view of its functions, a view not justified by the faculty legislation establishing the body, and is therefore largely responsible for its own sense of ineffectiveness. The President stated that he would call the attention of the 1970-71 Council to the provisions of the legislation establishing the body.

LE ROY C. MERRITT MEMORIAL. Mr. P.D. Morrison presented the following memorial:

Dean Merritt was born in Milwaukee, Wisconsin, September 10, 1912 and died May 22, 1970.

He worked in the Milwaukee Public Library while taking courses at the University of Wisconsin where he received the B.A. in 1935, with a diploma in librarianship. He received a Ph.D. in Librarianship from the University of Chicago in the spring of 1942.

During the Second World War Dr. Merritt was serving as librarian of Longwood College at Farmville, Virginia, when he was drafted and served for two years in the Armed Services. Near the close of the European fighting, he was aiding in a Special Services project in Paris for getting books and magazines to men in the front lines.

In 1946 Dean Merritt joined the faculty of the School of Librarianship at the University of California at Berkeley. He served for twenty years, and was vice-chairman of the school from 1954 to 1960, then acting dean until 1962. In 1966 he came to head the new School of Librarianship of the University of Oregon. Under his leadership the new school was accredited by the American Library Association in June 1968.

His doctoral dissertation, which was published by the University of Chicago Press in 1943, was entitled The United States Government As Publisher. He wrote a number of survey reports for California public libraries: La Jolla, Arcadia, Hayward, Oakland, Pacific Grove, and Vallejo. In 1951 he was the author of The Use of the Subject Catalog in the University of California Library and, in 1958, Reviews in Library Book Selection, co-authored with Boax and Tisdel. In 1949, he was joint editor of Planning the University Library Building. He is best known for his work on censorship and intellectual freedom. He published many articles in this field and edited the ALA Newsletter On Intellectual Freedom from 1962 until his death. The H.W. Wilson Company has just announced the publication of his book entitled Book Selection and Intellectual Freedom.

He was a past chairman of the California Library Association Intellectual Freedom Committee, a member of the ALA Intellectual Freedom Committee, former president of the Association of American Library Schools, and president-elect of the Library Education Division of the American Library Association.

During his teaching career Dean Merritt was especially interested in the course on "Book Selection," required of all who expected to become librarians. He advocated a definite, written book selection policy for each library, a clearly defined program for meeting the requests and complaints of the reading public, a careful interpretation to the public of sound book and magazine selection policies. He
believed that one man's prejudices or lack of information should not limit another man's free inquiry. He was known for the witty headings that gave sparkle to the Newsletter On Intellectual Freedom. In 1969 he received the University of Illinois Robert Downs Award for outstanding contributions to the cause of intellectual freedom in libraries.

Dean Merritt was a diligent and rigorous scholar, a very efficient and well-organized administrator, and a kind, generous, and understanding man. It is futile for me to try to express how much we miss him.

Mr. Morrison then asked that the memorial be recorded in the minutes of this meeting, and that a copy be transmitted to his family. At the request of the chairman, the faculty rose for a moment of silent tribute to Mr. Merritt.

DISRUPTIVE ACTIVITIES. The secretary read from the minutes of the May 20 faculty meeting passages indicating the present state of consideration of a motion by Mr. Lacy on behalf of the Student Conduct Committee, including:

(1) The text of Mr. Lacy's motion: That Sec. I.B.2.j. of the Code of Student Conduct be deleted and that the following new section be added:

I.B.3.g. Participation in disruptive activities. Disruptive activities are those which are intended to and do: block access to University buildings or rooms, interrupt or prevent any activity or operation of the University, interfere with any person's rights of free speech or assembly, or violate the confidentiality of records of the University and its members.

(2) Mr. Lacy's statement that, after notice of motion and consideration of the proposed new section by the Faculty Senate as Sec. I.B.2.j, classifying disruptive activities as a major offense, his committee had changed the section number to Sec. I.B.3.g, classifying disruptive activities as a minor offense.

(3) The report of the Faculty Senate recommending the adoption of the motion as presented to the Senate, with disruptive activities classified as a major offense.

(4) The text of a proposed Senate amendment, to change the period at the end of the motion to a comma, and to add the words: to include failure to comply when directed, by a person with authority to do so, to disperse, to leave a University building, room, or other facility; or to cease the use of loud speakers, amplifiers, or other forms of noise.

(5) Action by the faculty to refer the principal motion, with its pending amendment, back to the Senate, with instructions to consider revision of the Senate amendment in the interest of greater clarity.

Mr. C.P. Patton, secretary of the Faculty Senate, then requested permission to withdraw the Senate amendment. Permission being granted, Mr. Patton moved on behalf of the Senate to substitute the following for Mr. Lacy's motion and the withdrawn amendment:

(1) That Sec. I.B.2.j be amended to read: j. Conduct which intentionally obstructs

(2) or disrupts the University functions stated in paragraph I.A.3 of the Code of Student Conduct.

(2) That there be added a new Sec. I.B.3.c to read: c. Failure to disperse, to leave a University building, room, or other premises, or to cease the use of loudspeakers, amplifiers, or other forms of noise, after being given notice to do so by a person properly designated and identified as having authority from the President of the University to give such notice.

(3) That subsequent sections of I.B.3 be renumbered accordingly.

It having been seconded, Mr. F.E. Dart spoke to the motion to substitute. Mr. T.G. Goertz then moved that parts (1) and (2) of the motion be divided. The motion was seconded, put to a vote by a show of hands, and defeated: yes, 92; no, 102. Mr. Mohr, Mr. D.T. Smith, and Mr. G.W. Struble served as tellers for this and other divisions.

Mr. Bernhard rose to a point of order, suggesting that the Senate substitute motion involved substantive changes from the Student Conduct Committee motion, and was therefore out of order. The chairman ruled the Senate motion in order. After extensive discussion, Mr. E.F. Beal inquired whether another motion to divide would be in order. The chairman ruled that such a motion would not be in order.
A member of the faculty moved to delete part (2), which would add a new Sec. I.B. 3.c to the Code of Student Conduct. The motion was seconded. After discussion, Mr. A.F. Moursund moved the previous question on the amendment. The motion for the previous question was seconded, put to a vote, and carried. The motion to amend was then put to a vote by a show of hands and defeated: yes, 74; no, 124.

Mr. E.A. Cykler then moved the previous question on the motion to substitute; the motion was seconded, put to a vote, and carried. The motion to substitute was then put to a vote by a show of hands and carried: yes, 120; no, 74. Mr. Moursund then moved the previous question on the substitute motion, now the principal motion; the motion for the previous question was put to a vote and defeated for lack of a two-thirds majority; yes, 121; no, 69.

Mr. A.P. Rubin moved to amend part (1) to read: j. Conduct which intentionally, directly, and significantly interferes with the University's discharging its responsibilities within the sense of paragraph I.A.3. The motion was seconded, put to a vote, and defeated.

Mr. Aly moved the previous question on the substitute motion, now the principal motion; the motion was seconded, put to a vote, and carried. The principal motion was then put to a vote by a show of hands and carried: yes, 118; no, 69.

ADJOURNMENT. Mr. Struble moved that the meeting be adjourned, subject to the call of the President. The motion was seconded. Mr. J.M. Allman moved to amend to provide that the meeting be adjourned to reconvene at 3:30 p.m. on Wednesday, June 10. The motion to amend was seconded, put to a vote, and carried. The motion as amended was then put to a vote and carried.

George N. Belknap
Secretary of the Faculty

ADJOURNED MEETING OF THE FACULTY

June 10, 1970

The meeting was called to order by President Clark.

CAMPUS DISORDERS. The President asked unanimous consent to change the order of business to enable him to report to the faculty, at this time, concerning the meeting of the Oregon State Board of Higher Education at La Grande on Tuesday, June 9—with particular reference to the Board's consideration of recent disruption and violence on State System campuses, which has received widespread newspaper coverage. No objection was heard.

The President stated that the Board's consideration opened with a report on recent events presented by the Chancellor, incorporating factual material and recommendations for revision of Board policies and procedures in the light of these events. He also stated that, in his opinion, this was a good report and that neither the report nor the Board's consideration showed any evidence of "witch hunting." The Board's discussion was open and frank, and revealed differences of opinion concerning proper procedures among members of the Board. Policies approved in principle, subject to redrafting and later presentation for final adoption, incorporated substantial wording drafted by a member of the University of Oregon faculty and recommended by the Chancellor. The President also stated that he had objected to some phrasings of the original draft of the policy statements which he believed in conflict with the basic principles of academic freedom and the traditions of the University of Oregon—and that changes were made in the light of his objections.

WENDELL STEPHENSON MEMORIAL. Mr. T.P. Govan presented the following memorial.

Wendell Holmes Stephenson, teacher, scholar, editor, and professor of history in the University of Oregon since 1953, died at Eugene on April 14, 1970. A native of Indiana and a graduate of Indiana University, he received the doctorate from the University of Michigan in 1928, and before coming to Oregon was a member of the history faculty at the University of Kentucky, Louisiana State University, and Tulane University. As a historian, he was chiefly concerned with the slavery controversy and the ante-bellum South, and made a distinguished contribution through his biographies of James H. Lane, Alexander Porter, and Isaac Franklin, his two volumes of historiographical essays, and his service as co-editor of the ten-volume History of the South and of the Southern Biography Series.

But his colleagues in history throughout the United States gratefully remember him
best for his editorship of the Journal of Southern History (1935 to 1941) and of the Mississippi Valley Historical Review (1946 to 1953), through which, with a meticulous care that extended to the briefest review, he taught a whole generation of historians how to express what they wanted to say. Editing was an act of devotion to the profession, sufficiently important to justify postponement of his own scholarly work, and those who profited from this act of selfless sacrifice too frequently were unaware of the contribution he made—so carefully and modestly did he draw out from them the meaning of what they had intended to write, but which, without his aid, they had been unable to state.

They respected and honored him. Three historical societies chose him as president: The Agricultural Historical Association in 1940, the Southern Historical Association in 1944, and the Mississippi Valley Historical Association in 1957. But these honors were not what he valued the most, nor was it his own scholarly work, nor the long hours he patiently spent editing the work of others. He thought of himself as being the teacher in the classroom, and in the last five years of his service at this University, when, for reasons of health, he had been forced to renounce almost all activity, he continued his lectures to a large survey course in American history and conducted a colloquium for undergraduates. His popularity in a time of increasing divergence of views between the generations remained undiminished. He was loved and admired for his gentle, yet forceful, character and manner, and in the final term of last year, though confined to wheelchair in his home as the result of a fall in November 1968, the members of his colloquium insisted that he permit them to continue to meet.

Students in four institutions for more than forty years, along with his faculty colleagues, were privileged to know and to learn from a great and gentle man. We are grieved, but our grief is lessened, if not taken wholly away, by the memory of the joy he gave throughout his long and valuable life.

Mr. Govan then moved that the memorial be spread upon the minutes of the faculty and that a copy be sent to the widow of Mr. Stephenson. The faculty then rose for a moment of silent tribute to Mr. Stephenson.

RAYMOND ELLICKSON MEMORIAL. Mr. E. G. Ebbighausen presented the following memorial:

Professor Raymond Thorwald Ellickson died Sunday evening May 31 of this year 1970 at the age of 60. Ray come to the University of Oregon in 1948 to fill the two positions of associate dean of the Graduate School and head of the Department of Physics. He was born in 1910 on a farm near the small town of Charleston, North Dakota close to the Missouri River. After high school he received his Bachelor of Arts degree from Reed College, the Master of Arts degree from Oregon State University, and in 1938 his doctorate in physics from the University of Chicago.

Ray Ellickson’s professional career was quite varied and of the highest quality. After receiving his doctor’s degree he taught for several years at Brooklyn Polytechnic Institute. In 1946 he came to Reed College and became head of their Physics Department and then to the university of Oregon in 1948.

As might be expected of one of Ray’s stature, he was a member of many professional and honorary societies. I am sure that this modest man was proudest of all of his activities in the American Association of Physics Teachers and his active participation in the high-school and elementary-science teaching programs of the American Association for the Advancement of Science and the Harvard Project Physics. For, truly, Ray Ellickson was a teacher’s teacher and his strenuous, low-keyed efforts in lower-division teaching has been appreciated by many students here and at other schools.

When Ray came to this campus in 1948 it became apparent quickly that he was the committee member par excellence. He had an uncanny ability to regard the evidence of a case under consideration, to distill from it the essence of the problem, and to present his views in succinct and logical terms. For twelve years from 1958 he was the University’s faculty athletic representative and for this contribution he was highly regarded. The present high stature of the Department of Physics owes a great deal to his early tenure as department head from 1948 to 1960 and to his continuing advice. Although he had not been active in research in recent years, his colleagues highly regarded him for his broad knowledge of physics and related fields. Beyond this his activities in civic affairs contributed a great deal to bridging the gap between town and gown.

As a social person he was a delight to all. An evening at the Ellickson home with Ray and his charming wife Loene was always a delightful experience and one to be remembered. His fund of stories of his own experiences was seemingly unlimited
and highly entertaining. He liked people and this was reciprocated by his many friends.

Ray Ellickson will not be forgotten and our memory of him will endure. He was not an island but a part of the main and because of his departure we are all the less for it.

Mr. Ebbighausen then moved that the memorial be recorded in the minutes of the faculty and that a copy be sent to Mr. Ellickson's family. The faculty then rose for a moment of silent tribute to Mr. Ellickson.

GROUP REQUIREMENT. The secretary read from the minutes of the May 20, 1970 meeting of the faculty the record showing the present state of the consideration of a motion concerning the group requirement, including:

(1) The text of the motion, by Mr. J.M. Allman, chairman of the ad hoc Committee on Undergraduate Education, on behalf of his committee:

(a) To insure breadth of liberal education, all candidates for a bachelor's degree are required to take work in each of three groups--arts and letters, social sciences, and science--as listed below, in courses numbered 100-499, exclusive of courses numbered 400-410.

(b) Majors in liberal arts: 18 hours taken in each of the three groups--arts and letters, social science, and science--for a total of 54 hours.

(c) Majors in professional schools: 36 total hours in arts and letters, social science, and science. At least 9 hours shall be taken in each of the three groups.

Arts and Letters Group

General Arts and Letters
Art: ArH 201,202,203,204,205,206,207,208,209
Classics, and Chinese and Japanese
English
German and Russian
Music: Mus 201,202,203,204,205,206
Philosophy, except courses listed under Social Science
Romance Languages
Speech

Social Science Group

General Social Science
Anthropology
Economics
Geography
History
Philosophy, except courses listed under Arts and Letters
Political Science
Psychology, except courses listed under Science
Religion
Sociology

Science Group

General Science
Biology
Chemistry
Computer Science
Geology
Mathematics
Physics
Psychology, except courses listed under Social Science

(2) The recommendation of the Faculty Senate that the motion be adopted.

(3) A pending amendment by Mr. C.R.B. Wright to add the following to paragraph (a): "and subject to additional restrictions which may be imposed by the departments involved."
Mr. Wright, being recognized, requested permission to change his amendment to read: "Each liberal arts department listed below shall designate for the Catalog and Time Schedule which of its courses may not be used to meet these general education requirements." With the consent of Mr. Wright's second, permission was granted.

Mr. Jean Oliver, representative of the A.S.U.O. Senate at this meeting, reported that the A.S.U.O. Senate recommended the adoption of Mr. Allman's motion in its original form.

After discussion, Mr. Wright's motion to amend was put to a vote by a show of hands and defeated: yes, 54; no, 118. Mr. R.L. Bowlin, Mr. Fred M0hr, and Mr. D.T. Smith served as tellers for this and other divisions.

Mr. S.B. Greenfield moved to substitute the following for paragraphs (a), (b), and (c) of Mr. Allman's motion:

To insure a certain breadth of liberal education, all candidates for a bachelor's degree must take work in each of three groups (arts and letters, social sciences, and science, as listed below), with specific requirements as follows:

(a) Each student must complete a year sequence (in courses carrying 3, 4, or 5 hours credit) on the 100, 200, or 300 level in each of the three groups.

(b) Each student must take three additional term courses (of 3, 4, or 5 hours credit), either in or without sequence, from any courses numbered 100-499, exclusive of courses numbered 400-410, from one or more of the three groups.

(c) No course in student's major shall satisfy the requirements in (a) and (b) above.

Mr. Greenfield's motion was seconded and, after discussion, put to a vote and defeated.

Mr. S.S. Tepfer moved to amend by changing the words in paragraph (b) of Mr. Allman's motion, "18 hours taken in each of the three groups...for a total of 54 hours: to "six courses of at least 3 hours each in each of the three groups...for a total of at least 54 hours"; and by changing the words in paragraph (c), "16 total hours in arts and letters, social science, and science" to "twelve courses of at least 3 hours each in arts and letters, social sciences, and science." Mr. Tepfer's motion was seconded, put to a vote by a show of hands, and carried: yes, 98; no, 81.

Mr. F.W. Anderson moved to amend by providing that not more than four courses offered for the satisfaction of the group requirement may be in any one department. The motion was seconded, put to a vote, and defeated.

Mr. V.R. Lorwin moved to amend by changing the word "insure" in paragraph (a) to "promote." The motion was seconded, put to a vote, and carried.

Mr. M.D. Ross moved to amend by changing the line in the Arts and Letters group list, "Art: ArH 201,202,203,204,205,206,207,208,209," to "Art History." The motion was seconded. Mr. O.J. Hollis rose to a point of order, suggesting that the extension of the group lists beyond the provisions of Mr. Allman's motion in the field of art or any other field, by amendment without notice, was out of order. The chairman ruled that Mr. Ross's motion was out of order.

A member of the faculty raised the previous question on Mr. Allman's motion, as amended; the motion was seconded, put to a vote, and carried. The principal motion, as amended, was then put to a vote and carried.

GRADING SYSTEM. Mr. L.L. Lovell, chairman of the ad hoc Committee on the Grading System, moved on behalf of his committee the adoption of the following motion:

(I) Beginning fall term, 1970, the following grades will be used at the University of Oregon:

Pass-differentiated: A--excellent; B--good; C--satisfactory performance.

Pass-undifferentiated: P--satisfactory performance. (Satisfactory performance means a level of performance which, if achieved in all of the student's work, should qualify him for a University undergraduate degree.)

No credit: N--unsatisfactory performance.
Incomplete: I. (When the quality of work is satisfactory, but some minor yet essential requirement of the course has not yet been completed, for reasons acceptable to the instructor, a report of I may be made and additional time granted for completion of the work.)

X--No grade reported by the instructor.

Y--No basis for grade.

(2) The minimum University credits for an undergraduate degree will be 186 hours of satisfactory work, appropriately distributed as to group requirements, major field, and other University requirements. A minimum of 45 hours of pass-differentiated work must be taken in residence. There is no grade-point average requirement for graduation. Instead, 85 per cent of all work completed at the University of Oregon must be passed satisfactorily.

(3) Academic probation and suspension for undergraduate students are defined as follows: Students in the following categories of accumulated credit hours will be subject to academic probation or academic suspension upon accumulating the indicated number of N hours (for administrative reasons, the count of cumulative N grades will begin with the fall term, 1969; F grades will be counted as N grades).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Credit hours</th>
<th>Probation</th>
<th>Suspension</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0-44</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45-89</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90-134</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>135+</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Scholastic Deficiency Committee will establish the conditions, in individual cases, for removal from probationary status and for readmission to the University.

(4) Students registered prior to the fall term, 1970 may graduate under the grading system operative through summer session, 1970 by notification of such intention at the time of their next registration at the University of Oregon.

(5) Students with credits from other institutions must transfer both their passing and failing grades in all courses.

(6) No course open to undergraduate students may be offered on a pass-differentiated grading basis only. Individual students may be required to take such courses on a pass-differentiated basis, as may be specified in paragraph (7).

(7) Each degree-granting program will specify and publish in the University Catalog all requirements for a major in its field, and will make available such a list of specifications to any student requesting it.

(8) A student may change his grading option through the sixth week of any term. This change will then be binding upon both student and instructor.

(9) For the convenience of students desiring such information, the Registrar will record the following numerical equivalents with pass-differentiated grades: A--4; B--3; C--2.

(10) An ad hoc committee will be appointed annually, for at least five years, to study the effects and consequences of the new grading system. The committee will report its findings and recommendations for change to the faculty.

(11) The provisions of this motion supersede all previous University legislation on the grading system.

The motion having been seconded, Mr. C.P. Patton, secretary of the Faculty Senate, reported that, at the proper time, he would move several amendments on behalf of the Senate; he also reported that the Senate recommended that the principal motion, with or without these amendments, be disapproved. Mr. Lovell spoke to his motion and Mr. S.A. Pierson, Senate reporter, summarized the Senate discussion.

Mr. Patton then moved, on behalf of the Senate, to amend by changing the second sentence of Sec. 2, "A minimum of 45 hours of pass-differentiated work must be taken in residence," to read: "Minimum of 90 hours must be earned on a pass-differentiated basis, of which a minimum of 45 hours must be earned in residence." The motion to amend was seconded.
Mr. J.W. Crawford moved to table the principal motion, with its pending amendment, until the first fall 1970 meeting of the faculty; the motion to table was seconded, put to a vote by a show of hands, and defeated: yes, 46; no, 99.

Mr. B.N. Siegel asked whether it would be parliamentarily possible to present an amendment of broader scope which would, in part, relate to the subject of the Senate amendment. The chairman suggested that, to bring this question before the faculty, he present his proposal as a substitute for the Senate amendment. Mr. Siegel then moved, as a substitute for the Senate amendment:

(1) That Sec. 1 of the principal motion be amended by changing the grade designation "C" to "P"; and by deleting the words: "Pass-undifferentiated: P=satisfactory performance."

(2) That Sec. 2 be amended by deleting the sentence: "A minimum of 45 hours of pass-differentiated work must be taken in residence."

(3) That Secs. 6, 7, and 8 be deleted.

(4) That the grade designation "C" in Sec. 9 be changed to "P."

Mr. J.R. Menninger inquired whether Mr. Siegel's motion was in order. At the chairman's request, Mr. Hallis commented on this point. He stated that he believed that Mr. Siegel's motion was out of order, since it would radically change, without notice, the meaning of the mark of "P" in existing faculty legislation, and place the mark of "P" as one step in a graduated scale of pass-differentiated grades, and do away with longstanding concept of "P" as an alternative to a scale of grades. The chairman ruled Mr. Siegel's motion out of order.

Mr. Bower Aly moved that further consideration of Mr. Lovell's motion and its pending amendment be postponed until the October 1970 meeting. Mr. Hans Linde inquired whether Mr. Aly would be willing to add to his motion a request that, in the interim, departments study the impact of the proposal on their programs and report their conclusions. Mr. Aly accepted this addition. The motion was seconded.

Mr. Franklin Lowenthal moved to amend Mr. Aly's amendment to provide for postponement until the November 1970 faculty meeting; the motion was seconded, put to a vote, and carried. Mr. Aly's motion, as amended, was then put to a vote by a show of hands and defeated: yes, 76; no, 80.

After further discussion, Mr. Patton's amendment, on behalf of the Senate, was put to a vote by a show of hands and carried: yes, 83; no, 65.

Mr. Patton then moved, on behalf of the Senate, to amend Mr. Lovell's motion by deleting Sec. 6. The motion was seconded and, after discussion, put to a vote by a show of hands and defeated: yes, 64; no, 79.

Mr. Patton then moved, on behalf of the Senate, to amend by deleting Sec. 11. The motion was seconded, put to a vote, and carried.

Mr. K.W. Porter moved to amend by changing the definition of a "C" grade in Sec. 1 from "satisfactory performance" to "passing." The motion was seconded, put to a vote, and defeated.

Mr. George Streisinger moved the previous question on the principal motion as amended. The motion was seconded, put to a vote, and defeated.

Mr. Aly moved that the principal motion as amended, together with Mr. Siegel's proposal, be referred to the Faculty Senate for further study, with instructions to report to the faculty not later than the November 1970 meeting. The motion was seconded, put to a vote, and defeated.

A member of the faculty moved to amend the last sentence of Sec. 2 of Mr. Lovell's motion to read: "Instead, 85 per cent of all work graded A, B, C, P, or N completed at the University of Oregon must be passed satisfactorily." The motion was seconded. Mr. A.P. Rubin moved to amend the amendment by adding the marks I, X, and Y; the motion was seconded, put to a vote, and defeated. Mr. Lowenthal moved to amend the amendment by adding the marks I and Y; the motion was seconded, put to a vote, and defeated. The original amendment was then put to a vote and carried.

A member of the faculty moved that the meeting be adjourned. The motion was seconded, put to a vote, and defeated.
After further discussion, a member of the faculty moved the previous question on Mr. Lovell's motion as amended; the motion was seconded, put to a vote by a show of hands, and carried: yes, 108; no, 26. The principal motion, as amended, was then put to a vote by a show of hands and carried: yes, 96; no, 51.

ADJOURNMENT. A member of the faculty moved that the meeting be adjourned. The motion was seconded, put to a vote, and carried.

George N. Belknap
Secretary of the Faculty

SPECIAL MEETING OF THE FACULTY

September 23, 1970

The meeting was called to order by President Clark at 3:35 p.m. The Chairman announced that the minutes of the meeting of June 3, 1970, and June 10, 1970, would be held over for approval at the next regular faculty meeting scheduled for October 14, 1970.

Announcements

The President announced that Marshall D. Wattles had been appointed the regular secretary of the faculty.

Mr. Scoles made an announcement concerning the opening of the new Law School building and the plans for an open-house on Wednesday, October 21.

President Clark stated that if there were no objections he would change the normal order of business and discuss the State of the University prior to considering old business. No objections were made and the President spoke briefly on a number of issues facing the University. (See Appendix)

Old Business

MOTION TO CHANGE THE WITHDRAW DATE FOR STUDENTS:

Mr. Paul Civin presented, on behalf of the Academic Requirements Committee, the following motion: Effective September 15, 1970, a student may withdraw from a course by filing the appropriate form with the Registrar prior to the end of the eighth week of the term. For any withdrawal initiated by a first-term student during the first five weeks of the term or by any other student during the first three weeks of a term, the course enrollment will not be recorded on the student's permanent record card; otherwise, the course enrollment will be recorded with the mark of "W". An instructor be authorized to report a mark of "Y" (no basis for grade) for any student whose name appears on the final grade roster and for whom the instructor is of the belief that he has no basis on which to report a grade. If a student has not initiated a withdrawal in a course for which the student has been enrolled, and the instructor has not reported a grade or mark, the Registrar is authorized to insert a mark of "X" (no grade reported) in the grade column on the permanent record. If any instructor inadvertently marks a "W" on the final grade report, the Registrar's Office will automatically record this as a mark of "X". The instructor may change any differentiated grade to another differentiated grade or may interchange the grade of "p" or "n" by filing the appropriate form with the Registrar.

No undergraduate student shall register for more than 21 term hours of credit in any term without the approval of an authorized member of the Office of Academic Advising.

Mr. George Struble moved to amend the motion by deleting the first sentence. The motion to amend was seconded, put to a vote and defeated.

Mr. Alfred Rubin moved to amend the motion by substituting in the last sentence "18 term-hours of credit" in place of "21 term-hours of credit." The motion to amend was seconded, put to a vote and defeated.

Mr. Robert Friedman moved to amend the motion by adding the provision that no student be permitted to enroll in two classes scheduled for the same hour. The motion to amend was seconded, put to a vote and defeated.

The main motion was put to a vote and carried.

MOTION CONCERNING THE STATUS OF SPECIAL STUDENTS:
Mr. Paul Civin, on behalf of the Academic Requirements Committee, the Admissions Policy Committee and the Scholastic Deficiency Committee moved as follows: The legislation of December 13, 1922, and May 21, 1924, pertaining to "rules governing special students who are not candidates for a degree..." shall be rescinded, and the following new legislation adopted:

A special student is defined as an individual who does not hold a baccalaureate degree and who does not qualify or may not desire to qualify for regular undergraduate admission.

The Admissions Policy Committee shall establish and act as an appellate body on policies governing the admission of special students.

Each special student shall have his academic performance reviewed at least once each year by the Scholastic Deficiency Committee to determine whether he shall continue as a special student, be granted regular student status, be placed on academic probation, or be academically disqualified.

At the request of Mr. Eugene Scoles, the chairman directed that the minutes show that this legislation does not apply to students who enroll for courses in the School of Law with the intent of working toward an advanced professional degree or certification.

The motion was put to a vote and carried, unanimously.

MOTION CONCERNING THE PRIVILEGES OF THE PRESIDENT OF ASUO SENATE AT FACULTY MEETINGS.

Mr. James Tattersall presented the following motion: That at faculty meetings the ASUO Senate may, through its president or his designee, present notices of motion for faculty action.

After a rather lengthy debate, Mr. Hans Linde moved to postpone action until the next faculty meeting at which time a report of the Student Senate will be available. The move to postpone was seconded, put to a vote and passed, by a vote of 88 for and 73 against.

New Business

Mr. John Perrin gave notice of motion for the next regular faculty meeting as follows: Effective at the end of the Fall Term, 1970, students must complete, within one year of residence, work in any course for which an incomplete was granted; otherwise the Registrar will replace the incomplete with a grade of N.

There being no further business the meeting was adjourned at 5:20 p.m.

Marshall D. Wattles
Secretary of the Faculty

APPENDIX

REMARKS TO THE FACULTY

By Robert D. Clark
President, University of Oregon
September 23, 1970

I am glad to welcome you at the beginning of this new year. As an old schoolmate, I find that my pulse still quickens to the return of students to the campus and, despite the anxieties and tribulations of recent years, it is not a pulse that beats loud with anger or faint with trepidation. These have been troublesome years but exciting ones, and out of the student unrest, I believe, will emerge a stronger and better university--one more responsive to student and societal needs, but one no less committed to the search for truth and the acquisition and use of knowledge for humane purposes.

Perhaps these words are patently cant, but I do not think of myself as a Dr. Pangloss declaiming optimism in the face of disaster. The fact is that the University which nourished us and which we secretly cherish in the now unspoken and slightly embarrassing sentiment, alma mater, is not the University we serve today, and neither institution, past or present, is competent to meet the demands society has placed upon it. The University has changed much in the last three or four
years, and undoubtedly it will change more in the years ahead. How, I do not know. I suspect, and fervently hope, that it will hold fast and enlarge its passionate search for knowledge, not for conspicuous consumption, not as Newman said to acquire "mere repertories of miscellaneous and officious learning," but, as he insisted, for the exercise of thought or reason on knowledge, in a way that will engage the energies of the student. And beyond that, the application of knowledge for humane purposes—long a practice of the university in the traditional fields of law, medicine, architecture, engineering and applied science, pedagogy and others. We must improve our curriculum and instruction in all these areas, with particular concern for the public welfare. But we must reach beyond them to a more effective application of knowledge to the nearly insuperable problems the technological age has brought upon us—not simply as reformers whom later generations may applaud for their zeal and forgive for the little damage they have done—but as practitioners, skilled in the means to effect change, to transmit and implement the values we have professed but have not fully realized in our democratic society. We have made a modest beginning in the applied social sciences in our School of Community Service and Public Affairs and elsewhere. We need to enlarge and improve the enterprise.

I do not mean to suggest that we should politicize the University or that we should simply give credit for field work. Even if the central purpose of a college is defined as "socialization," as two eminent writers have recently defined it, the axis about which the socialization takes place remains the exercise of thought on knowledge. Field work or even political activity may serve as a laboratory exercise to be analyzed and evaluated. We have begun to develop the theoretical base and methodology necessary to serve that purpose. But to politicize the university is to subvert it. For once the university is perceived or used as a political tool or weapon, it will be seized by the strongest power and very likely that power will not be within the university.

This topic may well be an urgent issue this fall. The events of last spring—Kent State, Jackson State, Cambodia—have sensitized our students to political action. Of the many prospective institutional programs, the most widely known is the Princeton plan which calls for the closing of the university for two weeks before the November election. Only a few schools—mostly private—have adopted it. The plan, requiring an early beginning or late closing for the fall semester, is too costly for most students who attend our public institutions. The University of Oregon will not close its classrooms for the campaign. But it will have a program. With the cooperation of the president of the Associated Students, I have appointed a faculty-student committee to develop plans. The committee's recommendations will be announced this week.

We begin this fall term with mixed feelings of apprehension and confidence—apprehension because of the events of last spring, and confidence because of the manner in which our students and faculty responded.

The public reaction ranges from anxiety to anger. Against that background, and perhaps in anticipation of the forthcoming report of his Commission on Campus Unrest, President Nixon, according to the press, has addressed a letter to more than one thousand college and university presidents, charging them with the responsibility of maintaining order on the campus. I have not received, or have not yet received, a copy of the letter. I agree with the President that the university cannot tolerate disruption or violence and maintain its integrity. And I further agree that the university itself, and not the government, is the more competent agent to deal with disorder. But I concur also with the reported conclusions of the Scranton committee which not only condemn violence and disruption on the campus, but urge the President to ally himself with the American youth, to make a full commitment "to crucial domestic reforms to aid the poor, the blacks, the cities, and the environment."

The President in his Kansas State address urged colleges and universities to stand up and be counted. The University of Oregon has stood up to be counted against violence and disruption. It will continue to do so. But I want to emphasize that members of this University community will also stand up in alliance with students who are earnestly pressing for a reduction of the evils in our society which breed violence. All of us hope, I am sure, that President Nixon will stand up with us.

Certainly the President of the United States, more than any other person, can set the tone and lead the way for change.

I regret to spend so much time on the topic of campus disruption and violence, but events of the last year, and public concern make further comment necessary.
Last spring and this summer students and faculty have worked together to make significant changes in our procedures for enforcement of the rules of conduct. Not only from the demands of the public, but on the recommendation of the University, and with its cooperation, the State Board of Higher Education has taken action to make the rules of conduct clear to all. The procedural change adopted last spring was written by a member of our faculty. Our faculty submitted many of the specific provisions written into the code this fall and participated actively in modification and improvement of all of its sections. The specific procedure, including the definition of "cause" as recommended by our faculty was, regrettably, not adopted by the Board. When the faculty and board were so nearly in agreement on the new provisions, I regretted that they could not reach an accord on this and two or three other issues. But the Board did reaffirm its long-standing commitment to faculty participation in the procedures and in the determination of penalty. And it did draw a distinction between speech, which is protected and disruptive action or speech unequivocally linked with riotous action, both of which it proscribed.

I believe that the action of the Board provides us a basis for adequate controls on the campus, for defense of the rights of faculty members, and for protection from the imposition of unjust and oppressive regulation by an angry public.

Last summer I attended a special meeting of the National Association of State Universities and Land-Grant Colleges. It was a grim session. Institution after institution reported the same pattern: inadequate discipline code, collapse of the disciplinary procedures, precipitant action taken outside the code, or on the basis of vague and unconstitutional provisions, intervention of the courts, failure to repair the code, intervention of the legislature. In one state the regulations of the Board of Regents now have the force of law and the student guilty of infraction is subject to trial in the criminal courts; in the same state the courts are empowered to expel a student from the university for infractions of a law; in one state the legislature authorized the withholding of funds from any institution that cancells its classes because of student disruption; in several institutions the regents or the legislature have ordered the use of a hearing officer who, in some instances, will function outside the jurisdiction of the university or its president. Thirty-two states last year passed restrictive or repressive legislation; I do not know the count for this year. Given these circumstances, and given the very nature and integrity of the university, I believe it wise that the faculty of this institution, and the State Board of Higher Education have moved to deal with the problem in a context that is appropriate to the academy.

Unhappily, there are other by-products of campus disruption. Robert Nisbet, professor of sociology at Riverside, has said in recent statement that "Although most persons tend to think of freedom as the consequences of eroding authority in a culture, this is not the case, for freedom cannot exist save in circumstances of accepted authority." In times of stress the failure, or even the apparent failure, of the University to exercise its authority will result in the assumption of that authority by other agencies. "The first and crucial manifestation," he says, "will be increased participation of boards of trustees...in academic, including curricular affairs on campus."

We have, I believe, an unusually good governing board, one that has tried to act responsibly and not vindictively, a board that has sought to protect the welfare of the institutions it governs and at the same time to meet its obligations to the citizens of Oregon. Yet it showed uncertain and uneasy confidence in the management of academic affairs in some of the institutions when it refused to give more than tentative approval to projected curricular and administrative changes. Three of these were at the University of Oregon: the new legislation on group requirements, the reduction of the English composition requirement from nine to six credits, and the change in the grading system.

More significant is this fact: in years past, the secretary of the faculty informed me, changes of this order were not referred to the Board for action. I know that many years ago the University required only six hours of English composition, and I believe that it did not refer the matter to the Board when it increased the requirement to nine credits. I was a member of the committee that recommended a substantial increase in group requirements, a change not referred to the Board. I know that the Honors College was legislated without reference to the Board, and that an earlier and less imaginative plan--in which I had a part--to reward a student for his achievement rather than to punish him for his failures was not referred--nor was it referred some years later when it was dropped as an abortive and unsuccessful experiment. The University had some sense of freedom to experiment, evaluate, confirm or retract.

Given this understanding I did not refer last spring's legislation to the
Board. But a concerned member asked that it be placed on the agenda for discussion and possible action. I do not for one moment question the Board's authority to act. But I do regret the erosion or seeming erosion of confidence. In these times when change and experimentation are essential to the well-being of higher education we require also a climate of confidence that will make change possible. We cannot always expect that our several publics will agree with us, we may have to fight for programs we believe educationally sound. The public will more easily endure such struggles if they are persuaded that the University, indeed, acts within the context of authority and not as a consequence of its diminution. But in saying all of this we must not overlook the fact that the Board does allow us considerable latitude for experimentation in course offerings—and I am confident that satisfactory times for the exercise of authority in curricular matters will be drawn.

I could tell you a much happier story of what I believe to be a growing sense of confidence in the University. It seemed a strange thing to me last year when I returned to the campus that this university so highly respected in all parts of the country should be held in low esteem by some of the citizens of the State, including, unfortunately, some of our own alumni. My mail in these past months has not been a litany of praise. But I believe that we have turned the corner. I have tried to answer every inquiry, complaint, and commendation. I have sometimes written angrily, bluntly, aggressively, but I have also tried to understand the other man's point of view, to interpret events in a larger context, to be conciliatory where it was possible, without apology or improper concession, and to furnish facts that speak for themselves. Largely through the efforts of the Development Fund office, I have spoken in many communities of the State, in Portland a dozen times; a self-constituted group of local citizens has met with me frequently to acquaint themselves with the issues, the Alumni Association, Oregon Mothers, Oregon Dads have rallied to our support. From these groups we have developed a limited mailing list of persons to whom we have sent special letters, circulars, documents. Some of these people have done much to interpret the university to a larger public; some of them have devoted much time and effort in our behalf; some of them have been fiercely supportive of the University. My mail has begun to look better. In these times of financial stress, contributions of unrestricted dollars to the Development Fund increased appreciably last year. The Report from the President, sent to some 50,000 people, has prompted many favorable responses. One man wrote, "You have met many of my arguments against higher education. You have turned me around. Please send fifty more copies for me to distribute to my friends." Many of you, professors, administrators, counsellors, dormitory staff, and students, have been intimately involved in many ways, sometimes with an enormous investment of energy. On behalf of the University, I thank you.

I have one more topic to discuss: last year we gave much attention to the thorny topic of the government of the University. I said to you at the first meeting of the faculty that I favored a delegate legislative body and a higher degree of student participation. I still hold those views and I suspect that the issue is still a thorny one. In consequence, I have, on recommendation of the Advisory Council, appointed a special faculty-student committee to study the question and make recommendations.

I believe that we can profit from student insights and that our government ought to provide an adequate means to make their judgments, interests, and wants known and felt. I believe also, that faculty as professionally trained men and women have special responsibility for university government, for the development of the curriculum, the content and method of instruction and evaluation, the selection, retention, and advancement of professional colleagues. Further, I believe that an abridgement of the faculty's ultimate professional responsibility would lessen the quality of the University education and will invite intrusion into and direction of university business by outside forces. We shall have some differences over these questions. The discussion of differences, I trust, will lead to a clearer definition of roles and an accommodation that will be most beneficial to the University.

What more shall I say? -- with Eliot:

"Now, we come to discover that the moments of agony
***are likewise permanent
With such permanence as time has.***
People change, and smile: but the agony abides."
The faculty members listed below have been nominated for the Graduate Council and will appear on the ballots to be circulated soon.

Liberal Arts Group
Andrews, Fred C.
Dolby, Lloyd J.
Hart, Thomas R.
Leppmann, Wolfgang A.
Martin, Gene E.
Noyes, R. M.
Posner, Michael
Reithel, Francis J.
Rodgers, Roy H.
Sherwood, Irma Z.
Taylor, Donald S.
Wood, Kenneth Scott
Yood, Bertram

Professional Group
Candland, Dorothy N.
Clarke, H. Harrison
Dizney, Henry F.
Dougherty, M. Frances
Harris, R. S.
Kensler, Gordon L.
Lowe, Raymond N.
McCue, Betty F.
Maertens, Norbert W.
Mittman, Arthur
Munson, B. Corlee
Pond, Patricia B.
Prehm, Herbert J.
Rankin, Richard J.
Reuter, E. R.
Ross, M. D.
Rousseve, R. J.
Schafer, W. E.
Toobert, Saul
Vance, Stanley
Walker, Hill
Watson, D. A.
Wooten, Edna P.

Four members from each of the two groups will be voted for by each faculty member.

The faculty members listed below were elected to the Faculty Senate in the special election.

Roland Bartel
Arthur Mittman

REGULAR MEETING OF THE FACULTY

October 14, 1970

The meeting was called to order by President Clark at 3:40 p.m. in Room 150, Science.

The minutes of the meetings of June 3, June 10 and September 23 were approved.

Announcements

Mr. Clyde Patton, Chairman of the Faculty Advisory Committee, discussed briefly the work of the Advisory Council to date and announced an open house for October 26, 4:00 to 5:00 p.m. in the Faculty Club, where faculty members may talk informally with members of the Advisory Council.

Old Business

MOTION TO PERMIT ASUO SENATE PRESIDENT TO GIVE NOTICE OF MOTION.

Mr. James Tattersall was recognized to restate the motion which had been held over from the faculty meeting of September 23. He moved: At faculty meetings the ASUO Senate may, through its president or his designee, present notices of motion for faculty action.

The ASUO representative, Mr. Iain More, stated that the ASUO Senate favored the motion. After brief discussion, Mr. Tattersall moved to amend the motion to read as follows: At faculty meetings the ASUO Senate may, through the ASUO President or his designee, present notices of motion for faculty action.
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