Liberal Arts

C. P. Neal
E. R. Bingham
Paul Clevn
Bernd Grasemann
E. S. Ghent
J. R. Klomoski
W. A. Leppmann
T. M. Miven
E. S. Pomeroy
F. J. Reithel
L. W. Staples
George Streifinger
Kester Svendsen
Leona Tyler

Professional

D. A. Baernscoop
W. C. Ballance
T. O. Ballinger
F. A. Cuthbert
E. A. Cylker
C. T. Duncan
Grace Graham
O. J. Hollis
J. L. Hulteng
R. A. Linde
L. L. Lowell
M. D. Ross
K. D. Skelton
Robert Trotter

COMMITTEE ON INTER COLLEGIATE ATHLETICS. Mr. J. R. Klomoski, chairman of
the Committee on Intercollegiate Athletics, reported on the present state of plans
for an auditorium and athletic stadium on the north bank of the Willamette River.

MAIL BALLOTING IN FACULTY ELECTIONS. Mr. E. S. Pomeroy moved that, during an
experimental period of two years, beginning with the academic year 1965-66, all
nominating and the first electing ballots for members of the Advisory Council and
of the Faculty Senate be by ballots distributed and returned by mail. The detailed
procedure for implementing the proposal shall be worked out by the secretary of
the faculty and shall take effect upon approval by the Faculty Senate. The
motion having been seconded, Mr. L. W. staples, secretary of the Faculty Senate,
reported that the Senate recommended its approval. The motion was then put to
a vote and carried.

FEDERAL SUPPORT OF THE HUMANITIES AND THE ARTS. Mr. Harry Alpert moved the
adoption of the following resolution:

Be it resolved that the faculty of the University of Oregon endorses the
efforts of President Johnson and the Congress of the United States to provide
support in the areas of the humanities and the arts through research grants,
fellowships, training programs, facilities grants, and other means.

Without committing itself to any particular bill now under consideration
by the Congress, the faculty of the University of Oregon urges favorable action
on a measure that will provide for the strengthening of the arts and the humanities.

Be it further resolved that copies of this resolution be sent to President
Johnson, the six members of the congressional delegation from Oregon, and the
chairman of the Special Subcommittee on Arts and Humanities Foundation and a
National Arts Foundation.

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

ACADEMIC FREEDOM IN COMMUNITY COLLEGES. Mr. Robert Campbell moved the
adoption of the following resolution:

Pending the accreditation of the community colleges in Oregon, the State
System of Higher Education has created a Committee on Community Colleges to
which it has delegated the authority to rule on the acceptability of junior
college courses and programs for college credit.

In its statement of policy, the committee rightly recognizes the desirability
of creating, within the community college, an environment for learning comparable
to that of the four-year colleges in the State System. In their words: "... the
institution, through its faculty and administrators, should instill in (the
student) the love of learning and the ideal of intellectual excellence." The
committee further recognizes that: "unless courses offered by a community college
are really of college caliber and instruction is effective, students who transfer
into a four-year institution will be at a grave, or even crippling, disadvantage."

These objectives of the committee are, in a broad sense, underscored by the
statement of principles jointly adopted in 1940 by the American Association of University Professors and the Association of American Colleges, and endorsed by most of the professional associations. It states, in part, as follows:

"Institutions of higher education are conducted for the common good and not to further the interest of either the individual teacher or the institution as a whole. The common good depends upon the free search for truth and its free exposition.

"Academic freedom is essential to these purposes and applies to both teaching and research. Academic freedom in its teaching aspect is fundamental for the protection of the rights of the teacher in teaching and of the student to freedom in learning.

"Tenure is a means to certain ends; specifically: (1) Freedom of teaching and research and of extramural activities, and (2) a sufficient degree of economic security to make the profession attractive to men and women of ability. Freedom and economic security, hence tenure, are indispensable to the success of an institution in fulfilling its obligations to its students and to society."

We, the members of the faculty of the University of Oregon, recognize the importance of these principles in guiding the work of the Committee on Community Colleges. Recent developments in Oregon have made it clear that there is a considerable difference in the degree to which the community colleges have satisfied the minimum requirements of academic freedom and tenure expected of an institution offering college-level work for transfer credit. Events at one institution, for example, demonstrate that rights of academic freedom, extramural activity, and tenure are denied to faculty members there, while, in another, a faculty committee has been working closely with the administration in devising a set of rules that embody nearly all of the accepted principles of academic freedom and tenure that are employed by institutions in the State System of Higher Education. In order that these principles may be more fully implemented, we, therefore, strongly urge that the Committee on Community Colleges refuse, as of September 1965, to approve junior college courses or programs for transfer credit until it obtains evidence that the institution offering the course or program has adopted acceptable standards of academic freedom and tenure for its faculty members.

The motion having been seconded, Mr. Campbell inquired whether it required notice. President Fleming stated that it was his understanding that faculty legislation required notice of motion and automatic referral to the Faculty Senate only when a motion involved a change in policy on matters within the purview of the powers of the faculty. In accordance with this interpretation, he ruled that Mr. Campbell's motion did not require notice and referral to the Senate, but that the faculty might properly determine whether it wished the resolution to be considered by the Senate before the faculty meeting. The motion was referred to the Senate for consideration and report at the May 1965 faculty meeting. Mr. Wanner's motion was seconded, put to a vote, and carried.

QUESTIONNAIRE ADDRESSED TO PARENTS OF STUDENTS. Mr. Wanner moved the adoption of the following resolution:

The faculty of the University of Oregon, considering the recent questionnaire sent by the University Administration to the parents of University of Oregon students, goes on record that (a) it has never been consulted regarding the questionnaire, (b) the Student Conduct Committee, to whom it has delegated its responsibility in the field of student conduct, has never been consulted regarding the questionnaire. The faculty considers the wording of said questionnaire as being not in harmony with the function of a university.

The motion was seconded. President Fleming ruled that the motion required notice; he called attention, in particular, to the policy implications of the last sentence. In the course of discussion of the President's ruling, it was questioned whether the motion in itself provided for a change in policy and suggested that the rule might be suspended. In reply to a question from the chair concerning the majority required for suspension of the rules, Mr. O. J. Hollis stated that he was not certain whether faculty practice required a two-thirds or a three-fourths majority for suspension of the rules. He pointed out, however, that the intent of the rule for a very large majority was the protection of the rights and privileges of individual members of a parliamentary body. Specifically, the faculty's notice rule insures that faculty members are informed in advance when matters involving potential differences of views and opinions are to be brought before the faculty for action. Through notice and publication in the agenda,
individual faculty members are provided an opportunity to decide whether they wish to be present, participate in the discussion, and record their votes. This function has traditionally been given considerable weight in determining whether the notice rule applies to a given item of business. Mr. Wanner stated that he wished to delete the last sentence of his resolution. The President ruled that, if this sentence were deleted, the motion did not require notice. Mr. A. W. Urquhart moved that Mr. Wanner's motion be tabled. Mr. Urquhart's motion was seconded, put to a vote, and carried.

REPORT FROM STUDENT CONDUCT COMMITTEE. Mr. Wanner moved that the faculty of the University of Oregon invite the Student Conduct Committee to submit to the regular May meeting of the faculty a report on its activity since its creation. The report should emphasize the legislation passed by the committee, in particular as it departs from the Code passed by the faculty. The motion was lost through lack of a second.

STUDENT CONDUCT CODE. Mr. Wanner gave notice that he would move at the May 1965 faculty meeting the adoption of the following resolution: The faculty of the University of Oregon, considering the Student Conduct Code passed on November 6, 1963, and particularly Art. 6, Sec. 1 of that code, which enunciates the principle of equal treatment for men and women students, resolves that nothing in that article or any other part of the code shall be construed as allowing or encouraging more intensive supervision of the lives of male students by the University authorities, except in matters pertaining directly to their academic work.

STATE OF THE UNIVERSITY. President Flemming reported that it appeared the State System of Higher Education may expect more favorable action on the several aspects of its legislative program than was achieved two years ago.

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned.

George N. Belknap
Secretary of the Faculty

REGULAR MEETING OF THE FACULTY

May 5, 1965

The meeting was called to order by President Flemming. The minutes of the meeting of April 7, 1965 were read and approved.

SUSPENSION OF NOTICE-OF-MOTION RULE. The minutes of the April meeting reported a discussion of a parliamentary question, the vote required for the suspension of the faculty's notice-of-motion rule. The secretary informed the faculty that, under Robert's Rules of Order, a rule requiring notice of motion cannot be suspended, even by unanimous vote, since its purpose is to protect the rights of absent members. President Flemming stated that he would follow Robert on this point, if the question should arise in the future.

ADVISORY COUNCIL AND FACULTY SENATE ELECTIONS. Ballots were cast for the election of the 1965-66 Advisory Council and members of the Faculty Senate to serve two-year terms. The following persons served as tellers: J. S. Carlson, G. W. Struble, R. L. Bowlin, K. T. Metzler, A. W. Roecker, J. A. Shotwell, W. C. Woods, C. W. Schmaukke, L. E. Ward, R. J. Salisbury, W. J. Robert. The following were elected:


Faculty Senate (Liberal Arts)--C. B. Beall, E. R. Bingham, K. S. Ghent, I. H. Miven, E. S. Pomezary, L. W. Staples, Leona Tyler.

Faculty Senate (Professional)--D. A. Baerncoep, T. O. Ballinger, E. A. Cybler, Grace Graham, O. J. Hollis, J. L. Hulteng, Robert Trotter.

ADVISORY COUNCIL REPORT. Mr. Kester Svendsen, Secretary of the Advisory Council, presented the spring-summer 1965 report of the Council. A copy of the report is filed in the office of the secretary of the faculty as a part of these
minutes. At the suggestion of Mr. R. A. Littman, the faculty expressed with applause its appreciation of the work of the Council during the past year. President Fleming stated that the University owes a very great debt of gratitude to the Advisory Council for its effective work as one of the important functioning agencies in the structure of the institution.

MAIL BALLOTING IN FACULTY ELECTIONS. Mr. L. W. Staples, secretary of the Faculty Senate, reported that, in accordance with legislation adopted at the April 1965 meeting of the faculty, the secretary of the faculty has presented to the Senate a detailed outline of procedures for conducting Advisory Council and Senate elections through the nominating and first electing ballots by mail, and that the Senate has approved these procedures. He stated that the secretary of the faculty will send copies of the outline to members of the faculty for their information. A copy of the outline is filed in the office of the secretary as a part of these minutes.

LOWER-DIVISION ADVISING. Mr. Staples reported that Mr. C. E. Johnson has, at the request of the Faculty Senate, presented to the Senate information concerning a proposed revision of the University's program of lower-division advising, and that the Senate recommends that the faculty request a similar presentation by Mr. Johnson. President Fleming stated that, if there were no objection, he would ask Mr. Johnson to outline the proposed new program. Mr. Johnson outlines the program, which, he stated, was based on a report from the Office of Institutional Planning and Research and on reports of the experience of other institutions with similar programs.

Mr. L. E. Ward expressed his belief that the advising program in faculty business, and inquired whether the proposed program would be referred to the faculty. Mr. Johnson stated that there was no intent of bypassing the faculty. President Fleming suggested that the matter be placed on the agenda for discussion at the June 1965 faculty meeting. Mr. Ward indicated that this would be satisfactory.

ACADEMIC FREEDOM IN COMMUNITY COLLEGES. President Fleming recognized Mr. Robert Campbell to move the adoption of a resolution concerning academic freedom and tenure in Oregon community colleges. Mr. C. J. Bullock rose to a point of order, calling attention to the fact that the resolution had been moved and seconded at the April 1965 faculty meeting, had been referred to the Faculty Senate by vote of the faculty, not through notice of motion, and was therefore before the faculty for consideration without a further motion. The President stated that this was correct, and called upon Mr. Staples for a report from the Senate. Mr. Staples reported that the Senate recommended that the motion be disapproved.

The text of the resolution is recorded in the minutes of the meeting of April 7, 1965.

In the course of discussion, several faculty members indicated that they agreed with the objectives of the resolution, but did not believe that refusal by the State System Committee on Community Colleges to approve courses of programs for transfer credit "until it obtains evidence that the institution offering the course or program has adopted acceptable standards of academic freedom and tenure" was the best way to assure the realization of these objectives. Mr. R. A. Littman moved that the resolution be referred back to the Faculty Senate for further consideration, with particular attention to methods of achieving the desired objectives. The motion was seconded, put to a vote, and carried.

STUDENT CONDUCT CODE. Mr. C. W. Wanner moved the adoption of the following resolution: That the faculty of the University of Oregon, considering the Student Conduct Code passed on November 6, 1961, and particularly Art. 6, Sec. 1 of that code, resolve that nothing in that article or any other part of the code shall be construed as allowing or encouraging more intensive supervision of the lives of male students by the University authorities, except in matters pertaining directly to their academic work.

The motion having been seconded, Mr. Staples reported that the Faculty Senate recommended that it be tabled. After discussion, Mr. Alfred Bloom moved that Mr. Wanner's motion be tabled. Mr. Bloom's motion was seconded, put to a vote, and carried.
CREDIT BY EXAMINATION. Mr. L. C. Marquis gave notice that he would move at the June 1965 meeting of the faculty, that the University of Oregon grant credit by examination for undergraduate courses.

STATE OF THE UNIVERSITY. President Fleming reported briefly on the present state of the Oregon State System of Higher Education legislative program in the 1965 legislature. He announced that he would call an informal meeting of the faculty late in May for the purpose of discussing the missions of the several institutions of the State System and for a fuller report on the legislative program.

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned.

George N. Belknap
Secretary of the Faculty

REGULAR MEETING OF THE FACULTY

The meeting was called to order by President Fleming. The minutes of the meeting of May 5, 1965 were read and approved.

STUDENT CONDUCT COMMITTEE. Mr. W. M. Basay, chairman of the Student Conduct Committee, announced that copies of the 1964-65 report of his committee would be available at the door at the close of the meeting. A copy of the report is filed in the office of the secretary of the faculty.

ACADEMIC FREEDOM IN COMMUNITY COLLEGES. Mr. Robert Campbell moved the adoption of the following resolution:

"The Oregon State Board of Higher Education has been charged by law to approve courses and programs of study offered by the Oregon community colleges which are to be recognized for credit by institutions of higher education. Until these young and growing institutions become accredited, the State Board must continue to exercise this approval, which it has delegated to a Committee on Community Colleges. In so doing, the Board has adopted a statement of policies and procedures which rightly recognizes the desirability of creating, within the community colleges, an environment for learning comparable to that of the four year colleges in the State System. In its words: 'The Institution, through its faculty and administrators, should instill the love of learning and the ideal of intellectual excellence.' The Board further argues that its approval transforms the community colleges, however, there are considerable differences in the degree to which the standards set by the 1940 statement of principles have been met.

Since the uniform adoption of these established principles of academic freedom and tenure in the community colleges would be consistent both with the Board's practices in regard to those institutions which it administers and with the Board's policy statements with regard to the suitability of community college courses and programs for college transfer credit, therefore be it resolved that we, the faculty of the University of Oregon, strongly urge that the State Board of Higher Education explicitly recognize the conditions of academic freedom and tenure prevailing at a community college as one of the criteria to be considered in weighing the acceptability, for college transfer credit, of courses and programs of study undertaken there. (We would further urge that, as of September 1966, the State Board refuse to approve additional
college courses or programs for transfer credit from an unaccredited community college until the institution offering the course or program has adopted acceptable standards of academic freedom and tenure for its faculty members similar to those which have been adopted by the State Board of Higher Education for institutions in the State System of Higher Education.)

"The faculty respectfully requests that the President transmit this resolution to the State Board of Higher Education."

The motion having been seconded, Mr. Campbell stated that the text was a revision of the resolution presented at the May 1965 faculty meeting and referred back to the Faculty Senate for further consideration.

Mr. L. W. Staples, secretary of the Faculty Senate, moved on behalf of the Senate to amend by deleting the following sentence from the third paragraph of the resolution: "We would further urge that, as of September 1966, the State Board refuse to approve additional college courses or programs for transfer credit from an unaccredited community college until the institution offering the course or program has adopted acceptable standards of academic freedom and tenure for its faculty members similar to those which have been adopted by the State Board of Higher Education for institutions in the State System of Higher Education." Mr. Staples' motion was seconded and, after discussion, put to a vote and carried. Mr. Staples then reported that, with the deletion of the sentence in question, the Faculty Senate recommended the adoption of the resolution.

Mr. R. W. Lepser questioned whether the faculty has sufficient objective evidence to justify the last sentence of the second paragraph of the resolution: "At the community colleges, however, there are considerable differences in the degree to which the standards set by the 1940 statement of principles have been met." President Fleming suggested that the word "met" might be changed to "adopted." With the consent of his second, Mr. Campbell accepted this change.

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

CREDIT BY EXAMINATION. Mr. Lucian Marquis moved that departments be authorized to grant undergraduate credit by examination under policies to be approved by the faculty. The motion having been seconded, Mr. Staples reported that the Faculty Senate recommended its approval. The motion was then put to a vote and carried.

Mr. Staples then moved, on behalf of the Faculty Senate, that the President be requested to appoint a special faculty committee to develop policies governing credit by examination and that this committee report to the faculty not later than the December 1965 meeting of the faculty. The motion was seconded, put to a vote, and carried.

APPOINTMENT OF MISS TYLER AS DEAN OF THE GRADUATE SCHOOL. President Fleming announced the appointment of Miss Eoas E. Tyler, Professor of Psychology, as dean of the Graduate School. The announcement was greeted with applause.

RECOMMENDATION FOR GRANTING DEGREES. The secretary read the following statement from Mr. R. L. Bowlin, Acting Registrar: "I certify that the official degree lists, to be compiled shortly after the June 13, 1965 Commencement and the August 14, 1965 Summer Graduation Convocation, will include all and only those degree candidates who completed their respective degree requirements by the end of the spring term 1965 and the end of the eight-week 1965 summer session."

Mr. F. R. Washke 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, compiled by the University Registrar after the June 13, 1965 Commencement and the August 14, 1965 Summer Graduation Convocation, the degrees for which they have completed all requirements. The motion was seconded, put to a vote, and carried.
LOWER-DIVISION ADVISING PROGRAM. The faculty continued the discussion of proposed changes in the lower-division advising program begun at the May 1965 meeting. Mr. C. E. Johnson explained that the proposed change involved the part-time employment of five Ph.D. candidates, who have completed all requirements for the doctorate except their dissertations, to supplement the work of faculty lower-division advisers, with particular attention to the more-routine aspects of the advising process and to the needs of students who have not decided on a major field of study, and to staff a control center for the referral of students to faculty advisers. Mr. E. M. Baldwin, chairman of the faculty Committee on Advising, stated that his committee has reviewed the proposal and has voted to approve it on an experimental basis.

Mr. L. E. Ward moved the adoption of the following resolution: "That it is the sense of the faculty of the University of Oregon that any decision affecting the conduct of lower-division advising at the University of Oregon is the prerogative of the faculty. Moreover, no change in the present format of lower-division advising should be instituted at this time. Finally, it is the wish of the faculty that the Faculty Senate give its earnest attention to the problems of lower-division advising, and, at as early a date as is practicable, recommend to the faculty such changes as should be made in the advising program to render it more effective."

The motion was seconded. After discussion, Mr. L. W. Staples moved to amend by substituting "Committee on Advising" for "Faculty Senate" in the last sentence. The motion to amend was seconded. Mr. Ward stated that, with the consent of his second, he would incorporate this change in his motion.

Mr. E. G. Ebbighausen stated that he had seconded Mr. Ward's motion and would not consent to the change. Mr. Staples' motion to amend was then put to a vote and carried.

Mr. Paul Clavin moved to amend Mr. Ward's motion by deleting the second sentence: "Moreover, no change in the present format of lower-division advising should be instituted at this time."

Mr. Clavin's motion was seconded, put to a vote, and carried.

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

COMMENDATION OF MR. SUNDBERG FOR SERVICES AS ACTING DEAN OF GRADUATE SCHOOL.

Mr. Harry Alpert moved the adoption of the following resolution:

"Resolved that the faculty of the University of Oregon spread on the record its very deep appreciation to Professor Norman D. Sundberg for his outstanding services during academic year 1964-65 as acting dean of the Graduate School."

"Dean Sundberg accepted this assignment on very short notice at considerable sacrifice to his own professional commitments. He has served with exceptional diligence and dedication. He has provided leadership and direction to the programs of the Graduate School during a very difficult period in its development. The faculty is indebted to Dean Sundberg for his exceptional devotion to the welfare of the University and for his energetic and thoughtful pursuit of quality and distinction in the development of our programs of graduate training and research."

The motion having been seconded, the faculty responded with applause. The President stated that he interpreted the applause as a unanimous vote for the adoption of the resolution.

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned.

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

October 6, 1965

The meeting was called to order by President Flemming.

NORMAN OSWALD MEMORIAL. Mr. Kester Svendsen presented the following memorial:

"Norman Hubert Oswald was a member of the Department of English for twenty years. A native Oregonian, he received his baccalaureate degree from Reed and his advanced degrees from the University of California at Berkeley. His special interest in recent years was English and American satire; and the increased enrollment in those courses since 1960 confirmed the success he already enjoyed as a teacher of the undergraduate Shakespeare sequence. Earlier Norman Oswald represented the department and the University in liaison with high-school English teachers; and until his death he was departmental adviser to master's candidates in interdisciplinary studies. His whole heart was in teaching and teacher training; no man served the department more faithfully and, in the months of declining health, more courageously. It is a tribute to this gentle and good man that he compensated most ingeniously and effectively for his failing eyesight by the use of readers and tape recorders, stubbornly determined to teach as long as he could give something to his students, which is to say, teach until he dropped. Such men as Norman Oswald, quietly carrying out their duties, are the backbone of a faculty. The true measure of their contribution is obscured from notice by the large affairs of a growing University; but their colleagues know it early and they respect the devotion to duty of one who asks, and often receives, little in the way of reward and general recognition. So it was with Norman Oswald; and at his death September 1, 1965, the Department of English and the University of Oregon lost a good man."

At Mr. Svendsen's request, President Flemming instructed the Secretary to include the memorial in the minutes of this meeting of the faculty and to send a copy to Mr. Oswald's family.

INTRODUCTIONS. One hundred and seven new faculty members and thirty-one members returning from leaves were introduced by deans and division heads. Dean Jones, who took the chair during the introductions when President Flemming was called from the room, welcomed the new and returning faculty members.

MINUTES OF JUNE MEETING. The minutes of the June 2, 1965 meeting of the faculty were read and approved. President Flemming returned to the rostrum.

ACADEMIC FREEDOM IN COMMUNITY COLLEGES. The secretary read letters of July 8, 1965 from Chancellor Lieuallen to President Flemming and to Mr. M. C. Romney, Vice-Chancellor for Academic Affairs, related to the resolution adopted at the June 1965 faculty meeting concerning academic freedom and tenure in Oregon community colleges. The Chancellor stated, in part, that he shares "the conviction of the faculty of the University of Oregon that conditions of academic freedom and tenure existing at a college or university affect the quality of faculty which an institution is able to acquire and retain; and that these conditions, if negative, may even hamper an otherwise competent teacher in discharging his teaching responsibilities." The President reported that he had also received a copy of a September 20, 1965 memorandum from Vice-Chancellor Romney to the presidents of Oregon community colleges on "Conditions of Development of Policies Governing Academic Freedom and Tenure," with which the Vice-Chancellor had enclosed a copy of the 1940 Statement of Principles adopted by the American Association of University Professors and the Association of American Colleges. The three documents are filed in the office of the secretary of the faculty as a part of these minutes.

STATE OF THE UNIVERSITY. The President stated that, at his request, the Advisory Council has undertaken to formulate criteria for the selection of University recipients of awards for superior undergraduate teaching, established by act of the 1965 Oregon Legislature, and that the Council has appointed ad hoc committee to assist it. The members of the committee are: Bernd Cramer, chairman; Roland Bartel, D. R. Trux. The Council will present a draft of recommended criteria to
the Faculty Senate for consideration at its October meeting and to the University faculty at its November meeting.

Speaking in particular to new faculty members, the President pointed out that at the University of Oregon the organized faculty plays a major role in the government of the institution, and constitutes one of the University's most important sources of strength. He urged that new members become active participants in faculty business.

In conclusion, the President stated that, in accordance with past custom, he plans this year to call several informal meetings of the faculty for the discussion of University affairs and problems under less time pressure than is possible at formal faculty meetings. He indicated that he would call the first of these meetings late in October or early in November.

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned.

George N. Belknap
Secretary of the Faculty

REGULAR MEETING OF THE FACULTY

November 3, 1965

The meeting was called to order by President Flemming. The minutes of the meeting of October 6, 1965 were read and approved.

MERIT AWARD FOR UNDERGRADUATE TEACHING. Mr. Keith Goldhammer, secretary of the Advisory Council, presented, on behalf of the Council, the following proposed plan for the distribution of merit awards for undergraduate teaching:

1) (a) An Eligibility Committee will compile the list of persons who are eligible for merit awards.

(b) The Eligibility Committee will consist of a representative from the Office of the Dean of Faculties, the president of the Associate Students of the University of Oregon (ASUO) and two faculty members.

(c) Faculty members of the Eligibility Committee will be appointed by the University Committee on Committees.

(d) In addition to determining the eligibility of faculty members, the Eligibility Committee shall give consideration to the eligibility of graduate assistants (teaching assistants).

(e) The principles of eligibility proposed by the Eligibility Committee will be submitted to the Faculty Senate for approval.

2) (a) A Merit Awards Committee will be established.

(b) The Awards Committee will consist of five faculty members and five students.

(c) Faculty members will be appointed to the Awards Committee by the University Committee on Committees. Student members of the Award Committee will be appointed by the president of the ASUO.

(d) Only persons who are ineligible for the merit awards can be members of the Awards Committee. No member of the University administration can be a member of the Awards Committee.

3) (a) The Awards Committee in consultation with experts on student attitude and opinion surveys and on teacher ratings will design, distribute, collect, and evaluate rating forms, on which all students may rate eligible faculty members.
(a) The Awards Committee will select persons from the list of eligible faculty members for $1,000 merit awards for teaching excellence in undergraduate courses.

(b) In making the selection, the Awards Committee will be guided by the evaluations forms returned by students and may consider any other information if this appears desirable.

(c) The Awards Committee's records and transactions will be kept confidential, and rating forms will be destroyed immediately after the selection process has been completed.

Mr. O. J. Hollis, chairman of the Faculty Senate, moved on behalf of the Senate the adoption of the plan proposed by the Advisory Council. He then informed the faculty that, at the proper time, he would move certain amendments on behalf of the Senate. Mr. Hollis' motion was seconded.

Mr. Goldhammer stated that at the proper time he would move, on behalf of the Advisory Council, the adoption of a resolution expressing the concern of the University of Oregon faculty over certain implications of the establishment of the teaching award program through the budget report of a subcommittee of the Ways and Means Committee of the 1965 Oregon Legislature.

Mr. G. W. Struble rose to a point of order, questioning whether Mr. Hollis' motion required notice. President Flemming reminded the faculty that, under its rules, any motion involving a change in policy requires notice either at a meeting of the faculty preceding the meeting at which it is presented for consideration and action or through the campus mail at least three weeks before it is presented, and stated that he was inclined to rule that Mr. Hollis' motion required notice.

Mr. Goldhammer expressed the view that faculty action on the proposed plan would be only advisory to the President and that a change in policy was therefore not involved. The President called attention to the following sentence in the report of the legislative subcommittee: "The subcommittee anticipates that faculty members will be asked to propose plans for selecting grant winners, the plans to be approved by the Board of Higher Education . . ."; and to the following sentence in the guidelines approved by the Board of Higher Education: "Faculty acceptance of the plan is dependent in large measure upon the extent to which the faculty has participated in the development of the plan and the extent to which the final plan adopted by the institution is seen by the faculty to reflect the view of the faculty."

After further discussion the President ruled that Mr. Hollis' motion required notice. Mr. Goldhammer appealed from the ruling of the chair. The appeal was put to a vote and the chair sustained.

Mr. C. P. Schleicher inquired whether a motion to suspend the rules would be in order. The President stated that, under Robert's Rules of Order, which govern faculty business, a rule requiring notice of motion cannot be suspended.

Mr. Schleicher then moved that the faculty resolve itself into a committee of the whole. The motion was seconded, put to a vote, and carried.

While the faculty sat as a committee of the whole, the President remained in the chair and Mr. Belknap served as secretary. Discussion of the motion for a plan for the distribution of merit awards for undergraduate teaching continued, together with discussion of a substitute motion proposed in the committee of the whole. When the committee of the whole rose and the faculty resumed its meeting, there was no report from the committee.

Mr. D. W. Swinehart moved that the meeting be adjourned. The motion was seconded, put to a vote, and defeated.

Mr. Goldhammer moved to suspend the rules and continue the consideration of the business before the faculty. The President ruled that the motion was out of order.
Mr. Goldhammer then gave notice that at the December 1965 meeting of the faculty he would move, on behalf of the Advisory Council, the adoption of the following resolution:

The faculty of the University of Oregon views with considerable concern the establishment of the so-called "Merit Award Program for Teaching Excellence" specified in the Budget Report of Subcommittee No. 4 of the Ways and Means Subcommittee to the 53rd Legislative Assembly. The concern of the faculty is based upon the belief that, (1) the program arises out of several misleading or false assumptions, (2) the program constitutes a legislative interference with the academic decision-making of the State System of Higher Education, and (3) the program gives false assurance of solving a continuous and ever-pressing problem of higher education.

(1) The assumptions upon which the program is based include the following:

(a) That the State System of Higher Education has made no provision for rewarding meritorious teaching. The quality of teaching has long been one of the basic criteria for the promotion of faculty members. Merit salary increases have been the rule rather than the exception, and the quality of teaching has been one of the primary considerations in the granting of salary increases.

(b) That there is a distinction between scholarship (the search for knowledge) and teaching (the imparting of knowledge). There is considerable evidence to suggest that the most able teacher is also a life-long scholar who is constantly involved in the search for new knowledge, the organization and synthesis of existing knowledge, and the refinement of theory which points toward the identification of gaps in the existing state of knowledge. The outstanding teacher helps to inspire his students through the example he sets as an active participant in that search for knowledge.

(c) That the most able teachers are spending a larger share of their time in graduate teaching and research to the detriment of undergraduate teaching. Many nationally known researchers spend a significant part of their time in classroom teaching, and several departments make a conscious effort to have their most distinguished scholars engaged in the teaching of undergraduate courses. Research programs have brought many outstanding scholars to the campus as both teachers and researchers who might otherwise have remained in private research agencies. The administration of the University of Oregon has long held that all persons engaged in research at the University of Oregon shall also undertake substantive instructional responsibilities in their respective departments. It is one of the most serious deficiencies of the proposed program that it suggests that special rewards need to be given to stimulate the improvement of teaching on the undergraduate level but fails to consider the equally important need in our society for the constant up-grading of graduate programs of instruction.

(2) The proposed program constitutes a legislative interference with the operation of the State System of Higher Education in that it establishes a line-item in the budget and dictates to the State Board of Higher Education how this program shall be established. This practice can lead only to the reduction of the effectiveness of the State Board of Higher Education and may lead to a subordination of educational to political purposes.

(3) There is no evidence that special rewards or "bonuses" have any significant or direct effect upon the improvement of instruction. The experience of the academic community suggests that there are other factors which are far more important as stimulants to good teaching. These include the maintenance of an environment of academic freedom and acceptance, the provision of adequate resources for the operation of the University or college, the employment of sufficient personnel to relieve faculty of excessive loads and to permit effective leave programs, the provision of adequate instructional and research space, the development of competitive salary schedules, and the participation of the total academic community in all phases of policy determination which affect the instructional programs and personnel policies. The improvement of instruction can be accomplished only through continuing research into the problems of college teaching and the provisions of programs to assist faculty to improve their professional competencies.
The faculty of the University of Oregon recognizes that, although much has been done, not enough has been accomplished and insufficient allocations of resources and time have been devoted to the improvement of teaching. It, therefore, calls upon the administration of the State System of Higher Education, with assistance of the faculties of all the institutions of the State System, to develop positive, professional programs for instructional improvement.

Mr. Hollis then gave notice that at the December 1965 meeting of the faculty he would move, on behalf of the Faculty Senate, the adoption of the Advisory Council's plan for the distribution of merit awards for undergraduate teaching.

Mr. George Streisinger inquired whether notice was required for a substitute motion. The President stated that notice was not required for such a motion.

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

George N. Belknap
Secretary of the Faculty

REGULAR MEETING OF THE FACULTY

December 1, 1965

The meeting was called to order by President Flemming. The minutes of the meeting of November 3, 1965 were read and approved.

MAUDE I. KERNS MEMORIAL. The following memorial was presented by Mr. T. O. Ballinger:

"A grand lady, to whom both our University and our community shall forever be indebted, passed away on the 19th of October, 1965. Born of pioneer heritage in Portland, Oregon, Maude Irvine Kerns lived a long and productive life. After graduating from the University of Oregon, Class of 1899, Miss Kerns continued her education at the California School of Fine Arts and later at Columbia University, receiving a second degree and a Diploma of Fine Arts from the latter institution. Following travel and further study in Europe and Japan, Maude Kerns returned to teach, to paint, and to exhibit her work in some of the leading art museums in the United States. Seattle, San Francisco, Washington, D.C., the Guggenheim in New York are but a few of the galleries that showed the colorful and vigorous paintings of this gifted woman from the Northwest. In 1921 Miss Kerns accepted the position as the first director of the art education program at the University of Oregon. She served for twenty-six years, retiring in 1947. As an associate professor emeritus, Miss Kerns continued her personal interest in students, in art, and in her community. In 1961 her imagination and generosity afforded the local art center financial assistance, which subsequently resulted in the center being renamed the Maude I. Kerns Art Center of Eugene. Professor Kerns' life as an artist, and as a teacher, was of the highest quality. Her service to this University, the Museum of Art on this campus, the city of Eugene, and the many students whose lives have been touched by her scholarship and her goodness cannot be measured in the few days since her departure. Her warmth and her leadership will be missed."

At Mr. Ballinger's request, the President instructed the secretary to record the memorial as a part of the minutes of this meeting of the faculty and to send a copy to Miss Kerns' immediate family.

REPORT OF COMMITTEE ON THE CURRICULUM. Mr. L.W. Staples, secretary of the Faculty Senate, moved the approval of the report of the Committee on the Curriculum dated November 24, 1965, arabic-numbered pages 1-11. A copy of the report is filed in the office of the secretary of the faculty as a part of these minutes. The motion having been seconded, Mr. Belknap, secretary of the faculty, left the rostrum
to assist the chairman of the Committee on the Curriculum in his role as secretary of the committee. Mr. C.L. Constance served as secretary of the faculty pro tem while the report was before the faculty. Miss Grace Graham, chairman of the committee, stated that the proposal on page 8 of the report for a new course, Mental Health (HE 540), was being withdrawn for the time being, and should not be considered as a part of the report before the faculty. Mr. Staples' motion was then put to a vote and carried.

REPORT OF COMMITTEE ON CREDIT BY EXAMINATION. Mr. P.J. Runkel, chairman of an ad hoc Committee on Credit by Examination, stated that this committee has completed its business and had drafted a report, which will be distributed to the faculty through the campus mail within the next few days, and gave notice that he would move at the January 1966 faculty meeting the approval of policies recommended in the report for the implementation of a program for the granting of University credit by examination.

PRESS ATTENDANCE. The secretary read letters from Mr. W.L. Wassmann, managing editor of the Eugene Register-Guard, and Mr. Bob Carl, managing editor of the Oregon Daily Emerald, requesting that the faculty permit reporters from these newspapers to attend this meeting during the consideration of the program for merit awards for undergraduate teaching. The secretary then read extracts from the minutes of the faculty concerning press coverage of faculty business. These documents are filed in the office of the secretary of the faculty as a part of these minutes.

Mr. J.L. Hulteng moved that the faculty extend a special invitation to representatives of the press to attend this meeting during the consideration of the awards program. The motion having been seconded, Mr. Staples reported that the Faculty Senate recommended that the policy of the faculty that its meetings are not open to the press be maintained, and that a special invitation to attend this meeting not be extended. After discussion, Mr. A.R. Kitshaber moved the previous question. Mr. Kitshaber's motion was seconded, put to a vote, and carried.

By a standing vote, Mr. Hulteng's motion was defeated: yes, 112; no, 208. For this vote and other divisions during the meeting, Mr. C.L. Constance, Mr. P.R. Washeke, and Mr. Fred Mohr served as tellers.

AWARDS FOR UNDERGRADUATE TEACHING. Members of the faculty had in their hands an assembly of five documents related to the program for teaching awards, including: (1) a proposed plan for the distribution of awards for undergraduate teaching, recommended by the Advisory Council; (2) a proposed substitute motion concerning the merit award program; (3) an amendment to the Advisory Council plan sponsored by the Faculty Senate; (4) amendments and recommendations related to the program from the Graduate Council; and (5) a resolution concerning the program sponsored by the Advisory Council.

Mr. Staples moved, on behalf of the Faculty Senate, the approval of the following plan for the distribution of awards for undergraduate teaching, recommended by the Advisory Council:

Proposed Plan for the Distribution of Awards for Undergraduate Teaching

1. (a) An Eligibility Committee will compile the list of persons who are eligible for awards. The Eligibility Committee will consider as eligible any faculty member whose major responsibility is teaching and whose undergraduate teaching constitutes at least half his teaching when measured by either the number of term hours of instruction or the number of student hours of instruction.

(b) The Eligibility Committee will consist of a representative from the Office of the Dean of Faculties, two faculty members, and two student members.

(c) Faculty members of the Eligibility Committee will be appointed by the University Committee on Committees. Student members will be appointed by the president of the Associated Students of the University of Oregon.
(d) In addition to determining the eligibility of faculty members, the Eligibility Committee shall give consideration to the eligibility of graduate assistants (teaching assistants).

(e) The principles of eligibility proposed by the Eligibility Committee will be submitted to the Faculty Senate for approval.

2. (a) An Awards Committee will be established.

(b) The Awards Committee will consist of five faculty members and five students.

(c) Faculty members will be appointed to the Awards Committee by the University Committee on Committees. Student members of the Award Committee will be appointed by the President of the A.S.U.O.

(d) Only persons who are ineligible for the awards can be members of the Awards Committee. No member of the University administration can be a member of the Awards Committee.

3. (a) The Awards Committee in consultation with experts on student opinion surveys and on teacher ratings will design, distribute, collect, and evaluate rating forms, on which all students may rate eligible faculty members.

4. (a) The Awards Committee will accept proposals from eligible faculty members. These proposals are to describe the intended use of funds for the purpose of improving the faculty member’s undergraduate teaching, enriching his course offerings, or in some other manner enhancing undergraduate teaching.

(b) In making the selection of faculty members to whom awards will be made and in determining the sums to be granted, the Awards Committee will be guided by the potential effectiveness of the proposals, by the evaluation forms returned by students, and may consider any other information if it appears desirable.

(c) Eligible faculty members who wish to be apprised of the results of their evaluation by students will be supplied with a copy of this evaluation.

(d) The Awards Committee's records and transactions will be kept confidential, and rating forms will be destroyed immediately after the selection process has been completed.

Mr. Keith Goldhammer, secretary of the Advisory Council, and Mr. Bernd Grasemann, chairman of an ad hoc committee which assisted the Advisory Council in the drafting of the plan, made general comments on the plan, calling attention in particular to revisions since it was presented at the November 1965 faculty meeting.

President Flemming inquired whether the faculty wished to terminate this meeting at a stated time and to reconvene for an adjourned meeting at a later date. Mr. V.R. Lorwin moved that the meeting be terminated at 6:15 p.m. and reconvened at 4:00 p.m. on Wednesday, December 8, 1965. The motion was seconded. Mr. A.F. Moursund moved to amend by changing the time to 5:45 p.m. Mr. Moursund's motion to amend was seconded, put to a vote, and carried. Mr. Paul Cavin moved to amend by changing the day for the adjourned meeting to Thursday, December 2, 1965. Mr. Cavin's motion was seconded, put to a vote, and defeated. The principal motion as amended was then put to a vote and carried.

Mr. Keith Goldhammer moved that individual participation in the discussion be limited to three minutes. The motion was seconded, put to a vote, and defeated.

The President stated that he would recognize Mr. George Streisinger for a substitute motion, but that, before consideration of the substitute, he would first present the principal motion section by section and entertain amendments to the proposed plan. Mr. Streisinger stated that he wished to yield to Mr. Robert Campbell for the presentation of a substitute motion of which he and Mr. Campbell were joint sponsors. Mr. Campbell moved the adoption of the following substitute for the principal motion:
Be it resolved that the faculty of the University of Oregon declines to participate in the program of grants to teachers of undergraduate courses as it is now specified in the Budget Report of Subcommittee No. 4 of the Ways and Means Committee to the 53rd Legislative Assembly and in the "Recommended Guidelines" of the State System. The decision of the faculty is based upon the belief that, (1) the program arises out of several misleading or false assumptions, (2) the program constitutes a legislative interference with the academic decision making of the State System of Higher Education, and (3) the program gives false assurance of solving a continuous and ever-presenting problem of higher education.

(1) The assumptions upon which the program is based include the following:

(a) That the State System of Higher Education has made no provision for rewarding meritorious teaching. The quality of teaching has long been one of the basic criteria for the promotion of faculty members. Merit salary increases have been the rule rather than the exception, and the quality of teaching has been one of the primary considerations in the granting of salary increases.

(b) That there is a distinction between scholarship (the search for knowledge) and teaching (the imparting of knowledge). There is considerable evidence to suggest that the most able teacher is also a life-long scholar who is constantly involved in the search for new knowledge, the organization and synthesis of existing knowledge, and the refinement of theoretical concepts toward the identification of gaps in the existing state of knowledge. The outstanding teacher helps to inspire his students through the example he sets as an active participant in the search for knowledge.

(c) That the most able teachers are spending a larger share of their time in graduate teaching and research to the detriment of undergraduate teaching. Many nationally known researchers spend a significant part of their time in classroom teaching, and several departments make a conscious effort to have their most distinguished scholars engaged in the teaching of undergraduate courses. Research programs have brought many outstanding scholars to the campus both as teachers and researchers who might otherwise have remained in private research agencies. The Administration of the University of Oregon has long held that all persons engaged in research at the University of Oregon shall also undertake substantive instructional responsibilities in their respective departments. It is one of the most serious deficiencies of the proposed program that it suggests that special rewards need to be given to stimulate the improvement of teaching on the undergraduate level but fails to consider the equally important need in our society for the constant upgrading of graduate programs of instruction.

(2) The proposed program constitutes a legislative interference with the operation of the State System of Higher Education in that it established a line-item in the budget and dictates to the State Board of Higher Education how this program shall be established. This practice can lead only to the reduction of the effectiveness of the State Board of Higher Education and may lead to a sub-ordination of educational to political purposes.

(3) There is little evidence that special rewards or "bonuses have any significant or direct effect upon the improvement of instruction. The experience of the academic community suggests that there are other factors which are far more important as stimulants to good teaching. These include the maintenance of an environment of academic freedom and acceptance, the provision of adequate resources for the operation of the University or college, the employment of sufficient instructional personnel to relieve faculty of excessive loads and to permit effective leave programs, the provision of adequate instructional and research space, the development of competitive salary schedules, and the participation of the total academic community in all phases of policy determination which affect the instructional programs and personnel policies.

Given adequate support of the preceding policies, the further improvement of instruction can be accomplished only through continuing research into the problems of college teaching and the application of the results of such research in the classroom. If more is to be accomplished, more resources and time must be allocated to such programs. The faculty of the University of Oregon believes that it is the responsibility of the administration of the State System of Higher Education, with the assistance of the faculties of all the institutions of the State System, to develop and support positive, professional programs for instructional improvement.
The motion to substitute was seconded. Mr. Campbell explained that the
text of his substitute motion, except for the first paragraph, was identical
with the text of a proposed resolution drafted by the Advisory Council, copies
of which were in the hands of the faculty.

Mr. Washke rose to a point of order, suggesting that the discussion must
now be directed to the substitute motion. The President ruled that discussion
and amendments directed to the principal motion had precedence under parlia-
mentary rules. Mr. Goldhammer moved that the rules be suspended and that the
faculty proceed with the consideration of the substitute motion. The motion
was seconded and put to a standing vote. The tellers reported the following
vote: yes, 162; no, 133. The President ruled that, since suspension of the
rules requires a two-thirds majority, the motion was defeated.

The President then proceeded with the presentation of the Advisory Council
plan.

Mr. Civin moved to amend by deleting the work "undergraduate" from the title
of the proposed plan. The motion to amend having been seconded, Mr. Staples
reported that the Faculty Senate recommended that it be disapproved.

Mr. J.C. Sherwood rose to a point of order, questioning whether Mr. Civin's
amendment was in order if it was in conflict with the guidelines prescribed by
the legislative subcommittee and the Board of Higher Education. The President
stated that the opening of the awards program to graduate as well as under-
graduate teaching would be in conflict with the subcommittee guidelines, which
the Board regards as binding, but that this would not prevent the faculty from
taking whatever action it wished. He therefore ruled Mr. Civin's motion in order.

By a standing vote, Mr. Civin's motion to amend carried: yes, 159; no, 160.
Mr. R.S. Dill rose to a point of information, whether the principal motion
was in order, since it had been revised since notice of motion was given at the
November 1065 faculty meeting. The President stated that, under faculty rules,
Senate revisions of proposed motions do not require notice.

Mr. M.D. Girardeau moved to amend the principal motion by deleting the
second sentence of Sec. 1a. The motion was seconded, put to a vote, and
defeated.

Mr. R.A. Littman called attention to the fact that the time set for the
termination of this meeting, 5:45 p.m., was approaching, and moved that the
meeting be continued for an additional half hour. The motion was seconded.
Mr. Sherwood rose to a point of order, calling attention to the fact that the
time was now past 5:45 p.m. The President ruled that, since Mr. Littman had
made his motion before 5:45, it was in order. The motion was then put to a
vote and carried.

The President stated that he would like to consider, with the faculty, a
problem which he, as President of the University, might face if the faculty
should adopt a plan for merit teaching awards that conflicted with the provisions
of the report of the legislative subcommittee, which the Board of Higher Education
regards as binding. He expressed the view that it would be quite proper to request
the Board to modify its own guidelines, insofar as they go beyond the provisions
of the subcommittee report, but that he wondered whether he should take to the
Board a plan in conflict with the subcommittee report. He pointed out that,
under the Administrative Code of the State System, he as President of the University
has the power of veto over actions of the faculty, and stated that he would
consider the possibility of such action if such conflict should develop.

Mr. C.P. Schleicher stated that, in his opinion, the action of the legislative
subcommittee involved a clear invasion of executive powers and that it would be
proper to take to the Board a plan that the faculty believed was sound, though
it could be implemented only by the exercise of the Board's executive powers.
Mr. Keith Skelton expressed his agreement with Mr. Schleicher. He also pointed
out that the report of the subcommittee does not have the force of law, that
the subcommittee ceased to exist on the adjournment of the Legislature, and
that it seems probable that an attempt will be made by members of the Legislature
to have the $500,000 earmarked for the teaching award program made available for
partial relief of the State System's current budgetary crisis.

Mr. A.L. Ellingson inquired whether there had been any opportunity to call the
subcommittee's attention to the implications and problems of the award program before it adopted the report. The President replied that it was his understanding that the report was adopted in executive session without hearings. Mr. Skelton indicated that this was correct.

The President stated that he found the discussion very helpful.

At 6:05 p.m. Mr. W.C. Jones moved that the meeting be adjourned until 4:00 p.m. on Wednesday, December 8, 1965. The motion was seconded, put to a vote, and carried.

By unanimous consent, the faculty remained in session for the purpose of conducting other pressing business.

SCHOOL OF COMMUNITY SERVICE AND PUBLIC AFFAIRS. Mr. C.T. Duncan gave notice, on behalf of the office of the Dean of Faculties, that he would move at the January 1966 faculty meeting that the faculty approve the establishment of a new professional school to be known as the School of Community Service and Public Affairs.

SCHOOL OF LIBRARIANSHIP. Mr. Duncan gave notice, on behalf of the office of the Dean of Faculties, that he would move at the January 1966 faculty meeting that the faculty approve the establishment of a new professional school to be known as the School of Librarianship.

CODE OF STUDENT CONDUCT. Mr. W.M. Basye, Chairman of the Student Conduct Committee, gave notice, on behalf of his committee, that he would move at the January 1966 faculty meeting that Sec. I, D, 1 of the Code of Student Conduct be amended to read as follows: Living organizations, societies, clubs and similar organized student groups are responsible for compliance with University regulations. Upon satisfactory proof that the group has encouraged or did not take reasonable steps, as a group, to prevent violations of University regulations, the group may be subjected to permanent or temporary suspension of charter, social probation, denial of use of University facilities, or other like sanctions.

APPROVAL OF DEGREES. The secretary read the following communication from Mr. Constance, University Registrar, dated November 30, 1965: Will you please present to the faculty, at the December meeting, my certification that the official degree list for the December 10, 1965 Graduation Convocation will include all and only those degree candidates who completed their respective degree requirements at the end of the fall term?

Mr. Washke moved that the faculty of the University of Oregon recommend that the Oregon State Board of Higher Education confer upon the students whose names are included in the Official December 1965 degree list--as compiled by the University Registrar--the degrees for which they have satisfied all requirements. The motion was seconded, put to a vote, and carried.

The meeting was then adjourned.

George N. Belknap
Secretary of the Faculty.

ADJOURNED MEETING OF THE FACULTY

December 8, 1965

The meeting was called to order by President Flemming. The minutes of the regular meeting of December 1, 1965 were read and approved.

AWARDS FOR UNDERGRADUATE TEACHING. The President recognized Mr. C.P. Schleicher, who moved that further consideration of the Mosser Plan be postponed until the January 1966 meeting of the faculty. The motion was seconded.

Mr. Keith Skelton pointed out that, when the December 1 meeting was adjourned, a motion was before the faculty for the approval of the Advisory Council's plan for implementing the undergraduate teaching awards program, and that a section-by-section presentation of this plan was under way, and suggested that the continuation of this presentation had first place in the order of business at this
meeting. The President stated that Mr. Schleicher's motion was privileged under Robert's Rules of Order. Mr. Schleicher called the attention of the faculty to the fact that the State Emergency Board will meet on Friday, December 10, and may divert all or part of the $500,000 earmarked for the teaching award program to partial financing of additional teaching staff—in which case faculty action on the program would be moot.

Mr. R.W. Leeper inquired whether it would be in order to move that the faculty recommend that the funds in question be used for the employment of additional teaching staff. The President stated that such a proposal would appear to be a substitute for the pending substitute motion proposed by Mr. Robert Campbell and Mr. George Streisinger at the December 1 meeting, and would not be in order at this time. Miss Leona Tyler inquired whether, if Mr. Schleicher's motion carried, Mr. Leeper's suggested motion would then be in order. The President stated that a motion of this type would then be in order.

Mr. Kenneth Polk moved the previous question. The motion was seconded, put to a vote, and carried. Mr. Schleicher's motion was then put to a vote and defeated.

Mr. Keith Goldhammer moved for reconsideration of his motion at the December 1 meeting that the rules be suspended and the faculty proceed with the consideration of the Campbell-Streisinger substitute motion to decline participation in the program of grants to teachers of undergraduate courses (Mr. Goldhammer's December 1 motion had failed through lack of a two-thirds majority). The motion to reconsider was seconded, put to a vote, and carried. The motion to suspend the rules was then put to a vote and carried.

Mr. Leeper moved that the following resolutions be substituted for the Campbell-Streisinger motion:

Be it resolved: First, that the faculty of the University of Oregon express its concurrence with what it understands to be the fundamental concern of Representative Mosser and of the State Legislature—to wit, that major efforts should be made to strengthen the undergraduate teaching at the various institutions under the State Board of Higher Education;

Second, that the faculty also expresses its belief that, perhaps especially at the University of Oregon, a main factor that has hampered the work of undergraduate teaching has been the lack of sufficient staff. This lack of sufficient staff, the faculty notes, is a consequence both of increased enrollments and of the extra responsibilities which the faculty needs to bear if the University of Oregon is to provide the state of Oregon and the nation with the services which such a university is charged with providing;

Third, that the faculty therefore expresses its conviction that the greatest contribution to undergraduate teaching which could come at the University of Oregon from the portion of the Mosser funds that are assigned to it would come from the use of these funds for additional instructional staff.

Therefore, the faculty earnestly requests that, if such an assignment of these funds can be made, the funds assigned to the University of Oregon should be used for the significant expansion of the staff that these funds would make possible.

The motion was seconded. The President stated that the faculty should now proceed to the discussion of the Leeper motion. It was suggested by a member of the faculty that Mr. Leeper might agree to put aside his motion temporarily for the consideration of the Campbell-Streisinger motion. Mr. Leeper refused.

Mr. Skelton inquired whether another amendment would be in order. The President asked that the motion be stated. Mr. Skelton then moved to strike all of the Campbell-Streisinger motion except the words "be it resolved" in the first line of the first paragraph and to add the following words: "That the faculty hereby delegates to the Dean of Faculties and the Advisory Council the duty and obligation of making a plan which would meet the standards of the Legislature
and the sense of the faculty as expressed by the discussion of this question."
The President ruled that the proposal was not germane to the subject of the pending motion and was therefore out of order. Mr. Skelton appealed from the ruling of the chair; the chair was sustained.

Mr. L.W. Staples, secretary of the Faculty Senate, stated that, while the Senate had not had an opportunity to consider the Campbell-Streisinger motion, it had considered an earlier proposal by Mr. Streisinger that the faculty decline to participate in the teaching awards program, which was distributed to the faculty before the December meeting, and that he was prepared to report the recommendation of the Senate concerning this earlier proposal. Mr. I.M. Niven suggested that such a report was out of order, since this earlier proposal was not before the faculty. The President ruled that the report was in order. Mr. Staples then reported that the Senate had voted to recommend the disapproval of Mr. Streisinger's earlier proposal.

Mr. Herman Cohen asked for a report from the Senate on the Advisory Council's resolution concerning the teaching awards program, all of which except the first paragraph was incorporated in the Campbell-Streisinger motion. Mr. Staples reported that the Senate had voted to recommend the approval of this resolution.

The President reminded the faculty that the Leeper motion was not before the faculty for discussion. Mr. J.R. Shepherd stated that it was his belief that the faculty wished to proceed to the consideration of the Campbell-Streisinger motion. Mr. L.E. Ward asked if Mr. Leeper would withdraw his motion for the time being. Mr. Leeper declined.

Mr. William Parks moved the previous question and stated that he intended his motion to apply only to the proposal to substitute the Leeper motion for the Campbell-Streisinger motion. The motion was seconded, put to a vote, and carried. Mr. Schleicher rose to a point of information: whether, if the faculty defeated the Leeper motion, there would be an opportunity to present further amendments of the Campbell-Streisinger motion. The President replied that such amendments would be in order.

Mr. Streisinger rose to a point of order, questioning whether Mr. Leeper's motion was properly a substitute for the Campbell-Streisinger motion, since it did not deal with the question of acceptance or rejection of the teaching award program. The President ruled that the point of order was raised too late, and that the faculty must now vote on the Leeper motion.

Mr. Ward rose to a point of information: whether, if the Leeper motion carried, the text of the Campbell-Streisinger motion could then be added to it as an amendment. The President declined to rule on this hypothetical point. Mr. Leeper's motion was then put to a vote and defeated.

The President stated that the Campbell-Streisinger substitute motion was now before the faculty. Mr. Niven moved the previous question. The motion was seconded, put to a vote, and carried. The President stated that the Campbell-Streisinger proposal was now before the faculty as the principal motion. Mr. O.J. Hollis rose to a point or order, that the motion to substitute had not yet been put to a vote. The President stated that Mr. Hollis was correct. The motion to substitute was then put to a vote and carried.

Mr. Paul Civin moved to amend by adding the following clause to the first paragraph of the Campbell-Streisinger motion: "(4) the greatest educational benefit available at this date from the funds appropriated by the Legislature for the improvement of undergraduate teaching would be the use of such funds for additions to the faculties of the schools in the State System of Higher Education." The motion was seconded.

Mr. Schleicher inquired whether Mr. Civin would be willing to add to his amendment words calling attention to educational benefits from use of a portion of the appropriated funds for salary increases. Mr. Civin indicated that he would not be willing to make this change.

Mr. Leeper inquired whether Mr. Civin would be willing to modify his amendment to restrict to the University of Oregon only the assertion of educational
benefits from faculty additions. Mr. Civin indicated he would not be willing to make this change.

Mr. Parks moved the previous question. The motion was seconded, put to a vote, and carried. Mr. Civin's motion to amend was then put to a vote and defeated.

Mr. Niven moved the previous question on the principal motion, now the Campbell-Streisinger resolution. The motion was seconded, put to a vote, and carried.

By a standing vote, the principal motion carried: yes, 174; no, 80. Mr. Fred Mohr, Mr. P.A. Washke, and Mr. R.L. Bowlin served as tellers. The text of the adopted motion is as follows:

Be it resolved that the faculty of the University of Oregon decline to participate in the program of grants to teachers of undergraduate courses as it is now specified in the Budget Report of Subcommittee No. 4 of the Ways and Means Committee to the 53rd Legislative Assembly and in the "Recommended Guidelines" of the State System. The decision of the faculty is based upon the belief that, (1) the program arises out of several misleading or false assumptions, (2) the program constitutes a legislative interference with the academic decision-making of the State System of Higher Education, and (3) the program gives false assurance of solving a continuous and ever-pressing problem of higher education.

(1) The assumptions upon which the program is based include the following:
(a) That the State System of Higher Education has made no provision for rewarding meritorious teaching. The quality of teaching has long been one of the basic criteria for the promotion of faculty members. Merit salary increases have been the rule rather than the exception, and the quality of teaching has been one of the primary considerations in the granting of salary increases.

(b) That there is a distinction between scholarship (the search for knowledge) and teaching (the imparting of knowledge). There is considerable evidence to suggest that the most able teacher is also a life-long scholar who is constantly involved in the search for new knowledge, the organization and synthesis of existing knowledge, and the refinement of theory which points toward the identification of gaps in the existing state of knowledge. The outstanding teacher helps to inspire his students through the example he sets as an active participant in the search for knowledge.

(c) That the most able teachers are spending a larger share of their time in graduate teaching and research to the detriment of undergraduate teaching. Many nationally known researchers spend a significant part of their time in classroom teaching, and several departments make a conscious effort to have their most distinguished scholars engaged in the teaching of undergraduate courses. Research programs have brought many outstanding scholars to the campus both as teachers and researchers who might otherwise have remained in private research agencies. The administration of the University of Oregon has long held that all persons engaged in research at the University of Oregon shall also undertake substantive instructional responsibilities in their respective departments. It is one of the most serious deficiencies of the proposed program that it suggests that special rewards need to be given to stimulate the improvement of teaching on the undergraduate level but fails to consider the equally important need in our society for the constant upgrading of graduate programs of instruction.

(2) The proposed program constitutes a legislative interference with the operation of the State System of Higher Education in that it establishes a line-item in the budget and dictates to the State Board of Higher Education how this program shall be established. This practice can lead only to the reduction of the effectiveness of the State Board of Higher Education and may lead to a subordination of educational to political purposes.

(3) There is little evidence that special rewards or "bonuses" have any significant or direct effect upon the improvement of instruction. The experience of the academic community suggests that there are other factors which