

4. President Boyer notified the Council that it with other committees would be called into conference with the Chancellor concerning inter-institutional functions sometime during May of this year.

5. President Boyer asked the opinion of the Council concerning granting leaves of absence.

a. The Council recommended that there be no change in policy in such cases as visiting and exchange professorships and where faculty members take advantage of scholarships.

b. The Council recommended that leaves of absence should not be granted for more than one year. This recommendation is not intended to prejudice the case of a man who wishes to renew his leave of absence for scholarly purposes.

c. It was further recommended that leaves-of-absence should not be granted when faculty members leave to accept positions recognized as regular appointments by the institution making the appointment.

6. The Council called the President's attention to:

a. The need for new furniture at the library.

b. The need for increase in library book funds.

It was decided that any action should be postponed until the Council had further clarified its budget plans.

7. The report of the sub-committee on Tenure and Promotion was presented to President Boyer and approved. (See minutes April 15 meeting)

8. It was moved and passed that a sub-committee should be appointed to consider the special plea by Mr. Fish for promotion.

9. Dean Boyard's recommendations concerning his successor were approved and presented to the President. (See minutes April 15)

10. The following statement of function approved at the April 15 meeting was presented to President Boyer.

"The Council understands that in view of its advisory functions regarding budget and promotion matters it should also have an advisory and consultative voice as to the general character and qualifications to be sought for in new appointments of the rank of assistant professor or above."

President Boyer argued that it would be a very difficult function to exercise because of the competitive nature of selections of new faculty members and the hurried nature of selections of new faculty members and the hurried nature of acceptances and rejections.

Meeting adjourned.

R. W. Leighton

R. W. Leighton, Secretary

MEETING OF THE ADVISORY COUNCIL

April 27, 1937

Meeting held in Room 2, Commerce, 7:30. Dean Gilbert presiding.
 Present: Gilbert, Bovard, Burrell, Leighton, Smith. Mr. Hollis was absent.

The meeting was called to consider the content of a preliminary report and recommendations to President Boyer by the sub-committee on the Budget.

Two reports were considered: one prepared by Mr. Burrell and one prepared by Mr. Gilbert. The accompanying report was drawn from these two reports, approved, and transmitted to President Boyer.

Meeting adjourned.

R. W. Leighton
 R. W. Leighton, Secretary

REPORT OF
FACULTY ADVISORY COUNCIL
 REGARDING
RECOMMENDATIONS AFFECTING BUDGET FOR 1937-38

The Faculty Advisory Council, in accordance with the legislation passed last fall, expects to consult and advise with the administration as specific problems may arise in connection with the 1937-38 budget. At present there are certain matters of basic importance and certain major problems which the Council believe should be called to the attention of the President in the initial stages of budget making. Hence, the preliminary report that follows:

Restoration of Salaries to Original Base of Major Importance. While the State budget for the biennium of 1937-38 was under consideration and during the legislative session it was assumed that salary restorations should have a prior claim upon any additional funds made available through legislative appropriation. Although the amount secured from the legislature is less than the sum called for in the higher education budget originally submitted, it is believed that full restoration to the original base will be made possible. The Council believes that restoration to the base salary should be the goal even if restoration must be deferred for some time beyond the date originally contemplated. Full restoration is needed above all else to enable us to meet competition now becoming more evident from other colleges and universities. Within the past two months at least three offers have come to members of our staff at rates ranging from \$1,000 to \$2,000 above the Oregon standard. At least one promising man has been lost to another university in the Middle West.

As a Part of the Restoration Program All Salaries Below the Minimum Should Be Brought up to Standard Appropriate to the Rank. Under stress of the long-standing emergency promotions in rank have been made (for the most part fully justified) without any compensatory increase in salary. This has left thirty or forty members of our staff with pay considerably below a reasonable minimum for the rank they now hold. Several committees have been at work

on the question of minimum salaries for the several ranks. There have been some points of difference respecting recommended minima but general agreement in the necessity of raising salaries to the prescribed minimum before the process of re-establishing bases is begun. The minimum salary recommended by the Advisory Council for the several ranks is as follows:

Instructors	\$1,600	per year
Assistant Professors	2,400	" "
Associate Professors	3,000	" "
Professors	3,500	" "

There has been some sentiment in favor of adjusting these low salaries to the minimum for the rank only in case of staff members holding a Ph.D. degree, or its equivalent, and some would make adjustments only in case promotions without salary increases have come since 1932. It is obvious that the amount required to make these initial lifts will depend upon the basis of selection. If all members of the staff with pay below the minimum are to be made beneficiaries of these adjustments as much as \$16,878 per year would be required for the University, and \$30,635 for the entire system. If only holders of Ph.D. degrees, or their equivalent, be singled out for increase the adjustments can be accomplished for about one-half of that amount.

The Council is transmitting herewith its own recommendation (Document No. 2) affecting these needed adjustments. We believe that whatever scale of minimum salaries is established adjustments should be made on some reasonable basis to these prescribed minima before the process of restoration to base salary is undertaken. Otherwise inequalities and discriminations will result.

The Council Also Believes That the Minimum Should Be Set Quite Without Regard to the Ten or Twelve Month Period of Service. Any of the proposed minima are low enough even for a staff member on ten months tenure, and most of the teaching staff are nominally on this basis. To set a minimum as low as that proposed for twelve months period and shave it down still further for those on a ten months period of service will yield a figure too low to be defensible. Moreover, the Council believes that the distinction drawn in 1933 between 10 month and 12 month employees is largely without foundation and was made for the purpose of deepening still further the drastic cuts under the legislative act of that year. The teaching staff at the University had been employed and paid on a twelve months basis, and the university teacher, worthy of the position he holds, finds that the so-called vacation period is crowded with responsibilities associated with his teaching function. There are new courses to outline, researches to finish, productive writing to be done, and he is fortunate indeed in he can claim as much as one month of clear vacation time - the same period allotted to those on 12 months service. Whatever minimum salaries are finally agreed upon for the respective ranks they should apply to all members of the teaching staff regardless of specified period of service. The fiction of ten month tenure should receive no official recognition.

In Constructing the Budget for 1937-38 More Adequate Provision Should Be Made for Instruction. It is assumed that when salary adjustments and restorations, as indicated above, have been provided for there will remain some margin of undistributed funds to be allocated to University functions and services. The Council has taken pains to gather data bearing on the

distribution of funds between the several functions of higher education in Oregon from 1931 to 1936 inclusive. The data are in the auditing division of the Secretary of State's office at Salem. It will be noted that the first fiscal year included in this period (1931-32) was the one just preceding the consolidation and the establishment of the Chancellor's office under William Jasper Kerr. The percentage of the total budget assigned to instruction in the State System of Higher Education is given below:

1931-32	54.3%
1932-33	50.6%
1933-34	50.2%
1934-35	48.6%
1935-36	48.4%

In the initial year 1931-32 instruction claimed 54.3 per cent of the total expenditure. The final year (1935-36) sees instruction with only 48.4 per cent of the total. General administration remained at a fairly fixed percentage of the total (7 per cent) while the percentages on agricultural research and extension, and operation and maintenance were considerably increased.

The Council has also taken pains to compare the percentage of the total absorbed by instruction in the Oregon System with a number of representative institutions throughout the country. The classification of items is the same as that included in the auditing report referring to the Oregon System and the inclusion of items therefore identical. The percentage of total budget assigned to instruction in representative state universities is indicated below:

Percentage of Total Budget Applied to Instruction Of Five Selected States	
University of Illinois	54.2% (1935-36)
University of Michigan	73.9% (1935-36)
Ohio State University	63.9% (1935-36)
University of Minnesota	62.8% (1934-35)
Oregon State System of Higher Education	48.4% (1935-36)

In the University of Illinois 54.2 per cent of the total is spent for instruction; at Ohio State, 63.9 per cent; at the University of Minnesota, 62.8 per cent; and at the University of Michigan, 73.9 per cent. It will be noted that these figures are all very much higher than the percentage assigned to instruction in the Oregon State System (48.4%).

It may be argued that in the Oregon System, including the land grant college, larger expenditures are necessary for agricultural research and extension and various lines of rural service, thus reducing the share assigned to instruction. In answer it may be said that three of the institutions referred to above (Illinois, Ohio State, and Minnesota) are consolidated institutions in agricultural states assuming the legitimate functions of a land grant college. In Oregon, moreover, the figures include three normal schools where the item of instruction runs very high in comparison with the total since the function of a teacher's training institution is so exclusively classroom and laboratory instruction.

It may be argued with some weight that the contemplated restoration of salaries to the old base will automatically increase the share of the total assigned to instruction. The level of instructor's salaries is somewhat higher than that for the rank and file of university employees with the exception of a few administrative officers. Moreover, the fiction of the ten month period of service for teachers by yielding a higher monthly salary called for deeper cuts in compliance with the graduated percentage scale prescribed by the salary reduction act. Conversely full restoration will up the level of instructors' salaries relatively more than other branches of service. While something must be conceded to this point of view it is believed that the restoration process will not raise the percentage assigned to instruction to the level of 1931-32, and will still leave it far below the level of other standard universities with which comparisons have been made.

It is difficult, in the light of facts submitted, to escape the conclusion that the enforced reductions following 1932 fall too heavily on instruction and that in the State System of Higher Education the primary function of institutions of learning has been sacrificed in some measure to other lines of service, some secondary or only auxiliary in nature.

In Determining the Assignment of Instruction Funds the Trends of Instruction Loads and Present Overloads Should Be Given Proper Weight. The Council has obtained from the Registrar's office a statement of comparative enrollments and student credit hours for the fall terms of 1935-36 and 1936-37. From these it is possible to calculate the percentage increase or decrease in instruction load as compared with last year. The figures are striking in revealing the trend of student enrollment. While the student credit hours for the University as a whole increased 7.3 per cent, ten departments fell off in the amount of instruction given - one as much as 68 per cent, two as much as 31 per cent. On the other hand, some 26 departments had increases in the number of student hours of instruction - one as much as 41.7 per cent and four as much as 30 per cent or more.

The President has in his possession the study of teaching loads of University of Oregon staff. Accepting the method of this study as valid, the conclusions are certainly startling. The combined index of teaching loads exhibits a wide range. It is understood that an administrative committee has under consideration the problem of teaching loads, and that a report will be forthcoming. It may be possible to reduce somewhat the teaching loads in selected schools and departments by eliminating some sections or combining others. Where this solution is impossible a clearly indicated need exists for some additions to the staff as shown by the trend of student enrollment and the existing disparity of teaching loads. The indices referred to above are not conclusive but should certainly be given weight in deciding budget allocations.

IV.

The Graduate School Should Be Built Up by the Restoration of Graduate Assistants Eliminated During the Period of Drastic Economy. The Graduate Council has, we believe, transmitted to the administration a communication dealing with the need for additional graduate assistants. The Advisory Council wishes at this point to reinforce the request of the Graduate Council in the direction of adding graduate assistants or teaching fellows. The services of these assistants are greatly needed in many departments with crowded laboratory sections and with classes too large to handle without

an enormous amount of written work. In order to attract graduate students of high attainment, and promise, moreover, inducements must be offered commensurate with opportunities available at other universities and colleges. This year an unusually large number of applications have been received both at the graduate office and by the departments. With a considerable number of graduate assistantships available for distribution the graduate work at the University could soon be restored to its former position of strength and efficiency.

V.

The Library Should Be More Adequately Provided for in the Matter of Purchasing Books, Bound Periodicals and Research Collections. It is a matter of pride that University of Oregon students, even under adverse conditions, have acquired the reading habit so essential to the process of University education. With the facilities of the new library open to them this habit of reading widely can be still further developed and extended. To this end, however, the library collections must be rich and varied and kept adequately stocked with representative works of recent publication. It is precisely at this point that our University equipment has suffered most during the depression. The accumulated arrears in reserve books, periodicals, general reference books, research collections, etc., must be made good if our library continue to function as it should in a great university. It is not expected that the deficiencies can be made good in a single year. The Library Committee has formulated a "five-year plan" (shown in attached document) which calls for budgeting an annual sum (in addition to the current budget) for "catching up the arrears". This plan will call for an extra \$8,000 to \$12,000 annually for the next five years and the Council believes that provision should be made for this vital need beginning with the fiscal year 1937-38.

Another conspicuous need of the library is the requirement of new furniture and equipment for the new library building. The interior beauty of the structure just finished makes it extremely undesirable to mar the appearance of reading rooms, seminars, and office rooms by transferring old and unsuitable pieces of furniture to the new location. Some new furniture has been purchased to the extent of \$6,000, and a campaign is now under way to furnish the Browsing Room by popular subscription. It is estimated by Mr. Norris and the library staff, however, that an additional \$13,464 will be needed to provide the bare essentials for the new library rooms. The delayed occupancy of the new library building has saved something in the maintenance charge originally contemplated, and it should be possible to divert from this saving and any unappropriated fund balance some funds for the purchase of furniture and equipment. The Council urges upon the administration careful consideration of the request which comes from the Library Committee and the accompanying estimate by Will V. Norris.

The Council would be happy to discuss with the administration any points suggested in its preliminary report, and will be ready to render any assistance it can in settling the many questions that will arise in connection with the construction of the University budget for 1937-38.

Respectfully submitted,

James H. Gilbert, Vice-Chairman


Ralph W. Leighton, Secretary

MEETING OF THE ADVISORY COUNCIL

May 4, 1937

Meeting held in the office of R. W. Leighton, Room 2, Commerce, at 7:30.

Present: Boyer, Bovard, Burrell, Gilbert, Hollis, Leighton, Smith was absent.

The meeting was presided over by President Boyer.

Business of the meeting:

M 1. Lots were drawn to see which members of the Advisory Council would hold over for the next year and which complete their terms on July 1, 1937. Results of the drawing were: Dean Gilbert and Professor Burrell will hold over, and the terms of Professors Hollis, Bovard, Smith, and Leighton will terminate.

2. President Boyer was asked to explain the budget making regulations sent out May 4. He stated that:

a. At this time all budgets must be made out on the 1936-37 basis with no increases in budget items.

B b. All proposals to increase budgets, such as increases in salary or requisition items, must be made as supplementary statements in addition to the budget made out on the 1936-37 basis.

3. At an earlier meeting President Boyer asked the Council's advice concerning a request for promotion in rank for Professor Fish. At this meeting he presented for consideration a request for salary increase for Professor Caswell.

The Council decided to make no recommendation in either case until some time in the near future when it would have before it a number of proposals for increase in rank and salary.

4. Report of the Committee on Committees:

b Chairman Hollis asked the President several questions about procedure in making decision involved in the reduction of the number of people on faculty committees. It was decided that the chairman should prepare his proposals and present them to the Council for discussion before making his final report.

5. The Council decided that a full report of its proceedings and recommendations should be prepared and presented to the faculty at its May 29 meeting.

6. President Boyer stated that Professor Leslie Lewis had been offered a position at the University of Colorado at a salary of \$3000 and unless that salary could be met Mr. Lewis would be lost as a member of the University faculty. He stated that a decision had to be made immediately.

The Council recommended that President Boyer find ways and means within the Arts and Letters budget to raise the salaries of Professors Lesch, Moll, and Lewis to the \$3000 level. It was the general opinion of the Council that raising Mr. Lewis' salary to \$3000 without recognition of gross inequalities in salary adjustment among other members of the department would be a mistake.

On this motion Professor Burrell voted in the negative and asked that his reasons be spread upon the minutes. This statement of reasons follows:

(1) The Council has previously adopted a definite policy in the matter of recommendation concerning promotions in rank and salary. This policy was adopted on the recommendation of the Committee on Tenure and Promotion and appears as follows in the minutes of the meeting of April 15, 1937:

"The Council believes that all cases of increases in rank and pay for the rank of assistant professor or above should be recommended only after definite inquiry into:

1. Teaching ability
2. Publications, research and scholarship
3. Value to the University as an advisor in intra-campus policies and procedures
4. Value to the University in extra-campus relations and procedures

"The members of the Council believe that in making recommendations for promotion they should have the opinions and testimony of colleagues in the University of Oregon, and that of others in the same or allied fields elsewhere."

The action taken in this instance, particularly in the cases not involving an emergency, is in utter disregard of this previously adopted principle.

(2) Particularly in view of budget limitations it is not (except in dire emergencies) sound policy to consider isolated cases for promotion in rank and salary. It is necessary to view such requests as a whole before taking action. Attention is called to the policy adopted at the meeting of February 16, 1937. The minutes of that meeting show that the following resolution was adopted:

"When final recommendations involving budget matters, especially salary changes, are made by the Council, they shall not be made as recommendations concerning single budget divisions. Instead, any of these recommendations involving greater expenditure shall be accompanied by recommendations of ways and means for balancing this increased expenditure against savings or deductions from other budget divisions, or, by recommendations of ways and means of increasing revenues."

(3) The information relative to these three men was presented to the Council by the President who is a member of the Council. There may be innumerable equally worthy cases in the faculty where the school or department is not represented in the Council.

(4) The majority view that recommended increases in salary for the two men is warranted in view of other budgetary changes within the school is unsound. The fact that funds can be found within the school or departmental budget may indicate nothing more than that the school or department budget was padded to begin with. Budgetary savings, particularly such as that arising from the death of the late Professor Dunn, should not be regarded as the exclusive property of the school or department. The budgetary status quo should not be regarded as untouchable and holy.

(5) We have been advised that it will not be possible to adjust salaries of those promoted in rank but not in salary to the minimum for the rank held except in the case of instructors and assistant professors. There are relatively few assistant professors and instructors whose salaries are below the minimum. The action of the majority has the effect of adjusting (with a single exception) the salaries of the members of one department only the minimum for the rank held. Thus, one department is singled out for preference and without an adequate examination of the whole problem.

(6) The majority appears to be willing to recommend the \$600 increase for Professor Lewis largely on the theory that the University budget would not be adversely affected since the money would come from Board funds. It should be pointed out, however, that the additional funds which may be allowed to the University are strictly limited and this recommended increase simply diminishes whatever additional Board funds may be allotted to the University.

It should be definitely understood that the objections above are based upon principles rather than personalities. I agree fully that the base salaries of all three men are lower than they should be. My contention is only that the action taken is a gross violation of proper and equitable educational and budgetary policy.

7. It was moved and passed to strike out Item 1 in the minutes of April 19, 1937. Professor Burrell cast a dissenting vote.

8. President Boyer reported that he had presented to the Chancellor the Council's recommendation concerning the Advancement of science. His report follows:

MEMORANDUM: To Advisory Council.

I presented to the Chancellor yesterday the resolution of the Advisory Council that he be asked to submit to the State Board the necessity of expanding the work of the School of Science in the State System to include major work in pure sciences on the University campus at Eugene.

He replied that he could see nothing but disaster in a frontal attack to regain science. In his opinion the presentation of such a request to the Board would be denied by the Board because of the attack that would be made by all persons concerned with the College. Political pressure would be so great as to create a disturbance in the state which would jeopardize the welfare of higher education as a whole and, consequently, the University as part of that system. His belief was that any alterations in the science system would have to be brought about by other means, by agreement, for example, through such conferences as are now carried on by the Interinstitutional Curricula Committee. He was sympathetic towards the University's desire to carry on upper-division science, but felt that the method proposed by the Council would not attain the desired result.

G. Valentine Boyer.

9. The Secretary was instructed to introduce the following notice of motion at the next faculty meeting (May 5):

JVP

"That voting privileges shall extend to those of academic rank including deans, professors, associate professors, assistant professors, provided such individuals be normally engaged in teaching, research, personnel or library service, or in the formulation of educational policies."

Meeting adjourned.

R. W. Leighton, Secretary

MEETING OF THE ADVISORY COUNCIL

May 13, 1937

Present: Gilbert, Bovard, Burrell, Hollis, Leighton, Smith
Vice-chairman Gilbert called the meeting to order.

1. The question was raised as to when and how the Advisory Council was to consider requests for raises in rank and for promotion with all such requests before it at one time.

B
JVP

It was moved and passed that President Boyer be asked to submit copies of all recommendations concerning budget policy and proposed personnel adjustment to the Council as they come into his hands so that the sub-committees of the Council on Tenure and Promotion and on Budget can be collecting the information they need concerning each item.

2. The secretary was instructed to prepare an Advisory Council report to be submitted to the faculty May 29. He was instructed to make the report a brief of the policies established by the Council and of the reports of sub-committees; to have this brief mimeographed and sent to each member of the faculty.

3. The following letter from President Boyer was read:
May 6, 1937

"Dr. R. W. Leighton, Secretary
The Advisory Council
University of Oregon

My dear Dr. Leighton:

J

I shall want very soon to see the Advisory Council again concerning academic rank for professionally trained library assistants. It will not involve voting privileges except insofar as the Advisory Council has already made such recommendations but does involve an interinstitutional arrangement and standards adopted by the American Library Association.

Sincerely yours,

C. Valentine Boyer,
President."

The Council instructed the secretary to place this letter on the agenda for the next meeting with the President.

4. The desirability of a meeting with the Chancellor as suggested by President Boyer some time ago was discussed. The Council expressed a positive desire to have such a meeting, preferably shortly after May 26.

5. The following letter from Dr. Taylor was read and approved as being in direct accord with the policies of the Advisory Council.

"May 5, 1937"

President C. V. Boyer
University of Oregon

Dear President Boyer:

At the April meeting of the Graduate Council, the following resolution was unanimously passed:

GA

Resolved: That the President be requested to increase the number of graduate assistants, both in order to encourage graduate study, and to relieve the faculty of the excessive teaching loads under which they have been laboring, and release some of their time for research and study. The Council proposes that the administration work toward the plan of, eventually, giving the services of a graduate assistant as reader to every instructor who is teaching a class of fifty or more students.

Very truly yours,
Howard R. Taylor
Assistant Dean of the
Graduate Division

cc to the Advisory Council

6. The question of ways and means of bringing the salaries of all faculty members up to the minimum basis recommended for each rank was discussed at considerable length and the following communication was formulated for immediate transmittal to the President.

"It is the opinion of the Advisory Council that staff vacancies occurring at this time in any department should not be filled until the Council has an opportunity to discuss them with the President."

The motion for transmittal was made by Burrell, seconded by Smith and passed unanimously by the Council

7. Professor Martin's release from his position in the Sociology Department was discussed and Dean Gilbert reported on the circumstances of that release. It was decided that there was nothing the Council could do in the matter on the basis of the evidence at its disposal. The Council was advised that Professor Martin was being placed in the extension service.

8. The Council was adjourned until the next regular meeting time, Tuesday, May 18, at 7:30 P.M.; the Secretary was instructed to notify President Boyer that the Council hoped it would be possible for him to meet with the other members at that time.

R. W. Leighton
R. W. Leighton, Secretary

MEETING OF THE ADVISORY COUNCIL

May 15, 1937

Present: Boyer, Bovard, Burrell, Gilbert, Hollis, Leighton, Smith.

The meeting was presided over by President Boyer who submitted budget items for discussion by the Advisory Council.

The Council voted to pass upon these items according to the following principles and circumstances:

- a. They shall be considered at this meeting in terms of merit, it being understood that some elements of general policy were not ready for expression.
- b. The Council understands that the Chancellor has provided for the automatic raising of salaries for all ranks below the rank of associate professor to a minimum as follows: Instructor, \$1600; Assistant Professor, \$2400. The same minimum scale when extended to the upper ranks will be as follows: Associate Professor, \$3000; Full Professor, \$3500. Some of the items which are given will fall automatically within the provision made by the Chancellor, as just stated, and are so indicated.
- c. No increase in rank would be provided without raising the salary to the base salary for that rank.

The President submitted his budget items in two groups. Group I, those salary adjustments which will be taken care of within the present University budget; Group II, those salary adjustments which will be taken care of by the Chancellor's supplementary budget.

GROUP I

President's Office

Edith K. Fleming, recommended increase from \$1800 to \$2100. This increase is recognition of increased responsibility and experience during the last few years. She has been with the University of Oregon for eight years.

Vote: (No) Hollis, Gilbert, Burrell, Smith, Leighton. (Yes) Bovard.

Business Office

Una A. Clark, Secretary, recommended increase from \$1200 to \$1320. Mrs. Clark has been with the University for two years and has served the Business Office faithfully and efficiently as secretary and auditor. Her capability as secretary and her knowledge of bookkeeping and the responsibility of her position warrant this increase.

Vote: (No) Leighton. (Yes) Hollis, Gilbert, Burrell, Bovard, Smith

Editor's Office

George Balknap, recommended increase from \$2200 to \$2400. Mr. Byrne gives the following reasons: "Mr. Balknap has accepted responsibility for his position in a very satisfactory manner, has been a tireless worker, and is now thoroughly qualified to carry on the important work as editor for the University. The position and responsibility he carries are worth more money, and regular advancement is due him."

Vote: (No) Hollis, Gilbert, Burrell, Bovard, Smith, Leighton.

Department of Home Economics

Mary B. Farr, Instructor, recommended salary increase from \$1500 to \$1700 because she will take the place of Mrs. Peterson next year. Mrs. Peterson's base rate is normally \$1700. During the past year, however, her base rate was raised to \$1,950 while she acted as head of the department.

Vote: Approval unanimous

School of Physical Education

Warrine Eastburn, Instructor, recommended increase from \$2000 to \$2200. Because of her excellence in teaching and intra-campus service. She has been with the University two years.

Vote: (no) Unanimous. (Not voting) Bovard.

Russell K. Cutler, Assistant Professor, recommended for increase from \$2400 to \$2600, because of excellence in teaching and promotion of relationship between the Athletic Department and School of Physical Education. Mr. Cutler has been with the University for seven years.

Vote: Approval unanimous.

Earl E. Boushey, Assistant Professor, recommended for increase from \$2500 to \$2600 because of excellence in teaching, research, and stimulation of relationship between Education and Physical Education. Mr. Boushey has been with the University for seven years.

Vote: Approval unanimous.

Howard S. Hoyman, Assistant Professor, recommended for increase from \$2400 to \$2600, because of excellence in teaching and thorough scholarship and development of health education.

Vote: Approval unanimous.

Chemistry Department

A. H. Kunz, Associate Professor, recommended for increase from \$2700 to \$3000 because of added responsibility and teaching load, and adjustment in division of salary and service. Dr. Kunz received \$150.00 additional salary during the past year for additional responsibilities. Next year his added responsibilities will be continued and increased. Automatically placed in Chancellor's budget (see 2,b, of these minutes)

Roy C. Andrews, Instructor, recommended increase from \$1200 to \$1500 because of valuable service to the department. Automatically placed in Chancellor's budget under 2,b, of these minutes.

Zoology Department

A. L. Alderman, Instructor, recommended increase from \$2000 to \$2200. Recommended for increase in rank to Assistant Professor. He is a good instructor and merits this recognition. Automatically placed on Chancellor's budget (see 2,b, of these minutes)

Physical Plant

A. H. Foote, recommended increase from \$1728.26 to \$1850. Funds for this adjustment furnished by Chancellor in connection with adjustment toward union scale.

Rachel Van Osdol, recommended increase from \$1136.09 to \$1200. Increase for this adjustment allowed by Chancellor in connection with adjustment toward union scale for other Physical Plant employees.

O. L. Rhinesmith, recommended increase from \$1402.17 to \$1600, because he cannot be reimbursed for local travel next year which amounts to approximately \$200 per year.

Vote: Approval unanimous. It was moved and passed that the President find out if Mr. Rhinesmith cannot be reimbursed for gas used in travel called for in his duties.

English Department

E.C.A. Lesch, Associate Professor, recommended increase from \$2600 to \$3000. Mr. Lesch has been with the University nine years. He is considered to be an exceptionally able teacher, and his salary is out of line with his ability and his rank.

Automatic approval follows under 2,b, of these minutes, but the Council voted to sustain its original vote (See Minutes, May 4, 1937) in regard to this case. Negative votes were cast by Professors Burrell and Smith on the grounds that the original decision (Smith absent) was contingent upon Lewis acceptance of the matching offer made by the University.

E. G. Moll, Associate Professor, recommended increase from \$2600 to \$3000. Mr. Moll has been with the University nine years and is considered to be an exceptionally able teacher. His salary is out of line with his ability and his rank.

Same action as in case of Mr. Lesch, above.

CHANGES IN RANKGeneral Library

Willis Warren, to be assigned rank of Assistant Professor

The following to be assigned rank of instructor:
Margaret Gilman, Assistant in Cataloguing Department
Ella S. Carrick, Assistant in Cataloguing Department

John March, Assistant in Reference Department
 Elizabeth Findly, Assistant in Reference Department
 Marjorie Reynolds, Museum Library
 Mary Rutherford, Assistant in Circulation Department
 Betty Stamm, Assistant in Order Department
 Pauline Walton, Indexer
 Miriam Yoder, Assistant Cataloguer
 Corwin Seitz, Order Clerk

Alice Gardiner, Periodical Clerk
 Vote: (No) Burrell, Smith, Bovard, Hollis, Gilbert, Leighton. This recommendation was disapproved pending study of American Library Association recommendations by sub-committee on Tenure and Promotion.

Registrar's Office

Clifford Constance, recommended for rank of Assistant Professor
 Vote: (no) Burrell. (Yes) Leighton, Smith, Bovard, Gilbert, Hollis

School of Business Administration

Victor P. Morris, to be Dean instead of Acting Dean.
 Vote: Approval unanimous

A. B. Stillman, recommended change from Assistant to Associate Professor.
 Vote: Approval unanimous and recommended increase in salary to \$3000.

Ruth May Chilcote, recommended to be given rank of instructor.
 Vote: Approval unanimous.

Zoology

A. L. Alderman, recommended advance from Instructor to Assistant Professor.
 Vote: Approval unanimous.

History Department

Andrew Fish, recommended advance from Associate Professor to Professor.
 Vote: (No) Bovard, Hollis, Leighton. (Yes) Smith. (Not voting) Burrell, Gilbert.

CHANGES IN TENURE

Editor's Office

George Belknap, recommended change of yearly tenure to indefinite tenure.

Registrar's Office

Clifford L. Constance, recommended change from one year to indefinite tenure.

School of Business Administration

Lee C. Ball, Associate Professor
 Jesse H. Bond, Ph.D., Professor
 Daniel Gage, Associate Professor
 N. H. Comish, Ph.D., Professor
 W. P. Riddlesbarger, Assistant Professor

All of the men listed above are recommended to be advanced from yearly tenure to indefinite tenure.

Department of Home Economics

Mabel A. Wood, M.S., Head of Department, recommended for indefinite tenure.

German Department

Mrs. A. M. Williams, Ph.D., Assistant Professor, recommended for indefinite tenure.

School of Physical Education

Janet Woodruff, M.A., Associate Professor, recommended for indefinite tenure.