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Members Absent: Bolle, Hyndman (out of town), Lange (out of town), Shafizadeh (out of town), Silverman (out of town).

Ex-officio members present: Academic Vice President James Talbot and Dr. Philip T. Bain

1. The minutes of April 22 and May 6, 1976, were approved as distributed.

2. Announcements:

   Chairman Walsh informed Senators that Item 3 A. (1), Proposed University Writing Requirement, was on the agenda for discussion only, not for action.

3. Committee Reports:

   A. Academic Standards and Curriculum Review Committee.

      (1) English Proposed University Writing Requirement. Thompson, ASCRC Chairman, presented proposal to the Senate. Lott moved rules be suspended so that issue may be voted upon. Lott's motion was seconded and carried. Fisher, Flightner, Von Kuster and Reinhardt spoke against proposal. Grossman, Field and Porter supported motion. Grossman moved the question, his motion was seconded and passed. The proposal as presented by ASCRC passed.

      (2) Additional proposed curriculum changes. Thompson presented summaries of proposed changes. A motion was made, seconded and passed that the changes be approved. A request from Political Science regarding Political Science 592 was referred to Graduate Council.

      (3) Honors Proposal. Thompson introduced the Honors Proposal, stating it would be effective Summer Quarter, 1976. The motion passed the Senate.

   B. Library and Archives Committee. Lane McGaughy, Chairman, presented the report to the Senate and it was distributed to the members. Four recommendations to the Senate and Executive Committee were itemized by McGaughy and ECOS will take them under advisement.

   C. Review Committee. Frances Hill, Chairwoman of the Review Committee, presented a report of the year's activities. Report was distributed to Senate.

   D. Appeals Committee. Mark Behan, Chairman of Appeals, presented the report of the committee and it was distributed to Senators.
Field requested the Senate pass resolution expressing their appreciation and gratitude to the Review and Appeals Committee for their work and dedication. The motion was passed by the Senate.

E. Ad Hoc Women's Studies report. Slocum, Chairwoman, spoke briefly to the report previously distributed to the Senators.

4. Old Business:

A. Huff nominated William Farr, History, for a one year term on the Appeals Committee. His nomination was seconded and Farr was elected.

B. Academic Vice President James Talbot presented list number 148, list of candidates for the bachelor's degree and certificates and all advanced degrees at the close of Spring Quarter, subject to the provisions that all requirements for the respective degrees and certificates be completed in accordance with faculty rules. List number 147, corrections to Winter Quarter list, was also presented by AVP Talbot. It was moved, seconded and passed that both lists be approved.

C. Executive Committee's report on Law School allocation:

"At the last Senate meeting, the Executive Committee was charged to investigate the special funding allocation given to the Law School by the Regents following last year's accreditation visit by an ABA review team. Since that time, we have read over various documents and correspondence associated with the accreditation visit, discussed aspects of the matter with President Bowers, and received clarification on various points from Vice President Talbot.

With respect to two principal thrusts of the report we are in agreement: the law school faculty is underpaid and its library is not what it should be. These difficulties do not distinguish the law school in any way from the rest of the University, nor does the accreditation report argue in any persuasive fashion that the problems are more serious in the Law School than in the rest of the University.

If anything, the report would lead one to feel that the Law School may be relatively better off than the rest of us. The law library is short of shelf space but has a good seating capacity, comfortable appointments, and a competent staff. Law School salaries are higher on the average than for faculty members at the same rank in the rest of the University. And these law school salaries are higher for professors, many of whose teaching is frankly criticized by their students (the report brushes this off as 'normal' student reaction), whose publication records are not outstanding, but whose service commitments are very heavy. Unfortunately their service commitments are burdensome enough to cause students to complain of unexpected absences by their professors and lack of preparation by some lecturers. Moreover, it is not made clear how many of these off-campus commitments of the law faculty are indeed of a service nature and how many are paid consultations.

According to the ABA report, the Law School is suffering from a possible deterioration in the 'special relationship' that has existed between its dean and past university presidents. This 'special relationship' has apparently grown out of the recognition at the presidential level of unusual obligations which the Law School has to the State because its graduates are professionals. The accreditation team seems to have been unaware that there are other professional schools and pro-
grams on campus which presumably also have special obligations.

The Faculty Senate is viewed as a threatening presence in the accreditation team's report. The report implies that the Senate has apparently done little or no actual damage in the past, but it continually threatens to do so by insisting that matters of curriculum, salaries, tenure and promotion be handled in the same way for law school faculty as for other University professors. It is obvious from the report that the Faculty Senate does not recognize the special privileges which accrue to the Law School because of its presumed special obligation.

Whether or not additional funds for salary increases at the Law School will finally materialize is uncertain given the current altercation in Helena. If they do not, I have been assured that preferential salary increments for law school professors are a low priority item - one whose funding is unlikely in a year of scarcity. If the funds do become available, President Bowers has insisted that salary increments for law professors be made on a strictly merit basis. Vice President Talbot has outlined a procedure that will take into account performance over the total period of tenure at the University of Montana, student input consisting of evaluations of current teaching capabilities and follow-up from graduates, scholarly productivity, and service contributions. The Review Committee will be asked to advise the Vice President with respect to the cases presented. The procedure is undoubtedly a good one -- it would be much better if the Review and Appeals Committee functioned in precisely their actual way with respect to these cases.

In summary, the case for special treatment for the Law School seems not to be justified. Neither the needs of the law school library nor the merits of the law school faculty are great enough to command any sort of preferential treatment." Grossman asked that the Senate take some action, with respect to the Board of Regents, in the form of a resolution at the next meeting. Chessin moved the Executive Committee present a resolution at the next Senate meeting. His motion was seconded and passed.

5. New Business:

A. Graduate Council proposal for waiver of residency requirement for MPA Degree. Motion was passed by the Senate.

B. Law School curriculum changes. Changes have been referred to Graduate Council and will be presented at next Senate meeting.

C. Henningsen, Chairman of the Faculty Benefits Committee, informed the Senators of the Deferred Compensation Plan and Group Health Insurance Plan meetings currently being held on campus.

Meeting adjourned at 5:30 P.M.

Philip T. Bain