

NOTICE OF FACULTY COUNCIL MEETINGS

Ballantine 008, 3:30

Agenda, March 5, 1968

1. Approval of the Minutes of February 20, 1968
2. President's Business
3. Continued consideration of the Section Committee Report on Libraries, Section VIII, Items 18-20, (Recommended limit on discussion, 25 minutes) (Professor Byrnes)
4. Continued consideration of the Interim Report of the Buehrig Committee, Faculty Council By-Laws 7-9 (Recommended limit on discussion for this meeting, 85 minutes.)

Tentative Agenda, March 12, 1968

1. Approval of the Minutes of March 5, 1968, contingent upon their receipt by the Council by March 11.
2. Continued consideration of the Interim Report of the Committee on Picketing and Demonstrating: University Policy on Placement Services (Recommended limit on discussion 15 minutes)
3. Report of the Section Committee on Teaching, Faculty Council Document No. 6, 1967-68 (Recommended limit on discussion, 60 minutes) (Professor Wolff)
4. Continued consideration of the Section Committee Report on Libraries, Section I. (Recommended limit on discussion, 45 minutes) (Professor Byrnes)

Minutes of the Faculty Council

March 5, 1968

Ballantine 008, 3:30

(This document is internal to Indiana University)

Members present: President Stahr, Deans Snyder, Sutton, Bain, Carter, Clark, Harvey, Higgins, Shull and Endwright; Provost Penrod; Professors Auer, Byrnes, Lindesmith, Long, Pratt, Saltzman, R.C. Turner, Farmer, Friedman, Shellhamer, Buehrig, Horowitz, Manlove, and J.E. Carter, R.L. Turner.

Alternates present: Dean E.W. Martin for Dean Pinnell, Professor Laffey for Professor Fay, Professor Edwards for Professor D. Martin.

Absent, no alternate: Dean Merritt, Dean Holmquist, Dean Irwin, Professor Ryder.

Visitors present: Professors A.A. Fatouros, P. Appleman, A.F. Painter, R.C. Murray, S. Yellen, Mr. J.R. Jordan, and Dean Fry.

Agenda

March 5, 1968

1. Approval of the Minutes of February 20, 1968.
2. President's Business.
3. Continued consideration of the Section Committee Report on Libraries, Section VIII, Items 18-20, (Recommended limit of discussion, 25 minutes) (Professor Byrnes)
4. Continued consideration of the Interim Report of the Buehrig Committee, Faculty Council By-Laws 7-9 (Recommended limit on discussion for this meeting, 85 minutes.)
5. Nominations Committee: Election of the University Library Committee.

PRESIDENT'S BUSINESS

President Stahr called the March 5, 1968 meeting of the Council to order at 3:33 p.m. The minutes of the meeting of February 20, 1968 were approved as written.

PRESIDENT'S BUSINESS

The first item of business concerned the appointment of the all-campus "University Grievance Committee on Discriminatory Practices," the members of which are to be:

Professor Benjamin Peery (chairman)
 Professor Donald Bennett
 Professor Homer Neal
 Professor John O'Connor
 Mr. Robert Burton
 Mr. John Cable (student)

In addition, the University legal counselor will be consultant to the committee. President Stahr noted that the committee was created as a further step in pursuance of the Board of Trustees resolution of July last asking the administration to accelerate activity in erasing the last vestiges of discrimination based on race or religion. The creation of the committee provides a definite group to whom a person having an allegation concerning discrimination in the University community can turn.

The second item of business, most of which, by custom, was off the record, concerned luminaries to whom honorary degrees might be awarded. The President presented to the Council for discussion and approval those personalities forwarded by the Committee on Honorary Degrees.

Following discussion, the Secretary moved that the persons presented be approved. Professor Pratt seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously, and the list was forwarded to the Board of Trustees for their consideration.

FURTHER CONSIDERATION OF SECTION COMMITTEE REPORT ON LIBRARIES

Section VIII of this report was the announced agenda item for the present meeting; in introducing the report, however, Professor Byrnes observed that the section committee thought it wise to consider also Section VI, items 14 and 15, since these items might appropriately be sent to the newly created University Library Committee for more intense consideration before a definite recommendation was forwarded to the

Director of Libraries and the University Librarian. The two sections in question are as follows:

VI. RESOLUTION FROM THE FACULTY COUNCIL TO THE DIRECTOR OF LIBRARIES AND THE UNIVERSITY LIBRARIAN.

14. THAT THE LIBRARY SHOULD CREATE A NEW UNIT, STAFFED BY SYSTEMS PERSONNEL, TO MAINTAIN A CONSTANT REVIEW OF ITS OPERATIONS, PARTICULARLY AS THEY MAY BE AFFECTED BY NEW TECHNOLOGY, THE OPPORTUNITIES OFFERED BY THE NEW BUILDING, AND THE EVIDENT NEED FOR CONSIDERABLY INCREASED AND IMPROVED SERVICES.

15. THAT THE UNIVERSITY LIBRARY ADMINISTRATION SHOULD APPOINT A SCHOLAR-LIBRARIAN AS ASSISTANT DIRECTOR FOR INTERNATIONAL PROGRAMS AND SHOULD ESTABLISH CENTRAL COLLECTIONS OF REFERENCE WORKS, PERIODICALS, NEWSPAPERS, AND BOOKS IN THE STACKS OF THE NEW RESEARCH LIBRARY FOR OUR STRONGEST FOREIGN AREA STUDY PROGRAMS.

VIII. RESOLUTIONS FROM THE FACULTY COUNCIL TO THE UNIVERSITY LIBRARY COMMITTEE.

18. THAT THE UNIVERSITY LIBRARY COMMITTEE AS ITS FIRST STEP SHOULD ARRANGE FOR A REVIEW OF THE ORGANIZATION, POLICIES, AND OPERATIONS OF THE LIBRARY SYSTEM. THE FORTHCOMING MOVE AND PREDICTED HEAVY INCREASE IN STUDENT AND FACULTY USE IN THE NEW BUILDING SUGGEST THAT THIS IS A PARTICULARLY APPROPRIATE TIME FOR SUCH AN ANALYSIS.

19. THAT THE UNIVERSITY LIBRARY COMMITTEE APPOINT A SUBCOMMITTEE TO MAKE A THOROUGH REVIEW OF THE REGIONAL CAMPUS LIBRARIES, THE REGIONAL CAMPUS LIBRARY SYSTEM, AND THE POSITION THESE LIBRARIES SHOULD OCCUPY IN THE UNIVERSITY AND IN THE UNIVERSITY LIBRARY SYSTEM. THE SUBCOMMITTEE SHOULD REPORT ITS RECOMMENDATIONS TO THE UNIVERSITY LIBRARY COMMITTEE AND THROUGH IT TO THE FACULTY COUNCIL.
20. THAT THE UNIVERSITY LIBRARY COMMITTEE CONSIDER THE FOLLOWING RECOMMENDATIONS MADE BY THE UNIVERSITY STUDY COMMITTEE.
- "1. THE CONTINUATION OF BRANCH LIBRARIES IS HIGHLY DESIRABLE. (p. 268).

2. IF THE ACCEPTED RECOMMENDATIONS FOR AN UNDER-GRADUATE COLLEGE SYSTEM ARE ACCEPTED, A SUBSTANTIAL EFFORT MUST BE MADE TO PROVIDE AN ADEQUATE GENERAL LIBRARY IN EACH COLLEGE. (p. 268).
3. LIBRARIES IN THE HALLS OF RESIDENT SHOULD NOT BE LIMITED IN THEIR FINANCES TO PROFITS FROM VENDING MACHINES; THEY SHOULD BE ASSISTED BY INCREASING GENERAL FUND APPROPRIATIONS. (p. 268-269).
4. VOLUMES IN SPECIAL DEPARTMENT, SCHOOL, OR INDEPENDENT COLLECTIONS (NOT PRIVATE FACULTY) NO MATTER HOW THEY ARE PAID FOR, SHOULD BE LISTED IN THE MAIN LIBRARY CATALOGUE. (pp. 269-270)."

Opening discussion on the sections, Professor Shiner wished to know whether they were only to be studied by the committee, or whether action was to be taken, or both. Professor Byrnes said that study followed by action would be appropriate. Referring to VI. 15, and noting that there already were special librarians for the area study programs, Professor Buehrig inquired about the functions of the suggested assistant director for international programs. Professor Byrnes replied that the assistant director would coordinate the work of the special area librarians. He also noted that the various areas were now recognized to have much closer interrelationships than they were perceived to have ten years ago, and that while Dr. Byrd had in the past two or three years carried on the coordination work himself, he now needed relief from these responsibilities. He further observed that there were two separate points in item 15; one was the creation of the assistant directorship, and the other was the establishment of central collections. Those central collections which now exist (e.g. Asian Studies), he said, were of very great value to scholars in the particular area as well as to undergraduates and graduate students.

Pursuing the latter point, Professor Solt, representing the interests in the library of some persons, said that there was some feeling that central collections should not be established in the library. Representing the History Department, he noted that after lengthy discussion, that department had not in the majority favored the central collections recommendation in 15., although the recommendation was favored by a sizeable minority. (Professor Byrnes later noted that he exercised great restraint in passing the opportunity to respond, at length, to the issue of central collections in question.)

Focusing on item 14, Professor Wolff asked Dean Fry how the research work and expertise of the Graduate Library School would be fed into the operation. Calling attention to the recent position paper on library technology and mechanization, Dean Fry said that the School hoped to have closer relationships to the libraries, and that an arrangement had been made with them for experimental and pilot programs. He thought such programs might be extended into other areas in the future. The Library was valuable to the School and the School wanted to be useful to the library. Professor Wolff said that he was pleased that the kind of relationship described had appeared. Professor Shiner said that a member of the School should be on the University Library Committee, and Professor Solt noted, in response, that a member of the school did indeed appear on the ballot to be presented later in the afternoon. There was no further discussion.

Observing that the proposal had been moved and seconded by virtue of its presentation* (a point affirmed by the Parliamentarian), President Stahr called for the question, and the sections under consideration were unanimously accepted and forwarded to the newly-created University Library Committee.

CONSIDERATION OF THE INTERIM BUEHRIG COMMITTEE REPORT: FACULTY COUNCIL BY-LAWS 7-9.

Noting that 85 minutes might be devoted to the report, President Stahr said that he would have to leave at 5:00 p.m. to go downtown and attend another (less formal) meeting on the Highway 37 problem.

Professor Buehrig first introduced Professor Yellen and Professor Edwards, two of the other members of the committee. He then noted that since the last report, the committee had had the benefit of two special reports bearing on the Council, one from the AAUP and the other from the Continuing Committee. (These reports had also been circulated to Council members by these groups.) Turning to the immediate matter of the day, he asked the Council to consider paragraph 8 of the proposed revision of the by-laws, reading:

8. The President may speak off the record at any meeting of the Faculty Council. In addition, the Council may hold closed meetings on the initiative of the President or upon majority vote of members of the Council. No minutes will be kept. However, with the exception of actions relating to such matters as honorary degrees, final actions by the Council shall be taken in open meeting. Closed meetings may be

* by a committee of the Faculty Council

held after a regular open meeting, or an entire session may be closed by prior notice.

(The underlined portion is the revised portion).

Referring to the deliberations of the committee since the previous report (February 20) and to the AAUP and Continuing Committee reports intervening during the same period, Professor Buehrig said that the committee now wished to withdraw the addition it had originally proposed, i.e. the underlined portion. Specifically, he noted that the committee was now fully cognizant of Robert's Rules of Order, which specify that any organization, such as the Faculty Council, can, at any time, form a Committee of the Whole. While a committee of the whole need not be closed, non-recorded meeting, he noted, it is the case that by the vote of a simple majority, a committee of the whole meeting may be closed. In view of these facts, the committee decided that nothing would be lost if the proposed addition were deleted. Professor Buehrig also pointed out that inclusion of the addition seemed to place an undue emphasis on the closed meeting and thus seemed to encourage, albeit obliquely, that which the committee had thus far been aiming to avoid.

In addition to the deletion of the proposed revision, Professor Buehrig also proposed that the words "the President" in the first line of paragraph 8. be changed to "the Chair". The motion of the committee, given these considerations, was therefore that paragraph 8. read:

8. THE CHAIR MAY SPEAK OFF THE RECORD AT ANY MEETING OF THE FACULTY COUNCIL.

Apparently saving its shot for a subsequent target, the Council was unable to find any particular point to discuss in the motion. The President therefore called for the question, and the motion passed unanimously.

Next Professor Buehrig focused the attention of the Council on paragraph 7.e., reading:

e. It shall be the responsibility of the Agenda Committee to invite non-members to participate, without vote, in any Faculty Council meetings at which matters of interest to them are being considered. Members of the faculty are welcome as observers at any meeting of the Council, and a faculty member may speak to any agenda item by so requesting of the Secretary prior to a meeting. The Agenda Committee may invite the general faculty

to participate in special sessions of the Council, to be governed by ad hoc rules adopted by the Agenda Committee, though normally such sessions would not be for the purpose of making decisions.

He then suggested that the Council consider the first two sentences of the paragraph in one motion, while leaving the third sentence for a separate motion. By way of background to the first two sentences, Professor Buehrig observed that there was unanimous approval in the committee that members of the faculty might sit as observers at the meetings of the Council. There was, however, considerable discussion within the committee on the question of faculty observers participating in the discussions of the Council. Three points of view, he said, were expressed in the committee: 1) that no participation at all be permitted; 2) that participation be permitted contingent upon a request to the Secretary, prior to the meeting, and 3) that participation be permitted simply by recognition from the chair. From among these possibilities, the committee chose the second alternative, primarily as a compromise between the other more extreme positions. Professor Buehrig then moved that the Council accept the first two sentences of the paragraph.

Professor Pratt seconded the motion and then suggested that the word "as observers" in line 4 seemed a bit anomalous, at least from a psychological viewpoint, since the Council is, after all, the Faculty Council. Professor Buehrig suggested that "welcome to attend any meeting" might be substituted, while Dean Sutton suggested that "as observers" simply be deleted. President Stahr noted that the committee's theory may have been based on the thought that the Council is a representative body and is in this sense, at least faintly, analogous to, say, the United States Senate, which the constituents may observe, but in which they do not participate. The committee held a brief consultation and agreed to delete the terms "as observers".

Speaking hesitatingly from his ambiguous position as a visitor, Professor Murray noted that there was a slight problem in the wording in that two categories of visitors were created, those invited by the Agenda Committee, and those "welcome at any meeting", and that the former could speak in the meeting without prior request to the Secretary while the latter could not. He wondered whether it was appropriate to maintain this distinction, especially since there appeared to be some implication that a visitor in the second category who felt moved to speak during the meeting might feel that he first need to get the permission of the Secretary.

Responding, admittedly, as a footnote to only a part of Professor Murray's total point, President Stahr suggested that part of the distinction between the two categories might lie in the fact that some of the non-Council members referred to in the first sentence were also non-faculty members, including students and staff members, with whom the Council might need or wish to confer, and that the Agenda Committee needed the special power to invite such persons to participate in order to facilitate the business of the Council. The second sentence, however, referred exclusively to faculty members. Elaborating this point, Professor Buehrig pointed out that the wording of the second sentence made all faculty members welcome at meetings, but at the same time attempted to give the Agenda Committee some control over how many visiting persons might speak. The absence of any control over who might speak could foreseeably lead to the inability of the Agenda Committee and the Council to get through the business at hand.

Referring to the second sentence and to the point implicit in Professor Murray's statement, Professor Pratt asked the committee why prior permission was required. Professor Edwards spoke to the point, noting that he was the member of the Buehrig Committee who felt that visiting faculty members should not be allowed to participate at all in the meeting unless the Agenda Committee had planned for their participation. The reasons for his position, he said, were, first, that the Council is representative government, and that the Council meetings should be open to observation so that the constituents can see and respond to how their representatives perform. It is also for the latter reason, he said, that he felt the minutes and the next agenda should be distributed quickly after the meeting. Constituents may then contact their representative before the next meeting. Second, since the Council has elected representatives, they should have the responsibility and authority to perform. To this point, having Council meetings at which any faculty member may participate defeats the purpose of representative government in several ways. First, it eliminates the necessity for faculty members to express their views to elected representatives in advance of the meetings. He pointed out that if any faculty member feels strongly on a matter he should talk or write to the elected representatives rather than coming to the meeting to express his own views. Second, the extra time, for example, a three-hour Council meeting at least each week, needed to permit one and all to speak will make service on the Council burdensome and unattractive, especially since time is the scholar's most precious commodity. Third, if faculty members are to fully express their views, the most appropriate time and place would seem to be the

meetings of the committees preparing reports for the Council rather than waiting until the report becomes an agenda item, then speaking to it in Council meeting. Committees, he noted, should have the right to have all points of view expressed to them rather than having to wait until the Council meeting at which their recommendations are presented to discover the full range of alternate viewpoints.

Professor Wolff, responding to Professor Edwards, said that the point of departure for the Continuing Committee's proposal that faculty members be permitted to speak at Council meetings was not that there should be uncontrolled debate, but that Faculty members might be used as resource people who have special knowledges or skills which could facilitate the business of the meeting. He also noted that under present, rapidly changing conditions it is frequently very difficult to know in advance who might most appropriately and usefully be heard from. Next, he observed that the Council is not a representative body in the sense that the U.S. Senate is; that certainly each elected member's constituency is general and therefore vague, and that the Council, as representative government, is seriously damaged by this lack of specific representativeness. Lastly, he pointed out that Council members may have to consider a greater level of commitment and responsibility in the future and be willing to devote a much more significant portion of their time to Council affairs.

Subsequently, the Council entered a rather long discussion during which it struggled with the wording of the two sentences in order to express more adequately the precise role of the Agenda Committee in granting requests to visiting faculty members to speak, while still making it possible for the Agenda Committee to create a manageable agenda and for the Chair to manage a meeting for which the Agenda Committee had, in advance, given a kind of special permission for some persons to speak. To this end, Professor Davidson suggested that the words "upon recognition by the Chair" be inserted after "speak" in line 5, while Professor Murray pointed out that his change would make necessary a change to "by having so requested" at the end of line 5. Professor Wolff suggested "notified" rather than "requested", but Professor Edwards noted this change would severely curtail the management of the meeting by the Agenda Committee, since, say, 40 faculty members could notify it of intent to speak and the Agenda Committee would have no power to control the number speaking. Professor E.W. Martin suggested that the Agenda Committee be empowered to place time limits on speakers. Professor Yellen observed that "prior" had been inserted in line 5 not as an effort to "control" faculty members

but in order to permit the Agenda Committee to coherently organize a meeting. Professor Edwards pointed out that under paragraph 7.a. of the by-laws the Agenda Committee is responsible for the agenda of the meeting, and that in order to discharge the responsibility it needed the power to refuse or limit ad hoc requests.

Responding to Professor Wolff's points, Professor Manlove said that if the Council members are representatives, and if faculty members may make their viewpoint known to these representatives, which they can, he saw little advantage in having faculty members speak during the meeting, especially since the Council already seemed to get bogged down in its discussions.

Professor Murray suggested that some of the difficulties with the wording might be avoided by amalgamating the two categories of visitors and simplifying the second sentence to read "Any member of the faculty may request an invitation to attend any Faculty Council meeting." The Secretary said that functionally speaking the Agenda Committee would probably operate by extending an invitation to attend to any faculty member who expressed a genuine interest in an agenda item. The President observed that the full intent of the original motion appeared to be to permit unlimited observation without participation, as well as to provide a mechanism for limited participation by faculty members who wished to talk to an agenda item. Additional changes in the wording were then suggested, including changing "responsibility" to "prerogative" in line 1, and adding "and permission is granted" after "meeting" in line 6. Professor Neu pointed out that the latter addition was gratuitous since the Chair already held the power to grant permission. Nonetheless, Professor Martin moved that "permission is granted" be added, and Professor Manlove seconded the motion. There was no additional discussion; the President called for the question, and the motion was defeated.

Five o'clock had by this time arrived, and President Stahr departed, turning the Chair to Dean Sutton.

Dean Harvey, returning to the point concerning two categories of visitors made by Professor Murray, and a subsequent point by the Secretary, said that he was disturbed by the problems the Council was attempting to resolve by changes in wording. He said that he thought the Council was entitled to believe that the Agenda Committee would try to maintain an open texture in the meeting and that to this end they would invite to the meeting those interested in an agenda item and those whose viewpoint should be heard, while

at the same time maintaining an organized meeting. He then moved that the first two sentences in 7.e. be modified to read:

1. The Agenda Committee may invite non-members to participate
2. without vote in any Faculty Council meeting at which matters
3. of particular interest to them are being considered. Any member of the
4. faculty is welcome at any meeting of the Council.

Professor Auer seconded the motion.

Opening discussion on the motion, the Secretary suggested that the motion did not make sufficiently clear that faculty members could, in effect, invite themselves to a meeting by calling the Secretary, who might then formally invite them. Dean Harvey said the "may" in the first sentence was intended to include this possibility. Subsequently, at the suggestion of Professors (R.C.) Turner and Shiner, and with a supportive statement by Professor Fatouros, who observed that it is not clear to faculty members that they may initiate a request to attend, the terms "on its own initiative, or on the request of any faculty member," were inserted in line 1 of the revised motion between "Committee" and "may". After a brief consultation, the Buehrig Committee representatives who were present accepted the entire substitution to the original motion.

Professor Wolff observed that the change in wording meant that any faculty member could request that a non-faculty person could attend a meeting, an implication of which Professor Wolff approved.

Professor Davidson, returning to concern expressed earlier in the meeting, wondered whether under parliamentary law the Agenda Committee could set time limits on individual speakers. Professor Auer, Parliamentarian, thought that they could not set such limits unless a special rule was passed.

Dean Clark, addressing himself to Professor Wolff's point, said that if the intent of the clause, "or on the request of any faculty member" was to restrict such requests to include only faculty members, it was quite clear that the clause as worded did not meet the intent, since in a very large faculty anyone could surely find one faculty member who would intercede for him. Dean Sutton said that one had to assume good

faith in such matters since it was unlikely that any wording could be found which could cover all future contingencies.

Professor Buehrig said that with all the suggestions and counter suggestions for changes in wording, his committee was beginning to falter; he was getting conflicting advice from his fellow committee members. Dean Sutton then proposed that the committee take the suggestions offered by Council members and return at a later time with a wording that as nearly as possible embraced the varying viewpoints, and was agreeable to the committee. Dean Carter suggested that each Council member write out his suggestions for changes in the by-laws and send them to the committee so that process of re-wording which had just taken place might be avoided in subsequent meetings. The Secretary proposed that the Buehrig Committee return on March 19; Dean Sutton encouraged them to send a revised wording to the Council for perusal before that time if possible.

So that the committee could start its work without formal encumbrances, Dean Harvey withdrew his motion, and Professor Auer his second.

NOMINATIONS COMMITTEE:

ELECTION OF THE UNIVERSITY LIBRARY COMMITTEE

Professor Solt presented a slate of 18 faculty members of whom 9 were to be elected by the Council. Under the motion creating the committee, the lengths of the terms on the committee were to be staggered. To meet this condition, those three nominees receiving the greatest number of votes are to serve three years, the next three two years, and the last three one year. The ballot presented is attached.

University Library Committee

Ballot

Bloomington Campus (vote for eight)

<input type="checkbox"/>	Arghyrios A. Fatouros	Associate Professor of Law
<input type="checkbox"/>	Ronald Gottesman	Assistant Professor of English
<input type="checkbox"/>	Edward Grant	Professor of History and History & Philosophy of Science
<input type="checkbox"/>	James Halporn	Associate Professor of Classics
<input type="checkbox"/>	Hurbert C. Heffner	Distinguished Professor of Speech, Theatre, and Dramatic Literature
<input type="checkbox"/>	Carleton Hodge	Professor of Linguistics and Director of the Intensive Language Center
<input type="checkbox"/>	Quentin M. Hope	Chairman and Professor of French and Italian
<input type="checkbox"/>	Robert Kingsbury	Associate Professor of Geography
<input type="checkbox"/>	J. Gus Liebenow	Professor of Government and Director of African Studies Program
<input type="checkbox"/>	Ann Painter	Assistant Professor of Library Science
<input type="checkbox"/>	Willis P. Porter	Professor of Education
<input type="checkbox"/>	J.A. Robbins, Jr.	Professor of English
<input type="checkbox"/>	Howard G. Schaller	Professor of Business Economics and Economic Policy
<input type="checkbox"/>	Vernon J. Shiner, Jr.	Professor of Chemistry
<input type="checkbox"/>	Gerald Strauss	Professor of History
<input type="checkbox"/>	Edward G. Summers	Professor of Education

Regional Campuses (vote for one)

<input type="checkbox"/>	Philip Headings (Fort Wayne)	Associate Professor of English
<input type="checkbox"/>	Joseph H. Ross (South Bend)	Associate Professor of Chemistry

The results were:

Three year terms:

J. Gus Liebenow
Ann Painter
Philip Headings

Two year terms:

Quentin Hope
Vernon J. Shiner, Jr.
Arghyrios A Fatouros

One year terms:

Hubert C. Heffner
Howard G. Shaller
Gerald Strauss

The meeting adjourned at 5:35 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Richard L. Turner, Secretary