

JOURNAL OF THE UNIVERSITY SENATE
January 26, 1953, 4:10 P. M.
Monnet Hall, Room 101

The Senate, meeting in regular session, was called to order by the Chairman, Dr. Olin L. Browder, Jr.

<u>Present</u>	<u>Present</u>	<u>Present</u>	<u>Absent</u>
Bavinger, E. A.	Hughes, F. C.	Pray, J. C.	Cross, G. L.
Bell, R. E.	James, R. V.	Pugmire, D. R.	Fite, G. C.
Browder, O. L.	Kelly, Ellen	Raines, J. M.	Mertes, J. E.
Brown, H. B.	Kelly, Florene	Reese, J. E.	Monnett, V. E.
Bruce, J. B.	Leek, J. H.	Self, J. T.	Pritchard, J. P.
Crook, K. E.	Livezey, W. E.	Springer, C. E.	Rackley, J. R.
Edmondson, V. G.	Marrs, Wyatt	Stanley, A. J.	Ragan, W. B.
Goodman, G. J.	Matlock, J. R.	Wardell, M. L.	Scatori, Stephen
Hall, R. G.	Moorhead, M. L.	Warren, Mary	Sears, A. B.
Harlow, J. G.	Morris, F. C.	Wilcox, S. C.	
Herbert, H. H.	Peach, W. N.	Wiley, J. B.	
Hollon, W. E.	Poston, Lawrence		

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

The Journals of the University Senate for the regular meeting on November 24, 1952 and the special meetings on December 19, 1952 and January 9, 1953 were approved.

REPORT OF SPECIAL COMMITTEE ON TENURE

Explanatory Comment:

On April 28, 1952 the Senate elected a Special Committee on Tenure to examine the prevailing methods of granting tenure and to report the results of its investigation together with any recommendations regarding a change in the procedures. The Special Committee on Tenure consisted of Professors Hinman, Marrs, Poston, Reese, and Wilcox.

The formal report of this Committee was presented to the Senate by Dr. Wilcox. It appears on pages 2-4 of this Journal.

* * * * *

Report on Special Committee on Tenure:

January 26, 1953

President George L. Cross
Faculty Exchange

Dear President Cross:

On November 26, 1951, the Committee on Faculty Personnel recommended that Section 5a of the plan for "Departmental Administration" (Faculty Handbook, p. 23) be changed to read as follows:

Departmental recommendations concerning budget allotment requests, increases in salary, or promotions in rank shall be made by a committee of three (Committee A), consisting of the chairman of the department and two faculty members elected by the teaching staff as defined above. Recommendations regarding tenure shall be made by a majority vote of tenure-holding faculty members of each department, the chairman casting the deciding vote in case of a tie. The entire staff may act as a committee of the whole on all questions except tenure, but shall elect its Committee A to prepare and execute formal recommendations on budget and personnel matters.

The Senate approved this recommendation, and on December 17, 1951, you addressed to the Senate the following reply:

I have under consideration the Senate's recommendation that future tenure recommendations be made by a majority vote of tenure-holding faculty members of each department rather than by Committee A. This recommendation is receiving careful study but has not yet been approved for transmission to the Regents.

There are several thoughts which occur to me in connection with this recommendation. It seems to me that questions of salary, promotion, and tenure are so closely related that there may be no justification for prescribing a separate procedure for tenure recommendations. There is the thought also that this recommendation might be a step back toward the "closed corporation" kind of departmental administration which caused so much damage to faculty morale and departmental efficiency before the policy was changed several years ago.

Under these circumstances, I hope that the Senate will understand my desire to study this proposal a little longer before giving a final decision as to whether it should be approved for inclusion with our regulations concerning departmental procedures.

Subsequently the Senate appointed a special committee to look further into the question posed in your letter.

This Special Committee believes that on the whole the foregoing recommendation of the Committee on Faculty Personnel is sound. To this original recommendation the Special Committee would also like to add the following:

If the department, the Dean (or Deans) and the Budget Council unanimously recommend that a faculty member be granted tenure, the Budget Council shall send all recommendations to the President.

If there is disagreement among the department, the Dean(s) and the Budget Council, the Budget Council shall forward all pertinent material to the Committee on Faculty Retirement and Tenure.

Within five days after receiving official notification of a disagreement in recommendations, the Committee on Faculty Retirement and Tenure shall give written notice of a hearing to Committee A, the Dean(s) and the Budget Council.

The Committee shall invite Committee A and the Dean(s) to appear before it for separate hearings and each shall be given sufficient opportunity to present opinions upon the case. In addition the Committee shall be empowered to request the appearance individually of any member of the general faculty and to request relevant information from any source.

Within sixty days after receiving official notification of disagreement in recommendations from the Budget Council, the Committee shall make its recommendations in writing to the President; provided, however, that this time limit may be extended by the President.

RECOMMENDATION: The Special Committee on Tenure recommends that the foregoing provisions be added to Section 5a of the Plan for Departmental Administration (Faculty Handbook, p. 23): these provisions include both the original paragraph of Sec. 5a as amended, and the immediately foregoing paragraph.

DISCUSSION: It appears to the Special Committee that, important as are promotions and salary raises, tenure, being a long-term commitment, is even more important to the university, to the department, and to the individual concerned. For any errors in judgement regarding salaries or the granting of rank can be rectified; once an adverse decision is reached regarding tenure, however, no change in decision can occur without deeply affecting a faculty member's morale--or, if he leaves, he is hardly likely to be asked to return. Although promotions, raises, and tenure undoubtedly are related, as you observe in the third paragraph of your letter, the Committee feels that the Budget Council, which is heavily burdened, might well turn over to a separate, complementary faculty committee the responsibility for adjudicating differences of opinion in tenure cases. Furthermore, such procedure would not require the Budget Council ever to sit in an appellate capacity on a case already decided upon by itself. (An alternative would be to establish an ad hoc committee for each disputed case. Although this would enable the university to obtain committee members well acquainted with the individual under consideration, probably there is as much to be said for using such an "impartial" panel as the present Faculty Retirement Committee.)

The objection to allowing only tenure-holding faculty to vote to recommend the granting of tenure is, as the Committee understands it, based upon your wise desire to have as democratic departmental procedures as practicable. The Committee, however, feels that instructors, who are not even eligible for tenures, should hardly have a voice in granting to a colleague that for which they are not themselves eligible.

The Committee also recognizes the soundness of your penultimate paragraph, which observes that opinions should be had from all members of small departments, even though few or none of these members hold tenure. In such cases, nevertheless, the Dean, Budget Council and President presently must exercise more discretionary power of choice than they usually do when a large department recommends someone. Certain questions arise here: (1) If, in a small department in which no one holds tenure, a member of Committee A of that department comes up for tenure, should he have a vote regarding himself or not? If he does not vote, and the two remaining members of his Committee A are deadlocked, what then? (2) If only one member of Committee A has tenure, should he alone have power to recommend? The practical answer here would seem to be what has already been stated, that the Dean, Budget Council and President's office will have to exercise extraordinary discretionary power in deciding whether to recommend tenure. (The Committee should add here that it understands that it is not the practice for a member of a Committee A who is being considered for tenure to vote on his own case.)

The Committee, then, has concluded that small departments do and will present special difficulties whether the plan of tenure recommendation now operative is followed, or whether the one herein proposed is adopted. Since under the proposed plan the departmental committee-base would be as wide as seems feasible, and disputed tenure cases would receive treatment analogous to that accorded doubtful retirement cases, the Special Committee recommends that its proposals be accepted.

Respectfully submitted,

Jim Reese
Lawrence Poston
Wyatt Marrs
Stewart Wilcox, Chairman

Special (Hold-over) Committee
on Tenure Recommendations

Senate Action on the Report of the Special Committee on Tenure:

Dr. Wilcox discussed briefly some of the factors which caused the Senate to become interested in the methods of granting tenure. He indicated the procedure by which the above report was developed. Dr. Wilcox moved that the report of the Committee be accepted and that the report be transmitted to President Cross. His motion was approved unanimously.

COMMITTEE ON AGENDA FOR
MEETINGS OF THE GENERAL FACULTY

Explanatory Comment:

At the April, 1952 meeting of the General Faculty, President Cross stated that he believed it would be well to organize an Agenda Committee to be charged with the responsibility for the preparation of agenda for all meetings of the General Faculty.

In accordance with the suggestion by President Cross, Dr. Wilcox prepared a statement for the Agenda of the January 26, 1953 meeting of the University Senate. His statement follows:

The Chairman of the University Senate

Dear Dr. Browder:

At the last meeting of the General Faculty, President Cross suggested that a Committee on Agenda be appointed. The function of this committee would be to present topics and problems for discussion by the President, or other appropriate administrative officer or member of the General Faculty, at its meetings.

Since the powers of the University Senate are delegated to it by the General Faculty, it would, I believe, be sensible for the Senate to consider electing or appointing a temporary Committee on Agenda to function prior to the next General Faculty meeting.

It might also be wise for the Senate to consider suggesting to the General Faculty how the Committee on Agenda can be made into a permanent committee, what its size should be, how its members should be appointed or elected, etc.

Respectfully yours,

Stewart C. Wilcox

Senate Action:

Dr. Wilcox commented briefly on the need for a Committee on Agenda.

Dr. Raines moved that a temporary agenda committee be appointed by the University Senate to act as a program committee for the General Faculty meetings. His motion was seconded.

Following a brief discussion of the elements involved in the motion, Professor Matlock offered a substitute motion that the matter of a Committee on Agenda be referred to the Committee on Committees of the Senate, and that recommendations be prepared for consideration at the next meeting of the General Faculty. The substitute motion was approved by the Senate.

REPORT ON PRE-ENROLMENT PROCEDURES

Explanatory Comment:

At the October 27, 1952 meeting of the Senate some of the problems of pre-enrolment were discussed as they related to faculty-administration relationships. The Senate voted to refer the whole matter of pre-enrolment procedures to the Committee on University Organization, Budget, and Publications for investigation.

Report on Pre-Enrolment: (By the Committee on University Organization, Budget, and Publications)

January 20, 1953

The Committee is of the unanimous opinion that pre-enrolment for beginning students is a vital part of the University's public relations program. It is felt that beginning students arriving at the University for the first time should establish an immediate personal contact. They should be made to feel secure in their individual plans by means of an orderly enrolment procedure, during which they may renew personal acquaintance with representatives of the University who may have met them during high school visits.

However, the Committee feels that from the standpoint of public relations there is no real advantage in pre-enrolling students who have previously enrolled here and have been assigned an adviser. Indeed, the Committee believes that there are many disadvantages. To substantiate this belief, the following facts are presented.

Of the 5,600 enrolment booklets issued in November by the Office of Admissions and Records only 3,900 were returned as completed enrolments. This means that 1,700 booklets (costing approximately \$600) are unaccounted for, and that the 1,700 students involved, who will need to re-enrol, have caused an appreciable loss of time not only to themselves but to their advisers and to personnel in the departmental offices. It should be pointed out that 300 of these 1,700 students completed pre-enrolment with the exception of payment of fees. Many students who attempted pre-enrolment late in the six-weeks period set aside during the first semester of 1952-53 voiced strong disapproval of the plan because they found themselves standing in line at some departmental offices. Many found that more time was required for pre-enrolment than is normally necessary during the regular registration period. In fact, it was learned that a large number of students were absent from their classes in order to complete some phase of pre-enrolment. Furthermore, some advisers have volunteered the information that it was necessary for them to leave laboratory classes in order to re-advise students who were completing their enrolments.

Bitter complaints have been expressed by faculty members who during the six-weeks period of pre-enrolment found that they had no time for personal research and not enough time to prepare for their classes.

Some departments found it necessary to suspend vital work in favor of the pre-enrolment process which was often a full-time project for the office staff.

The Committee wishes to emphasize the fact that every student may call upon his assigned adviser for counsel concerning his enrolment for a succeeding semester, and that this need not be done during any prescribed period. An adviser should have the freedom to counsel with his students in any manner and at any time he finds most effective and convenient.

In view of the foregoing statements, the Committee recommends:

1. That pre-enrolment be available during the summer months for those who will enter the University for the first time in the fall. This is to include not only freshmen but also more advanced students who enter the University for the first time.
2. That pre-enrolment be in effect, as soon as the second-semester class schedule is ready, for all students whose second-semester enrolment constitutes their first matriculation at the University.
3. That pre-enrolment advice and program planning for freshmen be controlled by the University College, and for more advanced students by the respective departmental offices concerned. In case a departmental office is closed, for example, during the month of August, an advanced student may be advised by the Office of the Dean of the College concerned.
4. That assignment to classes for all new matriculants (as prescribed in 1 and 2 above) be conducted by the Office of Admissions and Records.
5. That before the beginning of the regular registration period, a report showing names of matriculants with their class assignments be made by the Office of Admissions and Records to the various departments concerned.
6. That all new matriculants not desiring to pre-enrol and all other students be advised and assigned to classes during the regular registration period immediately prior to the beginning of a semester.

Submitted by,

Committee on Organization, Budget
and Publications

Bavinger, Bell, Herbert, Livezey,
Sears, Springer, and Edmondson, Chairman

The Committee wishes to thank Dean Fellows for information furnished at the request of the Committee.

Senate Action:

Professor Edmondson moved that the report on pre-enrolment be adopted by the Senate. His motion was seconded.

Considerable discussion of the report on pre-enrolment followed the motion for adoption by Professor Edmondson. Dr. Bruce moved that the report be amended so that point number 4 on page 7 would read as follows:

4. That assignment to classes for all new matriculants (as prescribed in 1 and 2 above) be conducted, at the option of the departments concerned, by the Office of Admissions and Records or by the respective departments.

The motion by Dr. Bruce was seconded but failed to pass.

Dean Fellows was called upon for comment regarding point number 4 in the report and suggested that assignment to classes for all new matriculants be conducted by the Office of Admissions and Records under the supervision of the several departments concerned.

Professor Herbert then moved that the report be amended to include the suggestion made by Dean Fellows so that paragraph number 4 would read as follows:

4. That assignment to classes for all new matriculants (as prescribed in 1 and 2 above) be conducted by the Office of Admissions and Records under the supervision of the several departments concerned.

The motion by Professor Herbert was seconded and approved by the Senate.

The Senate then voted approval of the entire report on pre-enrolment with the amendment of paragraph number 4 as indicated above.

LOYALTY OATH

Explanatory Comment:

Dr. Pray commented briefly on the need for Senate action relative to loyalty oaths and presented the following resolution:

We, the University Senate of the University of Oklahoma, resolve that the traditional oath of allegiance which is embodied in the first paragraph alone* of House Bill 503, introduced recently in the 24th Oklahoma Legislature, is admirably phrased and in itself complete; that it is a pledge which any loyal American would freely make and which obviously no disloyal person could attest without perjury; that adherence to this pledge "is the highest loyalty that can be demonstrated by any citizen;" and that the exacting of any other test of loyalty involves the danger of violating the fundamental concepts of freedom which are basic to the traditions of American democracy.

* "I, _____, do solemnly swear (or affirm) that, consistent with my citizenship, I will support, obey and defend the Constitution of the United States and the Constitution of the State of Oklahoma, will not violate any of the provisions thereof, and will discharge the duties of my office or employment with fidelity."

Loyalty Oath Resolution Continued:

We fully recognize the need of protecting the public safety; but we believe experience has amply proved that security is not achieved by test oaths. Rather, the imposition of test oaths, in this state and in others, has caused loss to the public service of numerous able employees of unquestioned loyalty.

The loyalty and devotion of state employees, as of all others, should be judged not by the frequency with which they declare their patriotism, but by the record of their service to the State. If the legislature nevertheless feels that it must require declarations of loyalty from those in the State's service, we again urge that it closely examine any additions to, or qualifications of, the basic oath of unreserved allegiance, to make sure that none can be construed as infringing the very principles of American democracy which our State and Federal Constitutions were designed to safeguard.

Senate Action:

Dr. Pray moved that the above resolution be adopted by the Senate and sent to President Cross to be used as he sees fit in dealing with the Legislature. The motion was seconded and passed by the Senate.

INTERCOLLEGIATE PROGRAM OF ATHLETICS
AT THE UNIVERSITY OF OKLAHOMA

Explanatory Comment:

At the Special Session of the University Senate on January 9, 1953, two resolutions dealing with the athletic program were passed by the Senate. The resolutions were transmitted to President Cross along with a discussion of the athletic situation. The letter which follows indicates that President Cross appreciated the action that was taken by the Senate.

January 13, 1953

Professor Olin Browder
College of Law
Faculty Exchange

Dear Professor Browder:

Thank you very much for your communication of January 9 which contained resolutions and a discussion of the athletic situation at the University of Oklahoma. The entire letter will be submitted to the Regents of the University. I hope that the Regents will give it careful consideration.

Cordially yours,

G. L. Cross
President

GLC:AA

PROBLEM OF CLASS SCHEDULING

Explanatory Comment:

During the discussion of pre-enrolment in the early portion of this meeting, reference was made to the problems that exist because most classes are scheduled on Monday, Wednesday, and Friday of each week. Also, reference was made to the loss of time resulting from not scheduling classes on Saturday morning and having the non-academic staff operating on a 40-hour week. It was pointed out that maximum use and maximum efficiency are not being obtained from University facilities under the present plan of operation.

Senate Action:

Dr. Wardell moved that the proper standing committee consider the possibilities involved in returning to a five and one-half day program and prepare a report on this matter for the Senate. His motion was seconded and approved by the Senate.

Dr. Browder, as Chairman of the Senate, will designate the committee to consider this matter and notify the chairman of that committee.

ADJOURNMENT

The Senate adjourned at 5:55 p.m. The next regular meeting will be Monday, February 23, 1953, at 4:10 p.m. Material for the Agenda should be in the office of the Secretary by Tuesday Afternoon, February 17.

Gerald A. Porter, Secretary

Telephone: Station 308
Office: Room 306, Graduate Education Building