

## JOURNAL OF THE UNIVERSITY SENATE

Regular Session, March 25, 1957, 4:10 P.M.  
 Monnet Hall, Room 101

The University Senate, meeting in regular session, was called to order by the Chairman, Dr. Jim E. Reese.

Present

Bell, Robert E.  
 Benson, Oliver  
 Bowen, Willis  
 Crites, Dennis M.  
 Crook, Kenneth E.  
 Dunham, Lowell  
 Fraser, George B.  
 Hall, Rufus G.  
 Harvey, Harriet  
 Heilman, Arthur  
 Herbert, H. H.  
 Hoy, Harry E.  
 Keeley, Joe  
 Keown, William H.  
 Larsh, Howard W.

Present

Lewis, Eunice  
 Lnenicka, William J.  
 Morris, John W.  
 Neilsen, J. Rud  
 Powell, Lytle  
 Raines, John M.  
 Reese, Jim E.  
 Rice, Leslie H.  
 Riggs, Carl D.  
 Shuman, Ronald B.  
 Smith, William H.  
 Springer, C. E.  
 Turkington, D. Barton  
 Warren, Mary A.

Absent

Clark, Ralph W.  
 Cross, George L.  
 Daron, G. H.  
 Ezell, John S.  
 Feaver, J. Clayton  
 Felton, Jean S.  
 Jorgenson, Lloyd P.  
 Livezey, William E.  
 McGrew, William C.  
 Owings, Donnell M.  
 Plath, Ernest C.  
 Scott, L. V.  
 Vliet, R. Dale  
 Wilcox, Stewart  
 Wurtzbaugh, Jewel

## APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES

The Journal of the Senate for the regular meeting held on February 25, 1957, was approved as distributed to the Faculty.

One correction was noted in the Journal of the Senate for the special session held on March 1, 1957. The correction is as follows: Under Academic Tenure, Page 4, paragraph 3, line 2 -- delete the words "Budget Council" and insert the words "President's Office." With this correction noted, the Journal was approved.

## ACADEMIC TENURE ✓

Explanatory Comment

On March 1, 1957, the University Senate approved and transmitted to President Cross certain recommendations relative to academic tenure. The recommendations were distributed to the Faculty in the Journal of the Senate for March 1. On March 22, 1957, President Cross reported that the University Regents had approved the recommendations from the Senate with but one minor exception. The letter from Vice President McCarter, as presented here, indicates the nature of the one exception.

Academic Tenure - continued

Letter from Vice President McCarter Relative to the Senate Recommendations on Academic Tenure

March 25, 1957

Professor Jim E. Reese, Chairman  
University Senate

The University Regents at their meeting on March 21 approved the Senate's recommendations on "Academic Tenure" with the following revision of Section D, Paragraph 1, on Page 5:

In the absence of defect in procedures, the conclusions and recommendations of the Committee shall be received by the administration and Board of Regents as prima facie evidence regarding the competence and integrity of the faculty member, except when competence or integrity is specifically involved in the charges on which the administration and the Regents must make a final decision.  
(Underscored material was added by the Regents.)

The purpose of this revision is to clarify the point that final jurisdiction on the specific charges must rest with the administration and the Regents. It is assumed that the revision does not change the intent of the Senate's original recommendation.

The policies incorporated in the recommendation will go into effect immediately, except that they will not have ex post facto applications where such applications would mean reopening cases on which decisions have already been reached.

President Cross wishes me to express to the Senate, and especially to the members of its Committee on Personnel, his appreciation for their work on the development of these policy recommendations.

Pete Kyle McCarter

Senate Action

The members of the University Senate, on March 25, agreed that the above change was a clarification and requires no action.

STUDENT REPRESENTATION IN THE UNIVERSITY SENATE ✓  
FACULTY REPRESENTATION IN THE STUDENT SENATE

Explanatory Comment

On February 15, 1957, Rufus G. Hall, Jr. sent a letter to the University Senate requesting consideration of the possibilities in having a representative of the Student Senate sit in University Senate sessions and similarly having a representative of the University Senate attend sessions of the Student Senate. This matter was referred to the Committee on Student and Public Relations when the University Senate met on February 25.

Student-Faculty Representation - continuedReport of the Committee on Student and Public Relations

March 16, 1957

The Committee on Student and Public Relations is aware that some value would be derived by an interchange of senators from the University and Student Senates; however, due to the heavy schedule carried by students and faculty and to the fact that much of the business of the University Senate is not of direct concern to the students, we recommend that the problem of liaison between the University Senate and the Student Senate be resolved by:

1. Urging each committee of the University Senate to invite a member or members of the Student Senate to appear before the committee when the business is of direct concern to the students. The committee members would determine how and when to invite such representation.
2. Inviting a member or members of the Student Senate to appear before the University Senate when deliberations of direct concern to the students are to be discussed. The chairman of the University Senate would determine how and when to invite such representation.

Committee on Student and Public Relations

Willis Bowen  
 Eunice Lewis  
 William McGrew  
 Carl Riggs  
 W. H. Smith  
 Mary Warren  
 Harry E. Hoy, Chairman

Senate Action

Two students, Doug Mathews, President of the Student Senate, and Steve Beckman, Vice President, were present when this matter was introduced for discussion. The University Senate approved a motion by Professor Crook that the students be heard on this matter.

Dr. Hoy, Chairman of the Committee on Student and Public Relations, presented the report provided above and moved its approval by the Senate. His motion was seconded. Considerable discussion of the problem followed with comments from Doug Mathews and various members of the Senate. The motion to approve the report of the Committee was then passed by the Senate.

JUNIOR ENGLISH EXAMINATION AND ENGLISH "J"

Letter from President of the Student Senate

March 5, 1957

Dr. Jim E. Reese, President  
University Senate  
Department of Economics  
Faculty Exchange

Dear Dr. Reese:

For some time, the Student Senate has been receiving student criticisms and suggestions about the Junior English Examination and the English "J" course. We referred these to our Academic Affairs Committee, which made an investigation of the situation. The enclosed resolution was passed by the Student Senate on Thursday, February 28, 1957, and represents the conclusions of this committee. It includes the problems which the committee found, and the recommendations of the Student Senate as to improvement of the examination and course.

The Student Senate is in complete agreement with the purpose of the Junior English Examination and the English "J" course, and we believe the student body realizes their value to a University education. It is certainly not our desire to lower the academic standards of the University of Oklahoma. It is rather our purpose to point out what seem to be some problems that are presently existing, and some recommendations for possible solutions to these problems.

I am writing you, Dr. Reese, to request that this resolution be considered for action by the University Senate. If I or the Student Senate can be of any help on this matter, please let me know. We desire to work with the University Senate toward the improvement of both the Junior English Examination and the English "J" course.

Sincerely,

Doug Mathews, President  
Student Senate

DM/jm

Enclosure

Student Senate Bill No. 1957

A RESOLUTION RECOMMENDING CHANGES IN THE JUNIOR  
ENGLISH EXAMINATION AND ENGLISH "J"

Whereas: The Student Senate of the University of Oklahoma desires that a high standard of education be maintained at the University; and

Whereas: The Student Senate is in full agreement with the stated purposes of the Junior English Examination and English "J" course. This purpose is to ensure that the graduates of the University of Oklahoma have a working knowledge of English, including the ability to express themselves; and

Junior English Examination and English "J" -- continued

- Whereas: The fullest benefit from the Junior English Examination and the English "J" course is not being gained because of the present system; and
- Whereas: Among the shortcomings is the need for a uniform standard and more objective scoring system; and
- Whereas: One theme or essay is seldom sufficient to indicate the proficiency of a student in the English language to the same degree that two semesters study and work would reveal; and
- Whereas: Exempting those students who made a B or better in both beginning English courses from taking the English "J" Examination would be excusing those who have proven that they have a sound basic knowledge and usage of the English language; and
- Whereas: The type of examination frequently is such that no uniform standard or objective scoring system is possible; and
- Whereas: It is estimated that nearly fifty (50%) per cent of those taking the English "J" Examination do not pass; and
- Whereas: Such figures lead us to believe that either the two beginning courses in English are inadequate or that the method of scoring these examinations is at fault; and
- Whereas: This action would lessen the number required to take the examination and thus provide more space and also more time for grading the papers of the remaining students; and
- Whereas: The space provided for administering the examination is frequently inadequate to seat all those students who desire to take the examination; and
- Whereas: Those students who might actually need to take the course in English "J" would still be examined; and
- Whereas: Questions have arisen from many students enrolled in the course as to the value received from the material presented in this course; therefore be it

Resolved, That the Student Senate recommends to the University Senate and the Department of English of the University of Oklahoma that they consider the following possible improvements in the use of the Junior English Examination and course:

- (1) That all students who receive a grade of B or better in each of the beginning English courses be exempt from taking the Junior English examination.
- (2) A method for obtaining a more uniform and objective scoring of the examination be established.

Junior English Examination and English "J" -- continued

- (3) Topics of general knowledge and interest be chosen for discussion on the test.
- (4) Adequate space be provided for administering the examination to all those that are required to take it each semester.
- (5) An overall evaluation be given to the material presented in the English "J" course.

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be sent to the University Senate and to the Chairman of the English Department, and that the President of the Student Senate be instructed to write a letter of explanation to accompany those resolutions.

Submitted on motion by Puddin Sarazan  
Motion Seconded by Bill Carr  
Passed by the Student Senate on  
February 28, 1957

Senate Action

Dr. Hall made a motion to refer the problem of the Junior English Examination and English "J" to the proper committee of the University Senate. His motion was seconded.

Following some discussion, Professor Fraser made a substitute motion that the problem be referred to the Council on Instruction and that the recommendations of that group be transmitted to the various colleges in the University. His motion was seconded but failed to pass.

After additional discussion, Dr. Shuman moved that the matter be referred back to the Student Senate with the suggestion that that body deal directly with the Department of English in any further consideration of the problems involved. His motion was seconded and approved by the University Senate.

## ACADEMIC TENURE ✓

Letter from Stewart C. Wilcox

March 12, 1957

Dr. Gerald A. Porter, Secretary  
 University Senate  
 Faculty Exchange

Dear Professor Porter:

The following suggestions for action in academic freedom cases involving faculty members not on tenure are submitted to the Senate for its consideration. If found acceptable, these procedures would become point E under the plan for handling charges as set forth in the document entitled Academic Tenure which was accepted at the last special meeting of the Senate. The references to sections "A" (point 3 below) and to "B", "C", and "D" (point 6 below) are likewise to the appropriate parts of this document.

Sincerely yours,

Stewart C. Wilcox

E. Action in Non-Tenure Academic Freedom Cases

1. If the faculty member on probation believes that improper considerations have unmistakably affected the decision not to retain him, he shall determine whether he can assemble adequate proof in support of his contention.
2. The faculty member shall decide whether he is willing to hazard the disclosure of professional weaknesses he may have displayed at an early point in his career.
3. If his decisions under points 1 and 2 are positive, he shall request an opportunity for informal conciliation as set forth in section "A" above.
4. If such informal conciliation is denied or is unsuccessful, he may then request a formal hearing and submit a written waiver of the traditional right of faculty members on probation not to disclose the grounds upon which they have been released.
5. This request for a formal hearing will be granted or refused by the University Senate Committee on Faculty Personnel.
6. If a hearing is granted, the procedure set forth above in sections "B", "C", and "D" shall be used for adjudication.

Senate Action

Dr. Crook moved that the suggestions be referred to the Committee on Personnel and the motion was seconded. During the discussion it was brought out that the Personnel Committee had already considered the suggestion and decided against including the suggestions in its recommendations. Dr. Crook then withdrew his motion.

Dr. Hall moved that the Senate uphold the decision of the committee. This motion was seconded and passed.

## CAMPUS TRAFFIC ✓

Explanatory Comment

At the October 29, 1956, meeting of the University Senate, Dr. Larsh raised for discussion the problem of automobile traffic on the campus of the University. The matter was referred to the Committee on Student and Public Relations.

In a letter to the Senate on January 8, 1957, Dr. Doerr raised several questions relative to campus pedestrian traffic and campus grounds maintenance. This matter was also referred to the Committee on Student and Public Relations.

On March 16, 1957, the Committee on Student and Public Relations submitted two separate reports relative to these problems. They are presented here:

Report of the Committee on Student and Public Relations Relative to Vehicular Traffic and Parking on Campus

March 16, 1957

The Committee on Student and Public Relations of the Faculty Senate met in eight sessions to study the traffic and parking problems on the University of Oklahoma campus. Listed below are activities of the Committee:

1. Previous studies on the automobile problem were examined and discussed.
2. Lee Rodgers, Institute of Community Development and Richard Kuhlmen, University Architect, were invited and came to one session to discuss studies and plans already underway.
3. Correspondence was exchanged with representatives of the Faculty Council of Oklahoma A. and M. College regarding problems common to both campuses. A member of a committee comparable to this committee offered to meet with us and was invited to do so but the joint meeting did not take place.
4. Two members of the Student Senate, who were members of committees dealing with the student car problem, were invited and came to one meeting to contribute the thinking and results of their activities.

The Committee discussed the possibilities of recommending a no-car rule at the University as well as a no-car rule for Freshmen. It was recognized by all that a no-car rule would solve the traffic problems but a majority declined to recommend such a drastic solution.

The following recommendations are made:

1. That no student should drive an automobile on campus from 7:30 A.M. to 5:00 P.M. Monday through Friday and from 7:30 A.M. to 12:30 P.M. on Saturday. This recommendation should not apply until new peripheral parking space is provided.
2. That additional peripheral self-liquidating parking facilities be constructed, e.g. College Street and Old Golf course north of Jefferson House.



Campus Traffic - continued

3. That experiments be immediately initiated to close certain streets or portions thereof for a period of 30 days or more to determine the desirability of restricted street use. E Brooks Street in front of the Library is a particularly hazardous crossing and might be the first segment to be closed.
4. That the Institute of Community Development in cooperation with the Physical Plant and Safety Office study the overall traffic problem on campus and peripheral streets.
5. That the University take a more active part in the City's development of a system of arterial streets that serve the University.
6. That staff parking lots be made tow-in lots, and that student cars, illegally parked, be moved to a suitable place on North Campus and an appropriate charge be made to recover the automobile.
7. That the fine for failure to register student automobiles be increased.
8. That the basis for granting student parking permits for disability be re-examined with special emphasis on the relationship of disability to walking.
9. That the basis for granting staff permits be re-studied with a view to granting priority to full-time permanent academic and administrative personnel ahead of temporary or part-time personnel.

## Committee on Student and Public Relations

Willis Bowen	W. H. Smith
Eunice Lewis	Mary Warren
William McGrew	Harry E. Hoy, Chairman
Carl Riggs	

Report of Committee on Student and Public Relations Relative to Campus Pedestrian Traffic and Campus Grounds Maintenance (Doerr Letter)

March 16, 1957

The Committee is aware of the Physical Plants measures under a new landscape architect to improve the appearance of the campus by the addition of walks and strategically placed brambly hedges and we urge that this be continued, especially the construction of additional walks where heavy traffic indicates need.

We also recommend that the matter of the campus appearance be referred to the Student Senate for their recommendations on methods of improvements.

## Committee on Student and Public Relations

Willis Bowen	W. H. Smith
Eunice Lewis	Mary Warren
William McGrew	Harry E. Hoy, Chairman
Carl Riggs	

Campus Traffic -- continuedSenate Action

The report of the Committee on Student and Public Relations relative to vehicular traffic and parking on campus was presented by Dr. Hoy, Chairman of the Committee. He moved that the report be approved by the University Senate. His motion was seconded.

Following a lengthy discussion, Dr. Harvey moved that recommendation number "1" in the report be amended to read as follows:

1. That no student should drive an automobile on campus from 7:30 A.M. to 5:00 P.M. Monday through Friday and from 7:30 A.M. to 12:30 P.M. on Saturday. This recommendation shall apply as soon as new peripheral parking areas are constructed (for example, College Avenue and Old Golf Course) and, in any event, not later than September, 1958.

The motion to amend recommendation number "1" was seconded and passed by the University Senate.

Dr. Hall moved that recommendation number "2" be deleted and that the remaining recommendations be renumbered accordingly. His motion was seconded and passed.

The original motion by Dr. Hoy for approval of the entire report was voted upon and passed by the Senate. Thus, the report was approved with the amendments noted on this page.

Following approval of the report on vehicular traffic, Dr. Benson made a motion that the University Senate recommend to President Cross that the University Council on Planning and Development be assigned the additional duty of recommending adequate rules and regulations applicable to vehicular traffic on campus and to the issuance of permits for parking. The motion was seconded and approved by the Senate.

\*\*\*\*\*

To complete the consideration of the problem of campus traffic, Dr. Hoy presented the report of his committee relative to campus pedestrian traffic and campus grounds maintenance (see bottom of page 9). Dr. Hoy moved the adoption of the report. His motion was seconded and approved by the Senate.

REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE ON COMMITTEES ✓

Explanatory Comment

Each year, at the regular Senate meeting in March, the Committee on Committees submits nominations for University committees which will be appointed by President Cross. The Senate then considers the nominations, may make additional nominations from the floor, and at the regular meeting in April approves the list of nominations to be submitted.

Report of the Committee on Committees - continuedSenate Action

Professor George Fraser, Chairman of the Committee on Committees, presented the list of nominations prepared by the Committee. The University Senate accepted the nominations made by the Committee on Committees and one additional nomination was made from the floor of the Senate. The final list of nominations will be approved by the Senate at its regular session on April 29 and then will be submitted to President Cross so that he can make specific appointments to the various University committees.

## SELF-STUDY SURVEY OF THE UNIVERSITY ✓

Explanatory Comment

For several months the Senate Committee on University Organization, Budget, and Publications has been considering several recommendations made by the ad hoc Coordinating Committee on Self-Evaluation. On January 15, 1957, the Senate Committee filed a report for consideration at the January meeting of the Senate. Prior to that meeting, however, additional information was gained and Dean Clark, Chairman of the Committee on University Organization, Budget, and Publications requested that consideration of the report be postponed.

On March 20, 1957, the Committee on University Organization, Budget, and Publications filed a second report to supersede the one presented in January. The second report is presented here:

Report of the Committee on University Organization, Budget, and Publications

March 20, 1957

The work of the Coordinating Committee on Self-Evaluation has been very valuable, and the members of the Committee are to be commended for devoting so many hours to this work.

Since self-evaluation is so important, it should be continued, but within the framework of existing University organizations and, primarily, by the Council on Instruction. This duty has already been assigned to the Council on Instruction, since it is charged with the duty of making "recommendations to appropriate University authorities concerning any matters dealing with educational policies of the University." See Faculty Handbook p. 10. Apparently the Council has become bogged down with details. It should be freed of these so that it may spend more time on major policy problems. For instance, requests for the change of name or the number of a course should not be sent to it.

Although it is believed that the University cannot afford a large technical staff, personnel to collect data needed for the evaluation of the instructional policies of the University should be made available to the President's office.

Self-Study Survey of the University - continued

Therefore, it is recommended that:

1. Self-Evaluation be continued by existing University organizations.
2. The functions and procedures of the Council on Instruction be amended to read as follows:
  - I. The Council shall evaluate the educational policies of the University and plan the future instructional development of the University. It shall make recommendations to the appropriate University authorities concerning any matters dealing with the educational policies of the University, including the establishment or abolition of colleges, schools, departments, curricula, courses, and degrees.
  - II. The Council shall encourage and assist the various colleges, schools and departments to evaluate the effectiveness of their instructional programs.
  - III. All proposals *initiated by departments* for the establishment of, the abolition of and changes in curricula, for new courses, for a change in the subject matter of a course and for an increase in the hours of a course must be submitted to the Council for its approval, disapproval or modification. Before submission to the Council, such proposals must be approved by the appropriate committee of the departments or schools in which they originate, and of the colleges in which they will be taught. Graduate courses must also be approved by the appropriate committee of the Graduate College.

The Council may appoint subcommittees and it may recommend that the President appoint temporary committees to consider specific problems.

The Council shall request information from administrative officers where necessary to aid in its evaluation of the educational policies of the University.

3. ~~When the budget permits,~~ provisions shall be made for the addition of an administrative assistant in the President's Office whose duties shall include collecting data needed for self-evaluation as related to educational policies.

*provided to the Council on instruction*  
Respectfully submitted, *by*

Ralph W. Clark, Chairman  
Committee on University Organization,  
Budget, and Publications

Senate Action

In the absence of Dean Clark, the foregoing report was presented to the Senate by Professor Fraser. He then moved that recommendation number "3" of the report be approved by the Senate. The motion was seconded.

Self-Study Survey of the University - continued

Following some discussion, Dr. Keown offered a substitute motion that the entire matter be deferred until a subsequent meeting of the Senate and that the University Council on Instruction be requested to express its views on this problem. The substitute motion was seconded and approved by the Senate.

ADJOURNMENT

The University Senate adjourned at 6:05 p.m. The next regular meeting will be held on Monday, April 29, 1957, at 4:10 p.m. Material for the agenda should be in the office of the Secretary by Monday, April 22.

Gerald A. Porter, Secretary

Administrative and Financial

Following some discussion, the Board of Directors of the University of California, Berkeley, has decided to continue the present practice of having the Board of Regents of the University of California, Berkeley, to review the financial statements of the University of California, Berkeley, and to report thereon to the Board of Regents of the University of California, Berkeley.

Administrative

The University of California, Berkeley, has decided to continue the present practice of having the Board of Regents of the University of California, Berkeley, to review the financial statements of the University of California, Berkeley, and to report thereon to the Board of Regents of the University of California, Berkeley.

Very truly yours,  
[Signature]