

JOURNAL OF THE UNIVERSITY SENATE

Regular Session, January 27, 1958, 4:10 P.M.  
Monnet Hall, Room 101

The University Senate, meeting in regular session, was called to order by Dr. Arthur W. Heilman. (Dr. Rufus G. Hall, Jr., Chairman of the University Senate was absent.)

Present

Almquist, C. T.  
Bandy, William R.  
Bell, Robert E.  
Brinker, Paul A.  
Brixey, John C.  
Clark, Ralph  
Coffman, Stanley K.  
Crites, Dennis M.  
Dunham, Lowell  
Elconin, Victor A.  
Fell, Ruth D.  
Harvey, Harriet  
Heilman, Arthur W.

Present

Herbert, H. H.  
Livezey, William E.  
Morris, John W.  
Owings, D. M.  
Pool, Richard B.  
Foston, Lawrence S., Jr.  
Raines, John M.  
Reese, Jim E.  
Rice, Leslie H.  
Roller, Duane H.  
Rupiper, Omer J.  
Schultz, E. J.

Absent

Benson, Oliver  
Cass, Carl B.  
Colmore, John P.  
Cross, George L.  
Ezell, John S.  
Felton, Jean S.  
Hall, Rufus G., Jr.  
Larsen, Earl G.  
Larsh, Howard W.  
McGrew, William C.  
Mouck, Fred A.  
Nielsen, J. Rud  
Plath, Ernest C.  
Riggs, Carl D.  
Shuman, Ronald B.  
Smith, William H.  
Turkington, D. Barton  
Warren, Mary A.  
Wilcox, Stewart C.

APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES

The Journal of the University Senate for the regular meeting on November 25, 1957, was approved.

SELF-STUDY SURVEY OF THE UNIVERSITY

On December 26, 1957, Vice President McCarter submitted a statement to the University Senate as follows:

"When the Senate on May 27, 1957, adopted its revised statement concerning the functions and procedures of the Council on Instruction, the statements formerly appearing as Procedures, I and IV (Faculty Handbook, p.11) were omitted. Were these omissions intentional?"

Following a brief discussion of this matter, Dean Clark moved that consideration of Procedures I and IV be referred back to the Committee on University Organization, Budget, and Publications for clarification. Further, that the Committee study the effect of present procedures of the Council on Instruction as related to the regulations of accrediting boards of the respective professional colleges of the University. His motion was seconded and passed by the Senate.

NOISE INTERFERING WITH INSTRUCTION

Explanatory Comment

The problem of noise interfering with instruction was raised for consideration at the May 27, 1957, session of the University Senate. It was referred to a committee for consideration and a report.

Report of the Committee on Courses and Curricula

November 22, 1957

At the regular session of the University Senate on May 27, 1957, the problem of noise interfering with classwork and instruction was brought before the Senate. A motion was passed that the matter be referred to the appropriate committee for study and report. The problem was referred to the Committee on Courses and Curricula.

This Committee has met and discussed the matter with Mr. John H. Kuhlman, Director of Physical Plant and Mr. Lendon E. Hunt, Assistant Director of Physical Plant.

According to Mr. Kuhlman and Mr. Hunt, the administration of Physical Plant is aware of the possibility that its activities may interfere with instruction and is taking constant precautions to reduce distracting noise to a minimum. Construction noises are diminished by doing as much work as is possible after regular class hours. Hand labor and hand tools are frequently used to avoid noise made by construction machinery. Before a major reconstruction project is begun in a building, the chairman of the department requesting the work is consulted and is advised that unavoidable noise will accompany the work.

Mr. Kuhlman and Mr. Hunt are aware that one of the large, tractor-type mowers creates an excessive amount of noise. Plans have been made to reduce interference with classes by using hand mowers near class buildings. Clipping hedges by hand is prohibitively expensive and the only way to abolish noise from power hedge clippers is to reduce the number of hedges.

Mr. Kuhlman suggested that faculty members who are bothered by noise arising from Physical Plant activities should inform him of their complaints through their departmental chairmen.

The Committee on Courses and Curricula feels that Mr. Kuhlman and Mr. Hunt are cognizant of the general problem, that they realize their responsibilities toward an institution largely devoted to teaching, that they are taking reasonable steps to prevent or reduce undue construction and maintenance noise, and that their attitude of complete cooperation will insure prompt investigation of specific complaints reported to them by departmental chairmen.

|                          |                  |
|--------------------------|------------------|
| Stanley Coffman          | Fred A. Mouck    |
| Rufus Hall               | E. J. Schultz    |
| Jean S. Felton           | D. B. Turkington |
| Harriet Harvey, Chairman |                  |

Noise Interfering With Instruction -- continued

Senate Action

Dr. Harvey, Chairman of the Committee on Courses and Curricula, commented relative to the report and emphasized that the Committee believed that steps were being taken to prevent or reduce unnecessary noise on campus and that the Committee had no specific recommendations at the present time.

Dr. Reese moved that the Senate accept the report of the Committee on Courses and Curricula. His motion was seconded and passed by the Senate.

DEPARTMENTAL ADMINISTRATION

At the October 28, 1957, session of the Senate, Dr. Brixey raised for consideration by the University Senate certain questions concerning Section 5 under Departmental Administration on page 3 of the University of Oklahoma Faculty Handbook. He pointed up the problem that exists when the number of members of a department holding the rank of instructor exceed the number holding professorial ranks. The matter was referred to committee.

Report of the Committee on Faculty Personnel

January 6, 1958

The matter of having instructors vote within departmental units was referred to the Committee on Faculty Personnel of the University Senate for perusal. In contacting members of various departments informally, it was found that almost all departments had few instructors on their staffs, so that the question of instructor voting presented no problem. Also, in view of the fact that withholding voting privileges would go counter to the democratic principle, this committee reaffirms that instructors should retain voting privileges.

We do recommend, though, that the statement on voting in the Faculty Handbook should be clarified. At the present time Item 5 on page 3 states:

"It shall be the responsibility of the teaching staff of each department, including all those members with the rank of instructor or higher, to determine policies and procedures for carrying on the work of the department, subject to the following provisions."

We suggest that Item 5 be amended to read as follows:

"It shall be the responsibility of the teaching staff of each department to determine policies and procedures for carrying on the work of the department. The teaching staff shall include all those members with the rank of instructor or higher, but shall exclude temporary appointees. The titles of Visiting Professor, Visiting Associate Professor, Visiting Assistant Professor, Visiting Lecturer, and Special Instructor shall be used to designate temporary appointees. Any instructor working on an advanced

Departmental Administration -- continued

degree in his own department shall be given the title of Special Instructor. Departmental policies and procedures shall be subject to the following provisions:"

COMMITTEE ON FACULTY PERSONNEL

Jim E. Reese            O. J. Rupiper  
Leslie Rice            Stewart Wilcox  
Victor Elconin        John Morris  
Paul A. Brinker, Chairman

Senate Action

Dr. Brinker commented on the foregoing report and moved that the University Senate submit to President Cross the recommendation that Item 5 on page 3 of the Faculty Handbook be changed. His motion was seconded.

Following a brief discussion, Dr. Raines offered a motion to amend the revised Item 5 by inserting a sentence between the third and fourth sentences as follows:

"Visiting personnel with professorial rank, however, may at the discretion of the department be given voting privileges."

His motion was seconded and passed.

The original motion by Dr. Brinker was then voted upon and the Senate approved the revision of Item 5 with the amendment included. The recommendation to President Cross, thus approved by the Senate, reads in its entirety as follows:

"It shall be the responsibility of the teaching staff of each department to determine policies and procedures for carrying on the work of the department. The teaching staff shall include all those members with the rank of instructor or higher, but shall exclude temporary appointees. The title of Visiting Professor, Visiting Associate Professor, Visiting Assistant Professor, Visiting Lecturer, and Special Instructor shall be used to designate temporary appointees. Visiting personnel with professorial rank, however, may at the discretion of the department be given voting privileges. Any instructor working on an advanced degree in his own department shall be given the title of Special Instructor. Departmental policies and procedures shall be subject to the following provisions:"

NOMINATIONS FOR REPLACEMENTS ON BUDGET COUNCIL

Explanatory Comment

President Cross recently requested that the University Senate send him nominations for two replacements on the Budget Council. Dr. Lawrence Poston, Jr., will be on leave during the second semester of 1957-58 and Dr. Robert Bell has resigned from the Council.

Nominations for Replacements On Budget Council -- continued


Senate Action

In accordance with the procedure for handling nominations, Dr. Harvey, Chairman of the Senate Committee on Committees, presented the following nominations as offered by that Committee:

Replacement for Dr. Lawrence Poston, Jr., (1955-58 term) -- Kenneth E. Crook  
Lewis E. Winfrey

Replacement for Dr. Robert Bell (1957-60) -- Paul G. Ruggiers  
D. Barton Turkington

No additional nominations were made from the floor of the Senate. Dr. Morris moved that the nominations offered by the Committee on Committees be approved by the Senate and submitted to President Cross. His motion was seconded and passed.

SABBATICAL LEAVE 

Explanatory Comment

In May of 1957, the University Senate recommended a revised policy concerning sabbatical leaves. The recommendation was held without action in the President's Office because it appeared that a few new questions were raised and other questions of policy were not clear.

On October 10, 1957, President Cross returned the recommended revised policy to the Senate and requested clarification of a number of specific points. At the October, 1957, meeting of the Senate, the matter was referred to the Committee on Faculty Personnel for further study.

Report of the Committee on Faculty Personnel

January 14, 1958

Sabbatical Leave

I. Sabbatical leave at half pay.

- A. Leave of absence on half pay, for a period not to exceed two semesters, may be granted by the President of the University, with the approval of the Regents of the University, to any tenure holding faculty member who has completed at least six years of service as teacher in the University, provided that the time shall be given to study and travel approved by the President.

The term "six years of service" refers to teaching duties performed while in the employ of the University of Oklahoma. Temporarily such service could be part-time teaching or even involve no teaching provided that the work performed was in the nature of a service for the University.

Sabbatical Leave -- continued

Since extending the length of the sabbatical to include summer sessions would involve many complicated administrative problems, the sabbatical shall be limited to the fall and spring semesters and shall not be extended to summer.

If the person applying for a sabbatical leave will receive a stipend for the same period from another institution or agency, he may still receive a sabbatical provided that it appears to the proper authorities that it is in the best interest of the University and will be needed to prevent financial loss to the person obtaining the sabbatical.

Only in exceptional cases shall the University grant a sabbatical for the purpose of pursuing work toward a graduate degree. Normally the sabbatical shall not be used for the purpose of pursuing further graduate work.

Each sabbatical leave shall be judged on the merits of the individual case. A person receiving an appointment from abroad shall be given neither more nor less consideration than one receiving an appointment in the United States. Financial loss shall be considered both for appointments abroad and in the United States.

- B. The procedures to be used in the applying for and granting of sabbatical leaves at half pay shall be as follows:
1. The faculty member shall apply to his department's Committee A for a sabbatical leave. After recommending approval or disapproval, the department shall submit his application to his dean, who shall refer it with or without recommendation to the Office of the President. This Office shall refer the application to the Budget Council before taking final action.
  2. If the recommendation of the Budget Council and the Office of the President is favorable, and if the Board of Regents approves the recommendation, the Office of the President shall formally notify the faculty member to that effect.

## II. Research sabbatical at full pay.

- A. Leave of absence on full pay, for a period not to exceed one semester, may be granted by the President, with the approval of the Regents, to any teacher above the rank of instructor who has completed at least six years of service as teacher in the University, provided that the time be given to research approved by the President. At least two research sabbaticals shall be available for granting each semester.
- B. The procedures to be used in the applying for and granting of research sabbatical leaves shall be as follows:
1. The faculty member shall apply to his department's Committee A for a sabbatical leave. The faculty member shall forward to Committee A a prospectus and resume of research already sufficiently underway to

Sabbatical Leave -- continued

enable the Committee to appraise its merits in comparison with other applications submitted. After recommending approval or disapproval, in order of priority if necessary, the department shall submit his application(s) to his dean, who shall refer it with or without recommendation to the Faculty Research Committee. This Committee shall screen all applications for a research sabbatical, and shall select at least two each semester to be recommended to the Office of the President.

2. If the recommendation of the Office of the President is favorable, and if the Board of Regents approves the recommendation, the Office of the President shall formally notify the Budget Council and the faculty member to that effect.

III. Although instructors shall not be eligible for sabbatical leaves of absence, their years of service to the University at the rank of instructor may be counted toward the six years of service necessary to make them eligible for such leave after they have received tenure.

IV. In place of the bond, which is now required, the recipient shall sign a statement that he will return to the University for one year following receipt of the sabbatical. If this proposal is unacceptable, then we recommend that the applicant sign a surety bond for one year.

-----

Our committee was asked to ascertain the costs of the new sabbatical program. We feel that it would be impossible to ascertain the cost of financing sabbaticals. Some departments might adjust to the loss of a professor simply by scheduling fewer classes. In this particular case, the research sabbatical would not cost any additional money. Some departments might hire graduate assistants as replacements. In such a case the cost would be considerably less than hiring a replacement of higher rank. Also the cost would vary depending on the rank of the person receiving the sabbatical. In view of the above uncertainties, we feel that no monetary estimate could be placed on sabbaticals. We would assume that the University could carry the cost of our modest request of two research sabbaticals a semester.

Committee on Faculty Personnel

Jim E. Reese      O. J. Rupiper  
Leslie Rice      Stewart Wilcox  
Victor Elconin    John Morris  
Paul A. Brinker, Chairman

Senate Action

Dr. Brinker, Chairman of the Committee on Faculty Personnel, commented relative to the foregoing report and emphasized that the original recommendations made in May, 1957, had been completely rewritten. He moved that the committee report be approved by the Senate. His motion was seconded.

Sabbatical Leave -- continued

Following some discussion of this matter, Dr. Owings moved to amend the report by striking the last sentence of the fifth paragraph of Item I-A. The sentence to be omitted reads:

"Normally the sabbatical shall not be used for the purpose of pursuing further graduate work."

The motion by Dr. Owings was seconded and approved by the Senate.

The original motion by Dr. Brinker, for approval of the report of the Committee on Faculty Personnel, was then passed by the Senate.

RELATIONSHIP OF THE BUDGET COUNCIL TO THE UNIVERSITY SENATE ✓

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

January 15, 1958

At the Senate meeting on May 27th, the Chairman of the Senate referred to this Committee the task of "studying the relationship between the Budget Council and the University Senate." The motion to study this matter stated the belief that "the Budget Council has taken action that appears to be in the realm of the prerogatives of the University Senate."

In September, 1948, President Cross proposed to the University Senate certain changes in the University budget committee system which had been established in 1945. One of these changes proposed the creation of the "University Budget Council." The Senate approved the changes on September 27, 1948 and approved in March of 1953 certain amendments regarding ex officio members of the Council. According to these Senate-approved measures, the principal functions of the Council are to conduct "hearings at which every budget unit...has an opportunity to present orally the merits of its annual budget request," and to make "final recommendations to the President." The hearings they conduct are to cover: "(a) salaries and wages, (b) maintenance, (c) books, (d) equipment, (e) merit raises and promotions, and (f) tenure recommendations." The Senate-approved measure also describes the mechanics of budget preparation and concludes with the provision that "the final budget recommendations" presented to the President are to show on one sheet the recommendations not only of the Council but also of the departmental budget committee and of the appropriate deans. Members of the Council are selected from nominees proposed and voted upon by the University Senate.

Your Committee on Organization, Budget, and Publications has studied carefully the activities of the Budget Council with particular attention to certain actions which appear to be of special interest to the Senate. Practically all of these actions, even where they appear to involve broad policy decisions in which the Senate would be interested, are basically procedural arrangements adopted by the Budget Council to facilitate completion of the tremendous task which annually



Relationship of the Budget Council to the University Senate -- continued

confronts that body. These arrangements are apparently adopted to meet the particular circumstances confronting the Council during a given budget year, are considered carefully, and are often discussed at great length before being adopted. Furthermore, they are sometimes changed and perhaps changed again as the financial assumptions on which they are based undergo alteration. If any attempt were made by the Senate to duplicate the Council's study of these arrangements, the delay and additional work involved would in all likelihood preclude completion of the Council's task. There is also considerable question as to whether the Senate could make as sound a decision, on any given point, without duplicating the study and debate given it by the Budget Council, as the Council can make itself. This is especially true in view of the need for background data and material on related budget units which are considered by the Council.

The Budget Council itself often hears protests to its policies and, where deemed reasonable, makes changes or exceptions. Requests made by the Budget Council for Senate review of the criteria for merit raises and promotions indicate the Council's recognition of Senate responsibility for long-term policy decisions. Also, the removal for this year of the salary ceiling on faculty members who are "out-of-step" with their rank and years of service gives further evidence of the Council's reflection of faculty suggestions and attitudes. In addition, any faculty member has the right to ask the Senate to study or review any specific procedure or policy of the Budget Council at any time.

In short, your Committee on University Organization, Budget, and Publications feels that the present relationship between the University Senate and the University Budget Council is efficient and satisfactory and has no recommendations for change or additional action at this time.

Committee on University Organization, Budget,  
and Publications

Ralph Clark                      C. T. Almquist  
H. H. Herbert                     Lawrence Poston  
William E. Livezey               Robert Bell  
   Dennis Crites, Chairman

Senate Action

Following some discussion of the foregoing report, relative to the relationship between the Budget Council and the University Senate, Dr. Poston moved that the report be accepted by the Senate and published in this Journal. His motion was seconded and approved.

Thus, no formal action or recommendations are suggested by the University Senate.

RE-EVALUATION OF CREDIT IN MILITARY COURSES ✓  
and  
RE-EVALUATION OF COURSES IN PHYSICAL EDUCATION

Explanatory Comment

On September 30, 1957, Vice President McCarter requested the Senate to consider re-evaluation of elements in the offering of military and physical education courses. The problem was referred to the Committee on Courses and Curricula.

On October 28, 1957, the Senate considered a resolution from the Student Senate relative to Non-Compulsory R. O. T. C. The resolution was then referred to the Committee on Courses and Curricula.

On January 16, 1958, Vice President McCarter sent a statement to the University Senate with reference to changes in the general catalog which would affect the offering of military courses. That statement is reproduced below:

Statement from Vice President McCarter

January 16, 1958

The University Committee on Military Training has recommended the following changes in the general catalog:

General Catalog, Page 24, Paragraph 9 (b)

The University gives credit for satisfactory military service as follows: for six months to one full year of military service (including the completion of basic or recruit training) credit for the two freshman courses in Military Science; for more than one full year of military service (including the completion of basic or recruit training) credit for the two freshman and the two sophomore courses in Military Science. The recording of this credit on the student's academic record is not automatic; it is the student's responsibility to get in touch with the Office of Admissions and Records if he wishes the credit recorded.

General Catalog, Page 32, Paragraph 3

**MILITARY SERVICE:** Students who present evidence of having served in the armed forces may receive credit in basic military science as specified on Page 24, Paragraph 9 (b) of this bulletin. Such students will be excused from that portion of the basic requirement for which they receive credit. This credit, however, does not necessarily admit a veteran to advanced courses in military training.

I am transmitting these recommendations to the University Senate for its consideration and recommendation to the President.

PKMcC:ld

Re-Evaluation of Military Credit -- continued

Senate Action

The foregoing statement from Vice President McCarter was read by the Chairman of the University Senate.

Dr. Dunham moved that it be referred to the Committee on Courses and Curricula for consideration along with other data being accumulated in the procedure for studying the overall problem of re-evaluation. His motion was seconded and passed.

ADJOURNMENT

The University Senate adjourned at 5:03 p.m. The next regular meeting will be held on Monday, February 24, 1958, at 4:10 p.m. Material for the agenda should be in the Office of the Secretary of the Senate by Friday, February 14.

Gerald A. Porter, Secretary

