

JOURNAL OF THE UNIVERSITY SENATE

Regular Session, January 26, 1959, 4:10 P.M.
Monnet Hall, Room 101

The University Senate, meeting in regular session, was called to order by Dr. Rufus G. Hall, Jr.

Present

Almquist, C. T.
Artman, Jim
Bell, Robert E.
Bowen, Willis H.
Brinker, Paul A.
Brixey, John C.
Colmore, John P.
Crites, Dennis M
Croft, Albert J.
Cross, George L.
Ewing, Cortez, A. M.
Ezell, John S.
Fell, Ruth D.
Fite, Gilbert C.

Present

Hale, John M.
Hall, Rufus G., Jr.
Heilman, Arthur
Hoy, Harry E.
Keown, William H.
Larsen, Earl G.
Livezey, William E.
Love, Tom J.
Morris, John W.
Mouck, Fred A.
Pool, Richard B.
Poston, Lawrence Jr.
Rice, Leslie H.
Stearson, Edith
Wilcox, Stewart

Absent

Bandy, William R.
Cass, Carl B.
Coffman, Stanley K.
Elconin, Victor
Howard, Robert A.
Peterson, Robert A.
Raines, John
Roller, Duane H. D.
Rupiper, Omer
Schultz, E. J.
Smith, William H.
Sommers, E. Blanche
Tongue, William R.
Upchurch, Vernon
Warren, Mary A.

APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES

The Journal of the University Senate for the regular meeting held on November 24, 1958 was approved.

SENATE ACTION APPROVED

On December 11, 1958, President Cross approved policies governing the formulation of the University of Oklahoma Calendar as submitted by the University Senate on December 8. (See pages 1-4 of the Journal of the University Senate for December 8, 1958).

President Cross also approved the Senate recommendations relative to changes in the University Calendar for the second semester and summer session of the current year. (See page 4 of the Journal of the University Senate for December 8, 1958).

On December 11, 1958, President Cross approved the recommendations made by the University Senate on December 8 relative to the reporting of grades. (See pages 5 and 6 of the Journal of the University Senate for December 8, 1958).

APPOINTMENT TO A UNIVERSITY COMMITTEE

Acting upon nominations submitted by the University Senate on December 8, 1958, President Cross appointed Professor Cortez A. M. Ewing to the Council on Instruction as replacement for Professor Richard V. Andree for the second semester of the current year.

RELATIONSHIP OF THE UNIVERSITY SENATE
TO THE UNIVERSITY ADMINISTRATION

Explanatory Comment

President Cross was present on January 26, 1959, and discussed with the Senate the history and evolution of the current relationship of the University Senate and various University Committees and Councils to the President's office and the Regents of the University. His remarks constituted background information required in consideration of the report of the Committee on University Organization, Budget, and Publications.

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

At the meeting of the Senate in September, 1958, this committee was asked to study "means of improving liaison and communication between the Senate and the President's office." At the October meeting the committee was given a related assignment, a study of the possibility of having more frequent reports by the President to the General Faculty, such as the one presented at the October meeting of the General Faculty.

After gathering and studying information which might evidence a lack of communication between the Senate and the President's office, this committee believes that there have been at least some instances of defective communication, especially in regard to proposals which have concerned the University Calendar. However, neither the frequency nor consequences of these instances appear to have caused any serious difficulties to date.

In response to the suggestion made by some faculty members that the President might resume serving as Chairman of the Senate, President Cross, in a meeting with this committee, pointed out that he had resigned as Chairman of the Senate so that the Senate could be freer in conducting its discussions. He volunteered, however, that he would be willing to attend regularly a portion of each Senate meeting to render a brief report and to answer questions during perhaps the first one-half hour or so of the meeting. President Cross also stated that he would be happy to report to the General Faculty meeting as frequently as the Faculty wished him to do so. Although the Senate is described in the Faculty Handbook as a legislative body, Dr. Cross pointed out that under the State constitution and present Regents-President Procedures, the Senate is an advisory body recommending to the President, who in turn is directly and solely responsible to the Regents.

Relationship of the University Senate to the University Administration -- continued

Dr. Cross indicated that, if the Senate wishes, he will see to it that the views of the Senate on a given matter go along with his own recommendations to the Regents. He also noted that, if the Senate wished to act as a recommending body directly to the Regents, approval of the Regents would be necessary to set up such procedures. Dr. Cross pointed out that the university councils, such as the Budget council and the Council on Instruction, were initially recommended and implemented at his own suggestion. He also pointed out that, even though the Senate nominates members for such committees and had even participated in setting up these councils, these bodies are not the "creatures of the Senate," but are also, like the Senate, advisory bodies recommending to the President.

We recommend:

1. That President Cross be invited to give reports or make comments regularly as practicable at the beginning of each Senate meeting. These reports or comments might be either on subjects believed to be of especial interest to the Senate or on important administrative or public information implications of problems being considered by the Senate, especially where these implications might not otherwise be clearly recognized by members of the Senate.
2. That Senate committees studying matters having important administrative or public information implications should feel free, in the course of their study, to confer with the President or a representative of the President's office. Since Senate action is meant to be a representation of faculty viewpoint, however, such conferences should be utilized or viewed solely as a means of obtaining information, not direction, which would assist the Senate in arriving at its own best decisions and recommendation upon the matter being studied.
3. That members of the Faculty be encouraged to make suggestions to the Secretary of the General Faculty (Dr. Jim P. Artman) as to topics on which a Presidential report might be desirable and that the Secretary and the Committee on the Agenda for the General Faculty Meeting confer periodically with President Cross upon the nature and extent of such suggestions.

COMMITTEE ON UNIVERSITY ORGANIZATION,
BUDGET AND PUBLICATIONS

C. T. Almquist	W. E. Livezey
R. E. Bell	L. S. Poston
J. M. Hale	Miss E. Steanson
Dennis Crites, Chairman	

Senate Action

Following the comments by Dr. Cross, a motion was made by Dr. Crites that the report of the Committee on University Organization, Budget, and Publications be approved by the Senate. Motion was seconded and passed.

UNIVERSITY CALENDAR, 1959-60



Letter from Dean Fellows

January 5, 1959

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

Dear Dr. Porter:

As provided for in the new calendar principles, I am herewith submitting a proposed calendar for 1959-60. Dr. Jim Artman, Mr. B. D. Timmons, and I have prepared this calendar according to the principles approved by President Cross and the recommendations suggested in Plan B by the Senate Committee on Academic Standards. The following should be noted:

1. The Christmas holidays begin on December 17 as recommended by the Senate Committee. This seems to be a bit early, but if changed to December 19, would make the first semester two days longer than the second.
2. No specific freshman period dates have been set for either the second semester or the summer session since these activities will take place during the final examination period just preceding commencement.
3. Both commencements, June and Summer Session, fall on Sundays: June 5 and August 7.
4. July 4 has been listed as a holiday and has not been counted in the number of days allotted for classwork in the summer session.
5. This calendar provides for the following number of class sessions:

<u>First Semester:</u>	MWF	-- 46
	TTH	-- 31
	TThS	-- 45

<u>Second Semester:</u>	MWF	-- 46
	TTh	-- 30
	TThS	-- 45

Summer Session:	40 days (excluding July 4)
-----------------	----------------------------

Please present this to the Senate as soon as possible.

Respectfully submitted,

J. E. Fellows
Dean and Registrar

University Calendar, 1959-60 -- continued

Proposed Calendar for Academic Year 1959-60

First Semester

Sept. 14-19	Freshman period, registration, consultation of students with advisers: enrollment.
Sept. 21	Classwork begins -- 8:10 a.m.
October 7	Last day on which new enrollments will be accepted.
October 19	Final date for removal of conditions, and withdrawal without report on scholastic standing.
November 25	Thanksgiving recess begins -- 10:00 p.m.
November 30	Classwork resumed -- 8:10 a.m.
December 17	Christmas recess begins -- 10:00 p.m.
Jan 4, 1960	Classwork resumed -- 8:10 a.m.
Jan. 25-30	Semester examinations.

Second Semester


February 1-4	Registration--consultation of students with advisers: enrollment.
Feb. 5	Classwork begins -- 8:10 a.m.
Feb. 18	Last day on which new enrollments will be accepted.
March 3	Final date for removal of conditions, and withdrawal without report on scholastic standing.
April 2	Spring vacation begins -- 12:00 noon
April 11	Class work resumed -- 8:10 a.m.
May 30-June 4	Semester examinations
June 5	Commencement exercises

Summer Session

June 6-7	Registration --consultation of students with advisers: enrollment.
June 8	Classwork begins -- 7:00 a.m.
July 4	Independence Day (holiday)
August 4-5	Term examinations
August 7	Commencement exercises

University Calendar, 1959-60 -- continuedSenate Action

Dr. Artman moved that the proposed calendar, as presented on page 5 of this Journal, be approved by the University Senate for submission to President Cross. His motion was seconded and passed by the Senate.

FACULTY PARKING Explanatory Comment

On October 3, 1958, Professor William R. Bandy, in a letter to the University Senate, raised for consideration certain problems relating to faculty parking on campus. The problems involved were referred to the Committee on Faculty Personnel for study.

Report of the Committee on Faculty Personnel

The Personnel Committee of the University Senate has discussed the matter of Faculty Parking with Mr. John H. Kuhlman, director of the Physical Plant, and Mr. A. C. Bernier, chief of campus police. The session was primarily an educational one as most members of the committee had indicated earlier that they knew little about the various problems connected with faculty parking and had expressed a desire to hear from those responsible for enforcing campus parking regulations.

Here are some of the points discussed.

1. The Safety Department has handled parking violation complaints from both faculty and students since September 1 of this year. The department's position is that if a ticket is written the officer believes a violation has occurred, and the offender must pay for the violation. Strict adherence to this policy seems to have convinced many faculty and staff members that tickets must be paid as the number of tickets being written each day has declined by at least one third.

2. Parking lots are designed for both diagonal and straight parking with blocks set to indicate the correct parking position. Faculty and staff members are expected to park correctly when using the lots in order that the maximum number of cars can be accommodated. Those who use more than one space for parking or leave their cars in areas labeled "No Parking" can be expected to receive violation tickets. Such rules are necessary if these abuses are to be stopped.

3. There are no restrictions as to which parking lots faculty may use with the exception of the lot for visitors north of the Union building, and reserve parking areas. All reserved areas are clearly marked. An average of some sixty parking spaces west of the Stadium are vacant every day.

Faculty Parking -- continued

4. Physically disabled students, about 65 in number, are allowed to park in faculty and staff lots. It is easy to understand why faculty members would feel that these students are parking illegally. It is true some students hope their cars will go unnoticed while parked in restricted areas, but it is believed nearly all of these violators are given tickets. There are some visitors without proper identification who park in the various lots, and there are some students who willfully neglect to register their cars; however, the Safety Department makes every effort to see that traffic violation tickets are issued.
5. Students may park in any faculty lot after 5 p.m. and until 1 a.m. Their cars must be moved by 1 a.m. as overnight parking is not allowed except on Saturday night, and in metered lots. Night classes and the popularity of the library account for the student use of lots after 5 p.m.
6. Faculty members who come to the University after 8:30 a.m. find it difficult to park their cars. Some park in "No Parking Zones" and as a consequence are issued violation tickets.
7. The Safety Department says it receives some criticism because of the lack of parking space, yet many of those who complain about the lack of convenient parking are the ones who make requests for parking stickers for their secretaries and other personnel whose applications for stickers have not been approved.
8. Many excuses are given for illegal parking; however, at least 25 per-cent admit they deserve the tickets they receive.
9. The October 1, 1958, edition of the Faculty Handbook covers parking regulations rather fully; however, all the additional material developed by this committee should be made available to faculty and staff members.

Conclusions: The Committee feels the Safety Department is doing a good job. Unquestionably, there have been occasions when faculty members have been irritated to find violation tickets on the windshields of their cars. Sometimes, too, the complaints leveled against the Safety Department have merit. But when the size of the job and available manpower are considered, this committee believes those in charge of enforcing traffic regulations have made a commendable record. There are several things which need to be done such as sending police through the parking lots more frequently. Also, unauthorized student use of the faculty and staff lots should be checked more thoroughly. But with an understaffed department (short two traffic officers) it is unlikely much more can be done.

In view of the present University financial situation, the committee does not consider this an appropriate time to recommend the employment of additional men to do traffic enforcement work.

Committee on Faculty Personnel

Paul A. Brinker
Victor A. Elconin
John W. Morris
C. J. Rupiper
Vernon H. Church
Stewart C. Wilcox
Leslie H. Rice, Chairman

Faculty Parking -- continued

Senate Action

Professor Rice, Chairman of the Committee on Faculty Personnel, commented briefly relative to the foregoing report of his Committee. He then moved that the report be accepted by the University Senate. His motion was seconded and approved.

RECORDING OF GRADES ~~X~~

Letter from President of Student Senate

December 16, 1958

Dr. Rufus G. Hall
President, University Senate
University of Oklahoma
Norman, Oklahoma

Dear Dr. Hall:

Enclosed you will find a copy of a resolution passed by the Student Senate, entitled "A Resolution Suggesting A New System of Recording Grades In Courses Concerned with Subjective Examinations and Papers." You will find the contents of this resolution more or less self explanatory.

The author, Stan Betzer, with the concurrence of the Executive Committee of the Student Senate feels that this matter should be brought to the attention of the University Senate. It is hoped that this body will conscientiously weigh the relative merits of this proposal, and, if in agreement, will be in a position to direct it toward its logical fulfillment. This resolution is not to be construed in its meaning to propose a definite system, but rather to open the way to constructive thought toward a better way of recording grades concerning subjective examinations and papers.

There are several colleges which do not conduct subjective tests, but in those colleges which do--the problem of personal bias and prejudice on the part of the teacher often becomes a serious situation. I am led to understand that the Military Department (Army ROTC) and the Law School have adopted a grading system whereas a listing of examinations by student number instead of student name has been tried and carried out successfully. There may be other departments and colleges which utilize a similar system, but it is our hope that all academic circles which use subjective type tests will adopt some similar system of fairer grading practices.

Thank you very much for your consideration.

Sincerely,

James W. White
President

Recording of Grades -- continued

Senate Action

Dr. Morris moved that the problems indicated in the foregoing letter be referred to the appropriate committee of the Senate. His motion was seconded and passed.

This matter was immediately referred by the Chairman of the Senate to the Committee on Teaching and Research.

CENTER FOR CONTINUING EDUCATION ~~X~~

Letter from Dr. Granger

January 5, 1959

Dr. Rufus G. Hall, Jr.
Chairman Faculty Senate

Dear Dr. Hall:

I should like to direct the attention of the administration and, more especially, the faculty to the implications of an educational commitment that the University of Oklahoma entered into recently: the establishment of a Center of Continuing Education, which will probably open its doors in 1960. Whatever the nature of the work carried on there--whether an expansion of services now offered through extension, a new program in adult education, or a combination of these two--we must all face the hard fact that, if successful, the Center will attract a predicated 75,000 students in the course of a single calendar year.

Whether the individual's interest in the work of the Center prove large or small, it is the faculty collectively who will do the teaching there. This much being certain, it would be wise to settle certain questions before 1960. For example: will the faculty, acting through their deans, directors, and chairmen, be allowed to finally determine not only the range but the priority of work offered at the Center? can the individual faculty member who does not wish to teach in the Center be given assurance that he will not at some future date be discriminated against in the matter of either salary, promotion, or tenure? will the member who does teach receive compensation commensurate with his base salary; or will he receive a percentage (as is now the case in extension work) or, as at the Michigan State University Center, no compensation at all?

The faculty was hardly consulted in the decision to apply to the Kellogg Foundation for a grant toward establishing a Center at Norman. That decision executed finally by administrative fiat and the grant forthcoming, I for one should like to see the faculty given the final voice in setting educational policy (including a salary scale) for the Center. This is a faculty responsibility and one which the administration ought to honor. As perhaps never before in the history of the University of Oklahoma, academic 1958-59 is proving a year of decision. In a time when 10-25% increases in salary have

Center for Continuing Education --- continued

become mandatory if we are to maintain academic respectability and look toward first-class status, the implementation of so large and important a new teaching facility as the Center for Continuing Education on terms other than those acceptable for the faculty themselves might dangerously weaken an already shaken morale.

Sincerely yours,

Bruce Ingham Granger
Member of the Extension
Council

Senate Action

Dr. Ezell moved that the letter from Dr. Granger be tabled. His motion was seconded but failed to pass.

Following a brief discussion, Dr. Ewing moved that the letter be referred to the appropriate committee for study with the stipulation that the committee make periodic reports to the Senate regarding progress in the development of plans for the Continuation Center. His motion was seconded and approved.

Referral was made immediately by the Chairman of the Senate to the Committee on Courses and Curricula.

NOMINATIONS FOR REPLACEMENT ON UNIVERSITY COMMITTEE

Explanatory Comment

On January 13, 1959, Vice President McCarter requested that the University Senate submit to President Cross two nominations for a replacement for Professor Elbridge Phelps on the Budget Council. Professor Phelps will be on leave of absence the second semester, 1958-59. He is to be replaced for the one semester.

Senate Action

Dr. Heilman, Chairman of the Committee on Committees, submitted two names of two persons for consideration by the Senate:

George Fraser -- Law
E. A. Frederickson -- Geology

Dr. Heilman moved that the foregoing nominations be approved. His motion was seconded and passed.

Policies Governing the Formulation of the University Calendar -- continued

concerning establishment of dates for ROTC Commencement services. The problems involved necessitate change in the policies governing establishment of the Calendar as recommended by the Senate on December 8, 1958, and subsequently approved by President Cross.

Senate Action

Dr. Brixey moved that the current policies be amended by deleting:

- (a) All of policy number 11.
- (b) All of policy number 15 after the word "Period."
- (c) All of policy number 20 after the word "Sunday."

ANNUAL REPORT OF THE COUNCIL

ON INSTRUCTION

To:	The University Senate	Date:	January 20, 1959
From:	The Council on Instruction	Subject:	Annual Report 1957-1958

The period from July 1, 1957, to June 30, 1958, was the first year during which the Council on Instruction operated under the Senate mandate broadening the Council's activities and duties. This mandate follows:

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.

In order to have enough time to study the problems and to formulate the policies, the Council immediately changed from a schedule of two brief meetings a month to two full afternoon meetings each week with many active sub-committees meetings in addition.

The Council set about the task of making a careful study of the strengths and weaknesses of the instructional program, and an analysis of the greatest needs and how they could best be met. The Council was unanimous in feeling that a set of clear-cut principles and goals should be agreed upon so that actions of the Council in the future could arise out of policy rather than out of the thinking of the individual members who might make up the Council at any particular time.

Early in the year the Council was given an opportunity to clarify its thinking when it received a request from the President to work out a response

REPORTING OF GRADES

Letter from Dr. Andree

December 16, 1958

The University Senate
c/o Prof. J. C. Brixey
Chairman, Committee on
Academic Standards

Dear Colleagues:

The December 8, 1958 issue of the Journal of the University Senate records the report of your committee on the reporting of grades. Concerning item B-3 on page 6, may I suggest the addition of the option of reporting to the student via mail, if the instructor so desires.

I personally unwilling to burden our departmental secretary with grade lists and object to posting grades even by code number, since students easily learn or deduce code numbers in which they are interested. A student's grade is a personal thing, and he should be afforded the courtesy of a sealed envelope report if he desires to furnish an envelope in place of a post card.

Sincerely,

Richard V. Andree

cc: G. A. Porter

Senate Action

Dr. Brinker moved that the problem raised by Dr. Andree be referred to the Senate Committee which recently made recommendations relative to reporting of grades. His motion was seconded and passed.

Referral was immediately made to the Committee on Academic Standards.

POLICIES GOVERNING THE FORMULATION
OF THE UNIVERSITY CALENDAR

Explanatory Comment

Dr. Brixey, Chairman of the Senate Committee on Academic Standards, reported that people responsible for ROTC programs have raised questions

Annual Report of the Council on Instruction -- continued

to the Board of Regents for Higher Education which had asked each institution to review its curricula, subject matter taught, courses offered, and teaching methods to determine whether revisions were desirable; and to renew its efforts to encourage the exceptionally bright students to reach their chosen objectives.

The Council felt in drafting its reply that a careful study must be made of the instructional pattern of the University in order to formulate a statement of its goals and objectives.

The Council believes that a university is only as good as the staff it employs and the libraries and laboratories it maintains. Of all the Big Eight schools, the University of Oklahoma pays the lowest salaries in all professional ranks but one, and in that it is second from the bottom. At the full professor rank the University pays \$1,200 less on a nine-month basis than does the highest paying school, and \$550 less than the average of the eight schools. At associate professor rank, the University pays \$850 less than the highest paying school and \$400 less than the average. It should be noted that the universities in the Big Eight pay lower salaries than do universities in other areas of the United States.

When the University sets out to fill a position, great care is taken to compile a list of desirable applicants. Usually the ten to twenty-five best qualified candidates cannot be approached because their present salaries are so much higher than the salary that can be offered by the University. The University then selects the ablest person it can obtain with the funds available. This procedure makes it extremely difficult to build up a competent staff. Even more damaging to the instructional program are the losses experienced every year in personnel. Since 1952, 19 full professors, 34 associate professors, and 75 assistant professors have resigned. Usually the ablest and most valuable are the ones who accept employment elsewhere at higher salaries.

In developing its response to the Board of Regents' request, the Council studied the interrelationship between the instructional and financial problems. The Council on Instruction came to the conclusion that the only possible way to improve the Instructional program is to obtain more money per student.

The Council feels that, because of the increased need for mathematicians, engineers, and scientists, the University has made every effort to expand the programs in these areas. Since 1953, the University has increased the budgets of all departments in the College of Engineering; and the departments of chemistry, mathematics and astronomy, and physics in the College of Arts and Sciences from \$544,337 to \$902,152, an increase of \$357,815 or more than 65%. During this same period the budgets of the other departments in the College of Arts and Sciences were increased by only 54%. With the present budget no significant increases can be granted to the areas of the sciences without crippling seriously the rest of the University. Gains that can be made through the efforts of the Council on Instruction and of other agencies within the University will not be large enough to meet the present challenge; limitations of budget already have forced the University to pare every program to the barest minimum.

Annual Report of the Council on Instruction -- continued

The Council believes that the purposes and responsibilities of an university must include not only the natural sciences but also the humanities and social sciences, both in their liberal and theoretical, and in their applied and professional, aspects. The scientist, too, in addition to training in his areas of specialization, must receive a broad general education. To serve the best interests of a democracy, a state university must never become an institute of technology.

Through its study of the interrelationship between the instructional and financial problems, the Council on Instruction came to the conclusion that only with more money per student can the University improve its program. Without increasing the total appropriation from the legislature, additional money per student can be obtained in a limited number of ways: by reduction of enrollment through selective admissions and higher academic standards; by revision of the budgetary allocation formula; by the elimination of unnecessary duplications of programs between institutions within the system; by the curtailment or elimination in all institutions of the system of services and programs which are least important in the functions of higher education; and by the upward revision of student fees.

Through a process of selective admission and the raising of academic standards, the University can (as can other institutions in the system) reduce its enrollment by any desired number. Such a reduction in enrollment would accomplish the dual aims of retaining only the brighter students for whom the expectation of program completion is high and of increasing the amount of money available per student. However, as long as the present policy for the allocation of funds is in effect, any institution which by itself would reduce the number of its students would defeat its own purpose since its next budgetary allocation would be reduced and its improved quality of instruction could not be maintained.

The Council is convinced that the formula currently used for the allocation of funds is manifestly unfair to the University. Under this formula the University received \$525 per student per year for 1957-59, whereas Oklahoma College for Women received \$1,090 per student per year; Oklahoma Military Academy, \$746; and Northwestern State College, \$708. These comparisons make clear that several junior colleges and institutions operating less expensive programs receive more money per student than does the University. Maintaining science areas is much more expensive than the supporting of libraries and laboratories for undergraduate offerings. In addition, it is costly to acquire and retain a faculty competent to teach advanced graduate courses in which enrollments necessarily must be small and to direct masters' theses and doctoral dissertations. Any formula for allocation of funds which grants more money per student to undergraduate institutions not operating such programs is obviously inequitable.

Money could be saved by eliminating many of the costly duplications of programs among the various institutions in the system. The mere fact of the

Annual Report of the Council on Instruction -- continued

establishment of a new program in one institution should not serve as a stimulus for the establishing of the same program in other institutions. New programs should be duplicated only if they are clearly necessary. For example, there is no need for several institutions in the state to offer programs for the certification of school administrators.

Certain courses, curricula, degree programs, and services are essential in every institution of higher learning. Some courses and curricula must be maintained by state law and others through the requirements of accrediting associations; however, certain courses, curricula, and services, although desirable, are not essential. Substantial savings could be made if all institutions in the system would curtail or eliminate such non-essential courses, curricula, and non-self-supporting services.

While the Council on Instruction was in accord with the upward adjustment of fees, it recognizes that the amount of money raised would not go far toward a solution of the financial problem of the University. Because public interest in higher education is intense and the value of higher education to the safety of the nation has been perceived for the first time by so many people, the Council on Instruction recommended that the Board of Regents for Higher Education request the necessary money from the legislature. Enrollment in the College of Engineering and the basic sciences is increasing so rapidly that with its present staff and facilities the University will have no choice but to turn away hundreds of qualified students. With its present budget there is no possible way the university can handle this large influx. Obsolete laboratory equipment and inadequate library collections reduce the effectiveness of our training programs.

It was recommended that the State Regents help the institutions within the system reduce their enrollments through selective admissions and higher academic standards and an effort toward the elimination of unnecessary duplications. It was further recommended that the Board revise students fees upward and provide scholarships for needy, qualified students; utilize a more equitable method of allocating funds to the institutions; and make every effort to obtain additional funds through legislative appropriation.

From the preparation of the reply to the Board of Regents the Council recognized the impossibility of separating planning from budget and has worked more closely with the Budget Council than in the past. The Budget Council turned certain matters over to the Council on Instruction for its recommendation, for example, the determination of priority of new positions and vice-positions in the University; and throughout the year, the two councils worked toward a closer relationship.

During the year, the Council made a study of high cost departments. It is the policy of the Council that neither high total cost nor high cost per student should represent the primary criterion by which to determine the continuance or discontinuance of a department. Several departments were studied in relation to their contribution to the total University picture, and the Council voted, on this basis, to recommend the discontinuance of certain University programs.

Annual Report of the Council on Instruction -- continued

In its study of duplication of courses within the University, the Council has adopted this policy: that any such study be made by representatives of the departments and colleges involved and representatives of the Council on Instruction. For example, in coordinating offerings in statistics on a University-wide basis, a committee was set up, composed of two members of the Council on Instruction, and a representative appointed or elected from each of these departments or colleges: Business Statistics, Education, Electrical Engineering, Mathematics, Psychology, Public Health, and Sociology. This committee met several times and made the following resolution, subsequently approved by the Council: that there be one basic course in statistics to serve as a prerequisite to all advanced courses in statistics taught in the University; that this course be taught in the mathematics department; and that the course be numbered at the 100 level (Math 119). The committee also determined the content of the basic course.

Other specific problems studied during the year were: (a) the advisability of inaugurating an honors program at the university, (b) the scheduling of classes in such a way that maximum use might be made of both the physical plant as well as faculty, (c) the system of final examinations, (d) proposed changes in the prescribed work of the College of Arts and Sciences, (e) television instruction at the university, (f) advanced standing examinations, (g) the reduction of faculty teaching load, (h) University requirements in physical education for men and women, (i) courses in professional writing, (j) the use of civilian instructors in the various ROTC programs, (k) the graduate program in home economics, (l) the practice of offering basically elementary academic work for graduate credit, (m) large class instruction, (n) the relation of the University Laboratory School to the instructional program of the University, (o) classes in which small enrollments occur and the formulation of a policy with regard to such classes.

Near the end of the year the Council adopted a lengthy statement on University policies and procedures to submit to the President and to the Budget Council. The following are the principal recommendations contained in the report:

1. Use of a system of priorities in allocation of University resources which will emphasize quality of teaching staff, library and laboratory resources, and the promotion of research over public service activities.
2. Review by a representative faculty group of plans for major allocations of resources, prior to commitment, to non-instructional programs.
3. Adoption of the operating assumption that emphasis on elementary, vocational, purely technological, and public service functions is a departure from the University's primary goals.
4. Curtailment of broadness of instructional programs in favor of better quality for those aspects retained.
5. Avoidance of duplication of high cost, specialized programs offered elsewhere in the state or readily available in the region.

Annual Report of the Council on Instruction -- continued

6. Continuing attention to improvement of quality of teaching staff and facilities for instructional programs retained.

The following members of the faculty served on the Council on Instruction during the year July 1, 1957 -- June 30, 1958: P. K. McCarter (ex officio), Jim P. Artman (ex officio), Richard Andree, Oliver Benson, Ansel Challenner, Antonio de las Torre, Arthur Doerr, James Murphy, Joseph Rarick, Percy Teska, Stewart Wilcox. Harold Bone served on the Council during the first semester while Ansel Challenner was on leave of absence. Bennett Clark replaced Antonio de la Torre on the Council at the beginning of the second semester 1957-1958.

Pete Kyle McCarter, Chairman
Council on Instruction

CITIZENS COMMITTEE FOR ADEQUATE

MEDICAL AND HIGHER EDUCATION

Dr. John M. Hale, member of the University Senate representing the School of Medicine, commondted briefly in explanation of the development and activities of the recently formed Citizens Committee for Adequate Medical and Higher Education.

He indicated that the committee is attempting to develop financial support for all higher education in Oklahoma.

ADJOURNMENT

The University Senate adjourned at 5:45 p.m. The next regular meeting will be held on Monday, February 23, 1959 at 4:10 p.m. Material for the agenda should be in the office of the Secretary by Friday, February 14, 1959.

Gerald A. Porter, Secretary

Annual Report of the Federal Bureau of Investigation

The following information is being furnished to you for your information and is not to be distributed outside your agency.

The following information is being furnished to you for your information and is not to be distributed outside your agency. This information is being furnished to you for your information and is not to be distributed outside your agency.

Very truly yours,
Director

Enclosure

The following information is being furnished to you for your information and is not to be distributed outside your agency.

The following information is being furnished to you for your information and is not to be distributed outside your agency.

Very truly yours,

The following information is being furnished to you for your information and is not to be distributed outside your agency.

Very truly yours,