

JOURNAL OF THE UNIVERSITY SENATE

Regular Session, February 23, 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
Bandy, William R.
Bell, Robert E.
Bowen, Willis H.
Brinker, Paul A.
Brixey, John C.
Cass, Carl B.
Coffman, Stanley K.
Croft, Albert J.
Cross, George L.
Elconin, Victor
Ewing, Cortez, A. M.
Ezell, John C.
Fell, Ruth D.
Fite, Gilbert C.
Hale, John M.

Present

Hall, Rufus G., Jr.
Heilman, Arthur
Hoy, Harry E.
Keown, William H.
Larsen, Earl G.
Livezey, William E.
Morris, John W.
Peterson, Robert A.
Pool, Richard B.
Poston, Lawrence Jr.
Roller, Duane H. D.
Smith, William H.
Sommers, E. Blanche
Steanson, Edith
Tongue, William R.
Warren, Mary A.
Wilcox, Stewart

Absent

Colmore, John P.
Crites, Dennis M.
Howard, Robert A.
Love, Tom J.
Mouck, Fred A.
Raines, John
Rupiper, Omer
Rice, Leslie H.
Schultz, E. J.
Upchurch, Vernon

APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES

The Journal of the University Senate for the regular meeting held on January 26, 1959, was approved.

SENATE ACTION APPROVED

On January 30, 1959, President Cross indicated approval of the University Calendar for 1959-60 as it was recommended by the University Senate on January 26. The recommended calendar appears in the Journal of the University Senate for January 26, 1959, page 5.

On January 30, 1959, President Cross indicated approval of recommended changes in the policies governing the formulation of the University of Oklahoma Calendar. These changes were reported in the Journal of the University Senate for January 26, 1959, pages 11 and 12.

On February 3, 1959, President Cross appointed Professor E. A. Frederickson to the Budget Council as the replacement for Professor Elbridge Phelps who is on leave the second semester of this year.

RELATIONSHIP OF THE UNIVERSITY SENATE
TO THE UNIVERSITY ADMINISTRATION

Explanatory Comment

At the January 26, 1959, meeting of the University Senate consideration was given to certain elements in the relationship of the University Senate and University-wide committees and councils to the University Administration. It was informally agreed that certain elements merited further consideration at later meetings and an item was included in the Agenda for the meeting on February 23, 1959

Senate Action

Following a brief discussion of this matter, Dr. Morris moved that a special committee of members of the University Senate and non-members be appointed by the Chairman of the University Senate to work out the problems at hand. His motion was seconded and discussed.

Dr. Keown made a substitute motion that the Committee on University Organization, Budget, and Publications of the University Senate study the problem and determine how to proceed and present a recommendation not later than April. His motion was seconded.

In the discussion which followed, it was made clear that the problem involved here is one of re-evaluation of faculty government at the University. It is the function of the committee that works on this problem to first prepare a broad statement of what the committee itself should do and the general procedures to be followed.

The motion by Dr. Keown was passed by the Senate.

PLACEMENT TESTS

Report from the Committee on Student and Public Relations

February 3, 1959

At the April (1958) meeting of the University Senate a communication from the University College Council was read which recommended "that placement tests be administered to all students entering this University for the first time, rather than to new freshmen only." This problem was referred to the Student and Public Relations Committee. Immediately thereafter the committee learned that it would not be possible to put the recommendation into effect before the fall of 1959, so a complete consideration of the problem was deferred until the present school year.

During this school year the Student and Public Relations Committee has conferred with Dr. Maurice Temerlin, Dr. Stanly Coffman, Mr. Boyce Timmons, and Mr. Clarence Skinner. The committee found that approximately 1400 transfer students entered the University since one year ago-about 800 entering last September. The cost of administering placement tests to all these students

Placement Tests -- continued

would average somewhat less than 30¢ per student. However, the additional load placed upon the Machine Accounting Office would make it necessary to increase by one day the time between the giving of the tests and the delivery of test results to advisers. Some doubt was expressed concerning the significance of the results of the same tests given to students of different ages and different class levels, however, those who favor giving the tests to transfer students believe that results from the same tests will be very valuable to advisers regardless of differences in age and class level. Some concern was expressed also over the effect upon public relations that could result from requiring transfer students from accredited schools to take placement tests here with the evident purpose of trying to determine whether or not to advise these students to repeat course work already taken.

In view of these findings and considerations, the committee does not recommend any change in the present system of giving placement tests only to new freshmen.

Respectfully submitted,

Committee on Student and Public Relations

Ruth Fell	W. H. Smith
Harry Hoy	Mary Warren
Robert V. Peterson	Carl B. Cass, Chairman
Richard Pool	

Senate Action

Dr. Cass, as Chairman of the Committee on Student and Public Relations commented on the development of the foregoing report relative to placement tests. He then moved that the report be adopted by the University Senate. His motion was seconded.

Following considerable discussion of the report, Dr. Fite made a substitute motion that the Committee on Student and Public Relations reconsider the matter in the light of the Senate discussion. His motion was not seconded and was withdrawn by Dr. Fite.

Dr. Poston then moved that the University Senate recommend that placement tests be administered to all undergraduate students entering this University for the first time, rather than to new freshmen only. His motion was seconded and passed by the University Senate.

NOMINATIONS FOR REPLACEMENT ON UNIVERSITY SCHOLARSHIP COMMITTEE

Explanatory Comment

Vice President McCarter recently requested that the University Senate submit the names of two persons, one of whom will be appointed by President Cross to replace Professor Joe Smay who has resigned from the University Scholarship Committee.

Nominations for Replacement on University Scholarship Committee -- continued

Senate Action

Dr. Heilman, Chairman of the University Senate Committee on Committees, reported for his committee and moved approval by the Senate of the nomination of the two persons named here:

John E. Mertes, Jr. -- Marketing William S. Burgett -- Architecture

The motion made by Dr. Heilman was seconded and passed by the University Senate.

UNIVERSITY CALENDAR FOR 1960-61

Letter from Dean Fellows

February 13, 1959

Dr. Gerald A. Porter, Secretary
University Senate

As provided for in the new calendar principles, I am herewith submitting a proposed calendar for 1960-61. Dr. Jim Artman and I have prepared this calendar according to the principles approved by President Cross with one exception.

Policy 3 states that "First semester classes shall begin on the Monday which occurs within the period of September 20-28." If this principle was to be followed and classes were to begin on September 26, commencements for 1960-61 would fall on June 11 and August 13. We believe that this is too late and that classes should begin one week earlier on September 19, 1960. If this is done, the commencement dates will be June 4 and August 6.

The attached calendar is recommended for University Senate approval, and the following should be noted:

1. The calendar provides for two semesters of 15 weeks with 46 MWF class meetings each semester and 39 class meetings in the summer session.
2. The Christmas holidays begin on December 17 (Saturday) and last until January 2 -- a total of 16 days.
3. Both commencement exercises fall on Sundays.
4. Four days are allowed for second semester enrollment beginning on Monday, January 30.

Please present this to the University Senate as soon as is convenient.

Respectfully submitted,

JEF:gl

J. E. Fellows, Dean and Registrar

University Calendar, 1960-61 -- continuedProposed Calendar
for Academic Year 1960-61First Semester

September 12-17	Freshman period, registration, consultation of students with advisers, enrollment.
September 19	Classwork begins -- 8:10 a.m.
November 23	Thanksgiving recess begins -- 10:00 p.m.
November 28	Classwork resumed -- 8:10 a.m.
December 17	Christmas recess begins -- 12:00 noon
January 3, 1961	Classwork resumed -- 8:10 a.m.
January 23-28	Semester examinations

Second Semester

January 27-28	Freshman testing
January 30-Feb. 2	Registration consultation of students with advisers, enrollment (4 days)
February 3	Classwork begins -- 8:10 a.m.
April 1	Spring vacation begins -- 12:00 noon (Easter--April 2)
April 10	Classwork resumed -- 8:10 a.m.
May 29-June 3	Semester examinations
June 4	Commencement exercises (Sunday)


Summer Session

June 6-7	Registration and enrollment
June 8	Classwork begins -- 7:10 a.m.
July 4	Independence Day (Holiday)
August 3-4	Term examinations
August 6	Commencement exercises (Sunday)

University Calendar, 1960-61 -- continued

Senate Action

Following considerable discussion of the Calendar for 1960-61, as indicated on the foregoing page, and recognition of the fact that this calendar violates a basic policy, Dr. Ewing moved that the University Senate decline to approve the Calendar at this time. His motion was seconded and passed.

UNIFORM SYSTEM OF NUMERICAL DESIGNATION OF COURSES 

Letter from President of the Student Senate

Dr. Rufus G. Hall, President
University Senate
Department of Government
Faculty Exchange

Dear Dr. Hall:

Last night in the regular session, the Student Senate passed by a vote of 32-2, "A Resolution Relating to the Adoption of a Uniform System of Numerical Designation of Courses." This resolution is enclosed herein, along with a letter of explanation and a proposed system by the author of the bill, Mr. Roy Adams.

The Student Senate Academic Affairs Committee has given this matter careful consideration and study. The Registrar has noted the merit of this proposal as well as several Deans including the Dean of Admissions and Records. All have pointed to different, yet important aspects and values of such an improved course numbering system.

On the student level, the consistency in numbering would make it easier to arrange schedules and plan academic programs. For teachers and advisors this would aid in planning instruction and would simplify counseling. If this consistency can be made state-wide, the job of weighing and comparing the transcripts of state transfer students would be less complicated for the Deans in accrediting respective courses from other schools. When employers interview students for jobs, they would find it much easier to evaluate curriculum and compare relative training between students by examining the course numbers. They would not be forced to engage in extensive correspondence in order to interpret course content and level of attainment as related to that recorded numerical designation.

The details and benefits of a new, better, and certainly more sensible system could be expounded in much greater detail. This, Mr. Roy Adams or I would be happy to do either before the University Senate or before one of its committees. Our present and almost non-existent system would certainly be vitalized with departmental, school, and inter-collegiate consistency and/or uniformity.

Sincerely,

James W. White, President
Student Senate

Uniform System of Numerical Designation of Courses -- continued

Letter from Roy Adams Explaining His Proposal

February 19, 1959

Mr. Jim White, President
Student Senate

Dear Jim:

To supplement, for your information, my "Resolution Relating to the adoption of a Uniform System of Numerical Designation of Courses," which was passed by the Student Senate today, I am here expressing my ideas for a feasible numbering system incorporating those qualities mentioned in the resolution.

The provisions of any such uniform system would undoubtedly be similar to the following:

1. Each course would be represented by the abbreviated name of the particular department followed by a three digit number.
2. The first or hundreds digit would represent the year of study in which the course is most appropriately included. Therefore, one would represent freshmen courses; two, sophomore; three, junior; four, senior; five, first year graduate courses; and six, subsequent graduate courses.
3.
 - a. The second or tens digit would represent the relative level of difficulty within the designated year of study with the higher numbers assigned to the more difficult courses.
 - b. Two successive numbers here could indicate a two-course sequence to be taken that year.
 - c. Particularly for freshmen courses, a zero might be utilized here to indicate that there are no college courses prerequisite.
4.
 - a. The third or hundreds digit would specify the number of hours credit for the course.
 - b. A zero here would indicate a course for which credit is variable.
 - c. Since, for example, only ten three hour sophomore courses could, by the preceding requirements, be given numbers in a particular department, and, since two and three hour courses in some departments might slightly exceed this number, eight could be used to indicate additional two hour courses; and nine could be used for three hour courses.

Apparently, this system would satisfactorily fulfill the requirements of the resolution as utilized in a three digit numbering scheme. At any rate, it demonstrates that such a uniform system is possible.

Yours truly,

Roy Adams

Uniform System of Numerical Designation of Courses -- continued

Student Senate Resolution Relating to the Adoption of A Uniform System of Numerical Designation of Courses

- Whereas: The numerical designation of a course may be utilized to indicate certain significant characteristics of that course; and
- Whereas: The University of Oklahoma now has no inter-departmental uniformity in such numerical designation of courses; and
- Whereas: There is no such uniform system commonly used by all the institutions of higher learning in the State of Oklahoma; and
- Whereas: Such uniformity is an asset in enrollment, in the interpretation of official transcripts, and in the processing of records, particularly those of students who transfer from another institution; therefore be it

Resolved, That the Student Senate of the University of Oklahoma is desirous of adoption of such an inter-departmental uniform system of numerical designation of courses; and be it further

Resolved, That the Student Senate recommend to the Faculty Senate that consideration be given to the adoption of a uniform system which would include in the number of each course designation of:

1. The year of study in which the course is most appropriately included
2. The number of hours credit for the course
3. Whether the course requires prerequisite or falls in a particular sequence

And be it further

Resolved, That the Student Senate encourage the Faculty Senate and officials of the University administration to urge the State Board of Regents for Higher Education to consider the adoption of such a uniform system for all institutions of higher education in the State of Oklahoma.

University Senate Action

It was moved and seconded that this matter be referred to the appropriate committee of the University Senate for study and a report. The motion was passed.

The matter was referred immediately to the Committee on Courses and Curricula.

ADJOURNMENT

The University Senate adjourned at 5:25 p.m. The next regular meeting will be held on Monday, March 23, 1959 (one week early because of Spring Vacation) at 4:10 p.m. Material for the Agenda should be in the Office of the Secretary by March 11.

Gerald A. Porter, Secretary