

JOURNAL OF THE UNIVERSITY SENATE

Regular Session, January 30, 1961, 4:10 P. M.
Monnet Hall, Room 101

The University Senate, meeting in regular session, was called to order by the Chairman, Dr. Cortez A. M. Ewing.

Present

Bittle, William E.
Bowen, Willis H.
Clark, F. Donald
Cross, George L.
Crosser, Orrin K.
de Stwolinski, Gail
Doerr, Arthur
Ellison, Herbert J.
Ewing, Cortez A. M.
Feaver, J. Clayton
Fite, Gilbert C.
Granger, Bruce
Halé, John M.
Howard, Robert A.

Present

Hoy, Harry E.
Huff, William N.
Keeley, Joe W.
Kitts, David
Patterson, Helen E.
Peterson, Robert V.
Rarick, Joseph L.
Rice, Leslie
Schottstaedt, W. W.
Sommers, E. Blanche
Springer, C. E.
Steanson, Edith
Upchurch, Vernon
Upthegrove, William R.

Absent

Artman, Jim P.
Campbell, John M.
Corsaw, Roger
Crim, Ed. F.
Dunham, Lowell
Eriksen, John G.
Ewbank, Walter J.
Holland, C. Joe
Johns, O. D.
Keown, William H.
Peach, Nelson N.
Perry, Robert
Rohrbaugh, Lawrence M.
Shadid, Tannell A.
Stanley, A. J.
Williams, Lloyd P.

APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES

The Journal of the University Senate for the regular meeting held on November 28, 1960, was approved.

SENATE RECOMMENDATIONS APPROVED

Rules Concerning the Handling of Cases of Cheating. On December 3, 1960, President Cross approved the University Senate recommendation relative to an addition to the rules concerning the handling of cases of cheating as they are stated on page 33 of the Faculty Handbook. The recommendation was reported in the Journal of the University Senate for November 28, 1960, pages 3 and 4.

Equipment Rental and Departmental Services. On December 21, 1960, President Cross indicated approval of recommendation number 1 of five recommendations formulated by the University Senate under the subject of Equipment Rental and Departmental Services. These recommendations were reported in the Journal of the University Senate for November 28, 1960, pages 2 and 3.

Note: Please refer to pages 2 and 3 of this Journal for the letter from President Cross in which he states the reasons why he did not approve recommendations 2 through 5.

EQUIPMENT RENTAL AND DEPARTMENTAL SERVICES

Letter from President Cross indicating reasons why he did not approve all of the Senate recommendations on this matter

December 21, 1960

Dr. Cortez A. M. Ewing, Chairman
University Senate

Dear Dr. Ewing:

I have the recommendations of the University Senate formulated at its regular meeting on November 28, 1960, under the subject of Equipment Rental and Departmental Services.

I have considered the five recommendations carefully and have had members of my staff analyze the background data on items 2 and 4. As a result, recommendation number 1 is approved. I cannot approve recommendations 2 through 5. My decision is based upon the following facts and opinions:

Recommendation No. 2 -- Over the years in making audio and visual instructional aids available to instructional departments, the University has experimented with both free service and cost-of-service plans. When the decision was made by the Budget Council several years ago to shift from free service to cost-of-service rendered, a careful study was made by the Budget Council of the amount of service which had been requested and obtained by the various instructional departments. An estimate was made of the cost of providing the service in each case and this amount of money was added to the C Budgets involved. It is quite possible, of course, that, after these transfers of funds had been made, certain of our departments may have diverted the funds to other uses and curtailed their use of audio and visual instructional aids equipment. We are of the opinion, however, that a more efficient job can be done in budget planning if departments needing audio and visual instructional aids will request and substantiate their need for C Budget funds to pay for the use of such equipment. This permits more efficient planning on the part of our office of Educational Materials Services and it provides the Budget Council and the President's Office with more accurate information on the costs of operating the various instructional departments.

Recommendation No. 3 -- The University Book Exchange, as we all know, is operated for the students. I am of the opinion that, if we should offer a 15% discount to University employees on all purchases made at the Book Exchange, we would create an unnecessary student relations or morale problem. Students would undoubtedly take the position that their volume of buying at regular prices was being used to provide a discount or subsidy to our faculty and staff. Furthermore, I am of the opinion that the proposed discount plan would invite complaints from local retailers supported by their state association and possibly restrictive state legislation. The neighboring state of Kansas and others have experienced this kind of difficulty and as a result Kansas is now operating under a rigid state statute. Finally, experience in other states has shown that it is impossible to control a discount plan of this kind to assure the absence of abuse by individuals who make purchases for friends and relatives.

Equipment Rental and Departmental Services -- continued

Recommendation No. 4 -- After carefully reviewing our experience of making typewriters available by purchase, without cost and on a rental basis, I am convinced that our present arrangement is by far the most efficient and profitable in the long run to the University and to all concerned. Although no individual or department is required to release a particular typewriter at any time, it is our plan and policy to attempt to trade in all typewriters at the end of the fourth year of use. When a typewriter reaches an age in excess of four years, the trade-in allowance falls off very sharply; and, if we did not follow the policy of trading most of our machines at the end of the fourth year of use, the time would quickly come when the amount of money required for new machines would be sharply in excess of funds available for this item of equipment. To state this position in another way, we find that if we trade our machines systematically after four years of use, we are able to minimize the regular monthly rental rate, which includes, of course, repair and service to the typewriters at all times. I am fully aware of the fact that we may have a few offices where typewriters are used where the useful life of the typewriter is considerably in excess of four years. Under our present policy these machines can be retained for a longer period of use if the person responsible so desires; but, if we provided a lower rental rate on such machines, encouragement would be given to the accumulation of an old inventory with little replacement value.

The relatively low rental-service rate charged by the Book Exchange Typewriter Service is made possible by the relatively large number of typewriters which it rents and services. If this volume should be reduced by permitting departments to make private arrangements for typewriters from other sources, the rental-service rate would of necessity have to be raised. This, of course, would not be in the best interests of the University, so for this reason we must limit our typewriter business to the non-profit University Book Exchange Typewriter Service as it is presently operated.

Recommendation No. 5 -- The objective behind this recommendation is, of course, a praiseworthy one but Mr. Mayfield tells us that experience has demonstrated that there is relatively little demand for scholarly hardback books in the University Book Exchange. The students, from whom the larger part of our volume comes, seem to prefer, for reasons of economy, to purchase the same scholarly books in the much less expensive paper bound editions. Mr. Mayfield has assured me, however, that the University Book Exchange stands ready at any and all times to accept special orders from faculty members for any book that may be desired and is available in a hard-back edition. Another reason apart from the fact that the management of the Book Exchange would be opposed to tying up University funds in a slow moving inventory is the space problem. As I am sure you realize, the Book Exchange is presently crowded for the volume of business that it handles and the amount of inventory which must be carried. If additional space becomes available later and there appears to be a somewhat better market prospect for scholarly, hard-back books, it is entirely possible that more can be done in this area.

Cordially yours,

G. L. Cross
President

ADMISSION POLICIES X

University of Oklahoma Interoffice Communication

TO: The University Senate
The Council on Instruction

FROM: G. L. Cross

For some months the Inter-University Committee, composed of three administrative people from Oklahoma State University and three from the University of Oklahoma have been working at the task of evolving an identical set of admissions policies for the two institutions.

They have now agreed on the statement of policy which is quoted below.

I intend to submit the statement to the University Regents at their January meeting with the purpose, if they approve it, of joining President Willham in recommending it to the State Regents in time to announce it as effective for September, 1961.

Before I submit it to the Regents, however, I should like to have faculty reaction to it. I am asking the University Senate and the Council on Instruction, therefore, as the two most generally representative bodies for matters of this kind, to send me whatever observations and recommendations they care to.

POLICY STATEMENT

Requirements for Admission Directly from High School

1. Any student who has graduated from a high school accredited by the Oklahoma State Department of Education or by one of the Regional Accrediting Associations, and who has not attended any other college, is eligible to apply for admission directly from high school.
2. Admission of Residents of Oklahoma
 - a. Students who rank in the upper three-fourths of their high school graduating class are admissible without additional evidence of scholastic ability.
 - b. Students who rank in the lower one-fourth of their high school graduating class may qualify for admission by any of the following means:
 1. Establishing their qualifications for collegiate study by an appropriate score on the ACT Program battery of achievement and aptitude tests.
 2. Enrolling in the summer session preceding the fall term immediately subsequent to high school graduation for a minimum of 8 semester credit hours and meeting the minimum retention standard of the University at the end of the session.

Admissions Policies -- continued

3. Deferring entrance by at least one calendar year from high school graduation.
3. Admission of Non-Resident Students
Students who are not residents of Oklahoma will be expected to rank in the upper one-half of their graduating class or to have achieved at the fiftieth centile or above on the ACT Program battery of tests based on national norms or a similar battery of tests.
4. The admissions officer will be authorized to make infrequent exceptions when, in his discretion, they are justified by unusual circumstances.

Senate Action

President Cross made a number of comments relative to the manner in which the foregoing admissions policies were developed. A brief discussion of this matter followed and President Cross answered several questions directed to him by members of the University Senate.

Dr. Upthegrove then moved that the University Senate express support of the policy statement on admission requirements and encourage all efforts to implement the policies as quickly as possible. Furthermore, that the University Senate should extend encouragement to the development of any additional requirements which would bring about continued improvement in this regard. The motion was seconded and passed.

ANNUAL "ROBE DAY" AT O. U. ✕

Memorandum from Dr. Bienfang

December 20, 1960

To: Vice President McCarter

From: Ralph Bienfang

Graduation seniors, their wives and parents become interested in robes, hoods, etc. at Commencement time, with two possible reactions, curiosity as to what they mean and the realization that after all, the Bachelor's robe is pretty plain in comparison. Fortunately this latter is forgotten in the rush that night to leave town and get started on what may be 1000-mile trip. This part of the Commencement experience is perhaps desultory and diletante.

Students at many colleges have days for Western dress, Dogpatch dress, and the like. These are allowed as serving some purpose. Staff is frequently urged to follow suit. In a sense, one of the accomplishments is to bring the staff down to the student level.

Annual "Robe Day" at O. U. -- continued

Now, might it not be well to set up a situation wherein the student might aspire to the instructor's level?

Suggestion: Annual "ROBE DAY" at O. U. Staff who possess robes requested to wear them for the full scholastic day--teaching, counseling, strolling and coffeeing. As to timing, the first Wednesday in December seems to have merit--deep in the semester, back to work after the Thanksgiving holidays, etc.

Possible accomplishments:

- a. Increased respect for the dignity of education.
- b. Increased respect for the instructor.
- c. A desire on the part of students to go on for higher degrees.
- d. A realization of the heterogeneity of the instructional staff.

Note: This memorandum was forwarded to Dr. Ewing, Chairman of the University Senate, on January 3, 1961.

Senate Action

Dr. Crosser moved referral of this matter to the Committee on Student and Public Relations. His motion was seconded and passed by the Senate.

ACADEMIC STATUS AND TENURE

Letter from President Cross

January 16, 1961

Professor Cortez A. M. Ewing, Chairman
University Senate

Dear Professor Ewing:

Problems involving the recruitment and retention of non-faculty personnel have led to the thought that there may be certain categories of University employees, in addition to the teaching faculty, that should have academic status. There are several groups with members who are expected to have academic training and preparation comparable to, or even identical with, those expected of the teaching faculty; and whose duties are clearly academic and more than ancillary to the academic purposes of the University. I am seeking a way to recognize those groups as holding academic status.

Along with academic status comes the question of tenure. Under our present tenure policy, eligibility for tenure is defined solely in terms of formal teaching load. No credit toward tenure is permitted even for formal allocation of time to research. And other primarily academic pursuits do not lead to tenure. I am looking forward to the development of a policy whereby the privileges and responsibilities of academic tenure may be extended to all members of the staff who are given academic status.

Academic Status and Tenure -- continued

I should like to have the University Senate's advice and comments on this idea of broadening our present definitions of academic status and academic tenure to include some groups that, under present policy are not now eligible for them. Such broadening of policy would be most helpful in our efforts to recruit personnel for these groups.

Will you please bring this matter to the attention of the Senate at the next regularly scheduled meeting.

Sincerely yours,

G. L. Cross, President

Senate Action

This matter was referred by the Chairman of the University Senate to the Committee on Faculty Personnel.

MODIFICATION OF UNIVERSITY REGULATIONS *

University of Oklahoma Interoffice Communication

To: The University Senate
All Deans of Degree-Recommending Colleges

From: G. L. Cross

Date: January 16, 1961

Quoted below is a recommendation made by the Committee on School Relations. It has my hearty approval.

The University Senate and the colleges of the University are requested to take up the recommendation and consider specific ways in which they can be put into effect.

"A reduction in the rigidity of the University's present system of regulations would, in the opinion of this committee, have nothing but salutary effect on public and student relations.

"We believe that the University of Oklahoma has shown sufficient evidence of maturity to indicate a serious desire to eliminate or modify rules which because of their rigidity are impractical or even damaging to the institution. No effort to reduce standards is expressed or implied in this statement. The University, its various colleges, and administrative agencies should obviously continue to provide guide lines as an operational framework, but colleges and other administrative units should strive for greater flexibility.

"It is therefore recommended that the University Senate and the various executive committees or councils of the respective colleges examine existent regulations looking toward possible modification. It is believed that a thorough introspective examination of the regulatory structure of the University will result in changes which will yield the desired flexibility in operations."

Senate Action

The foregoing recommendation relative to modification of University regulations was referred by the Chairman of the University Senate to the Committee on Student and Public Relations.

ACADEMIC STANDARDS ~~X~~

Explanatory Comment

On April 25, 1960, the University Senate approved two resolutions pertaining to athletic eligibility requirements. These resolutions recommended action to raise the requirements and were designed to encourage similar procedures in all universities in the Missouri Valley Intercollegiate Athletic Association.

Senate Action

With reference to eligibility requirements, Dr. Upthegrove raised two questions:

1. What action has been taken in the Association (Big Eight) to implement the University Senate recommendations with regard to raising the athletic eligibility requirements?
2. What follow-up procedures have been followed in regard to correspondence with other Universities in the effort to establish comparable requirements for athletes in all schools in the Big Eight Conference?

The problems and questions raised by Dr. Upthegrove were referred by the Chairman of the University Senate to the Committee on Academic Standards.

ADJOURNMENT

The University Senate adjourned at 5:00 P. M. The next regular meeting will be held on Monday, February 27, 1961. Materials for the Agenda should be in the Office of the Secretary by Wednesday, February 15.

Gerald A. Porter, Secretary