

JOURNAL OF THE UNIVERSITY SENATE

Regular Session, February 26, 1962, 4:10 P. M.
Monnet Hall, Room 101

The University Senate, meeting in regular session, was called to order by the Chairman, Dr. John G. Eriksen.

Present

Allison, John E.
Bishop, L. Doyle
Clark, F. Donald
Comp, LaVerne A.
Crim, Ed F.
de Stwolinski, Gail
Eriksen, John G.
Fowler, Richard G.
Granger, Bruce
Hall, Rufus G., Jr.
Harvey, Harriet
Heilman, Arthur
Holland, C. Joe
Johns, O. D.

Present

Keeley, Joe W.
Lee, Cecil
Male, Roy R.
Olson, Ralph E.
Patterson, Helen E.
Rice, Leslie H.
Riggs, Carl D.
Schottstaedt, W. W.
Shadid, Tannell A.
Springer, C. E.
Stanley, A. J.
Steanson, Edith
Wiens, Gerhard
Williams, Lloyd P.

Absent

Bittle, William E.
Brixy, John C.
Brown, W. Jean
Campbell, John M.
Craven, Clifford J.
Crook, Kenneth E.
Cross, George L.
David, Paul R.
Dunham, Lowell
Feaver, J. Clayton
Heston, Bernard O.
Huff, William N.
Kitts, David
Morris, Virginia
Rarick, Joseph L.
Upthegrove, William R.

APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES

The Journals of the University Senate for the regular meeting held on January 29, 1962, and the special meeting held on February 12, 1962, were approved.

UNIVERSITY COMMITTEE APPOINTMENT

Council on Planning and Development. Utilizing nominations submitted by the University Senate, President Cross on February 2 appointed Professor George Fraser, College of Law, to fill the vacancy on the Council on Planning and Development created by the death of Professor William Bandy.

USE OF UNIVERSITY FACILITIES Report of the Committee on University Organization, Budget, and Publications

February 12, 1962

A Study of Various Plans for More
Effective Use of University Facilities

In March of 1961 this Committee was given the task of investigating the various methods of dividing the academic calendar into terms, with the objective of recommending to the Senate a calendar which would most efficiently utilize our present facilities on an expanded operational basis.

Use of University Facilities -- continued

Basic Assumptions

The Committee assumes (1) that its basic assignment is to portray both the advantages and disadvantages of the various ways of partitioning the calendar year into academic terms, (2) that the desired goal is the optimum use of personnel and facilities consistent with promising conditions for a high degree of excellence in academic standards, (3) that cost of operation, per student, should not be appreciably increased, (4) that available space for student stations will not be significantly augmented, (5) that faculty salaries would be based, as at present, on a nine months period with a proportionate increment for additional teaching in terms which may be added to extend the academic year, and (6) that a recommendation is to be made, based on the listed assumptions and the data collected from other institutions, (See Appendix), which will best fit the needs and resources of the University of Oklahoma.

Summary of Possible Plans

To expand to an operating period of eleven to twelve months through the use of:

- (I) The Trimester Plan
- (II) The Three-Quarter Plan plus a Summer Session
- (III) The Four-Quarter Plan
- (IV) The Semester Plan plus a Summer Term or Terms.

General Statement

The Committee feels it is most desirable to set down at this point three basic concepts which developed during its discussions, with the belief that these ideas clarify the misleading and sometimes contradictory statements frequently used by the advocates of each of the systems listed above:

(1) The expansion of the academic year from nine months to the longer period does not increase the number of students which may be on campus during any given normal term. Thus, none of the plans listed above would in itself permit the enrollment in September of more students than can now be admitted.

(2) The expansion to the longer academic year will accelerate the educational program of the student who is capable of sustained effort, and could permit the earning of the baccalaureate degree in fewer than the four years traditionally required. This means that the total number of students graduated over a period of years could be greater than under the present nine months system plus summer sessions.

(3) The capacity of the physical plant in terms of enrollment per semester may be increased in two ways:

- (a) To Construct more classroom, housing, and laboratory space, or,
- (b) To expand the academic day and week by utilizing our laboratories and classrooms at times not commonly used; Saturday periods, night classes, and scheduling during the "unpopular" periods of the day (ie; 3 p.m. to 6 p.m., 12 to 1 p.m.)

Use of University Facilities -- continuedDiscussion of Plans for Partitioning the Year
into Academic Terms

Various plans are set forth and discussed separately, and advantages and disadvantages of each plan are offered for consideration. In all cases the expanded academic year is considered to be as near to eleven months as possible. This is arbitrary, but is based on the fact that an institution of University magnitude should set aside a period of several weeks for routine maintenance of the plant.

I. Trimester Plan

A type of year-round academic calendar composed of three 15 week terms including an examination period, is commonly referred to as the trimester plan. The trimester system can be considered as an extension of the semester system and is so treated by the several colleges presently operating with this calendar.

This plan would provide maximum utilization of facilities, provided that the enrollment in all three terms were nearly the same, and, in turn, this would require a full complement of faculty and course offerings.

It is apparently a premise of this plan that applications for admission are so numerous that the institution can designate to the applicants the terms in which they may matriculate in order to have all student stations occupied. This premise makes the trimester plan particularly efficient for an institution in a large center of population where students who must support themselves can find jobs during each term of matriculation.

This plan would entail a sizeable increase in payment for faculty salaries, but if the year-round enrollment were sufficiently high, this increase could not be considered a disadvantage.

It should be emphasized that it would be unsound, educationally, for a faculty member to teach in three consecutive trimesters in each of two consecutive years. Students also need periodic rest from academic strain, but it may be argued that a trimester is too long a rest period for a serious student who desires some degree of acceleration in his program.

Full scale operation is required by this plan in each trimester and considerable financial risk develops unless full enrollment can be assured in the summer period. This assurance is questionable at the University when it is considered that a large number of our students must work during the summer to be able to return to the campus in the fall. Estimates of the student body falling in this category vary from 30 to 60 percent.

A student working through the summer could have his educational progress decelerated because he could earn in two trimesters fewer credit hours than in two semesters.

Some further disadvantages could be mentioned. There is some difficulty for students who transfer into or out of an institution with the trimester plan. (Of 1,058 universities and colleges accredited in 1960, fewer than 6 were using the trimester plan.) Athletic eligibility raises a question for the accelerated student in the trimester plan. If he receives the baccalaureate degree before the end of four calendar years he may be ineligible for competition in part of the fourth year.

Use of University Facilities -- continuedII. Three-Quarter Plan Plus Summer Session

This arrangement would replace two semesters by three quarters. The usual summer session would not be altered by this plan, but could, because of increased summer demand, be expanded to any economic capacity. From the point of view of increased use of facilities and staff, this plan has nothing to offer on the side of advantages.

The quarter plans are all most costly with regard to administration than the trimester or semester calendars. Details of this factor will be discussed under Item III (Four-Quarter Plan).

III. Four-Quarter Plan

The usual quarter calendar is composed of three regular terms per year with about ten weeks per term instructional time and a school year of about the same over-all length as under a semester system (typically 37 or 38 weeks), running from late September through early June.

The fourth quarter may be similar to the other quarters in scope and purpose, or it may be a summer session period outside of the regular program and with a different emphasis.

(a) Advantages:

This division of the year into quarters would be more flexible for undecided students wishing to transfer to a new major field of study. The new course work could be begun with little delay, assuming full offering each quarter.

If a faculty member were not to be employed for four quarters in one year, he would have a choice for his quarter out in which to improve himself professionally. For example, the fall quarter might be a more desirable time to complete degree requirements at another university.

As to the learning process, it has been argued that it is better for a student to take fewer courses and concentrate on them for a shorter period than a semester.

Certainly a sound advantage stems from the quarter system in that, under this calendar, the Christmas vacation and spring vacation fall between terms. This is a feature which cannot be matched in the semester system and maintain, also, matriculation dates which fit closely those of the public school system.

(b) Disadvantages:

There are relatively few major institutions on the quarter system. Of the 1,058 universities and colleges accredited as of January 1, 1960, a total of 156 were operating on the quarter plan. From 1956 to 1960, 26 institutions had changed from the quarter to the semester system and only two had changed from semester to quarter. The small percentage of institutions using the quarter plan, and the transfers from this system to the semester plan, may indicate that the accumulated disadvantages outweigh the advantages listed in the previous section.

Use of University Facilities -- continued

However, to list some specific factors on the disadvantage side:

If one quarter begins directly after the Christmas holidays, the following quarter runs late into June which causes the students to be at a disadvantage in finding summer employment. Again, as in the trimester plan, if students should be forced to drop out an additional quarter in the spring in order to work, his educational progress would be decelerated instead of accelerated.

Concerning the acceleration of course work in the quarter plan over the semester plan, there might be an advantage in some fields in reducing the time spent on a course to gain more efficiency, but in other areas the dilution resulting from a shorter period could be definitely harmful. Correspondence with people at institutions using the quarter plan discloses (see Appendix) that a large number of I (incomplete) grades are given in courses requiring term projects or papers. This may indicate that the quarter period does not allow sufficient time for a scholarly coverage of the material.

A tangible disadvantage is the additional cost for the administration of the three or four-quarter plan in comparison to a semester or trimester period of equivalent length. All of the standard operations of registration, scheduling of classes, examinations, the handling of grades and records, and the printing of class schedules are done one more time each year than under a comparable semester or trimester period. While this expenditure will vary with the number of students processed, a reliable estimate has placed the unit cost at about one dollar per student for the numbers we normally enroll.

With the four-quarter plan as with the trimester plan, the institution would find it necessary to fill the fourth quarter to capacity or suffer a financial loss on the operation.

Our correspondence with people from other institutions (See Appendix) who have participated in the change from one plan to another (semester to quarter, quarter to semester), bring out clearly the considerable cost in time and money of such a change. Each course must be modified to the different time interval, the total revision of all catalogue and bulletin material is required, and in many cases new text books must be selected in order to fit the revised coverage.

IV. Semester Plan plus Summer Session

This plan is based on a calendar of two semesters of about 15 weeks of classes each, running from late September to early June, plus a summer session which may consist of an 8 week term or two 6 weeks terms. The ideal arrangement is to plan the summer session to fit the existing demand and, within economical reason, supply the potential demand.

Studies on space utilization made by the Office of Admissions and Records reveal that it is possible to accommodate at least 20 percent more students with the present facilities. Although the University ranks in the top 10 percent of the nations universities and colleges in the number of class meetings per week per room, it would still be possible to expand the academic day and thus accommodate a larger student body. This can be done by scheduling classes (especially laboratories) on Saturdays and at night, by making better use of the period from 7:00 a.m. to 9:00 a.m., and by making more use of the "unpopular" hours of the day (12:00 noon and 2:00 to 6:00 p.m.).

Use of University Facilities -- continued

The above expansion of time in lieu of space would require, to be successful, the stipulation that the academic departments would cooperate and that a feasible system of assigning students to the undesirable periods could be developed.

An argument for the semester system is that the term length permits the student to concentrate on the subject material for a longer period of time than under the quarter system. In brief, more time is available for reflection.

The most serious deficiency in the present semester plan with regard to acceleration is the lack of an adequate offering in the summer session. If a student, say in engineering, finds that only one course in his required curriculum is available in a summer term, it is likely that he will not enroll. Graduate students in some departments must leave the University during the summer because there is not a sufficient offering of graduate courses, and because the undergraduate program is not large enough to finance his way by part time teaching.

It is well for the University to welcome the teachers from elementary and secondary schools who come in the summer for eight hours of work toward a promotion or increase in salary, but the summer session should become more than a teacher's institute. It should be expanded in each college to permit the accomodation of students who cannot attend the semester terms, and to provide an academic acceleration to those students who are capable and interested.

Recommendations

The Committee, after considering the data assembled, the experiences of other institutions, and the specific requirements of the University of Oklahoma, recommends:

1. That the calendar used by the University of Oklahoma should be similar in matriculation dates to the other major academic institutions in Oklahoma, and should be coordinated with the graduation dates of Oklahoma high schools.
2. That the University calendar will consist of two semesters plus a summer program. The summer offering should be broad enough in scope to permit a student to earn twelve to fourteen credit hours toward his academic objective. To make this possible, it is suggested that two six weeks terms replace the present eight weeks term as soon as practical.
3. That the University concentrate on the problem of expanding the academic day and week by a fuller utilization of the existing facilities. This would require the use of classrooms and laboratories in the late afternoon, at night, and on Saturdays. Appropriate control of student scheduling is an essential part of this recommendation.

Respectfully submitted,

William Bittle	Edith Steason
Luther Bishop	C. E. Springer
Clifford Craven	Lloyd Williams
Carl Riggs	Joe Keeley, Chairman

Use of University Facilities -- continued

A two-page listing of bulletins, reports, and correspondence studied by the Committee on University Organization, Budget, and Publications and from which data were taken for use in the foregoing report is omitted here. In the form of an Appendix, it was used by University Senate members in the meeting on February 26.

Senate Action

Professor Keeley, Chairman of the Committee on University Organization, Budget, and Publications, presented the foregoing report and commented relative to major items in it. He moved that the report be adopted by the University Senate and submitted to President Cross for his consideration. The motion was seconded.

Following considerable discussion, Professor Comp moved to amend the wording of Recommendation No. 2 (see Page 6 to this Journal) as follows:

Change the last sentence to read: "To make this possible, it is suggested that a longer term or two shorter terms replace the present eight weeks term as soon as the demand justifies such a change." (Underscore indicates the changed wording.)

Professor Comp's motion was seconded and passed.

The motion by Professor Keeley for adoption of the report was passed.

ADJOURNMENT

The University Senate adjourned at 5:15 p.m. The next regular meeting is scheduled to be held on Monday, March 26, 1962. Since that date falls within the period of SPRING VACATION, the nature and extent of senate business will determine whether there will be a meeting in March. The Agenda for the March 26 meeting, or a notice that it has been cancelled, will be sent to all senators on March 17.

Gerald A. Porter, Secretary

Department of Education

The Department of Education is pleased to announce the results of the recent examination. The candidates who have passed are listed below. The examination was held on the 15th of the month and the results were made known to the candidates on the 20th of the month.

Results

The following candidates have passed the examination. The names of the candidates who have failed are also listed below. The examination was held on the 15th of the month and the results were made known to the candidates on the 20th of the month.

The following candidates have passed the examination. The names of the candidates who have failed are also listed below. The examination was held on the 15th of the month and the results were made known to the candidates on the 20th of the month.

The following candidates have passed the examination. The names of the candidates who have failed are also listed below. The examination was held on the 15th of the month and the results were made known to the candidates on the 20th of the month.

The following candidates have passed the examination. The names of the candidates who have failed are also listed below. The examination was held on the 15th of the month and the results were made known to the candidates on the 20th of the month.

The following candidates have passed the examination. The names of the candidates who have failed are also listed below. The examination was held on the 15th of the month and the results were made known to the candidates on the 20th of the month.

Results

The following candidates have passed the examination. The names of the candidates who have failed are also listed below. The examination was held on the 15th of the month and the results were made known to the candidates on the 20th of the month.

The following candidates have passed the examination. The names of the candidates who have failed are also listed below. The examination was held on the 15th of the month and the results were made known to the candidates on the 20th of the month.