

JOURNAL OF THE UNIVERSITY SENATE

Regular Session, January 28, 1963, 4:10 P.M.  
Student Union Building, Room 165

The University Senate, meeting in regular session, was called to order by the Chairman, Dr. Bruce I. Granger.

Present

Allison, John E.  
Bishop, L. Doyle  
Bowen, Willis H.  
Brixey, John C.  
Brown, V. Jean  
Christian, Sherrill D.  
Craven, Clifford J.  
Cross, George L.  
David, Paul R.  
Granger, Bruce I.  
Hall, Rufus G.  
Johns, O. D.  
Keeley, Joe W.

Present

Kitts, David B.  
Male, Roy R.  
Matlock, J. Ray  
McFarland, Dora  
Patterson, Helen  
Plint, Colin A.  
Rarick, Joseph L.  
Rice, Leslie  
Riggs, Carl  
Sutherland, Patrick K.  
Wallingford, E. Keith  
Warren, Mary A.  
Wilcox, Stewart C.

Absent

Campbell, John M.  
Chisolm, Mildred V.  
Clark, F. Donald  
Comp, LaVerne A.  
Crim, Ed F.  
Crook, Kenneth  
de Stwolinski, Gail  
Ewing, George M.  
Gooch, Brison  
Fowler, Richard G.  
Lee, Cecil  
Morris, Virginia  
Phillips, Marion C.  
Pray, Joseph C.  
Ruggiers, Paul G.  
Schottstaedt, W. W.  
Stanley, A. J.  
Williams, Lloyd P.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Following notation of the correction indicated here, the Journal of the University Senate for the regular meeting held on November 26, 1962, was approved.

Correction: The title of the item presented on page 5 of the November 26 issue of the Journal of the University Senate was omitted. That title is: INSURANCE FOR FACULTY MEMBERS.

UNIVERSITY COMMITTEE APPOINTMENT

University Budget Council -- Acting on nominations submitted by the University Senate, President Cross, on December 3, 1962, appointed Dr. David Kitts to the University Budget Council. Dr. Kitts is filling the vacancy created by the death of Dr. Harriet Harvey.

## ACTION BY PRESIDENT CROSS

Reporting of Final Grades -- On December 3, 1962, President Cross approved the recommendations of the University Senate relative to the reporting of final grades. (See pages 2 and 3 of the Journal of the University Senate for November 26, 1962.)

Insurance for Faculty Members -- President Cross has indicated that the Office of the Vice President and Business Manager will consider suggestions of the University Senate relative to this matter. (See page 5 of the Journal of the University Senate for November 26, 1962.)

### REGULATIONS GOVERNING THE RESEARCH PROFESSORSHIP

#### Explanatory Comment

This matter was considered in a brief manner on November 26 and tabled for consideration in January of 1963. (See pages 6 and 7 of the Journal of the University Senate for January 26, 1962.)

#### Report from the Committee on Faculty Personnel

November 26, 1962

The Faculty Personnel Committee believes that Dean Doerr's letter of May 7, 1962, to President Cross presents two separate issues. The first is whether the budget of the Dean of the Graduate College should include all funds for faculty research, including "the funds necessary to support the research appointments and to provide replacements for any concomitant reduction in teaching load..." The second issue is how many types (or levels) of recognition should be granted faculty members who show or have shown unusual promise in research.

#### The First Issue: the Budget of the Graduate College

The Faculty Personnel Committee is convinced the development of the University practically requires that the status, power and budget of the Graduate Dean and Graduate College be brought into relative equilibrium with those of the other deanships and colleges. If the University is to put increasing emphasis upon upper division and graduate work, upon selective admissions to insure higher quality of student enrolment, and upon the sort of research which will justify the establishment of new chairs for an expanded faculty of distinction, then certainly the Graduate Dean should be expected to play an increasingly important role in University development. Furthermore, recent and prospective increases in the sizes of the colleges and departments make it imperative that a wise balance be struck not only between the administrative work loads of the deans but also between teaching and research. In this

Regulations Governing the Research Professorship -- continued

With these considerations in mind, the Faculty Personnel Committee therefore recommends that the budget of the Graduate Dean include (a) the salaries of Research Professors and (b) such other funds as come into being if other types (levels) of recognition for research are forthcoming as a result of recommendations regarding this second issue.

The Second Issue:  
Research Appointments

The Faculty Personnel Committee agrees with Dean Doerr and the Graduate Council that certain changes in the regulations relative to research appointments are needed. However, the Committee feels that two, instead of three, levels of recognition would be sufficient.

"1. Research Professor Canon the same as for the present Research Professor." (The Committee disagrees here. To restrict such appointments to 10 years is unrealistic, just as it has been unrealistic to require renewal of Boyd Professorships every five years. Has the President ever failed to recommend the renewal of a Boyd Professorship to the Regents?)

"2. Research Associate." The Committee believes the purposes which the Graduate Dean and the Council have in mind would be adequately served if the Graduate Dean and the Council were continuously to evaluate the projects and proposals of faculty members who show unusual promise as researchers or who need reduced teaching loads to bring current projects to completion. The Committee thinks (a) that a faculty member who has such a title as "assistant Professor-Research Associate" for a five-year term on a six-hour teaching load, or even less, would be reluctant to return to regular twelve-hour teaching duties and (b) that those who would decide such a faculty member's academic fate would also be reluctant to reach such a decision. For these reasons, therefore, the five-year term idea be abandoned. However, the rest of Dean Doerr's recommendations in his letter of May 7 (see pages 3 and 4 of the Journal of the University Senate for September 24, 1962.) should be implemented so that the Council and the Graduate Dean, after consultation with the dean of the college concerned, can make appropriate recommendations to the President. (This would require at least a majority of votes cast (by the Graduate Council) and never would require a unanimous vote.")

In addition to the foregoing, the Committee on Faculty Personnel suggests that the Graduate Council specifically formulate a flexible definition of the term research so as to lay down clear guide lines for future recognitions of research and reduced teaching load appointments. Such a definition should include recognition of creative work in all areas: the natural sciences, social sciences, humanities, and fine arts. It would thus embrace, e.g., painting, sculpturing, designing, musical and literary composition, as well as the more conventional meanings of the term.

Regulations Governing the Research Professorship -- continued

If the suggestions above are recommended to the President and subsequently adopted, they should appropriately supersede or modify the section in the Faculty Handbook upon Research Professorships (pp. 17-18) and any other sections to which they may relate.

Committee on Faculty Personnel

W. H. Bowen	L. Rice
V. J. Brown	A. J. Stanley
C. Lee	S. C. Wilcox,
J. L. Rarick	Chairman

Senate Action

Dr. Wilcox, Chairman of the Committee on Faculty Personnel, commented relative to the foregoing report. He then moved that the University Senate recommend to the University administration that it proceed as deemed wise to build up an academic budget for the Graduate Dean. His motion was seconded.

Considerable discussion developed regarding the motion. Dr. Hall then made a substitute motion that the matter be referred back to the Committee on Faculty Personnel for further study and more specific recommendations. His motion was seconded and passed by the University Senate.

GRADES ON MID-SEMESTER PROGRESS REPORTS

Explanatory Comment

This matter was brought before the University Senate in a letter from Dr. Stewart C. Wilcox (see Journal of the University Senate for November 26, 1962.) Consideration of the problems pointed up in the letter was referred to the Senate Committee on Courses and Curricula.

Report of the Committee on Courses and Curricula

January 15, 1963

Professor Bruce Granger, Chairman  
The University Senate

Dear Professor Granger:

The Senate Committee on Courses and Curricula has duly considered the problem raised in the attached letter of November 19, 1962 to the Chairman of the Senate from Professor Wilcox.

We can find no record in the Senate Journal of previous definitive action having been taken on this matter, although it has several times been discussed.

Grades on Mid-Semester Progress Reports -- continued

Our committee wishes to report the following recommendation:

that the Office of Admissions and Records be requested to permit the mid-semester standing of students whose work is deemed unsatisfactory to be reported either as a letter grade ("D", "E", "F") or as "U" (explained as signifying a provisional grade of "D" or below), at the option of the individual instructor.

Sincerely yours,

Bruce Granger  
Rufus G. Hall  
Richard G. Fowler  
J. Ray Matlock  
E. Keith Wallingford  
Mary A. Warren

Paul R. David, Chairman  
Senate Committee on Courses  
and Curricula

Senate Action

Dr. David, Chairman of the Committee on Courses and Curricula, commented relative to the foregoing report. He then moved adoption of the report by the University Senate. His motion was seconded and passed.

USE OF UNIVERSITY FACILITIES

Explanatory Comment

On February 26, 1962, the University Senate adopted a report submitted by the Senate Committee on University Organization, Budget and Publications. That report dealt with ideas relative to the use of University facilities. The report (Journal of the University Senate, February 26, 1962, pages 1 through 7) was presented to President Cross.

On March 1, 1962, President Cross sent a statement to the University Senate in which he indicated full accord with the spirit and intent of the recommendations of the University Senate. He pointed up, however, that additional study was required.

Subsequently, the Senate Committee on Student and Public Relations began a study of control of student scheduling under an expanded academic day and week. Also, the Senate Committee on University Organization, Budget and Publications continued its study of certain of the problems and currently is endeavoring to develop a master plan for year-round operation of University facilities.

Senate Action

Professor Keeley, Chairman of the Committee on University Organization, Budget and Publications presented a progress report. He asked the members of the University Senate to submit to him their ideas relative to year-round use of University facilities.

TEACHING LOAD

Progress Report of Committee on Teaching and Research

January 28, 1963

The following statement is taken from the Journal of the University Senate of April 30, 1962:

"Dr. Bishop raised for consideration by the University Senate the matter of teaching load as set forth in a University of Oklahoma Interoffice Communication issued to all faculty by Vice President McCarter on April 27, 1962. Dr. Bishop indicated special concern regarding item No. 8 in the communication sent out by Vice President McCarter.

"Dr. Bishop moved that the entire statement concerning teaching load be referred to the appropriate committee of the University Senate for study with special attention being given to item No. 8. His motion was seconded and passed.

"This matter was immediately referred to the Committee on Teaching and Research of the University Senate."

No action was taken by the committee before the summer recess of 1962 and the above item was handed on in the Fall to the revised committee for 1962-63.

Item No. 8 of Dr. McCarter's communication of April 27, 1962, is as follows:

"Undoubtedly there are members of the faculty who should be asked to teach more than twelve credit hours per semester, depending on the number of preparations required, the sizes of the classes, and the degree of the person's interest (or lack of it) in doing other kinds of professional or scholarly work."

A member of the committee has discussed this item with Dr. McCarter, and he has informed the committee that Item No. 8 is a statement of policy. However, he stated that this term in no way indicates an intention on the part of the administration to "move towards" a 15-hour teaching load but is necessary in providing flexibility in scheduling. The particular cases in question are primarily those where multiple sections of the same course are being taught (as provided for in the Faculty Handbook) and where a person is doing little or no scholarly or professional work.

Dr. McCarter pointed out that the main objective of his April 27 communication to the faculty was to clarify procedures by which reduced teaching loads (below 12 hours) can be granted. The administration is fully aware of the difficulties of recruiting desirable new faculty members and in retaining those already here in competition with many other universities which have standard teaching loads of 9 hours or less. He stated that the administration is working toward a selective reduction in teaching load, as budget conditions

Teaching Load -- continued

permit, for faculty members who are doing productive research work. He hopes that procedures concerning such reductions in teaching load can be liberalized further during the coming year.

The committee presents the preceding remarks as a statement of clarification and feels that no motion concerning Item No. 8 of Dr. McCarter's communication is necessary.

The committee is at present investigating the feasibility of compiling information concerning the various criteria for reduced teaching loads other than research.

Committee on Teaching and Research

John E. Allison  
Donald Clark  
Ed F. Crim  
Colin Plint

Joseph Pray  
Paul Ruggiers  
W. W. Schottstaedt  
Patrick K. Sutherland,  
Chairman

Senate Action

Dr. Sutherland, Chairman of the Committee on Teaching and Research, commented relative to the foregoing progress report. He indicated that his committee will continue to study the problems that have been pointed up. No formal action was taken.

ADJOURNMENT

The University Senate adjourned at 5:05 p. m. The next regular meeting will be held on Monday, February 25, 1963. Materials for the Agenda should be in the Office of the Secretary by Tuesday, February 12.

Gerald A. Porter, Secretary