

JOURNAL OF THE UNIVERSITY SENATE

Regular Session, May 27, 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.

<u>Present</u>		<u>Present</u>		<u>Absent</u>	
Allison, John E.	-	Kitts, David B.	(1)	Campbell, John M.	(3)
Bishop, L. Doyle	-	Lee, Cecil	(2)	Chisolm, Mildred V.	(5)
Bowen, Willis H.	-	Male, Roy R.	-	Craven, Clifford J.	(2)
Brixey, John C.	-	McFarland, Dora	(2)	Crook, Kenneth	(2)
Brown, V. Jean	-	Morris, Virginia	(1)	Cross, George L.	(4)
Christian, Sherrill D.	(1)	Patterson, Helen	(1)	Matlock, J. Ray	(2)
Clark, F. Donald	(4)	Plint, Colin A.	(2)	Sutherland, Patrick K	(1)
Comp, LaVerne A.	(1)	Phillips, Marion C.	(1)		
Crim, Ed F.	(2)	Pray, Joseph C.	(2)		
David, Paul R.	(1)	Rarick, Joseph L.	(1)		
de Stwolinski, Gail	(1)	Rice, Leslie	(1)		
Ewing, George M.	(1)	Riggs, Carl	(3)		
Fowler, Richard G.	(5)	Ruggiers, Paul G.	(3)		
Gooch, Brison D.	(2)	Schottstaedt, W. W.	(5)		
Granger, Bruce I.	-	Stanley, A. J.	(2)		
Hall, Rufus G.	(2)	Wallingford, E. Keith	(1)		
Johns, O. D.	(2)	Warren, Mary A.	(1)		
Keeley, Joe W.	(2)	Wilcox, Stewart C.	-		
		Williams, Loyd P.	(2)		

NOTE: During this year there were seven regular meetings of the University Senate. The numbers in the parentheses above indicate meetings missed. In each case where there is no number, the Senator has a record of perfect attendance for the seven meetings.

APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES

The Journal of the University Senate for the regular meeting held on April 29, 1963 was approved.

ACTION BY PRESIDENT CROSS

Stop Day -- On May 1, 1963, President Cross indicated approval of a recommendation from the University Senate that he disapprove a Student Senate resolution proclaiming May 16 at "Stop Day". (See the Journal of the University Senate for April 29, 1963, page 16.)

Grading Systems -- On May 22, 1963, President Cross indicated approval of two recommendations submitted by the University Senate. (See the Journal of the University Senate for April 29, 1963, pages 12 and 13.)

CONTROL OF STUDENT SCHEDULING UNDER AN EXPANDED
ACADEMIC DAY AND WEEK

Report of the Committee on Student and Public Relations

May 13, 1963

Introduction

In April, 1963, this Committee was given the assignment of studying the control of student scheduling under an expanded academic day and week. Progress reports were made in May, 1962, and November, 1962. The Committee has investigated various aspects of the problem and submits its findings and recommendations under three general headings: (1) Such information as it was able to secure about the characteristics of the University of Oklahoma student in 1962 which might have a bearing on the control of student scheduling; (2) A summary of reports from other Big-8 institutions on what they are doing about controlling student scheduling; and (3) Recommendations for the control of student scheduling.

Findings and recommendations

I. Characteristics of the Freshman Class of 1962-63.

- The information which follows was taken from a rough draft of a study being conducted by the University Guidance Service and covers 2,254 "new" freshmen enrolled in the University of Oklahoma in the fall of 1962. By "new" is meant students who have had no previous college courses, either at O.U. or at some other institution:
1. Most of these students were born in 1943 and 1944.
 2. The class is made up of 62% men and 38% women. This compares with 73% men and 27% women in the freshman class of 1952.
 3. A comparison of median ACT (American College Test) scores shows that the O.U. freshman class compares with the 1962 Oklahoma norms as follows: English, 21 and 19, mathematics, 21 and 18; social studies, 21 and 19; science, 22 and 19; composite, 21 and 19.
 4. The class had a median high school grade point average of 2.72.
 5. Major subject areas for the class are as follows: quantitative, 21% verbal, 14%; business, 13%; biological sciences, 11%; education, 9%; fine arts, 5%; and undecided, 26%.
 6. Number of resident and non-resident students: resident, 75%; non-resident, 25%. These figures compare with the 1952 freshman class figures of 83% resident and 17% non-resident.
 7. Marital status: single, 97%; married, 3%.
 8. Type of home community: farm or ranch, 4%; town of less than 2,500, 9%; town of 2,500 to 9,999, 16%; city of 10,000 to 49,999, 32%; and city of 50,000 and over, 39%.
 9. Size of high school senior class: 0 to 25, 3%; 26 to 49, 9%; 50 to 99, 12%; 100 to 499, 54%; 500 and over, 22%.
 10. Distance from home: 0 to 4 miles, 6%; 5 to 24 miles, 17%; 25 to 49 miles, 12%; 50 to 99 miles, 11%; 100 miles and over, 54%.
 11. Housing plans: parents' or relatives' homes, 12%; university housing, 81%; Greek house, 4%; private, off campus, 3%.
 12. Parental income: less than \$5,000, 16%; \$5,000 to \$9,999, 50%; \$10,000 and over, 34%.
 13. Educational level of parents: 8th grade or less, 3%; some high school, 8%; high school graduate, 34%; some college, 29%; college graduate, 18%; advanced degree, 6%.

Control of Student Scheduling Under An Expanded Academic Day and Week -- continued

14. Scholarships and loans: 488 students reported scholarship aid ranging from about \$350 to over \$1,000, with most in the first category; 63 were in the over \$1,000 bracket. 78 freshmen reported receiving loans of from \$200 to \$1,000, with most in the \$600 to \$800 range. Some students report both scholarships and loans.
15. Registration of cars on campus: 27% report car registered; 73%, no car registered.
16. Fraternity-sorority pledges: pledge, 37%, independent, 63%.
17. Proportion who plan to teach: Plan to teach, 17%; do not plan to teach, 83%.

II. Reports from Other Big-8 Institutions

A survey of other Big-8 schools was made in order to find out what is being done elsewhere to control student scheduling. The survey revealed various procedures were being used and that no school had a completely satisfactory way of controlling scheduling.

At Kansas State University the departments are asked to schedule 45% of the course offerings on MWF mornings -- and the students are assigned 50% of their work on MWF mornings.

The University of Kansas states that one-third of a student's classes must be in the afternoon or on Saturday morning unless excused by the Committee on Special Enrollment Privileges. Department heads are asked to schedule a number of their required classes at the hours which more or less force the student to take classes at an undesirable time. Pen sectioning is also used. The scribes, in assigning these classes, are told to keep the classes equally balanced throughout the day. The student is not aware of his schedule -- whether it is due to the balancing of the class or to the undesirable hours at which the particular class is offered.

Nebraska has a rule that two-fifths of a student's classes must be scheduled on Tuesday, Thursday, Saturday and/or MWF afternoons. Students are asked to turn in their suggested programs and then the registrar schedules the hours.

At the University of Colorado the student and adviser make a tentative schedule. At this point if the student wants to have special hours the student petitions for this privilege. A faculty committee reviews the petitions which must be accompanied by documentation showing that the student works, is in the band, etc. If the petition is accepted a permit is given which is turned in with the tentative schedule card. The cards go to a sectioning area staffed by faculty members representing each department. The student is given the requested schedule if possible -- if not, the best alternate schedule is assigned. The completed schedule is sent out to the student via printed registration. Any "drop" and "add" procedure is referred to the specific department.

Iowa State University has no control at the present time but is investigating the possibility of machine scheduling.

Control of Student Scheduling Under An Expanded Academic Day and Week -- continued

III. Recommendations for the Control of Student Scheduling

1. That the Deans of the Colleges and Schools, Heads of the Divisions and Chairmen of the Schools and Departments see that the plan approved for maximum utility of facilities to be put in effect in 1-63-64 be followed
2. That a machine method of scheduling be developed and put into effect when the ratio of student load to available facilities make it necessary.
 - a. Advantages
 1. Cut enrollment time
 2. Reduce changes necessary due to scheduled conflicts
 - b. Disadvantages
 1. Less student liberty in selection of schedule time and instruction
3. That the present method of scheduling be continued, with necessary changes, until the machine method is put into effect.
4. That provision, under close control, be made for early enrollment for the following special cases:
 - a. Seniors
 - b. Athletic team members
 - c. Working students
 - d. Band members
 - e. Students commuting long distance
 - f. Other
5. That a section be filled to capacity before closing. Then combine or cancel all sections with enrollments below the approved number.
6. That Departments and Advisers be fairly rigid in regard to approving changes in enrollment once a student has selected or been assigned a section.

Respectfully submitted,

Mildred Chisolm	Virginia Morris
Sherril Christian	Helen Patterson
LaVerne Comp	O. D. Johns,
Brison Gooch	Chairman

Senate Action

Dr. Johns, Chairman of the University Senate Committee on Student and Public Relations, presented the foregoing report relative to student scheduling. He moved that the recommendations in the report be adopted and transmitted to President Cross. The motion was seconded and passed.

ADVISABILITY OF THE UNIVERSITY OF OKLAHOMA RETAINING
MEMBERSHIP IN "MID-AMERICA STATE UNIVERSITIES ASSOCIATION"

Report of the Committee and Public Relations

May 13, 1963

The Committee on Student and Public Relations studied the University of Oklahoma file on MASUA and talked with Vice-President McCarter and others on the campus who have knowledge of its purposes and activities.

Information about MASUA

MASUA is an organization of the Big-Eight institutions plus Colorado State and the State University of Iowa. Representatives of each of these institutions were present at an organizational meeting held in Kansas City on October 28, 1959. (Dr. Lloyd Swearingen and Mr. Verne Kennedy attended for OU.)

All institutions participated in drafting the "Articles of Agreement of the Mid-America State Universities Association". This document provides for the establishment of a Council of Participating Institutions, consisting of the Chief Executive Officer, the Dean of the Graduate School (or College) and a representative of Organized Research from each institution. The Council elects a Chairman, Vice-Chairman and Secretary annually to conduct affairs of the Association between meetings of the Council. The Articles make it clear that no member institution assumes any liability for action or inaction of the Association, its Council or elected officials.

Departmental conferences in several subject areas have been sponsored by MASUA. The organization encourages exchange of students between member institutions when curricula available at one institution are not offered at others. Expensive research instruments may be shared between universities through the MASUA organization.

The possibilities of mutual gain by cooperation among the ten universities are worth exploring further. MASUA could provide the framework for carrying out programs involving the exchange of ideas, students, equipment and manpower. In the future, it is possible that financial commitments would have to be made to establish a central office for MASUA; however, at that time, the University could decide whether the expected additional benefits would outweigh the cost. Presently, the University stands to gain and risks little by remaining in MASUA.

Recommendation

The Committee on Student and Public Relations recommends that the University retain its membership in the Mid-America State Universities Association.

Respectfully submitted,

Mildred Chisolm	Virginia Morris
Sherril Christian	Helen Patterson
LaVerne Comp	O. D. Johns,
Brison Gooch	Chairman

Senate Action

Dr. Johns, Chairman of the University Senate Committee on Student and Public Relations, presented the foregoing report. He moved adoption of the recommendation included in the report. His motion was seconded and passed.

THE UNIVERSITY CALENDAR FOR 1964--65

Report of the Committee on University Organization, Budget and Publications

May 13, 1963

Introduction

On March 25, Dr. McCarter submitted to the University Senate the calendar for the year 1964-65, as proposed by Dean Fellows, and requested comment or recommendation.

The Committee scheduled a meeting with Dr. Fellows on May 7, and discussed with him the factors which had influenced the calendar preparation.

Suggestions were made, and concurred to by Dean Fellows, that a study day or weekend be included in each semester between the termination of classes and the beginning of final examinations. Also, the Summer Session was increased in length to provide the same course length in minutes that is scheduled in a semester.

The revised calendar is submitted to the Senate for consideration.

General Statement

In arriving at the calendar dates which are presented, the Committee formulated or accepted the general principles:

1. That a minimum instructional period of fifteen weeks constitutes a semester. This requires seventy-five instructional days each semester, counting the week as extending from Monday through Friday.
2. With the increase of course offerings throughout the University and more sections of many courses required by larger enrollments, the use of an eight day final examination period is found desirable to accomplish the following:
 - (a) To insure that the student, with minor exceptions, will not be scheduled for more than two final examinations in one day.
 - (b) To reduce the need of giving "uniform final examinations" in advance of the scheduled examination period.
3. That a study day or weekend, between the ending of course work and the beginning of final examinations, is advantageous to the student and should be scheduled in the academic calendar.
4. That a minimum period of two days between the final examination period and commencement is required to process student records and print the Commencement Program.

Recommendations

The Committee recommends:

1. That the revised calendar, as submitted, be approved by the Senate.
2. That a study day of weekend be included in subsequent calendars between course work ending and final examination beginning.

The University Calendar for 1964-65 -- continued

3. That an eight day final examination period is desirable at the present time, and should be so considered in future calendar preparations.
4. That administrative action be taken to insure compliance with the published final examination schedule as stipulated in the Faculty Handbook, Fall 1962 edition.

The Committee believes that unauthorized deviations from the official schedule of final examinations may create a handicap to the student and should be discouraged by appropriate administrative action.

Sincerely submitted,

Lloyd P. Williams	George M. Ewing
Clifford J. Craven	Dora McFarland
L. Doyle Bishop	Joe Keeley,
Carl Riggs	Chairman

PROPOSED CALENDAR FOR 1964-65

<u>First Semester</u>		
Sept.	7-11	Testing, advising, and enrollment
Sept.	14	Classwork begins, 8:10 a.m.
Nov.	25	Thanksgiving recess begins, 10:00 p.m.
Nov.	30	Classwork resumes, 8:10 a.m.
Dec.	19	Christmas vacation begins, 12:00 noon
<u>1965</u>		
Jan.	4	Classwork resumes, 8:10 a.m.
Jan.	12	Last day of classes
Jan.	14-22	Final examinations (8 days with intervening Sunday)
<u>Second Semester</u>		
Jan.	25-29	Testing, advising, and enrollment
Feb.	1	Classwork begins, 8:10 a.m.
March	27	Spring vacation begins, 12:00 noon
April	5	Classwork resumes, 8:10 a.m.
May	22	Last day of classes
May	24-28 and	Final examinations (8 days with intervening Saturday
May	31-June 2	and Sunday)
June	6	Commencement exercises
<u>Summer Session</u>		
June	5	Freshman testing
June	7-8	Advising and enrollment
June	9	Classwork begins, 7:00 a.m.
July	4	Holiday (Sunday)
July	30	Last day of classes
Aug.	2-3	Final examinations
Aug.	6	Commencement exercises

The University Calendar for 1964-65 -- continued

PROPOSED EIGHT-DAY EXAMINATION PERIOD

<u>Class Hours</u>	<u>Examination Day</u>	<u>Examination Time</u>
8 MWF	1st Day	8 to 10 a.m.
8 TThS		1 to 3 p.m.
8 MIWThFS		8 to 11 a.m.
*Uniform finals		6 and 9 p.m.
9 MWF	2nd Day	8 to 10 a.m.
9 TThS		1 to 3 p.m.
9 MIWThFS		8 to 11 a.m.
*Uniform finals		6 and 9 p.m.
10 MWF	3rd Day	8 to 10 a.m.
10 TThS		1 to 3 p.m.
10 MIWThFS		8 to 11 a.m.
*Uniform Finals		6 and 9 p.m.
11 MWF	4th Day	8 to 10 a.m.
11 TThS		1 to 3 p.m.
11 MIWThFS		8 to 11 a.m.
*Uniform finals		6 and 9 p.m.
1 MWF	5th Day	8 to 10 a.m.
1 TThS		1 to 3 p.m.
1 MIWThF		8 to 11 a.m.
*Uniform finals		6 and 9 p.m.
2 MWF	6th Day	8 to 10 a.m.
2 TThS		1 to 3 p.m.
2 MIWThF		8 to 11 a.m.
4 TThS		3 to 5 p.m.
*Uniform finals	6 and 9 p.m.	
3 MWF	7th Day	8 to 10 a.m.
3 TThS		1 to 3 p.m.
3 MIWThF		8 to 11 a.m.
4 MWF		3 to 5 p.m.
*Uniform finals	6 and 9 p.m.	
12 MWF	8th Day	8 to 10 a.m.
12 TThS		1 to 3 p.m.
12 MIWThFS		8 to 11 a.m.
4 MIWThF		3 to 5 p.m.

*The departments having classes scheduled throughout the day, and for which "uniform examinations" are desired, should schedule the examination time in accordance with the Faculty Handbook instructions; the objective being to minimize the possibility of a student having more than two examinations in one day.

Senate Action

The University Calendar for 1964-65 -- continued

Professor Keeley, Chairman of the University Senate Committee on University Organization, Budget and Publications, presented the foregoing report. He moved approval of the four recommendations in the report. His motion was seconded.

Dr. David then made an amendment to the motion that if a change in calendar becomes necessary, it be referred to the University Senate for approval. His motion to amend was seconded and passed.

The original motion by Professor Keeley, as amended, was passed.

TRANSFER OF CREDIT FROM JUNIOR COLLEGES

Report of the Committee on Courses and Curricula

May 13, 1963

Paragraph 6, page 24 of the General Catalogue of the University of Oklahoma (November 1, 1960) sets a limit on the number of hours which a student may transfer from a junior college to the University. The assignment of the committee was to consider whether an exception should be made for the "Unusually bright student".

The University Committee on Academic Regulations made a study in 1962 of the transfer of credit from junior colleges and reported that no change in the existing regulations be made. The Committee was furnished with a study of the transfer of credit policies pursued by the other Big Eight and selected Universities. Though differing a little in some details, the basic policy of not allowing junior college credit after the first half of the credit hours required for a degree has been earned, seems to be the rule in the Big Eight and other Universities. Only the University of Kansas permits an exception of an additional eight hours in "meritorious cases" and where the courses are equivalent to Freshman-Sophomore courses at Kansas.

Because it is difficult to define the term "unusually bright or meritorious student" and the fact that the quality of the grades from junior college is not uniform, the Committee felt that if any change is made in the transfer rules, the changes should apply equally to all students.

The question of transfer of credit from junior colleges has been examined and reported seven times since 1950 by various University agencies and committees. Some minor changes were made but the basic policy was not altered.

It is the opinion of the committee that no change should be made in the present regulations on the transfer of credit from junior colleges.

Respectfully submitted,

Bruce Granger
J. Ray Matlock
Keith Wallingford
Mary Warren
Rufus G. Hall, Chairman

Senate Action

Dr. Hall, Chairman of the University Senate Committee on Courses and Curricula, presented the foregoing report. He moved that it be adopted by the Senate. His motion was seconded and passed.

POLICY ON MAKE-UP EXAMINATIONS

Report of the Committee on Courses and Curricula

May 7, 1963

In the light of the number of examinations given during a semester at the University, any attempt to establish a central administration of make-up examinations would be too costly and involve too much unnecessary paper work. The Committee feels that regulations of make-up examinations is a power which each department may exercise and that such regulations can best be administered at the level of the various departments of the University.

Many departments have set up a system of giving regularly scheduled make-up examinations during the semester. The instructors who have students to take make-up exams will hand the examinations to the Department Chairman. A Proctor selected by the department will then administer the examinations to all the students at the scheduled time. Thus an instructor may announce to his classes at the beginning of the semester that any student missing an examinations and having a valid excuse will be permitted to make up the test at one of the periods scheduled by the department. All classes are informed of the make-up schedule during the course of the semester.

The Committee recommends that no university-wide regulations for make-up examinations be established since such regulations can best be formulated and administrated at the department level.

Respectfully submitted,

Mary Warren	Bruce Granger
J. Ray Matlock	Rufus G. Hall,
Keith Wallingford	Chairman

Senate Action

Dr. Hall, Chairman of the University Senate Committee on Courses and Curricula, presented the foregoing report. He moved that it be adopted. His motion was seconded and passed.

REGENTS' AWARDS FOR SUPERIOR TEACHING

Report of the Committee on Teaching and Research

May 7, 1963

General Statement

In response to a request by the Regents the committee has considered the question of the feasibility of the establishment of certain Regents' awards to be made for excellence in teaching, the object being to find some special means of maintaining the interest, motivation and recognition involved in this kind of excellence.

We believe that all members of the faculty are in full agreement with the desirability of encouraging the rewarding excellence in teaching. However, the main concern of the committee has been with the inadequacies in all procedures which have been tried in past years for the evaluation of good teaching. The procedure which we feel has the most merit follows as our recommendation.

Regents' Awards for Superior Teaching -- continuedRecommendationsA. Eligibility

Any tenure-holding member of the faculty will be eligible for an award.

B. Procedure for selection of recipients

1. Committee A of each teaching department may, at the time they make budget recommendations of the year, forward to their Dean, with a detailed substantiating statement, the names of persons recommended as having been particularly meritorious in teaching.
2. Each Dean may endorse the names sent to him and/or add nominees of his own. He will forward all names to the University Budget Council for consideration.
3. The Dean of the University College and the Dean of the Graduate College may submit nominees to the Budget Council along with detailed substantiating statements about each.
4. The Budget Council will consider all names received and will forward to the President the names of not more than five nominees in any one year. The President may submit these names to the Regents for consideration.

C. Name of the Award

It is proposed that the award be called: Regents' Award for Superior Teaching.

D. Character of the Awards

1. The character of the awards should be at the discretion of the Regents. Possibly a suitable scroll or plaque could be given by the Regents to each recipient. It is also recommended that the Regents consider the addition of cash awards if and when possible funds could be allocated by the Regents for this purpose.
2. It is recommended that the Regents, as a group, be personally involved in the presentation of these awards, possibly at the time of the General Faculty Meeting in the Spring or on some other suitable occasion of their choosing.

Respectfully submitted,

John E. Allison	Joseph Pray
Donald Clark	Paul Ruggiers
Ed F. Crim	W. W. Schottstaedt
Colin Plint	Patrick K. Sutherland, Chairman

Regents' Awards for Superior Teaching -- continuedSenate Action

Dr. Crim, Chairman of the University Senate Committee on Teaching and Research presented the foregoing report relative to Regents' Awards. He then moved that it be adopted by the Senate. His motion was seconded and passed.

SMOKING IN CLASSROOMS

Report of the Committee on Teaching and Research

May 7, 1963

On November 24, 1952, the University Senate recommended, and President Cross approved, the following regulation:

It shall be the policy on the Norman campuses of the University that there be no smoking in classes or laboratories while they are in session. This does not apply to informal groups such as seminars unless there is an objection by any member of the group.

The Deans' Council has requested that the Senate consider how this regulations can be made more effective.

The members of the Committee on Teaching and Research agree with the deans that there is no way to enforce the regulation unless the faculty can be persuaded to enforce it. We make the following recommendation:

That, at the beginning of each semester, it be the responsibility of the Dean of each college to remind the faculty members of their college and the chairman of each department that this regulation must be observed.

Respectfully submitted,

John E. Allison	Joseph Pray
Donald Clark	Paul Ruggiers
Ed F. Crim	W. W. Schottstaedt
Colin Plint	Patrick K. Sutherland, Chairman

Senate Action

Dr. Crim, a member of the University Senate Committee on Teaching and Research, presented the report relative to smoking in classrooms. He then moved that the report be adopted by the Senate. His motion was seconded and passed.

TEACHING LOAD

Report of the Committee on Teaching and Research

May 7, 1963

On April 30, 1962, the Committee on Teaching and Research was asked to consider the question of teaching load as set forth in a University of Oklahoma Interoffice Communication issued by Vice President McCarter on April 27, 1962, with particular regard being given to item No. 8 of that communication.

On January 28, 1963, the Committee presented a progress report in which Item 8, mentioned above, was clarified. At that time the Committee was considering the possibility of compiling information concerning the various criteria for reducing teaching loads other than research. We learned that the President's Council was already in the process of making such a compilation. In order to avoid unnecessary duplication of effort the Committee recommends that the Senate take no further action on this matter at this time.

Respectfully submitted,

John E. Allison	Joseph Pray
Donald Clark	Paul Ruggiers
Ed F. Crim	W. W. Schottstaedt
Colin Plint	Patrick K. Sutherland, Chairman

Senate Action

Dr. Crim, a member of the University Senate Committee on Teaching and Research, presented the foregoing report relative to teaching load. He then moved acceptance of the report by the Senate. His motion was seconded.

Dr. Bishop, following some discussion, moved to amend the motion to the effect that the Senate Committee on Teaching and Research continue during the next year to study the matter of reduced teaching load. His amendment was seconded and passed.

The original motion by Dr. Crim, as amended, was then passed.

UNIVERSITY COMMITTEE NOMINATIONS FOR 1963-64

At the meeting on April 29, 1963, the Senate Committee on Committees submitted a list of nominees for various University Committees. No additional nominations were made from the floor. On May 27, the Chairman of the University Senate again asked whether there were additional nominations. There were none and Dean Clark moved approval of the list submitted by the Committee on Committees. His motion was seconded and passed.

The following list of nominees was submitted to President Cross on May 29. He will select persons to fill various vacancies on the committees.

University Committee Nominations for 1963-64 -- continuedAthletic Council

Preston L. Moore - Petr. Engr.
 Cluff Hopla - Zool.
 Gene Bavinger - Art
 Harold Huneke - Math
 Sherman Lawton - Drama
 Harry Hoy - Geography
 William G. Monahan - Education
 Stewart Wilcox - English
 Pat Sutherland - Geology

Extension Council

James Burwell - Physics
 J. O. Melton - Ind. Mgt. Engr.
 A. W. McCray - Petr. Engr.
 Ed Klehr - Sanitary Science
 Gerald Porter - Education
 Paul Ruggiers - English
 Eunice Lewis - Education
 Horace Bliss - Chemistry
 Glenn Snider - Education
 Robert Ross - Music
 Franklin Williams - Music
 V. Jean Brown - Pharmacy

Faculty Personnel

Ronald Shuman - Bus. Mgmt.
 J. Ray Matlock - Civil Engr.
 C. M. Stookey - Music
 T. P. Herrick - Accounting
 Frank Morris - Engr. Graph.
 Mortimer Schwartz - Law
 Barton Turkington - Mech. Engr.
 Harry Parker - Education
 Ruth Fell - Education
 Ralph Bienfang - Pharmacy
 Sarah Crim - Home Economics
 Mildred Andrews - Music

Student Activities and Welfare

L. S. Reid - Petr. Engr.
 Robert Ketner - Social Work
 Gene Braught - Music
 Brandon Griffith - Aero. Engr.
 Steve Sutherland - Geography
 Charlyce King - Home Economics
 David French - English

Budget Council

D. E. Menzie - Petr. Engr.
 J. D. Palmer - Electr. Engr.
 Frank Elkouri - Law
 J. Palmer Boggs - Architecture
 Paul Brinker - Economics
 Thomas M. Smith - History
 W. M. David - Pharmacy
 A. J. Kondonassis - Economics
 Paul David - Zoology

Council on Instruction

Dennis Crites - Marketing
 Tom Love - Mech. Engr.
 Charles Mankin - Geology
 Doyle Anderegg - Botany
 Elroy Rice - Botany
 Wayne Brockeriede - Speech
 Leo Whinery - Law
 Doyle Bishop - Bus. Mgmt.
 Charles Reeves - Classics

Council on Planning and Development

Bruce Ketcham - Aero. Engr.
 Joseph Rarick - Law
 John Morris - Geography
 John York - Architecture

Libraries

Joe Fritz - English
 Mark Townsend - Chem. Engr.
 Frances Seeds - Home Economics
 Dominique de Lerma - Music
 M. E. Kraynack - Chemistry
 Miriam Ayer - Mathematics
 George Goodman - Botany
 Lawrence Poston - Modern Languages
 David Bergin - Journalism
 Nat Eek - Drama
 Henry Angelino - Education
 Harold Bone - Mech. Engr.

ELECTION OF MEMBER OF THE COMMITTEE OF COMMITTEES

In accord with the University Senate procedure of electing replacements to the Senate Committee on Committees at the May meeting, one replacement was elected on May 27, 1963. The replacement was selected from the list of new senators elected recently to represent the various colleges and the General Faculty.

The new senator elected to serve on the Committee on Committees from 1963 to 1966 is D. Barton Turkington, Mechanical Engineering.

RETIREMENT POLICY

Report of the Faculty Personnel Committee

May 27, 1963

The Faculty Personnel Committee of the University Senate has given careful consideration to the following question: Whether the retirement policies of the University be altered to allow the University to exercise the option to retire faculty members at 65.

Recommendation

Having failed by its own efforts to find any compelling reasons for altering the present provisions regarding retirement, the Committee recommends the retention of the present policies.

In reaching this conclusion the Committee became convinced that the following values ought to be protected and preserved:

First, the assurance of an optional five years of service beyond 65 has been a valuable, sometimes even a necessary attraction in recruiting faculty. In fact the reduction of the retirement eligibility period from 30 to 25 years was to enable the University to recruit faculty of 45 years of age and still leave them the opportunity to retire with full benefits.

Second, to alter the present policy with respect to the current staff, especially when the optional retirement age of 70 has been offered as an inducement to come to the University, would perilously approach breach of faith.

Third, the very existence of a policy which could retire faculty short of the mandatory retirement age would present the possibility of its misuse.

Fourth, any change rendering less secure the tenure of faculty who have conscientiously served the University would have adverse effect upon faculty morale and hence upon the retention of valued personnel.

Respectfully submitted,

V. J. Brown	A. J. Stanley
Willis Bowen	Leslie Rice
Joseph Rarick	Stewart C. Wilcox,
Cecil Lee	Chairman

Retirement Policy -- continuedSenate Action

Dr. Wilcox, Chairman of the University Senate Committee on Faculty Personnel, presented the report and then moved that it be adopted by the Senate. His motion was seconded and passed.

REGULATIONS GOVERNING THE RESEARCH PROFESSORSHIP

Memorandum from President Cross

May 16, 1963

On March 11, by memorandum to you, I notified the University Senate that I should like to withhold action on its recommendation 1962-63-5, "Regulations Governing the Research Professorship" until the President's Council for the Study of the University might have time to complete its study of the Graduate College.

That study has now been made and the Council's report and recommendations are in hand. I am sending a copy to you with a request for the observations and recommendations of the Senate.

Senate Action

The foregoing memorandum and portions of the Council's report were read aloud in the Senate by Chairman Granger. Considerable discussion followed and Dr. Fowler moved that the matter be referred to the University Organization, Budget and Publications Committee for study. His motion was seconded.

Dr. Rarick moved to amend the motion so as to refer to the University Organization, Budget and Publications Committee only those phases of the Council's report on which the University Senate has not already acted. His motion was seconded.

Dr. Plint moved to amend the amendment to the motion so that matters not relating to organization and budget be left to the Committee on Teaching and Research for consideration. His motion was seconded.

Dr. Bishop then made a substitute motion that the Chairman of the University Senate appoint an Ad Hoc Committee to study the matter and prepare a report. His motion was seconded and passed.

A STUDY OF THE SUMMER SESSION

Memorandum from Vice President McCarter

May 16, 1963

President Cross is prepared to approve in principle the recommendation of the University Senate concerning "A Study of the Summer Session," but he has asked me to convey to the Senate his reluctance to approve the specific recommendation until certain details are clarified:

A Study of the Summer Session - continued

1. Why is it necessary to restrict the membership of the proposed Study Committee to the three areas specified?
2. Why should these people have their teaching loads reduced when the members of the major standing University committees are not given reduced teaching loads?
3. What is the estimated cost of the clerical and stenographic service required?
4. Since most of the data required for the study will probably be compiled by administrative staff already on the payroll or will be drawn from compilations already made, can we justify the extra expense to be incurred by reducing teaching loads and hiring a staff for the Study Committee?

Senate Action

Dr. Hall moved that the questions in the foregoing memorandum be referred back to the committee which prepared the original report -- Senate Committee on University Organization, Budget and Publications. His motion was seconded and passed.

RECENTLY ELECTED SENATORS

During the past few weeks, elections have been held to provide proper representation in the University Senate for the year 1963-64. New senators elected to three-year terms (1963-66), are:

Arts and Sciences	-- John Eriksen -- Thomas Smith
Business Administration	-- Alex J. Kondonassis
Education	-- James G. Hawlow -- William G. Monahan
Engineering	-- R. D. Daniels -- Tom J. Love
Fine Arts	-- Digby Bell -- Nathaniel Eek
Law	-- E. D. Phelps
Medicine	-- Alice M. Brues -- Garmon H. Daron -- John Kelly
Nursing	-- Lillian W. Jones
General Faculty	-- D. Barton Turkington

ADJOURNMENT

The University Senate adjourned at 6:00 p.m. The next regular meeting will be held on Monday, September 30, 1963.

Gerald A. Porter, Secretary