

JOURNAL OF THE UNIVERSITY SENATE

Regular Session, October 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. Joseph C. Pray.

Present

Bell, Digby B.
Bishop, L. Doyle
Bowen, Willis H.
Brikey, John C.
Brown, V. Jean
Brues, Alice M.
Chisolm, Mildred Y.
Christian, Sherril D.
Comp, LaVerne A.
Crook, Kenneth
Cross, George L.
Daniels, Raymond D.
David, Paul R.
Eek, Nathaniel S.
Eichholz, Erich H.
Eriksen, John G.
Ewing, George M.
Fowler, Richard G.
Gibson, Arrell M.
Hall, Rufus G., Jr.
Harlow, James G.

Present

Jones, Lillian W.
Kondonassis, Alexander J.
Lee, Cecil
Love, Tom J.
Matlock, J. Ray
McFarland, Dora
Monahan, William G.
Morris, Virginia
Phelps, Elbridge D.
Phillips, Marion C.
Pray, Joseph C.
Riggs, Carl
Ruggiers, Paul G.
Smith, Thomas M.
Sutherland, Patrick K.
Turkington, D. Barton
Wallingford, E. Keith
Warren, Mary A.
Wilcox, Stewart C.

Absent

Allison, John E.
Daron, Garmon H.
Kelly, John W.
Male, Roy R.

APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES

The Journal of the University Senate for the regular meeting held on September 30, 1963, was approved.

ACTION BY PRESIDENT CROSS

On October 5, 1963, President Cross indicated his approval of a recommendation from the University Senate relative to confusion existing in the names of University committees and councils. In accord with his action, eight major advisory groups will in the future all be referred to as Councils. (See the Journal of the University Senate for September 30, 1963, Page 4)

NEW SENATOR

The Graduate Faculty, at its regular meeting on October 15, 1963, elected Dr. Arrell M. Gibson, Department of History, to complete the unexpired term of Dr. Brison Gooch in the University Senate. Dr. Gooch is on leave of absence. Dr. Gibson will serve in the Senate for the two-year period, 1963-65.

ADMINISTRATION OF THE GRADUATE COLLEGE ✓

Because Dr. Pray, chairman of the University Senate, was a member of the ad hoc committee that dealt with this problem, Dr. Virginia Morris, vice chairman of the University Senate, presided over consideration of it.

Report of the University Senate ad hoc Committee appointed to study the recommendations of the President's Council for the Study of the University

October 18, 1963

Background of the Problem

The problem of the proper role for the Graduate College is an old and difficult one. It is probably safe to say that it has never been solved to everyone's satisfaction at any university. The events leading up to the present study at the University of Oklahoma may be detailed as follows:

On May 7, 1962, Dean Arthur Doerr transmitted the recommendations of the Graduate Council to President Cross. (See the summary of these recommendations on pages two and three and the complete letter in Appendix A.) President Cross referred these recommendations to the Faculty Senate.

On November 26, 1962, the Senate Committee on Faculty Personnel submitted a report which, after debate, was referred back to the committee for further study. A later report (summarized in the comparison chart on pages two and three) was approved by the Senate and transmitted to President Cross.

On March 11, 1963, President Cross reported that he was in only partial agreement with the Senate recommendations; that he has asked the President's Council for the Study of the University (hereinafter referred to as the President's Council) to consider the matter; and that he preferred to delay his decision until the Council had submitted its report.

On April 10, 1963, The President's Council submitted its report (see summary in the comparison chart on pages two and three) and the full text in Appendix B. President Cross then referred the Council's report to the Senate for further consideration. On May 27, the Senate referred the matter to an ad hoc committee composed of a representative from each of the three standing committees which had an interest in the matter.

(It should be noted that several years ago an Ad Hoc Committee on Goals for the University under the chairmanship of Professor Gilbert Fite submitted a comprehensive report to the graduate faculty which, while it was broader in scope than the recommendations referred to above, substantially agreed with the later recommendations of the Graduate Council and the President's Council.)

Finally, any consideration of the role of the Graduate College should take into account the prespective of the rapid increase in enrollment and degree output of the Graduate College in recent years. For the year ending June 30, 1963, 496 master's degrees, 20 Ed. D. degrees, and 71 Ph. D. degrees were conferred. The 1962-63 enrollment was approximately 2,400, exceeding that of the previous year by 600.

Administration of the Graduate College -- continuedThe Issues

The following chart summarizes in an abbreviated fashion the recommendations of the Graduate Council, the President's Council, and the previous report of the Faculty Senate.

<u>No.</u> <u>President's Council of the</u> <u>Study of the University</u>	<u>Graduate Council</u>	<u>University Senate</u>
1 Horizontal (umbrella) organization of the graduate college should be maintained and strengthened.	No recommendation, but presumably in agreement with recommendation of Perry Committee.	No change proposed--some strengthening of graduate college.
2 Develop separate graduate college budget, include salaries of Research Professors and their secretarial and research assistance.	Funds necessary to support research appointment (incl. expenses required by reduced teaching load, research & clerical assistance) should be under the control of the Dean of Graduate College.	No proposal to change budgetary arrangements for Research Professors but recommended that funds necessary to support reduced teaching loads be under control of Graduate Dean and Graduate Council.
3 Research professors appointed for ten years with possibility of reappointment. Teaching load to be determined by graduate dean. Such teaching will be above the minimal needs of department.	No change in canon, but term of appointment should be ten years with possibility of renewal. Majority (not unanimous) vote of Council required for appointment recommendations.	No change from present system (appointments require approval of 75% of total membership of Graduate Council.)
4 Supply graduate dean with funds to finance teaching load reductions for promising researchers for 3-year periods (Graduate Council to advise Dean on this).	Establish rank of research associate--5-year term--with possibility of renewal. For persons of extraordinary promise in research but of lesser reputation than research professor.	Agree with this, but no specific term for reduced load.
5 Graduate Dean to retain control of existing subvention monies associated with NSF, NASA, Woodrow Wilson and similar organizations. (Separate recommendation made as to Administration of overhead funds for all sources.)	No recommendation--presumably in agreement with President's Council.	No recommendation--presumably agree.

Administration of the Graduate College -- continuedPresident's Council of the
No. Study of the UniversityGraduate CouncilUniversity Senate

- | | | |
|---|---|--------------------------------|
| 6 Abolish present faculty research committee; put fund under graduate dean (graduate council to serve as advisory agency on disposition of funds).
(Separate recommendation made as to Administration of overhead funds from all sources). | All funds for faculty research should become a part of the budget of the Dean of the Graduate College. | Leave as is. |
| 7 Graduate Dean (in conjunction with undergraduate dean) should work toward nine-hour load for <u>productive</u> faculty members. Develop list of eligibles now and put load reductions into effect as soon as budget permits. | Reduced teaching load for short period (1 or 2 semesters) may be granted by graduate council to assist individual in bringing particular research activity to fruition. | Substantially agree with this. |
| 8 Annual cash awards by Dean of Graduate College (upon recommendation of graduate council) for outstanding research and/or creative activity. | No recommendation. | No recommendation. |
| 9 Establish appropriate scholarly journal and/or monograph series under aegis of graduate college. | No recommendation. | No recommendation. |
| 10 Establish society of fellows appropriately housed and financed. | No recommendation. | No recommendation |
| 11 See items 3 and 7. | Graduate council would establish procedures for recommending research appointments and reduced teaching loads to the president. Recommendations would require at least a majority of votes cast but never a unanimous vote. | See item 3. |

NOTE: (to apply to No. 3 and No. 4) Maximum teaching load 6 hours normally at least one course (Research Professor may be relieved completely by all duties during a semester.) Graduate dean and chairman of department or school determine teaching load, merit of research, amount and kind of research and secretarial assistance needed, and amount of non-department travel needed.

Administration of the Graduate College -- continued

The undersigned members of the Senate ad hoc committee have conferred, individually or collectively, with two members of the President's Council, the Dean of the Graduate College, the Vice President for Business and Finance, and all of the college deans. The committee also surveyed by mail questionnaire the fifteen research professors and received very detailed replies from ten of them. The committee has held seven study sessions averaging two hours per session. It has become apparent to the committee that there is a considerable diversity of opinions on most of the recommendations outlined on pages two and three.

With regard to the organizational arrangement for administration of graduate work, the committee does not view the problem as a clear-cut 'vertical vs. horizontal' question. The horizontal arrangement has served us well for many years; and, although increasing graduate enrollment tends to cause pressures toward adopting a vertical arrangement, the committee does not feel that a shift from the horizontal to the vertical arrangement is warranted by our present state of growth. It may well be that continued growth in the graduate program will, in the future, make the vertical arrangement desirable, especially in the professional areas.

The present problem probably should be thought of in terms of the degree of centralization we should have under the horizontal arrangement. The degree of centralization, or decentralization, also should be thought of as a continuum rather than one or the other. It seems rather obvious to the committee that we have been trending toward greater decentralization in the administration of the graduate program for the past several years. The recent appointment of an associate dean for graduate work in the College of Engineering is evidence of this. The effect of the recommendation of the President's Council for the Study of the University is that this decentralization is not desirable and that we should move back toward more centralization. The creation of a Graduate College budget which would include the salaries and their research assistance of the research professors as well as miscellaneous other monies would be a considerable step toward recentralization.

It should be pointed out that increasing the fiscal responsibility of the Graduate Dean and Graduate Council is only one way in which greater centralization could be achieved. A more active or positive role for the Graduate Dean in the formulation and direction of the various graduate programs would probably more effectively bring about recentralization that would increase his fiscal responsibility. If those who are in some manner responsible for the direction of the various graduate programs were made at least jointly responsible to the Graduate Dean, greater recentralization could be achieved. In fact, considerable recentralization could be effected without in any way changing our present budgetary arrangements.

Recommendation #1: The horizontal arrangement should be retained for the foreseeable future. Any recentralization of authority for administration of graduate work should be limited to non-budgetary means except for certain budgetary changes, outlined in later recommendations, which can be accomplished with a minimum of friction.

Administration of the Graduate College -- continued

One of the most controversial matters is the proposal that salaries for Research Professors and the funds necessary for their secretarial and research assistance be transferred from the Undergraduate to the Graduate College budget. The undergraduate deans are rather uniformly opposed to this change; some are bitterly opposed. (It should be remembered here that in recent years University policy has had the effect of building up the position of the undergraduate dean, especially in budgetary matters.) The Research Professors who responded were about evenly split on this issue. University policy as stated on pages 21-22 of the Faculty Handbook clearly places the primary responsibility for appointment and maintenance of Research Professors on the Graduate Dean and the Graduate Council. Responsibility without commensurate authority is repugnant to accepted principles of management, and this fact must be considered as an argument in favor of this proposal. A desire to strengthen the position of the Graduate College must also be considered an argument in favor of this recommendation (although there are other means of doing this). The following arguments against the proposal must be considered: (1) Undergraduate work cannot logically be separated from graduate work in a given field. (2) Graduate standards are best established and maintained by specialists in a given field. (3) There is no good reason for separating and giving special consideration to a particular group of distinguished professors. (4) Greater flexibility, hence better administration, is possible when Research Professors are considered a part of a larger faculty than when they are isolated in a small group for budgetary purposes. (5) Since Research Professors (under present budget conditions) must do some teaching and since the Undergraduate Dean is primarily responsible for the staffing of course offerings, it is illogical to assign a portion of this responsibility (in a budgetary sense) to the Graduate Dean. This committee believes that the cons outweigh the pros and, therefore, proposes:

Recommendation #2: The budget for Research Professors salaries and the necessary funds for research assistance should not be transferred to the Graduate College.

The recommendation of the President's Council that in the future the teaching load of Research Professors be considered as 'above the minimal needs of the department' has also provoked quite a little opposition. The reason for the proposal is, we assume, that the Research Professor would thus be in a more flexible position and would be able to concentrate more on research activities. Three main arguments have been voiced against this proposal: (1) Until our budgetary situation improves, it simply is not feasible to reduce substantially the teaching loads of Research Professors. For the present, we must be able to count on their regularly assuming a part of the teaching load. (2) Research Professors are usually also our best teachers, a fact which argues that their contacts with students should not be reduced. (3) Even if we had adequate financial resources, it would be difficult for a department to provide a suitable quarter-time or half-time replacement on short notice. The committee feels that the financial argument is a rather compelling one and submits

Recommendation #3: For the present and where necessary the department and college should be permitted to count on the teaching services of Research Professors in the staffing of their regular course offerings.

Administration of the Graduate College -- continued

The questions of term and method of appointment have been raised by the President's Council and the Graduate Council. Both recommend that the term of appointment be limited to ten years, with the possibility of renewal, and the Graduate Council has recommended that a majority (instead of unanimous) vote of the Council be required for appointment. To put it bluntly, the main argument in favor of the ten-year term is that Research Professors may be stimulated to greater productivity; and, in case of failure to produce, the appointment may be taken away and given to a more deserving person. Opposing arguments are that: (1) the life tenure of the appointment is a significant prestige factor in the award; (2) good, careful consideration of the appointments will minimize the likelihood of a non-productive research appointment; (3) based on past experiences, the likelihood that an appointment would fail to be renewed is remote; (4) evaluation of a man's productivity is difficult, especially when the decision must be made by those who are not well acquainted with the man's field; and (5) those who produce less than expected could be properly penalized by withholding merit increased. With regard to the second proposal, the committee feels that a unanimous vote is actually unnecessary but that something more than a simple majority of the Graduate Council should be required because of the nature of the appointment.

Recommendation #4: The term of appointment for a Research Professor should be until statutory retirement and an appointment shall not be made if there is more than one negative vote in the Graduate Council (as the Council is presently constituted).

The Graduate Council has recommended the creation of the position of Research Associate which will have a five-year renewable term, and the President's Council has recommended that the Graduate Dean be supplied with funds to finance teaching load reductions for promising researchers for a three-year period. The desirability of lightening the course load for such persons seems obvious, but the inflexibility of the creation of a special position and/or a fixed term of appointment makes that portion of the recommendation questionable. Research projects vary in their requirements of money and time. In one case, an individual may need to be relieved completely of teaching duties for one semester; in another case a quarter load reduction for two years or more may be indicated. This committee and many other individuals are convinced that we should systematically work toward a nine hour teaching load for most professors, as quickly as our finances will permit. We can continue toward this goal by establishing a procedure which will permit reduction of course load in carefully selected cases for both research and unusually heavy responsibilities for graduate work.

Recommendation #5: The Graduate Dean should be provided with a budget as soon as feasible which will be used for financing teaching load Reductions (through reimbursement to the Undergraduate College budget) of varying amounts and periods for either promising researchers or those with unusually heavy academic responsibilities in the graduate area. The Graduate Dean should, of course, seek the advice and consent of the Graduate Council in making these selections. (Suggestion: that some portion of the increase due to graduate enrollment which may result from the revision by the State Regents of the budget formula could be used to establish this budget.)

Administration of the Graduate College -- continued

Both councils have recommended that faculty research monies (including those currently administered by the faculty research committee) be made a part of the Graduate College budget. The President's Council recommended that the Graduate Dean retain control of all existing subvention monies, and it has submitted a separate recommendation relative to administration of research funds resulting from various activities, including overhead funds, which will presumably strengthen the Graduate Deans' fiscal responsibilities. It does seem that we have what might be called 'splintered authority' as regards to the administration of research generally. On the other hand, it could be argued that such splintering may be desirable in that it prevents the domination of the research efforts by one group. Everyone seems to agree that the Faculty Research Committee has done an excellent job and that no justification of performance failure can be cited for the abolition of that committee. On the other hand, if a subcommittee of the Graduate Council could be assigned this responsibility we could reduce by one the number of committees in existence.

Recommendation #6: Those subvention monies currently administered by the Graduate College should be placed in the Graduate College budget. The Faculty Research Fund should be transferred to that budget also with a subcommittee of the Graduate Council taking over the function presently performed by the Faculty Research Committee. A special study of the administration of the whole research effort should be conducted to determine whether funds from other sources should be transferred to the Graduate College budget.

Of the variety of problems inherent in the proposals that (1) annual cash prizes for outstanding research and/or creative activity would be awarded by the Dean of the Graduate College upon the recommendations of the Graduate Council ... (2) an appropriate scholarly journal and/or monograph series should be established under the aegis of the Graduate College, and (3) A society of Fellows appropriately housed and financed should be formed, the basic problem would be cost. It would seem unlikely with our present budget that this genre of things could receive much encouragement. Separate problems relating to item one above would be whether it would be possible to determine quality among the various endeavors to research and creativity. Most likely the awards would go to those persons already receiving, via research professorships, reward for their accomplishments. A question on point two would be as to whether or not existing professional publications more adequately fill this need. While the monograph series might be exempt from this attack, the expense problem would remain. As to the Society of Fellows, this problem of cost and administration and appropriateness to the tone of the existing campus structure leave doubt as to whether this would be a sound direction at this time. In summary, while some of these ideas may have merit, they must at present be classed as luxury items whose acquisition should be delayed until more pressing needs are satisfied.

Administration of the Graduate College -- continued

- Recommendation #7:
- (a) The awarding of cash prizes for outstanding research or creative activity should not be undertaken. Monies which may be available for cash prizes can better be used for salary increases and/or teaching load reductions.
 - (b) The scholarly journal or monograph series should not be undertaken at this time because of expense and because of a very real doubt that it is needed.
 - (c) The establishment of a society of fellows should await either a more pressing need for it or more adequate financing than we presently have.

Joseph C. Pray
 Cecil Lee
 Doyle Bishop, Chairman

APPENDIX A

President G. L. Cross
 University of Oklahoma
 Faculty Exchange

April 10, 1963

Dear President Cross:

For several months one of the topics under consideration by the President's Council for the Study of the University has been alternative methods of administration of graduate degree programs. Dr. McCarter has informed us of your interest in receiving a recommendation in this area as soon as convenient. Accordingly, this letter will set forth our conclusions.

As you know, we are agreed that administration of the graduate degree programs by a central administrative office, i.e., the Dean of the Graduate College, should be strengthened. We are not in favor of the so-called vertical arrangement, wherein each college is responsible for the administration of its own graduate programs. We do appreciate, though, that individual colleges, particularly the professional ones, can make a legitimate argument that their fields are becoming so involved as to require special competence in order to intelligently administer graduate degrees. So, while we recommend that the office of the Dean of the Graduate College be strengthened, we have also provided for insuring that individual colleges are represented in decision-making for their own graduate programs.

We found that it would be impossible to increase meaningfully the stature of the Graduate College without providing fairly substantial monies to be within its administrative control. Therefore, in a separate recommendation there is a suggested reorganization of the manner in which overhead funds from all sources, including Research Institute Projects, summer institutes, NDEA grants, etc., are administered. This latter recommendation is intended to provide cohesive administration along broad policy lines as opposed to the piecemeal decision making now followed which results in dilution of the effect of these monies within the University structure.

Administration of the Graduate College -- continued

This report is divided into two sections:

1. Specific recommendations to enhance the stature of the Graduate College and its influence on the University's graduate programs.

2. Reorganization of the Graduate Council to insure representation for individual colleges.

ENHANCEMENT OF THE ROLE OF THE GRADUATE COLLEGE

Since the beginning of graduate work at the University of Oklahoma, a total of 10,202 master's degrees and 658 doctor's degrees have been awarded. The recent emphasis on Ph.D. - Ed. D. work is clear when it is noted that 81 doctor's degrees were given from 1929 through World War II, and 577 have been awarded since that time. It appears likely that the 1963 total will exceed the 81 doctorates awarded prior to 1946. Graduate enrollment has expanded from 1,493 in the fall semester of 1960-61 to 2,398 during the spring semester of 1962-63. Continued dramatic expansion of enrollment is likely. Such an explosion of educational activities at the graduate level demands an assessment of our present organization with recommendations for change, if change appears advisable.

A critical examination of existing Graduate College organization and administration has been made by the President's Council. Several alternatives appear to be available. First, a continuation of the existing structure and function of the Graduate College and its Dean could be recommended. Second, a change in the direction of greater strength for the Graduate College and its Dean could be advocated. Finally, the abolition of the present Graduate College and the establishment of a series of graduate colleges, i.e., a Graduate College of Business Administration, a Graduate College of Fine Arts, etc., is possible.

In viewing the choices, the advantages and disadvantages of the alternatives were assessed. The Council came quickly to the conclusion that maintenance of the status quo was inadvisable, since such an arrangement is quite appropriate to the ever-increasing size and complexity of today's graduate programs.

The principal advantages and disadvantages of the horizontal, or umbrella, structure and the alternate vertical arrangement were set forth and carefully considered.

ADVANTAGES

Horizontal (Present)

1. Maintenance of an overall perspective of graduate work.
2. Maintenance of an over-all quality check.

Vertical (New)

1. Development of rational programs by knowledgeable people in a given field.
2. Rapid response to needs of changing times in curricula, administration and recruitment.

Administration of the Graduate College -- continued

- | | |
|---|---|
| <p>3. Administration of all-University financial programs such as NDEA, Woodrow Wilson, NSF Co-op, NASA.</p> <p>4. Fostering of research activity, released time, etc.</p> <p>5. Development within faculty members of a sense or relationship to the entire University rather than to a small segment of it.</p> | <p>3. Ready response to the demands of accrediting agencies.</p> <p>4. A more clear-cut chain of command leading to quicker response in recruitment and retention of faculty, processing course changes, and the solution of other administration problems.</p> <p>5. An admission and recruitment policy for students which is more realistic in terms of individual college problems.</p> <p>6. A greater sense of control over the individual destinies of the several colleges.</p> <p>7. Improved opportunities for long-range college planning.</p> |
|---|---|

DISADVANTAGESHorizontal

1. The policeman concept.
2. Persecution complex of some professional colleges.
3. Slow action caused by two additional hurdles, i.e., Graduate Council and Graduate Faculty.

Vertical

1. Probably higher administrative costs.
2. Probable reduction in cross-college fertilization.
3. A tendency to lose an all-University identity.

It is our decision that the advantages of the umbrella structure outweigh other considerations and, in fact, this type of administrative organization should be considerably strengthened over our present organization.

Rapidly expanding knowledge and increased emphasis on graduate education of a high order of excellence focus increased attention upon the educational role of the Graduate College and its Dean. The position of the Dean of the Graduate College must be strengthened in order to permit him to exert the kind of vigorous leadership essential to the development and maintenance of quality research and education programs.

1. Since the direction of graduate student research and the development of imaginative thinking is central to the theme of graduate education, it is recommended that the Dean of the Graduate College be given a greater fiscal and

Administration of the Graduate College -- continued

regulatory role in matters pertaining to research. Increased financial responsibility would serve to emphasize the importance of the Graduate Office in research programs. Therefore, important steps in the implementation of this recommendation include the development of a separate Graduate College budget. Funds in the budget should include the salaries and funds for secretarial and research assistance for all Research Professors whose tenure in this position shall be ten years with possibility of reappointment. In addition, funds should be supplied to enable the Dean of the Graduate College, with advice of the Graduate Council, to provide classroom teaching reductions for promising researchers for three-year periods. Also, the Dean of the Graduate College would retain control of existing subvention monies associated with NSF, NASA, Woodrow Wilson, and similar organizations.

2. It is assumed, of course, that in the budget of the colleges affected, FTE replacements for the Research Professors will be provided usually at lower ranks and salaries. In other words, any classroom teaching done by Research Professors in the future will be above the minimal needs of a department. It is assumed that the Research Professors will continue to teach, but it is recommended that their classroom teaching loads be determined by the Dean of the Graduate College.

3. The Faculty Research Fund should be brought under the control of the Graduate Office. The Graduate Council would serve as the advisory agency on the disposition of Faculty Research Funds, and the present Faculty Research Committee would be abolished.

4. The Dean of the Graduate College in conjunction with the undergraduate dean, should work towards the development of a basic nine-hour load for productive faculty members. A list of deserving professorial staff should be prepared immediately, and load reductions should be effected as soon as budgetary exigencies permit.

5. Certain additional programs should be undertaken to direct attention to the Graduate College as the focal point of scholarship, research, and creative activity. Annual cash prizes for outstanding research and/or creative activity should be awarded by the Dean of the Graduate College upon the recommendations of the Graduate Council.

6. As funds become available an appropriate scholarly journal and/or monograph series should be established under the segis of the Graduate College.

7. A Society of Fellows appropriately housed and financed should provide extraordinary stimulation for able graduate students and faculty. Informal discussions in surroundings of scholarship should provide educational experience of a kind not now available at the University of Oklahoma.

In short, if the Graduate Dean and Graduate College are to assume significant stature at the University of Oklahoma the research orientation of the college must be made clear. Faculty members must identify in the graduate faculty a community of scholarship with research activity as a central theme. Policies and programs attendant to graduate education should reside firmly in the Graduate Office.

Administration of the Graduate College -- continuedREORGANIZATION OF THE GRADUATE COUNCIL

The President's Council recommends against any reorganization of the Graduate Council. However, if you as President of the University, feel that such a reorganization is required at this time, we would recommend the following procedure.

Because several schools, colleges, and departments of the University of Oklahoma have developed increasingly large programs sufficient to identify them with their own specific problems in graduate work, it seems that the present method of electing the members of the Graduate Council may need reformulating to assure their proper representation on the Council. Traditionally, Graduate Council members are elected in Graduate Faculty meetings. There is considerable objection to this method of election because at no one time are all of the major graduate units properly represented at Graduate Faculty meetings. Traditionally also, the most faithful attendance at Graduate Faculty meetings is on the part of people from the College of Arts and Sciences rather than from colleges and schools outside arts and sciences. Even though all of these have opportunity to attend meetings, as a practical matter it probably never happens that even all of the major graduate units in the arts and sciences are present in any one Graduate Faculty meeting. Consequently, it would seem reasonable that those major graduate units within Arts and Sciences with major graduate programs should be allowed to elect representatives to the Graduate Council.

In re-formulating the methods for electing members of the Graduate Council, it is highly important that it not be increased significantly in size because it would then become unwieldy. It is important, therefore, to identify only the major graduate units with a representative on the council. It is believed that minor graduate units in the University will not suffer from this.

It is our suggestion that the graduate faculties of each of the following schools and colleges be allowed to elect from their own number one member to the Graduate Council for three year terms and that no faculty member can be immediately re-elected:

Business
Education
Engineering
Fine Arts
Medicine

Because there are several units within the College of Arts and Sciences whose graduate programs are as large as, or larger than, those of some schools and colleges named above, it would seem that each of these also should be allowed to elect a Council member from their graduate faculties. These are: (1) humanities, (2) professional schools, (3) social sciences, and (4) physical and life sciences. In addition, the Associate Dean of the Medical School shall continue to serve, though on an ex-officio basis.

This would increase the size of the Graduate Council over its present composition by one to a total of nine but some advantage is seen in this in that an odd number of members has advantages over an even number.

Respectfully,

/s/ Robert H. Perry
Robert H. Perry

Administration of the Graduate College -- continued

President George L. Cross
Office of the President
Faculty Exchange

May 7, 1962

Dear President Cross:

The Graduate Council unanimously recommends the implementation of the following regulations relative to research appointments. Said recommendations, if adopted, would supersede all existing regulations.

Three types (or levels) of recognition should be developed.

1. Research Professor - The same as the present Research Professor, but appointment would be for a ten year term with the possibility of renewal.
2. Research Associate - It is intended that such an individual would carry this title in addition to his academic rank, as, for example, Assistant Professor - Research Associate. Such appointments would be made in recognition of extraordinary promise of research productivity. The appointment would be made to an individual with a lesser academic reputation than for the Research Professor. The appointment would be made for a five year term and could be renewed, but the application (i.e., justification) for the renewal would be considered by the Graduate Council along with all other applications for appointment that year.

Maximum teaching load for both categories 1 and 2 above would be six (6) hours and normally at least one course. The dean of the Graduate College, after consultation with the chairman of the department or school, determines the following:

- a. The amount of instructional load including the supervision and counseling of graduate students, which the Research Professor shall carry each semester during the academic year. If it is deemed wise by the Dean of the Graduate College, and agreed to by the departmental chairman, the Research Professor may be relieved completely of all teaching duties during a semester.
- b. The merits of the research being carried on.
- c. The amount and kind of secretarial help and research assistance needed.
- d. The amount of non-departmental travel necessary for the research project.

3. Reduced teaching load for a limited period (probably one or two semesters). This reduction in load would be made by the Graduate Council for a short period to assist an individual to bring a particular research activity to fruition.

Administration of the Graduate College -- continued

The Graduate Council further recommends that:

1. The funds necessary to support the research appointments and to provide replacements for any concomitant reduction in teaching load should be under the control of the Dean of the Graduate College.
2. All funds for faculty research should become part of the budget of the Dean of the Graduate College.
3. The Graduate Council would establish procedures for recommending Research Professorship, Research Associates, and reduced teaching loads to the President. In every case, however, a recommendation would require at least a majority of votes cast and never would require a unanimous vote.

If such recommendations are implemented the Graduate Council believes that it will provide a flexible arrangement which will permit recognition of mature established scholars as well as the younger man on the way up. I concur in the Council's recommendations, and I urge your serious consideration of them.

Sincerely yours,

(s) Arthur H. Doerr
Dean of the Graduate College

Senate Action

Dr. Bishop, chairman of the ad hoc committee, commented at length concerning the development of the foregoing report. Dr. Wilcox then moved that each of the seven recommendations in the report be considered separately. His motion was seconded and passed.

The seven recommendations were considered consecutively, with considerable discussion, and all were approved. Minor changes were made in the wording of recommendation number 5 and the second sentence was deleted from number 6.

The seven recommendations relative to the administration of the Graduate College are to be submitted to President Cross in the following statements:

1. The horizontal arrangement should be retained for the foreseeable future. Any recentralization of authority for administration of graduate work should be limited to non-budgetary means except for certain budgetary changes, outlined in later recommendations, which can be accomplished with a minimum of friction.
2. The budget for Research Professors salaries and the necessary funds for research assistance should not be transferred to the Graduate College.
3. For the present and where necessary the department and college should be permitted to count on the teaching services of Research Professors in the staffing of their regular course offerings.

Administration of the Graduate College -- continued

4. The term of appointment for a Research Professor should be until statutory retirement and an appointment shall not be made if there is more than one negative vote in the Graduate Council (as the Council is presently constituted).
5. The Graduate Dean should be provided with a budget as soon as feasible which will be used for financing teaching load reductions (through reimbursement to the Undergraduate College budget) of varying amounts and periods for either promising researchers or those with unusually heavy academic responsibilities in the graduate area. The Graduate Dean shall obtain the advice and consent of the Graduate Council and departments concerned in making these selections. (Suggestion: that some portion of the increase due to graduate enrollment which may result from the revision by the State Regents of the budget formula could be used to establish this budget.)
6. Those subvention monies currently administered by the Graduate College should be placed in the Graduate College Budget. A special study of the administration of the whole research effort should be conducted to determine whether funds from other sources should be transferred to the Graduate College budget.
7.
 - (a) The awarding of cash prizes for outstanding research or creative activity should not be undertaken. Monies which may be available for cash prizes can better be used for salary increases and/or teaching load reductions.
 - (b) The scholarly journal or monograph series should not be undertaken at this time because of expense and because of a very real doubt that it is needed.
 - (c) The establishment of a society of fellows should await either a more pressing need for it or more adequate financing than we presently have.

DISCIPLINARY SUSPENSION ✓

Explanatory Comment

Refer to pages 5 and 6 of the Journal of the University Senate for September 30, 1963. This matter was brought to the attention of the University Senate by Dr. Bishop. It was referred to the Senate Committee on Academic Standards for study and a report.

Report of the Senate Committee on Academic Standards

October 24, 1963

After considering the resolution adopted by the Faculty of the College of Business Administration at its September 1963 meeting, the Committee on Academic Standards recommends that the University adopt and publish in the appropriate place in the University General Catalog the following rule:

Disciplinary Suspension -- continued

'Credit earned by a student at any institution during the period such student is under disciplinary suspension will not be accepted for credit by the University of Oklahoma.'

Senate Committee on Academic Standards

Kenneth E. Crook	Nathaniel S. Eek
Raymond D. Daniels	James G. Harlow
Marion C. Phillips	John C. Brixey Chairman

Senate Action

Dr. Brixey presented the foregoing report and moved adoption of rule stated above. His motion was seconded and passed.

REMOVAL OF AN 'I' GRADE ✓

Memorandum from Vice President McCarter

October 18, 1963

The adoption by the State Regents this year of a uniform set of retention policies for all the institutions in the state system led to the discovery that there was not a uniform method of calculating grade point averages.

After a survey and a compilation of the various practices in effect, the Chancellor called a meeting of academic administrators to see what change there might be for arriving at some uniformity. This ad hoc group reached almost unanimous agreement. Their recommendations went to the Presidents' Council (made up of all the Presidents of state institutions) and from them to the State Regents for an interpretation of the term 'semester hours attempted.'

On July 26 the Office of the State Regents issued the attached memorandum, which the Chancellor believes should represent the final action of that body on this subject -- at least, in the present circumstances.

As you will note, the recommendations in the memorandum represent the present practices of the University of Oklahoma except that, by action of the University Senate not long ago, we now allow a full calendar year of enrollment for removal of an 'I' before it becomes 'F'.

It has been thoroughly understood throughout these various discussions that the matters under consideration lie within the academic area where faculty legislation should prevail and where administrators should do no more than suggest. Each President, including President Cross, has agreed to convey the proposed policies to the faculty of his institution and ask that it be considered.

Accordingly the President has asked me to send the proposal to the University Senate for its consideration and recommendation. I shall be glad to provide any representative or committee of the Senate with what other information we have in this Office on the subject.

Removal of an I Grade -- continuedMemorandum from Chancellor Dunlap

July 26, 1963

To: Presidents of Institutions in the State System

From: E. T. Dunlap, Chancellor

You will recall that the Presidents' Council on July 8 requested that the Oklahoma State Regents for Higher Education make an interpretation of the term 'semester hours attempted' as used in the new statement of policy on retention of students scheduled to become effective in September, 1963.

We submitted to the State Regents at their meeting on Monday, July 22, the recommendation on this point which was developed by the academic deans of institutions in the State System in collaboration with the staff of the Regents' office and approved by the Presidents' Council. The Regents concurred in the interpretation, which is as follows:

1. Definition of Semester Hours Attempted. The term 'semester hours attempted' is interpreted to mean all semester hours of collegiate study in which a student has enrolled and received a final grade for which a point value is assigned. (If a student repeats a course, both grades received count for cumulative GPA calculation purposes.)
2. The Grade of WF. The grade of 'WF' (Withdrawn Failing) shall be considered the same as the 'F' in the calculation of the cumulative grade-point average for purposes of retention.
3. The Grade of I. The grade of 'I' (Incomplete) shall be neutral in the calculation of the cumulative grade-point average for retention purposes, except that such grade shall be considered an 'F' if it is not removed by the end of the next fall semester in which the student is enrolled.

Senate Action

Dr. Bishop moved that consideration of the removal of an I grade be referred to the appropriate committee of the University Senate for study and a report. His motion was seconded and passed.

Referral was immediately made to the Senate Committee on Academic Standards.

ADJOURNMENT

The University Senate adjourned at 5:47 p.m. The next regular meeting will be held on Monday, November 25, 1963. Materials for the Agenda should be in the Office of the Secretary by Wednesday, November 13.

Gerald A. Porter, Secretary.