JOURNAL OF THE UNIVERSITY SENATE

Regular Session, January 25, 1965, 4:10 P. M. Student Union Building, Room 165

The University Senate, meeting in regular session, was called to order by Dr. James G. Harlow, Chairman.

Presen
Bienfang, Ralph D. Berthrong, Donald J. Bowen, Willis H. Christian, Sherril D. Collier, Robert E. Cross, George L. Duncan, J. Paul Eek, Nathaniel S . Eriksen, John G. Ewing, George M. Gibson, Arrell M. Harlow, James G. Jentz, Gaylord A.

> Present
> Kondonassis, Alex J. Levy, Gene Monahan, William G. Phelps, Elbridge D. Phillips, Marion C. Reeves, Charles $H$. Rice, Leslie $H$. Scheffer, Walter F . Smich, William H. Steen, Wilson D. Wallingford, E. Keith Warren, Mary A. Wilcox, Stewart C.

Absent<br>Bell, Digby B. Brues, Alice M. Campbe11, John M. Chisolm, Mildred Y, Daniels, Raymond D. Daron, Garmon H. Huneke, Harold $V$. Jones, Lillian W. Love, Tom J. Maehl, William H., Jr. Matlock, J. Ray McFarland, Dora Patnode, Robert Plint, Colin A. Rohrbaugh, Lawrence M. Smith, Thomas M. Sutherland, Stephen M. Turkington, D. Barton

## APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES

The Journal of the University Senate for the regular meeting held on November 30, 1964, was approved.

STUDENT CHEATIHG


Report of the Senate Committee on Academic Standards
January 13, 1965

The Committee has considered the desirability and the appropriateness of the statement:

Where a student is failed in a course because of cheating, but no further punishment follows, the permanent record of the student shall not show the cause of failure.
which appears in the policies of the University pertaining to instruction and other student relationships under the subject of Cheating.

Student Cheating -- continued
The Committee recommends that the statement, omitted by error in the current issue, be reinserted in the Faculty Handbook with the next publication of it.

This recommendation is supported by all but one of the major administrative officials of the University.

Senate Committee on Academic Standards

| Nathaniel S. Eck | Donald J. Berthrong |
| :--- | :--- |
| Raymond D. Daniels | Harold V. Huneke |
| Arrell M. Gibson | Marion C. Phillips, Chr. |

Senate Action
Dr. Phillips presented the report of the Senate Comittee on Academic Standards and commented relative to elements in it. Dr. Gibson moved that the report be approved by the Senate. His motion was seconded and passed.

RECIPROCAL WAIVER OF OUT-OF-STATE FEES
Report of Senate Committee on Organization, Budgets, and Publications
December 11, 1964
The meeting of the Committee was held in the Kulp Room ar the College of Law on Friday, December 11, 1964. Present: Chairman, E. D. Phelps; Members, Professors Ewing, Jentz, and McFarland.

The purpose of the meeting was to deal with a referral from the Senate meeting of November 30 concerning the possibility of waiving, on a reciprocal basis and among Big Eight institutions, the payment of out-of-state tuition fees by children of faculty members in any of those institutions.

## Background and Discussion

The chairman reported that preliminary to this meeting, he had talked with Vice President McCarter, Mr. Giezentanner, Mr. Tom Sexton of the Office of the Higher Regents, and Dean Livezey. Dr. McCarter advised that the matter had previously been raised in the Budget Council and furnished the committee with a copy of a flle of correspondence had with other institutions at that time. Briefly this file of correspondence indicated that a fee waiver of this sort has apparently thus far been accomplished only among private institutions. It also indicaced that with respect to the arrangements thus far reached, some difficulty had been experienced as to (1) Determining the faculty and staff members to whom the waiver should apply; (2) Imbalance in operation for instance, Dartmouth reported that it furnished far more daughters for Smith than Smith furnished sons for Dartmouth; as a consequence, the latter dropped the plan and simply budgets $\$ 1400$ a year (the amount of the Dartmouth tuition) for each faculty child who wishes to attend another college, the money being paid directly to that college by Dartmouth; (3) Possible adverse sentiment on the part of unmarried or childless faculty members, alchough this was specifically denied in responses from some schools; (4) The possibility that such a plan might put a squeeze on some schools where the input of students might be large enough to substantially increase costs.

Reciprocal Waiver of Out-of-state Fees -- continued
The committee discussed the matter at length. Among points other than raised above was the question of whether a substantial number of faculty members would be benefitted by such a fringe benefit, whether it would be useful to a large degree unless a very substantial number of institutions joined, thus making possible a rather large choice for students or faculty members who might wish to send their children to their own alma maters, whether costs would be increased and revenue would be decreased, whether it would serve as a strong recruiting factor, etc. The committee did not explore the question of the potential legality of such a plan, although suggestion was made that it is at this point that such plans among public institutions have most likely foundered. The feeling was that this aspect need not be canvassed until it is established that the plan represents a desirable policy.

## Conclusion

The consensus of the committee is that in view of the probable number of faculty children who would benefit from such a plan, the anticipated administrative detail in connection with its establishment would quite outweigh the advantages. It seems likely that a plan for total or partial remission of general fees to children of faculty members attending oU would benefit a larger portion of the faculty group. It is to be noted, however, that both such plans would depart from the pattern of most present fringe benefits at $O U$ which are restricted to faculty and staff members themselves. For example, the cost of the present insurance coverage for dependents is borne by the faculty member himself. The committee suggests, however, that if members of the University administration are at meetings at which personnel from sister institutions are present, they might informally explore the problem with such representatives.

Committee on University Organization, Budget,
and Publications
George M. Eving Robert E. Collier Dora McFarland
William G. Monahan

Gaylord A. Jentz
Elbridge D. Phelps, Chairman

## Senate Action

Dr. Phelps presented the foregoing report and moved that it be adopted by the University Senate. His motion was seconded and passed.

PHYSICAL EDUCATION AND ROTC


## Explanatory Comment

Various aspects in the offering of physical education and ROTC were studied by the University Senate in 1963-64. Study of the problems was continued during the first semester of this year by the Senate Committee on Courses and Curricula. Presented on the pages which follow are:

1. A memorandum from the Department of Physical Education.
2. A statement of the Major Provisions of H. R. 9124 (ROTC Bill).
3. Recommendations of the Senate Committee on Courses and Curricula.

Physical Education and $R O T C=\infty$ continued<br>Memorandum from the Department of Physical Education

To: University Senate<br>From: Department of Physical Education<br>Subject: Physical Education Requirements at the University of Oklahoma

In light of the present situation concerning required physical education at the University of Oklahoma, the Department of Physical Education appreciates the opportunity to present its recommendation for required physical education, the need for such a requirement, and its academic justification.

We recommend that all men and women entering the University of Oklahoma be required to take two consecutive semesters of physical education. These courses will be marked in the same way as other courses given at the University and grades will be included in the student's academic average. Further, the student may elect to take additional work in physical education beyond the requirement.

The changes which have taken place in our society in the past few generations have given rise to a society in which individuals now work fewer hours than ever before and do less physical labor in their work. Concurrent with these changes has been the rapid increase of the chronic debilitating diseases of later life such as coronary heart disease.

The basic goal of education at the University of Oklahoma is to prepare the student to function maximally in society. This implies a responsibility beyond merely providing the student with technical skills so that he will be capable of earning a living. The student must also leave the University prepared in every possible way for effective participation in all aspects of society. The introductory course in physical education which all students at the University of Oklahoma would be required to take would have this sort of preparation as its primary purpose.

It is becoming increasingly evident that as our working lives become more sedentary, we must seek activity in other aspects of life in order to maintain the standards of health which medical science has been able to provide for us. There is a great deal of research evidence which adequately makes the case for activity in daily living. The student must be provided with these facts and made aware of their importance in his life. In addition, it must also be realized that constant referral to the future must be complemented by an opportunity for the student to experience physical change in the present. This personal experience will make the entire program more effective and meaningful.

The introductory physical education course is to be a combined lecture and laboratory course in which the student would be presented with the facts concerning exercise and activity and their relation to modern living. Other aspects of the lecture section would be concerned with mechanics of daily living, preventive aspects of exercise, development of selected physical attributes, self-evaluation, and guidance for selection of future physical education activities. The basic goals of the laboratory portion of the course would be to allow the student to make a realistic appraisal of his physical condition by means of a selected testing program, to provide the student with a program of training designed to increase his ability in areas in which he is below par, and to introduce the student to areas of activity designed to help him continue his exercise pattern in later life.

Physical Education and ROTC -- continued
After compleing the introductory course in physical education, the student would then be free to choose any course he wishes for the second semester. Ideally, this course would be chosen in light of the student's present physical needs in combination with his anticipated future needs. The courses available to che student would be designed to be of value to the student in the future.

On an academic basis, the introductory course grades would be determined primarily on the basis of written tests designed to evaluate how much of the material the student has learned. The courses which follow would be graded on a combination of written and skills tests.

In summary, a one year requirement in physical education for all men and women at the University of Oklahoma is proposed. In the first course the studeni would receive information indicating the need for activity in his daily pattern of living, and have the opportunity to experience physical change. The student would then be required to take at least one, and could take as many as five activity courses designed to equip him with the skills needed for active and continued participation in some activity or activities.

Statement Prepared by the Committee on Courses and Curricula
Major Provisions of H. R. 9124 (ROTC Bill)

1. In addition to the 4 -year program there will be a 2 -year program for Army and Air Force. The 2-year program will consist of a Basic Summer Camp (between sophomore and junior years), an Advanced Summer Camp (between junior and senior years), and the AdvancedCourse in residence (junior and senior years).
2. An institution may choose to offer either the 2 -year program, the 4-year program, or both. Scholarships (see 3 below) are not available to students in institutions that have the 2 -year program only.
3. The Act provides for scholarships for all three services, similar to the so-called Holloway plan that the Navy already has. A limit of 5,500 is set on the number of scholarships in effect at any one time in each service (present Navy number is 5,300 ). The Army and Air Force may start with 4,000 scholarships each in 1965 and go up to a total of 5,500 by 1969. (Our information is that they will probably start with fewer than 4,000 , maybe with as few as 1,000 each.) Each scholarship provides a payment to the student of $\$ 50$ per month for 10 months a year over a 4 -year period, plus fees, books, and supplies. This means that scholarships will be as far as the institution's tuition happens to be .
4. Pay to Advanced Course students is raised from $\$ 27$ to $\$ 40$ per month. Summer camp pay and allowance for travel are also increased.
5. Advanced Course students (and presumably scholarship students) are placed on enlisted reserve status. This means that, if a student violates his contractual obligation with the armed secvices, he may by called immediately to active duty for as many as four years.

Physical Education and ROTC -- continued
Report of the Senate Committee on Courses and Curricula
January 24, 1965
The Committee on Courses and Curricula recommends that the University of Oklahoma:

1. Continue ROTC on a voluntary basis.
2. Offer both the 2-year and the 4 -year programs in Army and Air Force ROTC.
3. Require one year of Physical Education of all women students and of all men students who did not take ROTC. (This recommendation is based on the belief that the proposal of Professor William Eick for a "revised course" in Physical Education will be implemented by September, 1965).
4. Compute the Physical Education grades in the student's total grade point average.
5. Take appropriate steps to insure that incoming freshmen male students would not take Physical Education if they plan to take the 2 -year ROTC program upon completion of their sophomore year.

J. Paul Duncan Lillian W. Jones<br>Lawrence M. Rohrbaugh J. Ray Matlock

## Sanate Action

Dr. Kondonassis presented the report of the Senate Committee on Courses and Curricula. He called upon Professors Eick and Weber, of the Department of Physical Education, to comment relative to the physical education aspects of the problems under consideration. Dr. Kondonassis moved approval of the recommendations in the foregoing report. His motions was seconded. Voting upon the numbered recommendations in sequence, the University Senate indicated approval of items 1 and 2 ; then, 3 and 4 ; and finally, item 5.

FACULTY RETIREMENT

## Explanatory Comment

From the floor of the Senate, on January 25, Dr. Wilcox raised for consideration certain matters relating to the retirement of faculty members. Specifically, he suggested that the University Senate should study ways of relating retirement pay to cost of living indexes so that the buying power of a retired faculty member would be maintained; further, he suggested that an arrangement should be developed whereby a person might be employed on the faculty and given credit toward retirement for at least a part of the teaching experience he had acquired elsewhere.

## Faculty Retirement - continued

Benate Action

Following a brief discussion of the matters involved in his suggestions, Di. Wilcox moved that consideration of them be referred to the appropriate comittee of the University Senate. His motion was seconded and passed.

The chairman of the University Senate immediately made the referral to the Sinate Committee on Faculty Parsonnel.

## ADJOURIMMENT

The University Senate adjourned at $5: 00 \mathrm{P}$. M. The next regular meeting will be held on Monday, February 22, 1965. Materials for the Agenda should be in the Office of the Secretary by Wednesday, February 10.

Gerald A. Porter, Secrecary

