

JOURNAL OF THE UNIVERSITY SENATE

Regular Session, March 29, 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.

Present

Bell, Digby B.
Brues, Alice M.
Christian, Sherril D.
Cross, George L.
Eriksen, John G.
Harlow, James G.
Jentz, Gaylord A.
Jones, Lillian W.
Kondonassis, Alexander J.
Love, Tom J.
McFarland, Dora
Patnode, Robert
Plint, Colin A.
Reeves, Charles H.
Rice, Leslie H.
Scheffer, Walter F.
Smith, William Harold
Steen, Wilson D.
Turkington, D. Barton
Wallingford, E. Keith
Warren, Mary A.
Wilcox, Stewart C.

Absent

Berthrong, Donald J.
Bienfang, Ralph D.
Bowen, Willis H.
Campbell, John M.
Chisolm, Mildred Y.
Collier, Robert E.
Daniels, Raymond D.
Daron, Garmon H.
Duncan, J. Paul
Eek, Nathaniel S.
Ewing, George M.
Gibson, Arrell M.
Huneke, Harold V.
Levy, Gene
Maehl, William H., Jr.
Matlock, J. Ray
Monahan, William G.
Phelps, Elbridge D.
Phillips, Marion C.
Rohrbaugh, Lawrence M.
Smith, Thomas M.
Sutherland, Stephen M.

APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES

The Journal of the University Senate for the regular meeting held on February 22, 1965, was approved.

SENATE INFORMATION

General Faculty Membership for Administrative Officers. -- On March 8, President Cross approved the recommendation of the University Senate that status as members of the general faculty be granted to five administrative officers (see pages 1-3, Journal of the University Senate, February 22, 1965).

Faculty Retirement. -- On March 8, President Cross indicated approval of University Senate recommendations relative to faculty retirement (see pages 3 and 4, Journal of the University Senate, February 22, 1965).

NOMINATIONS FOR UNIVERSITY COUNCILS, 1965-66

Professor Wallingford, Chairman of the Senate Committee on Committees, reported that the Committee is continuing its work in the development of a list of nominations. A formal report will be presented at the April meeting of the University Senate.

GRANTING DEGREES POSTHUMOUSLY Letter from Dean Childress

March 11, 1965

Dr. James G. Harlow, Chairman
University Senate

Dear Dr. Harlow:

A request was received a few days ago by telephone from Mrs. Joseph Finkelstein of New York City that a posthumous degree be awarded her son Gerald, who was killed in an automobile accident in January this year. Mrs. Finkelstein was advised that the request would be referred to a committee from this college for study and recommendation at the faculty meeting. The committee did consider the circumstances in this case and discovered that Gerald Finkelstein would not have graduated at the earliest until August, 1965, and more likely in January of 1966. The matter was referred without recommendation to the faculty.

In action which this faculty took in a prior case, a degree was granted on behalf of a deceased student who had been enrolled in what would have been the graduating semester. The circumstances in this case are so different that I have been instructed on behalf of the faculty of this college to refer the question to the University Senate in the hope that guidelines may be developed which will govern the awarding of posthumous degrees. In the absence of such a policy, applicable University-wide, there is reason to believe that we may be faced with a serious problem in public relations. I think it is likely that if the faculty of one college insists that a deceased student have been enrolled in the semester in which he normally would have filled his degree requirements and thus denies a degree to the family of one student and later the faculty of another college awards a degree posthumously to a junior or first semester senior, the family of the first student would have reason to feel there had been unfair discrimination. The faculty of this college, therefore, has requested that the question be referred to the University Senate in the hope that with sufficient study and discussion agreement may be reached upon a uniform policy governing the awarding of posthumous degrees, the policy to be administered by the President's Office.

Respectfully yours,

(s) Donald R. Childress, Associate Dean
College of Business Administration

Granting Degrees Posthumously -- continuedAction of the University Senate -- March 1951

Dr. Fayette Copeland made the following recommendation concerning the matter of posthumous degrees.

The Recommendation: The faculty of a degree-recommending college may recommend that a degree be granted posthumously to a second semester senior who, at the time of his death, has a cumulative grade average equal to that required for graduation by the college in which he was enrolled.

Explanatory Comment by Dr. Copeland: The Committee's purpose in stating the recommendation in this manner was to permit each degree-recommending college to adhere to the requirements which have been heretofore followed by that college. It was believed that the general wording of the recommendation would facilitate administration.

Senate Action: The recommendation, as stated above, was approved.

Senate Action

Following a brief discussion of this matter, Dr. Turkington moved that the University Senate reaffirm the action taken in March of 1951 and that an appropriate statement relative to granting degrees posthumously be published in the proper University publications. His motion was seconded and passed by the University Senate.

REAPPORTIONMENT OF MEMBERSHIP OF THE UNIVERSITY SENATE 

Report of the Senate Committee on Organization, Budget and Publications

March 25, 1965

A. Recommendation for Reapportionment of the University Senate:

The Charter of Government of the University of Oklahoma provides that the University Senate shall consist of 43 members. It also provides that the allocation of Senate seats shall be determined in an official triennial reapportionment proposed by the Senate and approved by the general faculty. The charter further provides: "Under the apportionment the allocation of senate seats shall be determined by the ratio which a constituent college's full-time professors and instructors (as listed on the university payroll) bears to the total number of full-time professors and instructors in the university, provided that each college and independent degree-recommending school shall have at least one senate seat and that no fewer than six nor more than nine seats shall be allocated to the general faculty."

The time for such periodic reapportionment has arrived. Thus there has been referred to this committee the task of proposing a reapportionment plan in conformity with the charter. After considering the various possibilities and making computations based thereon, the committee has concluded that the best and the most feasible plan is as follows:

Reapportionment of Membership of the University Senate -- continuedMembership Allocation for 1966-69

<u>Number of Faculty</u>	<u>College or School</u>	<u>Ratio</u>	<u>Seats Allocated</u>
252	Arts & Sciences	14.05	14
82	Engineering	4.57	5
13	Law	.73	1
6	Pharmacy	.33	1
52	Education	2.90	3
45	Business Administration	2.51	3
61	Medicine	3.40	3
15	Nursing	.84	1
47	Fine Arts	2.62	3
	Graduate	0.00	1
	Continuing Education	0.00	1
	(General Faculty)		7
			43

B. Recommended Charter Amendment:

The committee suggests that colleges which have no separate faculty but simply furnish instruction through faculty members from other colleges in the University, should not have separate representation in the Senate. Such colleges receive adequate representation through the elected representatives of colleges from which their faculty members come and through representatives elected from the general faculty. Accordingly the committee recommends that the present charter language appearing in quotes in the first paragraph on this page be deleted from the charter and that there be substituted the following:

"Under the apportionment, the allocation of senate seats shall be determined by the ratio which the number of full-time professors through instructors (as listed on the University payroll) in the Colleges of Arts and Sciences, Business Administration, Education, Engineering, Fine Arts, Law, and Pharmacy, and the Schools of Medicine and Nursing, respectively, bears to the total number of such professors through instructors in the university, provided that each of the colleges and schools just named shall have at least one senate seat and that at least six but not more than nine seats shall be allocated to the general faculty."

The committee also recommends that the first sentence in that paragraph of the charter which contains the language quoted in the first paragraph on this page be amended so as to read: "The members of the senate shall be elected by written ballot in the general faculty and in the colleges and schools hereinafter mentioned in this paragraph."

The committee recommends that these changes be made effective so as to control the next triennial apportionment, i.e., 1967-68.

Senate Committee on Organization, Budget and Publications

Dora McFarland
Gaylord Jentz
George Ewing

Robert Collier
E. D. Phelps, Chairman

Reapportionment of Membership of the University Senate -- continuedSenate Action

In the absence of the Chairman of the Senate Committee on University Organization, Budget and Publications, Dr. McFarland presented the foregoing report. She then moved adoption of the membership allocation for the University Senate for 1966-69 as presented in the report. Her motion was seconded and passed.

Dr. McFarland then discussed the recommended Charter amendment in the report and moved adoption of it by the University Senate. Her motion was seconded. Following considerable discussion the motion FAILED to pass.

TRANSFER OF FACULTY MEMBERS FROM ONE INSTITUTION TO ANOTHER ✓

Memorandum from President Cross

March 19, 1965

Here is an excerpt from the minutes of the Executive Council of the Mid-America State Universities Association for February 27, 1965:

On motion of President Ellis and Vice-President Chamberlain, the Council agreed unanimously to recommend to the member institutions that each adopt the AAU statement relating to transfer of faculty members between institutions, or at least its substance, as its policy with respect to other MASUA member institutions. The AAU statement in its entirety is quoted herewith, with a single nonsubstantive change made for the sake of clarity in line 4 of paragraph 2:

Inter-University Understanding Relating to Transfer of
Faculty Members from One Institution to Another

The sharp increase in the demand for teacher-scholars of high talent arising from our growing national needs in both instruction and research is now pressing against a limited supply of such talent in many disciplines. To assure the highest possible effectiveness in each university in producing high talent to meet future national needs, sound and orderly planning will be required. When late and sudden, induced departures of personnel assigned to provide instruction or to lead in research in one institution may well do more to impair the effectiveness of that institution than is justified by the gain to the institution extending the offer. This is particularly true at the level of tenure appointments where the institution has declared its willingness to undertake a continuing obligation and where there are most likely to be continuing obligations by the faculty member to graduate students and colleagues.

Therefore we consider it incumbent upon the administrations of both the prospective and current institutions of employment to call the attention of the individual faculty member to these obligations when changes of employment, not accepted before May 1 for the immediately ensuing academic year, are under consideration. We believe that a responsible approach for both the institutions and the faculty member would be to consider offers made or pending on May 1, or thereafter, to be effective normally only after the intervention of an academic year."

Transfer of Faculty Members from One Institution to Another -- continued

The acceptance of this statement as policy would place administrators under obligation not to raid the faculties of the other MASUA institutions after May 1. But it also places the faculty member under obligation not to accept appointment at another MASUA institution after May 1, even though negotiation may have started before that date. For this reason I am requesting the recommendation of the University Senate as to whether the statement should be adopted as University policy.

Vice President McCarter, who attended the February 27 meeting, will be glad to give further information to the Committee to which this question is referred.

Senate Action

This problem was referred to the Senate Committee on Faculty Personnel for study and a report.

SABBATICAL LEAVE

Letter from Dr. Granger

March 18, 1965

Dr. James G. Harlow, Chairman
University Senate
The University of Oklahoma

Dear Dr. Harlow:

I am anxious to see that fringe benefit known as the sabbatical leave strengthened at the University of Oklahoma. The Faculty Handbook defines the present policy thus: "Sabbatical leave of absence on half pay, for a period not to exceed two semesters, may be granted by the President of the University, with the approval of the Regents to any tenure-holding faculty member who has completed at least six years of service as teacher in the University, provided the time shall be given to study and travel approved by the President. . . . Sabbatical leave is intended to provide a deserved opportunity for study and travel to enhance the academic performance of the faculty."

As a step toward restoring this venerable and precious academic privilege to its historic meaning, I urge the University Senate to take early action on a hope President Cross voiced in a memorandum to Dr. Rufus Hall, Chairman of the Senate, on April 8, 1958: "I do hope that a time may come when the University of Oklahoma will be able to adopt a policy of sabbatical leave under which there is a choice between two semesters at half-pay and one semester at full pay. Many institutions now have such a policy, but I think we are not yet ready to move into it. Perhaps within the next few years the Senate will be able to develop such a policy for the University to try."

Sabbatical Leave -- continued

The Research Institute presently makes available two annual grants of \$3,000 each to faculty members receiving concurrent leaves. Unfortunately, the rule, "Project directors, present and past, will in general receive priority in the award of these grants," works to the disadvantage of the independent researcher. Of the four faculty members who applied for these grants in 1965 the two who received them are both project directors. Moreover, no grant has yet been made to a nonscientist. If applications for sabbatical leave at full pay are to be judged fairly and impartially, it will have to be by a screening committee that is broadly representative of all academic areas in the University, not by one that reflects special interests. The Graduate Council, for example, or perhaps the Faculty Research Committee.

Mark H. Ingraham, Professor of Mathematics at the University of Wisconsin and former Dean of the College of Arts & Sciences, has just published The Outer Fringe: Faculty Benefits Other Than Annuities and Insurance (Madison and Milwaukee, 1965). Referring to this book, he writes in the Spring, 1965, issue of the AAUP Bulletin, p. 27: "A conviction that I have come to during this study is that many types of programs do more harm than good unless adequate resources are devoted to them. The institution which on the books has a rule that a man is eligible to apply for sabbatical leave after six years of continuous service, but can only afford to grant leaves to a small number of those eligible, is fostering false hopes, developing frustrations, and will be accused of partiality and bad faith even when leaves are granted by understood processes and with good judgment. In such cases I believe strong efforts should be made to augment the funds available for leaves. The professor who finds, as his college becomes more researchminded, that he needs a project--not just six years and a weary look--to get a leave, is certain that the academic world is not what it used to be."

At a time when the University of Oklahoma is falling farther and farther behind the national and even regional averages in faculty salaries, it becomes increasingly urgent that we, faculty, administration, and regents, act in concert to strengthen important fringe benefits like the sabbatical leave as a compensating inducement to secure and retain an outstanding faculty. I was shocked to discover that during the five-year period 1959-1964, only 47 members in a faculty numbering 450 took sabbatical leaves (and 9 of these were for one semester only). Many others would surely have taken them, and deservedly so, could they have afforded to do so. Let us get busy and realize Webster's definition of the sabbatical year as "a leave of absence granted every seventh year, as to a college professor for rest, travel, and research".

Sincerely yours,

(s) Bruce Granger

Sabbatical Leave -- continued

Letter from Dean Doerr

March 19, 1965

Dean James Harlow
College of Education

Dear Dean Harlow:

This letter is written to you in your capacity as Chairman of the University Senate. At its meeting on March 18, 1965 the Graduate Council made a unanimous recommendation that the Senate seriously consider a modification of existing sabbatical leave policies. Specifically, the Council recommends a continuation of existing practices, i.e., one-half pay for the sabbatical year, and the addition of a provision which would permit full pay for a sabbatical semester.

Flexibility engendered by such a modification in existing regulations would doubtless enhance research activities and improve faculty recruitment and retention. You and members of the Senate are aware of the fact that few sabbaticals are taken now, since most faculty members cannot afford the financial strain.

I hope it will be possible for the Senate to give this matter its urgent attention.

Sincerely yours,

(s) Arthur H. Doerr, Dean
Graduate College

Senate Action

This matter was referred to the Senate Committee on Faculty Personnel for study and a report.

REPORT OF AAUP PRESIDENT ✓

Dr. Calvin G. Thayer, President of the University of Oklahoma Chapter of the American Association of University Professors, brought to the University Senate a report of discussion within the AAUP chapter concerning procedures for the appointment of a president of the University.

Upon invitation by Chairman Harlow, President Cross responded at some length, reporting that agreements have already been reached with the Regents of the University of Oklahoma concerning broad faculty participation in the selection of deans and the president. It was the judgment of President Cross that neither further agreements nor additional formalization of present agreements was necessary at this time. He reported the Regents as very pleased with the operation of the recent agreements in the selection of the new dean of the School of Medicine.

ADJOURNMENT

The University Senate adjourned at 5:20 P. M. The next regular meeting will be held on Monday, April 26, 1965. Materials for the Agenda should be in the Office of the Secretary by Wednesday, April 14.

Gerald A. Porter, Secretary