

JOURNAL OF THE UNIVERSITY SENATE

Regular Session, February 28, 1966 -- 4:10 p.m.
 Student Union Building, Room 165

The University Senate, meeting in regular session, was called to order by the Chairman, Dr. John G. Eriksen.

Present

Bell, Digby B.
 Berenda, Carlton W.
 Bienfang, Ralph D.
 Bishop, L. Doyle
 Braver, Gerald
 Collier, Robert E.
 Crook, Kenneth
 Duncan, J. Paul
 Eriksen, John G.
 Feiler, Seymour
 Gooch, Brison D.
 Goodman, George J.
 Harlow, James G.
 Hart, Frances
 Howard, Robert A.
 Ivey, Michael
 Johns, O. D.
 Levy, Gene

Present

Livezey, William E.
 Love, Tom J.
 Maehl, William H.
 Murphy, James M.
 Ohm, Robert E.
 Olson, Ralph E.
 Patnode, Robert
 Peterson, Robert V.
 Phelps, Elbridge D.
 Plint, Colin A.
 Reeves, Charles H.
 Smith, Thomas M.
 Smith, William H.
 Sutherland, Stephen M.
 Terry, Richard A.
 Thayer, Calvin G.
 Turkington, D. Barton
 White, Raymond R.

Absent

Campbell, John M.
 Cross, George L.
 Daniels, Raymond D.
 Daron, Garmon H.
 Eek, Nathaniel S.
 Huneke, Harold V.
 Rohrbaugh, Lawrence M.
 Steen, Wilson D.

 *
 * NOTE: The March meeting *
 * of the University Senate *
 * will be on March 21 *
 * rather than March 28, as *
 * regularly scheduled. *
 *

APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES

The Journal of the University Senate for the regular meeting held on January 31, 1966, was approved.

ACTION BY PRESIDENT CROSS

- A. Acting upon the nominations submitted by the University Senate, President Cross appointed Dean John Ezell to the position vacated by Dr. Arthur Doerr on the Council on Planning and Development, 1966-69.
- B. On February 3, 1966, President Cross indicated his approval of the University Senate resolution pertaining to the making of instructional and administrative appointments in the University (see the Journal of the University Senate for January 31, 1966, pages 3-4).

Action by President Cross -- continued

- C. On February 2, 1966, the University Senate recommended that negotiations be initiated with the Regents of the University relative to the possibility of waiving tuition and fees for graduate students.

On February 17, 1966, President Cross sent the following message back to the University Senate.

I referred to the Budget Council the recommendation of the University Senate concerning the waiving of tuition and fees for Graduate Assistants. On February 8 the Budget Council returned to me its own recommendation, as follows:

That at the earliest feasible time consideration be given to raising stipends for Graduate Assistants. This action was taken in lieu of the request of the Association of Graduate Assistants that tuition and fees for graduate assistants be waived.

To waive tuition and fees would require the approval of the Oklahoma State Regents for Higher Education. Trying to obtain such approval would raise a number of complex questions involving fee requirements at other institutions and discriminatory practices in the assessment of fees, and the success of such an effort would be uncertain, to say the least. The Budget Council's recommendation offers a method of avoiding the raising of such questions and at the same time provides a way of arriving at the same net financial benefit to the Graduate Assistant. For these reasons I have thought it best to approve the recommendation of the Budget Council rather than the recommendation of the University Senate.

ONE SALARY POLICY ✓

Explanatory Comments

Matters relating to consideration of a one salary policy constituted the last item on the Agenda of the meeting of the University Senate on January 31, 1966. The University Senate recessed at 6:02 p.m. without completing its deliberations in this regard (see the Journal of the University Senate for January 31, 1966, pages 4-6).

Senate Action

This matter was again considered on February 28, 1966, and a vote was called for on the substitute motion made by Dr. Maehl on January 31. The vote indicated approval of his motion. The motion approved was as follows:

The University Senate wishes to express its thanks to the Committee on Teaching and Research for the time and work it has spent in studying the proposed one salary policy for the University and takes note of its recommendations against the present adoption of the policy because of lack of financial support. In addition the Senate wishes to express further misgivings about the one salary policy for the following reasons:

One Salary Policy -- continued

1. It is unclear what effect the new policy will have on the conception of the normal faculty teaching load as twelve hours in lecture courses plus related activities as expressed in the Faculty Handbook of Fall 1962, pp. 18-19.
2. The principle of definition between which activities will be included under the new policy and which will not be covered has not been made clear.
3. No assurance is made that the principle of voluntary participation in activities such as extension teaching and outside research activities will be preserved.
4. There is serious danger to the teaching program of the University if permanent staff members are released from normal on-campus teaching responsibilities for other activities and are replaced by more junior personnel.
5. There is a danger that normal budgetary procedures of the University may be neglected in the use of funds which accrue from faculty services to the Extension Division or outside agencies.

In view of the foregoing difficulties, therefore, the University Senate recommends against the implementation of a university-wide one salary policy, except with respect to governmental contracts.

LIBRARY HOURS

Dr. Love, Chairman of the University Senate Committee on Teaching and Research, made a brief oral report on this matter. He indicated that his Committee should be in a position to submit a formal report after one more meeting.

COMMENCEMENT Report of the Senate Committee on Student and Public Relations

February 21, 1966

The Committee on Student and Public Relations has met several times to consider this matter. Mr. Boyce Timmons and Dr. Raymond R. White have met with the Committee.

It has been argued, surely with basis, that Commencement has gotten so large that, as now handled, it has little significance, and perhaps each college should have its own Commencement exercises. The matter was discussed lengthily by the Committee and it was concluded that a single Commencement is best. Numerous obstacles, it was thought, stand in the way of separate Commencements. The imposition on the administration, particularly the President, would be considerable. Too, many staff members are on at least two faculties. Some of the individual colleges have so large a graduating class that it would not be feasible to handle a separate graduation in a manner greatly different than our present one. It seemed better to have one Commencement, making every effort to have it commensurate in dignity and significance with the status of the University.

Commencement -- continued

Also referred to the Committee was consideration of the number or percentage of the faculty that should be required to attend Commencement. It was suggested to the Committee that perhaps departments could be notified of the number of their staff members that should attend, based on a quota system. The Committee concluded that:

1. Any faculty member who cannot attend may readily be excused.
2. Faculty members who neither get excused nor attend pose a problem the solution of which is not worth the effort.
3. The time it requires of each faculty member to attend graduation each year is too little to warrant great concern of the University Senate.

With full cognizance of its responsibility in considering these matters and awareness of the ideas expressed above, the Senate Committee on Student and Public Relations at this time recommends no action with regard to Commencement.

Senate Committee on Student and Public Relations

Digby Bell	Thomas Smith
John Campbell	David Steen
Kenneth Crook	George Goodman, Chairman

Senate Action

Dr. Goodman presented the foregoing report of the Senate Committee on Student and Public Relations and moved that Paragraph 2, dealing with the single commencement, be accepted by the University Senate. His motion was seconded and passed.

Dr. Goodman then moved that the remainder of the report be accepted. His motion was seconded.

Following discussion, Dr. Plint made a substitute motion that the University Senate recommend that attendance at Commencement be made voluntary on the part of the faculty. His motion was seconded but FAILED to pass.

Dr. Berenda then made another substitute motion that the University Senate recommend that each college, department, or school in the University be represented at Commencement by a percentage of its faculty members. His motion was seconded but FAILED to pass.

The original motion by Dr. Goodman was passed. In effect, this means that the University Senate at this time recommends no action with regard to Commencement.

STUDENT SENATEExplanatory Comments

During the past semester, the Student Senate sought aid from the University Senate in the selection of future sponsors of the organization and in the establishment of an Oklahoma University Academic Affairs Progress Commission. These two matters were referred to the Senate Committee on Student and Public Relations. At the February 28 meeting of the University Senate, the matters were handled separately although they were contained in one report from the Committee.

Report of the Senate Committee on Student and Public Relations

February 21, 1966

Student Senate Sponsor

On November 17, 1966, the Student Senate submitted a resolution in which it was requested that the University Senate provide aid in the selection of a Student Senate Sponsor. The request entails the University Senate appointing a nominating and advisory committee each fall to aid the Student Senate in selecting a Sponsor.

The Senate Committee on Student and Public Relations approves the General idea heartily, but thinks that, inasmuch as University Senate members are elected for three-year terms, better continuity would be advisable. Hence, it recommends that the University Senate appoint three Senators, one from the three-year class, one from the two, and one from the one-year class. Each year, as one of these Senators leaves the Senate, a new three-year man would be appointed. This would be implemented upon the Student Senate appointing three student Senators to this "committee of six".

Oklahoma University Academic Affairs Progress Commission

The Senate Committee on Student and Public Relations carefully considered the request from the Student Senate for aid in establishing an Oklahoma University Academic Affairs Progress Commission. The Committee has no recommendation on the request, simply because it believes that this is exactly the sort of thing that the "committee of six", referred to in the item above, should consider before it is presented to the University Senate.

Senate Committee on Student and Public Relations

Digby Bell	Thomas Smith
John Campbell	David Steen
Kenneth Crook	George Goodman, Chairman

Senate Action

Dr. Goodman presented the portion of the foregoing report relative to Student Senate Sponsor. He moved that it be approved by the University Senate. His motion was seconded and passed.

This matter will now be referred back to the Student Senate. If the idea of forming a "committee of six" is accepted by the student organization, it can then be implemented.

Student Senate -- continued

Dr. Goodman presented the portion of the foregoing report relative to the formation of an Oklahoma University Academic Affairs Progress Commission. He moved that it be approved by the University Senate. His motion was seconded and passed.

This matter, too, will be referred back to the Student Senate. If the 'committee of six' is formed, it may give additional consideration to the development of an Oklahoma University Academic Affairs Progress Commission.

ASSOCIATION OF GRADUATE ASSISTANTS ✓

Explanatory Comments

At the January, 1966, meeting of the University Senate extensive consideration was given to a letter from the Association of Graduate Assistants. The letter expressed the major concerns of Graduate Assistants and asked the University Senate to lend support to certain requests (see the Journal of the University Senate for January 31, 1966, pages 2-3). This matter was referred to the Senate Committee on Faculty Personnel for study and a report. That Committee submitted a report on February 25, 1966. At the meeting on February 28, the report was considered at length and amended substantially.

Amended Statement

The University Senate makes the following recommendations in response to the requests of the representatives of the Association of Graduate Assistants, outlined before the University Senate at its January 31, 1966, meeting:

1. That the University Administration take immediate steps to increase the base pay of all graduate assistants.
2. That the Administration grant parking privileges to the graduate assistants as specified in their request to the University Senate, January 31, 1966.
3. That the Council on Libraries be asked to review the whole question of faculty and graduate assistants use of University libraries in order to ameliorate problems arising from present and anticipated demands on library facilities. Their recommendations should be submitted to the University Senate.

Senate Action

Following much discussion and amendment of the original report, a motion by Dr. Bienfang that the foregoing recommendations be approved by the University Senate was seconded and passed.

EVALUATION OF TRANSCRIPTS

Report of the Senate Committee on University Organization,
Budget and Publications

February 17, 1966

Statement of Problem

It has been brought to the attention of the Senate Committee on Organization, Budget and Publications that as of last fall, the Office of Admissions and Records ceased to evaluate the transcripts of transfer students, other than foreign students. This unilateral action was carried out over the protests of the several deans and the Deans' Council. After discussion, the Committee has concluded that an intolerable situation has resulted. Indicated below are facts believed by the Committee to be pertinent to an understanding of the matter, together with a recommendation for action by the Senate.

Information Concerning the Problem

The action so taken by the Office of Admissions and Records throws on advisers and all college offices the responsibility of trying to determine the degree requirements of students without the benefit of evaluation of transfer credits. Neither from the standpoint of experienced personnel nor from that of source material are these advisers and offices equipped to handle this work. As a result, for example, already there have been students who have suffered by having taken courses at O. U. only to be denied transfer credit because it develops that they have taken at another school the same course under a different course title. Thus, without accurate and uniform evaluation of transcripts, students cannot be advised properly on their semester-to-semester enrollments, nor can their colleges certify them for graduation.

Under conditions now prevailing, students are passed from adviser to department to college and/or to the Office of Admissions and Records and back to adviser, as in a comic opera, with no assumption of responsibility anywhere. This procedure not only creates confusion at all levels as well as discontent on the part of students and faculty, but creates a bad university image. Furthermore, a backlog of unevaluated transcripts has built up since last fall and will grow steadily larger.

It is obvious that evaluation of such transcripts must be made. Proper evaluation demands trained personnel as well as current copies of the catalogs of the major colleges from which students come, as well as a back file of these materials. It simply is not feasible for each adviser or even each college to maintain such a file. Accuracy and uniformity of evaluation of transcripts throughout the University is critically important. We think it can derive only from a central source, such as the Office of Admissions and Records. In addition, it seems obvious that a central evaluating office will promote efficiency and economy. Decentralization can lead only to confusion, as is being experienced now, together with vastly more costly operation.

Nor does it appear that centralized handling by the Office of Admissions and Records will impose on that office an impossible burden. It has the source

Evaluation of Transcripts -- continued

material already on hand and in addition has expert personnel. Evaluated transcripts will not be required for students who apply but do not ultimately "show". Thus the number of transcripts to be handled will not be tremendous. By way of example, the College of Business Administration required the evaluation of the transcripts of only 76 transfer students during the fall semester, and the College of Arts and Sciences 241. Thus the overall burden, although not insignificant, is not crushingly great.

Recommendation for Senate Action

The Committee concludes that the problem has reached such a critical stage throughout the University as to demand immediate top-level action by the President's Office. The Committee therefore recommends that the University Senate adopt the following resolution and transmit it, together with this Committee report, to the President's Office:

Be it resolved by the University Senate that the President's Office require of the Office of Admissions and Records an immediate resumption of its former service of furnishing complete written evaluations of all transfer transcripts, including the present backlog.

Senate Committee on University Organization,
Budget and Publications

Gerald Braver	O. D. Johns
Robert Collier	William E. Livezey
Raymond White	E. D. Phelps, Chairman

Senate Action

Dr. Phelps presented the foregoing report on the evaluation of transcripts and moved that it be approved by the University Senate. His motion was seconded and passed.

FACULTY INSURANCE ✓

Memorandum from Darrel R. Williams, Electrical Engineering

February 28, 1966

To: Robert A. Terry
Subject: Faculty Insurance

A ruling which affects all faculty members of the University has evidently been passed by the Board of Regents of the University, with no good explanation of its passage having been made to the faculty. As in any ruling many interpretations may be placed upon its effects and upon its intent. One of its effects has been a reduction in income for some members of the faculty.

Faculty Insurance -- continued


This ruling applies to the insurance benefits for employees and dependents. Under this new ruling an employee is forced to register his dependents for coverage by the insurance company selected to handle the University group policy. If he does not so select, he is forced into losing benefits which were granted in lieu of raises some few years past, and this must be considered as a pay cut. If he does so select, and has less than two dependents, he must pay the same rate (\$12.00 per month) which is paid by all other members. This rate is approximately three times the rate which is presently paid by at least one faculty member for coverage outside this policy.

The principle that the Board of Regents may force an employee to place dependent coverage insurance for which he is expected to pay with a particular company is at least questionable. In addition the faculty was led to believe that dependent coverage was still a matter of choice. Application forms furnished to faculty indicated that a choice was available. The Faculty Handbook states that dependent coverage is the faculty member's choice (Reference page 49, item 2). It is believed that an explanation is due the faculty from the administration and the Board of Regents for this arbitrary and discriminatory pay reduction.

Senate Action

Dr. Terry presented the foregoing memorandum to the University Senate and moved that the problem of faculty insurance be referred to the appropriate committee for study. His motion was seconded and passed.

This item was immediately referred by the Chairman of the University Senate to the Senate Committee on Faculty Personnel.

STUDENT FEE INCREASE Resolution presented by Dr. James M. Murphy

February 28, 1966

Most of the members of the University Senate, being directly or indirectly involved in the recruiting effort for replacement faculty members for the 1966-67 academic year, are acutely aware that salaries offered by the University of Oklahoma are distinctly under the current norms of comparable institutions with whom we are competing in the national market for qualified personnel. We are also aware that certain other working conditions, notably "normal" credit hour loads, put us at a disadvantage in recruiting. Furthermore, in view of the number of University of Oklahoma professorial staff members now known to be taking interviews for positions at other institutions, we are likely to lose a significant number of additional staff members via resignation before the end of the current fiscal year.

If we are to face an essentially static budget picture for the next fiscal year (that is, if the 1965-66 budget limits are likewise to apply to the 1966-67 fiscal year), the difficulties in staff recruiting will increase in intensity, and the risk of further resignations effective in June, 1966, will increase. In short, a static budget situation for another year will do irreparable harm to the University of Oklahoma.

Student Fee Increase -- continued

Apparently the only possible source of additional funds in significant amount for the next fiscal year is an increase in student fees. In view of the sacrifices which a fee increase would necessitate on the part of students and their parents, we share a reluctance in recommending an increase. But it is the feeling of the majority of this Senate that a fee increase constitutes the lesser of the evils.

Be it resolved, therefore, by the University Senate that this body be recorded as favoring and recommending a student fee increase effective September 1, 1966, and that the President of the University be requested to transmit this resolution to the University Regents and to the Oklahoma Regents for Higher Education.

Senate Action

Dr. Murphy presented the foregoing resolution. Dr. Bishop moved that it be referred to the appropriate committee for study. His motion was seconded and passed.

This item was immediately referred by the Chairman of the University Senate to the Senate Committee on University Organization, Budget and Publications.

ADJOURNMENT

The University Senate adjourned at 6:00 p.m. The next regular session will be held on Monday, March 21, 1966. Materials for the Agenda should be in the Office of the Secretary by Friday, March 11.

Gerald A. Porter, Secretary
University Senate

NOTE: THE NEXT MEETING OF THE UNIVERSITY SENATE WILL BE ON

MARCH 21.