

JOURNAL OF THE UNIVERSITY SENATE

Regular Session, March 21, 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.
Bishop, L. Doyle
Braver, Gerald
Collier, Robert E.
Daniels, Raymond D.
Eek, Nathaniel S.
Eriksen, John G.
Feiler, Seymour
Gooch, Brison D.
Goodman, George J.
Harlow, James G.
Hart, Frances
Huneke, Harold V.
Ivey, Michael

Present

Levy, Gene
Love, Tom J.
Maehl, William H.
Murphy, James M.
Olson, Ralph E.
Patnode, Robert A.
Peterson, Robert V.
Phelps, Elbridge D.
Plint, Colin A.
Reeves, Charles H.
Rohrbaugh, Lawrence M.
Smith, William H.
Thayer, Calvin G.
Turkington, D. Barton
White, Raymond R.

Absent

Bienfang, Ralph D.
Campbell, John M.
Crook, Kenneth E.
Cross, George L.
Daron, Garmon H.
Duncan, J. Paul
Howard, Robert A.
Johns, O. D.
Livezey, William E.
Ohm, Robert E.
Smith, Thomas M.
Steen, Wilson D.
Sutherland, Stephen M.
Terry, Richard A.

APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES

The Journal of the University Senate for the regular meeting held on February 28, 1966, was approved.

ACTION BY PRESIDENT CROSS

- A. On March 11, 1966, President Cross indicated his approval of a report submitted to him by the University Senate relating to the establishment of a one salary policy (see the Journal of the University Senate for February 28, 1966, pages 2 and 3).
- B. On March 14, 1966, President Cross indicated that he would neither approve or disapprove the recommendations of the University Senate relative to recommendations involving the status of graduate assistants (see the Journal of the University Senate for February 28, 1966, page 6). He transmitted to the University Senate the following statement:

I am returning without action the University Senate's two recommendations concerning Graduate Assistants. I am not willing to disapprove them for I am in full agreement with their intent. On the other hand, I cannot approve them, for at this particular time they are impractical.

Action by President Cross -- continued

1. Upon recommendation of the Budget Council, we have given the Deans authority to go above the old \$2,000 ceiling for Graduate Assistants wherever budget conditions permit them to do so. In the last few days we think we have found a way to increase stipends for a number of Graduate Assistants, at least for the remaining months of this year, through permissible application of Federal funds under the Work-Study Program. Neither of these, of course, represents a satisfactory increase in the base pay of Graduate Assistants. But we can do no more until we find ways to increase the University's income.

2. The effect of the Senate's recommendation concerning parking privileges for Graduate Assistants would be to grant them the privilege of parking their cars in Faculty Lots. I doubt that the Faculty really wishes something over 500 automobiles added to the number that now have Faculty decals. But, if this is what the Senate intends to recommend, I am unable to see how the plan could be made to work. If the Senate has recommendations as to how the Faculty Lots can be made to accommodate such an increase, I shall be glad to consider them.

LIBRARY HOURS ✓

Report from the Senate Committee on Teaching and Research

March 21, 1966

In the November 1965 Senate meeting the Committee on Teaching and Research received the assignment to study the matter of proper hours for opening and closing of the library and the problem of keeping the library open throughout vacation periods.

The committee members have discussed the problem informally with various faculty members and students and have met formally with Dr. McAnally and with Dr. Fritz, Chairman of the University Council on Libraries.

The committee recommends that the University Senate request the following changes in the library schedule in order to better serve the instructional and research needs of the University:

1. That the closing hour of the library be extended to 12:00 midnight.
2. That this same schedule continue between semesters.
3. That the normal work-week schedule be maintained during vacation periods immediately following each holiday, including being open for a full schedule on Sunday before classes resume after a holiday.
4. That the Director of Libraries consider the adoption of a procedure which would permit faculty members to remain in the library after closing hours.

Dr. McAnally in an "off the cuff" estimate guessed that the cost for the extended service would be \$1,850 per year.

The Council on Libraries has subsequently considered these recommendations and their reaction is given in the attached copy. (see next page)

Library Hours -- continued

The Committee on Teaching and Research does not believe that the practice in other schools should be the basis of our recommendations and we feel that the Council on Libraries can adjust next year's budget to include the relatively modest increase in expense for the extended services recommended.

Senate Committee on Teaching and Research

Robert A. Patnode	Seymour Feiler
Charles H. Reeves	Michael Ivey
Stephen M. Sutherland	Tom J. Love, Chairman
Robert A. Howard	

Letter from the University Council on Libraries

February 13, 1966

On February 3, 1966, the University Council on Libraries considered at length the recommendation of the Senate Committee on Teaching and Research that the hours during which the University Library is open be extended.

The Council considered comparative data on hours maintained presently by the University of Oklahoma Library and by libraries at such universities as California, Cornell, Michigan, and Yale; in this area, Kansas, Louisiana State, Oklahoma State, and Texas. Some figures might be of interest to the Senate Committee on Teaching and Research: Fifty-one of the larger university libraries in the country that belong to the Association of Research Libraries are open for weekly service an average of 90.5 hours. The University of Oklahoma Library is open 93 hours. Four libraries in this group open earlier in the morning than does the OU Library, 7:30 a.m. Six libraries remain open until midnight, with curtailed services or no services at all. During vacation periods, the libraries in this group are open with services an average of 51.5 hours weekly, without services an average of 53.4 hours; OU, in both categories, an average of 50 hours.

The Council then discussed problems of security, of staffing, of additional requirements of the Physical Plant, and of financing. The Council could find no means, in its current budget, to finance an extension of hours.

With all but two members present and voting, the Council declined unanimously to recommend any extension of hours by the University Library at the present time.

(s) Alphonse J. Fritz, Chairman
University Council on Libraries

Senate Action

The foregoing report of the Senate Committee on Teaching and Research and the letter from Dr. Fritz were presented by Dr. Love. He then moved that the report of his committee be approved by the University Senate and submitted to President Cross. His motion was seconded and passed.

INCOMPLETE GRADES ✓

Memorandum from the Office of Admissions and Records

February 18, 1966

The present regulation concerning the make-up of incomplete grades says that, "Any undergraduate student receiving an I must remove the I or complete the course by re-enrollment within twelve months of the date of receiving the I or the I becomes the grade of F (with the exception of problems courses and research)." The previous regulation permitted the student to have twelve months after he returned as a student to the University.

We would like to point out that, under the present regulation, any student who receives a bona fide "incomplete" and transfers to another university or who decides not to continue his education receives an automatic F, which seems unjust in view of the fact that the I grade is not meant to be used to indicate failing work...it may eventually be an A as well as an F.

We might also point out that a student who is called into military service for two years who is eligible for "incompletes" will have all F's when he returns. There is also the situation of the student who graduates with the minimum grade point average required for his degree with an "incomplete" on his record received during his last year. If he graduates having an "incomplete", he obviously does not need that course credit for his degree...yet at the end of twelve months the "incomplete" automatically becomes an F and could conceivably reduce the student's grade point average to less than the minimum required for his degree. We will have a number of students who will have bona fide incomplete grades who graduate and, in a year's time the I's will automatically become F's which certainly seems unfair to our graduates.

In addition, there is the pre-medic, pre-dental, and nursing student who may justifiably receive "incompletes" while on campus and who properly, by the very nature of his curriculum leaves the campus to continue his programs elsewhere and who never returns to the campus to have an opportunity to make up his work. Again, it seems to abuse the intent of the grade I for it automatically reverts to F.

When President Cross indicated his approval of the last action taken by the University Senate concerning the I grade (Senate Journal of April 27, 1964), he strongly urged that an appeal procedure be established for "the student who, for reasons beyond his control because of the... 'thinking of the faculty', receives an I, and who, again for reasons quite beyond his control or for the convenience of the University, is unable to remove the I within the twelve-month period...". Such a procedure is established through faculty action. We are already seeing many such petitions. In nearly all instances the various faculties are approving the petitions. Thus, we currently have the inconsistency of the student who is familiar with this procedure taking advantage of it (as he is entitled to) and the student who is uninformed, or not even present, suffering the penalty mark.

We would like to request that the University Senate reconsider this regulation and go back to the former policy allowing the student two semester's enrollment after he returns to the University of Oklahoma campus in which to remove the I AND FURTHER, to provide the exemption of "incompletes" if the student graduates within the established time allowed for the removal of the "incomplete".

Incomplete Grades -- continued

Dr. Bishop moved that the matter of incomplete grades, as presented in the foregoing memorandum from the Office of Admissions and Records, be referred to the appropriate committee of the University Senate for study and a report. His motion was seconded and passed.

This matter was immediately referred by the Chairman of the University Senate to the Senate Committee on Academic Standards.

LATE ENROLLMENTS IN SINGLE COURSES ✓

Memorandum from the Office of Admissions and Records

February 21, 1966

This is a request to amend the University Senate regulation that a student cannot enroll in or add a course after the second week of classes in a semester or the first week of classes in a summer session.

We are asking that this statement be added: Exception may be made by the student's college dean to add a course if there are extenuating circumstances and with the approval of the department and instructor concerned.

Under the present regulation, there is no basis by which a deserving student can add a course after the second week of classes unless it is a course which he is repeating or one which does not have a required scheduled class attendance.

It would seem that those persons concerned with the student's original enrollment should be in the best position to determine the merits of late enrollment in a course.

The Office of Admissions and Records would then merely be the receiving and recording agency. This would not change the rule with regard to the filing of a complete original enrollment after the two weeks of a semester or one week of a summer session.

Senate Action

Dr. Bishop moved that the matter of late enrollments, as presented in the foregoing memorandum from the Office of Admissions and Records, be referred to the appropriate committee of the University Senate for study and a report. His motion was seconded and passed.

This matter was immediately referred by the Chairman of the University Senate to the Senate Committee on Academic Standards.

STUDENT FEE INCREASE ✓

Report from Senate Committee on University Organization,
Budget and Publications

March 10, 1966

Statement of the Problem

At the last meeting of the Senate, Professor Murphy made a statement from the floor and then proposed a resolution by the Senate favoring and recommending to the University administration an increase in student fees, effective September 1, 1966. Chairman Eriksen at once referred the matter to this committee for consideration, report, and recommendation.

Information Concerning the Problem

Undoubtedly most members of the Senate are sufficiently aware of the fiscal problems of the University. The committee in considering the problem, however, feels that it is desirable to refer to a study of fees charged by schools in the Big Eight. The Study was presented last fall at a meeting of the Big Eight Business Officers and covered the year 1965-66 for the regular academic two semesters or three quarters, as the case might be. The pertinent figures are listed below.

	Colo.	Iowa St.	Kan.	Kan.St.	Mo.	Nebr.	Okla.*	Okla.St.*
<u>UNDERGRADUATE</u>								
Resident:								
Genl. fee	\$ 143	276	200	200	280	260	210	210
Req. Special fee	43	69	78	74	20	74	-	-
Total	\$ 186	345	278	274	300	334	210	210
Non-Resident:								
Genl. fee	\$ 517	771	600	600	655	786	540	540
Req. Special fee	43	69	78	74	20	74	-	-
Total	\$ 560	840	678	674	675	860	540	540
<u>GRADUATE</u>								
Resident:								
Genl. fee	\$ 143	333	200	200	280	260	210	210
Req. Special fee	43	42	78	74	20	74	-	-
Total	\$ 186	375	278	274	300	334	210	210
Non-Resident:								
Genl. fee	\$ 517	588	290	290	280	786	540	540
Req. Special fee	43	42	78	74	20	74	-	-
Total	\$ 560	630	368	364	300	860	540	540

* Based on 30 semester credit hours

The Missouri figures do not include certain student activity fees charged at the Rolla, Kansas City, and St. Louis campuses.

The only proposed change of fees for 1965-66 was a \$90 increase at Iowa State University.

Student Fee Increase -- continued

The committee understands that other studies of schools in a different but related area alignment indicate similar or greater disparities.

The committee also wishes to point out the fact that the University is short not merely on money for salaries for faculty, but that serious problems are developing with respect to funds for "C" budgets. The graduate stipend increase, need for which has recently been recognized, suggests still another need for an immediate increase in University revenue.

It is the belief of the committee that the University cannot carry on effectively next year unless relief in the form of a student fee increase is granted. It is convinced that with a fee increase the University will not want for students, nor will it even reduce the student population. It is likewise of the opinion that in view of the other items paid by students, a fee increase will add very little to the total cost of their education. A great many students will also receive a windfall in the form of the GI monies. As for non-resident students, they will continue to come in increasing numbers for the practical reason that even with a fee increase here, this item will in general be substantially lower than in their home areas.

Conclusion and Recommendation

The committee concludes that a fee increase represents the only practical method for producing the needed increased income for the University during the ensuing year. It therefore recommends that the Senate adopt the following resolution and transmit it to President Cross:

The University Senate strongly urges a student fee increase for the University of Oklahoma, effective with the 1966 fall semester, independently and/or in collaboration with Oklahoma State University and/or other state colleges.

Senate Committee on University Organization, Budget and Publications

Robert E. Collier
Raymond R. White
Gerald Braver

William E. Livezey
O. D. Johns
Elbridge D. Phelps, Chairman

Senate Action

Dr. Phelps presented the foregoing report relative to Student Fee Increases. He then moved that the report and the recommendations contained in it be approved by the University Senate. His motion was seconded and passed with a unanimous vote of the 30 members present.

NOMINATIONS TO UNIVERSITY COUNCILS AND COMMITTEES, 1966-67

Dr. Turkington, Chairman of the Senate Committee on Committees, indicated that his committee is now at work preparing nominations for 1966-67 councils and committees. He invited members of the University Senate to submit nominations for consideration.

RULES APPLICABLE TO STUDENTS IN UNIVERSITY HOUSING

Letter from Dr. Plint relative to study hall rules

March 8, 1966

The University Senate
University of Oklahoma

I wish to draw your attention to the enclosed clipping from The Oklahoma Daily of March 8, 1966. The situation described in the letter warrants our serious attention if the facts are correct.

Sincerely,

(s) C. A. Plint
Professor of Physics

NOTE: The clipping is not reproduced here. It is a Letters to the Editor item in the Tuesday, March 8, issue of The Oklahoma Daily. It was written by Steve Knickermeier, a Norman senior.

Senate Action

Dr. Plint commented relative to how his attention was brought to bear on the matter of rules applicable to students in university housing. He indicated that he had gained information from the Office of the Dean of Students and that his concern was now primarily with the matter of retention of students.

Dr. Plint then moved that the University Senate should study the present regulations concerning grade-point averages required for the retention of students in the University. His motion was seconded.

Following a brief discussion, Dr. Eek made a substitute motion that Dean Glenn Couch, Dr. Dorothy Truex, and Dr. William R. Brown be invited to explain to the University Senate the retention policies in the University College, the rules regarding study hall, and academic regulations. His motion was seconded but FAILED to pass.

A vote was then taken on the original motion by Dr. Plint and it FAILED to pass.

ADJOURNMENT

The University Senate adjourned at 5:04 p.m. The next regular session will be held on Monday, April 25, 1966. Materials for the Agenda should be in the Office of the Secretary by Wednesday, April 13.

Gerald A. Porter, Secretary
University Senate