

JOURNAL OF THE UNIVERSITY SENATE

Regular Session, January 30, 1967 -- 4:10 p.m.
Student Union Building, Room 165

The University Senate, meeting in regular session, was called to order by the chairman, Dr. William H. Maehl, Jr.

Present

Andrews, Mildred M.
Berenda, Carlton W.
Bienfang, Ralph D.
Bishop, L. Doyle
Blick, Edward F.
Braver, Gerald
Brixey, John C.
Canfield, Frank B.
Collier, Robert E.
David, Paul R.
Duncan, J. Paul
Elkouri, Frank
Everett, Mark R.
Feaver, J. Clayton
Feiler, Seymour
Goggans, Travis P.
Gooch, Brison D.
Goodman, George J.

Present

Hoy, Harry E.
Huneke, Harold V.
Levy, Gene
Livezey, William E.
Maehl, William H., Jr.
Male, Roy R.
Ohm, Robert E.
Olson, Ralph E.
Patnode, Robert A.
Peterson, Robert V.
Plint, Colin A.
Rice, Leslie H.
Rohrbaugh, Lawrence M.
Suggs, Charles C.
Sutherland, Stephen M.
Terry, Richard A.
West, Kelly M.
Williams, Lloyd P.

Absent

Campbell, John M.
Cross, George L.
Hart, Frances
Hengst, Herbert R.
Howard, Robert A.
Smith, William H.
Tuma, Gerald
White, Raymond R.

APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES

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

ACTION BY PRESIDENT CROSS

Late Enrollments in Single Courses. -- President Cross has indicated his approval of the recommendations passed by the University Senate (see the Journal of the University Senate for October 31, 1966, pages 1 and 2).

EFFECTIVE DATES FOR RECOMMENDATIONS MADE BY THE UNIVERSITY SENATE ~~X~~Memorandum from Vice President McCarter

December 9, 1966

I have a request, or perhaps a suggestion, that the University Senate make it a regular practice to include an effective date, if possible, in each recommendation that it sends to President Cross.

Effective Dates for Recommendations Made by the University Senate -- continued

I further suggest that, in considering the effective date, the Senate consider whether the recommendation involves a change in a bulletin and so cannot become justly effective until the next publication of the appropriate bulletin.


These suggestions are prompted by the recommendation concerning "Incomplete Grades" (File No. 1965-66-11), which was passed by the University Senate on June 6, 1966, and approved by President Cross on July 2, 1966. The Graduate College has asked me for a ruling as to the date on which the new regulations thus recommended and approved become effective and whether they are to be applied retroactively.

In the absence of guidance in the language of the recommendation, I have ruled that the revised regulations cannot be made mandatory until they are published in the appropriate bulletin (specifically, for graduate students, the Bulletin of the Graduate College) and that any student enrolled before they are thus published cannot be required to comply with them (i.e., he may choose to follow the bulletin under which he first enrolled). I hope that this ruling represents the intention of the Senate, but I would have more confidence in it if I knew that the Senate, in framing the recommendation, had included this problem in its deliberations.

As a postscript, may I add that I was asked also to rule on whether the exception made in the same recommendation for "graduate research and research problems courses" applies to seminars, and I have ruled that it does. If I am wrong, I hope the Senate will correct me.

Senate Action

The foregoing memorandum from Vice President McCarter was noted by members of the University Senate. Several questions were raised about how the dates for recommendations might be set. No formal action was taken.

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

January 30, 1967

On February 17, 1966, the Committee on University Organization, Budget and Publications, after a study of the evaluation of transcripts of transfer students, offered the following resolution to the University Senate:

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.

This motion was approved by the Senate.

Evaluation of Transcripts -- continued

At the May 30 meeting of the University Senate President Cross's response to the Senate resolution of February 17 was read to the Senate:

I understand the Dean Fellows has worked out a plan by which routine evaluations are made in the Dean's Office and unusual evaluations are made in the Office of Admissions and Records and that so far this plan seems to be working satisfactorily. I think this plan should be given time to prove itself, and for this reason I am delaying approval or disapproval of the University Senate's resolution.

In the meeting on May 30, there was a brief discussion of the foregoing statement with several members of the Senate expressing opinions to the effect that the present plan for evaluation of transcripts is not working satisfactorily. Dr. Bishop then moved that the matter be referred again to the University Senate Committee on University Organization, Budget and Publications for additional study in the Fall of 1966. His motion was seconded and passed.

The Senate Committee on University Organization, Budget and Publications has held three meetings discussing this problem. After investigation of the alternate plan suggested by the Office of Admissions and Records, we find consensus that the plan is not working satisfactorily. The committee, therefore, recommends to the University Senate that the Senate again request the immediate resumption of the evaluation of transfer student transcripts by the Office of Admissions and Records.

Recommendation For Senate Action

The Committee 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

Mildred Andrews	Robert Collier
Gerald Braver	William Livezey
Frank Canfield	Raymond White, Chairman

Evaluation of Transcripts -- continued

Dr. Braver, in the absence of the chairman of the Senate Committee on University Organization, Budget and Publications, presented the foregoing report and commented briefly on its development. He then moved that the report be approved by the University Senate. His motion was seconded and passed.

PROCEDURES FOR NOMINATION OF DISTINGUISHED PROFESSORS XReport of the Senate Committee on Faculty Personnel

January 6, 1967

The Senate Committee on Faculty Personnel recommends to the University Senate re the Research Professorship the following:

1. Title of the professorship.

Because the title, Research Professor, is probably used at many institutions (as it was until recently at our own School of Medicine) as merely descriptive of the holder's primary or exclusive duties, and without any particularly honorific implication, we suggest that the professorships awarded for "distinguished contributions to knowledge" and presently called "Research Professorships" be designated instead as "Distinguished Research Professorships."

2. Method of nomination.

Nomination to a distinguished research professorship may be made to the Dean of the Graduate College by the executive committee of the nominee's department or may be initiated by the Dean of the Graduate College himself.

3. Evaluation of the candidate.

(a) When a nomination has been made, the Dean of the Graduate College shall write to a number (five or six) of the department chairmen in the candidate's subject at other institutions to secure names of persons who are intimately acquainted with current activity in the candidate's field of specialization; the chairmen who are solicited should be chosen by reason of the size or prestige, or both, of their departments.

(b) When the Dean of the Graduate College has received the names of five persons at other institutions who are presumed to be qualified to evaluate the candidate, he shall request each of them to state approximately where he would place the candidate (e.g., in the top 10%, 20%, 30%, etc.) among those who are actively engaged in research and publication in the candidate's area of specialization.

4. Recommendation of the candidate.

If as many as four of the five persons selected to evaluate the candidate regard him as being among the top 20%* of those actively working in his field, the Dean after obtaining the advice of the Graduate Council shall recommend to the President that he be appointed a Distinguished Research Professor.

Procedures for Nomination of Distinguished Professors -- continued

If three, but not four, of the evaluators place the candidate among the top (20%), he shall not be recommended for the appointment, but his nomination shall be reactivated in the ensuing year, and his name submitted to another set of five evaluators selected as prescribed above (3 a), but through solicitation of Department Chairmen other than those approached in the first year.

*The figure of 20% is, of course, both arbitrary and provisional (although it seems a priori a plausible one); the actual cut-off percentile should doubtless be decided upon by the Graduate Dean after consultation with the Graduate Council and the Office of the President.

Senate Committee on Faculty Personnel

William H. Smith	Paul R. David
Richard A. Terry	Roy R. Male
Mark R. Everett	Ralph D. Bienfang, Chm.

Senate Action

Dr. Bienfang presented the foregoing report. He indicated that it was only the first of perhaps several reports in that it deals with just one type of distinguished professorship -- "Distinguished Research Professorships". He moved that the report be adopted by the University Senate. His motion was seconded.

Following a brief discussion, Dr. Flint made a substitute motion that the report of the Senate Committee on Faculty Personnel be tabled until the next meeting of the University Senate. His motion was seconded and passed.

PRICES OF TEXTBOOKS ~~X~~Explanatory Comment

On November 28, 1966, Dr. Berenda raised from the floor of the University Senate certain matters relating to the cost of textbooks and the collection of the one-cent sales tax on items sold in the University Bookstore. He did this because a number of students had requested that the University Senate take these matters under consideration and express a point of view to the Student Senate. The matter was referred to the Senate Committee on Student and Public Relations.

Report of the Senate Committee on Student and Public Relations

January 4, 1967

The Senate Committee on Student and Public Relations has considered the question of campus book store practices referred to it by the University Senate. This concerns the charge that the three bookstores in question are practicing price collusion.

Prices on Textbooks -- continued

It is our conclusion that this is a matter with legal, and maybe, administrative implications but is not a proper matter for a policy group such as the University Senate. We therefore recommend that the University Senate take no action on this matter and so inform those who brought it to our attention, stating the reasons.

Senate Committee on Student and Public Relations

George J. Goodman	Gerald Tuma
Kelly M. West	J. Clayton Feaver
John C. Brixey	John M. Campbell, Chairman

Senate Action

The foregoing report was presented by Dr. Feaver. He moved approval of the recommendation that the University Senate take no action with regard to prices of textbooks. His motion was seconded and passed.

FACULTY HANDBOOK ✓

The Chairman of the University Senate orally reported on the results of the survey that has been made relative to the need for revision of the Faculty Handbook. (Refer to the Journal of the University Senate for November 28, 1966, page 2.)

Dr. Duncan moved that the Senate Committee on Faculty Personnel be charged with responsibility for studying all of the material pertaining to faculty tenure which has come in as a result of the survey. His motion was seconded and passed.

Dr. Plint moved that the results of the survey be submitted to the Office of the President. His motion was seconded and passed.

ENGLISH "J" EXAMINATION ✓

Student Senate Resolution -- Senate Bill No.: Fall-39-66

A Resolution to Abolish the English "J" Exam

- Whereas: It is questionable whether the English "J" exam is a valid test of English proficiency; and
- Whereas: It is also questionable whether the remedial course in English 5 is as effective in correcting the English difficulties of juniors and seniors as a similar course might be in correcting the mistakes of freshmen; and
- Whereas: There is at present no remedial English course for those freshmen who are not qualified to do the class work required in English 21; and
- Whereas: These students are given no remedial aid to correct the incorrect practices with which they came to college until they have attained the status of juniors and seniors;

English "J" Examination -- continued

BE IT THEREFORE RESOLVED by the Student Senate of the University of Oklahoma:

- Section 1: That the English "J" exam be abolished.
- Section 2: That certain of the freshmen English sections be designated as "remedial sections" following the general format of the present English 5 course and offering no credit.
- Section 3: That students be assigned to the remedial sections on the basis of their score on the A.C.T. test and other consideration and that no student enrolled in a non-credit remedial section be allowed to take English 21 or 22 for credit until he has completed the remedial course material to the satisfaction of the department.
- Section 4: That copies of this resolution be sent to the Board of Regents, Dr. Elconin of the English Department, the Faculty Senate and the Student House of Representatives.

Author of the Bill: Ralph Doty
 Submitted on Motion by: Ralph Doty Action by the Student Senate: Passed 26-1-0
 Motion Seconded by: Ron Ferguson Date: December 1, 1966

Senate Action

The Chairman of the University Senate read a letter from Mr. Paul H. Peterson, President of the Student Senate, in which he urged that the University Senate take action on the Student Senate Resolution presented above.

Dr. Bishop moved that the matter be referred to the Senate Committee on Courses and Curricula for study and a report. His motion was seconded and passed.

NOMINATIONS FOR BUDGET COUNCIL

Explanatory Comment

On January 18, 1967, Vice President McCarter requested that the University Senate submit nominations from which President Cross might select a person to replace Dr. Rufus G. Hall as a member of the University Budget Council. Dr. Hall is currently on leave from the University.

Senate Action

Dr. Levy presented a report from the Senate Committee on Committees with the following nominations for the unexpired term of Dr. Hall -- February 1967 to June 1968.

- Seymour Feiler Modern Languages
- Robert E. L. Richardson Law
- Blanche Scmmers Pharmacy

Dr. Levy moved approval of the nominations. His motion was seconded and passed by the University Senate.

STUDY OF THE FUTURE OF THE UNIVERSITY ✓

Explanatory Comment

The Chairman of the University Senate raised from the floor of the Senate certain questions relative to how the University Senate functions and matters that might well be of concern to the group.

Senate Action

Following a brief discussion, Dr. Bishop moved that an ad hoc committee be appointed to draw up an agenda for a special meeting of the University Senate at which time consideration might be given to the feasibility of a study of the future of the University and any other pertinent matters that should be the concern of the University Senate. His motion was seconded and passed.

ENROLLMENT PROCEDURES ✓

Explanatory Comment

Dr. Suggs raised from the floor of the University Senate questions that related to pre-enrollment and regular enrollment procedures as they operated with regard to the enrollment for the second semester of 1966-67. Other senators commented and raised further questions.

Senate Action

Dr. Male moved that the University Senate urge the University Committee on Enrollment to review the procedures for the enrollment of students because the procedures for the second semester, 1966-67, were not good. His motion was seconded and passed.

ADJOURNMENT

The University Senate adjourned at 5:25 p.m. The next regular session will be held on Monday, February 27, 1967. Materials for the Agenda should be in the Office of the Secretary by Monday, February 13.

Gerald A. Porter, Secretary