

JOURNAL OF THE UNIVERSITY SENATE

Regular Session, October 28, 1968 -- 4:10 p. m.
Student Union Building, Room 165

The University Senate, meeting in regular session, was called to order by the Chairman, Dr. Sherril D. Christian.

Present

Alley, John N.
Andrews, Mildred M.
Babb, Stanley E., Jr.
Blick, Edward F.
Bowen, Willis H.
Boyes, Rodney L.
Brikey, John J.
Bruce, John B.
Canfield, Frank B.
Christian, Sherril D.
Ciereszko, Leon S.
David, Paul R.
Doerr, Arthur H.
Elconin, Victor A.
Elkouri, Frank
Everett, Mark R.
Feaver, J. Clayton
Fite, Gilbert C.
Goggans, Travis P.
Harden, Darrell

Present

Hart, Frances
Heller, Ben I.
Henderson, George
Hengst, Herbert R.
Hilbert, Richard E.
Hoy, Harry E.
Kendall, J. L.
Lancaster, John H.
Nordby, Gene M.
Pray, Joseph C.
Renner, John W.
Roller, Duane H. D.
Smith, Thomas M.
Springer, C. E.
Suggs, Charles C.
Tolson, Melvin B.
Tuma, Gerald
West, Kelly M.
White, Raymond R.

Absent

Dunham, Lowell
Hollomon, J. Herbert
Kitts, David B. (on leave)
Olkinetzky, Sam
Parker, Jack F.

APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES

The Journal of the University Senate for the regular meeting held on September 30, 1968, was approved.

SCHEDULE FOR ENROLLMENT IN JANUARY *✓*

In a memorandum to the Chairman of the University Senate, Vice President McCarter indicated on October 11 that, in addition to Monday and Tuesday, January 27 and 28, 1969, the two days already scheduled for enrollment, Friday, January 24 is now scheduled as the first day of the enrollment period. Under this arrangement, Saturday, January 25, will be the day for special registration for evening and Saturday courses. In this regard, Dr. McCarter wrote:

Normally, of course, we take a change in the University Calendar to the University Senate for its action and recommendation. In this case we do not have enough time. It is essential that the change be approved within the next week or two so that announcements may be made and forms may be printed. Since

Schedule for Enrollment in January -- continued

Friday, January 24, is a day that would fall between semesters and since scheduling it for enrollment will not disrupt any academic business that I know of, I have given the change administrative approval. I hope, of course, that the University Senate will concur.

Recommendations for corresponding changes in the Calendar for 1969-70 will be submitted to the University Senate soon.

Having noted the foregoing information, the University Senate, on October 28, took no action.

PROCEDURE FOR NOMINATION OF DISTINGUISHED PROFESSORS *W*

Dr. Fite reported that the Senate Committee on Faculty Personnel had held an organizational meeting and that he was elected chairman for 1968-69. The Committee will continue to study the procedure for nomination of distinguished professors.

AUTHORIZATION OF CREDIT *X*

Dean Price recently reiterated his belief that this matter should be studied in terms of students being called into military service in the middle of a semester.

Dr. Blick reported that the Senate Committee on Teaching and Research has not yet held its organizational meeting. It will be held soon and authorization of credit will be given attention.

STUDY OF THE FUTURE OF THE UNIVERSITY *X*

In May of 1967 an ad hoc committee was formed to study the future of the University. The chairman of that committee was Dr. L. Doyle Bishop. Other members were James Burwell, Paul David, Turner Edge, Arrell Gibson, Tom Love, and Gilbert Fite.

On October 28, 1968, Dr. Bishop reported that the committee has worked hard and has kept in close touch with the development of the Plan for OU's Future, as that Plan was formulated under the direction of Dr. Hollomon. Dr. Bishop indicated that in the view of his committee there are nine pressing faculty concerns:

1. Role of the University Senate.
2. Faculty responsibility for instruction and research.
3. Compensation of faculty.
4. Evaluation of individual faculty performance.
5. Participation of students in University operations.
6. Redefinition of University councils.
7. Faculty work loads.
8. Organization for academic activities.
9. Faculty participation in University government.

Dr. Bishop reported that, in the opinion of the Committee, the formulation of a constitution for the University is now the most pressing matter. It is the recommendation of the Ad Hoc Committee that the University Senate concern itself immediately with the development of a constitution for the University of Oklahoma.

REPORT ON LEGISLATION

Dr. Joseph C. Pray, the University Senate liaison with the Cleveland County legislative delegation, commented briefly. He indicated that he had no formal report because the Legislature is not now in session.

REPORT ON LIAISON WITH BOARD OF REGENTS

The Chairman of the University Senate reported that he and Dr. Fite attended the October meeting of the Board of Regents. He indicated that there was no item that required the attention of the University Senate.

ANTI-DISCRIMINATION †

The Ad Hoc Anti-Discrimination Committee will function in 1968-69 with the same membership as in April 1968, when the Committee was established. Its chairman is Donald J. Berthrong. Other members are: John N. Alley, Paul R. David, George Henderson, and Mrs. Lennie-Marie Tolliver.

On October 28, it was reported that the Committee is at work but that no formal recommendations have yet been reached for presentation to the University Senate.

STUDY OF THE GRADING SYSTEM ✓

Dr. Suggs reported that the Senate Committee on Academic Affairs has held an organizational meeting and that he was elected chairman for 1968-69. In addition, the Committee is meeting weekly to study the problems related to grading.

REPORTS TO THE FACULTY †

This matter was assigned to the Senate Committee on University Organization, Budget, and Publications at the September 30 meeting. Dr. White indicated on October 28 that the Committee had not yet been organized for the year. It will meet on October 29.

ROLE OF THE UNIVERSITY SENATE †

Dr. Fite addressed the University Senate with regard to the role of that body. In particular, he stressed the need for the University Senate to assume a more positive and meaningful role.

He moved that the Chairman of the University Senate appoint an ad hoc committee to study the Senate as the faculty's chief legislative body, and recommend to the Senate for action in 90 days any changes in structure, organization, or operational procedures which the committee deems desirable. His motion was seconded.

Dr. Hengst moved to amend the foregoing motion to the effect that the Committee be requested to report to the University Senate at its November meeting with regard to what the Committee plans to do. The amendment was accepted by Dr. Fite. The original motion, as amended, was passed.

Role of the University Senate -- continued

Dr. Fite presented additional information and then made the following motion:

That the Chairman of the University Senate appoint an ad hoc committee, not necessarily all members of the Senate, to serve in a continuous capacity to bring recommendations to the Senate for action on all matters relating to the University in its teaching, research and public service functions, and that members of this committee be assigned reduced work loads to facilitate their commitment.

The motion was seconded. Considerable discussion followed. Dr. White then moved that the matter be tabled. His motion was seconded and passed.

ARMING OF CAMPUS POLICE X

On October 28, the following letter was read to the University Senate by the Chairman of that body. Dr. Henderson then commented at some length.

Letter from Faculty Members

October 23, 1968

Dr. Sherril D. Christian, Chairman
University Senate

Dear Dr. Christian:

The practice of permitting the campus police at OU to carry firearms is one which we find highly disturbing. The display of lethal weapons intended for use within the university community has a harmful effect on the academic environment of the university without fulfilling a compensatory need. We believe the policy upon which this practice is based should be re-examined in the light of the university's needs and purposes.

The sight of a revolver is, in general, an indication of the degree of force a man is willing to use. In the hands of an attacker, a revolver represents a level of aggression justifying a like response which we call "self-defense." In the holster of a policeman, the revolver equally represents the upper limit of force available to keep controversy safe; he is literally prepared to kill in the name of general safety.

In the civil community this level of force may well be appropriate and, at times, an obvious need. But even in the civil community the gun has been seen on occasion not as the limit on violence but the provocation for it. In the university community, both at large and in this university particular, the presence of arms is more likely to be considered provocative. Knowing the difference between the limiting and provoking uses of deadly weapons is a sign of a thoroughly professional police system.

Little evidence exists for the need of weapons in university precincts. First, there are in actuality few, if any, occasions when such extreme force is an appropriate response. There is certainly nothing in the past record of the University of Oklahoma to prompt the assumption that campus violence is likely. Second, the university function is such as to make open, invited exchange and argument a normal act of controversy which has as its mode of resolution more of the same. In fact, the very openness of controversy in the university community provides the protection from forceful resolution of conflict which the gun supposedly assures in the civil

community. Third, the university community, both here and in general, has traditionally been an area of peace. This peace has, to be sure, been disturbed on recent occasions, but there is considerable evidence to suggest that these disturbances were the result of an initial breakdown of the openness of relations in the university community, especially between administration and faculty-student groups. Fourth, security of persons and property may require the presence of authorized personnel of the university to discourage unlawful acts, but guns do not seem to us necessary to performance of that duty. Fifth, on those occasions where violence beyond the control of the campus police has occurred, help from the Norman force has been employed; we see no reason why a satisfactory arrangement for the future might not be made.

The arming of the campus policeman implicitly raises a central issue for any campus, i.e., the place of a potential for deadly force on the campus of a university. To put an avert of the university in a dutiful position to inflict injury or death is to place the university on the wrong side of an important moral issue. To do so is inconsistent with the values, the meaning and the function of the institution.

If the conception of a university community, so recently articulated in the report on the future of the university, is dependent upon having campus police armed, then we should like to know why. If it is not, then in our view, the practice should be discontinued as offensive to members of the community. We feel nothing in the past justifies the practice and we have a confidence that our future affairs will be as well managed.

We ask the University Senate to consider the policy of arming campus police and urge you to recommend that it be terminated.

Sincerely,

George Henderson, Sociology	William H. Maehl, Jr., History
Cecil Lee, Art	Geoffrey Marshall, English
David W. Levy, History	Richard S. Wells, Pol. Science

Senate Action

Dr. Roller moved that the matter be referred to the appropriate committee of the University Senate for study. His motion was seconded.

More discussion followed and then Dr. Fite moved an amendment to instruct the committee to bring a report to the next meeting of the Senate. Dr. Roller accepted the amendment to his motion. The original motion, as amended, was passed.

The matter was referred immediately to the University Senate Committee on Student and Public Relations.

ADJOURNMENT

The University Senate adjourned at 5:24 p.m. The next regular session will be held on Monday, November 25, 1968. Materials for the Agenda should be in the Office of the Secretary by Wednesday, November 13.

Gerald A. Porter, Secretary

The first part of the report deals with the general situation in the country. It is a very interesting and detailed account of the political and social conditions. The second part of the report deals with the economic situation. It is a very interesting and detailed account of the economic conditions. The third part of the report deals with the educational situation. It is a very interesting and detailed account of the educational conditions.

The fourth part of the report deals with the cultural situation. It is a very interesting and detailed account of the cultural conditions. The fifth part of the report deals with the health situation. It is a very interesting and detailed account of the health conditions. The sixth part of the report deals with the labor situation. It is a very interesting and detailed account of the labor conditions.

The seventh part of the report deals with the foreign relations situation. It is a very interesting and detailed account of the foreign relations conditions. The eighth part of the report deals with the military situation. It is a very interesting and detailed account of the military conditions. The ninth part of the report deals with the judicial situation. It is a very interesting and detailed account of the judicial conditions.

The tenth part of the report deals with the administrative situation. It is a very interesting and detailed account of the administrative conditions. The eleventh part of the report deals with the financial situation. It is a very interesting and detailed account of the financial conditions. The twelfth part of the report deals with the statistical situation. It is a very interesting and detailed account of the statistical conditions.

Appendix

1. List of members of the committee.
2. List of members of the sub-committee.
3. List of members of the working group.

4. List of members of the advisory committee.

5. List of members of the executive committee.

6. List of members of the secretariat.

7. List of members of the board of directors.

8. List of members of the board of trustees.

9. List of members of the board of governors.

10. List of members of the board of regents.