

## JOURNAL OF THE UNIVERSITY SENATE

Regular Session, November 25, 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.  
Brixey, John C.  
Bruce, John B.  
Canfield, Frank B.  
Christian, Sherril D.  
David, Paul R.  
Doerr, Arthur H.  
Elconin, Victor A.  
Elkouri, Frank  
Everett, Mark R.  
Feaver, J. Clayton  
Fite, Gilbert C.

Present

Goggans, Travis P.  
Hart, Frances  
Heller, Ben I.  
Hengst, Herbert R.  
Hilbert, Richard E.  
Kendall, J. L.  
Lancaster, John H.  
Nordby, Gene M.  
Olkinetzky, Sam  
Parker, Jack F.  
Renner, John W.  
Roller, Duane H. D.  
Smith, Thomas M.  
Springer, C. E.  
Tuma, Gerald  
West, Kelly M.  
White, Raymond R.

Absent

Ciereszko, Leon S.  
Dunham, Lowell  
Harden, Darrell  
Henderson, George  
Hollomon, J. Herbert  
Hoy, Harry E.  
Kitts, David B. (on leave)  
Pray, Joseph C.  
Suggs, Charles C.  
Tolson, Melvin B.

## APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES

The Journal of the University Senate for the regular meeting held on October 28, 1968, was approved.

ACTION BY PRESIDENT HOLLOMON 

Grading System - "P" Grade -- President Hollomon has indicated his approval of the recommendation of the University Senate that the "P" be established as a "Pass" grade.

UNIVERSITY SENATE POLICY COMMITTEE Explanatory Comment

From the floor of the Senate, Dr. Fite raised for consideration matters that relate to the Plan for the Future of the University.

University Senate Policy Committee -- continuedSenate Action

Following relatively brief comments, Dr. Fite moved:

that the University Senate establish a policy committee whose first responsibility will be to analyze the Plan for the Future of the University as published in October, 1968, and to recommend to the Senate, and through the Senate to the Administration, the priorities for implementation on all aspects of the plan relating to academic matters. Specifically, the recommendations should include what parts of the plan should be implemented as soon as possible, what parts require further study, and what parts should be postponed. The Committee should make its first recommendations to the Senate at a special meeting on Saturday morning, December 14 at 9 a.m. and any recommendations which the Senate approves should be transmitted to the President's Office before December 20.

Dr. Fite's motion was seconded. There followed considerable discussion. The motion was passed.

The Chairman of the University Senate referred to action taken on November 25 when an Ad Hoc Committee to study the Senate as the faculty's chief legislative body was established. He asked the Chairman of the Ad Hoc Committee if that group could pick up analysis of the Plan for the Future. With the consent of the chairman, this matter was then referred to the Ad Hoc Committee. That Committee consists of:

Arthur H. Doerr, Chairman  
Gilbert C. Fite  
Frank Elkouri  
Ben I. Heller

L. Doyle Bishop  
Jack F. Parker  
R. S. Wells

NOMINATION AND SELECTION OF DAVID ROSS BOYD PROFESSORS X

Report of Senate Committee on Faculty Personnel

November 13, 1968

## 1. Eligibility:

Any full professor who has taught at the University of Oklahoma for at least ten years, and who has demonstrated vigorous performance and leadership in teaching, counseling and guidance of students, is eligible for appointment as a David Ross Boyd Professor.

## 2. Nominations:

An eligible professor may be nominated by his department (either by the chairman or by Committee A, or by both), by the dean of his college, or by any three members of the general faculty. Each year at least six months before the recommendations are to be made to the President of the University, the President will notify each dean, departmental chairmen and members of the general faculty that recommendations for the David Ross Boyd Professorship should be sent to the chairman of the selection committee.

Nomination and Selection of David Ross Boyd Professors -- continued

## 3. Selection:

Nominations for David Ross Boyd Professorships, with supporting information will be transmitted to a special selection committee which will screen the nominations. The selection committee will consist of nine members, seven from the faculty, one from the alumni and one from the student body. The terms of appointment shall be staggered so that each year three members will be replaced by new appointments and no member shall serve for more than three consecutive years. The faculty members will be nominated by the University Senate, the Alumni Association will nominate alumni members, and the Student Congress will nominate student members. Nominations for the selection committee will be twice the number of appointments to be made. The President of the University will name the committee from these nominations. The selection committee will evaluate the nominations for David Ross Boyd Professorships and recommend nominations to the President of the University. Final selections will be made by the President and the Board of Regents. Not more than two Boyd Professors may be appointed in any one year.

## 4. Stipend:

The Board of Regents has stipulated that "The stipend of a David Ross Boyd Professor shall be commensurate with the honor of the award." Besides the initial increase in salary which will accompany the award, the Boyd Professor's salary should increase at a rate at least equal to that among full professors of the general faculty.

## 5. Tenure:

Each David Ross Boyd Professor retains membership on the staff of his department or school. The tenure of a Boyd Professor is continuous so long as the recipient fulfills the qualifications of distinguished performance in "the teaching, counseling, and guidance of students."

## Senate Committee on Faculty Personnel

Paul R. David  
Gene M. Nordby  
J. L. Kendall

John C. Brixey  
Gilbert C. Fite, Chairman

Senate Action

Dr. Fite presented the foregoing report. He commented on each of the numbered paragraphs and then moved that the report be approved by the University Senate. His motion was seconded.

Dr. David moved that the report be amended by deleting the word "his" in line 2 of paragraph 2 and inserting the word "any" in its place. His motion was seconded and passed.

Dr. David then moved that the report be amended by placing after the second sentence in paragraph 2 the following: "The faculty members on the selection committee should be restricted to those who by virtue of already holding a David Ross Boyd Professorship or other distinguished professorships are deemed ineligible for nomination." This motion was seconded but failed to pass.

Nomination and Selection of David Ross Boyd Professors -- continued

Dr. Fite moved to amend the foregoing report so that members of the selection committee as established in paragraph 3 will serve no more than two consecutive years rather than the three years as indicated. His motion was seconded and passed.

With the two minor amendments, the report of the Senate Committee on Faculty Personnel was then approved by the University Senate.

Minority Report

A minority of the members of the Committee on Faculty Personnel, while concurring in the above report of the Committee, recommend that the following be added:

A. (At the end of Section 1, Nomination)

In addition, the selection committee shall each year solicit nominations from graduates of the University whose names have been randomly selected from the class rolls (for the 5th to 7th or 8th years preceding the instant one) of each\* eligible professor, excluding those whose names have previously been submitted for alumni nominations, and excluding the rolls of courses that are devoted to the direction of individual graduate students in research or study leading to an advanced degree. Letters should be sent in sufficient number to insure receipt of at least 50 responses from the former students of each eligible professor. Enclosed with each letter shall be a list of those currently eligible for nomination by alumni (i.e., the professors from whose rolls the names of the addressees have been obtained) and a numbered nominating ballot.

Each alumnus addressed shall be asked to insert on the ballot a name from the list that accompanies it, and only if, he finds thereon the name of a professor who has indelibly impressed him as being of preeminent excellence in his teaching and/or counseling. He shall be invited to enclose a supporting letter with his ballot if he selects a name for nomination; and he shall be urgently importuned to return the ballot, marked "none", if he fails to find listed a professor who meets the criterion stated.

The name of a professor on a ballot received from any of the first 50 respondents among those addressed from that professor's rolls shall be considered by the selection committee as a nomination.

---

\*For the first several years of operation of this procedure, it will probably not be feasible to apply it to all professors eligible for nomination. In this event, the selection committee is empowered to submit for nomination by alumni an appropriate randomly-selected fraction (but no less than one quarter) of the total number eligible.

---

B. (At end of Section 3, Selection)

The selection committee shall be provided with funds to cover mailing expenses, and with whatever clerical assistance is required in the performance of its prescribed functions.

Minority -- Senate Committee on Faculty Personnel

Jack L. Kendall  
Paul R. David

Nomination and Selection of David Ross Boyd Professors -- continuedSenate Action Relative to Minority Report

Dr. David presented the minority report and then moved that the report be approved by the University Senate and incorporated in the total report relative to Boyd Professorships. His motion was seconded. Much discussion followed. The motion FAILED to pass.

The procedures for the nomination and selection of David Ross Boyd Professors, as presented on pages 2 and 3 (and with the minor amendments), will be forwarded to President Hollomon.

## AUTHORIZATION OF CREDIT †

The Senate Committee on Teaching and Research is continuing its study of the authorization of credit in terms of students being called into military service in the middle of a semester.

Dr. Blick reported that the immediate problem has been lessened by evidence indicating that students will not be drafted in the middle of semesters. No formal action was taken.

## REPORTS TO THE FACULTY †

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

November 13, 1968

In response to a letter from Professor A. H. Doerr (see the Journal of the University Senate for September 30, 1968, page 7), this committee recommends that the University Senate adopt the following resolutions concerning annual reports from the President and from the Deans:

1. The President of the University is requested to prepare an annual report of the state of the University for distribution to the general faculty and other interested persons.
2. The Deans of the various colleges are requested to prepare annual reports for their respective college for distribution to college faculty and other interested persons.

Senate Committee on University Organization,  
Budget, and Publications

Mildred M. Andrews  
Jack F. Parker  
Raymond R. White

Rodney L. Boyes  
Melvin Tolson  
Frank B. Canfield, Chr.

Reports to the Faculty -- continuedSenate Action

Dr. Canfield presented the foregoing report. He moved that item No. 1 of the report be approved by the University Senate. His motion was seconded and passed.

Dr. Canfield then commented on the second aspect of the report. He moved that item No. 2 be approved by the University Senate. His motion was seconded. Dr. Olkinetzky made a motion to amend item No. 2 by inserting "including financial" after the word annual in the first line of the item. His motion was seconded and passed. The motion by Dr. Canfield, as amended, was then approved.

ROLE OF THE UNIVERSITY SENATE

Explanatory Comment

At the October 28, 1968, meeting of the University Senate, the Chairman was directed to appoint an Ad Hoc Committee to Study the Organization and Functions of the University Senate. He appointed the following people:

Arthur H. Doerr, Chairman	Gilbert C. Fite	Frank Elkouri
L. Doyle Bishop	Jack F. Parker	R. S. Wells
Ben I. Heller		

Senate Action

On November 25, Dr. Doerr presented a progress report from the above committee. It is as follows:

Following a general discussion of the role, functions, and organization of the University Senate, the Ad Hoc Committee considered the following specific proposals and recommendations:

1. The suggestion of making instructors eligible for Senate membership failed to get approval.
2. It was unanimously agreed that the Senate needs more frequent meetings if it is to be really effective as a positive force in the University.
3. It was agreed that the University system of presidential councils should be overhauled, and that a faculty council should be established in each of the areas of responsibility administered by vice-presidents as provided for in Dr. Hollomon's new administrative organization.
4. Sherril Christian, Chairman of the Senate, reported that he has been asked by Gordon Christenson to suggest four or five names of faculty members to serve on the committee to draw up a University Constitution. Following some discussion, Dick Wells moved that in light of (1) the Charter of the Government of the University of Oklahoma (as revised in 1963) which stipulates that "the Senate shall have authority to enact legislation on any matter affecting academic welfare of the University provided that any enactment of the Senate shall be subject to review

Role of the University Senate -- continued

by the general faculty," and (2) the provision which states that "faculty committees shall be utilized by the president in the development of policies on matters of vital interest to students and faculty of the university," that it is the responsibility and prerogative of the senate to review the fitness and qualifications of those who will be named to the committee to write a constitution for the university.

The foregoing progress report as presented by Dr. Doerr was accepted by the University Senate.

Dr. Fite then made the following motion:

I move that the proper committee of the Senate study the system of University Councils in light of the resolution calling for revising the present council system, including the size, functions, qualification for and term of membership, and all related questions, and report to the Senate at a special meeting to be held Saturday morning, December 14 at 9 a.m.

The motion was seconded and following a brief discussion it was passed by the University Senate. This matter was immediately referred by the Chairman of the University Senate to the Senate Committee on University Organization, Budget, and Publications.

At this point, Dr. Renner moved that the Ad Hoc Committee to Study the Organization and Functions of the University Senate be directed to make a recommendation regarding more frequent meetings of the University Senate; this to be done at the special meeting called for December 14, 1968. His motion was seconded and passed.

The Chairman of the University Senate called the attention of Senate members to the following letter and Proposed Procedure for the University Constitution.

November 20, 1968

Dr. S. D. Christian, Chairman  
University Senate

At the Regents meeting on November 14 a committee to draft the University constitution was authorized. The Chairman of the Board of Regents will appoint the committee from among the students, the faculty, the administration and the public. A copy of the proposed procedures for the drafting committee is enclosed.

We wish to submit to the Chairman of the Board of Regents our recommendations as soon as possible. Therefore, we would like to have the nominations of the University Senate for membership on the drafting committee within the next week.

Gordon A. Christenson  
Assistant to the President

Role of the University Senate -- continuedProposed Procedure for the University Constitution

By authority of action of the Regents on November 14, 1968, there is established a drafting committee for the University constitution, as proposed in the report of the Executive Planning Committee. That report recommended a process for adopting the constitution as follows:

The Regents of the University of Oklahoma should adopt and publish a constitution for the University--consistent with the guidelines set out in this chapter--by a process which includes the opportunity for all interested or affected to participate, whether in the larger community or within the University. We recommend the following procedure:

1. A proposed constitution should be prepared at the direction of the Regents, consistent with the intent of this report.
2. The proposal should then be published for comment by the general public, students, faculty, staff and alumni, for a reasonable time.
3. After considering all comments and other information, the Regents should then promulgate the Constitution of the University of Oklahoma and take such further steps as may be necessary to implement it.

Since the constitution should allocate appropriate authority to the student government, it will be essential in the process that the work of the current student constitutional convention be integrated in the work on the University constitution and that the student constitutional convention participate in developing the University constitution.

Further, the charter of the University Senate needs to be reviewed by that body in light of the recommendations of the report, and the University Senate, as the senior legislative body, should participate in developing the University constitution.

To ensure these ends, the following procedure shall apply:

1. The Chairman of the Board of Regents under authority of Regents' action appoints members of the drafting committee. In recommending appointments, the President will consult with the University Senate, the Student Government (and Constitutional Convention) and administrative officers and will seek a balance on the committee among students, faculty, administration and public leaders. The committee shall have staff assistance and will be encouraged to obtain any independent advice and counsel it determines desirable.
2. After consultation with the student constitutional convention and the University Senate and other appropriate bodies of the University and advisors, the drafting committee shall prepare a constitution for the University giving full consideration to the recommendations of the Executive Planning Committee Report.
3. The draft should be made public by the committee for comment by the general public, students, faculty, staff and alumni, for a reasonable but certain time.
4. During this period of time the drafting committee shall work with the student constitutional convention and the University Senate in resolving any conflicts among the proposed student constitution, the University Senate Charter as revised and the draft University constitution.

Role of the University Senate -- continued

5. The drafting committee should then present to the President for his further action a draft University constitution together with recommendations on the University Senate charter as revised and the proposed student constitution.

6. The President shall then present all constitutional documents to the Regents for approval, subject to any ratification requirements, together with his recommendations. The student constitutional convention and the University Senate would be consulted regarding any provisions unacceptable to the Regents before final action.

7. When all procedures have been followed, the President shall then and only then recommend final action on each of the three constitutional documents.

Senate Action

Following consideration of the foregoing material, Dr. Fite made the following motion:

I hereby move that the University Senate instruct the Executive Committee of the Senate to ask for a meeting with President Hollomon and arrange to work with the administration in carrying out the intent of the resolution dealing with the selection of a committee to write a constitution for the University. In conformance with the request from the Assistant to the President, the Executive Committee of the University Senate will nominate the members of the faculty who will serve on the constitutional committee.

The motion was seconded and passed.

## ARMING OF CAMPUS POLICE

Professor Olkinetzky, Chairman of the Senate Committee on Student and Public Relations, reported on November 25 that the committee has met to consider this problem (see Journal of the University Senate for October 28, 1968, pages 4 and 5).

Dr. Roller moved that the Senate Committee on Student and Public Relations make a report and recommendations at the special meeting of the Senate on December 14 and that the report be Item No. 1 on the Agenda. The motion was seconded.

Following some discussion, Dr. Bruce moved to amend the Roller motion to the effect that a report and recommendations be presented at the last meeting of the University Senate in January 1969. This motion was seconded and passed.

The original motion by Dr. Roller as amended by Dr. Bruce was approved.

Memorandum from Mr. Arnold Kaufman

November 22, 1968

Dr. John W. Wood, Chairman  
Department of Political Science

I would like to be informed as to the obligation of an instructor in the following situation:

Arming of Campus Police -- continued

On Thursday, November 7, I was accosted by an armed campus policeman and two Cleveland County Sheriffs Deputies on my way into my Political Science I lecture section. The police requested that I accompany them into the auditorium (255 Adams Hall) and point out to them a student whom they wished to question. The police refused to answer my questions as to whether this was in regard to a serious or minor matter. The police remained standing in both doorways of the lecture hall during the hour, creating a distracting influence on the students and myself. The following day the same three policemen entered a discussion section I was teaching at 105 Richards Hall, interrupted my lecture, and once again asked me to point out this student. The student was not present on either occasion.

I would like to state that I consider the situation that I have described above to be highly objectionable. As an instructor in this University, I feel that an invasion of the campus police into my class severely disrupts a healthy educational atmosphere, and the demands of the campus police, if met, would fundamentally compromise the mutual trust that a teacher must build in order to educate.

Arnold Kaufman, Instructor  
Department of Political Science

Memorandum from Dr. Richard Wells and Dr. Richard Baker

November 25, 1968

Dr. Sherril Christian, Chairman  
University Senate

Since Professor Wood is out of town, Professor Baker and I are forwarding the attached memorandum. (See above.)

The Department feels the relationship between the operation of the campus police and the professor should be examined by the Senate in light of the situation described by Mr. Kaufman. Quite frankly, we are simply in the position of having to tell Mr. Kaufman to do what we would do, namely, the best we could under the circumstances. The Department's position is that stated by Mr. Kaufman in his third paragraph and in terms of our view of the matter would strongly urge that a clear and stringent policy apply to the matter of when the campus policemen might feel free to enter a classroom in the pursuit of meeting his own responsibility. Of course our opinion is only one among many within the total University. We would appreciate, therefore, some consideration of this matter by the University Senate.

Richard Wells  
Richard Baker

Members of Committee A  
Department of Political Science

Senate Action

Dr. Doerr moved that this matter be referred to the appropriate committee of the University Senate. His motion was seconded and passed.

The Chairman of the University Senate made immediate referral to the Senate Committee on Student and Public Relations.

## RELEASE TIME AND STAFF SUPPORT

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

November 13, 1968

Professor Gilbert Fite has suggested that the University of Oklahoma Senate become more participative -- and innovative -- with respect to the governance of the University. The report of Professor L. Doyle Bishop regarding Senate involvement in the development of a new constitution also suggests increased involvement.

If the Senate is to participate in the above (and other) matters, it is apparent that the current configuration of Senate activities will not suffice. Both Senate and Senate committee work will increase markedly and the current practice of one 1-hour meeting per month will not allow time to do the job effectively.

The Committee on University Organization, Budget, and Publication feels that several changes should be made before initiating highly participative activities. Two areas merit consideration:

1. Extensive staff support will be necessary.
2. Release time for Senators engaged in these activities will facilitate doing a good job within a reasonable time period.

It is conceivable that some committees will need to meet 3 or more hours per week (supported by preparation) and the Senate might be required to meet at least once a week.

The Committee on University Organization, Budget and Publication does not wish to make a specific recommendation at this time. The Committee is concerned, however, about the resources available during the Spring semester to undertake and examine complicated issues which affect the University.

The Committee suggests that this report be referred to the Ad Hoc Committee to study the structure and function of the Faculty Senate.

Senate Committee on University Organization,  
Budget, and Publication

Raymond R. White	Rodney L. Boyes
Mildred M. Andrews	Jack Parker
Melvin Tolson	Frank Canfield, Chairman

Senate Action

The foregoing report was a part of the Agenda for the University Senate meeting on November 25, 1968. No formal action was taken with regard to it.

## ADJOURNMENT

The University Senate adjourned at 6:20 p.m. The next regular session will be held on Monday, January 27, 1969. Materials for the Agenda should be in the Office of the Secretary by Wednesday, January 15. A SPECIAL MEETING OF THE SENATE WILL BE HELD AT 9 a.m. ON SATURDAY, DECEMBER 14.

Gerald A. Porter, Secretary

MEMORANDUM FOR THE DIRECTOR

Subject: [Illegible]

Date: [Illegible]

The following information was obtained from [Illegible] on [Illegible]. It is being furnished to you for your information.

[Illegible text block]

Very truly yours,  
[Illegible Signature]

[Illegible typed name and title]

[Illegible typed name and title]

The following report was prepared by [Illegible] on [Illegible]. It is being furnished to you for your information.

APPENDIX

[Illegible text block]

[Illegible text block]