

JOURNAL OF THE FACULTY SENATE (Norman campus)

The University of Oklahoma

Special session -- March 28, 1983 -- 3:30 p.m., CONOCO Auditorium,
Doris W. Neustadt Wing, Bizzell Memorial Library

The Faculty Senate was called to order by Professor Teree Foster, Chair.

Present:

Baker	Foster	Hayes	Lehr, Roland	Ragan
Black	Gollahalli	Hebert	Levy	Reynolds
Bredeson	Goodman	Hibdon	Lis	Scharnberg
Cohen	Grant	Howard	Locke	Schmitz
Conner	Graves	Inman	McDonald	Seaberg
Davis	Gross	Karriker	Mills	Smith
Dunn	Harper	Lanning	Nicewander	Sonleitner
Fishbeck	Hauser	Lehr, Robert	Patten	West
Ford				

PSA representatives: Boehme Corcos Morrison

Liaison, AAUP: Turkington

Absent:

Catlin	Kiacz	Kutner	Moriarity	Stock
Christian	Kleine	Love	Slaughter	Whitmore
Dumont				

Provost's office representative: Ray

PSA representatives: Cowen Guyer Powers

UOSA representatives: Albert Stanhope Rodriguez

Liaison, Women's Caucus: Cleaver

Liaison, Association of Black Personnel: Butler

GSA representatives: Strickland Walsh

(Secretary's note: In accordance with precedent, absences from special meetings of the Senate are not counted in the attendance records of Senators. However, Senate members have the privilege of utilizing their attendance at the special meeting on March 28 to offset an absence from a regular meeting during the 1982-83 academic year.)

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Announcement: Spring meeting, General Faculty	2
Actions taken by President Banowsky:	
Senate resolution - KGOU programming	2
Faculty replacements - University groups	2
Report of Senate Executive Committee:	
Budgetary constraints, FY 1982-83.	2
April 9 meeting - OSU/OU Executive Committees.	3
EAC - Commencement/Computing Advisory Committees	3
Report, Senate Committee on Admission Requirements.	3

ANNOUNCEMENT: Spring meeting, General Faculty.

The General Faculty on the Norman campus will hold its spring semester meeting at 3:30 p.m., on Thursday, April 14, in the Ballroom, Oklahoma Memorial Union.

A reception, hosted by President William S. Banowsky, will follow immediately to honor recipients of awards and distinguished professorships.

ACTIONS TAKEN BY PRESIDENT WILLIAM S. BANOWSKY

(1) Senate resolution - KGOU programming: On March 10, President William S. Banowsky acknowledged, without comment, receipt of the Senate resolution of March 7, 1983, concerning programming at radio station KGOU. (Please see the Senate Journal for March 7, 1983.)

(2) Faculty replacements - University groups: On March 15, President Banowsky approved the Senate's election of Professor George Henderson to the Faculty Appeals Board.

At the same time, he also selected the following faculty replacements from the nominations submitted by the Faculty Senate:

<u>Academic Regulations Committee:</u>	Leon Price
<u>Class Schedule Committee:</u>	Evelyn Curry
<u>Graduate Assistants</u>	
<u>Appeals Board:</u>	John Cotner Akhtar Khan
<u>KGOU Community Advisory Board:</u>	Sidney Brown
<u>Patent Advisory Committee:</u>	Rex Ellington

(Please see the Senate Journal for March 7, 1983.)

REPORT OF SENATE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

Professor Teree Foster, Chair, Senate Executive Committee, reported on the following items:

(1) Ongoing campus discussions, budgetary constraints, FY 1982-83: In Professor Foster's opinion, the Norman Transcript and the Oklahoma Daily have "thoroughly and accurately" reported on Provost J. R. Morris' meeting on March 9 with the Budget Council. The Budget Council is now trying to find \$2 million in the Norman campus budget for FY 1982-83.

At its March 30 meeting, the Budget Council will break up into small groups in an effort to find the \$2 million. The Council is soliciting suggestions from all over the campus.

Last December, the Senate Executive Committee submitted its suggestions to President Banowsky. The Senate Chair would like to send appropriate suggestions to the Budget Council by Wednesday, April 6. She requested interested Senate members to meet with her after this meeting to set up a convenient meeting schedule.

(2) April 9 meeting - OSU and OU Executive Committees: For the past few years, the Executive Committees of the Oklahoma State University Faculty Council and the Oklahoma University Faculty Senate have been holding spring weekend retreats to discuss interests and problems of common concern. This year, because of the budgetary constraints, both groups decided to forego the retreat format and, instead, Oklahoma State University counterparts are hosting a one-day meeting in Stillwater on Saturday, April 9, 1983.

Professor Foster solicited faculty suggestions for appropriate agenda topics to be forwarded to Professor Robert A. Ford, Senate Chair-elect.

(3) EEC representation, Commencement/Computing Advisory Committees: President William S. Banowsky has recently apprised the Senate Chair of an EEC request for staff representation on the Norman campus Commencement and Computing Advisory Committees.

To provide some Employee Executive Council representation on both University groups, therefore, President Banowsky has suggested that the membership of both Committees be increased as follows, beginning with the academic year, 1983-84:

Commencement Committee: from 11 to 12
 Computing Advisory Committee: from 16 to 17

She solicited faculty comments and/or reactions to this proposal before the end of the week so that she can report accordingly to President Banowsky.

REPORT OF SENATE ad hoc COMMITTEE ON ADMISSION REQUIREMENTS

Background information: At the Norman campus General Faculty meeting on April 16, 1981, Regent President Dee Replogle, Jr., challenged the faculty to review the University's functions, purposes, and definition so that "graduates who not only are qualified professionals but also are able to function effectively in all walks of life."

In the summer of 1981, Provost J. R. Morris appointed the following Administrative Advisory Committee on General Education, with himself as Chair: (Please see pages 5-6 of the Senate Journal for September 14, 1981.)

Dean James Burwell (College of Arts and Sciences)
 Dean Martin Jischke (College of Engineering)
 Dean Jerome Weber (University College)
 Professor Greg Kunesh (Chair, Faculty Senate, 1980-81)
 Professor Gary Thompson (Chair, Faculty Senate, 1981-82)
 Associate Provost Joseph Ray

The final report of that Committee was presented to the University Board of Regents on September 17. On that same day, copies were also distributed to Senate members. In its report, the Committee recommended that the Faculty Senate appoint a faculty committee to work with the AAC "in exploring some of the questions raised concerning general education on this campus." (Please see pages 5-7 of the Senate Journal for October 19, 1981.)

Accordingly, the following Senate ad hoc Committee on General Education was subsequently appointed:

Professor Gordon Atkinson (Chemistry)
 Professor Susan Caldwell (History of Art)
 Professor Claude Duchon (Meteorology)
 Professor John Dunn (Anthropology), Chair
 Ms. Jean Marie Elliott (UOSA)
 Professor Robert A. Ford (Finance)
 Professor David Gross (English)
 Professor Thomas Hill (Mathematics)
 Professor Alexander Holmes (Economics), Vice Chair
 Professor William Huseman (Modern Languages)
 Professor Beverly Joyce (University Libraries)
 Professor Tom Love (AMNE)
 Professor Jean McDonald (Political Science)
 Professor Allan Ross (Director, School of Music)
 Professor Thomas Selland (Architecture)
 Professor Jay Smith (Education)
 Professor George Tauxe (CEES)
 Professor Henry Tobias (History)
 Professor Mary Whitmore (Zoology)

The final report of the Committee was accepted by the Senate on May 3, 1982. Section IV, A, of that report is entitled "Curricular Entrance Requirements." (Please see pages 4-6 and 13-29 of the Senate Journal for May 3, 1982.)

In June, President William S. Banowsky forwarded copies of that report to the Deans on the Norman campus. At the Deans' Council meeting on June 16, 1982, Provost J. R. Morris asked the Deans to submit appropriate reports to him by December, 1982, that would address "both general education in their Colleges and any recommendations for change." On January 3, 1983, Provost Morris appointed the following General Education Campus-wide Coordinating Committee "to serve as a liaison among the various colleges, as well as to assist him and the colleges in facilitating their general education desires": (Please see pages 2-4 of the Senate Journal for January 17, 1983.)

Vice Provost Jerome Weber, Chair
 Associate Dean John Francis (College of Engineering)
 Associate Dean Morris Marx (College of Arts and Sciences)
 Assistant Dean James Faulconer (College of Fine Arts)
 Interim Dean Ronald Hess (College of Environmental Design)
 Professor James Constantin (Marketing)
 Professor Charles Harper (Geology/Geophysics)
 Professor Richard Wells (Political Science)
 Professor Lloyd Williams (Education)

At their spring, 1982, retreat in Poteau, the Executive Committees of the OSU Faculty Council and the OU Faculty Senates (Norman campus and HSC), urged that the faculty-governance organizations at both institutions study general education and admission requirements. (Please see page 3 of the Senate Journal for April 12, 1982.)

The 1981-82 Oklahoma Legislature approved a "legislative intent" resolution that calls upon the two comprehensive universities to undertake a review of admission standards and general education requirements. (Please see page 7 of the Senate Journal for June 28, 1982.)

In the fall of 1982, the following Senate ad hoc Committee was appointed to study the University admission requirements:

Professor Russell Buhite (Chair, History Department)
 Dr. Myrna Carney (Director, Student Affairs Research)
 Ms. Barbara Cousins (Director of Admissions)
 Professor Robert Ford (Finance), Chair
 Associate Dean John Francis (College of Engineering)
 Professor Tom Gallaher (Education)
 Professor Greg Kunesh (Director, School of Drama)
 Associate Dean Morris Marx (College of Arts and Sciences)
 Dean Jerome Weber (University College)

The preliminary report of that Committee was distributed to Senate members on March 23, 1983, and is reproduced in full below:

Preliminary Report
 of the
 Faculty Senate
 Committee on Admission Requirements
 University of Oklahoma

March 23, 1983

The Committee makes the following recommendations for admitting first-year students to the University of Oklahoma:

1. After summer, 1987, freshman students will be admitted to the University of Oklahoma provided the student has completed the high school curriculum described below and meets at least one of the following criteria:
 - a. A four-year, overall GPA of 3.0 or better.
 - b. A rank in the top 50 per cent of high school graduating class.
 - c. An ACT score at least equal to the national median score for entering freshmen for the prior academic year.
 - d. Admission of up to 5 per cent of the first-time freshman class who do not meet the above standards.

2. The high school curriculum required for admission is as follows:

Units (Years)	Course areas*
4	English
2	Lab Science (from Biology, Chemistry, Physics)
3	Mathematics (from Algebra, Geometry, Trigonometry, Math Analysis, Calculus)
2	History (including 1 unit American History)
2	Foreign Language
1	Additional unit from college-preparatory course areas above
<hr/> 14	Required
6	Elective (Recommend courses from Fine Arts, Humanities, Social Sciences, Computer Science)
<hr/> 20	Total

3. Any transfer student who enters OU with fewer than 30 credit hours from another college or university will be required to meet the high school standards set for other entering freshmen.
4. The current policy of admitting students in summer school who do not meet the regular admission standards will be abolished.

BACKGROUND

Over the past several years, it has become obvious that many entering freshmen are not adequately prepared to do college-level work. The belief that a problem exists has been reinforced by a decline in ACT scores in the state and nation. The result has been that colleges and universities have had to teach remedial courses to make up for the deficiencies of entering freshmen. In many cases, the level of course content has been lowered to accommodate poorly prepared students.

*Some students, both in-state and out-of-state, may find it impossible to complete the above high school curriculum requirements but still meet the other admission standards. The Committee, therefore, recommends that up to 5 per cent of the first-term freshmen be admitted who do not entirely meet the required curriculum. These exceptions would be in addition to the 5 per cent admitted under Section 1d above.

At the present time, Oklahoma high schools have minimum graduation requirements as follows:

<u>Units</u>	<u>Course area</u>
4	Language Arts
1	Mathematics
1	Laboratory Science
1	American History
½	Oklahoma History
<hr/> 7½	Required courses
10½	Electives
<hr/> 18	Total

This curriculum requirement is unbelievably weak and means that, after completing only 7½ units of academic or college-preparatory courses, the student is free to take any frivolous or meaningless courses he or she chooses. Since students know that OU and OSU require 3.0 GPA or a rank in the upper half of their graduating class, many take easy courses in order to ensure a high GPA and rank. Fortunately, high school graduation requirements will increase in 1986.

HIGH SCHOOL CURRICULUM REQUIREMENTS

The State Department of Education has increased graduation requirements for the State's high schools beginning in 1986. A summary of the present requirements, the 1986 requirements, and those recommended for admission to OU

<u>Course area</u>	<u>Units Present</u>	<u>Units 1986</u>	<u>Units OU (1987)</u>
Language Arts (English)	4	4	4
Mathematics	1	2 (1 may be Business Math)	3 (from: Algebra, Geometry, Trigonometry, Math Analysis, Calculus)
Science	1	2 (1 shall be lab science)	2 (from: Biology, Chemistry, Physics)
American History	1	1	1
Oklahoma History	$\frac{1}{2}$	$\frac{1}{2}$	$\frac{1}{2}$
World History	-	$\frac{1}{2}$	$\frac{1}{2}$
Foreign Language	-	-	2
Additional College-preparatory courses from areas above	-	-	1
Elective courses	10 $\frac{1}{2}$	10	6 (from areas such as Fine Arts, Humanities, Social Sciences, Computer Science)
Total units	18	20	20

Obviously, the 1986 increase in requirements in required courses and total number of units is a welcome strengthening on the part of the high schools and should result in better prepared students. The Committee feels, however, that even these requirements should be upgraded.

In the area of mathematics, courses would have to be in traditional math courses with no substitutions. In the science area, both units would be in lab sciences. Since biology, chemistry, or physics courses would normally be preceded by a ninth-grade general science course, most students would present three units of science.

Oklahoma has a poor record in secondary school, foreign-language education. Only three other states, Louisiana, Alabama, Mississippi, rank below Oklahoma in foreign language enrollment as a percentage of public secondary school enrollment. From 1973 to 1981, foreign language enrollment in the Oklahoma public schools dropped by over 27 per cent, with the biggest yearly drop of 10 per cent coming in 1976-77, the year the OU college of Arts and Sciences dropped the foreign-language requirement. The Committee feels this trend should be reversed and that the foreign-language admission requirement should be imposed.

The question has been raised about the difficulty of smaller school systems' offering sufficient math, science, and foreign language courses. We have been reassured by representatives of the State Department of Education that, through schedule planning, pooling among districts, and by other means, these requirements can be met. In this direction, the 1986 State Department requirements go a long way toward meeting our requirements.

In line with upgrading courses taken in high school, the Committee recommends one additional unit be taken in a college-preparatory subject. This procedure allows for some flexibility for both student and high school but ensures better preparation on the part of the student. The remaining six units of electives should be sufficient to allow for some vocational or activity-type courses. The Committee recommends courses in areas such as fine arts, humanities, etc.

One of the concerns of the Committee is the admission of transfer students from other colleges without adequate high school preparation. Even if some students do enter in this manner, at least some others will be weeded out in junior colleges or other four-year colleges. Since this problem may have to be settled by administrative negotiation among institutions of higher learning in the state, the Committee urges the OU administration to safeguard the integrity of the admission requirements which we propose. As a minimum, the Committee recommends that any transfer student who enters OU with under 30 credit hours be required to meet the high school standards set for other entering freshmen.

One question uppermost in the minds of many people is the effect of an increased admission requirement upon enrollment. With four years of lead time, students should have no difficulty in meeting the high school curriculum requirements. With better preparation in high school, ACT scores should rise. We are roughly doubling required academic courses taken in high school. Certainly that difference should be reflected in test scores. As a matter of fact, the Committee believes it is possible that the result would be an increase in admissions in line with the experience at other universities that have increased entrance requirements. Closer to home, the OU College of Engineering raised entrance requirements in 1981. Overall enrollment was stable that year with an increase in freshman enrollment being offset by declines in transfer students and foreign students. Better-prepared entering freshmen should reduce the attrition rate for students, particularly during the freshman year.

The Committee feels strongly that higher admission requirements will produce better entering students, reduce the student drop-out rate, allow for more rigorous level of university instruction, and produce better graduates. We believe that the total mission of the University of Oklahoma will be served by the implementation of the recommendations for stronger admission requirements.

Senate action: Professor Ford, Committee Chair, formally introduced the Committee report for Senate consideration and moved its acceptance by the Senate with the stipulation that this question would be routinely tabled until the Senate session on April 11.

He also announced the following schedule of "faculty open hearings" of the Committee with any interested faculty members on the Norman campus:

March 30 - 3:00 p.m., DR 7, Oklahoma Memorial Union

March 31 - 10:00 a.m., Bizzell Memorial Library 225

An appropriate announcement was sent by the Senate Secretary to Senate members and department chairs on campus.

Invited guests at this Senate meeting included Dean Jerome Weber, Dr. Milford Messer (University Registrar), Dr. Myrna Carney (Director, Student Affairs Research), and Ms. Barbara Cousins (Director of Admissions).

Professor Ford reviewed the history of this question, in general, and the activities of his Committee, in particular. "The Committee approached its task with an open mind. With the assistance of Dr. Carney, we came up with a huge volume of numbers that gave us an insight into the situation existing in Oklahoma high schools."

"We have worked very closely with our counterparts at Oklahoma State University, who have been doing the same thing there. Without too much effort, we surprisingly came forth with very similar proposals." The OSU faculty is voting on their own proposal on April 12.

In Professor Ford's opinion, the major difference between the OSU and OU proposals is the foreign-language requirement. Whereas the OU proposal specifies a 2-unit requirement, OSU proposes a 1-year requirement. However, the totals of required units for both are equal because OSU is specifying 2 additional units from college-preparatory course areas, whereas OU is specifying only 1 additional unit.

He next noted the current high school graduation requirements, the changes therein that will become effective in 1986, and the additional changes proposed by the Committee.

In response to Professor Levy's question, Dean Weber stated that students coming in under the 5 per cent exception rule must be recommended by a program in the University that provides additional academic support for such students (e.g., the Athletic Department, the Women Returning to College Program, the Threshold Program, and the like).

Professor Locke raised a question about the other (new) 5 per cent exception rule either for those who did not take the curriculum or for whom the curriculum was not available. Dean Weber replied that in every state with a similar procedure there is a provision for handling exceptions. In his opinion, students with unavailable opportunities should be admitted but should also be held responsible within the first year.

Professor Hebert asked whether the exception rule would "go too far in taking the heat off the school districts." Dean Weber replied that, to his knowledge, the school districts want the impetus and also want "to take some of the sloppiness out of their curricula. They are very supportive of what we are trying to do!"

Professor Conner reported on an informal poll among his colleagues. They are "very supportive of the proposal," but a minority felt that high school courses in communication theory should be authorized as alternatives for greater flexibility. Dean Weber commented that even in the larger school districts the disciplines are far less defined "than what we are used to. Some areas are staffed with people who have little or no expertise in a particular field."

Professor Conner also expressed the opinion that the proposed requirements would force the student to decide on a college-preparatory curriculum by the time the student reaches the 9th grade. He felt that this pressure would put a heavy burden on a youngster of 14 or so.

At this point, Professor Ford noted that the Mathematics Department is now handling about 9,000 students and that about 1,800 (about 20 percent) of them are taking remedial courses. Dean Weber added that 80+ percent of undergraduates come from Oklahoma high schools. He felt that students can make a decision just before their junior year and still be able to take care of the mathematics requirement.

Professor Dunn raised a question concerning the number of freshmen from schools that would not be providing such a curriculum. Dean Weber's "guess" was "absolutely none, if they used the resources available."

Professor Smith asked whether the four years' lead time would suffice. Professor Ford stated that, although the mathematics and science teacher situation is critical at present, the State Department of Education feels that state schools can "handle the various aspects of the curriculum proposed."

Professor Lanning suggested substituting computer language for a foreign language. Dean Weber indicated that the intent of the Committee was not to include computer language as a language alternative. Professor Grant suggested that one year of each of two languages be permitted for even greater flexibility. Professor Gross expressed the opinion that "general education requirements should dovetail with this question." He also felt that two years of a particular language would be an absolute minimum to give the student a more meaningful knowledge of a language. However, he did favor offering greater flexibility for those concerned by not specifying two years of a single language.

Professor Locke noted that, as a result of recent changes in admission requirements, the number of entering freshmen in the College of Engineering increased with a big drop in international and transfer students.

In conclusion, Professor Ford stated that the Committee will recommend that the Provost be authorized to negotiate with his OSU counterparts. "They have been discussing these items in private already. Almost everyone feels that it would be desirable that any OU and OSU proposals forwarded to the State Regents at least be quite similar."

Without dissent, the Senate approved tabling the motion to accept the report.

ADJOURNMENT

The Faculty Senate adjourned at 4:43 p.m. The next regular session of the Senate will be held at 3:30 p.m., on Monday, April 11, 1983, in the Conoco Auditorium, Doris W. Neustadt Wing, Bizzell Memorial Library.

Respectfully submitted,

Anthony S. Lis

Anthony S. Lis

Professor of

Business Administration

Secretary, Faculty Senate