A joint meeting of The University of Oklahoma Board of Regents and the Oklahoma State Regents for Higher Education was held in Room 324 of the Biomedical Sciences Building on the Health Sciences Center Campus of The University of Oklahoma on October 24, 1977, beginning at 1:30 p.m.

The following University of Oklahoma Regents were present: Regent Thomas R. Brett, President of the Board, presiding; Regents Bob G. Mitchell, M.D., Richard A. Bell, Dee A. Replogle, Jr., and Ronald H. White, M.D.


The following Oklahoma State Regents for Higher Education were present: Regent Russell D. Vaught, Chairman; Regents Rubye M. Hall, Bert H. Mackie, James L. Mills, Scott E. Orbison, John H. Patten, Eugene L. Swearingen, and Bob F. Allee.

Absent: Regent Joe F. Gary.

The following were also present: Dr. Paul F. Sharp, President of the University of Oklahoma, Dr. E. T. Dunlap, Chancellor of the Oklahoma State Regents for Higher Education, Provost William G. Thurman, Vice President David Burr, Executive Assistant Joseph C. Ray, Dr. Dan Hobbs, Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs, and Mrs. Barbara H. James, Executive Secretary of the University of Oklahoma Board of Regents.

Regent Brett welcomed the State Regents and reviewed the items included on the agenda for this session.

President Sharp commented briefly on energy costs at the Health Sciences Center. He said we estimate an increased cost, without the most recent Corporation Commission ruling, of $750,000 for next year. With the Corporation Commission ruling eliminating the OG&E institutional rate, probably we will have additional costs of $150,000. At this point, President Sharp asked Mr. Bruce Love, Director of Operations at the Health Sciences Center, to present the statistics on energy costs. Mr. Love distributed information comparing steam, chilled water, electrical, and gas usage and cost in three different buildings at the Health Sciences Center and for the Health Sciences Center as a whole over a period of a year, and in some cases comparing the fiscal year 1975-76 costs and usage with the 1976-77. He called attention to the savings we have been able to make by shutting down the heating and air conditioning systems in the Basic Sciences Education Building when the building is unoccupied on weekends and after 8:00 p.m. on weekdays. Even though there were one million fewer kilowatt
hours used, the cost of electricity was up for 1976-77 over 1975-76. He called attention also to the fact that because of the research carried on in the Biomedical Sciences Building it is not possible to circulate the air in that building and this makes the cost for operation much higher. He called attention to the fact that the gross square footage of buildings on the Health Sciences Center Campus that must be heated and air conditioned increased 66.76% for 1976-77 over 1975-76. For 1977-78 we have added another building, College of Nursing Building, and the Library, another large building, will be coming on stream in 1978-79.

Regent Brett asked Dean William Brown to present information on College of Dentistry admissions. Dean Brown distributed copies of the admission statistics for the class which began this fall. He called attention to the decrease in the number of qualified in-state applicants—that this year there were only 133 total resident applicants with 72 positions to be filled. Dean Brown feels 133 is not a very good pool from which to choose 72 to be admitted to the class. The feeling is there should be two to two and one-half times the applicants for the positions to be filled. To date, he said, the College of Dentistry has not admitted any applicants from out of the state. One question that needs to be answered, he said, is whether this is the appropriate time to look at accepting a small number of out-of-state students. He suggested that this is a question both sets of Regents might want to take a look at.

In responding to a question from Dr. Swearingen, Dean Brown said we do not have a regional agreement with other states to take care of their students. Dr. Brown believes that New Mexico might be very interested in this type of thing and there possibly would be some other states as well. With regard to the possible admission of out-of-state students, there was a discussion of the fact that the residency determination in Oklahoma is very lax and it is very easy for students to obtain residency status after a year or so of college in the state. The material distributed by Dean Brown indicates that 11 students who were admitted to the 1977 class in the College of Dentistry as residents of Oklahoma actually graduated from high schools outside of the State of Oklahoma. It was the feeling of some that we are in fact admitting out-of-state students, but because of the lax residency requirements they have been able to obtain residence status.

A question was raised about whether any preference is given by the Admissions Committee to students from OU. Dr. Brown indicated the Admissions Committee does not take this into consideration. He said when this question is asked of officials of the College of Dentistry by prospective students, they indicate that any of the institutions in Oklahoma would be satisfactory. They do suggest, he said, that the students select a college or university that has a strong biological sciences program. Dean Brown then explained in detail the admissions procedure used by the College of Dentistry. In response to Regent Patten's question about whether the Admissions Committee is racially balanced with the population of Oklahoma,
Dean Brown indicated that of the 12 on the Admissions Committee one is a Black. In a brief discussion of this, it was generally agreed that this is about the correct percentage.

Chancellor Dunlap suggested that we should move very slowly in accepting any out-of-state students to the College of Dentistry. He believes it is a plus with the Legislators that we accept only in-state students.

Regent Vaught complimented Dean Brown on the fine job he has and is doing with the College of Dentistry. He said the State Regents have heard many compliments about the College of Dentistry.

Dr. Thurman distributed information on applicants, nationwide, to colleges of medicine: numbers, women accepted, Blacks accepted, proportion of minorities, etc. He reviewed the statistics. Dr. Thurman also presented information on the composition of our College of Medicine Admissions Committee and the Oklahoma Medical Association nominees. He explained the procedure for selecting the members of the Admissions Committee and reviewed their attendance record over the past two years since the change in the procedure. Dr. Thurman presented a chart showing the distribution of applicants and those admitted to the College of Medicine for 1977. He explained the mechanism the Admissions Committee uses in selecting those to be admitted.

Chancellor Dunlap asked about the status of the John Patterson case. Provost Thurman explained briefly that when Mr. Patterson completed the third year of medical school he was on the borderline. The Promotions Committee reviewed his case and felt he would do much better by repeating the third year; that he would have a better fund of knowledge. The Dean of the college sustained this recommendation and Mr. Patterson appealed to the Provost. The Provost asked him to go back and appeal the decision to the Promotions Committee. Dr. Thurman believes at this point Mr. Patterson delayed going back through the appeal process unduly and began his lengthy correspondence with OU Regents, State Regents, and others. One of Mr. Patterson's concerns was the fact that he had debts and a family, etc. and needed to get out of school and begin repaying these debts as soon as possible. Dr. Thurman said that he had offered to pay from private funds his tuition, books, and a living allowance for the year he would be repeating over and above what might be done for others because he was considered a hardship case. However, Mr. Patterson proceeded with the appeal to the Promotions Committee. Following the appeal, the Promotions Committee still recommended that he repeat the third year, and this recommendation was sustained by the Dean. Dr. Thurman said he looked into this case thoroughly, talked to each one of the student's instructors during the third year, and every one of them felt he would be much better off repeating the third year, which would give him a more sound basis for the fourth year. Dr. Thurman said he sustained two of the three recommendations of the Appeals Committee - that he not be required to pass Part I of the
National Board Examinations and that he must successfully complete all other requirements for the M.D. degree including passing Part II of the National Boards. Dr. Thurman said he did not sustain the recommendation of the Appeals Committee that he be required to repeat the third year of the College of Medicine. He said he allowed Mr. Patterson to proceed into the fourth year on academic probation. He has made it clear to Mr. Patterson that any academic failure in the fourth year will result in being dropped from the rolls of the College of Medicine since he is on academic probation.

Regent Bell asked about the Tulsa Medical College and how successful it has been. Dr. Thurman said he believes it has been highly successful. Our program now is firmly based in five of the hospitals in the community and in the Muskogee VA Hospital. We have acceptances by those hospitals and cooperation and financial support. The students who go to Tulsa, and they all go voluntarily, have achieved academic honors at a higher rate than on the Oklahoma City campus. Their performance on Part II of the National Boards has been better. Dr. Thurman said we do have political problems there, but we have established a quality educational program for the third and fourth year students.

In response to a question, Dr. Thurman said he sees problems ahead. He referred to the fact that Oral Roberts University is in the process of building a College of Medicine physical plant and plans to enroll students in 1978 or 79, and is proposing going to 100 students. Dr. Thurman said this will directly impact the Tulsa Medical College because Mr. Roberts does not project that the hospital he will construct will provide Pediatrics or Obstetrics. In addition, he would like to have 55 residencies in Tulsa. All of the residencies now are committed to the University of Oklahoma. Where the additional residents are going to go, Dr. Thurman said he does not know. Dr. Thurman said he has had lengthy discussions with Mr. Roberts about this matter; he knows our concerns and he shares them. Dr. Thurman said this makes it absolutely imperative that the OU College of Medicine and the Osteopathic College work together much more effectively than we have been doing.

There was a lengthy discussion about this problem. Mr. Orbison felt that it would not be possible politically for either Tulsa institution to be closed. He feels that Tulsa's population is entitled to services of the scope provided by both of these medical institutions. Mr. Orbison also expressed the opinion that the osteopaths would not allow a merger of the two institutions which would make the osteopathic school a branch of the Health Sciences Center, with its president in effect reduced to the role of dean. He said this might have been possible several years ago before the institution was established because the osteopaths did not have anything at that time, but now that they have their own school he feels they are not about to give it up.

Regent Patten said he believes these two Boards very much need to be working together more on the health training situation in Tulsa and make
sure we are not duplicating physical facilities, administrative facilities, and so forth. He suggested this matter should be pursued. Dr. Thurman then talked about the feasibility of establishing a common basic science program for the two schools.

During the discussion a question was raised about TAHEC - the Tulsa Area Health Education Center. Dr. Thurman said it became apparent some months ago that all of the hospitals and the various institutions in Tulsa were carrying on separate programs in continuing education. He said the University accepted the responsibility for coordinating the continuing education programs in Northeastern Oklahoma in the health professions. This was not budgeted and has been handled informally. A proposal was submitted but funding has not been provided. In the meantime, the University will continue to coordinate the program and staff it.

Regent Brett said the OU Board would like to make some recommendations to the State Regents with regard to the consolidation of the medical education programs in the Tulsa area but recognizes the prerogative is up to the State Regents or perhaps the Legislature. Discussion continued about the problem and the difficulties of implementing a consolidation. It was generally agreed that additional cooperation and coordination needs to take place. Regent Brett indicated the OU Board will get some information to the State Regents that we have on this matter.

Regent Brett asked Provost Thurman to comment on the proposed fee increase for the Health Sciences Center. Dr. Thurman explained the increases and the changes proposed. He presented comparative data on the fees in colleges of medicine in the surrounding states at state-supported schools. Chancellor Dunlap indicated a public hearing will be held on all proposed fee increases in the State System at 1:30 p.m. in the State Regents' offices on November 28.

Regent Brett said the OU Board is grateful for these discussions with the State Regents. He suggested we continue them on a fall and spring basis. He stated the OU Regents are open for discussions at any time with members of the State Regents about any subject, and he said he hoped the reverse would be true.

The meeting adjourned at 3:05 p.m. for a tour of the Health Sciences Center Campus by bus.

Barbara H. James
Executive Secretary of the Board of Regents