THE University of Oklahoma is making three principal requests of the Legislature now in session. The requests are:

1. A salary and maintenance appropriation large enough to take care of the steady increase in enrolment.

2. Public Building Fund appropriations totaling $1,050,000 for Petroleum Engineering, Graduate Education, and Geology-Museum buildings.

3. Authorization to issue a million dollars worth of bonds to erect self-liquidating dormitories.

The budget request is supported by an impressive array of facts. The amount of money requested for salaries and maintenance is based on what the regents believe to be the serious needs of the University, and not the full amount of money that they believe could be spent wisely on the institution's program if it were available.

The total number of resident students enrolled has increased from 6,806 in the school year of 1929-30 to an estimated 8,025 for the present school year, while the total amount appropriated by the Legislature per student has declined steadily.

The table on the next page shows the average appropriation per student during the last ten years.

These figures show that the combined salary and maintenance appropriation per student has declined from $241 in 1929-30 to $164 in 1938-39. Considering the great growth in enrolment since 1929, the appropriations for buildings and capital improvements during this period have been very small—in that period appropriations were made for only one new building.

For the last several years the average increase in the total number of resident students has been about four hundred per year. Since 1924 the number of persons graduating each year has practically doubled. In all probability more than 1,300 degrees will be granted during 1939, bringing the total number of degrees granted to more than 20,000.

"The drastic cut in appropriations that came with the depression has never been restored," President W. B. Bizzell comments, and the actual figures show how true his statement is.

The low salary scale, as compared to similar universities and colleges, has caused the loss of a number of valuable men and women from the faculty during the last few years. The lack of promotional rewards to look forward to has made a great many faculty members look for opportunities elsewhere.

The shortage of salary funds in the face of steadily increasing enrolment has caused the teaching load per instructor to become burdensome. A normal university class is...
supposed to have from twenty to thirty students in it. O. U., however, because its teaching staff is too small, has a hundred classes in which there are more than sixty students. Many classes have between 100 and 120 students in them, which, of course, prohibits individual instruction and guidance.

During the last ten years, the number of students enrolled in the University has increased much more rapidly than the size of the teaching staff. In 1929-30 there were 23.5 full-time students enrolled for each full-time teacher, but this year there are 26.9 students for each teacher.

Statistics comparing the enrolment with the size of the teaching staff at O. U. and other similar universities show that the teaching load at O. U. is far heavier than the average.

The need for more classroom space on the campus is really acute. Classes are meeting under the Stadium, in the rickety Old Gym, in makeshift quarters wherever a few square feet can be found regardless of how inconvenient or inefficient it may be.

The Engineering Building was used by 485 students when it was erected in 1925, but today 1,571 students are enrolled in engineering courses.

While the enrolment jumped during the last ten years, the only building appropriation granted by the Legislature was one for the Business Administration Building. A PWA grant was secured to supplement the State appropriation, and the first unit of a Science Building on the South Oval was built with this grant.

The Regents believe that it would be disastrous to wait another biennium before relieving the crowded conditions on the campus. They are asking $450,000 for a Petroleum Engineering Building and to complete the main Engineering Building: $300,000 for a Graduate Education Building; and $300,000 for a Geology and Museum Building. All of these buildings would serve educational fields that are of special importance to the present and future development of Oklahoma.

The University already has on file with the Public Works Administration, a request for PWA grants to supplement the State building appropriations if it is secured. The federal grant would be used for a Home Economics Building and another Science unit on the South Oval.

The numerous strong arguments in favor of a state appropriation for a Petroleum Engineering Building at O. U. have been presented several times in The Sooner Magazine in recent years. Petroleum engineering is the field in which O. U. has national and world preeminence. Students come to Norman from all over the world to take petroleum engineering. Oil production is Oklahoma's chief industry, and the State plainly has an obligation to offer the youth of Oklahoma the best of educational opportunities in this field. O. U. has some tremendously valuable equipment for teaching petroleum engineering, but the classroom, laboratory and office facilities are woefully inadequate for the constantly increasing enrolment.

The importance of an appropriation for a Graduate Education Building was described in detail in the January issue of Sooner Magazine. Experts for the Brookings Institution, who made a careful and extensive survey of the Oklahoma educational setup, a number of years ago made a strong recommendation that all graduate work in education in Oklahoma be centralized at O. U., and that adequate facilities for it be provided on the O. U. campus.

Present facilities, centered in the small and ancient building that was once the University library many decades ago, are so inconvenient and unsatisfactory that many of Oklahoma's school administrators have gone to other states for graduate work. They prefer to take graduate work at their own state university, however, and are voluntarily carrying on a campaign of their own for an appropriation for a Graduate Education Building at O. U.

Like the School of Petroleum Engineering, the University's School of Geology ranks high in the nation and the world. Enrolment in geology has increased steadily. The present building, which houses the Oklahoma Geological Survey and a make-shift museum as well as geology offices and classes was outgrown years ago.

One out of every five students enrolled in the University is taking some course in geology or geography this semester. The enrolment so exceeds capacity of the Geology Building that 42 per cent of the students in geology and geography have to meet in other buildings—Old Science Hall, Old Gymnasium, West Wing of the Stadium, Administration Building, and the basement of the Business Administration Building.

The third main request that the University is presenting to the Legislature—the request for authorization to issue dormitory bonds—is based on acutely bad housing conditions disclosed by a recent survey.

There has been little expansion of student housing facilities in Norman for many years. Most of the residential building in Norman in recent years has consisted of smaller homes, without rooms for renting to students. Most of the rooms for rent are in old houses. The University has two residential halls for women but their capacity is limited. There is no University dormitory for men, except for the co-operative dormitory under the West Wing of the Stadium.

Investigators found many men students living in basements with poor heating equipment and bad sanitary facilities.

No State appropriation would be required for the dormitory building project as the plan calls for issuance of bonds and paying for the dormitories out of revenue.

The men who have worked on details of the University budget request hope that O. U. alumni and former students will keep in mind three important points in public discussion of the budget:

1. The budget request is considered a minimum request and is not padded in anticipation of cuts by Legislative committees.

2. The budget request is solidly supported by actual facts, and the details will gladly be supplied to anyone who wants them.

3. In asking a larger appropriation than it was given last time, the University is only trying to take care of its increased enrolment, and is not seeking an "expansion" program.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Number of Resident Students Enrolled</th>
<th>Average Appropriation Per Student</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Total Salaries &amp; Maintenance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$216</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1929-30</td>
<td>6,806</td>
<td>$175</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1930-31</td>
<td>6,970</td>
<td>$171</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1931-32</td>
<td>6,876</td>
<td>163</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1932-33</td>
<td>7,072</td>
<td>168</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1933-34</td>
<td>6,273</td>
<td>125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1934-35</td>
<td>6,678</td>
<td>118</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1935-36</td>
<td>6,836</td>
<td>118</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1936-37</td>
<td>7,091</td>
<td>118</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1937-38</td>
<td>7,417</td>
<td>132</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1938-39</td>
<td>8,023</td>
<td>122</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>