

C O N T E N T S
MINUTES OF A REGULAR MEETING
BOARD OF REGENTS OF THE UNIVERSITY OF OKLAHOMA
THURSDAY, FEBRUARY 12, 1976

Minutes of the meeting held on January 15, 1976 (13731)

REPORT OF THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNIVERSITY - Development Council (13731)

REPORT OF THE PRESIDENT OF THE BOARD OF REGENTS

Appointment of Committee for Regents' Award for Superior Teaching (13732)

Report of the Academic Affairs Committee (13732)

Report of the Health Sciences Center Committee (13760)

Report of the Student Affairs Committee (13761)

A. The Health Sciences Center

II. Academic

- a. Personnel Actions (13767)
- Tenure - Verna Holtzen (13760)

III. Finance and Management

- a. Non-Academic Personnel (13772)
- b. Oklahoma Regional Medical Program (13772)
- c. Purchase of Laboratory Equipment (13773)
- d. Purchase of Dental Chairs (13773)
- e. Proposal, Contract, and Grant Report (13775)

V. Operations and Physical Plant

- a. Corridor/Bridge Project (13775)
- b. Library/Learning Resources Center (13776)
- c. Expansion of the Steam and Chilled Water System (13776)
- d. Research and Consultation Diagnostic Laboratory (13777)
- e. Thrombosis-Coagulation Laboratory Renovation (13778)
- f. Report on Major Capital Improvements Projects (13778)
- g. Land Transfer (13779)
- Use of Land South of Service Center (13760)

B. Administration

V. General Policies

- a. Faculty Personnel Policy (13732)

C. Academic (Norman Campus)

I. Personnel Actions (13780)

VIII. Admission Policies

- a. Admission by Performance Plan (13782)

D. Finance and Management

I. Non-Academic Personnel

- a. Educational and General, Agency Special, and Service Units (13785)
- b. Grants and Contracts (13787)

- II. Budgets
 - a. 1976 Summer Session Budget (13787)
 - IV. Fees
 - a. Independent Study (13788)
 - b. Advanced Programs (13789)
 - c. Off-Campus Classes (13790)
 - VI. Purchases
 - a. Microscopes (13791)
 - b. Teaching Instruments (13793)
 - c. Spectroscopy Amplifier (13794)
 - d. Vending Machines (13794)
 - VII. Project Financing
 - a. Proposal, Contract, and Grant Report (13795)
- F. The University Community
- V. Student Government
 - Student Activity Fee 1975-76 (13761)
 - Student Congress Bill "Abolishing the Film Review Committee" (13761)
 - Student Congress Bill on Funding Responsibility for Intramurals (13763)
 - Student Congress Bill Abolishing User Charges (13766)
- G. Operations and Physical Plant
- I. New Construction
 - a. Law Center Project (13795)
 - b. Report on Major Capital Improvements Projects (13796)
 - Student Recreation Center (13797)
 - II. Remodeling, Renovations, Repair
 - a. Acceptance of Robertson Hall Renovation (13796)
 - IV. Contracts and Agreements
 - a. Agreement with United States Geological Survey (13797)

MINUTES OF A REGULAR MEETING
BOARD OF REGENTS OF THE UNIVERSITY OF OKLAHOMA
THURSDAY, FEBRUARY 12, 1976

A regular meeting of the Board of Regents of The University of Oklahoma was held in Dining Room 5 of the Oklahoma Memorial Union Building on the Norman Campus of the University on Thursday, February 12, 1976, beginning at 10:45 a.m.

The following were present: Regent Walter Neustadt, Jr., President of the Board, presiding; Regents Mack M. Braly, Thomas R. Brett, Bob G. Mitchell, M.D., K. D. Bailey, Richard A. Bell, and Dee A. Replogle, Jr.

The following were also present: Dr. Paul F. Sharp, President of the University; Provosts Thurman and Morris; Vice Presidents Dean, Nordby, and White; Mr. Joseph C. Ray, Executive Assistant to the President; Mr. R. Boyd Gunning, University Trust Officer; Dr. Thomas H. Tucker, University Chief Counsel; and Mrs. Barbara H. James, Executive Secretary of the Board of Regents.

Regent Braly moved approval of the minutes of the regular meeting held on January 15, 1976, as printed and distributed prior to the meeting. The following voted yes on the motion: Regents Neustadt, Braly, Brett, Mitchell, Bailey, Bell, and Replogle. The Chair declared the motion carried unanimously.

President Sharp announced that the Development Committee of the Regents and he have met with a group of 12 distinguished business leaders who are serving as the Executive Committee of our Development Council. This volunteer group will study the need for private funding at the University and will recommend to the administration and the Board of Regents plans for the development of new private sources for implementing the funding projects. He expressed his personal feeling that it is imperative that the University now move vigorously into the area of private funding. "We have so many projects with respect to the endowment of chairs, scholarships, fellowships, program development, and others, that we will never be able to accomplish it on State or Federal funding. It is now my judgment that it is a matter of great importance to us that we move forward in this." President Sharp said we are moving forward with very strong support from a distinguished group:

Fred E. Brown, Jr., New York, partner in J.&W. Seligman & Co.
Elizabeth Merrick Coe, Oklahoma City, President of the
Merrick Foundation in Ardmore
Walter H. Helmerich, III, Tulsa, President and Chief Executive
Officer of Helmerich and Payne, Inc.
F. C. Love, Oklahoma City, retired President and Director
of Kerr-McGee Corp.

Dean A. McGee, Oklahoma City, Chairman of the Board and Chief Executive Officer of Kerr-McGee Corp.
J. W. McLean, Oklahoma City, Chairman of the Board and Chief Executive Officer of Liberty National Bank
William F. Martin, Bartlesville, Chairman of the Board and Chief Executive Officer of Phillips Petroleum Co.
Walter Neustadt, Jr., Ardmore, President of the Westheimer-Neustadt Corp.
Sam R. Noble, Ardmore, President of Noble Affiliates
John H. Patten, Norman, President of Security National Bank and Trust Co.
T. H. "Perk" Robinson, Houston, retired Chairman of the Board and Chief Executive Officer of Houston Light and Power Co.
John H. Williams, Tulsa, Chairman of the Board and Chief Executive Officer, The Williams Companies

President Sharp said the above named are the Executive Committee and around this will be a larger Council which will represent the national constituency of the University.

President Sharp also called attention to the successful completion of the fund-raising for the Law Center Building. He said this is an example of the kind of private support we are talking about and what it can do for a public university. He said more than 410 donors contributed nearly \$1.4 million toward the construction costs. At the present time we are receiving additional gifts for special expenses involved in opening the building. President Sharp said these funds were donated to the University as a result of an intensive two-year campaign conducted by a volunteer group headed by Law Dean Emeritus Earl Sneed, and planned and programmed by Vice President David Burr and his staff. President Sharp expressed appreciation to all of them--the 410 donors, those who led in the peer development program, and our own staff--for a successful campaign.

Regent Neustadt announced the appointment of the Committee on the Regents' Awards for Superior Teaching as follows:

Thomas R. Brett, Chairperson
Richard A. Bell
Dee A. Replogle

Faculty Personnel Policy

Regent Brett, Chairperson of the Regents' Academic Affairs Committee, said the Committee recommends approval and he so moved of the Faculty Personnel Policy as incorporated in the agenda for this meeting with three changes which were then enumerated by Interim Provost Morris.

The policy as recommended by the Committee, including the changes explained by Dr. Morris, is as follows:

FACULTY PERSONNEL POLICY

(The numbers at the beginning of each section and within the text refer to the Faculty Handbook numbering)

It is the policy of the University to recognize and implement the functions assigned to it by the State Regents for Higher Education. These functions are teaching, research, continuing education and public service. The responsibility for carrying out this policy is shared by the University Regents, administrative officers, and the general faculty.

3.1 The General Faculty. The General Faculty of the University is composed of all faculty members with regular appointments. The General Faculty does not include faculty members with temporary appointments. (See Section 3.5.3)

All legislative powers of the faculty relative to the University as a whole are vested in the General Faculty. These legislative powers are exercised either directly by the General Faculty or by the Faculty Senates on the Health Sciences Center and the Norman Campus. The Faculty Senates are responsible to the General Faculty for all action taken in its behalf.

Additional policies related to the General Faculty and the Faculty Senates are contained in the Charters of the General Faculty and Faculty Senates of the University of Oklahoma on the Health Sciences Center and the Norman campuses.

3.2 Academic Freedom and Responsibility

3.2.1 Academic Freedom. The 1940 Statement of Principles on Academic Freedom and Tenure of the American Association of University Professors has long been recognized as providing valuable and authoritative guidelines for policy and practice in American colleges and universities. The section on academic freedom below is essentially a restatement of these principles, with some modification and extension consistent with their intent and with later declarations by the Association. In the formulation that follows, these principles have been adopted as University policy by the Regents of the University of Oklahoma.

(a) Faculty members are entitled to full freedom in research and publication, subject to any restrictions set by law or by applicable codes of professional ethics, and subject to adequate performance of their other academic duties and to stated University policy on outside employment; but, except under conditions of national emergency, a faculty member should not undertake to do research on University time or using University facilities or funds under any agreement which would (except for a definitely and reasonably limited time) prohibit open communication of the results.

(b) Faculty members are entitled to freedom in the classroom in discussing their subject, but it is inappropriate for a teacher persistently to intrude material which has no relation to the subject of instruction.

(c) As members of the community, university teachers have the rights and obligations of any citizen. They measure the urgency of these obligations in the light of their responsibilities to their subject, to their students, to their profession, and to their institution. In speaking or acting as private persons, faculty members avoid creating the impression of speaking or acting for their college or university. As a citizen engaged in a profession that depends upon freedom for its health and integrity, the university teacher has a particular obligation to promote conditions of free inquiry and to further public understanding of academic freedom.

(d) As citizens, university teachers should be free to engage in political activities consistent with their obligations as teachers and scholars. Some activities, such as seeking election to an office for which extensive campaigning is not required, or service in a part-time political office, may be consistent with effective service as a member of the faculty. More extended or intensive activity may require that the faculty member request a leave of absence. A leave of absence incident to political activity should come under the normal rules and practices respecting leaves of absence; and it should not affect the tenure status of a faculty member, except that time spent on such leave does not count as probationary service.

(e) Freedom of access to recorded knowledge being essential to learning and research in a democracy, the right and the obligation of the university to provide a full range of materials on any subject, even though some views might be currently unpopular or controversial, or appear incorrect, shall not be infringed. The principles of academic freedom shall apply to the presence of materials and also to those who provide and those who use them.

(f) The University of Oklahoma endorses the 1957 declaration of the American Association of University Professors which "...asserts the right of college and university students to listen to anyone whom they wish to hear... affirms its own belief that it is educationally desirable that students be confronted with diverse opinions of all kinds, (and) therefore, holds that any person who is presented by a recognized student or faculty organization should be allowed to speak on a college or university campus." Duly constituted organizations at the University of Oklahoma may invite speakers without fear of sanctions. However, in the exercise of these rights, it is clearly recognized that:

"Membership in the academic community imposes on students, faculty members, administrators, and trustees an obligation to respect the dignity of others, to acknowledge their right to express differing opinions, and to foster and defend intellectual honesty, freedom of inquiry and instruction, and free expression on and off the campus. The expression of dissent and the attempt

to produce change, therefore, may not be carried out in ways which injure individuals or damage institutional facilities or disrupt the classes of one's teachers or colleagues. Speakers on campus must not only be protected from violence but must be given an opportunity to be heard. Those who seek to call attention to grievances must not do so in ways that significantly impede the functions of the institution." (1970 declaration of the AAUP Council)

3.2.2 Academic Responsibility. The concept of academic freedom shall be accompanied by an equally demanding concept of academic responsibility. Nothing in the following statement is intended to abridge in any way the principles and procedures advanced in the 1940 Statement of Principles on Academic Freedom and Tenure of the American Association of University Professors. This statement is derived in substantial measure from the AAUP 1966 Statement on Professional Ethics.

Faculty members have responsibilities to their students. They shall encourage in students the free pursuit of learning and independence of mind, while holding before them the highest scholarly and professional standards. Faculty members shall show respect for the student as an individual and adhere to their proper role as intellectual guides and counselors. They shall endeavor to define the objectives of their courses and to devote their teaching to the realization of those objectives; this requires judicious use of controversial material and an avoidance of material which has no relationship to the objectives of a course. Faculty members shall make every reasonable effort to foster honest academic conduct and to assure that their evaluations reflect, as nearly as possible, the true merit of the performance of their students, regardless of their race, creed, sex or political beliefs. Faculty members shall avoid any exploitation of students for private advantage and acknowledge significant assistance from them.

Faculty members have responsibilities to their colleagues, deriving from common membership in a community of scholars. They shall respect and defend the free inquiry of their associates. In the exchange of criticism and ideas, they should show due respect for the opinions of others. They shall acknowledge their academic debts and strive to be objective in the professional judgment of their colleagues. Although service must be voluntary, faculty members should accept a reasonable share of the responsibility for the governance of their institution. If driven by his or her conscience into dissent, the faculty member shall take care that this dissent does not interfere with the rights of colleagues and students to study, research, and teach.

Faculty members have responsibilities to their discipline and to the advancement of knowledge generally. Their primary obligation in this respect is to seek and to state the truth as they see it. To this end, they shall devote their energies to developing and improving their scholarly competence. They shall exercise critical self-discipline and judgment in using, extending, and transmitting knowledge, and they shall practice intellectual honesty.

Faculty members have responsibilities to the educational institution in which they work. While maintaining their right to criticize and to seek revisions, they shall observe the stated regulations of the institution, provided these do not contravene academic freedom. Faculty members shall determine the amount and character of the work they do outside their institution with due regard to their paramount responsibilities within it. When considering the interruption or termination of his or her service, the faculty member recognizes the effect of such a decision upon the program of the institution and gives due notice of the decision.

3.3 Faculty Accountability. A faculty member is held accountable for his or her performance in fulfilling faculty duties (Section 3.6) and in meeting the requirements of academic responsibility (Section 3.2). The most immediate agents of faculty accountability are the faculty member's chair or director and Committee A, who should maintain close and regular communication with the faculty member. Among the various mechanisms for ensuring faculty accountability, the most important include annual evaluations for possible salary increases, and such periodic evaluations as those for advancement in rank. These processes have the primary function of identifying meritorious performance to be rewarded, but they also provide a means by which the University may strengthen itself, by identifying needs for improved performance.

Meritorious and responsible faculty performance is first and foremost an individual professional obligation. But it is also the product of a cooperative effort by faculty members and administrative officers--assisting one another, informing one another, jointly seeking to assure that each faculty member's capabilities are developed fully and creatively. Performance that is lacking in merit or responsibility, when identified, is a challenge both to the individual and to the academic unit and its leaders, in their exercise of the unit's career development responsibilities. Just as faculty members are held accountable for their performance, administrators of academic units are held accountable for their leadership in the career development of the faculty in their units.

Counseling, career development support, and other kinds of administrative remedies are available to academic units in their normal operations, as a means of attempting to rectify poor professional performance or breaches of academic responsibility.

If normal administrative remedies fail to correct a faculty member's poor professional performance or breach of academic responsibility, the President may consider applying a minor sanction, such as a formal reprimand. Prior to any such action, the President should have consulted fully with the appropriate administrative officers.

For those cases where they are needed, the University has at its disposal the more drastic measures of severe sanctions, dismissal, and abrogation of tenure (See Section 3.8).

3.4 Fiscal Responsibility. In each case where tenure is awarded there must be assurance that continuing financial support can reasonably be anticipated. The President of the University, or his or her designee, shall determine annually which sources and amounts of funds are sufficiently secure to support the University's tenure awards and what portion of those funds are to be available to each academic dean for tenure awards within the colleges.

3.5 Appointments. Any regular appointment to an academic position must be either a term appointment (beginning and terminating at a specified date) or a continuous appointment (beginning with and following the granting of tenure). Temporary appointments with remuneration are also for specified periods.

For the faculty on the Health Sciences Center campus, the following three paragraphs shall also apply:

(a) Full-time faculty appointment with unqualified academic title (Instructor, Assistant Professor, Associate Professor, and Professor) shall be limited to those faculty who devote their full-time professional effort to direct University activities (See Section 3.6) and who are compensated by the University or University-approved sources.*

(b) When service to the University (defined in Sections 3.6.3, 3.6.4, and 3.6.5) is used as a basis for full-time academic appointment, teaching, research, and/or administration of academic units must constitute a major part of the faculty member's assigned duties.

(c) Faculty who devote less than their full-time professional effort to direct University activities as defined above shall be eligible for faculty appointment with a modified academic title (Visiting, Adjunct, Clinical, etc.).

3.5.1 Appointment of New Faculty. In the appointment of new faculty, action is initiated by the academic unit through the respective dean to the Provost, President, and in accord with the prevailing policies of the Board of Regents. The University follows the law of the land regarding affirmative action.

(a) Official Offer - The formal offer of appointment must come from the Provost or the President. The offer will include the statement that the appointment is contingent upon the approval of the University Regents. Enclosed with the formal offer of rank and salary will be a copy of the Faculty Handbook, together with supplementary information on such matters as retirement, group insurance, and patents.

(b) Contract - If the appointment is approved by the Regents, a Contract of Employment will be furnished to the applicant for signature if the

* Institutions with which the University has an affiliation agreement.

appointment is accepted. Included in this contract will be the approved rank and salary and a statement indicating that the applicant has read the Faculty Handbook along with the necessary additions to reflect policies current at the time of appointment and accepts appointment in accord with the policies specified, with the understanding that policies of the University are subject to change by the Board of Regents. (See also par. (a), Section 3.7.3).

3.5.2 Appointment Period. Faculty appointments for the academic year are made for the period September 1 through May 31, though the instructional period may not correspond precisely to these dates. It is the responsibility of the appropriate chair or dean to notify each faculty member of the date the faculty member is expected to start work. The appointment period for the first semester ends January 15, even though the semester may end at a different time.

Some faculty members on the Norman campus and most faculty on the Health Sciences Center campus are appointed on a 12-month basis, for the period July 1 through June 30.

Summer session appointments for the regular eight-week period are effective June 1 through July 31. Again, the appointment period does not coincide exactly with the instructional period.

3.5.3 Term, Continuous, and Temporary Appointments. Faculty appointments may be term, continuous, or temporary. Prior to the awarding of tenure all full-time faculty appointments with the title of assistant professor, associate professor, and professor are term appointments; following the award of tenure, such appointments are continuous.

For simplicity, the term "regular appointment" is employed to refer to those appointments which are either full-time term appointments or continuous appointments at the above specified academic ranks.

All other academic appointments are temporary, and are indicated by other titles, such as instructor, lecturer, preceptor, or by the use of such adjectives as visiting, adjunct, clinical, or acting. Persons holding temporary appointments are not eligible for tenure and their contracts shall so specify.

Those appointed full-time to a temporary rank may serve a maximum of seven years in this rank, after which any additional appointment must be regular.

3.5.4 Joint Appointments. Appointments between two or more academic units or colleges are not only possible but are encouraged when they benefit the University, provided they (a) do not total more than 1.0 Full-time Equivalent (FTE) and (b) are approved by all the units and colleges involved. Such appointments must have the approval of the appropriate administrative officials of all units involved.

Before a faculty member first receives a joint appointment, the appropriate academic units must mutually determine and record in writing, and secure administrative approval for, all conditions of the appointment pertaining to such matters as probationary period, criteria for tenure and promotion, and procedures for recommending salary increases and reappointment or non-reappointment. The appointee shall receive a copy of this agreement.

In the case of faculty members holding a joint appointment, one academic unit and college shall have primary responsibility for promotion and tenure.

3.5.5 Part-Time Appointments. A part-time appointment is one at less than 1.0 Full-Time Equivalent (FTE). At the time of any part-time appointment, the appointee and the University must reach a clear understanding of the terms of the appointment.

3.5.6 Reappointment and Non-Reappointment. Action on the reappointment of term appointees is initiated by the academic unit through the respective dean to the Provost, President, and Board of Regents. Any final decision not to reappoint a faculty member is determined by the Board of Regents.

3.5.7 Notifications of Expiration of Term Contract

(a) A faculty member with a regular appointment who is not to be reappointed for a second year of service must be so notified no later than March 1; or, if the first year of appointment terminates at a time other than the end of the academic year, not less than three months before the end of the appointment period.

(b) A faculty member with a regular appointment who is not to be reappointed to a third year of service must be so notified no later than December 15 of the second year of appointment; or, if the second year of appointment terminates at a time other than the end of the academic year, not less than six months before the end of the appointment period.

(c) A faculty member with a regular appointment who is not to be reappointed to a fourth or subsequent year of service must be so notified no later than May 31 of the year preceding the final year of appointment; or, in the case of an appointment ending at a time other than the end of the academic year, not less than twelve months before the end of the appointment period.

(d) All notifications of non-reappointment shall be given in writing by the President of the University.

(e) If the notification practices prescribed in the foregoing paragraphs of this section are not followed, the faculty member may appeal to the Faculty Appeals Board.

3.5.8 Resignation. A faculty member who elects to resign his or her appointment at the end of an academic year is obligated to give notice

in writing at the earliest possible opportunity, but not later than May 15, or thirty days after receiving notification of the terms of his or her appointment for the coming year, whichever date is the later. A faculty member may request a waiver of this requirement.

3.6 Professional Activities of the Faculty. Above all else, the University exists for learning and scholarship of a breadth and depth that result in excellence in all of the University's major functions: teaching, research, continuing education, and service. Each academic unit has an obligation to contribute to each of the four functions of the University. Faculty members play a central role in the realization of these functions and fulfill the obligations of the academic unit by contributing their unique expertise and competence. Decisions regarding tenure, promotions, and salary increases are based upon an assessment of the faculty member's performance and contributions to the total mission of the University (See Sections 3.7.4, 3.10, and 3.11).

3.6.1 Teaching. Teaching, which is the transmission of knowledge and cultural values, focuses upon helping students to learn. As a part of its mission, the University is dedicated to undergraduate, graduate, and continuing education. The term teaching as used here includes, but is not restricted to, giving regularly scheduled instruction, directing graduate work, and counseling and advising students. This includes the direction or supervision of students in reading, research, internships, or fellowships. Faculty supervision or guidance of students in recognized academic pursuits that confer no University credit should also be considered as teaching. Faculty performing non-administrative professional duties for which they are employed shall be regarded as engaged in teaching when the clear and direct purpose and function of these activities are academic instruction. Professional librarians in the discharge of their professional duties shall be regarded as engaged in teaching.

3.6.2 Research or Creative Achievement. Research, which is the development and validation of new knowledge, focuses upon faculty participation in the extension of knowledge and maintenance of professional development and vitality. The term research as used here is understood to mean systematic, original investigation directed toward the enlargement of human knowledge or the solution of contemporary problems. Creative achievement is understood to mean significantly original or imaginative accomplishment in literature, the arts, or the professions. The criteria for judging the original or imaginative nature of research or creative accomplishments must be the generally accepted standards prevailing in the applicable discipline or professional area. To qualify as research or creative achievement, the results of the endeavor must be disseminated and subject to critical peer evaluation in a manner appropriate to the field in question.

3.6.3 Professional Service. Service, which is the application of knowledge gained through research or creative achievement, focuses upon

resolving contemporary problems, identifying new areas for inquiry and development, and sharing knowledge with the larger community. The term professional service always refers to activities directly related to the faculty member's discipline or profession. Included in professional services are such activities as artistic or humanistic presentations; official service in relevant professional societies; service on local, state, national, or international commissions, advisory boards, or agencies, public or private, related to the faculty member's discipline or profession; service to professional communities outside the University; health care delivery; consultation; participation in a specialized professional capacity in programs sponsored by student, faculty, or community groups; editing professional journals or other publications; book reviews in professional journals; refereeing of research papers submitted for publication; and service within the University that reflects an application of specialized knowledge or skill to the institution's affairs.

3.6.4 Participation in University Governance. The nature of the academic enterprise is such that the faculty properly shares in responsibilities involving formulation of the University's policies. The faculty has a major responsibility in making and carrying out decisions affecting the educational and scholarly life of the University. Faculty members have a responsibility to contribute to the government of the University through timely participation on committees, councils, or other advisory groups at the department, college, or University level.

3.6.5 Other Faculty Activities. Other areas of activity in which faculty members may have assignments include:

Administration. Many faculty members are called upon to perform administrative tasks. These include service in such positions as department chair, associate or assistant dean, or director of a program or special center.

Public Relations. On occasion, the University's interests are served by faculty members requested to perform public relations tasks that might not necessarily involve the faculty member's discipline. These may include participation in a professional capacity in programs sponsored by student, faculty, or community groups; or appearances as a University representative before government bodies or citizen groups.

3.7 Faculty Tenure. Tenure implies a mutual responsibility on the part of the University and the tenured faculty member. In granting tenure to a faculty member, the University makes a commitment to his or her continued employment, subject to certain qualifications (See Section 3.8). The University expects that tenured faculty members will maintain the level of performance by which they initially earned tenure. In those exceptional cases, when it is recommended that a faculty member be permitted to reduce his or her employment to less than full-time and maintain a tenured status, specific regential approval must be granted (See 3.7.2.e).

3.7.1 Definitions

(a) The term tenure means continuous reappointment to an achieved academic rank in accordance with the 1947 action of the Regents of the University of Oklahoma. It is hereinafter understood that tenure must be granted or denied by specific action of the University Regents.

Tenure is designed as a means to protect the academic freedom of faculty members. This is to say, tenure is a means to assure unfettered, unbiased, unencumbered search, verification, and communication of truth by professional scholars and teachers. Tenure is designed to provide faculty members with freedom from political, doctrinaire, and other pressures, restraints, and reprisals which would otherwise inhibit their independent thought and actions in their professional responsibility of search, verification, and communication of truths.

(b) The term probationary period refers to the period of employment in an academic rank prior to the time tenure is granted. Notwithstanding different uses of the term elsewhere (as in some statements of the American Association of University Professors), the probationary period does not include any period of employment following the awarding of tenure.

(c) The term prior service means academic employment at an institution of higher education (including the University of Oklahoma) before the first appointment in the effective probationary period at the University of Oklahoma.

3.7.2 Eligibility for Tenure

(a) For the faculty on the Health Sciences Center Campus, the following shall apply: All faculty of the University who hold a regular rank of assistant professor or above who devote full-time effort to direct University activities (See Section 3.6) are eligible for tenure provided they devote at least 50 percent of their time to teaching and/or research for the University of Oklahoma and maintain this requirement during the entire probationary period.

Research conducted under the auspices of another institution is specifically excluded. Excluded also is participation in educational programs with which the University is affiliated but for which it is not primarily responsible.

(b) For the faculty on the Norman Campus, the following shall apply: All employees of the University who hold a regular full-time academic rank of assistant professor or above are eligible for tenure.

(c) It is understood that a faculty member who has been granted tenure by the University of Oklahoma, and thereafter accepts an administrative post within the University, retains tenured status as a member of the faculty.

(d) When an initial appointment is made to a position which is primarily administrative, but carries with it academic rank of assistant professor or above, specific understanding should be reached at the time of offer with the individual concerned and agreed to in writing by the Provost, the dean, and the academic unit as to whether the individual will be reviewed for tenure at the proper time and what conditions must be met before there is tenure eligibility.

Whenever a regular faculty member during the probationary period assumes primary administrative responsibilities, agreement should be reached in the same manner. Likewise, whenever an administrator is given academic rank at any time following the initial appointment, the same would apply.

(e) It is understood that a faculty member who has been granted tenure by the University of Oklahoma and thereafter changes from a full-time appointment to a volunteer or part-time faculty appointment on other than a temporary basis forfeits tenured status.

3.7.3 Probationary Periods

(a) The "Contract of Employment" furnished to a candidate for appointment to the faculty shall specify, in addition to the rank and salary, the length of the probationary period entailed in the appointment and any special conditions pertaining to the appointment. All such conditions must be set forth in writing by the Provost whenever any faculty appointment is offered.

(b) The probationary period for a faculty member whose effective date of appointment is later than the start of the academic year but no later than the first day of the second semester will be considered as dating from the beginning of the first semester, provided that the department or division in question records in writing its prior agreement to such an arrangement. If the effective date of appointment is later than the first day of the second semester, the probationary period shall begin with the first semester of the next academic year.

(c) For a faculty member who is eligible for tenure, and whose initial appointment is at the rank of assistant professor or associate professor, the probationary period shall be six academic years, or twelve regular semesters, except in cases noted below in paragraph (d). Included in the probationary period is prior full-time service (up to a maximum of three years) in professorial ranks at other institutions of higher education. Included also is prior regular, full-time service (up to a maximum of three years) which the appointee may have performed in the past at the University of Oklahoma in the rank of instructor or above. Prior full-time service as instructor or in a comparable non-professional rank at other institutions of higher education, and prior full-time service on temporary appointments at the University of Oklahoma will be counted as part of the probationary period if this arrangement is agreed upon in writing at the time of the first regular appointment. The parties to such an agreement are the appointee, academic unit, dean, and Provost.

(d) In certain unusual cases tenure may be awarded to faculty members of extraordinarily high merit prior to the end of the sixth probationary year. Any academic unit's recommendation to award tenure before the end of the usual probationary period should be accompanied by an accounting of compelling reasons for this action. If the University's decision at that time is not to confer tenure, however, the faculty member in question may, subject to continuation or renewal of contract, continue to serve in the probationary period, and be considered for tenure again without prejudice.

(e) A new faculty member appointed at the rank of professor or associate professor may be given tenure from the date of appointment, or the probationary period may be set at two, three, or four years, when prior service in a professorial rank at another institution is less than three years. Persons with three or more years of such prior service may have a probationary period of no more than three years. The probationary period's length shall be set by the tenured members of the appointee's academic unit, subject to agreement by the dean and Provost, at the time of offer. If a majority of the unit's tenured faculty members favor tenure upon appointment, the determination of tenure shall be made in the regular fashion, as specified in Section 3.7.5.

(f) Whenever an untenured part-time faculty member converts from part-time to full-time, with the rank of Assistant Professor or above, specific written understanding must be approved by the Provost as to how the period of part-time service will be counted toward satisfying the probationary period for tenure.

(g) A maximum of one year of leave of absence without pay may be counted as part of the probationary period, provided the department or division in question records in writing its prior agreement and secures administrative approval. Leaves of absence without pay counted as part of the probationary period must entail appropriate evaluation of professional activities carried out during the leave.

(h) During the probationary period, a faculty member will be provided by the Chair of the academic unit with an annual, written evaluation of performance. Such annual evaluation shall be provided prior to the applicable notification deadline for reappointment, with a copy sent to the dean.

(i) A faculty member at any rank who is denied tenure shall be retained on the faculty until the end of the academic year following that in which there was notification of the denial, unless there are reasons (under Section 3.8) to the contrary.

(j) Faculty members accorded tenure will normally commence their continuous appointments in the academic year immediately following the Regents' action.

3.7.4 Criteria for the Tenure Decision. The choices that the University makes in granting tenure are crucial to its endeavors toward academic excellence. A decision to grant tenure must reflect an assessment of

high professional competence and performance measured against national standards. Tenure should never be regarded as a routine award.

The tenure decision shall be based on a thorough evaluation of the candidate's total contribution to the mission of the University. While specific responsibilities of faculty members may vary because of special assignments or because of the particular mission of an academic unit, all evaluations for tenure shall address the manner in which each candidate has performed in:

- (1) Teaching (See Section 3.6.1)
- (2) Research or Creative Achievement (See Section 3.6.2)
- (3) Professional Service (See Section 3.6.3)
- (4) University Service (See Sections 3.6.4 and 3.6.5)

Above all else, it is essential to any recommendation that tenure be granted that the faculty member has clearly demonstrated scholarly attainment, primarily but not exclusively through teaching and research or creative achievement.

Each academic unit, with the participation and approval of the dean and the Provost, shall establish and publish specific criteria for evaluating faculty performance in that unit, so long as those criteria are in accord with this policy.

In those cases, in which specific assignments might limit the faculty member's involvement in any area of faculty responsibility, a written understanding to this effect should be filed in the Provost's office, approved by the dean and the chair of the academic unit at the time the assignment is made.

The award of tenure carries with it the expectation that the University shall continue to need the services the faculty member is capable of performing and that the financial resources are expected to be available for continuous employment. It also carries the expectation that the faculty member will maintain or improve upon the level of attainment which characterized the qualifications for tenure.

3.7.5 Procedures for the Tenure Decision

(a) A faculty member who is eligible for tenure consideration should be notified by the chair of the academic unit at least five weeks before the initial vote by the faculty member's colleagues (see f below).

(b) At the time of notification, the candidate for tenure shall be requested to submit material which will be helpful to an adequate consideration of the faculty member's performance or professional activities in relationship to the tenure criteria. The candidate should be advised to consult

with the chair or any other senior colleagues concerning the materials to include. It should be made clear, however, that responsibility for the contents resides with the candidate.

(c) The chair should be responsible for providing copies of the candidate's material to each of the voting members of the academic unit and one for the Provost. Copies of the candidate's material should be distributed to the faculty of the academic unit at least two weeks prior to the vote. The Provost's copy should be forwarded through the deans with the academic unit's recommendation forms.

(d) Preceding the vote, all tenured faculty voters who are available shall meet for a discussion of the candidate's qualifications for tenure. It is assumed that the eligible voters will have studied the candidate's materials prior to the meeting.

(e) The candidate should not be present during the discussion of his or her qualifications. The candidate should be available, however, to enter the meeting on invitation to answer questions or clarify circumstances relevant to the qualifications.

(f) Formal consideration for tenure shall originate with the polling by secret ballot of all tenured members of the candidate's academic unit, including when practical those who are on leave of absence. If it is proposed to consider a tenure recommendation prior to the candidate's sixth probationary year, the tenured members of the unit shall hold a preliminary vote on whether or not to do so, and consideration of early tenure will proceed only if a majority of tenured faculty members favor such consideration. Subsequently, in any formal poll of tenured faculty taken prior to the candidate's sixth probationary year, no tenure recommendation will be forwarded unless a majority of those polled favor granting tenure. Whatever the result of the faculty poll taken during the sixth probationary year, it will be forwarded. In all cases, the result of the vote must accompany the recommendation.

(g) The chair shall submit a separate recommendation with supporting reasons.

(h) While primary responsibility for gathering complete information on professional activity rests with the individual faculty member, the chair should assume a share of this responsibility to be certain that all tenure recommendations are initiated on the basis of full documentation, which must be considered by any person or group making a recommendation.

(i) All recommendations shall be in writing and, with the exception of the faculty recommendation resulting from the secret poll, reasons for the recommendations must be stated. At the time recommendations are made at any stage of the review process, notification of such recommendations must be provided the chair and the individual candidate. It shall be the responsibility of the chair to inform the faculty of the unit about recommendations made at the various stages of the review process.

(j) Copies of the academic unit recommendation will be forwarded separately to the appropriate dean and to one of the Campus Tenure Committees (Health Sciences Center Campus or Norman Campus). The Campus Tenure Committee and the dean will attach their recommendations to the tenure materials and separately forward all materials to the Provost.

(k) The main purpose of the Campus Tenure Committee is to provide faculty advice on whether or not the academic unit's recommendation with regard to both substance and process is sustained by the accompanying documentation and is consistent with the approved tenure criteria (Section 3.7.4). If defects are found in either of these particulars, the recommendation will be returned to the academic unit for remedy or correction.

(l) The Campus Tenure Committee will be composed of nine tenured faculty members on staggered three-year terms selected by the President from nominations from the Faculty Senate.

(m) In determining its recommendation the Tenure Committee may request information or advice from any person. Committee members from the originating academic unit of a case under consideration will absent themselves from discussions regarding that case.

(n) The existence of the Campus Tenure Committee in no way limits the right of administrative officers to solicit advice from faculty members in determining their recommendations.

(o) In any tenure case where the President plans to submit to the Regents a recommendation contrary to that of the Campus Tenure Committee, the President shall so notify the Tenure Committee, allowing sufficient time and opportunity for the President and the Committee mutually to conduct a thorough discussion of the case before the President presents a final recommendation to the Regents.

(p) At any stage of the tenure review process, the concerned faculty member may appeal to the Faculty Appeals Board if it is believed that procedural violations have occurred in the case or that violations of academic freedom have occurred. If it is believed that there has been discrimination on the basis of race, sex, age, creed, or ethnic or national origin, the faculty member may appeal to the Committee on Discrimination. Such appeals must be made within 14 days after discovery of the alleged violation, and the review process will be suspended until a resolution is effected. Such an appeal shall not have the effect of extending the faculty member's terminal year, should tenure be denied.

(q) The President will notify each faculty member by May 31 of whether or not tenure has been granted, except when appeals make this impossible.

3.8 Abrogation of Tenure, Dismissal before Expiration of a Term Appointment, and Severe Sanctions. The University strives to exercise great care in selecting its faculty appointees and to confer tenure only upon those faculty members who have demonstrated their merit for continuous appointment.

For that reason, a dismissal proceeding involving a tenured faculty member or of a faculty member during the term of an appointment will be an exceptional event. It is also recognized, however, that a few faculty members may, from time to time, be guilty of offenses of lesser gravity which require sanctions short of dismissal. Such sanctions may include loss of prospective benefits for a stated period (for instance, loss of eligibility for a sabbatical leave of absence, loss of remunerated consultative privileges, loss of remunerated private practice privileges, etc.); restitution (payment of damages due to individuals or to the institution); a fine; a reduction in salary; or suspension from service for a stated period, without other prejudice. As in the case of dismissal, the imposition of severe sanctions short of dismissal should be viewed as a serious and infrequent step usually undertaken only after administrative remedies and minor sanctions have failed.

While extreme action will be required infrequently, the University must be prepared for such an eventuality, so that both the integrity of the University and the rights of the faculty member may be preserved. Toward this end, the faculty must be willing to recommend sanctions upon or dismissal of a colleague when necessary. By the same token, the President and the Regents shall give all reasonable consideration to faculty judgments.

Only the Board of Regents has the power to impose severe sanctions or to dismiss a faculty member who has tenure or one whose term appointment has not expired. It is the University's policy that the Regents shall exercise this power only in cases where they determine that there exists sufficient cause for such action, or when there exists a demonstrably bona fide condition of financial exigency requiring termination of a continuous appointment.

3.8.1 Termination of Continuous Appointment on Grounds of Financial Exigency. (Recommendations on this aspect of policy will be forthcoming from the Faculty Senate ad hoc Committee on Retrenchment.)

3.8.2 Grounds for Abrogation of Tenure, Dismissal, and Severe Sanctions. A faculty member against whom the imposition of a severe sanction is to be brought, or whose dismissal is to be requested, must have given such cause for the action as relates directly and substantially to his or her professional capabilities or performance. It is not possible to specify all proper grounds for these drastic measures. Proper reasons for dismissal of a faculty member who has tenure or whose term appointment has not expired include the following:

- (a) Professional incompetence or dishonesty;
- (b) Substantial, manifest, or repeated failure to fulfill professional duties or responsibilities;
- (c) Personal behavior preventing the faculty member from satisfactory fulfillment of professional duties or responsibilities;

(d) Serious violations of law which are admitted or proved before a competent court, preventing the faculty member from satisfactory fulfillment of professional duties or responsibilities, or violations of a court order, when such order relates to the faculty member's proper performance of professional responsibilities.

(e) Changes in the University's educational function through action of the Regents of the University and/or the State Regents for Higher Education which results in the elimination of an academic unit. In such instances the University will make every reasonable effort to reassign affected faculty members to positions for which they are properly qualified before dismissal results from such elimination.

3.8.3 Grounds for Summary Suspension. Suspension of a faculty member or assignment to other duties in lieu of suspension is justified only if immediate harm to the faculty member or to others is threatened by that person's continued performance of regular duties. The faculty member may on request, be relieved of some or all professional duties if this is necessary to provide time for the preparation of a defense. Summary suspension does not remove from the University the obligation to provide due process within a reasonable period of time following action.

3.8.4 Initial Procedures

(a) When reason arises to question the fitness of a faculty member who has tenure, or whose term appointment has not expired, or whose conduct may warrant the imposition of a severe sanction, the appropriate administrative officer(s) shall ordinarily discuss the matter with the faculty member in personal conference, at which time the matter may be terminated by mutual consent. If a mutually acceptable result is not forthcoming, and if the President decides that there still is reason to question the faculty member's fitness or professional behavior, the President shall so inform the Chair of the Faculty Appeals Board (See Section 3.8.5).

The Chair shall then, following consultation with the individual, academic unit(s), and administrators concerned, and acting with the advice of the Faculty Appeals Board, appoint an ad hoc Committee of Inquiry composed of five members of the Faculty Appeals Board. The Committee of Inquiry shall informally and confidentially inquire into the situation to effect a possible adjustment. If they fail in this, the Committee of Inquiry shall advise the President whether in its view formal proceedings should be instituted.

(b) If the Committee of Inquiry recommends formal proceedings, or if the President favors such proceedings despite a contrary recommendation from the Committee, the President or the President's delegate shall frame with reasonable particularity a statement of charges. The President may ask the aid or advice of the Committee of Inquiry in framing the charges.

(c) The faculty member in question shall then be informed in writing by the President of the commencement of formal dismissal or sanction proceedings and of the alleged grounds for the proposed action. The hearing shall take place before the FACULTY HEARING COMMITTEE, consisting of seven members chosen by lot from the Faculty Appeals Board.

3.8.5 The Faculty Appeals Board

(a) The Faculty Appeals Board is a standing body which responds to matters of tenure abrogation, dismissal, severe sanctions, alleged violations of academic freedom or academic due process, and other grievances unresolved through administrative procedures. Because of the extraordinary importance and the range of such issues, the Faculty Appeals Board shall be empowered to appoint ad hoc hearing committees to assist in the conduct of its affairs. The Faculty Appeals Board considers all matters brought before it by individual faculty members, academic units, or administrative units, or other duly constituted bodies within the University community.

(b) The Faculty Appeals Board of the Health Sciences Center shall consist of twenty (20) members representing fairly the existing colleges on the Health Sciences Center Campus. The members shall be elected from among all full-time faculty whose duties are primarily non-administrative. For the first Board, six (6) members shall be selected for a two-year term; six (6) for a three-year term; and eight (8) for a four-year term. Thereafter, all terms shall be for four years.

(c) The Faculty Appeals Board on the Norman Campus shall consist of forty (40) members, ten of whom shall be elected each year for four-year terms by the Faculty Senate from among all full-time tenured faculty whose duties are primarily non-administrative.

(d) Each Faculty Appeals Board shall annually elect its own chair from among those whose terms are nearest expiration. Membership on the Board is not a disqualification for service on University Councils.

All members of the Board are eligible for re-election. Terms of service shall begin July 1 and end June 30 except that, if a hearing is in progress at this time, any retiring member of the Board who is on the Hearing Committee shall be continued on the Committee until the case in process is closed.

If a member of the Board ceases to be a full-time member of the faculty, or if his or her duties become primarily administrative, the Senate shall elect a replacement to complete the term; but if the change in the Board member's status occurs while serving on a Hearing Committee, the remainder of the Board shall decide by a majority vote whether he or she shall continue to serve on the Hearing Committee until the conclusion of the case or shall be replaced by another member of the Board chosen by the procedure prescribed in the next paragraph for the original selection of the Committee.

3.8.6 Formal Procedure

(a) The Chair of the Faculty Appeals Board, upon notification of impending proceedings by the President, shall select seven members of the Board to constitute the Hearing Committee for these proceedings. These shall be selected from the entire membership of the Board, unless another hearing is in progress, in which case the selection may be made from the members not involved in that hearing. The selection of the Hearing Committee shall be by lot, and it shall be made in the presence of the Chair of the Senate or a designated representative, and a representative of the University administration; the respondent in the hearing shall also be invited to be present or to send a representative.

(b) Any member of the Faculty Appeals Board selected to serve on a Hearing Committee who is a member of the same academic unit or related by consanguinity or affinity to the respondent or to an administrative officer who is a complainant in the case shall be disqualified from serving on the Committee.

(c) The Complainant and the respondent in the case may each by written request to the Chair of the Faculty Appeals Board, ask that a member or members of the Hearing Committee be disqualified on grounds of bias or personal interest in the case.

(d) A member of the Hearing Committee may disqualify himself or herself on personal initiative or in response to such challenge for cause as is provided for in the immediately preceding paragraph. If, however, a challenge for cause is disputed, the whole Faculty Appeals Board (including the members selected for the Hearing Committee, except for those challenged) shall decide by majority vote whether cause has been shown.

(e) The complainant and the respondent, additionally, shall each have a maximum of two peremptory challenges of members selected for the Hearing Committee.

(f) Members of a Hearing Committee who have been disqualified, and any members who, by reason of illness or absence from the campus, are unable to serve, shall be replaced immediately by the Chair of the Faculty Appeals Board, and the replacement shall be determined by lot in the manner prescribed for the original selections.

(g) The Hearing Committee shall elect its own chair and set the date of its initial hearing, which shall be not less than twenty nor more than thirty days after the delivery to the respondent of the materials discussed in Section 3.8.7, Handling of Charges.

3.8.7 Handling of Charges. All matters brought to the Faculty Appeals Board shall be handled according to the following procedures, which are designed to insure fairness and academic due process.

(a) At least twenty days before the hearings, the President's Office shall present to the faculty member a written statement embodying:

(1) Relevant legislation of the Faculty Senate, and policies of the President's Office and the Board of Regents.

(2) The charges in the case in full particularity.

(3) A summary of the evidence upon which the charges are based and a first list of witnesses to be called.

(4) A list of the members of the Faculty Appeals Board and of the Hearing Committee selected for the particular case.

(b) The faculty member may select from among his or her colleagues a person to act as advisor, or he or she may select counsel for advice on legal matters. At his or her discretion the faculty member may be assisted by both an advisor and a legal counselor.

(1) The faculty member shall inform the President's Office in writing of the identity of any advisor and/or counsel.

(2) The following procedure assumes that the faculty member will use his or her own judgment in acting upon any advice or deciding when to be represented by counsel.

(c) Faculty members who serve on the Faculty Appeals Board may call on the Office of the Chief Legal Counsel for procedural advice concerning the case in question, but the University's Legal Counsel, depending on the involvement of that office in the proceeding, must determine the most appropriate manner of providing the requested legal advice.

(d) The faculty member shall review the statement tendered by the administration and present a written reply.

(1) The reply shall include any modifications the faculty member may wish to suggest regarding either the charges or the procedures.

(2) The reply shall also indicate the evidence to be used in refutation of the charges and shall include a first list of witnesses to be called.

(e) At this point, the President's Office and the faculty member shall, as completely as possible, arrive at agreement on procedures and the formulation of charges. Communications shall be in writing with copies retained. Oral discussion shall be followed by an exchange of memoranda indicating the understanding which each party has of the conversation.

(f) If the faculty member waives a hearing but denies the charges or asserts that the charges do not support a finding of adequate cause, the Hearing Committee will evaluate all available evidence and rest its recommendation upon the evidence in the record.

3.8.8 Hearing Regulations. The following regulations shall apply to the hearing for a faculty member before the Hearing Committee.

(a) The faculty member shall have the right to be present and to be accompanied by a personal advisor or counsel, or by both, throughout the hearing. The Faculty Appeals Board shall also have the right to have its counsel present throughout the hearing.

(b) The hearing shall be closed unless the faculty member requests it be open. If the hearing is closed, such information and facts as are made public shall be released only by the Hearing Committee, or by permission of the Hearing Committee.

(c) The Committee shall proceed by considering the statement of grounds for grievances already formulated and the faculty member's response written before the time of the hearing. If any facts are in dispute, the testimony of witnesses and other evidence concerning the matter shall be received.

(d) Both parties to the contention shall have the right to present and to examine and cross-examine witnesses.

(e) The President's Office shall make available to the faculty member such authority as it possesses to require the presence of witnesses, and it shall bear any reasonable cost attendant upon the appearance of witnesses at the hearing.

(f) The principle of confrontation shall apply throughout the hearing.

(g) A full transcript shall be taken at the hearing; it shall be made available in identical form and at the same time to the Hearing Committee, the President's Office and the faculty member.

(h) The full text of the findings and the conclusions of the Hearing Committee shall be made available in identical form and at the same time to the President's Office and the faculty member. The full cost shall be borne by the University.

(i) The Committee may proceed to decision without having the record of the hearings transcribed; or it may await the availability of a transcript of the hearings if it feels its decision would be aided thereby.

(j) The President may attend the hearing and may designate a representative to assist in developing the case.

3.8.9 Disposition of Charges. The President shall transmit to the Board of Regents the full record of the hearing and the conclusions and recommendations of the Hearing Committee, together with presidential recommendations. If the Board of Regents is disinclined to sustain the decisions of the

Hearing Committee, it may return the proceedings to the latter, specifying its objections. In this event, the Hearing Committee shall reconsider, taking account of the stated objections, receiving new evidence and testimony if necessary, and reporting its final conclusions to the President for transmittal to the Board of Regents as before. The work of the Hearing Committee is finished when the President communicates the final decision of the Regents to the respondent and to the chairs of the faculty groups involved.

In the event that the Board of Regents chooses to review the case itself, its review shall be based on the record of the formal hearings, plus additional information which they wish to consider, accompanied by the opportunity for written argument by the principals in the case or their representatives. Oral arguments will be presented only upon request by the Regents.

The full transcript of the hearings shall finally be deposited in the office of the Executive Secretary of the Board of Regents. Any copies or excerpts made from it after the completion of the Committee's work shall be done at the expense of the party to the case so desiring.

3.9 Appeals and Grievances. If in the course of performing professional duties or in the process of being considered or evaluated for recommendations regarding reappointment, salary increase, promotion, tenure, or other personnel decisions, a faculty member has reason to believe there has been unjust discrimination, violation of due process or academic freedom, or if there are other grievances which have not been resolved administratively, the faculty member may seek redress through the appropriate grievance procedure.

3.9.1 Alleged Discrimination. The University has a policy of internal adjudication in matters relating to alleged discrimination. Any faculty member, including those on temporary or part-time appointment, who believes that he or she has been discriminated against because of race, ethnic or national origin, sex, creed, color, or age should give the University's Affirmative Action Officer a written account of the alleged act of discrimination, no later than twenty days after becoming aware of its occurrence. The Affirmative Action Officer shall investigate the alleged discriminatory act, and attempt to effect an informal settlement between the parties involved.

In the absence of such a settlement, the complainant may submit to the President of the University a written request that hearings be held on the grievance, enlisting the aid of the Affirmative Action Officer in setting out the request, if this is desirable. If the President, after informal discussion of the matter with the parties involved and the Affirmative Action Officer, is unable to bring about a resolution of the matter satisfactory to all parties, the President shall notify in writing the Chair of the COMMITTEE ON DISCRIMINATION. The Chair shall convene the Committee for an informal discussion of the grievance and a decision as to whether there exist adequate grounds for a formal hearing. The parties involved, the Affirmative Action Officer and the President or his or her representative shall be present.

(a) The Committee on Discrimination on each campus shall consist of nine members, three of whom shall be elected each year for three-year terms by the Faculty Senate. The Senate in selecting members should be sensitive to the purpose of the Committee and to the need for representation on the Committee of both sexes, of ethnic minority groups, and various academic ranks. The Committee shall elect its own Chair annually from among those members whose terms are nearest expiration. The initial committee shall be elected to consist of nine members to staggered terms: three members for three-year terms, three members for two-year terms, and three members for one-year terms.

(b) Within three weeks of receiving notification, the Committee on Discrimination shall conduct the above-mentioned informal discussion of the grievance. At all meetings, each party may be accompanied and/or represented by an advisor. However, participation of legal counsel shall be considered inadvisable for so long as the case remains a matter of internal University adjudication.

(c) If the Committee decides at its informal hearing that there is no basis for formal proceedings, it shall remand the matter in writing to the President with a copy to the Affirmative Action Officer. The President shall render his or her decision on the matter in writing to each of the parties involved in the informal proceedings.

(d) In the event of a formal hearing, the Committee shall invite the parties to the grievance to present their arguments. The advisor to either party in the case shall be permitted to act in his or her stead. Hearings shall be closed unless the complainant or respondent requests that they be open.

Members of the Committee, and the parties directly involved and/or their advisors, may call witnesses, present statements, and ask questions of one another and of the witnesses. The principle of confrontation shall apply.

The Committee shall have access, within legal limitations, to all relevant documents and other materials, but shall consider as evidence only those materials to which all parties to the dispute have been afforded access.

At any point in the proceedings, the complainant may withdraw the charge. The grounds for the alleged grievance, however, may not be changed after the informal conference involving the Affirmative Action Officer and the parties to the complaint.

The administration shall bear the cost attendant upon the appearance of witnesses and the preparation of transcripts of the hearings and shall use such authority as it possesses to require the presence of witnesses.

The Committee shall complete its hearings and submit its report to the President, with copies to the parties directly involved and to the Affirmative Action Officer, within sixty days of receipt of the grievance. This

report shall consist of a summary of the proceedings--the Committee's recommendations, the evidence presented, and the basis for the recommendations. The decision of the Committee shall be the definitive faculty position on the dispute.

(e) Within thirty days of receipt of the Committee's recommendation, the President shall communicate his or her own written decision to the parties involved, the Chair of the Committee, and the Affirmative Action Officer. If the President decides not to accept the recommendations of the Committee, he or she shall include a statement of the reasons for the action. If the President finds that an act of discrimination has in fact occurred, any professional or personnel decision affected by the act must be initiated anew, and appropriate steps must be taken to remedy the situation.

In the event of dissatisfaction with the action taken by the President, the complainant or the respondent may appeal to the Board of Regents for a review of the case. The decision of the Regents ends the internal processes for settlement of the grievance.

3.9.2 Alleged Violation of Academic Freedom or Academic Due Process or Other Grievances. All faculty whether tenured or not, are entitled to academic freedom as set forth in Section 3.2.1 and academic due process.

Any faculty member, academic unit, administrative unit, or other duly constituted body within the University community who believes that either academic freedom or academic due process has been violated or alleges other grievances should first seek prompt redress through regular administrative channels. If this fails to produce a satisfactory result, the faculty member, unit, or body may submit a written complaint to the Chair of the Faculty Appeals Board no later than twenty days after becoming aware of the alleged violation. The Chair of the Faculty Appeals Board shall supervise the drawing of seven names from the Board to form an ad hoc Hearing Committee to hear the case in the manner prescribed in Sections 3.8.6, 3.8.7, 3.8.8, and 3.8.9, but with suitable adjustments to the circumstance that individuals, rather than the institution, bring grievances of this kind. The complainant is responsible for stating the grounds upon which the allegations are based and the complainant shall bear the burden of proof.

The Committee shall communicate its decision in writing to the parties involved and to the President. If the Committee finds that academic freedom or academic due process has in fact been violated, any professional or personnel decision affected by the violation must be initiated anew. The Committee may also recommend necessary remedies appropriate to the case.

3.10 Faculty Evaluation, Advancement in Salary, and Promotion in Rank. Faculty evaluation is a continuous process, both prior to and following the granting of tenure. An annual review of each faculty member's

performance is the responsibility of the academic deans and the specific academic units. A systematic procedure for accomplishing such evaluations shall be developed in each college by the Provost working with the deans and the academic units, and approved by the President. The criteria for evaluation shall be carefully and clearly stated. Although the criteria stated in Section 3.7.4 are basic to an on-going faculty evaluation system, specific faculty assignments and the specific mission of the unit may modify the relative weight given to any one area of professional activity.

All salary adjustments and promotions in rank shall be based on systematic evaluations of faculty performance.

3.10.1 Salary Adjustments

(a) The most frequent reflection of a continuing faculty evaluation system is in the annual recommendations for merit salary increases. Deserving faculty should be rewarded, within the limits of the financial resources of the University for meritorious performance.

(b) Each academic unit, with the participation and approval of the dean and the Provost, shall establish and publish specific criteria for evaluating faculty performance in that unit, consistent with over-all University evaluation procedures, so that any ensuing disagreements on salary recommendations will arise only through differences of opinion concerning evaluation and application of the criteria rather than over the criteria themselves.

(c) Under no circumstances will merit increases in salary be based upon race, sex, color, age, creed, or religion.

(d) At times when a faculty member is recognized with a special award designating a specific merit increase in salary to accompany the award (such as a Regents' Award for Superior Teaching), such special monetary award will be treated as additional to any increase recommended through normal procedures.

(e) In certain circumstances, merit salary increases may cause the salary of a faculty member to equal or exceed the salary of faculty in higher ranks. Such a situation is perfectly acceptable provided the salary levels are fair reflections of the respective merits in effort and achievement of the faculty.

3.10.2 Procedures for Recommendations on Salary Adjustments. Procedural guidelines for salary recommendations are as follows:

(a) The academic unit will annually collect (1) achievement data from all the academic unit's faculty and (2) evaluations of each individual's performance from those who are in supervisory positions and from other sources agreed upon as suitable in departmental policy.

(b) For each faculty member, the Chair (along with Committee A, where appropriate) will prepare a recommendation based upon a comparison of faculty performance with University and departmental criteria (section 3.10), and forward a documented recommendation to the dean.

(c) The dean will review each recommendation and notify the Chair of any changes or adjustments made.

(d) The salary recommendations from the college will be forwarded from the dean to the Provost for additional discussion, further recommendations, and administrative action.

(e) Each faculty member may request the reasons for the salary recommendation that was made. It is the duty of the chair to discuss such matters individually with the unit's faculty. These discussions should take place as soon as feasible following delivery of the official salary notifications from the President's office.

3.10.3 Adjustments of Salary Inequities

(a) Upon occasion, adjustments in salary may be needed to correct inequities caused by annual variations in available funds, changing conditions in the academic profession or in the economy, or other elements beyond the University's control. The responsibility for making adjustments, where needed, lies primarily with the dean, who, after consultation with the appropriate academic unit, recommends to the Provost specific salary adjustments to correct evident inequities. Such adjustments should be made as funds are available, without causing disruption to the merit reward system.

(b) If budgetary limitations make impossible the awarding of appropriate merit increases in salary for exceptional performance in any particular year, an adjustment should occur at the next budget period when funds are available.

3.11 Advancement in Rank. Advancement in rank is a major way in which the University recognizes a faculty member's achievements. A promotion is not a routine reward for satisfactory service but reflects a positive appraisal of high professional competence and accomplishment.

3.11.1 Criteria for Promotion. Decisions to promote a faculty member must be made in light of a thorough evaluation of his or her performance in all the areas of faculty activity (see Sections 3.6.1, 3.6.2, 3.6.3, 3.6.4, and 3.6.5).

The candidate's performance is judged by all recommending parties against the academic unit's written statement of criteria for promotion to the rank in question, the approved written assignment for the candidate, and any special conditions pertaining to the candidate's appointment (See Section 3.7.3, (a)).

Each academic unit, in concert with the dean and the Provost, shall establish and publish specific criteria for promotion in that unit. These statements of criteria determine the emphasis placed on the various areas of faculty activity, subject to the following conditions:

(a) Qualifications for promotion in all units should include attainment of high standards in teaching, research or creative achievement, and professional service and University service, and the evaluation should be substantially the same process as followed in tenure considerations (Section 3.7.4).

(b) Service in a given rank for any number of years is not in itself a sufficient reason for promotion.

(c) Promotion should indicate that the faculty member is of comparable stature with others in his or her field at the same rank outside the University.

3.11.2 Procedures for Promotion Decisions

(a) Recommendations regarding advancement in rank shall originate in the academic units, by procedures to be determined by the Provost.

(b) The college dean or the Provost may, at his or her discretion, require an academic unit to initiate consideration of promotion for an individual faculty member. In such a case, the academic unit must forward a recommendation, whether or not it is favorable.

(c) While primary responsibility for gathering complete information on professional activity rests with the individual faculty member, the chair should assume a share of this responsibility to be certain that all promotion recommendations are initiated on the basis of full documentation. All such documentation must be considered by any person or group making a recommendation.

(d) All recommendations must be in writing and, with the exception of a recommendation based on any polling of the unit's faculty members, all must include a statement of reasons for the recommendation made. Notification of all such recommendations made above the level of the academic unit, up to and including the recommendation of the Provost, must be provided to the unit's chair.

(e) In all recommendations that are to be forwarded, the chair and Committee A members shall provide their recommendations. Each member shall record an independent opinion, by name, without obligation to represent majority departmental opinion. Reasons must be given for all recommendations.

(f) Whenever possible, a promotion should be accompanied by an appropriate increase in salary. If budgetary limitations make this impossible

in any particular year, an adjustment should occur at the next budget period when funds are available. Promotions should not be delayed because of budgetary constraints. Conversely, promotions should be earned on their own right and not be used as substitutes for salary increases.

Effective date: This revised personnel policy shall take effect on both campuses when approved by the Regents. Currently untenured faculty, however, shall have the option of indicating in writing by July 1, 1976, to their academic units, their preference for compliance with the current tenure regulations.

Regent Neustadt said the Academic Affairs Committee of the Regents and the administration, in concert with the Norman Campus Senate, the Norman Campus Task Force, and the Health Sciences Center Senate have worked long, long hours in preparing this final document. "We feel that even though there still may remain a few areas of basic disagreement, that we have developed a document that in time will be considered a model for other tenure documents in universities throughout the country. We recognize that this policy is not set in concrete, it is flexible, and that from time to time as changes become necessary the Regents in future years will make those changes." He applauded the efforts of the Faculty Senates and the Task Force and said the Regents feel this is a document with a great deal of validity and merit.

Regent Replogle agreed that this document will serve as a model and said he believes this is a clear indication of the University's commitment to excellence.

The following voted yes on Regent Brett's motion to approve the Faculty Personnel Policy: Regents Neustadt, Braly, Brett, Mitchell, Bailey, Bell, and Replogle. The Chair declared the motion carried unanimously

Tenure Consideration - Verna Holtzen

Regent Brett said the Academic Affairs Committee also recommends approval of President Sharp's recommendation that the academic tenure probationary period for Professor Verna Holtzen be extended. This, in essence, means her qualifications for tenure will be completely reviewed in the spring of 1976. Regent Brett moved approval of the recommendation.

The following voted yes on the motion: Regents Neustadt, Braly, Brett, Mitchell, Bailey, Bell, and Replogle. The Chair declared the motion carried unanimously.

Use of Land South of Service Center

Regent Mitchell said the Health Sciences Center Committee has reviewed the various proposals regarding the use of the land south of the Service Center on the Health Sciences Center Campus. He said the Committee

recommends the Board go on record as having no opposition to the sale of this land by the Oklahoma City Urban Renewal Authority for purposes of constructing the Oklahoma City Allergy Clinic. He moved approval of the recommendation.

The following voted yes on the motion: Regents Neustadt, Braly, Brett, Mitchell, Bailey, Bell, and Replogle. The Chair declared the motion carried unanimously.

Regent Bell said the Student Affairs Committee met yesterday afternoon and considered several items. He reported as follows:

Student Activity Fee 1975-76

Regent Bell said the Student Affairs Committee recommends approval of President Sharp's recommendation that \$32,479 of the unobligated portion of the 1975-76 student activity fee income be appropriated to the University of Oklahoma Student Association for use in Special Programs which will be of benefit to the entire student body, with the understanding that specific project information will be presented to the Regents' Student Affairs Committee on a line item basis.

Regent Bell moved approval of the recommendation. The following voted yes on the motion: Regents Neustadt, Braly, Brett, Mitchell, Bailey, Bell, and Replogle. The Chair declared the motion carried unanimously.

Student Congress Bill "Abolishing the Film Review Committee"

Regent Bell said the following Student Congress Bill was adopted on December 2, 1975:

Title: AN ACT ABOLISHING THE UNIVERSITY OF OKLAHOMA FILM REVIEW COMMITTEE.

Section 1: This act shall be known and may be cited as AN ACT ABOLISHING THE UNIVERSITY OF OKLAHOMA FILM REVIEW COMMITTEE.

Section 2: The purpose of this act is to comply with the mandate of the students, who voted to abolish said committee.

Section 3: The University of Oklahoma Film Review Committee is hereby abolished.

Section 4: This act is hereby enacted.

Section 5: This act shall become effective when passed in accordance with Article III, Section 6 of the UOSA Constitution.

February 12, 1976

13762

The Bill was approved by the Student President on December 3, 1975 and forwarded to President Sharp. President Sharp's letter to Mr. Terry Womack, Student President, under date of December 4 reporting his disapproval of the act is as follows:

"Dear Terry:

"I am unable to approve the action of Student Congress to dissolve the Film Review Committee sent me on December 3. In disapproving this act, the following points should be known:

- "1. If we are going to have entertainment films in University facilities, some form of meaningful regulation will be necessary.
- "2. The Film Review Committee has not yet been given the opportunity to function since no films have yet been reviewed since that Committee was appointed.
- "3. The purpose of the Committee is to place that responsibility in the hands of a faculty-staff-student group as opposed to having a single administrator making such decisions. It is a safeguard that avoids the possibility of a single individual imposing his or her values and judgments on what should be shown. The purpose is directed specifically at avoiding the unacceptable practice of showing 'sexploitation' or 'stag-type' films which are improper for showing in state-owned facilities. The judgment of what is 'improper' is understandably a complex and controversial matter, but with the film market these days being flooded with what those in the business consider 'hard core pornography,' some form of regulation is necessary.
- "4. As I have indicated in past conversations, I have no objection to adding two students to the Committee and will do so as soon as I receive nominations from the UOSA President."

Student Congress voted on January 13, 1976, to override the Presidential veto.

Regent Bell said the Committee recommends that President Sharp's veto be sustained and he so moved. The following voted yes on the motion: Regents Neustadt, Braly, Brett, Mitchell, Bailey, Bell, and Replogle. The Chair declared the motion carried unanimously.

Student Congress Bill "Moving Funding Responsibility for Intramural Athletics from the Student Activity Fee to the Athletic Department"

Regent Bell said the following Student Congress Bill was adopted on December 9, 1975:

Title: AN ACT MOVING FUNDING RESPONSIBILITY FOR INTRAMURAL ATHLETICS FROM THE STUDENT ACTIVITY FEE TO THE ATHLETIC DEPARTMENT.

Section 1: This act may be known and cited as AN ACT MOVING FUNDING RESPONSIBILITY FOR INTRAMURAL ATHLETICS FROM THE STUDENT ACTIVITY FEE TO THE ATHLETIC DEPARTMENT.

Section 2: The purpose of this act is to correct various imbalances and disruptions of service to students caused by the cuts in this year's UOSA budget. The method of the correction is inherent in the title.

Section 3: Beginning with the fiscal year 1976-77 and in every year thereafter, the Intramurals Program of the University of Oklahoma shall derive the following minimum level of funding from the University of Oklahoma Athletic Department:

\$40,000 or 74% of the total intramural budget, whichever is greater.

Section 4: Beginning with the fiscal year 1976-77 and in every year thereafter, absolutely no more than \$5,000 in student activity fee money may be used to fund the Intramural Program.

Section 5: This act is hereby enacted and shall take effect when passed in accordance with Article III, Section 6 of the UOSA Constitution.

The Bill was approved by the Student President on December 10, 1975 and forwarded to President Sharp. President Sharp's letter to Mr. Terry Womack, Student President, under date of December 15 reporting his disapproval of the act is as follows:

"Dear Terry:

"Because the issue of funding intramural athletics has been the focus of much student interest over the past year, I am going to respond at some length to the UOSA Congressional Act that the Athletic Department fund intramurals.

"Traditionally, we have enjoyed here a unique arrangement in having an Athletic Department capable of funding intramural athletics from funds generated solely through intercollegiate athletics. At all other schools in the state and virtually at all of those throughout the nation, the primary

source of funding is a Student Activity Fee. Even where intramural activities are administered by Athletic Departments, student activity fees support intramurals. Such activities are specifically designated in the State Regents' policy as the type of activity the Student Activity Fee was intended to fund.

"Two years ago, when it became apparent that the University would have the responsibility to develop and fund a women's intercollegiate athletic program, a number of policy decisions were made which affected the budget of the Athletic Department. These were as follows:

"1. The Athletic Department would have the responsibility of developing and funding women's intercollegiate athletics to the level necessary not only to comply with Title IX but to represent the kind of quality which has characterized men's athletics at the University. We are now in the first year of a three-year developmental period. We have \$112,000 budgeted; next year we will budget well over \$200,000, and the following year that figure will likely double.

"2. An annual donors' program would be developed by the Athletic Department in order to generate funds which provide scholarships for intercollegiate athletics, releasing a like amount of funds each year--the goal being \$500,000 annually--to fund a ten-year capital improvement program, which the University Regents had mandated to make up for a twenty-five year period during which there was little significant capital expenditure in major athletic facilities.

"These privately generated funds are committed funds and do not, as many believe, directly enhance the operational budget of the Athletic Department.

"3. It was decided that it would be necessary for the Athletic Department to assume a \$100,000 annual obligation toward retiring the bonds of The Lloyd Noble Center, in addition to the rental arrangements negotiated for the Athletic Department's use of that facility. In addition, the money spent on Sports Information should be provided by the Athletic Department, and thus that department assumed the entire \$42,000 annual budget for Sports Information.

"4. In an effort to make these new burdens manageable, the general policy was adopted that the Athletic Department should not be expected to assume all of the costs of intercollegiate athletics and, at the same time, subsidize other programs outside of intercollegiate athletics.

"For the three years prior to the initiation of the donors' program expenditures of the Athletic Department exceeded income, and a reserve of over \$300,000 was depleted. The donors' program took the strain off of the operational budget because operational funds would not need to be diverted to capital projects, but at the same time the scholarship bill of the Athletic Department increased from \$500,000 to \$700,000 because of inflationary increases in such areas as food and utilities.

"It was decided that the funding of intramurals should no longer be carried by the Athletic Department in the light of these increased demands (although the subsidy to the Band was regarded as a necessary part of the Athletic Department's responsibilities because of the Band's role in the football program).

"In order to prevent the transfer of the intramural budget from the Athletic Department to the Student Activity Fee from being too severe, a phasing policy was developed with the Athletic Department providing \$20,000 instead of \$42,000. It was anticipated that as the women's intercollegiate athletic programs developed this subsidy would eventually be diverted. (For the time being, however, I shall ask the Athletic Department to continue this level of subsidy.)

"While all of this was happening, the intramural budget increased from \$42,000 to \$63,000, partially because the entire cost of women's intramurals was transferred from Physical Education to the intramural budget, putting a greater burden on the Student Activity Fee than was anticipated.

"Nonetheless, UOSA this year will have total funds to appropriate which are in excess of \$190,000 (\$163,000 in an initial allocation; \$32,000 in a supplementary allocation). That is not only comparable to the funds available in the past to UOSA, it is substantially above that commitment expressed in the Regents' policy statement of 1973 that the amount of money made available to UOSA would not normally fall below \$150,000.

"We must move vigorously toward a fully-funded women's intercollegiate program in athletics, and it is doubtful that such a program will generate any revenue, at least for several years. Therefore, I must disapprove the act of Congress as part of an all-out effort to insure equitable funding for women's intercollegiate athletics, as a more appropriate responsibility for the Athletic Department.

February 12, 1976

13766

"After we have reached the goal of providing equal opportunity for women in athletics, we can reconsider the funding of intramurals."

Student Congress voted on January 13, 1976, to override the Presidential veto.

Regent Bell said the Committee recommends that President Sharp's veto be sustained and he so moved. The following voted yes on the motion: Regents Neustadt, Braly, Brett, Mitchell, Bailey, Bell, and Replogle. The Chair declared the motion carried unanimously.

Student Congress Bill "Abolishing the Newly Established User Charges in the College of Arts and Sciences"

Regent Bell said the following Student Congress Bill was adopted on January 27, 1976:

Title: AN ACT ABOLISHING THE NEWLY ESTABLISHED USER CHARGES IN THE COLLEGE OF ARTS AND SCIENCES.

Section 1: This act shall be known and cited as AN ACT ABOLISHING THE NEWLY ESTABLISHED USER CHARGES IN THE COLLEGE OF ARTS AND SCIENCES.

Section 2: The purpose of the act is inherent in the title.

Section 3: All user charges which were not in effect fall, 1975, and not announced prior to enrollment of spring, 1976, are hereby rescinded.

Section 4: All of the monies collected for the aforementioned charges shall be refunded as soon as possible after the enactment of this act.

Section 5: All supplies formerly provided by the aforementioned charges, will be furnished by the University.

Section 6: This act is hereby enacted.

Section 7: This act shall become effective when requirements for enactment of external acts as set forth in the UOSA Constitution are met.

The Bill was approved by the Student President on January 28, 1976 and forwarded to President Sharp. President Sharp's letter to Mr. Terry Womack, Student President, under date of January 29, 1976, reporting his disapproval of the act is as follows:

"Dear Terry:

"I am returning to you the 'Act Abolishing the Newly Established User Charges in the College of Arts and Sciences.' I cannot approve it because the

user charges covered by the bill are essential in view of the tight financial situation we face. They cover supplies that each student must have. Since we cannot supply them from the funds available to us, the service charges have been established to assist students in securing the supplies as easily and conveniently as possible. On the other hand, if a student wishes to provide the supplies, that option is open to each student. The charges exist because of a serious funding problem. They are another indication of that problem which we are coping with throughout the University."

Student Congress voted on February 3, 1976, to override the Presidential veto.

Regent Bell said the Committee recommends that the veto override be sustained. He said also that President Sharp has agreed that since the new charges were implemented in a manner which provided no notice prior to this semester, any students affected may request in writing that a refund be made and then funds as needed will be transferred to the academic unit to compensate for the refunds. The student should send his request and the receipt to the academic department which collected the charge. Requests must be made by March 1. This applies only to those charges that are new this semester in the College of Arts and Sciences. The academic unit will then forward all such requests and receipts to the Office of the Vice President for Administration and Finance.

Regent Bell moved approval of the recommendation. The following voted yes on the motion: Regents Neustadt, Braly, Brett, Mitchell, Bailey, Bell, and Replogle. The Chair declared the motion carried unanimously.

A. The Health Sciences Center

II. Academic

a. Personnel Actions

LEAVE OF ABSENCE:

Stephen David Shappell, Associate Professor of Medicine, leave of absence without pay, January 1, 1976 through June 30, 1976.

APPOINTMENTS:

Tsuguhiko Nakai, M.D., Clinical Assistant Professor of Research Medicine, without remuneration, January 1, 1976.

Mary E. Overall, Assistant Professor of Continuing Education, College of Nursing, \$16,500 for 12 months, January 5, 1976 through June 30, 1976. Budget, page 225, position 0002 and page 226, position 0024.

February 12, 1976

13768

John Steven Irons, M.D., Clinical Assistant Professor of Pediatrics, without remuneration, July 1, 1976.

William J. Kruse, M.D., Clinical Assistant Professor of Pediatrics, without remuneration, December 1, 1975.

Harold George Sleeper, M.D., Clinical Assistant Professor of Psychiatry and Behavioral Sciences, without remuneration, January 1, 1976.

Hubert Dale Hamilton, Adjunct Assistant Professor of Radiologic Technology, without remuneration, January 1, 1976.

Kimberly Ann Cavanagh, Instructor in Cardiorespiratory Science, \$9,600 for 12 months, January 5, 1976 through June 30, 1976. Budget, page 263, position 0024 and 0019.

Kay Lynn Blosser, Special Instructor in Clinical Laboratory Science, without remuneration, January 1, 1976.

Mary Jane Easley, Special Instructor in Clinical Laboratory Science, without remuneration, January 1, 1976.

Judy Louise Green, Special Instructor in Clinical Laboratory Science, without remuneration, January 1, 1976.

Madelyn A. McCants, Special Instructor in Clinical Laboratory Science, without remuneration, January 1, 1976.

Paula Dawn Robinson, Special Instructor in Clinical Laboratory Science, without remuneration, January 1, 1976.

Frank Harold Stalling, Special Instructor in Clinical Laboratory Science, without remuneration, January 1, 1976.

Karen Ann Timmerman, Special Instructor in Clinical Laboratory Science, without remuneration, January 1, 1976.

Kimberly Ann Whorton, Special Instructor in Clinical Laboratory Science, without remuneration, January 1, 1976.

Marlene Kay Smucker, Instructor in Nursing, rate of \$11,340 for 12 months, January 14, 1976 through May 31, 1976. Budget, page 225, position 0013.

Karen Mae Waganer, Instructor in Nursing, rate of \$11,940 for 12 months, January 5, 1976 through May 31, 1976. Budget, page 225, position 0002, page 226, positions 0039, 0042, and 0038.

William J. Weir, D.D.S., Instructor in Operative Dentistry, \$3,850 for 11 months, .20 time, January 1, 1976 through June 30, 1976. Budget, page 198, position 0094.

February 12, 1976

13769

Thomas Allen David, D.D.S., Instructor in Oral Diagnosis, \$3,850 for 11 months, .20 time, January 1, 1976 through June 30, 1976. Budget, page 200, position 0073.

Jo Anna Clark, Special Instructor in Radiologic Technology, without remuneration, January 1, 1976.

Karen Joy Maggard, Special Instructor in Radiologic Technology, without remuneration, January 1, 1976.

Linda Denise Strickland, Special Instructor in Radiologic Technology, without remuneration, January 1, 1976.

NAME	TITLES	FTE INCOME CEILING	GUARANTEED BASE SALARY		PPP EARNINGS POTENTIAL	EFFECTIVE DATE	REMARKS
			TENURED	NON-TENURED			
APPOINTMENT:							
Kjaeren Aleece Hankins	Instructor in Otorhinolaryngology	\$12,500		\$12,500	- 0 -	1-1-76 thru 6-30-76	Budget, page 123, position 0012.
CHANGES:							
Nong The Anh	Instructor in Medicine	\$50,250		FROM: \$20,000 TO: \$24,000	FROM: \$30,250 TO: \$26,250	1-1-76 thru 6-30-76	Funds available from grant C2200601.
Thomas C. Coniglione	Assistant Professor of Medicine; Clinical Assistant Professor of Family Practice and Community Medicine and Dentistry	\$54,700		FROM: \$29,747 TO: \$31,500	FROM: \$24,953 TO: \$23,200	7-1-75 thru 6-30-76	Budget, page 135, position 0004, page 104, position 0118 and page 101, position 0069.
J. Michael Dennis	Assistant Professor of Otorhino- laryngology	FROM: \$24,000 TO: \$25,500		\$20,790	FROM: \$ 3,210 TO: \$ 4,710	10-1-75 thru 6-30-76	
James F. Hammarsten	Professor and Head of Medicine	\$85,000	FROM: \$43,144 TO: \$44,144		FROM: \$41,856 TO: \$40,856	1-1-76	Increase from C2200601.
Willis E. Lemon	Associate Professor of Radiological Sciences and Lecturer in Radio- logic Technology	\$69,000	FROM: \$30,400 TO: \$22,400		FROM: \$38,600 TO: \$46,600	1-1-76	
Joe M. Parker	Clinical Professor of Surgery and Clinical Associate Professor of Radiological Sciences	\$63,000		FROM: \$21,000 TO: \$26,000	FROM: \$42,000 TO: \$37,000	12-1-75 thru 6-30-76	.80 time. Funds available from grant C2300203.
Malcolm Elza Phelps	Title changed from Clinical Pro- fessor of Family Practice and Community Health to Clinical Professor of Family Practice and Community Medicine and Dentistry	FROM: WITHOUT REMUNERATION TO: \$ 7,000		TO: \$ 4,800	TO: \$ 2,200	2-1-76 thru 6-30-76	.10 time. Funds available from grant C2200601.
Edwin Ide Smith	Titles changed from Clinical Assistant Professor of Surgery and of Pediatrics to Professor of Surgery and Clinical Assistant Professor of Pediatrics	FROM: WITHOUT REMUNERATION TO: \$79,500		TO: \$30,000	TO: \$49,500	1-1-76 thru 6-30-76	Budget, page 172, position 0014.

February 12, 1976

13770

February 12, 1976

13771

CHANGES:

Patricia Ann Browne, Instructor in Cardiorespiratory Science, salary changed from \$9,600 for 12 months, full-time, to \$4,800 for 12 months, $\frac{1}{2}$ time, January 12, 1976 through June 30, 1976.

Elmer Heard, Jr., Instructor in Operative Dentistry, salary changed from \$12,600 for 12 months, .60 time, to \$16,800 for 12 months, .80 time, January 1, 1976 through June 30, 1976. Budget, page 197, position 0071 and page 198, position 0083.

Arvil Blanchard Holt, Instructor in Operative Dentistry, salary changed from \$4,200 for 12 months, .20 time, to without remuneration, January 1, 1976.

Carol Jean Massey, Visiting Lecturer in Pediatrics; given additional title of Clinical Assistant Professor of Psychiatry and Behavioral Sciences, January 1, 1976.

Dale E. McCune, Instructor in Orthodontics, salary changed from \$7,700 for 11 months, .40 time, to \$3,850 for 11 months, .20 time, January 1, 1976 through June 30, 1976. Budget, page 203, position 0088.

Kenneth D. Ray, Instructor in Periodontics, salary changed from \$2,100 for 12 months, .10 time, to \$1,050 for 12 months, .05 time, February 1, 1976 through June 30, 1976. Budget, page 200, position 0072.

William Paul Sommer, Instructor in Periodontics, salary changed from \$2,100 for 12 months, .10 time, to \$1,050 for 12 months, .05 time, February 1, 1976 through June 30, 1976. Budget, page 200, position 0067.

Carole A. Sullivan, Associate Professor of Radiologic Technology, salary changed from without remuneration to \$22,460 for 12 months, February 1, 1976 through June 30, 1976. Budget, page 272, position 0003 and page 246, position OTHER.

TERMINATIONS:

Mary Rebecca Baker, Associate Professor of Anesthesiology, March 1, 1976.

James E. Davis, Adjunct Instructor in Pathology, February 1, 1976.

Ahmet Koker, Assistant Professor of Anesthesiology, Colleges of Medicine and Dentistry, January 1, 1976. Entered private practice outside Health Sciences Center. Correction of Regents' action on December 11, 1975.

Diane Elizabeth Murphy, Instructor in Cardiorespiratory Science, January 10, 1976.

President Sharp recommended approval of the personnel actions listed above.

President Sharp requested, and received, unanimous consent to add to this agenda the appointment of Dr. Thomas N. Lynn as Dean of the College of Medicine, effective February 12, 1976. Dr. Lynn has been serving as Acting Dean of the College since August 1974.

Regent Mitchell moved approval of the recommendations. The following voted yes on the motion: Regents Neustadt, Braly, Brett, Mitchell, Bailey, Bell, and Replogle. The Chair declared the motion carried unanimously.

III. Finance and Management

a. Non-Academic Personnel

LEAVE OF ABSENCE:

Audrey M. Clonce, Assistant to the Dean, College of Medicine, sick leave of absence with pay, November 17, 1975 through February 16, 1976.

APPOINTMENT:

Roberta F. McDonough, Audiologist, Department of Otorhinolaryngology, \$10,800 for 12 months, January 5, 1976. Budget, page 124, position 0015.

CHANGE:

Linda LouAnn Moore, title changed from Programmer Analyst to Systems Analyst, Administrative Information Services, salary increased from \$15,000 to \$15,500 for 12 months, January 1, 1976. Budget, page 316, positions 0016 and 0018.

President Sharp recommended approval of the personnel actions listed above.

Regent Braly moved approval of the recommendations. The following voted yes on the motion: Regents Neustadt, Braly, Brett, Mitchell, Bailey, Bell, and Replogle. The Chair declared the motion carried unanimously.

b. Oklahoma Regional Medical Program

Addenda to the following Oklahoma Regional Medical Program agreements are proposed:

<u>Contractor</u>	<u>Extended From</u>	<u>Monies Added</u>
Oklahoma Health Planning Commission (OHPC)	August 1, 1975 - June 30, 1976	none
Shared Hospital, Institutional and Professional services, Inc. (SHIPS)	August 1, 1975 - June 30, 1976	none

Oklahoma Council for Health Careers (OCHC)	August 1, 1975 - June 30, 1976	\$16,000
Southwestern Oklahoma Shared Services Program, Inc. (SOSSP)	December 1, 1975 - June 30, 1976	none
Southwestern Oklahoma Development Association (SWODA)	October 22, 1975 - June 30, 1976	\$ 7,906
Hospital Shared Services, Inc. (HSSI)	August 1, 1975 - June 30, 1976	\$ 7,402
Medical Products Systems, Inc. (MPSI)	August 1, 1975 - June 30, 1976	\$ 5,000

President Sharp recommended approval of the Oklahoma Regional Medical Program agreement addenda as explained above.

Regent Replogle moved approval of the recommendation. The following voted yes on the motion: Regents Neustadt, Braly, Brett, Mitchell, Bailey, Bell, and Replogle. The Chair declared the motion carried unanimously.

c. Purchase of Laboratory Equipment

A quotation was requested from Perkin-Elmer Corporation to purchase a medical analyzer with 2 pieces of accessory equipment. The equipment was not bid as it is a sole source item as explained in an affidavit signed by Dr. Robert M. Rogers, Chief, Pulmonary Disease Section.

Funds are available in Budget Accounts D0302100, B4101200, C1123701, A0000274, A0000091, C1124602 and D8306000 to pay for the purchase of equipment.

President Sharp recommended the purchase of the equipment from Perkin-Elmer Corporation in the amount of \$22,865.00.

Regent Replogle moved approval of the recommendation. The following voted yes on the motion: Regents Neustadt, Braly, Brett, Mitchell, Bailey, Bell, and Replogle. The Chair declared the motion carried unanimously.

d. Purchase of Dental Chairs

The following bids were received on dental chairs:

Weber Dental Canton, Ohio	\$31,447.50
------------------------------	-------------

February 12, 1976

13774

Vacudent Salt Lake City, Utah	\$12,600.00
Reeve Dental Supply Company Oklahoma City	\$18,847.50
Patterson Dental Company Oklahoma City	\$17,150.00

The bids were evaluated by the Dean and the faculty of the College of Dentistry. The low bid of Vacudent does not meet specifications for the following reasons:

Specification 2 - Calls for a hydraulic sealed base operating mechanism. The Vacudent X-300 is gear driven and is unacceptable.

Specification 3 - Calls for manual operation of the upper part of the chair. The Vacudent is electrically powered with a gear mechanism. We do not want an electrically powered back on the x-ray chairs.

Specification 5 - Vacudent is controlled electrically rather than manually, as called for in the specifications.

Specification 6 - Calls for foot controls for vertical adjustment of chairs so technician or students do not have to use hands. Vacudent X-300 is adjusted electrically by switches mounted on sides of the chair back.

Specification 7 - The Vacudent chair does not meet the specification that there be "no metal protrusion" when the arms rests are in the raised position for patient entry or exit. The metal protrusions represent a potential safety hazard to patients and are unacceptable.

The next low bid of Patterson Dental Company meets all specifications.

Funds are available in Budget Account 99400090, College of Dentistry Equipment, to make this purchase.

President Sharp recommended awarding the bid for the dental chairs to Patterson Dental Company, Oklahoma City, on the basis of their low bid of \$17,150 less 2%-20 days, for a total of \$16,807.

Regent Replogle moved approval of the recommendation. The following voted yes on the motion: Regents Neustadt, Braly, Brett, Mitchell, Bailey, Bell, and Replogle. The Chair declared the motion carried unanimously.

e. Proposal, Contract, and Grant Report

Included with the agenda for this meeting was a summary of proposals for contracts and grants for the Health Sciences Center for January, 1976. Also included was a report to the Regents of all contracts executed during the same period of time on proposals previously reported.

President Sharp recommended that the President of the University or his designees be authorized to execute contracts on the pending proposals as negotiations are completed, with the understanding the contract budgets may differ from the proposed amounts depending upon these negotiations.

Regent Replogle moved approval of the recommendation. The following voted yes on the motion: Regents Neustadt, Braly, Brett, Mitchell, Bailey, Bell, and Replogle. The Chair declared the motion carried unanimously.

V. Operations and Physical Plant

a. Corridor/Bridge Project

The following bids have been received on construction of the corridor/bridge to connect the Biomedical Sciences Building with the Basic Sciences Building over N.E. 11th Street:

Anderson and House, Inc.
Oklahoma City

OU Portion: \$181,900
OCURA Portion: \$137,100 \$319,000

Walter Nashert & Sons, Inc.
Oklahoma City

OU Portion: \$164,369
OCURA Portion: \$117,535 \$281,904

The Constructors Company, Inc.
Norman

OU Portion: \$146,600
OCURA Portion: \$127,000 \$273,600

Jim Cooley Construction Company
Oklahoma City

OU Portion: \$182,000
OCURA Portion: \$125,000 \$307,000

Lippert Bros., Inc.
Oklahoma City

OU Portion:	\$134,000	
OCURA Portion:	<u>\$147,000</u>	\$281,000

E. V. Cox Construction Co.
Oklahoma City

OU Portion:	\$153,640	
OCURA Portion:	<u>\$130,000</u>	\$283,640

J. J. Cook Construction, Inc.
Oklahoma City

OU Portion:	\$178,082	
OCURA Portion:	<u>\$124,502</u>	\$302,584

Oklahoma City Urban Renewal Authority (OCURA) has agreed to reimburse the University for the portion of the project included in the street right-of-way.

Regent Brett said the Facilities Planning Committee reviewed these bids and recommends approval of President Sharp's recommendation to award the contract to The Constructors Company, Inc., Norman, in the amount of \$273,600, subject to concurrence of the Oklahoma City Urban Renewal Authority.

Regent Brett moved approval of the recommendation. The following voted yes on the motion: Regents Neustadt, Braly, Brett, Mitchell, Bailey, Bell, and Replogle. The Chair declared the motion carried unanimously.

b. Library/Learning Resources Center

Regent Brett said bids were received on February 5 for the construction of the Library/Learning Resources Center on the Health Sciences Center Campus, but are still being reviewed by the administration. It is hoped that a recommendation will be ready at the time of the next meeting regarding awarding a contract.

c. Expansion of the Steam and Chilled Water System

This project involves the design and installation of steam and chilled water piping required to interconnect the existing steam and chilled water primary distribution system with the existing system at the site and to extend the mechanical systems into current project areas under renovation in the building. Equipment relating to this utility extension must also be specified and these specifications are understood to be part of the scope of engineering work.

It is proposed that the required engineering design work be included as an addition to the Engineering Services Contract for Phase III and Phase IV Expansion of the Health Sciences Center Steam and Chilled Water Plant. An

amendment, under the Extra Services of the Engineer, Section B of the contract, would authorize the engineering services needed to provide the designs for utility support for the Health Sciences Center Service Center.

As outlined in Section B of the contract, the fees for these services will be paid as multiple of direct personnel expense and have been estimated by Carnahan, Thompson, Delano, Incorporated, the engineers, to be less than \$7,000. Funds for the design and renovation work are available.

President Sharp recommended that the steam and chilled water system expansion to and within the Service Center be authorized by the Board of Regents and that the necessary design work be included in the existing contract with Carnahan, Thompson, and Delano, engineers.

Regent Brett said the Facilities Planning Committee recommends approval of President Sharp's recommendation and he so moved. The following voted yes on the motion: Regents Neustadt, Braly, Brett, Mitchell, Bailey, Bell, and Replogle. The Chair declared the motion carried unanimously.

d. Research and Consultation Diagnostic Laboratory

A renovation project has been proposed for space located in the east wing of the College of Medicine Building. The area is contiguous with the laboratories and support spaces that were renovated for a Thrombosis Studies program last year. The renovated area will provide research and equipment space to properly house both the ongoing and projected activities of the project. The current estimated cost of this renovation is \$31,000. The project will be funded from grant funds available for the Thrombosis-Coagulation Laboratory (no payments will be made to the Hospital for this space until renovation of the laboratory is completed).

In April 1975, the Health Sciences Center received a \$3.2 million grant from the National Heart and Lung Institute of the National Institutes of Health to fund a five-year program project in thrombosis and related blood disorders. This program, directed by Dr. Fletcher B. Taylor, is divided into nine sub-projects which include both basic research and clinical applications. Researchers at the Health Sciences Center are studying blood proteins, which cause or are involved in clot formation. Clinical specialists from the Departments of Medicine and Surgery are studying patients with clotting disorders. During this first year of the grant, researchers and clinicians involved in the program have determined that a Research and Diagnostic Laboratory is needed for the clinical research area.

President Sharp recommended that a renovation project for the Research and Consultation Diagnostic Laboratory in the College of Medicine Building with a budget of \$31,000 be approved by the Board of Regents.

Regent Brett said the Facilities Planning Committee recommends approval of President Sharp's recommendation and he so moved. The following voted yes on the motion: Regents Neustadt, Braly, Brett, Mitchell, Bailey, Bell, and Replogle. The Chair declared the motion carried unanimously.

e. Thrombosis-Coagulation Laboratory Renovation

A capital improvement project which involves renovation of space within the "A" Wing of the University Hospital and Clinics has been proposed. The space has been assigned to the Department of Pathology and has been specifically identified in the National Institutes of Health Grant Proposal.

In April 1975, the University of Oklahoma Health Sciences Center received a \$3.2 million grant from the National Heart and Lung Institute of the National Institutes of Health to fund a 5-year program project in thrombosis and related blood disorders. This program, directed by Dr. Fletcher B. Taylor, is divided into nine sub-projects bridging basic research and clinical applications.

Researchers at the College of Medicine and at the Oklahoma Medical Research Foundation are studying blood proteins, which cause or are involved in clot formation. Clinical specialists from the Departments of Medicine and Surgery are studying patients with clotting disorders. The Thrombosis-Coagulations Laboratory, to be established in University Hospital and Clinics, will be the regional center for the southwest for study of blood clotting disorders and is the facility in which information generated in the basic research laboratories will be translated into diagnostic tests.

The renovated area will provide two inter-related laboratory areas, a phlebotomy room and administrative support space. The estimated cost of this renovation is \$55,000 of which \$35,000 was awarded in the grant for construction of this facility. The University Hospital and Clinics is expected to provide the additional \$20,000 required to cover the estimated cost.

President Sharp recommended that the Thrombosis-Coagulation Laboratory renovation be approved by the Board of Regents contingent upon the firm commitment of the required additional funds by University Hospital and Clinics.

Regent Brett said the Facilities Planning Committee recommends approval of President Sharp's recommendation and he so moved. The following voted yes on the motion: Regents Neustadt, Braly, Brett, Mitchell, Bailey, Bell, and Replogle. The Chair declared the motion carried unanimously.

f. Report on Major Capital Improvements Projects

As shown on the following page, a report was presented to the Regents on major capital improvements projects now under construction and in various stages of planning on the Health Sciences Center Campus. No action was required.

g. Land Transfer

OFFICE OF ARCHITECTURAL AND ENGINEERING SERVICES
THE UNIVERSITY OF OKLAHOMA

MAJOR CAPITAL IMPROVEMENTS PROGRAM

PROGRESS REPORT, FEBRUARY, 1976

PROJECTS UNDER CONSTRUCTION

Project	CMP Priority No.	Architect	Contractor	Contract Award Date	Original Adjusted Completion Date	Original Current Contract Amount	Status (% complete)	Sources of Funds
HEALTH SCIENCES CENTER								
Biomedical Sciences Building	7	Wright and Selby	Lippert Brothers, Inc.	08/27/73	<u>01/13/76</u> 01/30/76	\$ 8,700,500 8,969,747	95%	Bond Funds, Grants, DHEW
Dental Clinics (Dental Clinical Sciences Building)	10	McCune and McCune	Rayco Construction	12/13/73	<u>12/17/75</u> 01/28/76	6,786,271	96%	Bond Funds Grant, DHEW
Laboratory Casework Dental Clinics	10 (partial)	McCune and McCune	Kitchen Interiors	12/13/73	<u>12/17/75</u> 01/23/76	474,000 471,245	80%	Bond Funds Grant, DHEW
Steam & Chilled Water Plant, Phase III & IV		Carnahan, Thompson, and Delano	Kay Engineering	02/18/75	05/16/76	3,883,400 3,826,459	60%	Revenue Bonds
College of Nursing Building	2	Murray, Jones, Murray	Harmon Construction Co.	10/16/75	07/04/77	3,635,000	2%	Bond Funds Grant, DHEW
Steam & Chilled Water Plant, Phase III and IV, Project "G"		Carnahan, Thompson, Delano	R. Johnson, Incorporated	11/13/75	02/12/76	52,199	85%	Revenue Bonds

OFFICE OF ARCHITECTURAL AND ENGINEERING SERVICES
THE UNIVERSITY OF OKLAHOMA

MAJOR CAPITAL IMPROVEMENTS PROGRAM

PROGRESS REPORT, FEBRUARY, 1976

PROJECTS IN VARIOUS STAGES OF PLANNING

Project	CAP Priority No.	Engineers & Architects	Contract or Letter	Estimated Cost	Status
HEALTH SCIENCES CENTER					
Student Housing	--	Murray, Jones Murray	C 10/20/71	\$ 5,647,070	Inactive.
College of Health	--	Murray, Jones Murray	C 07/23/70	10,000,000	Inactive. Funds for this project have been transferred to the Biomedical Sciences building project.
Library/Learning Resources Center	1A & 1B	Binnicker Associates	C 01/15/76	5,886,000	A grant award of \$2,874,340 has been received. Final plans have been completed. Bids are to be received on February 5, 1976.
Ambulatory Medical Clinics	--	Frankfurt, Short, Emery, McKinley	--	2,400,000	Inactive. Schematic design plans for this project have been completed. Responsibility for this project has been transferred to the University Hospital.
Bridge/Corridor, Biomedical Sciences Building	--	Wright & Selby	C 05/09/75	343,700	Final plans for this project have been completed. Bids are to be received on February 3, 1976.
Tulsa Medical College	3	A & E Services	--	2,476,000	Inactive. An application requesting a Federal construction grant will be resubmitted during 1976.
College of Pharmacy Building	4	A & E Services	--	3,915,000	Inactive. An application requesting a Federal construction grant will be resubmitted during 1976.
Multi-Purpose Building	--	A & E Services	--		A feasibility study has been completed and is undergoing review.

In order to have adequate construction space for the expansion of Oklahoma Children's Memorial Hospital, the University allowed DISRS to utilize land in the Everett Drive area. DISRS paved a new access area servicing both the University and University Hospital.

As completion nears, DISRS has asked that the University deed the land to them in order not to have a traffic flow immediately adjacent to the new hospital. DISRS will landscape the area, maintain access to University buildings, and provide air rights to the shared-service concourse when built.

President Sharp recommended that the Regents transfer the following described plat of land to the Department of Institutions, Social, and Rehabilitative Services:

A part of the SE $\frac{1}{4}$, Section 27, T 12 N, R 3 W., I.M., Oklahoma County, Oklahoma, more particularly described as follows: Commencing at the SW corner of Block 13, Howe's Capitol Addition, said point being on the East right of way line of North Phillips Avenue; Thence S. 89° 47' 37" E. along the South line of said Block 13 and Block 14, Howe's Capitol Addition a distance of 746.30 ft.; thence N. 0° 12' 03" E. a distance of 445.49 ft. to the point or place of beginning; thence continuing N. 0° 12' 03" E. a distance of 229.41 ft. to a point on the South right of way line of N.E. 13th Street; thence N. 89° 48' 51" W. along the South right of way line of N.E. 13th Street, a distance of 126.29 ft.; thence S. 23° 29' 12" E. a distance of 250.50 ft.; thence S. 89° 48' 51" E. a distance of 25.78 ft. to the point or place of beginning AND a part of the SE $\frac{1}{4}$ of Section 27, T 12 N, R 3 W., I.M., Oklahoma County, Oklahoma, more particularly described as follows: Commencing at the SW corner of Block 13, Howe's Capitol Addition said point being on the East right of way line of North Phillips Avenue; thence S. 89° 47' 37" E. along the South line of said Block 13 and Block 14, Howe's Capitol Addition, a distance of 746.30 ft.; thence N. 0° 12' 03" E. a distance of 372.99 ft. to the point or place of beginning; thence continuing N. 0° 12' 03" E. a distance of 301.91 ft. to a point on the South right of way line of N.E. 13th Street; thence S. 89° 48' 51" E. along the South right of way line of N.E. 13th Street a distance of 27.00 ft.; thence S. 0° 12' 03" W. a distance of 301.91 ft.; thence N. 89° 48' 51" W. a distance of 27.00 ft. to the point or place of beginning.

This transfer has been considered and approved by the Health Sciences Center Committee.

Regent Mitchell moved approval of the recommendation. The following voted yes on the motion: Regents Neustadt, Braly, Brett, Mitchell, Bailey, Bell, and Replogle. The Chair declared the motion carried unanimously.

C. Academic (Norman Campus)

I. Personnel Actions

LEAVES OF ABSENCE:

Arrell Morgan Gibson, George Lynn Cross Research Professor of History, sabbatical leave of absence with half pay, September 1, 1976 through May 31, 1977.

Gene D. Shepherd, Professor of Education, sabbatical leave of absence with full pay, July 1, 1976 through December 31, 1976.

Thomas Wiggins, Professor of Education and of Human Relations, sabbatical leave of absence with full pay, January 1, 1977 through June 30, 1977.

Henry J. Tobias, Professor of History, sabbatical leave of absence with half pay, July 1, 1976 through June 30, 1977.

Frances Laverne Carroll, Professor of Library Sciences, sabbatical leave of absence with half pay, September 1, 1976 through January 15, 1977.

Richard V. Andree, Professor of Mathematics and of Information and Computing Sciences, sabbatical leave of absence with half pay, September 1, 1976 through May 31, 1977.

Gerald Kidd, Associate Professor of Education, sabbatical leave of absence with full pay, January 1, 1977 through June 30, 1977.

Michael Langenbach, Associate Professor of Education, sabbatical leave of absence with full pay, January 1, 1977 through June 30, 1977.

Robert A. Nye, Associate Professor of History, sabbatical leave of absence with half pay, September 1, 1976 through May 31, 1977.

Sabetai Unguru, Associate Professor of the History of Science, sabbatical leave of absence with half pay, September 1, 1976 through May 31, 1977.

Jo Ellen Uptegraft, Associate Professor of Home Economics, sabbatical leave of absence with half pay, September 1, 1976 to June 1, 1977.

Howard W. Day, Assistant Professor of Geology, sabbatical leave of absence with half pay, September 1, 1976 through May 31, 1977.

George Henderson, Director and Goldman Professor of Human Relations, dates of sabbatical leave of absence with full pay changed from January 16, 1976 to June 1, 1976 to September 1, 1976 through January 15, 1977.

February 12, 1976

13781

Darrell G. Harden, Associate Professor of Aerospace, Mechanical and Nuclear Engineering, leave of absence without pay, January 16, 1976 through January 15, 1977.

APPOINTMENTS:

David Tredway Carr, Ph.D., Associate Professor of Philosophy with tenure, \$19,200 for 9 months, September 1, 1976. 1976-77 Budget.

Clark Noren Glymour, Ph.D., Associate Professor of Philosophy with tenure, \$19,200 for 9 months, September 1, 1976. 1976-77 Budget.

Thomas L. Baxter, reappointed Research Scientist, Meteorology - Weather and Environ. Analy. Tech. Ener. & Vort. Bud. Dev. Cyclone, rate of \$22,000 for 12 months, January 1, 1976 through April 30, 1976. Paid from 156-118, Weather and Environ. Analy. Tech.

CHANGES:

Marilynn Brown, Auditor III, Internal Auditing; given additional title of Adjunct Assistant Professor of Accounting, without additional remuneration, January 16, 1976 through May 31, 1976.

Lonnie J. Moore, Associate Internal Auditor, Internal Auditing; given additional title of Adjunct Assistant Professor of Accounting, without additional remuneration, January 16, 1976 through May 31, 1976.

Olen Travis Duncan, Program Specialist, Special Students Concerns Project; given additional title of Adjunct Assistant Professor of Education, without additional remuneration, January 16, 1976 through May 31, 1976.

Robert F. Hill, Adjunct Assistant Professor of Human Ecology and Environmental Health and of Family Practice and Community Medicine and Dentistry; given additional title of Adjunct Assistant Professor of Anthropology, without additional remuneration, January 1, 1976 through June 30, 1976.

Theodore Roberts, Acting Director of Legal Internship and Visiting Assistant Professor of Law, salary increased from \$20,000 to \$21,200 for 12 months, September 1, 1975 through June 30, 1976. Increase from Budget, page 300, position 17, and page 304, position 1.

Thomas J. Morris, III, title changed from Chief Flight Instructor and Assistant Airport Manager to Chief Flight Instructor, salary changed from \$13,860 for 12 months, full-time, to \$10,395 for 12 months, .75 time, January 1, 1976 through June 30, 1976. Budget, page 420, position 2.

RESIGNATIONS:

C. Phillip Colver, Professor of Chemical Engineering and Materials Science, January 16, 1976. To enter private practice.

Ralph A. Jacobson, Assistant Professor of Chemistry, June 1, 1976. To accept position at California Polytechnic State University.

February 12, 1976

13782

Jack Burrier Wright, Associate Professor of Drama, August 1, 1976. Accepting position elsewhere.

RETIREMENTS:

William T. Reid, Phillips Professor of Mathematics, August 1, 1976. Named Phillips Professor Emeritus of Mathematics.

Carlton W. Berenda, Professor of Philosophy, July 1, 1976. Named Professor Emeritus of Philosophy.

President Sharp recommended approval of the personnel actions listed above.

President Sharp requested, and received, unanimous consent to add to the agenda his recommendation as follows:

That Ramon Alonso, Associate Dean, College of Business Administration, be given the additional title of Interim Dean, effective June 1, 1976, and a salary supplement of \$500 per month effective February 12, 1976 and continuing throughout the period of service as Interim Dean.

Regent Replogle moved approval of the recommendations. The following voted yes on the motion: Regents Neustadt, Braly, Brett, Mitchell, Bailey, Bell, and Replogle. The Chair declared the motion carried unanimously.

President Sharp reported the death of Dr. Louis Edgar Winfrey, Professor Emeritus of Modern Languages, on January 27, 1976.

VIII. Admission Policies

a. Admission by Performance Plan

President Sharp requested, and received, unanimous consent to add the following to the agenda for this meeting:

President Sharp said the College of Law requests approval of its Admission by Performance Plan for a second year, June 1, 1976 to June 1, 1977. This program was approved originally by the faculty of the College of Law for a two-year period. However, approval by OU Regents on February 13, 1975 and by the State Regents was for one year, June 1, 1975 to June 1, 1976. Continuation for another year would mean that the program would be conducted on essentially the same basis as the first year with the exception that the faculty recommends that enrollment be limited to 25 students. This limitation is for the purpose of permitting adequate individual attention by the professors and student counselors to the Admission by Performance Group (APG) students. This program will be submitted to the Oklahoma State Regents for Higher Education again for approval and full funding. The College of Law will be able to offer this program for a second year only if adequate funding is provided by the State Regents.

The Admission By Performance Plan is as follows:

Because of limited facilities and resources, the College of Law has been required to limit enrollment since 1966. Students have been selected for admission on the basis of their undergraduate grade point average (GPA) and Law School Admission Test score (LSAT). Such factors have been used because they provide the most reliable basis available for predicting success in the study and practice of law. They also provide an objective standard that can be applied with uniformity. It is possible, however, that there are other qualities which are required for success in the study and practice of law, which are not necessarily revealed by the GPA and LSAT, which are not capable of mathematical measurement, and which are not taken into account under present admission policies.

In order to provide an experience upon which to judge the validity of our present admission practices and to determine if they tend to exclude students who should be admitted, we propose that the College of Law be authorized to conduct an Admission by Performance Plan under which a selected group of students will be given the opportunity to prove by performance their capacity for the study and practice of law.

APG students will be selected by the Admissions Committee on the basis of factors in addition to the GPA and LSAT which demonstrate that the applicant may be capable of success in the study and practice of law. These factors may include significant improvement in scholastic record, significant achievement in various activities in which the applicant has engaged, and any factor which reveals a capacity for significant achievement. In determining the significance of the achievement, consideration may be given to any handicaps which the applicant has overcome whether it be a physical handicap or handicaps presented by his economic, ethnic, social or educational background.

APG students will enroll in the Summer Semester and will take those courses prescribed by the faculty. The courses so prescribed will total not less than five nor more than eight hours credit. At the end of the Summer Semester a determination will be made as to which students are eligible for retention; others will be excluded. All APG students, whether retained or excluded, will receive credit for any law course successfully completed during the Summer Semester.

An APG student who achieves a grade point average of 4.5 on a 12 point scale at the end of the Summer Semester will be eligible to remain as a student in good standing for the following year. His course of study for such first year will be prescribed by the faculty and Special Counselors will be made available to him during that year. At the end of such first year, retention and ultimate graduation of students admitted as APG students will be governed by the standards applied to all law students.

The success of a special admissions program will depend very heavily on the availability of extensive special education processes as well as special

counseling for these students. The College of Law is requesting funds to cover the summer salaries of two law professors for the Summer Semester of 1976. In addition funds are requested to cover the cost of hiring about 5 special counselors to work with these special students during the entire year. Since it is anticipated that about 25 students would participate in this program, this would allow each counselor to work closely with 5 students. It is absolutely essential that each of these students be given individual attention and assistance.

The College of Law is prepared to supply all promotional expenses (including the revamping of present minority recruitment literature), costs connected directly with recruitment and selection, and the administrative costs of the program.

<u>Proposed Budget</u>	
June 1, 1976 - June 1, 1977	
Salaries for two law professors for Summer 1976 teaching	\$12,000
Wages for 5 counselors for June 1, 1976 - June 1, 1977 @ \$750/Counselor (about 250 hours/year @ \$3/hr.)	\$ 3,750
<u>Total funds requested:</u>	<u>\$15,750</u>

It is hoped that this College of Law program will serve as a model for special admissions programs that might be adopted by other professional schools in meeting the requirements of the State Plan for Oklahoma Higher Education compliance with Title VI of the 1964 Civil Rights Act. It is expected that most of the students who would be admitted under this special program would be minority students. Due to the teaching and counseling requirements for these students, it is essential that special funding be available.

The College of Law faculty see this program as offering some interesting possibilities with respect to graduate and professional education in Oklahoma generally as well as assisting in our affirmative action efforts.

President Sharp recommended approval of the College of Law Admissions by Performance Plan for June 1, 1976 to June 1, 1977, subject to approval by the State Regents and subject to adequate funding by the State Regents.

Regent Replogle moved approval of the recommendation. The following voted yes on the motion: Regents Neustadt, Braly, Brett, Mitchell, Bailey, Bell, and Replogle. The Chair declared the motion carried unanimously.

D. Finance and Management

I. Non-Academic Personnel

a. Educational and General, Agency Special, and Service Units

APPOINTMENTS:

Cynthia Kennedy Freeman, Medical Technologist, Goddard Health Center, \$10,200 for 12 months, January 12, 1976. Professional Staff. Budget, page 431, position 36.

Johnny D. George, Staff Pharmacist, Goddard Health Center, \$15,800 for 12 months, January 19, 1976. Professional Staff. Budget, page 429, position 10.

Theodore M. Raley, reappointed Program Manager, Special Training Projects, \$19,800 for 6 months, January 1, 1976 to July 1, 1976. OCCE income available to cover this position.

Lucious Selmon, Assistant Football Coach and Counselor, Athletic Department, \$17,000 for 12 months, January 27, 1976. Budget, page 320, position 12.

Ronald Kent Womack, Chief Pharmacist, Goddard Health Center, \$16,800 for 12 months, February 1, 1976. Professional Staff. Budget, page 429, position 9.

CHANGES:

Ansley Eugene Aynesworth, title changed from Assistant Director of Purchasing to Senior Buyer, Purchasing Department, March 1, 1976. Changed from Administrative Staff to Professional Staff.

William David Bontempi, title changed from Student Architectural Assistant to Project Coordinator, Architectural and Engineering Services, salary increased from \$3.17 per hour, .88 time, to \$10,004 for 12 months, full-time, January 5, 1976. Professional Staff. Budget, page 258, position 8.

Charles Everett Bramel, title changed from Production Scheduler to Manager, Production Scheduling, Physical Plant, salary increased from \$13,200 to \$15,000 for 12 months, January 1, 1976. Professional Staff. Physical Plant Service Unit funds available.

Gary D. Bray, title changed from Computer Shift Supervisor to Programmer, University Computing Services, salary increased from \$11,700 to \$12,300 for 12 months, January 1, 1976. Professional Staff. Computing Services funds available.

Chris Lowell Brown, Assistant to the Vice President for University Development, salary increased from \$12,500 to \$14,000 for 12 months, full-time, March 1, 1976. Budget, account 179-151, position 1.

William G. Harris, title changed from Associate Internal Auditor to Auditor III, July 1, 1975. Professional Staff.

Jesse P. May, title changed from Data Base Analyst to Programmer/Analyst, Administrative Systems, salary increased from \$12,000 to \$12,600 for 12 months, January 1, 1976. Professional Staff. Budget, page 18, positions 2 and 4.

February 12, 1976

13786

Leroy T. McConnell, promoted from Computer Shift Supervisor to Section Head, Computer Operations, University Computing Services, salary increased from \$11,400 to \$13,200 for 12 months, March 1, 1976. Professional Staff. Budget, page 262, position 16.

F. Bartley Meaders, Director, Auxiliary Services; given additional title of Director of Printing and Publishing Services, March 1, 1976.

Kenneith M. Merritt, title changed from Acting Director to Director, International Students and Scholar Activities, Center for Student Development, February 1, 1976. Professional Staff.

Gerald E. Pettibone, Assistant Football Coach, Athletic Department, salary increased from \$18,000 to \$20,000 for 12 months, February 1, 1976. Funds available from Athletic Department.

RESIGNATIONS:

Tommy L. Chester, Director, Engineering Relations, February 6, 1976.

Robert Keith Kiehn, Pharmacist, Goddard Health Center, January 20, 1976.

Satyra Lancaster, Medical Technologist, Goddard Health Center, January 2, 1976.

Claude Neal McCollum, Medical Technologist, Goddard Health Center, January 1, 1976.

Norrell Thomas, Jr., Pharmacist, Goddard Health Center, February 5, 1976.

Peggy Joan Timmons, General Duty Nurse, Goddard Health Center, February 3, 1976.

RETIREMENT:

Mary E. Stith, Editor, University of Oklahoma Press - Publishing, March 16, 1976.

President Sharp recommended approval of the personnel actions listed above.

Regent Replogle moved approval of the recommendations. The following voted yes on the motion: Regents Neustadt, Braly, Brett, Mitchell, Bailey, Bell, and Replogle. The Chair declared the motion carried unanimously.

b. Grants and Contracts

(All of the following are subject to the availability of funds)

APPOINTMENTS:

Bobby L. Atkins, Programmer, Center for Economic and Management Research, rate of \$10,500 for 12 months, November 24, 1975. Professional Staff. Paid from 158-367.

Richard Smith Brooks, Course Moderator, FAA Management Training School, rate of \$12,500 for 12 months, January 19, 1976 to July 1, 1976. Professional Staff. Paid from 157-210.

CHANGE:

Vicki Jean Collier, Course Moderator, FAA Management Training School, salary increased from rate of \$12,500 to \$13,000 for 12 months, January 1, 1976 to July 1, 1976. Paid from 157-210.

RESIGNATIONS:

Wayne R. Wilson, Senior Course Moderator, FAA Management Training School, January 30, 1976.

Gene L. Hauptert, Senior Course Moderator, FAA Management Training School, January 8, 1976.

* * * * *

157-210 FAA Management Training School
158-367 Center for Economic and Management Research

President Sharp recommended approval of the personnel actions listed above.

Regent Brett moved approval of the recommendations. The following voted yes on the motion: Regents Neustadt, Braly, Brett, Mitchell, Bailey, Bell, and Replogle. The Chair declared the motion carried unanimously.

II. Budgets

a. 1976 Summer Session Budget

The following summary of the proposed budget for the 1976 Summer Session was presented:

	<u>June</u>	<u>July</u>	<u>Total</u>
Amount Available	\$404,272.29	\$401,977.03	\$806,249.32
Proposed Budget	404,272.29	401,977.03	806,249.32
Balance	-0-	-0-	-0-

	<u>June</u>	<u>July</u>	<u>Total</u>
ARTS & SCIENCES	\$219,839.99	\$220,056.17	\$439,869.16
BUSINESS	40,210.84	38,488.62	78,699.46
EDUCATION	15,031.32	13,866.32	28,897.64
ENGINEERING	35,926.99	35,904.76	71,831.75
FINE ARTS	48,765.01	49,265.01	98,030.02
PHARMACY	7,901.59	7,901.59	15,803.18
PROVOST DIRECT	18,798.79	18,798.79	37,842.02
Architecture			
Aviation			
Library Science			
RESEARCH UNITS	15,806.65	15,704.66	31,511.31
Biological Survey			
Stovall Museum			
INTERNATIONAL PROGRAMS	1,991.11	1,991.11	3,982.22

President Sharp said that in accordance with the action of the Regents at the December, 1973 meeting, personnel appointed to serve during the Summer Session do not require Regents' action as long as funds are included in this budget.

President Sharp recommended approval of the 1976 Summer Session budget as presented.

Regent Replogle moved approval of the recommendation. The following voted yes on the motion: Regents Neustadt, Braly, Brett, Mitchell, Bailey, Bell, and Replogle. The Chair declared the motion carried unanimously.

IV. Fees

a. Independent Study

For three consecutive fiscal years income from fees charged for high school and college courses offered through the Department of Independent Study have fallen slightly below expenditures. It is now advisable to request approval of the State Regents for a fee increase designed to produce an average break even cost-income relation for the next three to five years. The fee increase should produce income slightly in excess of expenditures for the first half of the cycle and slightly under expenditures for the final one or two years of the cycle.

President Sharp recommended approval of the following:

1. That the enrollment fee for college courses offered by the Department of Independent Study be increased from \$16.50 per semester credit hour to \$20.00 per semester credit hour effective September 1, 1976.
2. That the enrollment fee for high school courses offered by the Department of Independent Study be increased from \$20.00 per $\frac{1}{2}$ unit to \$25.00 per $\frac{1}{2}$ unit effective September 1, 1976.

These changes are subject to approval of the Oklahoma State Regents for Higher Education.

Regent Mitchell moved approval of the recommendation. The following voted yes on the motion: Regents Neustadt, Braly, Brett, Mitchell, Bailey, Bell, and Replogle. The Chair declared the motion carried unanimously.

b. Advanced Programs

The \$60 per credit hour fee for Advanced Programs has been in effect since September 1, 1970. Through the fiscal year 1974, this fee produced income slightly in excess of expenditures. Continuous inflation during this period, however, resulted in expenditures for Advanced Programs in fiscal year 1975 slightly in excess of \$60 per semester credit hour. This trend has continued for the first half of fiscal year 1976. Further costs are being incurred in the implementation of the University policy of Faculty Over-load and Extra Compensation approved by the University Regents, July 1, 1975.

It is now advisable to request approval of the State Regents for a fee increase designed to produce an average break-even cost-income relation for academic instruction, and for stand-by authority to add an off-campus travel and on-site logistical support service fee to be applied only to Advanced Programs students enrolling at out-of-state and overseas instructional sites where contractual support for such services provided by the receiving agencies does not permit Advanced Programs to be supported by the academic enrollment fee.

President Sharp recommended approval of the following:

1. That the academic enrollment fee for Advanced Programs be increased from \$60 to \$70 per semester credit hour effective September 1, 1976.
2. That an additional service charge of not less than \$5 per semester credit hour and not more than \$15 per semester credit hour be authorized for addition by the

Division of Advanced Programs to the academic course enrollment fee for those out-of-state sites where contractual support services provided by the agencies served do not permit Advanced Programs to be supported on those sites by the \$70 per semester credit hour academic enrollment fee; that this authority be granted effective September 1, 1976 with the understanding that any additional charge assessed under this authorization would be a prior notification of the State Regents' Office and in conformance with any policies and procedures of the State Regents applicable to such changes.

These changes are subject to the approval of the Oklahoma State Regents for Higher Education.

Regent Replogle moved approval of the recommendation. The following voted yes on the motion: Regents Neustadt, Braly, Brett, Mitchell, Bailey, Bell, and Replogle. The Chair declared the motion carried unanimously.

c. Off-Campus Classes

The enrollment fee of \$20 per semester credit hour currently set for off-campus classes severely limits the ability of the University of Oklahoma to serve its off-campus class student body. Whereas other State institutions with State appropriated funds to allocate to this function can schedule off-campus classes for 10 to 15 students, the Department of Off-Campus Classes of the University of Oklahoma receives no State appropriated funds for the off-campus student body and must require enrollment of 25 to 35 per class to maintain a balanced budget.

Increasing the enrollment fee to \$25 per semester credit hour will permit us to lower the required number per class and thus enable the University to expand its off-campus class offerings. It is not intended that the change will affect the fee of \$20 per semester credit hour currently charged to Intersession and other variably-calendared courses conducted by Continuing Education and Public Service on the Norman Campus.

President Sharp recommended an increase in the off-campus enrollment fee from \$20 to \$25 per semester credit hour, with the exception of the special fee for courses taught at Altus Air Force Base, effective September 1, 1976. This change is subject to approval by the Oklahoma State Regents for Higher Education.

Regent Replogle moved approval of the recommendation. The following voted yes on the motion: Regents Neustadt, Braly, Brett, Mitchell, Bailey, Bell, and Replogle. The Chair declared the motion carried unanimously.

VI. Purchases

a. Microscopes

In a response to an invitation to bid on three different microscopes and accessories for use by our Department of Zoology, the following bids were received:

<u>Bidder</u>	<u>Bid Price</u>	<u>Condition</u>	<u>Brand</u>	<u>Meets Specs.</u>
1. Sargent-Welch Dallas, Texas Net, FOB Norman	\$21,428.94	All or None only	Swift	No
2. Sargent-Welch Dallas, Texas Net, FOB Norman (Alternate Spec. to #1 bid)	\$21,616.29	All or None only	Swift	No
3. Melton Company	Item#1 \$15,328.50	Line Item	American	No
Okla. City, Okla.	#2 6,900.75	Line Item	Optical	No
Net 30, FOB Norman	#3 787.95	Line Item		No
	#4 739.50	Line Item		No
Total:	\$23,756.70			
4. Sargent-Welch Dallas, Texas Net, FOB Norman	\$23,979.75	All or None only	American Optical	No
5. Sargent-Welch Dallas, Texas Net, FOB Norman	\$24,111.36	All or None only	American Optical	No
6. Southwest Instrument Wichita, Kansas Net 30, FOB Norman	\$26,646.90	All or None only	Nikon	Yes
7. Sargent-Welch Dallas, Texas Net, FOB Norman	\$26,703.84	All or None only	American Optical	No
8. Sargent-Welch Dallas, Texas Net, FOB Norman	\$26,877.24	All or None only	American Optical	No
9. Seiler Instrument	Item#1 \$19,734.00	Line Item	Swift	No
St. Louis, Missouri	#2 5,820.00			No
Net 30, FOB Norman	#3 996.00			No
	#4 900.00			No
Total:	\$27,450.00			

February 12, 1976

13792

10.	Southwest Instrument	#1	\$21,120.00	Line Item	Nikon	Yes
	Wichita, Kansas	#2	7,500.00			Yes
	Net 30, FOB Norman	#3	1,125.00			Yes
		#4	1,170.00			Yes
	Total:		<u>\$30,915.00</u>			
11.	United Medical Equip.	#1	\$30,954.00	Item #1 only	Britoline	No
	Kansas City, Missouri					
	Net 30, FOB Norman					
12.	ActionRex	Item #1	\$20,064.00	Line Item	Olympus	Yes
	Springfield, Mo.	#2	6,465.00			Yes
	Net, FOB Norman	#3	3,630.00			Yes
		#4	1,200.00			Yes
	Total:		<u>\$31,359.00</u>			
13.	Scientific Products	#1	\$25,050.30	Line Item	American	No
	Grand Prairie, Texas	#2	5,214.90		Optical	No
	Net 30, FOB Norman	#3	1,899.30			No
		#4	755.05			No
	Total:		<u>\$32,919.55</u>			
14.	Dolan Instrument	#1	\$21,780.00	Line Item	Nikon	Yes
	Dallas, Texas	#2	8,970.00			Yes
	Net, 1%-30, FOB Norman	#3	1,800.00			Yes
		#4	1,147.50			Yes
			<u>\$33,697.50</u>			
	Less 1%		336.97			
	Total:		<u>\$33,360.53</u>			
15.	Ehrenreich Photo	#1	\$22,928.40	Line Item	Nikon	Yes
	Garden City, N. Y.	#2	9,045.00			Yes
	Net 30, FOB Norman	#3	2,207.92			Yes
		#4	1,147.50			Yes
	Total:		<u>\$35,328.82</u>			
16.	Hacker Instrument	#1	\$27,654.00	Line Item	American	No
	Fairfield, N. J.	#2	6,772.50		Optical	No
	Net 30, FOB Norman	#3	1,368.00		&	No
		#4	1,071.00		Hacker	No
	Total:		<u>\$36,865.50</u>			
17.	Olumpus Corp.	#1	\$25,048.65	Line Item	Olympus	Yes
	New Hyde Park, N.Y.	#2	7,140.00			Yes
	Net 30, FOB Norman	#3	4,300.80			Yes
		#4	1,389.75			Yes
	Total:		<u>\$37,879.20</u>			

18.	Ehrenreich Photo	#1	\$28,512.00	Line Item	Nikon	Yes
	Niles, Illinois	#2	8,977.50			Yes
	Net 30, FOB Norman	#3	1,534.50			Yes
		#4	1,147.50			Yes
	Total:		<u>\$40,171.50</u>			
19.	Olympus Corp.	#1	\$29,031.75	Line Item	Olumpus	Yes
	New Hyde Park, N.Y.	#2	7,140.00			Yes
	Net 30, FOB Norman	#3	4,300.80			Yes
		#4	1,389.75			Yes
	Total:		<u>\$41,862.30</u>			
20.	Micro-Tech Instr.		\$46,860.00	All or None	Carl Zeiss	Yes
	Richardson, Texas			only		
	Net 30, FOB Norman					
21.	Carl Zeiss Corp.	#1	\$62,029.74	Line Item	Carl Zeiss	Yes
	New York, New York	#2	22,819.00			Yes
	Net 30, FOB Mfg.	#3	4,287.00			Yes
	Total:		<u>\$89,135.74</u>			

The review and evaluation of the bid by the Purchasing Office and the Department of Zoology resulted in the disqualification of the first five low bids because of non-responsiveness to the specifications in the invitation to bid. A copy of a memorandum from Dr. Hutchinson to the Purchasing Office, under date of January 28, explaining how the five low bidders do not meet specifications was enclosed with the agenda.

Funds to cover this purchase are included in the Special Equipment Fund, 163-015.

President Sharp recommended that this bid be awarded to Southwest Instrument, Inc., Wichita, Kansas, on the basis of their all-or-none bid of \$26,646.90. This is the lowest bid which meets the specifications.

Regent Brett moved approval of the recommendation. The following voted yes on the motion: Regents Neustadt, Braly, Brett, Mitchell, Bailey, Bell, and Replogle. The Chair declared the motion carried unanimously.

b. Teaching Instruments

Invitations to bid were distributed for 11 items of various teaching instrument packages for use by the Department of Psychology. Only one bidder responded as follows:

Lafayette Instrument Company	\$15,494
Lafayette, Indiana	

Funds to cover this purchase are included in the special equipment fund, 163-015.

President Sharp recommended that the bid for the various teaching instruments be awarded to Lafayette Instrument Company at a total cost of \$15,494.

Regent Brett moved approval of the recommendation. The following voted yes on the motion: Regents Neustadt, Braly, Brett, Mitchell, Bailey, Bell, and Replogle. The Chair declared the motion carried unanimously.

c. Spectroscopy Amplifier

The Purchasing Office recently circulated five bid solicitations for eight items of equipment associated with multichannel fission analysis systems for use by the Department of Physics and Astronomy to 17 firms.

The only bid received was from Ortec, Inc. for items of \$21,792. Thus, Ortec, Inc. appears to be the only bidder capable of providing these items. The bid of \$21,792 for these eight items is considered to be a fair and reasonable price.

Funds are available in Special Equipment Fund, 163-015, to cover this purchase.

President Sharp recommended that the purchase of the eight items of scientific equipment associated with the multichannel fission analysis systems be made from Ortec, Inc. at the total bid price of \$21,792.

Regent Brett moved approval of the recommendation. The following voted yes on the motion: Regents Neustadt, Braly, Brett, Mitchell, Bailey, Bell, and Replogle. The Chair declared the motion carried unanimously.

d. Vending Machines

The following bids were received for the purchase of eight vending machines to be installed in the new Law Center Building.

Rowe International, Inc. Dallas, Texas	\$19,637.95
Alternate bid all or none less 3%	\$19,048.82
The Vendo Company Broken Arrow, Oklahoma	\$19,438.90

One of the stipulations of the bid is that the machines will be paid for in three increments, one-third upon receipt; one-third payment one year from date of receipt; and the final one-third payment two years from date of receipt.

The cost of these vending machines will be charged to 172-112, Vending Services.

President Sharp recommended awarding the bid to Rowe International, Inc. on the basis of their all or none bid of \$19,048.82.

Regent Replogle moved approval of the recommendation. The following voted yes on the motion: Regents Neustadt, Braly, Brett, Mitchell, Bailey, Bell, and Replogle. The Chair declared the motion carried unanimously.

VII. Project Financing

a. Proposal, Contract, and Grant Report

Included with the agenda for this meeting was a summary of proposals for contracts and grants for the Norman Campus for January, 1976. Also included was a report to the Regents of all contracts executed during the same period of time on proposals previously reported.

President Sharp recommended that the President of the University or his designees be authorized to execute contracts on the pending proposals as negotiations are completed, with the understanding the contract budgets may differ from the proposed amounts depending upon these negotiations.

Regent Replogle moved approval of the recommendation. The following voted yes on the motion: Regents Neustadt, Braly, Brett, Mitchell, Bailey, Bell, and Replogle. The Chair declared the motion carried unanimously.

G. Operations and Physical Plant

I. New Construction

a. Law Center Project

The Law Center project, being constructed under the construction management method, involves multiple contracts between a large number of prime contractors and the University. The Board of Regents will be asked, periodically, to accept the completion of individual contracts when the work covered is completed.

The project architect, the construction manager, and the University staff have inspected the work of three of these prime contractors and developed punch lists for each element of the job. The University staff has proposed

that the work identified below be accepted as substantially complete. The staff has also proposed that final acceptance be held until the total Law Center project is accepted as complete.

<u>CONTRACT</u>	<u>COST</u>	<u>CONTRACTOR</u>
1. Elevator	\$39,370	ESCO Elevator Company
2. Parking Lot	\$78,031	HOPPO Paving, Incorporated
3. Lathing and Plastering	\$15,200	Jones & Gilcrease Lathing & Plastering Company

President Sharp recommended that the Board of Regents accept the three prime contracts listed above as substantially completed, subject to completion of the punch list items, and that final acceptance of the work be withheld pending total acceptance of the Law Center project.

Regent Brett reported the Facilities Planning Committee recommends approval of President Sharp's recommendation, and he so moved. The following voted yes on the motion: Regents Neustadt, Braly, Brett, Mitchell, Bailey, Bell, and Replogle. The Chair declared the motion carried unanimously.

b. Report on Major Capital Improvements Projects

As shown on the two pages attached, a report was presented to the Regents on major capital improvements projects now under construction and in various stages of planning on the Norman Campus. No action was required.

II. Remodeling, Renovations, Repair

a. Acceptance of Robertson Hall Renovation

This project involved the renovation of a small area of the second floor and the entire third floor for the Housing Office. The third floor now houses the administrative offices of the Housing Office. The project consisted of heating and air conditioning and lighting installations, new floor and wall coverings, and changes to meet fire code requirements. An elevator was installed to provide easier access for the handicapped.

The University staff has inspected this project and proposes that it be accepted as complete. The renovation work was completed by the Department of Physical Plant. The cost of this renovation work was \$121,000.

President Sharp recommended that this project be accepted as complete.

OFFICE OF ARCHITECTURAL AND ENGINEERING SERVICES
THE UNIVERSITY OF OKLAHOMA

MAJOR CAPITAL IMPROVEMENTS PROGRAM

PROGRESS REPORT, FEBRUARY, 1976

PROJECTS UNDER CONSTRUCTION

Project	Engineers and Architect	Contractor	Contract Award Date	Original Adjusted Completion Date	Original Current Contract Amount	Status (% complete)	Sources of Funds
NORMAN CAMPUS							
Lloyd Noble Center	Binnicker-Graves	Rayco Construction Company	01/11/73	01/10/75 05/15/75	4,929,000 5,094,298	97%	Student Facilities System Bond of 1971, Private Funds and Student Facilities Fee Reserve
Law Center Phase I Bid Package # 1	Stone & Associates Whiteside, Schultz, Hammett & Assoc.	H.A. Lott, Inc. Construction Manager	07/26/74	11/06/74	72,331 73,131	100%	State Bond Fund, Private Funds, Private Services
Law Center Phase I Bid Package # 2	Stone & Associates Whiteside, Schultz, Hammett & Assoc.	H.A. Lott, Inc. Construction Manager	10/26/74	12/26/75	3,270,080 3,560,667	90 %	State Bond Fund, Private Funds, Private Services
Evans Hall, 1st, 2nd, & 3rd Floor Remodel	A&E Services	Physical Plant	01/22/75	10/10/75	101,000 163,500	99%	Section 13 Funds
University Tennis Courts (Rebuild)	A&E Services	McCracken Construction Company	10/26/74 11/15/74	05/26/75 04/01/76	77,850 75,800	95%	Revenue Bond Fund (Encumbered in Stadium Project)
Robertson Hall, 2nd and 3rd Floor Remodel	A&E Services	Physical Plant	03/20/75	06/01/75 01/01/76	121,000	100%	Auxiliary Reserves
General Purpose Hangar	A&E Services	McCracken Construction Company/ Physical Plant		10/26/74 03/01/76	147,681 249,000	60%	Westheimer Auxiliary Reserves

OFFICE OF ARCHITECTURAL AND ENGINEERING SERVICES
THE UNIVERSITY OF OKLAHOMA

MAJOR CAPITAL IMPROVEMENTS PROGRAM

PROGRESS REPORT, FEBRUARY, 1976

PROJECTS IN VARIOUS STAGES OF PLANNING

Project	CMP Priority No.	Engineers & Architects	Contract or Letter	Estimated Cost	Status
NORMAN CAMPUS					
Richards Hall Renovation	1	McCune & McCune	Regents Approval 01/22/76	\$1,137,000.00	The scope of this project has been modified to include portions of of the Life Sciences Center project.
Richards Hall Fixed Equipment	2	McCune & McCune	"	185,120.00	"
Richards Hall Movable Equipment	3	--	--	167,015.00	Inactive.
Old Science Hall Renovation	4	Shaw Associates, Inc. Bass & Associates	01/22/76	278,000.00	Preliminary design is being prepared.
Old Science Hall Fixed Equipment	5	"	"	66,202.00	"
Gittinger Hall Movable Equipment	8	--	--	1,803.00	Inactive.
Kaufman Hall Movable Equipment	11	"	"	3,861.00	Inactive.
Felgar Hall Renovation	12	Turnbull & Mills	01/22/76	805,000.00	Preliminary design is being prepared.
Felgar Hall Fixed Equipment (Includes TBT Equipment)	13	"	"	18,152.00	" "
Felgar Hall Movable Equipment	14	--	--	5,151.00	Inactive.
College of Environmental Design	15	Howard-Samis-Porch, Inc.	01/22/76	544,500.00	Preliminary design is being prepared.
College of Environmental Design Fixed Equipment	16	"	"	55,011.00	" "
College of Environmental Design Movable Equipment	17	--	--	41,406.00	Inactive.
Nielsen Hall Renovation	18	Howard-Samis-Porch, Inc.	01/22/76	496,000.00	Preliminary design is being prepared.
Nielsen Hall Fixed Equipment	19	"	"	7,157.00	" "
Nielsen Hall Movable Equipment	20	--	--	210,000.00	Inactive
DeBarr Hall Renovation	21	Turnbull & Mills	01/22/76	465,295.00	Preliminary design is being prepared.
DeBarr Hall Fixed Equipment	22	"	"	10,885.00	" " "
DeBarr Hall Movable Equipment	23	--	--	177,737.00	Inactive
Gould Hall Renovation	24	--	--	719,800.00	"
Burton Hall Renovation	25	--	--	368,000.00	"

OFFICE OF ARCHITECTURAL AND ENGINEERING SERVICES
THE UNIVERSITY OF OKLAHOMA

MAJOR CAPITAL IMPROVEMENTS PROGRAM

PROGRESS REPORT, FEBRUARY, 1976

PROJECTS IN VARIOUS STAGES OF PLANNING

Project	CMP Priority No.	Engineers & Architects	Contract or Letter	Estimated Cost	Status
NORMAN CAMPUS					
Engineering Lab Renovation	26	--	--	\$116,300.00	Inactive
Engineering Lab Fixed Equipment	27	--	--	3,132.00	"
Engineering Lab Movable Equipment	28	--	--	5,370.00	"
Pharmacy Building Renovation	29	--	--	225,000.00	"
Pharmacy Building Fixed Equipment	30	--	--	17,260.00	"
Jacobson Hall Renovation	31	--	--	153,500.00	"
Carpenter Hall Renovation	32	--	--	261,500.00	"
Holmberg Hall Renovation	33	--	--	255,500.00	"
Carnegie Hall Renovation	34	--	--	136,000.00	"
Womens Building Renovation	35	--	--	140,400.00	"
Adams Hall Modifications	36	--	--	30,200.00	"
Adams Hall Fixed Equipment	37	--	--	30,348.00	"
Nuclear Engineering Laboratory Modifications	38	--	--	32,000.00	"
Main Campus Water Well	39	--	--	25,000.00	"
Separation of OU Water System from Norman System	40	--	--	50,000.00	"
South Oval Improvements	41	--	--	250,000.00	"
South Perimeter Improvements	42	--	--	135,000.00	"
North Perimeter Improvements	43	--	--	210,000.00	"
Student Union-Monnet Hall Area Improvements	44	--	--	36,000.00	"
Old Science Hall Area Improvement	45	--	--	32,000.00	"
Hester-Robertson-Kaufman Area Improvements	46	--	--	45,000.00	"

OFFICE OF ARCHITECTURAL AND ENGINEERING SERVICES
THE UNIVERSITY OF OKLAHOMA

MAJOR CAPITAL IMPROVEMENTS PROGRAM

PROGRESS REPORT, FEBRUARY, 1976

PROJECTS IN VARIOUS STAGES OF PLANNING

Project	CMP Priority No.	Engineers & Architects	Contract or Letter	Estimated Cost	Status
NORMAN CAMPUS					
Tennis Courts Phase II	47	--	--	\$ 82,050	Inactive.
Armory Conversion	48	--	--	390,000	Inactive.
Armory Conversion Fixed Equipment	49	--	--	75,000	Inactive.
Monnet Hall Conversion	50	--	--	101,500	A reuse study is in process.
Law Center - Phase II	52	Stone & Associates	C 01/20/72	1,812,000	Design program and contract negotiations for this phase of the work are included with the Law Center, Phase I Project.
Student Physical Recreation Center	--	Reid and Heap	L 10/16/66	4,965,000	A feasibility study is in process. Implementation of this project is contingent on development of sources of funding.
Westheimer Field Lighting Project	--	Carnahan, Thompson Delano	--	127,850	Awaiting federal grant application results prior to proceeding with project development phase.
University Museum	--	Shaw & Shaw	C 04/03/71	2,400,000	Design development drawings completed. Total funding arrangements have not been completed.
Cross Center Dining Hall	--	Bass & Associates	--	93,250	Project abandoned.
Life Sciences Center	--	McCune, McCune	L 02/08/66	2,171,000	This project has been superseded. Elements of this project are now included in the Richards Hall Addition and Renovation Project. (See CMP Priority No. 1).
South Stadium Expansion	--	A&E Services		625,000	A&E Services is preparing a feasibility study and cost analysis.
Varsity & Visiting Team Facility				325,000	A feasibility is being prepared.
Dormitory Lounge, Social & Recreation Building				300,000	Under study.
Renovation of Washington House				600,000	Under study.

Regent Brett said the Facilities Planning Committee recommends approval of President Sharp's recommendation, and he so moved. The following voted yes on the motion: Regents Neustadt, Braly, Brett, Mitchell, Bailey, Bell, and Replogle. The Chair declared the motion carried unanimously.

IV. Contracts and Agreements

a. Agreement with United States Geological Survey

A renewal of the cooperative agreement between the Oklahoma Geological Survey and the United States Geological Survey has been proposed. The renewal agreement for 1975-76 proposes an overall program increase of \$54,550 with the Oklahoma Geological Survey's share set at \$27,275. The components of the program are as follows:

Direct Pay from OGS to USGS	\$ 62,500
Computer Services	20,000
Services In-Kind	19,775
NECO Project	<u>15,000</u>
TOTAL	\$117,275

The NECO project is a proposed program of analysis of water from abandoned mines in the lead/zinc district of Northeastern Oklahoma. NECO will have between \$10-\$15,000 to contribute to the project. The Oklahoma Geological Survey will contribute the difference, if any, between the NECO contribution and \$15,000.

President Sharp recommended approval of entering into the agreement with the United States Geological Survey for the period July 1, 1975 to July 1, 1976.

Regent Brett moved approval of the recommendation. The following voted yes on the motion: Regents Neustadt, Braly, Brett, Mitchell, Bailey, Bell, and Replogle. The Chair declared the motion carried unanimously.

Student Recreation Center

Regent Replogle said there has been a lot of discussion recently concerning the possibility of constructing a Student Recreation Center on the Norman Campus. He said the students certainly have the support of the Regents in their efforts to obtain the necessary funding for the construction of this building. "We share the concern of the students regarding the need for this building and we have an appreciation of the urgency of their request. Speaking as one Regent only, my condition for supporting any efforts in the Legislature to obtain funding would be that the money not be taken away from academic programs and not be used to cut the University's appropriation

for E&G purposes." Regent Replogle said he thinks it important that the Legislature understand there isn't any real possibility of funding the Student Recreation Center unless it comes from a special State appropriation. He said the Legislature should be advised the University Regents consider this a top priority item.

President Sharp said we are all in agreement that this is a facility essential to student life on this campus and all are eager to move forward with it. He said our problem all along has been to find the funding. The extra funds available to the Legislature this year appear to be a source for this one-time expenditure. He congratulated the students for their initiative in submitting this request to the Legislature.

There being no further business the meeting adjourned at 11:20 a.m.


Barbara H. James, Executive Secretary of the
Board of Regents

Others present at all or part of the meeting:

Mr. Jack Stout, Associate Vice President for University Community
Dr. Harold Ray, Assistant to the Vice President for University Community
Mr. Jerry Farley, Controller
Ms. Anona Adair, Director for the Center for Student Development
Mr. Bill Jones, Chief of Security, Fire and Police Protection
Dr. Rolande Andrade, Project Specialist, Office of the President
Dr. Gail deStwolinski, Chair, Norman Campus Faculty Senate
Ms. Denise Durham, Chair, Student Congress
Dr. A. J. Kondonassis, Chair-Elect, Norman Campus Faculty Senate
Dr. Marilyn Affleck, Chair, OU Women's Political Caucus
Ms. Racheal Keely, Director of Student Data Services
Dr. Donald Counihan, Chair-Elect, HSC Faculty Senate
Dr. Andrea Bircher, Secretary, HSC Faculty Senate
Dr. Joanne Moore, Chair, HSC Faculty Senate
Dr. Anthony Lis, Secretary, Norman Campus Faculty Senate
Dr. Raymond White, Professor of Education and of Business Administration and
Acting Director of Southwest Center for Education in Family Finance
Dean Thomas N. Lynn, Dean, College of Medicine
Mr. Joe Flowers, Director of Information Services, HSC Office of Media Information
Mr. Jack Cochran, Director of Public Relations
Mr. Mike Treps, Director of Media Information
Ms. Donna Murphy, Senior Writer, Media Information Office
Mr. Dave Smeal, Assistant Director for Broadcast Services, Media Information
Mr. Mike Sulzycki, Writer-Producer, Media Information
Mr. Jim Bross, The Norman Transcript
Mr. Mark Kingsolver, Daily Oklahoman

February 12, 1976

13799

Mr. Lewis Pulley, The Oklahoma Daily
Ms. Jan Meadows, Oklahoma City Times
Mr. Gary Perceful, The Tulsa World
Mr. Skip Nickolson, KEBC Radio
Ms. Marcia Franklin, KGOU Radio
Mr. Brad Edwards and cameraman, KTVY
Mr. Tom Daniels and cameraman, KWTW