

JOURNAL OF THE UNIVERSITY SENATE

Regular Session, January 31, 1966 -- 4:10 p.m.
Student Union Building, Room 165

The University Senate, meeting in regular session, was called to order by the Chairman, Dr. John G. Eriksen.

Present

Berenda, Carlton W.
Bishop, L. Doyle
Braver, Gerald
Crook, Kenneth E.
Cross, George L.
Duncan, J. Paul
Eriksen, John G.
Gooch, Brison D.
Goodman, George J.
Harlow, James G.
Howard, Robert A.
Levy, Gene
Livezey, William E.
Love, Tom J.

Present

Maehl, William H.
Murphy, James M.
Olson, Ralph E.
Peterson, Robert V.
Phelps, Elbridge D.
Plint, Colin A.
Reeves, Charles H.
Rohrbaugh, Lawrence M.
Smith, Thomas M.
Smith, William H.
Sutherland, Stephen M.
Thayer, Calvin G.
Turkington, D. Barton
White, Raymond R.

Absent

Bell, Digby B.
Bienfang, Ralph D.
Campbell, John M.
Collier, Robert E.
Daniels, Raymond D.
Daron, Garmon H.
Eek, Nathaniel S.
Feiler, Seymour
Hart, Frances
Huneke, Harold V.
Ivey, Michael
Johns, O. D.
Ohm, Robert E.
Patnode, Robert
Steen, Wilson D.
Terry, Richard A.

APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES

The Journal of the University Senate for the regular meeting held on November 29, 1965, was approved.

WORK OF THE SENATE COMMITTEE ON STUDENT AND PUBLIC RELATIONS

In a brief oral report to the Senate on January 31, Dr. George Goodman, Chairman of the Senate Committee on Student and Public Relations, indicated that work is continuing on three matters of concern to that Committee. Formal reports probably will be completed during February on:

- (1) Problems relating to Commencement.
- (2) Feasibility of establishing an Oklahoma University Academic Affairs Progress Commission.
- (3) Consideration of a resolution relative to the selection of a Student Senate Sponsor.

ASSOCIATION OF GRADUATE ASSISTANTS

Letter from the Association

January 3, 1966

Members of the University Faculty Senate
c/o Dean John G. Eriksen
Faculty Exchange

Dear Sirs:

We, the recently-formed Association of Graduate Assistants, wish to present a few germane complaints about our status, role, and compensation as graduate assistants at this university. You, as a body and as individuals, are the selected recipients of these complaints because of our mutual concern for the continued excellence of the university. We hope to elicit your sympathy and, even more, your voice.

The pay for a graduate assistant, with or without a master's degree, is simply inadequate. In order to live or to help support his family, the graduate assistant is forced to assume more employment than he can competently handle while making reasonable progress toward his degree. This overextension is frequently reflected in the assistant's usefulness to his department, in his course work, or both. The inevitable result is a dissipation of his energy and interest.

The pay scale here, moreover, does not compare favorably with those of universities of roughly the same size and reputation. It is almost certain that this university will be unable to attract assistants with adequate skills or credentials in the immediate future.

The status enjoyed (or endured) by the OU assistant is, likewise, neither just nor satisfactory. The graduate assistant is classified as faculty when the administration wishes to compute its student-faculty ratio for accreditation, but he is considered a mere student when he seeks compensation or status. The consideration and kindness received by the assistant from the faculty are indeed gratifying, but they are not enough.

We therefore, urge you to act favorably on our request for at least temporary alleviation of this deplorable situation. Two changes that would contribute to this are granting of staff parking privileges, and faculty library privileges. We earnestly request your support as a body in our seeking these privileges.

Doubtless, you will wish to be aware that the following request is being sent through academic channels and to the Office of the President: remission of all tuition and fees, and an increase in salary of \$500 per semester for all graduate assistants, effective in the spring semester of the current year. The Association of Graduate Assistants would be pleased to have you discuss our request and, if appropriate, support it by means of a resolution. We are, of course, aware of the budgetary complications occasioned by this proposal, but we are confident that they can be met.

We most respectfully and earnestly request your consideration of this petition.

Sincerely,

(s) Richard French
(For the Association of Graduate Assistants)


Association of Graduate Assistants -- continuedSenate Action

Mr. Richard French, writer of the foregoing letter, along with two other graduate assistants and several faculty members, were present when consideration was given by the University Senate to the matters set forth in the letter. Mr. French commented at some length about the purposes of the Association, its membership, and its major concerns. He asked the University Senate to give consideration and support to the requests of the Association of Graduate Assistants; in particular, those requests relative to salary, parking, and library privileges. He responded to a number of questions posed by members of the Senate.

Dr. Ronald B. Shuman, present at the request of Mr. French, expressed certain of his views. He urged the University Senate to give consideration to the problems advanced by the Association of Graduate Assistants. Dean Carl D. Riggs also made a number of comments in this regard.

The Chairman of the University Senate then referred the entire matter to the Senate Committee on Faculty Personnel for detailed study and a report.

Dr. Duncan moved that the University Senate recommend to President Cross that negotiations be initiated with the Regents of the University relative to the possibility of waiving tuition and fees for graduate assistants. His motion was seconded and passed.

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

January 27, 1966

The Senate Committee on University Organization, Publications, and Budget has held several meetings during the present academic year. At its latest meeting, concern was expressed with regard to recent press publicity indicating disinterest on the part of the faculty in University personnel appointments. Feeling that the faculty is vitally interested in this matter and after discussion, the Committee recommends adoption of the following statement:

The University Senate compliments the members of the Athletic Council on the excellent job done recently in the hiring of a football coach. The University Senate also compliments the Regents and the President for working with and accepting the recommendations of the Athletic Council. We share with other friends of the University the regret that publicity surrounding this selection brought unfavorable attention to the University.

The University Senate wishes to reaffirm its continuing dedication to the University Charter which provides for faculty representation on properly authorized committees for all appointments to instructional and administrative positions.

Gerald Braver
Robert Collier
O. D. Johns

William E. Livezey
Raymond R. White
E. D. Phelps, Chairman

University Appointments -- continuedSenate Action

Dr. Phelps presented the foregoing resolution from the Senate Committee on University Organization, Publications, and Budget. He moved that the resolution of the Committee be adopted. His motion was seconded and passed unanimously.

It was stipulated that the resolution be conveyed by President Cross to the Regents of the University.

NOMINATIONS FOR THE COUNCIL ON PLANNING AND DEVELOPMENT ✓

Explanatory Comment

On January 6, Vice President McCarter asked the University Senate to send to President Cross nominations for a replacement for Dr. Arthur Doerr. Dr. Doerr is on a leave from the University.

Senate Action

Dr. Turkington, Chairman of the Senate Committee on Committees, reported for that Committee and submitted the following names in nomination:

James S. Ezell John G. Eriksen Colin A. Plint

Dr. Crook moved that the nominations be accepted. His motion was seconded and passed.

ONE SALARY POLICY ✓

Report from the Senate Committee on Teaching and Research

January 18, 1966

1. The single-salary policy is a device for putting an evaluation on a faculty member's contribution to the University in teaching, research, and extension work. Under such a device the University is considered as employing a man's entire professional time and pays him with a single pay check, which excludes the possibility of his receiving additional compensation from the University or from any government agency for these activities. Although the salary is paid in a single check, the money need not be derived from a single budgetary account.
2. It is the interpretation of the deans interviewed that such a system would not include incomes derived from approved consulting, book royalties, and certain extension activities which will be detailed below.
3. It has been estimated that up to 70 percent of the total effort in correspondence study, the BLS program, and extension can be anticipated in an annual 9-month contract. Activities coming under these categories would then be included in the single salary and would thereby be guaranteed. The remaining 30 percent, which cannot be guaranteed, would have to be put on a special payment basis. The remaining activities, such as short courses, conferences, and seminars, are unpredictable and would, therefore, also involve special payments.

One Salary Policy -- continued

4. Money received by the University for services rendered by a faculty member to the Extension Division or to an outside agency, such as the federal government, would be used principally to employ replacement teachers. Any remainder would be used to supplement faculty salaries within the college and to establish a reserve fund to compensate for unanticipated decreases in income from these sources.
5. Bureau of the Budget Circular A-21, entitled Principles for Determining R & D Costs under Government Grants and Contracts to Educational Institutions, has required the establishment of a single-salary system for faculty members involved in government-sponsored research. The University is now complying with this requirement. Since some deans anticipate an additional circular which would make applicable provisions similar to those of A-21 to other federally sponsored activities, such as institutes and the Peace Corps, the deliberations of this committee have considered the advisability of extending this system to faculty not yet participating in federally sponsored programs.
6. It is the opinion of the committee that, in principle, a single salary system, as limited in paragraph 2, would improve the quality of the University, for under such a system a faculty member could devote his entire professional time and energy to academic objectives. The faculty member would not be required or tempted to work overtime in order to augment his income. However, to implement such a system properly, sufficient funds should be available to provide adequate salaries and to permit the increase in the number of faculty members made necessary by the elimination of overloads.
7. The committee recognizes that, at the present level of financial support, a single-salary policy cannot be implemented. The committee wishes to emphasize that the implementation of the single-salary policy will require a significant increase in the base salary of the faculty as well as a substantial increase in the number of faculty members.

We accordingly recommend that the single-salary policy be adopted only when financially feasible.

Senate Committee on Teaching and Research

Robert Patnode
 Stephen Sutherland
 Seymour Feiler

Charles H. Reeves
 Robert A. Howard
~~Frances Hart~~

Tom J. Love, Chairman

Michael Dry

Senate Action

Dr. Love presented the foregoing report and moved that it be adopted by the University Senate. His motion was seconded.

One Salary Policy -- continued

Following considerable discussion of the foregoing report and motion by Dr. Love, Dr. Maehl made the following substitute motion:

The Senate wishes to express its thanks to the Committee on Teaching and Research for the time and work it has spent in studying the proposed one-salary policy for the University and takes note of its recommendation against the present adoption of the policy because of lack of financial support. In addition the Senate wishes to express further misgivings about the one-salary policy for the following reasons:

1. It is unclear what effect the new policy will have on the conception of the normal faculty teaching load as twelve hours in lecture courses plus related activities as expressed in the Faculty Handbook of Fall 1962, pp. 18-19.
2. The principle of definition between which activities will be included under the new policy and which will not be covered has not been made clear.
3. No assurance is made that the principle of voluntary participation in activities such as extension teaching and outside research activities will be preserved.
4. There is serious danger to the teaching program of the University if permanent staff members are released from normal on-campus teaching responsibilities for other activities and are replaced by more junior personnel.
5. There is a danger that normal budgetary procedures of the University may be neglected in the use of funds which accrue from faculty services to the Extension Division or outside agencies.

In view of the foregoing difficulties, therefore, the Senate recommends against the implementation of a university-wide one-salary policy, except with respect to governmental contracts.

The foregoing motion made by Dr. Maehl was seconded.

Following a lengthy discussion, Dr. Flint moved that the entire matter of the one salary policy be referred back to the Senate Committee on Teaching and Research. His motion was seconded.

Dr. Harlow then moved that the Senate meeting be recessed and that the discussion be continued at the regular meeting on February 28. His motion was seconded and passed.

ADJOURNMENT

The University Senate RECESSED at 6:02 p.m. The next regular session will be held on Monday, February 28, 1966. Materials for the Agenda should be in the Office of the Secretary by Monday, February 14.

Gerald A. Porter, Secretary