

JOURNAL OF THE UNIVERSITY SENATE

Regular Session, September 25, 1967 -- 4:10 p.m.
Student Union Building, Room 165

The University Senate, meeting in regular session, was called to order by the Secretary, Dr. Gerald A. Porter.

<u>Present</u>	<u>Present</u>	<u>Absent</u>
Alley, John N.	Hart, Frances	Blick, Edward F.
Andrews, Mildred M.	Heller, Ben I.	Canfield, Frank B.
Berenda, Carlton W.	Hengst, Herbert R.	Dunham, Lowell
Bishop, L. Doyle	Howard, Robert A.	Roller, Duane H. D.
Braver, Gerald	Hoy, Harry E.	Smith, Thomas M.
Brixey, John C.	Kendall, J. L.	Tuma, Gerald
Bruce, John B.	Kitts, David B.	<i>West, Kelly M.</i>
Christian, Sherril D.	Livezey, William E.	
Cross, George L.	Nordby, Gene M.	
David, Paul R.	Ohm, Robert E.	
Elconin, Victor L.	Olkinetzky, Sam	
Elkouri, Frank	Pray, Joseph C.	
Everett, Mark R.	Springer, C. E.	
Feaver, J. Clayton	Stone, George T.	
Feiler, Seymour	Suggs, Charles C.	
Fite, Gilbert C.	Terry, Richard A.	
Goggans, Travis P.	White, Raymond R.	
Goodman, George J.		

APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES

The Journal of the University Senate for the regular meeting held on May 29, 1967, was approved.

ACTION BY PRESIDENT CROSS ✓

Nomination of Research Professors. -- On June 23, 1967, President Cross indicated his approval of the recommendations made by the University Senate relative to the nomination of Research Professors (see the Journal of the University Senate for May 29, 1967, pages 2-3).

PENCIL SHARPENERS ✓

For information on this item please refer to the Journal of the University Senate for May 29, 1967, page 7. On May 31, 1967, John H. Kuhlman, Director of the Physical Plant Department sent the following memorandum to the Senate:

I regret that I must report that the Physical Plant Department does not have funds available for the furnishing and installation of pencil sharpeners in University of Oklahoma classrooms.

NOTATION OF UNFINISHED ITEMS OF BUSINESS

Procedures for Nomination of Distinguished Professors -- This continues to be a matter for consideration by the Senate Committee on Faculty Personnel. In particular, a study of the David Ross Boyd Professorship remains incomplete.

Faculty Tenure -- This is a matter being studied by the Senate Committee on Faculty Personnel. The Committee is considering also the results of a survey conducted by the Chairman of the University Senate during 1966-67.

Study of the Future of the University -- An ad hoc committee has been appointed by the Chairman of the University Senate to engage in a continuing study of the future of the University. Members: Tom J. Love, Arrel M. Gibson, Paul R. David, Turner W. Edge, L. Doyle Bishop, and James R. Burwell. This committee will coordinate its efforts with those of President Designate, Dr. J. Herbert Hollomon, who is also studying this question.

Faculty Liaison Committee -- The Senate Committee on University Organization, Budget and Publications is studying the possibility of developing a faculty liaison committee to serve either with or on the University of Oklahoma Board of Regents (see the Journal of the University Senate for April 24, 1967).

CONTRIBUTIONS TO RETIREMENT SYSTEM ✓

Dr. Berenda called the attention of the members of the Senate to the increase in faculty contributions for faculty retirement that go into effect with the distribution of salary checks on October 1, 1967. The change in the percentage of salary contributed was the result of the Oklahoma Senate Bill 311, approved by Governor Bartlett on May 23, 1967.

Following a brief discussion, Dr. Berenda moved that Senator Phil Smalley, of the Oklahoma Legislature, be invited to speak to the University Senate relative to the development and implementation of Senate Bill 311. His motion was seconded and passed.

STATEMENT BY PRESIDENT CROSS

President Cross, in accord with precedent, spoke briefly to the members of the University Senate at this first meeting on September 25. He directed his remarks to certain aspects of the annual budget and to speculations about the enrollment figures soon to be released.

STATEMENT BY PRESIDENT DESIGNATE HOLLOWON

Dr. J. Herbert Hollomon was presented to the University Senate by President Cross. Dr. Hollomon outlined for the Senators his plan for studying University functions for the ensuing year. He specifically requested that the members of the University Senate, both individually and collectively, help him and his staff in their study of the University and in their formulation of plans for the future of the University.

UNIVERSITY SENATE OFFICERS FOR 1967-68

Chairman -- Dr. Gilbert C. Fite was elected to serve as Chairman of the University Senate. He immediately assumed his duties for 1967-68 and presided over the remainder of the meeting on September 25.

Vice Chairman -- Dr. L. Doyle Bishop was elected to serve as Vice Chairman.

Secretary -- Dr. Gerald A. Porter was re-elected to serve as Secretary.

COMMITTEES OF THE UNIVERSITY SENATE FOR 1967-68

Dr. Fite presented the report of the Senate Committee on Committees and approval was indicated by the University Senate for membership of committees for 1967-68 as follows:

Academic Standards

✓ Robert E. Ohm
 Charles C. Suggs
 Herbert R. Hengst
 Victor A. Elconin
 David B. Kitts
 ✓ *Donald J. Berthrong*
Courses and Curricula

✓ Carlton W. Berenda
 Frances Hart
 Travis P. Goggans
 Lowell Dunham
 ✓ ~~John B. Bruce~~
 Joseph C. Pray

Faculty Personnel

Mark R. Everett
 Paul R. David - *CHR.*
 Sherril D. Christian
 Gene M. Nordby
 J. L. Kendall

Committee on Committees

Harry E. Hoy - *CHR.*
 Frank Elkouri
 C. E. Springer
 ✓ *John B. Bruce*
 ✓ *John Renner*

Student and Public Relations

Kelly M. West
 John C. Brixey
 Gerald Tuma
 J. Clayton Feaver
 Sam Olkinetzky
 John N. Alley

Teaching and Research

✓ Seymour Feiler - *CHR.*
 Edward F. Blick
 ✓ Robert A. Howard
 Duane H. D. Roller
 Ben I. Heller

University Organization, Budget and Publications

Raymond R. White - ~~CHR.~~
 ✓ Gerald Braver - *CHR*
 ✓ William E. Livezey
 Frank B. Canfield
 Mildred M. Andrews
 ✓ George T. Stone

Executive Committee

Gilbert C. Fite
 ✓ L. Doyle Bishop
 Thomas M. Smith
 ✓ Richard A. Terry
 ✓ George Goodman

Journal Committee

Gilbert C. Fite
 ✓ L. Doyle Bishop
 ✓ *Thomas M. Smith*

NOTE: Assignments to the Committee on Committees and the Journal Committee will be completed at the October meeting of the University Senate. The replacements for Dr. Brison Gooch, representing the Graduate College, and for Dr. Lloyd P. Williams, representing the College of Education, will be elected and assigned to committees.

FACULTY TENURE X

Letter from President Cross:

June 21, 1967

Professor William H. Maehl, Chairman
The University Senate
Faculty Exchange

Dear Professor Maehl:

Enclosed is a copy of a letter to us from the Council on Faculty Personnel, pointing out what the Council considers to be flaws in our tenure procedures and making suggestions for correction of them.

I agree with the Council that these are flaws, and I refer the letter to the University Senate with my request that the Senate study the regulations and make such recommendations as it deems suitable.

At the same time I advise the Senate that our tenure regulations are already unduly complex. They have come to be so by accretion, as we have tried to improve various parts of them and have tended to correct one regulation by addition of another. We now have such a large number of time periods and deadline dates for decision and notification that administration of the regulations is difficult for the various offices concerned, and we have some indication that they are rather confusing to the faculty, especially to the newer members.

The Senate may also wish to consider whether our present regulations are so labored and cumbersome as to create an impression of undue concern about these matters and of an institutional immaturity which, I hope, is long since behind us.

For these reasons I invite the Senate, as it considers the suggestions of the Council on Faculty Personnel, to consider a thorough revision of all our tenure regulations with a view toward (1) precision, (2) clarity, and (3) simplification.

Cordially yours,

G. L. Cross
President

Senate Action

Dr. Elconin moved that the matters discussed above by President Cross be referred to the Senate Committee on Faculty Personnel. His motion was seconded and passed.

Faculty Tenure -- continued

Letter from Council on Faculty Personnel

April 21, 1967

Dr. George L. Cross
President, University of Oklahoma

Dear Sir:

During recent tenure hearings before this Council, it has come to our attention that there is a certain amount of confusion in the minds of our probationary faculty, both as to the standards which the University uses in judging their eligibility for a tenure position, and as to the manner in which these standards are administered.

To be specific, the men involved have complained that they are now told they are being denied tenure because of their deficiencies in teaching and/or research, but that they were never informed either that they were being held to a particular standard of excellence or that they were informed that their performance was deficient.

This Council has studied the Faculty Handbook and finds that there is substance to the first of these complaints. The Fall 1962 Handbook states three criteria for advancement in rank and salary, and it is further stated that a recommendation for advancement should be supported by evidence that the subject is strong in at least two of the three criteria. However, the Handbook in no place states either that these same criteria are to be used in judgments on tenure or that any other specific criteria are to be used in tenure decisions. From testimony given us, it is apparent that most faculties do in fact accept the promotion criteria as being the implied basis on which tenure decisions should be made.

Testimony given us indicates that the probationary staff members are not aware that judgment will be made on these implied standards. We therefore believe that it would be desirable for the University Senate either to formally adopt these criteria and publish an amendment to the Faculty Handbook, or to adopt such other tenure criteria as may seem fitting to the Senate members.

With regard to the second matter, such definite statements of fact are not possible since the understanding between Committee A and the faculty member is a matter of mutual understanding and memory of past conversations. However, enough statements have been received from probationary members to indicate a real possibility that the typical probationer does not receive from anyone in authority at the University any statement regarding his performance in the three areas which are stated to be the criteria for rank and salary and which are apparently also used in making tenure decisions until the end of the probationary period. At this time, either tenure is granted implying satisfactory performance, or it is denied because of deficiencies in performance about which no one had previously complained in three years of service.

Faculty Tenure -- continued

The Faculty Handbook states that the budget committee of each department (usually Committee A) shall inform itself as to the faculty members performance in each of the three specified areas and rank him on a semi-quantitative scale ranging from excellent to unsatisfactory. There is at present no provision for transmission of these ratings to the faculty member either in writing or orally.

The Council recognizes that these rankings are subjective and vary widely from department to department. However, since they are in fact being used for decisions both on promotion and tenure, the Council on Faculty Personnel recommends that the President take steps to insure that department chairmen each year notify each probationary member of his exact ranking in each of the three quality areas. In cases where the ranking is considered by Committee A to be such as to endanger the probationary member's chances for tenure, the chairman should have a personal conference with the staff member involved either along or in conjunction with Committee A. The purpose of this conference is to explain why Committee A gave the man a low rating and what steps he should take in the context of departmental goals to improve his ranking in the succeeding year.

The departmental chairmen should then reduce to writing a summary of this interview which would be made a part of the probationer's confidential personnel file so that it will be available to the departmental faculty at the time when tenure is to be considered and if necessary to the Council on Faculty Personnel if a tenure dispute should arise.

Although it is not directly involved in the tenure problem, the Council further feels that there is some lack of communication between the various Committees A and the tenure holding faculty. The Council recommends that the President refer to the proper committee of the Senate consideration of the question of requesting that the departmental chairmen transmit in a sealed, personally addressed letter to the faculty member's home a statement of the merit ratings for each year as soon as these merit ratings have been established by the departmental budget committee. Only if the faculty are aware that they are considered to have deficiencies in a particular area, can they be expected to make attempts to improve.

COUNCIL ON FACULTY PERSONNEL

Leslie H. Rice, Chairman	Gilbert C. Fite
Oliver Benson	Robert A. Ford
Digby Bell	Ralph E. Olson
C. Stanley Clifton	Harry J. Parker
Walter Ewbank	

Senate Action

Dr. Livezey moved that the matters discussed in the foregoing letter from the University Council on Faculty Personnel be referred to the Senate Committee on Faculty Personnel. His motion was seconded and passed.

THE REGENT'S PROFESSORSHIP X

Letter from Dr. Doerr:

September 5, 1967

Dr. Gerald A. Porter, Secretary
The University Senate
Faculty Exchange

Dear Dr. Porter:

It has long seemed to me that one of the distinguished professorships, i.e. The Regent's Professorship has unintentionally been relegated to the bottom of the distinguished professor list. Perhaps this relates to the canon as outlined in the Faculty Handbook. I quote from the Fall, 1962 issue of that document, p. 22 "The Regent's Professorship has been conferred by the University Regents from time to time in recognition of outstanding service to the University in activities not primarily involving teaching or research."

Inferentially, at least, this suggests that these professors are not outstanding teachers or researchers. In practice quite the reverse is true, i.e. most Regent's Professors are outstanding in teaching, research, and service to the University. I respectfully suggest, therefore, that the Faculty Senate revise the canon for the Regent's Professor to read "The Regent's Professorship is conferred by the University Regents from time to time in recognition of distinguished service to the University."

Sincerely,

Arthur H. Doerr
Professor of Geography

Senate Action

Following a brief discussion, Dr. David moved that the University Senate take appropriate steps to call to the attention of the University Board of Regents the views expressed by Dr. Doerr in the foregoing letter. His motion was seconded and passed.

The Chairman of the University Senate will communicate with the Board of Regents via the President's Office.

ADJOURNMENT

The University Senate adjourned at 5:21 p.m. The next regular session will be held on Monday, October 30, 1967. Materials for the Agenda should be in the Office of the Secretary by Wednesday, October 11.

Gerald A. Porter, Secretary

1950

The first part of the report deals with the general situation of the country and the progress of the work during the year. It is followed by a detailed account of the work done in each of the departments.

The second part of the report deals with the work done in each of the departments. It is followed by a detailed account of the work done in each of the departments.

The third part of the report deals with the work done in each of the departments. It is followed by a detailed account of the work done in each of the departments.

The fourth part of the report deals with the work done in each of the departments. It is followed by a detailed account of the work done in each of the departments.