

5-6<sup>5</sup>, Page 1  
note hand  
change page 10

JOURNAL OF THE UNIVERSITY SENATE

Regular Session, May 27, 1968 -- 4:10 p. m.  
Student Union Building, Room 165

The University Senate, meeting in regular session, was called to order by the Vice Chairman, Dr. L. Doyle Bishop. Dr. Gilbert C. Fite, the Chairman was absent.

Present

Present

Absent

-Alley, John N. (2)	Goodman, George J. (1)	Berenda, Carlton W. (4)
Andrews, Mildred M. (-)	Hart, Frances (1)	Blick, Edward F. (3)
Berthrong, Donald J. (1)	Howard, Robert A. (2)	Cross, George L. (5)
Bishop, L. Doyle (3)	Hoy, Harry E. (1)	-Dunham, Lowell (8)
Braver, Gerald (-)	-Kendall, J. L. (-)	Feaver, J. Clayton (2)
Brixey, John C. (2)	-Kitts, David B. (3)	Feiler, Seymour (3)
-Bruce, John B. (1)	-Nordby, Gene M. (2)	-Fite, Gilbert C. (2)
Canfield, Frank B. (3)	-Olkinetzky, Sam (2)	Heller, Ben I. (4)
Christian, Sherril D. (1)	-Pray, Joseph C. (1)	Hengst, Herbert R. (4)
David, Paul R. (-)	Smith, Thomas M. (2)	Livezey, William E. (2)
-Elconin, Victor L. (-)	-Springer, C. E. (-)	Ohm, Robert E. (5)
Elkouri, Frank (3)	-Stone, George T. (1)	-Renner, John W. (3)
Everett, Mark R. (-)	Suggs, Charles C. (3)	-Roller, Duane H. D. (3)
Goggans, Travis P. (-)	Tuma, Gerald (4)	Terry, Richard A. (2)
		West, Kelly M. (6)
		White, Raymond R. (2)

NOTE: During this year there were eight regular meetings of the University Senate. The numbers in the parentheses above indicate meetings missed. In each case where there is no number, the Senator has a record of perfect attendance for the eight meetings.

APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES

The Journal of the University Senate for the regular meeting held on April 29, 1968, was approved.

ACTION BY PRESIDENT CROSS

Faculty Liaison With Regents -- On May 2, 1968, President Cross indicated his approval of the recommendation made by the University Senate that the Chairman of the University Senate and/or one or more faculty members designated by him, should attend the Regents' meetings as observers (see the Journal of the University Senate, April 29, 1968, page 8).

Proposed Calendar for 1969-70 -- On May 20, 1968, President Cross indicated his approval of the proposed calendar for 1969-70 that was recommended by the University Senate (see the Journal of the University Senate, April 29, 1968, pages 2-4).

## FACULTY PARTICIPATION IN POLICY MAKING

The following resolution was presented by Dr. Berthrong from the floor of the University Senate on May 27, 1968.

One of the distinguishing features about the University of Oklahoma under the administration of Dr. George L. Cross has been the large amount of faculty participation in University policy making. During his 25 years as President, Dr. Cross has been sensitive to the needs and desires of the faculty, and his administration has sought to involve the faculty in meaningful decision making. Therefore, be it resolved that the University Senate hereby expresses its deep appreciation to President George L. Cross for his interest in, support of, and respect for faculty views and opinions during his years as President, and for establishing the principle of effective faculty participation on the University of Oklahoma campus.

Dr. Berthrong moved that the University Senate approve the foregoing resolution and that it be forwarded to President Cross. His motion was seconded and passed by a UNANIMOUS vote of the members present.

### NAME OF SOCIAL SCIENCE BUILDING

#### Explanatory Comment

From the floor of the University Senate on April 29, Dr. Stone presented his views relative to the naming of the social science center now under construction. He then moved that

the University Senate recommend to President Cross, to President-Designate Hollomon, and to the Board of Regents that the new social science building be named after Martin Luther King, Jr.

The motion was seconded.

Dr. Berthrong, after some discussion, moved that the motion be tabled and that the matter be listed as the first item of old business on the Agenda of the May 27 meeting of the University Senate. His motion was seconded and passed.

#### Senate Action

On May 27, Dr. Stone commented further with regard to the motion that he made on April 29. The motion was then removed from the table and other senators commented with regard to it. Dr. Suggs made a substitute motion to table further consideration of this matter for a period of one year. His motion was seconded and passed.

Report of Ad Hoc Committee on Academic Freedom

April 24, 1968

The Ad Hoc Committee on Academic Freedom reports the following recommendation. We move that the following statement:

As a member of his community, the professor has the rights and obligations of any citizen. He measures the urgency of these obligations in the light of his responsibilities to his subject, to his students, to his profession, and to his institution. When he speaks or acts as a private person he avoids creating the impression that he speaks or acts for his college or university. As a citizen engaged in a profession that depends upon freedom for its health and integrity, the professor has a particular obligation to promote conditions of free inquiry and to further public understanding of academic freedom.

replace the statement found in the Faculty Handbook on page 23, paragraph three. This motion is supported unanimously by all members of the committee.

Ad Hoc Committee on Academic Freedom

Gerald Braver	Travis P. Goggans
Victor L. Elconin	Richard A. Terry
Donald J. Berthrong, Chairman	

Senate Action on April 29

Dr. Berthrong called the attention of the University Senate to the foregoing material and copies of it were distributed on April 29. Dr. Berthrong then requested that the matter be formally considered at the May 27 meeting of the University Senate. It was the consensus that this should be done.

Senate Action on May 27, 1968

Dr. Berthrong commented briefly on the foregoing report of his committee and then moved approval by the University Senate of the statement contained in that report. His motion was seconded and passed.

## ROOMMATE PREFERENCE FORM

Explanatory Comment

From the floor of the University on April 29, Dr. David presented his views of certain material printed on the Roommate Preference Form used at the University of Oklahoma. On that form is the following:

It is University policy to assign roommates on the basis of mutual interests, without regard to race or nationality, unless you indicate an objection. (If you indicate a racial preference in regard to your roommate, you must also indicate your own race here \_\_\_\_\_.) While we try to take into account any preference or exclusion, applicants should realize that the University usually has information only on the personal characteristics of which the applicants themselves inform us. During the first several weeks of the term a limited number of roommate changes can usually be arranged.

Roommate Preference Form -- continued

Dr. David moved that the President of the University be requested to instruct the Director of Housing to remove from the Roommate Preference Form the following words (in lines 2 and 3 of Part I Your Roommate):

"unless you indicate an objection. (If you indicate a racial preference in regard to your roommate, you must also indicate your own race here \_\_\_\_\_.)"

If immediate replacement of the present form is not feasible, the Senate urges that the words in question be blocked out until replacement can be made. The motion was seconded.

Dr. Roller moved that consideration of the motion be tabled and that the item be listed close to the beginning of the Agenda for the May 27 meeting of the University Senate. His motion was seconded and passed.

Senate Action on May 27, 1968

Dr. David moved reconsideration of the motion that he made on April 29 with regard to the deletion of material in lines 2 and 3 of Part I Your Roommate. His motion was seconded and passed.

Following some discussion, Dr. Smith moved to amend the above motion to the effect that the words "or exclusion" be deleted from line 3 of Part I. His motion was seconded and passed.

The original motion by Dr. David was passed.

UNIVERSITY RETIREMENT SYSTEM ~~X~~

Report of the Senate Committee on University Organization, Budget, and Publications  
May 23, 1968

Recommendations are as follows:

1. That the present plan of faculty retirement, viz., the combination of Social Security, Oklahoma Retirement System, and University supplement be continued with modifications as outlined below.
2. That rights to benefits, including employers contributions, be vested in the employee after granting of tenure or after three years of employment, whichever is less.
3. Actuarial consideration should be given the employee who delays retirement beyond age 65. Present policy "freezes" benefits at age 65 and no weight is given to succeeding years of service before actual retirement.
4. The addition of a pre-funded plan such as Teachers Insurance and Annuity Association - College Retirement Equities Fund is not recommended for the following reasons:

University Retirement System -- continued

- a. In cases of moderate salaries, all benefits received from this plan would appear to cause the loss of an equivalent benefit in the University supplement to the ORS. Moreover, TIAA-CREF is a participating plan and would require a contribution of approximately 4% in addition to other contributions now made.
  - b. If not further amended, present Social Security law requires contributions which will total 11.8% of the first \$7,600 earned by the year 1987. In addition, employees now contribute 4% of their salaries to the ORS, and it is proposed that this be increased to 5%. If TIAA-CREF were added to the present plans, total contributions of the employer (including the matching requirement in pensions) and employees would approximate 29.8% of the payroll for all positions drawing \$7,600 or less.
  - c. With the new schedule of benefits of the Social Security Act it appears that supplements in the amount previously required for an adequate standard of living are not as urgent. Most present faculty should be able to qualify for the maximum amount at the age of retirement which for man and wife would be about \$327 per month. This amount plus present teacher retirement benefits would equal approximately \$5,500 per year exclusive of the University benefit. Social Security benefits for single retirees would be reduced by \$109 per month.
5. TIAA-CREF or a comparable program would be feasible only as a substitute for the present package of benefits modified as proposed.
  6. The present annual rate of inflation is such that it appears that retirement benefits should be geared to some indicator of the level of economic activity, e.g., the consumer price index, a wage index, or comparable economic indicator.
  7. Any renovation of the retirement system should include incorporation of features which would allow employee contributions to be tax exempt under Section 403 (b) and 501 (c) (3) of the Internal Revenue Code.

The above recommendations were made from the standpoint of benefits to the faculty member as compared with costs. Although the addition of a pre-funded program would in some instances increase benefits, the increase in costs would be highly disproportionate as long as the University continued to provide supplements to Social Security and the ORS.

Senate Committee on University Organization, Budget,  
and Publications

Mildred M. Andrews  
Frank B. Canfield  
William E. Livezey

George T. Stone  
Raymond R. White  
Gerald Braver, Chairman

Senate Action

Dr. Braver presented the foregoing report and moved its approval by the University Senate. His motion was seconded. Following a brief discussion, the motion was passed.

## SABBATICAL LEAVE

Report of the Senate Committee on University Organization, Budget and Publications

May 23, 1968

The Committee has been studying the question of sabbatical leave, raised by Dr. Al Weinheimer (see Journal, January 29, 1968, page 7). Dr. Weinheimer objected to two aspects of the present policy:

1. the obligation to return for a year following the sabbatical.
2. the concomitant loss of the normal means of expressing dissatisfaction with the contract for the sabbatical year and for the subsequent year.

In response to Dr. Weinheimer's contention that sabbatical leave is merited by prior service and should not necessitate return for a year, this committee has concluded (though not unanimously) that at least for the present, there should be an obligation to return. The committee is in disagreement as to whether there should be a moral or legal obligation to return. The present sabbatical leave policy requires either return for a year or a legal obligation to repay the sabbatical leave salary.

In connection with Dr. Weinheimer's second argument concerning the loss of bargaining power because of the obligation to return, the committee feels that this is, unfortunately, a natural hazard associated with the sabbatical leave. If return is to be obligatory, we would recommend greater protection for leave recipients. The committee recommends addition of the following to the first paragraph on page 32 of the Faculty Handbook:

Applications for sabbatical leave should be encouraged, and a faculty member who is on sabbatical leave should be considered to be enhancing his value to his department and to the University. Accordingly, a faculty member who is on sabbatical leave shall receive a salary increase no less than that which he would have received had he not been on sabbatical leave.

Committee on University Organization, Budget & Publications

Mildred M. Andrews  
Frank B. Canfield  
William E. Livezey

George T. Stone  
Raymond R. White  
Gerald Braver, Chairman

Senate Action

Dr. Braver presented the foregoing report and moved the approval of the recommended addition to the Faculty Handbook. His motion was seconded. Following some discussion, the motion was passed.

## GROUP TERM INSURANCE FOR DEPENDENTS

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

May 23, 1968

The committee has met with Mr. Eldon Nance, who is representing the Underwriters Life Insurance Co. of Oklahoma City. This company is offering the insurance policy that was referred to this committee for study (see the Journal of the University Senate for April 29, 1968, pages 8-9). The committee has also solicited the opinions of Mr. Giezentanner, the University Business Manager, and Professor Childress of the Finance Department, who agree that to the best of their knowledge, this plan is unique and could be highly desirable for some staff members.

The University would cooperate by making monthly payroll deductions, but the entire cost of the insurance would be met by the participating staff member (there is no minimum number or fraction of participating staff required by the company).

The committee would like the addition of an option whereby the dependent children would not be covered, and the wife's insurance would be increased by 25% (as it now is if there are no dependent children). In response to our inquiry, the Oklahoma City office indicated that this would not be a possible option, but we recommend pursuing this further.

The committee recommends that the University make this insurance available to the staff through the payroll deduction plan.

Committee on University Organization, Budget and Publications

Mildred M. Andrews  
Frank B. Canfield  
William E. Livezey

George T. Stone  
Raymond R. White  
Gerald Braver, Chairman

Senate Action

Dr. Braver presented the foregoing report. He moved that the University Senate recommend to the University administration that the group term insurance plan for dependents offered by the Underwriters Life Insurance Company be made available to the faculty and the staff of the University of Oklahoma. His motion was seconded and passed.

## FACULTY TENURE

Explanatory Comment

On April 29, Dr. David presented a substantiation report from the Senate Committee on Faculty Personnel. That report dealt with several aspects of faculty tenure. In the Senate meeting on April 29, the first two sections of the report were approved. Section III was tabled for consideration on May 27 (see the Journal of the University Senate, April 29, 1968, pages 4-7).

Faculty Tenure -- continuedSenate Action on May 27, 1968

Dr. David reviewed the situation with regard to faculty tenure. He indicated that most of the work of the Senate Committee on Faculty Personnel, with regard to faculty tenure, had already been approved; that only one item remained. He moved that consideration of the last item be raised from the table. His motion was seconded and passed.

This brought before the University Senate a vote situation with regard to the motion made by Dr. David on April 29. That motion was:

To substitute for Paragraph 3-b, Page 28, in the Faculty Handbook, the following:

The Council, after consultation with the president and the faculty member, shall decide whether the hearing shall be open or closed.

Following some discussion the motion FAILED to pass. The material on Page 28 remains intact.

AD HOC ANTI-DISCRIMINATION COMMITTEE *MM*

On April 29, 1968, the University Senate approved the establishment of an Ad Hoc Anti-Discrimination Committee consisting of five persons.

On May 1, 1968, the chairman of the University Senate made the following appointments to this committee: John N. Alley, Donald J. Berthrong, Paul R. David, George Henderson, and George T. Stone.

On May 27, noting that George T. Stone will be on leave during 1968-69, the chairman of the University Senate appointed Lennie-Marie Tolliver as the replacement for Dr. Stone.

At the Senate meeting on May 27, Dr. Berthrong indicated that the committee was beginning its work and that it had no report to offer formally to the Senate.

## SENATE COMMITTEE ON COMMITTEES

It is a University Senate procedure to elect replacements to the Senate Committee on Committees at the final meeting of each year. It was noted that all members of the Committee at this time will return to the Senate in 1968-69. Thus, there is no need to elect replacements.

## REPORT OF UNIVERSITY ELECTIONS COMMITTEE

The individuals who have been elected to represent the various colleges and the General Faculty in the University Senate, 1968-71, are:

<u>Arts and Sciences</u>	-- Stanley Babb, Jr. -- Physics	Richard A. Goff -- Zoology
	Willis H. Bowen -- Mod. Lang.	J. L. Kendall -- English
	Leon Ciereszko -- Chemistry	Melvin Tolson -- Mod. Lang.
	Arthur H. Doerr -- Geography	

Report of University Elections Committee -- continuedBusiness Administration -- Rodney L. Boyes -- ManagementEducation -- Jack F. ParkerEngineering -- Harden, Darrell -- Mechanical EngineeringGraduate College -- Richard E. Hilbert -- SociologyGeneral Faculty -- George Henderson -- Sociology and Education

## NOMINATION OF DISTINGUISHED PROFESSORS

Progress Report on Procedures for the Selection of David Ross Boyd Professors

May 27, 1968

The Committee on Faculty Personnel is not prepared at this time to make definite recommendations regarding procedures for the selection of David Ross Boyd Professors. The following progress report outlines proposals (originating both within and from outside the committee) in order to solicit comment and criticism, not only from members of the Senate, but from the General Faculty and the Administration as well. Any communications addressed to the present chairman will be gratefully transmitted to his successor in the fall.

1. Eligibility

Eligibility is at present restricted to those holding the rank of full professor. It has been suggested that attaining this rank may sometimes be contingent on factors other than performance in "the teaching, counseling and guidance of students". (Of the 20 David Ross Boyd Professors appointed in the last ten years, six had served from 14 to 32 years before promotion to full professorship). It has been proposed, therefore, that a faculty member be eligible for nomination if he has taught at the University for 12 years and either is a full professor or has for six or more years held the rank of associate professor.

2. Nomination and selection procedures.

It has seemed incongruous to members of this committee that the Budget Council, a body appointed to deal primarily if not altogether with fiscal problems--in themselves sufficiently onerous--should be charged in addition with making the arduous evaluations of teaching and counseling performance that are required for recommendations of appointments to David Ross Boyd Professorships. For this reason, it has been proposed that a standing committee of the faculty (perhaps including a dean or other administrative officer) should be appointed to deal specifically with the task of selection--i.e., of making recommendations for--David Ross Boyd appointments; the committee should be composed largely, if not altogether, of present David Ross Boyd professors or others who are themselves ineligible for nomination.

There is also some feeling that the present nominating procedure (nominations can be made only by the several deans and by the Budget Council) may not have sufficiently broad reach--that is, that faculty members whose visibility, for one

Progress Report on Procedures for the Selection of David Ross Boyd  
Professors -- continued

reason or another, is less than that of others of comparable performance, might tend to be overlooked. It has been proposed, therefore, that the privilege of initiating nominations be extended to departmental Committees A and, under some prescribed formula (see below), to certain alumni of the University as well.

Since David Ross Boyd Professorships are awarded for distinguished performance in teaching and counseling, it is paradoxical that the entire process of nominating and recommending is in the hands of persons who rarely, if ever, have been taught or counseled by the professors whose qualifications they must evaluate. It has been proposed, therefore, that a procedure be developed for obtaining nominations from alumni who have been students of the eligible professors. Such a procedure must avoid the inequities of random polling of alumni, which would inevitably involve a heavy bias favoring those who teach high-demand subjects; it must also guard against the possibility of overenthusiastic graduates actively campaigning on behalf of favorite professors.

It has been suggested that the pitfalls just indicated could be avoided in some such manner as the following:

The selection committee (see above) could each year obtain names of students who had completed one or more courses under each of the faculty members eligible for nomination, and who had subsequently been graduated from the University; the names could be obtained from the class rolls for the 5th to 7th or 8th years preceding the instant one, excluding the rolls of courses that are devoted to the direction of individual graduate students in research or study leading to an advanced degree. Names would be selected in sufficient number to insure receipt of at least fifty responses, from the former students of each eligible professor, to letters soliciting nominations. Each such letter should include a list of those eligible and a nominating ballot on which the alumnus is asked to insert a name from the list if, and only if, he finds thereon the name of a professor who has indelibly impressed him as being of preeminent excellence in his teaching and/or counseling; he should be urgently importuned to return the ballot, marked "none", if he fails to find such a name. The name of an eligible faculty member on a ballot received from any of the first 50 respondents among those addressed from that faculty member's rolls <sup>would</sup> be considered by the selection committee as a nomination.

The procedure just outlined is admittedly a complex and burdensome one, but its complexity is perhaps not incommensurate with the complexity and weight of the problem with which it is designed to deal. We should note, of course, that in the first two or three years of operation of such a procedure as this it would not be feasible to apply it to all faculty eligible for nomination; but by random selection in each of these years of perhaps a third or fourth of those eligible, the procedure would, after a few years, need to involve only those who have just attained eligibility.

### 3. Prestige

Concern has been expressed that a David Ross Boyd Professorship is not sufficiently prestigious as compared, say, with a Research Professorship. Perhaps in response to this concern, the Regents of the University, in action taken on May 12, 1966, stipulated that "The stipend of a David Ross Boyd Professor

Progress Report on Procedures for the Selection of David Ross BoydProfessors -- continued

shall be commensurate with the honor of the award." Possibly this stipulation could be implemented and made more meaningful if it were required that the salary of a David Ross Boyd Professor should, upon his appointment, be increased by (say) 15 percent or by one-half the difference between his salary immediately before appointment and the salary at the 95th percentile of those for full professors in his college, whichever is the larger; and, further, that in subsequent years his salary shall not fall below the percentile in which this increment places it, among salaries of full professors on the General Faculty.

It has been suggested also that the appointment might be rather more prestigious if, like that of a Research Professorship, its tenure were made continuous.--In practice there has, in fact, been no failure to reappoint after the expiration of a first or second term as David Ross Boyd Professor, and no one thus far has completed a third term prior to retirement or decease.

Senate Committee on Faculty Personnel

Sherril D. Christian	Gene M. Nordby
Mark R. Everett	Paul R. David,
J. L. Kendall	Chairman

## ADJOURNMENT

The University Senate adjourned at 5:30 p.m. The next regular session will be held on Monday, September 30, 1968. Materials for the Agenda should be in the Office of the Secretary by Wednesday, September 18.

Gerald A. Porter, Secretary  
University Senate

