

JOURNAL OF THE UNIVERSITY SENATE

Special Session, January 13, 1969 -- 3:30 p. m.
Student Union Building, Room 165

The University Senate, meeting in special session, was called to order by Dr. Sherrill D. Christian, Chairman of the University Senate.

Present

John N. Alley
Mildred M. Andrews
Stanley E. Babb, Jr.
Willis H. Bowen
Rodney L. Boyes
John C. Brixey
John B. Bruce
Frank B. Canfield
Sherrill D. Christian
Leon S. Ciereszko
Paul R. David
Arthur H. Doerr
Victor A. Elconin
Frank Elkouri
Mark R. Everett
J. Clayton Feaver
Gilbert C. Fite
Travis P. Goggans

Present

Ben I. Heller
George Henderson
Richard E. Hilbert
Harry E. Hoy
J. L. Kendall
John H. Lancaster
Gene M. Nordby
Sam Olkinetzky
Jack F. Parker
Joseph C. Pray
John W. Renner
Duane H. D. Roller
Thomas M. Smith
C. E. Springer
Charles C. Suggs
Kelly M. West
Raymond R. White

Absent

Edward F. Blick
Darrell Harden
Frances Hart
Herbert R. Hengst
J. Herbert Hollomon
David B. Kitts (on leave)
Melvin B. Tolson
Gerald Tuma

NOTE: Dr. Lowell Dunham representing the General Faculty 1967-70 has tendered his resignation from the University Senate. His replacement will be elected when the procedure is initiated next month for election of the other General Faculty representatives.

PLAN FOR THE FUTURE OF THE UNIVERSITY 

Report from the Executive Committee of the Senate

The Executive Committee of the University Senate has met several times with Dr. Hollomon and Dr. Christenson to recommend and discuss appointments to the University committee to plan the Law Center, the committee to draft a constitution for the University, and the committee on the Provost and Academic Organization. The President has already named the Provost committee, which includes the following members:

Duane H. D. Roller
Edward F. Blick
Robert A. Bowser
Ann Cosgrove
Gail deStwolinski
Victor A. Elconin

Calvin Garrett
A. Gerlof Homan
David W. Levy
Charles J. Mankin
Geoffrey Marshall
Maurice Merrill

J. R. Morris
James Morris
John W. Renner
John A. Schilling
Randal A. Sengel
Lloyd P. Williams

Plan for the Future of the University -- continued

The Executive Committee has formally invited people to serve on the Senate committees to study individual chapters of the Plan for the Future of the University. We have followed the recommendations of the Senate with respect to the membership of the committees (see the Journal of the University Senate, December 14, 1968) with the following exceptions:

1. No student members were appointed to the chapter committees. It was felt that since these are committees of the Faculty Senate, we should in general restrict membership to faculty members. Students will, of course, be consulted by the various committees in the course of their operations.
2. The committee to study Chapter XII has not been appointed. The Alumni Development Fund Committee consists of several non-faculty members, and we did not believe it should function as the major component of a University (Faculty) Senate Committee.
3. Professor Duane Roller, Chairman of the Faculty Research Committee, was not asked to serve on the committee to study Chapter VII. We felt that, considering his function as chairman of the Provost committee, he should be asked to serve on the committee to study Chapters VIII and X. Professor Thomas Smith, who has had previous experience as a member and acting chairman of the Faculty Research Committee has been asked to serve on the Chapter VII committee.

As soon as the complete membership of the chapter committees is known, we will provide the Senate with a list of people serving on each committee.

Senate Action

On January 13, Dr. Christian presented the foregoing information and made comments extending beyond the limits of the report as presented here.

Dr. David moved that the University Senate approve the exceptions made by the Executive Committee of the Senate as it formulated the membership of the various committees for study of the Plan for the Future of the University. His motion was seconded and passed.

FINANCIAL SUPPORT FOR THE UNIVERSITY SENATE ✓

On December 14, 1968, the University Senate approved a motion for the appropriation of funds for use by the Senate in an experimental attempt to improve its effectiveness.

On January 13, 1969, the Chairman of the University Senate reported that he had considered this matter with President Hollomon. The Chairman indicated that he found no financial support available for 1968-69; that some office space arrangements might be made; and that the Senate could reasonably expect more secretarial help at a later time.

UNIVERSITY COUNCILS

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

December 19, 1968

Remark: No Faculty Senate Action is requested in this report. The report is for transmittal to the Committee which will revise the Faculty Senate Charter. At the present time, it is not clear that Policy Councils, which are somewhat independent of the Faculty Senate, are the optimal way to involve faculty in the University policy decision process.

I. Review of Present Council System

A. Committee conference with P. K. McCarter (Academic Vice President)

1. McCarter presented a partial plan for reorganization of the present councils along the administrative lines of authority presented in the Hollomon Plan. McCarter's proposal is presented in Figure 1. McCarter's plan is consistent with the statement regarding Policy Councils in the Hollomon Plan.
2. McCarter suggested that the Policy Councils be advisory to the President, not the Vice-Presidents and Provost. Should provide means of transmitting minority views to the President.
3. The Council on Instruction, with which McCarter has been closely associated, has tended to become immersed in trivia.

B. Committee Conference with E. N. Brandt, Jr. (Associate Director of the Medical Center and Associate Dean of the School of Medicine)

1. While the Medical Center faculty are not overly enthusiastic about participating in the present Policy Councils, they could become more enthusiastic if the Councils considered less trivia and if they had well-defined authority. Under these conditions, Brandt felt that the Medical Center should be represented on all Policy Councils.
2. Brandt suggested, that with an increasing number of joint projects between the two campuses, a Council of Joint Projects be considered. The new Council could recommend policy for shared facilities and resources, and could act as a catalyst to stimulate new joint projects.
3. Of the six schools on the OKC campus (Medicine, Dentistry, Nursing, Health Related Professions, and Graduate), he suggested that students from the Medical School are too busy to become involved with Policy Councils, but they do have considerable interest in the Athletics Council (Freshmen in Medical School have same ticket priority as freshmen in University College).
4. A listing of present committees at the Medical Center is presented in Appendix I. (The Appendix consists of 9 pages of committees and is not included in this Journal report.)

Figure 1. McCarter Plan for University Councils

<u>Administrative Function</u>	<u>Present Council</u>	<u>Proposed Council</u>
Provost	Instruction	Council on Academic Policy (with sub-committee on Courses and Curricula)
V. P. for Operations	Planning and Development	Council on Planning and Development (perhaps larger)
V. P. for University Projects	None	Council for University Projects
V. P. for Finance and Adm.	Budget	Budget Council 1
V. P. for Res. & Public Service	Extension	Council for Res. and Public Service
V. P. for University Community	Student Activities and Welfare (athletics?)	Council on University Community
V. P. for University Relations	None	Council on University Relations
V. P. for OKC campus	None	Council on Health Education (with two or so representatives from Norman campus)

Present Councils & Committees which need to be considered

1. Committee on University Libraries
2. Committee on Faculty Personnel
3. Athletics Council (Must be consistent with NCAA requirements)

University Councils -- continued

C. Committee Investigation of Present Councils.

Members of the committee visited with two or three members from the Councils to solicit response to the questions, "What is the current function of the Council?" and "What should be the function of the Council?" A summary of responses for each Council is as follows:

1. BUDGET:
 - a. Work only with faculty salaries and recommend allocation to Colleges for distribution as College sees fit.
 - b. Should work with entire University budget.
2. INSTRUCTION:
 - a. Too much time spent with trivia.
 - b. Should develop new instructional programs.
3. STUDENT ACTIVITIES AND WELFARE:
 - a. Did not meet last year.
 - b. Should recommend policies on extracurricula activities, living arrangements, and general welfare on campus.
4. ATHLETICS:
 - a. Little authority. Budget matters presented "cut and dry". In exceptional cases, budget revision has been effected by Council.
 - b. Should be communication link to faculty. Should help by, e.g., guidance of athletes.
5. EXTENSION:
 - a. Little authority. Mainly public relations function.
 - b. Should be consulted on key appointments, e.g., Dean. Should consider clientele to be served, price of courses, and what should be done to prepare for rapid growth of adult education.
6. LIBRARY:
 - a. Consider appropriate matters at present.
 - b. No modification suggested.

University Council -- continued

7. PLANNING AND DEVELOPMENT: (Note: Two faculty members have been added this year in conflict with Council Charter.)

- a. Too much trivia. Mainly a vehicle to say 'no' to requests which an administrator could have handled.
- b. Senate should define scope and level of responsibilities more precisely.

8. FACULTY PERSONNEL:

- a. It is an appeal board for questions of tenure, promotion, and dismissal.
- b. Should make recommendations for distinguished professorships in addition to current function.

D. Review of Recent Studies of Policy Council System.

1. The Hollomon Plan recommends that the Policy Councils be reorganized to coincide with lines of administrative authority at the Vice-Presidential level.
2. Report of the Sub-Panel on Academic Administration (Doyle Bishop, Chairman). Although comments regarding faculty participation are dispersed in the report, pages 49ff contain specific recommendations concerning reorganization of Policy Councils.

II. Suggestions for Increasing Effectiveness of Present Councils.

Two reasons for ineffectiveness of some of the present Councils are readily isolated: (1) they have little authority and (2) too much time is spent in dealing with trivia. To help alleviate these problems, the committee developed two specific suggestions.

- A. Authority. All Councils are supposed to be advisory to the President. As such they have no authority except for their power of persuasion. The committee feels that the Councils persuasive powers could be increased by scheduling at least two meetings per year with the President.
- B. Trivia. The committee believes that the consideration of too many trivial items is due to lack of organization within the Councils. Much time is spent discussing an item which is trivial to all except the speaker. It is suggested that the Chairman of each Council formulate an agenda well in advance of the meetings. Agenda items could be suggested by the Chairman, by members, by administrative officials, or by any other interested person. The order of items on the agenda should be selected by the Chairman. Keeping in mind that the best disposition of many items will be to ignore them, the committee should vote after limited discussion (5 minutes) on whether the item should be considered. A majority vote of the members present should be adequate to avoid discussion of trivial items. Special items which were formulated too late to appear on the agenda could be handled in the same way.

University Councils -- continued

Dr. Canfield presented the foregoing material as a summation of the work done by the University Senate Committee on University Organization, Budget, and Publications. He suggested that the report be sent on to the committee that is dealing most directly with study of university councils within the Plan for the Future of the University.

Dr. Smith moved that the report be accepted by the University Senate and that it be submitted to the appropriate committee for it's use. His motion was seconded and passed.

SENATE CHARTER

On January 13, Dr. Renner moved that the Ad Hoc Committee to Study the Organization and Functions of the University Senate (Journal of the University Senate, November 25, 1968) and the Senate Committee on University Organization, Budget, and Publications hold a joint meeting to determine the makeup of a committee to consider the problems in revamping the Senate Charter as a part of the new University Constitution. His motion was seconded and Passed after much discussion.

ADJOURNMENT

The University Senate adjourned at 4:40 p.m. The next regular session will be held on Monday, January 27, 1969, at 3:30 p.m.

Gerald A. Porter, Secretary

