

JOURNAL OF THE UNIVERSITY SENATE
The University of Oklahoma

Regular Session -- May 25, 1970 -- 4:10 p. m.
Student Union Building, Room 165

The University Senate was called to order by Dr. Duane Roller, Chairman.

<u>Present:</u>	Alley, John N.	(0)	Harden, Darrell	(1)	Olkinetzky, Sam	(2)
	Babb, S. E., Jr.	(1)	Heller, Ben I.	(1)	Parker, Jack	(2)
	Bowen, Willis H.	(1)	Henderson, George	(4)	Parr, Arnold	(2)
	Christian, Sherril	(0)	Hilbert, Richard E.	(2)	Potter, Emma	(1)
	Ciereszko, Leon	(0)	Hopla, Cluff E.	(1)	Pray, Joseph	(1)
	Doerr, Arthur	(4)	Johnson, B. Connor	(2)	Roller, Duane H.	(1)
	Elconin, Victor A.	(0)	Kendall, J. L.	(1)	Root, Paul	(4)
	Enis, Thomas	(5)	Kitts, David B.	(3)	Snow, J. B., Jr.	(6)
	Foote, B. L.	(0)	Lancaster, John H.	(1)	Springer, C. E.	(2)
	Hall, Rufus	(1)	Norton, Spencer	(1)	Weiss, Kurt	(2)
					Zelby, Leon	(0)

<u>Absent:</u>	Abell, Creed	(7)	Hollomon, J. H.	(9)	Smouse, A. D.	(3)
	Bruce, John B.	(6)	Lynn, Thomas, Jr.	(9)	Tolson, Melvin B.	(9)
	Deckert, Gordon C.	(8)	Shepherd, Gene	(4)	White, Raymond R.	(3)

(NOTE: During the year, the University Senate met in eight regular and two--May 20 and June 17--special sessions. The number in parentheses above indicates the total number of meetings missed by each Senator.)

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

The Journal of the University Senate for the regular meeting on April 27, 1970, was approved.

ACTION BY PRESIDENT J. HERBERT HOLLOWOMON

On April 28, 1970, President J. Herbert Hollomon approved the change in faculty participation in commencement activities as recommended by the University Senate (see page 5 of the University Senate Journal for March 30, 1970). At that time, he also made the following pertinent comments in a memorandum addressed to Dr. Roller, Chairman of the University Senate:

"I am with some reluctance approving the action of the University Senate changing the policy regarding faculty participation in commencement. I hope that there will not be a lack of faculty participation as a result of the new policy. I personally feel very strongly that commencement is a tradition in which each individual should wish to participate voluntarily. I do not like any compulsory requirements and I think in any great institution the faculty would revere tradition by the fullest participation. If this should not prove to be the case, we would, of course, want to review the policy."

ACTION BY THE CHAIRMAN OF THE UNIVERSITY SENATE

On May 7, 1970, Dr. Roller, Chairman of the University Senate, sent the following memorandum to President J. Herbert Hollomon about sending military and state police units to the campus:

"In view of the present tensions throughout the nation resulting from the killing of students on the Kent State campus and the military action in Cambodia, I request that you remind the Governor of the attached resolution passed May 12, 1969, by the Senate of the University of Oklahoma Faculty."

(See pages 3 and 4 of the University Senate Journal for the special meeting on May 12, 1969.)

RECENT APPOINTMENT OF AN ASSISTANT PROVOST FOR
COMMUNICATIONS AND INFORMATIONBackground Information:

The University Senate met in special session on May 20, 1970, to consider faculty reaction to the recent appointment of Dr. William Carmack as the Assistant Provost of the University for Communications and Information. After the attendance dropped below the quorum level, the meeting was adjourned without any formal action being taken by the University Senate in this matter. (See pages 1-6 of the University Senate Journal for the special session on May 20, 1970.)

Senate Action:

With the permission of the University Senate, Dr. John S. Ezell, Dean of the College of Arts and Sciences, appeared before the University Senate on May 25, 1970, and read the following memorandum that he had addressed to the University Senate, concerning President Hollomon's letter of May 14, 1970, to Professor Roller (see pages 3 and 4 of the University Senate Journal for the special session on May 20, 1970):

"Because of the wide interest and concern about the recent appointment of an Assistant Provost, I would like this opportunity to amend, for purposes of clarification, one of the statements made in President Hollomon's letter of May 14th to the Senate and reprinted in the Norman Transcript on May 21, 1970. The particular part of the letter to which I refer is as follows: 'Furthermore, Dr. McCarter consulted with the Dean of Arts and Sciences on this change in administrative structure and the change had the Dean's prior understanding and concurrence' (Italics mine).

"I do not consider that my 'prior concurrence' was either asked for or given at any time before the Regents' Meeting (May 14th) at which the position of Assistant Provost for Communications and Information was established. It was not until the afternoon of May 15th that President Hollomon explained to me his reasons for instituting this change and assured me that he did not consider this to be an implementation of the Provost System."

Dr. Elconin then moved adoption of the following resolution that was distributed at this meeting:

"Recently it was announced that the Regents had approved the appointment of an Assistant Provost for Communications and Information. An important consequence of this appointment is the transfer of budget responsibility for three academic departments from the Dean of the College of Arts and Sciences to an Assistant Provost. The functions and responsibilities of the Assistant Provost correspond to those of a Vice Provost as set forth in the Plan for the Future of the University.

"From the time of the proposal of the Vice Provost system in the Plan, there has been very strong objection to implementation of the system without further study by the faculty. We strongly object to this change in administrative structure having been made without prior consultation with and study by the University Senate."

Without further discussion, the Senate approved the motion without opposition.

Dr. Christian then moved that the Executive Committee of the University Senate be empowered to submit to the President of the University names for the Faculty Oversight and Evaluation Committee on Administrative Structure requested by the President in his letter of May 14, 1970, to Dr. Roller, Chairman of the University Senate. The motion was approved by the Senate without opposition.

Immediately thereafter, Dr. Christian moved the adoption of the following resolution that had also been distributed at this meeting:

"We are dismayed by the regrouping of academic departments without prior consultation with the University Senate. To avoid a similar action in the future without adequate consultation between the Administration and the Faculty, we urge that the Oversight and Evaluation Committee requested in President J. Herbert Hollomon's letter of May 14, 1970, be consulted prior to any further regrouping of academic departments or the appointment of additional Assistant Provosts."

The Senate approved the motion without opposition.

NCMINATIONS FOR OVERSIGHT AND EVALUATION COMMITTEE
On May 26, 1970, the Secretary of the University Senate submitted to President Hollomon the following nominations approved by the Executive Committee of the University Senate for membership on the proposed Oversight and Evaluation Committee on Administrative Structure:

1. Stanley Babb, Jr. (Physics)
2. Lowell Dunham (Modern Languages)
3. Victor Elconin (English)
4. Robert Ford (Finance)

5. Richard Goff (Zoology)
6. Sam Olkinetzky (Art)
7. Kenneth Taylor (History of Science)
8. Dick van der Helm (Chemistry)
9. Kurt Weiss (Medicine)
10. Leon Zelby (Engineering)

PROPOSED UNIVERSITY CONSTITUTION

Background Information:

At its regular session on April 27, 1970, the University Senate tabled action on the proposed University constitution until this meeting. (See pages 4 and 5 of the University Senate Journal for April 27, 1970.)

On May 22, 1970, Dr. Feaver, Drafting Committee Chairman, reported as requested to the Secretary of the University Senate that the Drafting Committee has made no changes in the draft as printed on April 6, 1970, and that he did not know of any changes being contemplated.

Senate Action:

Dr. Hall moved that the question of the proposed University Constitution be removed from the table and also that the Constitution draft be approved.

During the discussion that followed, Dr. Zelby moved that the University Senate appoint a Committee to study the new draft of the Constitution. In a subsequent voice vote, the substitute motion was defeated. In answering a query from the floor, Dr. Feaver, Chairman of the Constitution Drafting Committee, remarked that the commentary included with the draft of the Constitution should be considered an integral part of the document and, therefore, would also be published whenever the Constitution is approved. In his opinion, the minutes of the Drafting Committee could be considered as a third source to assist with any subsequent questions about interpretation of the Constitution. Dr. Feaver also reported recent approval of the draft by the Student Congress and some University employee groups. In a show-of-hands vote, the University Senate approved the University Constitution in a count of 24 to 1.

UNIVERSITY TENURE REGULATIONS

Background Information:

On April 8, 1970, Dr. Pete Kyle McCarter, University Provost, sent the following memorandum to Dr. Duane Roller, Chairman of the University Senate:

"Pursuant to my recent conversation with you and other members of the Executive Committee, I send you the following comments and questions on the University Senate's Recommendation on "Academic Freedom and Tenure" (File No. 1967-68-13), transmitted to the President on June 6, 1968, and delayed by President Hollomon for reasons given in his letter
27 22 1968 to Professor Benton

"My comments and questions are keyed to the pages, headings, and sub-headings of the recommendations.

Page 1.

"(a) Invitation to the lecture-interview. Since 'the President's Office' does not now mean what it meant two years ago, I suggest the deletion of 'the President's Office' from the first sentence. The policy now in effect requires the letter to go from my office and over my signature. The suggested deletion would make 1(a) consistent with 1(b), which does not specify who shall send a letter of offer. Since both types of letter involve the commitment of University funds, I believe it may be taken for granted that, for legal reasons, the letters must be sent by the President or his designee.

Page 2.

"Definitions, first paragraph: 'All persons employed by the University at the rank of assistant professor or above shall serve a designated probationary period at the University.' At times in recent years this rigid policy has caused some very desirable people, who seemed otherwise to be attracted to the University, to withdraw from consideration; that is, having achieved tenure at another institution, they declined to give it up and entrust their destinies to unknown or uncertain circumstances here. This regulation also causes severe problems when a person from another institution is brought into an administrative position at the University of Oklahoma to correct a set of recognized deficiencies and finds that in carrying out his mandate, he may alienate a number of his colleagues and so be denied tenure for succeeding in what he was employed to do. I suggest that the Senate consider a policy that will allow a department (or other academic unit, as appropriate) to have the option of recommending that a person be appointed to the faculty with academic tenure if it can be shown (a) that he has already achieved tenure at another institution which is considered by the department to enjoy at least as high a reputation in the field as does the University of Oklahoma, and (b) that he has achieved tenure at a University whose tenure regulations are at least as stringent as those of the University of Oklahoma, and (c) that he has held tenure without qualification and continuously for some stated minimum time (such a minimum might be stated, it seems reasonable to me, at not less than six years or more than ten). (A fourth requirement perhaps worth considering is that he hold the rank of Professor at the other institution.) Such a policy would require the department to make some tough discriminatory judgements of other institutions. It would also require the department exercising the proposed option to make a more thorough and careful investigation than I fear many of our departments now make into the prospective appointee's acceptability among his present colleagues in spite of his holding tenure. Other solutions to the problem I have described are, of course, possible, and the one I have suggested may be too formalistic and restrictive. One solution, of course, is to keep to our present policy, which says in effect that it is impossible for any one to achieve such eminence in his field as to be eligible for tenure at the University of Oklahoma without being judged by whatever people we happen already to have in that field, *whether they have achieved similar eminence or not.*

"Definitions, fourth paragraph: 'regardless of the source of funds for their salaries.' If this provision is kept (and I have no great objection to it if we are all willing to live with its financial implications), the faculty must, in my view, accept a correlative policy that people whose initial appointments are not funded from regular University sources (that is, who are paid with 'soft money') should be given temporary appointments (see the paragraph 'Temporary Appointments,' supra). We do not now have a policy, but the financial risk of allowing people paid from temporary sources to proceed to tenure is too great for us not to institute such a requirement. One problem that this brings us to is that the approved nomenclature for temporary appointments ('visiting,' 'adjunct,' and 'special instructor') is limited in variety and applicability. I have no yearning to increase and variegate our array of titles, but we have trouble now with departments and deans in getting acceptance of 'visiting' ('might scare him off'), and 'adjunct,' as we use it, means something quite different. There is opportunity here for inventiveness, and I solicit the creativeness of the Senate in working for a solution.

"Page 3.

"Definitions," (cont.): The most welcome recognition of research as having a bearing upon tenure causes me to make the following observation: Although we have a clear definition of 'teaching,' as it pertains to these policies, we do not have a parallel definition of 'research.' Whether this omission may cause problems in administering the policy I cannot now predict. We may, however, learn about research what we learned last year about cheating: everybody knows what it is, but not all people agree as to what it is. I assume (but with some uncertainty) that, for purposes of administering these tenure policies, research, whatever its definition may be, must be a part of the load clearly so recognized by the department while it is going on. That is, let us say, a person who has been teaching for less than half-time and then comes forward with a claim that he has been conducting research surreptitiously or on his own time would not be eligible for tenure. Or would he? Also I take it that no judgement of the quality of the research is intended; that is, it is better to do poor research than to do none. Or is it?

"Just above the heading 'Probationary Periods' occurs this sentence: 'All notifications referred to below shall be in writing from the President!' I do not believe the President should be burdened with this kind of detail. Nor should any one office be burdened with it. I strongly urge that these notifications be made the responsibility of the Chairman (or Director or Dean, as the case may require) or of Committee A, with carbon copies to the Provost and to appropriate Deans. Even with form letters the amount of paper work required to have these notifications emanate from one office would cause great congestion, and, considering the near-misses that seem to excite the spirits of most of us when deadlines are involved, the chances of serious error would be very high.

"I am tempted into the following observation on a related problem: I have often wished that a snide comment could be inserted somewhere

along here (similar to the one in most of our bulletins that says, in effect, that a student is responsible for his own inability to comprehend the intricacies of degree requirements) that all faculty and academic administrators are responsible for understanding our tenure regulations-- including the system of dates and deadlines, who has the franchise in tenure-voting, when a person appointed at mid-term becomes eligible for tenure-consideration, and all the rest of it. You wouldn't believe how many people call me in the course of a year to ask me, in effect, to read to them spot-passages from my copy of the Faculty Handbook that they could read for themselves from their own copies. It is much like telephoning for the definition of a word that is in one's own desk dictionary. I usually ask the caller to get out his copy of the Handbook and turn to the right page, and then we hold a responsive reading by telephone. Some day maybe we can get all these things on tape and establish a Dial-a-Tenure-Regulation service. As the engineers like to say, we already have the technology.

"Professorial Ranks": The probationary period for the assistant professor and for the associate professor is extended by one year. This is an improvement and is to be applauded. Two comments: (1) It is assumed that the four-year period will be effective for only those people initially appointed after the final approval of these revised policies. (2) The recognition of a year in a professorial rank at another institution does not seem entirely consistent with the refusal to recognize tenure at any other institution.

Page 4.

"Procedure for the granting of Tenure." The requirement that a chairman and a dean who deem that a faculty member is not advancing regularly toward tenure should build an adverse file, made up of memoranda bearing the faculty member's initials, is a highly objectionable one. There should be a better way of achieving the result here intended. This proposal gets into sensitive areas of personal dignity and professionalism. It seems to me to be in the same category with our present requirements of the loyalty oath and the credit report. I strongly urge some modification in favor of a more acceptable way of building a personal file on a faculty member, even on those few people who from the outset give evidence that they are going to turn out to be incompetent, contumacious, boorish, immoral, or recalcitrant, or any combination of these.

At this time there are varying opinions in the wind as to what changes should be made in getting a representative faculty-wide review of tenure recommendations and the like. The roles of the various councils, including the Budget Council, are being studied. It is likely that the Budget Council will not turn out to be the appropriate body to review tenure recommendations. Last year I sent to the University Senate a suggestion that this responsibility, along with other reviews pertaining to special recommendations on individuals, be shifted from the Budget Council to the Committee on Faculty Personnel, recognizing that the present function of that Committee as an appellate body would thereby be compromised. That suggestion seems to have run off into the sand, and the docket of the Senate is presumably not now encumbered with it. Other

suggestions would have a new committee established to handle such matters or would have no review committee in the line of tenure considerations. I do not know what suggestions have reached the Senate this year. In any case, I think it will devolve upon the Senate soon or later to devise a system that will take the Budget Council out of the line of recommendations and put something else in its place (either another committee or a closed gap). Personally I strongly favor having a responsible review body between the departments and deans on the one hand and the central administration on the other.

"A small detail of nomenclature: The recommendations consistently refer to the 'Council on Faculty Personnel.' I think the approved designation is 'Committee on Faculty Personnel.' Whether it should be a Council or not may depend on what the University Constitution finally says about Councils. At present the term 'Committee' should be kept until due legislation originating with the Senate changes it.

"I have written a lengthy manuscript on what in the main are small but potentially troublesome points. It might have saved time if I had been asked to come before a Senate committee and talk from my notes. Please be assured, however, that my motive is to expedite the adoption and approval of what I consider to be, in substance, an excellent set of revisions (both changes and clarification) or our present regulations governing tenure. In general, I hope that the Senate will further refine them so that their operation will not be dependent on potentially temporary or uncertain circumstances (such as the role of the Budget Council) so that changes in administrative structure will not require too much new legislation of tenure-procedures."

(See pages 2 and 7-10 of the Agenda of the University Senate for the meeting on April 27, 1970.)

On April 21, 1970, Dr. Arthur Doerr, Chairman of the University Committee on Faculty Personnel, submitted the following letter to Dr. Duane Roller, Chairman of the University Senate:

"The University Committee on Faculty Personnel has come to the conclusion that several matters relating to faculty tenure are imperfectly understood, others apparently need updating or new consideration, and a number of similar matters need investigation by the University Senate. The Committee on Faculty Personnel recommends, therefore, that the Senate consider the following questions relating to tenure and personnel as well as others which the Senate may deem appropriate, i. e.

- "1. Within the department, who does/should vote on tenure?
- "2. Should different voting rules be applied in departments where only a small number of people have tenure?
- "3. Should opinions on a candidate's fitness be solicited from outside the department prior to a tenure vote?
- "4. Should the actual vote be reported?
- "5. Should a vote for tenure require more than a simple majority of favorable votes?

- "6. Should different probationary periods be applied for different ranks, e. g. immediate tenure for a professor, a one year probationary period for an associate professor, etc. ?
- "7. Should minority views on a tenure case be forwarded to the deans?
- "8. Should the department notify a faculty member of its tenure recommendations prior to a final decision on tenure by the President?
- "9. Shall the Committee on Faculty Personnel have discretionary authority to appoint alternate members to the committee in the event that a regular member disqualifies himself from a hearing because of personal prejudice?

"In these and similar questions the Committee on Faculty Personnel urges the University Senate to consider carefully the recommendations of faculty tenure made by the AAUP.

"To another question--the Committee on Faculty Personnel raises the question as to whether the Faculty Handbook has been officially adopted; i. e., is it an official university guide? If so, it's clear that it needs immediate revision and constant updating. In the opinion of the Committee on Faculty Personnel many precedents of procedure make a number of sections of the Faculty Handbook outmoded.

"We believe these matters to be of such significance as to require careful Senate investigation. "

On May 4, 1970, Dr. Doerr's letter was forwarded to the University Senate committee on Faculty Personnel for appropriate study and comment.

Senate Action:

Professor Spencer Norton, Chairman of the University Senate Committee on Faculty Personnel, reported that his Committee would present its report in this matter at the September, 1970, Senate meeting. (See pages 7-8, University Senate Journal, for April 27, 1970.)

RESEARCH AND PUBLIC SERVICE COUNCIL ✓

Background Information:

On September 28, 1969, Vice President E. L. Katzenbach suggested to Dean C. D. Riggs that the existing Extension Council be replaced by a new Research and Public Service Council. This suggestion was subsequently referred to the University Senate Committee on University Organization, Budget, and Publications. (See page 5 of the University Senate Journal for October 27, 1969, and pages 2 and 4 of the Agenda for the University Senate meeting on April 27, 1970.)

Senate Action:

Dr. Parker, Chairman of the University Senate Committee on University Organization, Budget, and Publications moved approval of the following recommendation of his Committee:

"The Committee recommends that the Extension Council be abolished and that it be replaced by a new council to be known as the Research and Public Service Council.

"The Research and Public Service Council shall include nine (9) full-time tenure-holding faculty members with no more than four (4) members from the same undergraduate degree-recommending college. Each member may serve three (3) years. The terms of three members should expire each year, with new members being appointed by the President from a list of persons nominated by the University Senate. The President also shall appoint annually two students who shall serve as voting members of the Council and one student who shall serve as an alternate. A requirement for student appointees shall be that they have been awarded a baccalaureate degree. Appointments of both faculty and student members shall be directed toward obtaining as broad representation of the entire University community as possible.

"The Vice President for Research and Public Service shall be an ex-officio, non-voting member of the Council.

"**DUTIES:** The Council shall act in an advisory capacity to the Vice President for research and Public Service on all matters relating to the Research, public service, and extension activities of the University."

The ensuing discussion was concerned primarily with the "research" aspect of this council. Dr. Roller felt that the activities of the proposed new Council would not apply to research projects of individual faculty members.

The Senate approved the Committee recommendation in a voice vote without opposition.

SENATE NOMINATIONS FOR UNIVERSITY COUNCILS

Background Information:

On April 20, 1970, Dr. Pete Kyle McCarter, University Provost, submitted his reactions to the recent University Senate decision to reduce from 3 to 2 the number of nominations to be submitted for University Council vacancies. This matter was referred to the University Senate Committee on University Organization, Budget, and Publications. (See page 7 of the University Senate Journal for April 27, 1970.)

Senate Action:

Dr. Parker, Chairman of the University Senate Committee on University Organization, Budget, and Publications, reported that his Committee had received assurances from the University Senate Committee on Committees that greater care and diligence would be taken in screening and submitting nominations in consonance with the comments offered by Dr. McCarter. Under the circumstances, the Committee could find no basis for rescinding the University Senate's action.

Background Information:

Last September, the University Senate requested its Committee on University Organization, Budget, and Publications to study recent reports of delayed mail delivery on the campus. (See pages 7 and 8 of the University Senate Journal for September 29, 1969, and page 4 of the University Senate Journal for March 30, 1970.)

Senate Action:

Dr. Parker, Chairman of the University Senate Committee on University Organization, Budget, and Publications, presented the following report:

"The Committee sought and received from the Vice President for Operation a written report of the operation of the University mail system. It noted both strengths and weaknesses in the present system and that many of the changes that have been introduced in recent years are the result of new operating procedures of the U. S. Post Office.

"The Committee has no recommendations concerning specific changes in the present University mail system."

UNIVERSITY RETIREMENT PROGRAM ✓

Throughout the past year, the University Senate referred various pertinent items to its Committee on University Organization, Budget, and Publications. (See page 8 of the University Senate Journal for January 26, 1970; pages 1 and 3 of the Agenda and page 4 of the Journal for the University Senate meeting on March 30, 1970; and pages 1-3 of the Agenda for the University Senate meeting on April 27, 1970.)

Senate Action:

Dr. Jack Parker, Chairman of the University Senate Committee on University Organization, Budget, and Publications, presented the following report:

"The Committee has little to report on the University Retirement Program. It feels that high priority attention should be given by the Senate to this matter during the next academic year. Perhaps it should be the first item referred to the new Senate Committee on University Organization, Budget, and Publications.

"We have become aware of the existence of a committee of faculty members which, with the assistance of administrative staff members, has devoted much time in recent months to an analysis of the present retirement system and a consideration of possible changes in it. We had scheduled a meeting of our committee with a representative of that committee, but a failure in communication leading to a mix-up in dates resulted in our not getting together. We urge that the Senate's role in attempting to bring about improvement in the retirement system be coordinated with the work of that committee."

UNIVERSITY PARKING POLICY ✓

Background Information:

In his letter of March 20, 1970, to Dr. Duane Roller, Chairman of the University Senate, Professor Victor Eppstein objected to the recent imposition of a fifteen-dollar fee for faculty parking and requested Senate consideration of this matter. (See page 12 of the Agenda for the University Senate meeting on April 27, 1970.) The communication was referred to the University Senate Committee on University Organization, Budget, and Publications.

Senate Action:

Dr. Parker, Chairman of the University Senate Committee on University Organization, Budget, and Publications reported on that Committee's discussions with Professor Eppstein, who was at that time requested to prepare an appropriate resolution for Senate consideration.

Dr. Parker then read Professor Eppstein's proposed resolution, dated May 20, 1970, without additional Committee comment and recommendation, as follows:

"It is the sense of this body that the Administration should rescind the \$15 faculty parking fee and should issue identification decals as in the past upon payment of a nominal handling fee of not over five dollars.

"Although it is obvious that the maintenance budget must be increased, this objective must be realized without taxing the faculty for expenses involved in fulfillment of the basic essential functions of the University. Faculty parking, for those certified by the Department chairmen, is not an optional privilege to be purchased, but a necessary prerequisite to classroom teaching and other faculty duties.

"The imposition of the \$15 fee has been widely resented, both on constitutional grounds and as an unwarranted burden upon an already underpaid faculty. Its prompt repeal will have a salutary effect."

Dr. Darrell Harden moved adoption of Professor Eppstein's resolution. In the ensuing discussion, some faculty members indicated varying degrees of improvement in the parking situation on the campus.

The Senate approved the resolution with 18 affirmative and 4 negative votes cast.

NOMINATION FOR UNIVERSITY COUNCIL ON INSTRUCTION

Background Information:

On April 27, 1970, the University Senate approved nominations for vacancies on the various University Councils.

Subsequently, Dr. David Levy, one of the nominees for the Council on Instruction, requested that his name be withdrawn because of other commitments. Dr. T. H. Milby, another nominee for the same Council, called attention to an improper identification.

Dr. Hall moved approval of the following changes recommended by the University Senate Committee on Committees:

Council on Instruction

Dr. Matthew Kraynak (Home Economics) to replace Dr. David Levy (History)
Dr. T. H. Milby (Library) rather than (Library Science)

The changes were approved by the University Senate without opposition.

ELECTION OF NEW SENATORS BY VARIOUS COLLEGES

According to official reports from the respective Deans, the following individuals were elected to membership in the University Senate for three-year (1970-73) terms, unless otherwise indicated:

Arts and Sciences: James R. Burwell
Paul David (for one year only to complete Dr. Doerr's
1968-71 term)
David Levy
K. L. Taylor
A. J. Weinheimer
Geoffrey Marshall

Business Administration: Forrest L. Frueh

Engineering: Ronald R. Mohler

Fine Arts: Helen Gregory

Medicine: John Colmore
Robert Hansen (for two years only to complete Dr. R. Williams'
1969-72 term)

EQUAL EMPLOYMENT OPPORTUNITY: MARRIED PROFESSIONAL WOMEN ✓

Background Information:

On April 13, 1970, Dr. Gail Jacobson in a letter to Dr. Duane Roller, Chairman of the University Senate, called attention to alleged lack of equal opportunity for professional women married to faculty members. The Senate referred this matter to its Committee on Faculty Personnel. (See pages 7 and 8 of the University Senate Journal for April 27, 1970.)

Senate Action:

In his informal, progress report, Professor Spencer Norton, Chairman of the University Senate Committee on Faculty Personnel, stated that at an early date

he would submit to the Secretary of the University Senate for subsequent publication in the Journal pertinent excerpts from applicable state laws concerning campus employment policies.

RESIGNATION FROM THE UNIVERSITY SENATE

On May 19, 1970, Dr. Stewart Wolf sent the following letter of resignation to the Chairman of the University Senate"

"Because of my impending move to the University of Texas, I must submit to you my resignation as a member of the University Senate. In doing so I would like to express my great affection for and loyalty to the University of Oklahoma. My experience here over the past eighteen years has meant a great deal in my life, and I wish every success to the continuing deliberations of the Senate."

Dr. Wolf's term of office as a representative of the general faculty of the University expired at the end of the current academic year.

PROPOSED STUDENT CODE

Background Information:

At the special session on May 20, 1970, members of the University Senate received copies of the proposed new Student Code. (See page 1 of the University Senate Journal for the special session on May 20, 1970.)

Senate Action:

Dr. Hall moved approval of the proposed Student Code. After a brief discussion, the Senate approved the motion with one dissenting vote.

FACULTY RESPONSIBILITY DURING STUDENT UNREST

On May 15, 1970, Dr. Richard S. Wells of the Department of Political Science, sent the following memorandum to Dr. Roller, University Senate Chairman, concerning faculty responsibility during any student unrest:

"Based on the experience of the last week on the campus, it appears to me that the time has come for a deliberate policy on the faculty's responsibilities on those occasions when high levels of student unrest threaten the peace and tranquility of the University community. It is my opinion that the involvement of faculty marshals during the rump strike last Friday and during the Tuesday military demonstration in the stadium held both events within reasonable bounds. This is not to say that the faculty marshals were crucial, but it is to say that I think they and the student marshals were the main restraining force keeping people within bounds and 'out of the hair' of the **military**.

"It seems to me that the Senate should convene a special committee which attempts to fashion a statement and assign responsibility for the planning of the faculty's responsibility and involvement in what, I am sure, in the future will be continual disturbances on the campus

"Basic to this suggestion is my assumption that the faculty must assume an active responsibility in the ongoing affairs, academic and otherwise, of the campus. I do not wish to suggest that we go to the length of having the faculty become high school teachers patrolling the halls, but I do think that on those occasions when high levels of tension exist, the faculty must do more than stand around holding signs indicating that they are for peace.

"I hope my suggestion is not presumptuous, and if it is unclear, I will be more than happy to try and make it clear enough for the Senate to consider whether it wishes to act upon it."

This matter has been referred to the University Senate Committee on Student and Public Relations.

PROPOSAL FOR ELECTION OF UNIVERSITY SENATE ALTERNATES ✓

In his memorandum of May 21, 1970, to Dr. Duane Roller, University Senate Chairman, Professor Wilson B. Prickett, Department of Finance, offered the following suggestion for Senate consideration:

"An examination of the minutes of the Faculty Senate over the past two years discloses the fact that, on the average, one-third of the membership is not in attendance at each meeting. Some meetings are conducted with fewer than fifty percent of the Faculty's elected representatives.

"In view of the fact that the General Faculty regularly meets but once a semester, during which there is no time to conduct business, the Faculty Senate must act for the Faculty in conducting its business and formulating policy. This is becoming more important with each passing year.

"It appears evident that the broad spectrum of Faculty viewpoint is not being adequately represented when such a small number of their peers effect policy and conduct the business of the Faculty.

"I suggest the following procedure to correct this situation and respectfully submit it for the Senate's consideration. For each Senator elected to the Faculty Senate, there should also be an alternate elected. Both the Senator and his alternate should be authorized to attend all Senate meetings. Should the elected Senator be absent, the alternate automatically would have the right to participate in discussions and vote. If the regular Senator is present, the alternate's role would be that of a silent observer.

"Such a procedure would permit a wider Faculty participation in the business of the Faculty. Further, it would create better liaison between the Senate and the Faculty of the separate Colleges. At the Faculty meetings of the separate Colleges, reports on actions taken or to be considered by the Senate would have benefit of several additional 'reporters,' since the alternates would have been present at the Senate meetings and able to assist in informing the majority of the Faculty

concerning matters of interest to the Faculty.

"Perhaps the meeting place of the Faculty Senate could be changed to Adams Hall 150, or other suitable quarters to accommodate the larger numbers involved in the above suggested procedure."

This matter has been referred to the University Senate Committee on University Organization, Budget, and Publications.

ELECTION OF SECRETARY, UNIVERSITY SENATE, 1970-71

Dr. Kurt Weiss moved that Dr. Anthony S. Lis be re-elected Secretary for 1970-71 by acclamation. The Senate approved the motion.

ELECTION OF CHAIRMAN-ELECT, UNIVERSITY SENATE, 1970-71

Dr. Rufus Hall was elected Chairman-Elect of the University Senate for the 1970-71 academic year.

At this point, Dr. Roller turned the meeting over to the incoming Chairman, Dr. Cluff E. Hopla.

RESOLUTION OF APPRECIATION: DR. DUANE ROLLER

Dr. Heller moved that the University Senate express its sincere appreciation to Dr. Duane Roller for being an excellent Chairman of the University Senate under most trying conditions during the past academic year. The University Senate approved the resolution without opposition to commend Dr. Roller for being "fair, firm, and reasonable."

ADJOURNMENT

The University Senate adjourned at 5:00 p. m. The next regular session will be held on Monday, September 28, 1970, in Room 165 of the Student Union. Items for the Agenda should reach the Secretary by Wednesday, September 16, 1970.

Anthony S. Lis
Secretary