

JOURNAL OF THE UNIVERSITY SENATE
The University of Oklahoma

Special Session, May 20, 1970 -- 4:10 p. m.
Student Union Building, Room 165

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

Present:

Alley, John N.	Hilbert, Richard	Pray, Joseph
Bowen, Willis H.	Hopla, Cluff	Roller, Duane
Christian, Sherril	Kendall, J. L.	Root, Paul
Ciereszko, Leon	Lancaster, John	Weiss, Kurt
Elconin, Victor	Norton, Spencer	White, Raymond
Foote, B. L.	Olkinetzky, Sam	Zelby, Leon
Hall, Rufus	Parr, Arnold	
Harden, Darrell	Potter, Emma	

Absent:

Abell, Creed	Henderson, George	Smouse, A. D.
Babb, S. E.	Hollomon, J. H.	Snow, James B.
Bruce, John	Johnson, B. Connor	Springer, C. E.
Deckert, Gordon	Kitts, David	Tolson, Melvin
Doerr, Arthur	Lynn, Thomas	Wolf, Stewart
Enis, Thomas	Parker, Jack	
Heller, Ben	Shepherd, Gene	

PROPOSED STUDENT CODE ✓

Copies of the proposed new Student Code, prepared this spring by a joint student-faculty-administration committee, were distributed at this meeting for consideration at the next regular meeting of the University Senate on May 25, 1970. The Secretary of the University Senate will mail individual copies to the members of the Senate who were absent.

RECENT APPOINTMENT OF ASSISTANT PROVOST ✓

Dr. Roller, Chairman of the University Senate, announced that this special meeting was called by request of several faculty members specifically to consider the recent appointment of Dr. William Carmack as Assistant Provost of the University. He called attention to (a) President J. Herbert Hollomon's letter of May 14, 1970, addressed to Dr. Roller and reproduced in the Agenda for the special meeting and (b) the May 18, 1970, memorandum from Dr. Pete Kyle McCarter, Provost of the University, to all Deans, Chairmen, and Directors of academic units. Copies of Dr. McCarter's memorandum were distributed at this meeting. Both communications are reproduced on pages 3-6 of this Journal.

Dr. Elconin expressed his feeling that the recent appointment of Dr. Carmack actually establishes one-fourth of the Vice Provost system outlined in the Plan for the Future of the University. In his opinion, the Senate was being asked to accept something that it had specifically refused to endorse previously. To him, this question was essentially one of the "correct procedure" in effecting administrative changes that involve the instructional program of this University.

The ensuing discussion covered the following points:

- (1) The similarity between the duties of Vice Provost in the Plan and those of the recently appointed Assistant Provost.
- (2) The question as to whether the recent appointment of the University Assistant Provost was, in effect, a start in the implementation of the Provost program outlined in the Plan.
- (3) The lack of consultation with the University Senate in the appointment of Dr. Carmack.

(4) The transfer of budgetary responsibilities of three academic departments, viz., Journalism, Library Science, and Speech.

After discussing this matter for approximately 20 minutes, the Senate decided to invite Dr. Pete Kyle McCarter to appear either at this meeting or at the regular meeting scheduled for May 25, 1970, to discuss the various aspects of this question, as well as answer any questions of the members of the Senate.

Dr. Cluff Hopla, Chairman-Elect of the University Senate, left the meeting to extend the invitation of the University Senate to Dr. McCarter who accepted the invitation and shortly thereafter appeared before the Senate.

In his prefatory remarks and subsequent answers to questions from individual members of the University Senate, Dr. McCarter noted the following:

(1) In his opinion, the terms, Vice Provost and Assistant Provost, are synonymous.

(2) The recent appointment of the Assistant Provost, in his judgment, is not an implementation of the Provost system as described in the Plan. Involving no sizable expenditures for the time being, the recent appointment is an experiment with one phase of the Provost system and is partly innovative in nature and partly a continuation of past practice.

(3) The increasing workload, particularly with regard to budgetary and personnel matters, in the Office of the Provost requires the delegation of some of the responsibilities to an individual with the title of Assistant Provost.

(4) Faculty consultation and participation was neither invited nor sought because, at that time, Dr. McCarter felt that such faculty involvement did not seem logical to him.

Dr. McCarter took the opportunity to make the first public announcement of the fact that the successor to Dr. William Price, Dean of Admissions and Registrar, is being offered the position of Assistant Provost for Academic Affairs and University Regulations.

In summarizing the lengthy discussion of the afternoon, Dr. Roller listed the following items as being indicative of the Senate consensus in this matter:

(1) The recent appointment of the Assistant Provost should not have been made without consultation with the University Senate.

(2) Some assistance is urgently needed in the Office of the University Provost.

(3) The University Senate desires prior faculty consultation in such matters to prevent a recurrence of this situation.

Inasmuch as the remaining members of the Senate no longer constituted a quorum, no formal action could be taken on this matter, including the request from Dr. Hollomon for faculty nominations for the Faculty Oversight Committee. Dr. Roller, therefore, announced that this question would be considered further at the regular meeting of the University Senate on May 25, 1970.

The Senate adjourned at 5:35 p. m.

Anthony S. Lis
Secretary

Letter dated May 14, 1970, from President Hollomon to Dr. Roller, Chairman of the Faculty Senate:

As you will remember, the so called Vice-Provost System as sketched in the Plan for the Future of the University aroused considerable discussion and opposition. Much of the negative criticism of this System seemed to be quite justified; for example, the sample groupings of academic units clearly were not suitable for use in practice.

I have received three formal pieces of advice from the Faculty on this matter. The relevant portions are:

- (1) An ad hoc committee, appointed by me, recommended:
 - (a) That the position of Provost be established.
 - (b) That substantial administrative reorganization requires study by the Faculty Senate and the Student Government.

I concurred with both of these recommendations.

- (2) A Chapter Study Committee of the Senate noted:

"Since this system has not been conclusively tested, its validity must rest on successful implementation."

The Committee recommended:

"In the event the Provost system is implemented a Continuing Faculty Oversight and Evaluation Committee should be established to evaluate the impact of the new structure on departmental development, a more meaningful set of undergraduate programs and its effect on the Faculty and students."

I concurred with the recommendations of this committee.

- (3) A senate ad hoc Committee reviewing the work of the Chapter Study Committees appended the recommendation:

"The Provost system as recommended in "The Plan" shall not be implemented."

I largely concurred with this view as well; indeed the system as outlined in the Plan was clearly not suitable for implementation in the form given there. This is one of the many portions of that study that required changes if they were to be implemented.

As President I am faced with the duty of steadily altering the structure of the University to fit changing needs and with the necessity of improving the office of Provost by providing the Provost with badly-needed assistance in the form of assistants. Accordingly, I have obtained approval of the

Regents to assign to Professor Carmack the additional responsibilities of Assistant Provost for Communications and Information.

This action has the concurrence of the Provost as being a more efficient way of managing some of the many activities that lie within his responsibility and of giving better administrative support from his office to the departments and agencies concerned. It also associates the Computing Center more closely with academic programs. Furthermore, Dr. McCarter consulted with the Dean of the College of Arts and Sciences on this change in administrative structure and the change had the Dean's prior understanding and concurrence. He also informed the Director of the School of Journalism, Director of the School of Library Science, the Director of the University Libraries, the Director of the University Press, the Editor of Books Abroad, and the Coordinator of Broadcasting Instruction, and found no opposition from any of these.

Neither the Provost nor the Dean of Arts and Sciences regard this administrative change as being an implementation of the Provost System. Nevertheless, because of deep Faculty concern in such matters it seems appropriate to establish a Faculty Committee of the sort called for by the Faculty Senate Chapter Study Committee.

I, therefore, am asking the Senate to recommend names from which I may appoint such an Oversight and Evaluation Committee on Administrative Structure. This is both in accordance with the Senate's wishes and with my desire to obtain advice and aid from the Faculty in solving the administrative problems of the University.

Memorandum of May 18, 1970, from Dr. Pete Kyle McCarter, University Provost, to all Deans, Chairmen, and Directors of Academic Units:

This message is prompted by a suggestion that an explanation of the reasons for last week's appointment of Prof. William R. Carmack to the position of Assistant Provost would be of interest to the General Faculty, and by reports that in some parts of the faculty an adverse reaction, apparently based on rumor, misunderstanding, and perhaps misrepresentation, has appeared. I hope that you will use your own way of passing the word.

The newspaper stories, which were based on a summary prepared by me for the use of the press, correctly indicated that, an Assistant Provost, Professor Carmack becomes responsible for working with those instructional and other academic departments that are concerned primarily with information, communication, and publication. As a member of my office he is expected to give these units closer administrative support and understanding than I have been able to give them, especially in the development of their resources -- i. e., money, staffing, and equipment.

The newspapers did not give the reasons for this development of the Provost's Office. They are the following:

1. As all of you can attest who have recently had business with my office, the office is overloaded with work. As a matter of fact, whether one counts the money, the people, or the budget units, the volume of work has more than doubled in the last two years. We are floundering in a morass of detail. The office that is responsible for a greater variety and a larger volume of work than any other in the University, except the President's, has been trying to get along with a smaller staff than several of the Deans and perhaps some of the departments have. We can no longer pretend that the whole is smaller than some of its parts.
2. The result has been slower response to the various departments and units; a loss in communications, knowledge, and understanding; and a progressive paralysis of the administrative function. This situation cannot be remedied by adding classified staff. It calls for the help of people with a professional understanding of whatever questions may be involved.
3. The cluster of units that I am delegating to Professor Carmack is a natural one which fits his interests, talents, and experience. They include some units (Library and Computer Laboratory) whose smooth functioning is crucial to every department and faculty member. They include other units that can develop better when their interrelationships are given proper administrative attention. In budget they carry something over four million dollars' worth of responsibility.
4. It happens that this move can be made at very small cost. Professor Carmack has agreed to accept these new duties over and above his present responsibilities as Chairman and Professor. No additional persons are being added to the administration or faculty to release part of his time, and no funds for professional staff are involved.

5. Before the recommendation of this appointment was made to the Regents I talked to all the budget administrators of the units involved except one (the President talked to him.) None of them resisted the plan; all of them understood the reasons for it; most of them applauded it.

I hope that this explanation will find a similar attitude in those who are less directly involved. Candor requires me to say that I am still looking for other devices to add to the staff of the Provost's Office, when the opportunity to do so at minimum expense appears, in order to give more effective support and service to the academic units.