

JOURNAL OF THE UNIVERSITY SENATE  
The University of Oklahoma  
Norman

Regular Session - November 30, 1970 - 3:30 p. m.

The University Senate was called to order by Dr. Cluff Hopla, Chairman.

<u>Present:</u>	Babb, Stanley E.	Hilbert, Richard E.	Root, Paul
	Bowen, Willis H.	Hopla, Cluff E.	Shepherd, Gene
	Burwell, James	Kendall, J. L.	Snow, James B.
	Crim, Sarah	Levy, David	Taylor, K. L.
	David, Paul	Livezey, William	Tolson, Melvin
	Frueh, Forrest	Love, Tom	Truex, Dorothy
	Gregory, Helen	Marshall, Geoffrey	Weinheimer, A. J.
	Grunder, J. Richard	McNichols, William	Weiss, A. Kurt
	Hall, Rufus	Mohler, Ronald R.	Zahasky, Mary
	Harden, Darrell	Norton, Spencer	Zelby, Leon
	Henderson, George	Nuttall, Edmund	
 <u>Absent:</u>	 Abell, Creed	 Lancaster, John H.	 Potter, Emma
	Deckert, Gordon	Lynn, Thomas	Smouse, A. D.
	Hansen, Robert	Parker, Jack	Sokatch, John
	Johnson, B. Connor	Parr, Arnold	

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

The Journal of the University Senate for the regular session on October 26, 1970, was approved.

ACTION BY INTERIM PRESIDENT PETE KYLE McCARTER

University Oversight and Evaluation Committee on Administrative Structure:

On November 10, 1970, the Secretary of the University Senate was notified of the fact that President J. Herbert Hollomon had selected during the summer of 1970 the following five faculty members to serve on the University Oversight and Evaluation Committee on Administrative Structure:

Lowell Dunham (Modern Language)  
Victor Elconin (English)  
Robert Ford (Finance)  
Kenneth Taylor (History of Science)  
Kurt Weiss (Medical Center)

(See pages 3-4 of the University Senate Journal for the regular session on May 25, 1970.)

University Committee To Study Inequalities of Women in the University Structure:

On November 13, 1970, the Secretary of the University Senate was informed that Interim President Pete Kyle McCarter had appointed the following three

faculty members to serve on the University Committee To Study Inequalities of Women in the University Structure:

James Kenderdine (Marketing)  
 Betty Pollak (Physics)  
 Dorothy Truex (Education)

(See page 12 of the University Senate Journal for October 26, 1970.)

Proposed Student Code:

Interim President Pete Kyle McCarter informed the Secretary of the University Senate on November 4, 1970, that he had approved the three faculty nominations (Professors Alley, Olkinetzky, and Pray) submitted by the University Senate for membership on the conference Committee (representing Regents, faculty, administration, and students) to study the proposed Student Code. (See pages 2-3 of the University Senate Journal for October 26, 1970.)

Faculty Parking Fee:

In response to University Senate action on May 25, 1970, Interim President Pete Kyle McCarter informed the Chairman of the University Senate on October 28, 1970, that the University Senate resolution on this subject had been carefully considered by the University Council on Planning and Development. Dr. McCarter concluded his five-page letter as follows:

"I have asked the Council on Planning and Development to continue to study this situation, but I do not see any possible drastic change in the parking fees requirement. Under present conditions, it seems appropriate that those who use the parking facilities bear a portion of the costs."

(See pages 7-8 of the University Senate Journal for October 26, 1970.)

ACTION BY THE SECRETARY, UNIVERSITY SENATE: University Book Exchange

On October 27, 1969, the University Senate empowered its Secretary to contact the Editor of The Oklahoma Daily whenever erroneous reports are published concerning University Senate action. (See page 7 of the University Senate Journal for October 27, 1969.)

In accordance with the above directive, the Secretary of the University Senate dispatched the following self-explanatory letter to the Editor, The Oklahoma Daily, on October 27, 1970:

"Pursuant to the policy established by the University Senate on October 27, 1969, I call to your attention an erroneous report in today's issue of The Oklahoma Daily concerning action taken by the University Senate at its regular meeting on October 26, 1970.

"At one point, the Daily account of the University Senate meeting reads: 'The OU Faculty Senate approved unanimously Monday a student proposed faculty-student board of directors to oversee the University Book

Exchange.'

"Actually, the University Senate yesterday approved unanimously the entire report of the University-wide ad hoc University Bookstore Committee, dated April 17, 1970. As reported correctly at another point in the Daily account, that Committee report includes the recommendation that a University Bookstore Advisory Committee of faculty and students be appointed to work with the store manager on the details of policy and operations.

"During the discussion of this question at the meeting on October 26, 1970, at which a representative of the University Student Association was present, the consensus of the group was that the terms board of directors and advisory committee were synonymous in intent, spirit, and meaning.

"Furthermore, the fact was emphasized during the University Senate meeting yesterday that the approved recommendations of the ad hoc Committee go beyond the scope of the Student Congress Act of October 13, 1970.

"I shall appreciate your cooperation in bringing this clarification to the attention of your readers."

(See pages 8-11 of the University Senate Journal for October 26, 1970.)

## UNIVERSITY BOOK EXCHANGE

### Background Information:

On October 16, 1970, Interim President Pete Kyle McCarter requested University Senate consideration of the Student Congress Act of October 13, 1970, concerning the establishment of a proposed Student-Faculty Board of Directors of the University Book Exchange.

At its meeting on October 26, 1970, the University Senate considered not only (a) the Student Act of October 13, 1970, but also (b) the full report of the ad hoc University Committee on the Bookstore that had been completed during April, 1970. The University Senate at that time approved the ad hoc Committee report whose recommendations had actually exceeded those of the Student Act. (See pages 8-11 of the University Senate Journal for October 26, 1970.)

Interim President Pete Kyle McCarter indicated on November 6, 1970, in a joint letter to the Chairman of the University Senate and the President of the Student Association his readiness to approve the Committee, which he preferred to call the "Oversight Committee." To expedite the matter, he requested faculty nominations for the three faculty vacancies on the Committee.

### Senate Action:

Dr. Hall moved the acceptance of the report of the University Senate Committee on Committees nominating the following six faculty members for the three vacancies on the above-mentioned University Bookstore Oversight Committee:

Richard Grunder (Pharmacy)  
 F. Ted Hebert (Political Science)  
 Duane Roller (History of Science)  
 Ernest Trumble (Music)  
 Robert D. Van Auken (Office Administration)  
 Lloyd P. Williams (Education)

The University Senate approved the nominations with the recommendation that the individual terms of the members be staggered for one, two, and three years to provide for overlapping tenures.

#### UNIVERSITY RETIREMENT PLAN: TIAA-CREF Participation

On September 21, 1970, the University Senate approved the recommendation of its Committee on University Organization, Budget, and Publications to include TIAA-CREF participation in the University Retirement Program. (See pages 4-5 of the University Senate Journal for September 21, 1970.)

At its October 26, 1970, meeting, the University Senate heard progress reports and pertinent comments from Vice President Gene Nordby and Mr. Dud Giezentanner, Chairman of the ad hoc University Retirement and Fringe Benefit Committee.

To keep the faculty apprised of continuing developments, Mr. Giezentanner accepted an invitation to appear before the University Senate on November 30. He reported that the Board of Regents would consider the formal request for TIAA-CREF participation on December 3, 1970. If approved in principle by the Regents at that time, such TIAA-CREF participation would become effective on September 1, 1971, subject to subsequent necessary approval by the general faculty and final approval by the Regents. Mr. Giezentanner called attention to the detailed, 14-page report of his Committee. (Copies of that report were distributed by the Senate Secretary to members of the University Senate on December 2, 1970.)

No formal action in this matter was either appropriate or taken at this meeting.

#### SALARY CONTINUANCE PLAN

##### Background Information:

During the past few months, the University Senate Committee on University Organization, Budget, and Publications has been studying the proposals for both the TIAA-CREF participation in the University Retirement Program and also a Salary Continuance Plan to be financed entirely by the individuals desiring such additional coverage. Both proposals have originated with the University Retirement and Fringe Benefit Committee.

##### Senate Action:

Dr. Leon Zelby, Chairman of the University Senate Committee on University Organization, Budget, and Publications, moved that the Senate (a) approve in principle the proposed Salary Continuance Plan and (b) urge the Board of Regents

to approve the plan inasmuch as all costs would be borne by the individuals desiring such additional, low-cost coverage.

The Senate approved the motion without opposition.

### UNIVERSITY TENURE REGULATIONS

Jr. Paul David, Chairman of the University Senate Committee on Faculty Personnel, presented a progress report on the continuing, extensive deliberations of his Committee that is studying this complex question. He expressed hope that a final report would be presented at the January 25, 1971, meeting of the University Senate. In soliciting additional faculty reactions and suggestions, he acknowledged receipt of the following pertinent letter of October 29, 1970, addressed to the Chairman of the University Senate and signed by four married women faculty members:

"We believe the following policies are of imminent concern to the University Senate in the current study of faculty tenure.

- "1. We feel that the anti-nepotism policies of the University Regents need to be revised when members of a family have separate immediate supervisors and one is not the immediate supervisor of the other. We believe that each faculty member who meets the professional qualifications of his or her school should be eligible for consideration for tenure although other family members hold tenure or are eligible for consideration for tenure. Furthermore, the anti-nepotism policy is apparently not followed at Oklahoma State University and the state colleges.
- "2. Lack of eligibility for tenure and denial of voting rights restrict the potential service to the University of 'visiting' faculty members. Their interest, enthusiasm, and knowledge could be tapped for the benefit of the University Community.

"We are approaching the University Senate at the suggestion of Dr. McCarter. For your information we are enclosing copies of pertinent correspondence."

Dr. Rebecca R. Cohen (Visiting Assistant Professor)  
 Dr. Gail Jacobson (Visiting Assistant Professor)  
 Mrs. Harriet B. Turkington (Visiting Associate Professor)  
 Mrs. Clara Dumas (Visiting Associate Professor)

### UNIVERSITY FINAL EXAMINATION POLICIES

#### Background Information:

On October 26, 1970, the University Senate agreed to delay until this meeting consideration of the proposal for a University policy concerning final examinations. (See pages 4-5 of the University Senate Journal for October 26, 1970.)

Senate Action:

Paragraphs 1 and 3 of the original proposal were discussed at length. Subsequently, Dr. Zelby moved that the following change be made in paragraph 3:

Delete (entire paragraph): "The instructor must announce his final examination policy at the beginning of the semester."

Substitute (new paragraph): "Normally, every course will have a final examination unless otherwise announced by the instructor."

With one dissenting vote, the Senate approved the change in paragraph 3.

As thus amended, the proposed examination policy was approved by the University Senate without opposition. The complete, revised text reads as follows:

#### Final Examination Policies

1. Final examinations are given at the discretion of the instructor, or, in the case of multiple sections, the department in which the course is offered. When a final examination is given, the student must take the examination.
2. If a final examination is given, no member of the faculty is authorized to depart from the published examination schedule for either a class or an individual without approval, as stated in the Faculty Handbook. Special early examinations given to individual students or groups of students as substitutes for final examinations are prohibited.
3. Normally, every course will have a final examination unless otherwise announced by the instructor.
4. A student absent from a scheduled final examination, either by permission of his dean or through sickness or other unavoidable cause, shall be given a grade of Incomplete (I) if his work in that course has been satisfactory until the time of his absence. He may remove his Incomplete in the manner provided for the removal of Incomplete grades. In all other cases of absence from the scheduled final examination, a student may be given a grade of Failure (F).
5. Make-ups, Incompletes, and conflicts may be completed whenever mutually agreeable to faculty and students concerned. They should be scheduled no later than the last day of final examination week.
6. Working students are responsible for arranging their hours to enable them to attend the final examination.
7. A student will not be expected to take more than three (3) examinations in one day. In cases where a student has four (4) or more

see p. 2. Journal Nov. 8, 1971  
examinations on the same day, departments must offer make-up examinations ~~on the same day~~ to bring the student's number of examinations down to three (3) in the following order:

- a) Departments giving uniform final examinations must offer make-up examinations before departments giving regularly scheduled examinations.
- b) If the student still has four (4) or more examinations on the same day, the department giving the fourth examination must give make-up examinations.
8. Courses meeting two or three hours on one day a week will have the final examination during the last day of class.
9. Two credit courses which have one of their meetings on MWF will have the final examination at the time scheduled for MWF classes. Those meeting both days of TTh will have the examination at the time scheduled for TTh classes.
10. Classes meeting four or five days will have the final examination at the time scheduled for MWF courses with the same meeting time.
11. Irregularly scheduled courses will have the final examination during the last class period.
12. If laboratory examinations are given, they will be held the last regularly scheduled meeting of the laboratory.
13. Request for uniform examinations either during the semester or finals week MUST be submitted to the Class Schedules Committee through the Office of Admissions and Records for any particular semester along with the request for class schedule for that same semester. Uniform examinations given during the semester must be in lieu of a regularly scheduled class.
14. Uniform examinations will be assigned in order to minimize the possibility of taking more than one uniform examination per day.

#### X APPELLATION OF MEMBERS OF THE FACULTY

##### Background Information:

At its September 21, 1970, meeting the University Senate rejected Dr. Zelby's proposal for standardizing the form to be used in addressing faculty members, viz., "Professor" instead of "Doctor." (See pages 7-8 of the University Senate Journal for September 21, 1970.)

On October 30, 1970, Dr. Zelby addressed the following request to the Secretary of the University Senate:

"Favorable comments following the publication of the Journal of the University Senate for the regular session on 21 September 1970 encourage me to request that the following resolution be put on the agenda for the next Senate meeting:

"WHEREAS 'Professor' is a traditional academic title designating faculty members of professorial rank in an academic institution, and,

"WHEREAS 'Doctor' is a title designating a profession or an academic degree not rank,

"BE IT THEREFORE RESOLVED that the preferred title for members of the General Faculty of professorial rank be 'Professor'."

(See pages 7 and 8 of the University Senate Journal for September 21, 1970.)

Senate Action:

Dr. Zelby moved approval of his resolution. Questioning the relevance and appropriateness of such a topic for Senate consideration, Dr. Paul David raised a formal objection to further discussion of this question. Voting by a show of hands, the University Senate sustained Dr. David's objection and ceased further consideration of the matter.

X PROPOSAL FOR A UNIVERSITY PATENT POLICY

Background Information:

On November 28, 1970, Dr. Alfred J. Weinheimer, Professor of Chemistry, submitted the following proposal to Dr. Cluff E. Hopla, Chairman of the University Senate:

"The potential for discovery of patentable inventions exists in a substantial proportion of the research and development work being conducted routinely by the University's faculty, staff and students, particularly in our graduate programs.

"Despite occasional efforts to establish a patent policy, the University still has neither a routine mechanism for assessing the desirability of patenting specific internal discoveries, nor guidelines for division of equity between the University and the inventor (s). Of course, relative equity can vary between broad limits depending upon the circumstances of the discovery and its reduction to practice.

"Contrary to popular belief, discoveries made under federally supported programs are subject to patenting by the inventor, with assignment to the University.

"We can no longer afford our present stance of virtually ignoring the



economic potential of internal discoveries. In appropriate cases, the simple additional step of obtaining a patent could provide a new and possibly significant source of income to the University via licensing royalties.

"Since an equitable patent policy is essential to the successful development of this potential source of income, I urge the Senate, together with representatives of the University and the Research Institute, to undertake a study of this matter with the objective of formulating a patent policy for recommendation to the President and the Regents."

Copies of the above letter were distributed to the members of the Senate at this meeting.

Senate Action:

Dr. Weinheimer moved that (as noted in the final paragraph of his letter) the University Senate, together with representatives of The University of Oklahoma and the Oklahoma University Research Institute, undertake a study of an appropriate patent policy for recommendation to the President and the Board of Regents.

Most of the ensuing discussion was concerned with the suggestion that copyrights also be included in the proposal. The consensus of the Senate, however, was that copyrights were sufficiently unique to warrant separate consideration, study, and action.

The University Senate approved the motion with one dissenting vote.

PROPOSED FACULTY MEETING WITH GOVERNOR-ELECT DAVID HALL

Dr. Hopla, Chairman of the University Senate, reported on his unsuccessful attempts to arrange for either a University Senate or a General Faculty meeting with Governor-Elect David Hall. Dr. Geoffrey Marshall countered with a report of likewise unsuccessful attempts by the local chapter of the American Association of University Professors to schedule such a meeting and suggested joint efforts for a meeting early next semester.

ADJOURNMENT

The University Senate adjourned at 5:00p. m. The next regular session will be held on Monday, January 25, 1971, at 3:30 p. m. Items for the Agenda should reach the Secretary by Wednesday, January 13, 1971.

Anthony S. Lis  
Secretary

100

The first part of the document discusses the importance of maintaining accurate records of all transactions. It emphasizes that proper record-keeping is essential for the integrity of the financial system and for the ability to detect and prevent fraud.

The second part of the document outlines the various methods used to collect and analyze data. It describes the use of statistical techniques to identify trends and anomalies in the data, and the importance of using reliable sources of information.

The third part of the document discusses the role of the auditor in the financial system. It explains how the auditor's independent review of the financial statements provides assurance to investors and other stakeholders.

The fourth part of the document discusses the importance of transparency and accountability in the financial system. It argues that open access to financial information is essential for the development of a strong and resilient financial system.

The fifth part of the document discusses the challenges facing the financial system and the need for reform. It identifies areas such as regulation, supervision, and system risk that require attention and action.

The sixth part of the document discusses the role of the central bank in the financial system. It explains how the central bank's policies and actions can influence the overall health and stability of the financial system.

The seventh part of the document discusses the importance of international cooperation in the financial system. It argues that global standards and best practices are essential for the stability and growth of the world economy.

The eighth part of the document discusses the role of the private sector in the financial system. It explains how the private sector's innovation and investment are essential for the development of a strong and resilient financial system.

The ninth part of the document discusses the importance of public-private partnerships in the financial system. It argues that such partnerships can bring together the strengths of both the public and private sectors to address the challenges facing the financial system.