

JOURNAL OF THE UNIVERSITY SENATE
The University of Oklahoma
Norman

Regular Session -- January 10, 1972 -- 3:30 p.m.

The University Senate was called to order by Dr. Rufus Hall, Chairman.

Present: Boroussa, Ronald Hall, Rufus Potter, Emma J.
 Brown, Homer A. Hopla, Cluff E. Prickett, Wilson B.
 Christian, Sherril Levy, David Shahan, Robert W.
 Costello, James F. Love, Tom Snow, James B., Jr.
 Daniels, Raymond D. Lutz, Raymond P. Stone, George T.
 Eek, Nat S. Lynn, Thomas N. Taylor, K. L.
 Eliason, Stanley B. Maehl, William H. Walker, Dallas R.
 Feaver, J. Clayton Marshall, Geoffrey Wilson, William H.
 Frueh, Forrest Milby, T. H. Zahasky, Mary C.
 Gibson, Arrell Miller, Fred Zelby, Leon W.
 Gregory, Helen Norton, Spencer
 Grunder, J. Richard Olson, Ralph E.

Absent: Abell, Creed Kuhlman, Richard Stuart, Chipman G.
 Bibens, Robert F. McNichols, William Truex, Dorothy
 Bogart, George A. Owens, Mitchell V. Upthegrove, William R.
 Burwell, James Shepherd, Gene D. Weinheimer, A. J.
 Crim, Sarah Sims, James H. Weiss, A. Kurt
 Hansen, Robert Sokatch, John R. Whitney, David A.
 Hardin, Neal H. Wilcox, Stewart C.
 Johnson, B. Connor

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

The Journal of the University Senate for the regular session on December 13, 1971, was approved.

ACTION TAKEN BY PRESIDENT SHARP

Regents Policy Manual -- Faculty Personnel Matters. On December 16, 1971, Dr. Paul F. Sharp, President of the University, approved for submission to the Regents the Senate recommendation for deletion of three faculty personnel items in the Regents Policy Manual. (See page 4 of the University Senate Journal for December 13, 1971.)

Midsemester unsatisfactory grade reports. Also on December 16, 1971, Dr. Paul F. Sharp, President of the University, approved the Senate recommendation for discontinuing the gathering and the mailing of midsemester unsatisfactory grade reports. (See page 6 of the University Senate Journal for December 13, 1971.)

Faculty participation in University commencements. On December 21, 1971, Dr. Paul F. Sharp, President of the University, approved the two recommendations (discontinuance of the summer commencement and participation by all faculty members in the spring commencement) proposed by the University Senate at its December 13, 1971, meeting. (See page 5 of the University Senate Journal for December 13, 1971.)

REGENTS POLICY ON OUTSIDE EMPLOYMENT AND EXTRA COMPENSATION

Background Information: The Regents of The University of Oklahoma on December 9, 1971, approved a new policy concerning outside employment and extra compensation within the University (Norman campus) with the effective date of July 1, 1972.

Senate Action: The Executive Committee of the University Senate on December 23, 1971, directed the Secretary of the University Senate to obtain and distribute to University Senate members copies of the new Regents policy concerning outside employment and extra compensation. Distribution was made to individual Senate members on December 28, 1971.

For the information and guidance of all members of the University faculty, the full text of the new policy statement is given below:

✓ POLICY ON OUTSIDE EMPLOYMENT AND EXTRA COMPENSATION
WITHIN THE UNIVERSITY (Norman campus)

(Approved by the Regents of the University of Oklahoma on December 9, 1971
with the effective date of July 1, 1972)

1. A person who accepts full-time employment in the University of Oklahoma owes his first duty and his first loyalty to the University. Any other employment or enterprise in which he engages for income must be understood to be definitely secondary to his University work, and he must be willing to accept the judgment of the President and the Regents as to whether he may engage in such outside employment and retain full-time employment on the University faculty or staff.
2. The obligations of a faculty member to the University are obviously not limited to meeting classes. There is a stated or implied obligation to advise students, to direct and conduct research, to read and remain professionally competent, to attend professional meetings, and to cooperate in essential committee work of the department, the college, and the institution as a whole. It must be assumed that any faculty or staff member who accepts outside employment, even with administrative approval, is taking time away from such activities to which a faculty member is regularly supposed to devote that portion of his working time not required by his primary University duties. The same assumption holds true of other professional staff members. The faculty or staff member who engages in outside employment should expect, therefore, that his advancement within the University will be less rapid than that of his colleague who devotes all his working time to professional activities and University duties.
3. Faculty and staff members are encouraged to engage, within the limits of the time available to them, in such income producing activities as consulting work, sponsored research, the creative arts, textbook writing, and other activities which are closely related to their University work. They are discouraged from engaging in outside activities which are not closely related to, or are foreign to, their professional qualifications for University work.
4. The President is authorized by the Regents to exercise his discretion as to the propriety and desirability of proposed outside employment and extra compensation from the point of view of the welfare of the University and of the whole faculty and staff. He is expected not to approve any outside employment or business undertaking which is likely to distract the faculty or staff member from the performance of his regular University duties, which will make excessive demands on his time, which will require him to be absent from Norman and the University when

such absence may conflict with his regular University duties, or which is likely to be embarrassing to the University or to the faculty or staff member's colleagues.

5. With regard to the amount of outside employment permitted, faculty and staff who do consulting and contract work outside the University are permitted to engage in such employment on an average of one day per week up to a total of not more than forty days during the nine-months contract period of the academic year, including weekends and holiday periods. Prolonged absences from the campus are obviously undesirable and should not be permissible under normal circumstances.

6. With regard to the amount of supplementary employment within the University (usually paid by Special Payment) faculty and staff are permitted to work for additional remuneration up to a limit of forty days within the nine-months contract period, including weekends and holiday periods. The authorization of special payments within the nine-months contract period is also limited to one-fourth (25%) of the individual's base salary for that period.

7. If Special Payments exceed the 25% or forty-day limit, and/or outside activities are expected to exceed the forty-day limit, a faculty member's base salary and teaching/research responsibilities will be adjusted after consultation with his department chairman and his dean.

8. A full-time member of the University faculty or staff may not engage in an outside business enterprise or accept outside employment without the prior approval of the President of the University. Application must be made in writing on the forms provided and must bear the approval of the faculty member's department and his dean before it comes to the President for his consideration.

9. Chairmen of departments, directors of schools, and deans of academic and professional colleges and the vice presidents in other than academic areas, should be kept informed of the level of outside employment and the time periods in which it is engaged. The faculty and staff member is responsible for informing his chairman or immediate superior of all such outside employment activities. The same administrative procedures should be followed for informing chairmen and superiors regarding supplementary employment within the University. In addition, the chairman should know and approve of arrangements which are made to dismiss classes or provide substitute teachers for them when the faculty members are to be absent from these duties. Absence from the campus for more than a week at a time is considered detrimental to the teaching effort and will not be approved.

10. If an outside business enterprise or outside employment continues beyond the end of the contract year, an application for approval must be renewed before the beginning of the next contract year. Information in the files of the President's Office must be always up to date; the faculty or staff member is responsible for keeping it so.

11. In the interpretation of these regulations, employment in the Research Institute is to be considered as regular University employment and not as outside employment.

12. No member of the University faculty or staff may hold regular multiple appointments which reflect more than a total of 1.0 full-time-equivalent.

13. During a period when a faculty or staff member is not under contract to the University, he is free to engage in any enterprise which is not compromising to his professional dignity as a regular member of the University staff or in which his identification with the University will not be damaging or embarrassing to the University.

14. The Regents look with disfavor upon any University employee's accepting either part-time or full-time employment in any political organization or in connection with the campaign of any candidate for public office.

15. These regulations supersede the regulations on outside employment adopted by the Regents, in 1931, 1948, and 1958.

At the January 10, 1972, Senate meeting, Dr. Rufus Hall, Senate Chairman, called attention of the Senate members to the new policy statement. There was no response to his request for any faculty reaction and comment.

REORGANIZATION OF UNIVERSITY COUNCILS

Background Information: Last fall, the University Senate Committee on Committees was requested to study possible revisions of the University Councils and Committees. The report of that Committee was reproduced on pages 7-10 of the Agenda for the University Senate meeting on December 13, 1971. At that meeting, Dr. Marshall Chairman of the Senate Committee on Committees, moved approval of his Committee's report. In accordance with Senate By-Laws, no action could be taken until the January 10, 1972, meeting. (See page 7 of the University Senate Journal for December 13, 1971.) Faculty reactions and comments were requested.

Senate Action: As the spokesman for a group of interested faculty members, Dr. William Maehl, Jr., submitted at this meeting an "alternate" proposal. (The complete text of that proposal is reproduced on pages 10 through 12 of this Journal.) After moving that his proposal be accepted as a substitute for the report of the Committee on Committees, Dr. Maehl then presented the following principles behind its formulation:

(1) The primary goal of a system of committees in the University is to enhance its performance of its educational mission.

(2) We tried to review and revise the committees of the University as a whole, rather than the committee structure in any subunit of the University community, such as a college or departmental committees, Student Association committee structure, or the standing committees of the Senate.

(3) Accordingly, the proper way to proceed is by legislation or resolution of the Senate addressed to the President for his approval. To amend the Senate By-Laws is not pertinent to the task at hand.

(4) A few years ago, the AAUP and other groups issued a joint STATEMENT OF GOVERNMENT OF COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES. This statement described areas of primary faculty interest and other areas that required faculty participation. The local AAUP chapter used the same criteria in evaluating the Hollomon Plan. Although they do not square exactly with the committee structure that we have had or are proposing, they do provide the point of departure for these recommendations.

(5) We should proceed in two stages. The first should outline a pattern or structure of committees. The second should define and charge each committee by separate legislation in each case.

(6) We believe that the relationship between the administration and the faculty should be one of liaison and collegiality, rather than an adversary one. At the same time, we must recognize the constitutional and legal lines of authority and responsibility in the institution. Furthermore, it should involve active faculty participation at the planning and development stages, as well as power to review

(7) At present, many faculty members feel that committee participation has been used as a red herring to distract faculty attention and energies or that insufficient attention has been given to faculty views. To deal with this problem, the selection of and the role of faculty members should be strengthened to give them a more forceful voice.

(8) We regard this proposal as a basis for discussion. We hope that the Senate will delay action on the committee question long enough to consider it. If this proposal is substituted for the Committee on Committees' proposal, the Senate can then refine it in detail by amendment. We also hope that the President will give the Senate his views on committee structure before we act.

Considerable discussion ensued. At one point, Dr. Bourassa expressed his opinion that the new proposal was merely a greatly watered down version of the original recommendations of the Senate Committee on Committees, with nothing more than a reshuffling of the present structure. Dr. Maehl disagreed with that characterization of his proposal and reiterated his feeling that the new proposal was intended to bring the faculty and the administration together early in the planning and development stages. In contrast to the original proposal, the Maehl proposal broadens the base of the faculty pool for effective faculty participation and also preserves the lines of communication between the various committees and the University Senate.

Dr. Marshall agreed with Dr. Bourassa's comments that the Maehl proposal does not change the current structure significantly. In his opinion, the Maehl proposal suffers from the same weakness inherent in the present structure--i.e., the system does not and will not work. He commented at length on the provision in his proposal that a written response from the council concerned must be submitted to the University Senate for approval. Subsequently, both the written Council response and the policy would be forwarded together to the Regents. He also felt that the original proposal does not violate the recent AAUP statement concerning University governance. In conclusion, he agreed that the faculty should not pit itself against the administration but rather should be motivated by the desire to cooperate effectively in University governance.

Dr. Stone stated that, on the basis of a quick reading of the new proposal, he did not feel that the Maehl proposal was as innovative as the one presented by the Committee on Committees. He urged a reorganization that would provide a more effective role for the faculty. He added that a number of the points raised by Dr. Maehl had been discussed by the Committee on Committees in its deliberations of the original proposal. He also felt that empowering the Councils to make separate statements to the Regents would provide an effective assurance of expressing faculty opinion.

Dr. Leon Zelby agreed with Dr. Marshall's contention that the present structure has not been very effective in practice. He cited the following examples of the administration's indifference toward University Senate actions and recommendations: (1) ignoring the University Senate recommendation of a few years ago that the University President prepare an appropriate annual report, (2) not implementing the TIAA-CREF retirement plan recommended by the University Senate last year, and (3) not requesting Senate input concerning the recently approved Regents policy on outside employment and extra compensation.

Dr. Shahan expressed the opinion that both proposals do vary significantly from the present structure, as well as from each other in some respects, and that neither one is merely a "rehash of the status quo."

At this point, Dr. Marshall added that the Senate review of the present Council and Committee structure was begun at the initiative of the Senate, as well as President Sharp's requests addressed to both the faculty and the Chairman of the Senate. He

reported that the Senate Committee on Committees met once with Dr. Pete Kyle McCarter, the University Provost, and a few times with Dr. Thomas Broce of the President's Office.

Dr. Feaver called attention to the ambiguity caused by referring to this body at one time as the University Senate and at another time as the Faculty Senate. He feels that the question of reorganization involves not only the University but also the three constituent bodies of the University community.

Dr. Cluff Hopla urged the Senate to clarify the situation by resolving the question of the appropriate name for this body.

Dr. Christian moved that both the Marshall and the Maehl proposals for reorganization be tabled until the February 14 meeting. The University Senate approved without dissent the tabling motion. The Committee on Committees will make further appropriate changes in the original proposal. The consensus of the Senate was that the President should be invited to address the Senate on the general question of University councils and committees.

UNIVERSITY PATENT POLICY

In the absence of Dr. Weinheimer, Chairman of the ad hoc University Senate Committee on University Patent Policy, Dr. Tom Love reported that the Committee is making some revisions in the original proposal for resubmission to the Senate at the February 14 meeting. (See page 3 of the University Senate Journal for December 13, 1971.)

REVISION OF UNIVERSITY POLICY CONCERNING AUDIT ENROLLMENT

Background Information: On November 29, 1971, Dr. Pete Kyle McCarter, Provost of the University, requested the University Senate to consider Mr. Ekstrom's proposal for revising the University policy on enrollment as an auditor. The matter was referred to the University Senate Committee on Courses and Curricula. (See pages 5 and 6 of the Agenda for the University Senate meeting on December 13, 1971.)

Senate Action: Dr. William Maehl, Jr., Chairman of the University Senate Committee on Courses and Curricula, moved acceptance of his Committee's recommendation that the proposed revision be approved as requested by the Assistant Provost for Academic Records and University Registrar. The Senate approved the motion without dissent.

The full text of the revised policy is given below.

Enrollment as an Auditor is permitted in all courses subject to the approval of the instructor in the course and the dean of the college in which the course is offered.

Initial enrollment in a course as an Auditor may be completed only between the first day of classes and the last day permitted for late enrollment for credit in any semester or term.

A change of enrollment from Audit to credit may be made provided the change is made not later than the end of the second week of classes of a semester or the first week of classes of a summer term, and provided the instructor and appropriate dean approve.

A change of enrollment from credit to Audit may be made during the first eleven weeks of classes of a semester or five weeks of classes of a summer term, provided the student is passing in the course at the time the change is processed, and provided the student has the approval of his instructor and the appropriate dean. A change of enrollment processed during the first eleven weeks of a semester or five weeks of a summer term requires a report of progress from the student's instructor. A change of enrollment to Audit supersedes the original enrollment for credit and no withdrawal from the credit enrollment is posted on the student's academic record.

At his discretion, an instructor may assign a final grade of W (withdrawn passing) at the end of a semester or term to a student enrolled in his class as an Auditor in the event the student has not performed according to the instructor's requirements for an Auditor.

Enrollment as an Auditor is indicated on the student's permanent academic record with the final mark AU (identified as Audit), subject to the same posting regulations governing the entry of a credit enrollment.

Fee and refund policies for Audit enrollments are the same as fee and refund policies for credit enrollments. A student enrolled exclusively as an Auditor may withdraw only during the fee-refund period. A student enrolled exclusively as an Auditor who withdraws during the fee-refund period will have his registration canceled and no entry will be made on his permanent academic record.

TEACHER EVALUATION

Background Information: The University Senate Committee on Teaching and Research was requested last fall to study all aspects of the teacher evaluation question. (See page 6 of the University Senate Journal for October 11, 1971.)

Senate Action: Dr. Raymond Daniels, Chairman of the University Senate Committee on Teaching and Research, distributed copies of the following report of that Committee:

The Senate Committee on Teaching and Research recommends that the Senate adopt a resolution favoring the implementation of a University-wide program of course content and instructional evaluation. This program should be a continuing one and should be mandatory for all instructional programs in the University. The Committee believes that responsibility for implementation of such a program should rest at the college level. Toward this end, the Senate should urge each college to establish a committee which will have representation from the faculty and student body of the college and which will have responsibility for developing and implementing an evaluation program most suitable to the college's instructional activities.

In reviewing reports of evaluation programs of other Universities, it was noted repeatedly that although there are few really objective criteria for teaching effectiveness, that concern for effective teaching comes into prominence at all levels as departments, colleges, and universities examine their criteria for good teaching, their procedures for reviewing it, and their stated expectations with regard to faculty performance. The fundamental importance of evaluation is to provide a feedback to the instructor on his work. In this way, the evaluation takes on a constructive role in improving teaching. In a secondary role, evaluation is necessary here if we hope to be able to give appropriate recognition to quality of instruction. It also follows that the results of course and

instructional evaluations should be reported to departmental chairmen and deans and be made available to departmental review committees. They should not, however, be published for widespread review, nor used for public comparisons of various departments.

The committee further recommends that a centralized University agency be established to assist the colleges in these endeavors. It could be called the University Center for Course Content and Instructional Evaluation. The Center would work with colleges to develop effective instruments for the continuing evaluation of the quality and effectiveness of instruction. The center would provide professional help in the preparation of questionnaires and in the processing and statistical evaluation of survey results where appropriate.

Dr. Daniels called attention to the considerable expense that would be required to implement the Committee's recommendations.

Dr. Costello reported on the current teacher-evaluation program in the College of Engineering.

Professor Prickett expressed his opposition to the creation of another University unit while critical faculty positions are not being funded. He felt that such an evaluation program would be a fringe benefit that the University cannot afford at this time. He also suggested that such a program could degenerate into a faculty popularity contest. He added that a department that does not know the effectiveness of its teachers is not "worth its salt."

Dr. Zelby stated that he favored the idea but questioned the nature of teacher effectiveness and ways of measuring such effectiveness. He suggested that the evaluation of prerequisite courses be conducted a semester or two after the courses are completed for a true measurement of teacher effectiveness.

Dr. Marshall moved adoption of the committee report after deletion of the words "... course content and ..." in the first, second, and third paragraphs in references to course content and instructional evaluation. The motion was seconded.

In further discussion, Senate members expressed the consensus that the primary goal of any such evaluation should be to provide information for the instructor himself.

Dr. Daniels stressed repeatedly that the Committee had felt that the proposed evaluation program was only one possibility in an overall evaluation program. There was opposition to the word mandatory in the second sentence of the first paragraph.

Dr. Stone then moved that this question be referred back to the Committee for reconsideration and appropriate revisions in the light of the discussion at this meeting. The Senate approved the referral motion without dissent. The Senate Chairman requested that individual faculty recommendations and comments be forwarded to Dr. Daniels, Committee Chairman.

DEPARTMENTAL "C" BUDGETS: Office Equipment Rental Charges

Background Information: Dr. Arrell Gibson requested Senate study of charges assessed departmental "C" budgets for office equipment rentals. This matter was referred to the University Senate Committee on Courses and Curricula for study and appropriate recommendations. (See page 8 of the University Senate Journal for November 8, 1971.)

Senate Action: Dr. William Maehl, Jr., Chairman of the University Senate Committee on Courses and Curricula, moved acceptance of the following report of that Committee:

The committee confined its study to typewriter rentals since that is the most important activity of the University equipment rental service and the typewriter service was what particularly interested the proposer of the resolution which was referred to the committee. Members of the committee interviewed the staff of General Services Administration for information on present service and costs, and, for purposes of comparison, also gathered information from various private rental services. The results of this study lead the committee to the following conclusions, which it recommends to the Senate:

1. The present system is the cheapest and most efficient means of providing typewriters and maintenance service to the University.
2. There are a few items in the cost analysis in which the Senate might wish to recommend change, but the committee believes no significant saving could be made which would not have to be paid for in some other way. These are:
 - a. Item 7--A certain amount of the income from rentals each year is devoted to expanding the pool of machines available for rental. The amount does not seem excessive and would have to be supplied some other way if it did not come from this source.
 - b. Items 20 and 21--The typewriter rental service share of General Services' administrative budget might be scrutinized, but the amount again is not large and would have to be taken up through charges to users of service somewhere else.
 - c. Item 22--This amount contributes to the support of General Services' services which are not now charged directly, e.g., Central Stenographic Service, University Exchange, etc.
 - d. Presently machines are replaced every fifty months. Conceivably this period could be lengthened, especially for machines in relatively light use, such as those in faculty members' offices. The saving then could be passed on in reduced rental charges. On the other hand, longer retention of the machines would probably result in a lower figure of resale recovery as well as higher maintenance on older machines and this would have to be balanced off against rental savings. General Services presently is studying this question as part of a general review of the structure of rental charges and will have a report ready later this month.

The committee wishes to express its thanks to Mr. Norman McNabb and Mr. F. W. Volker of General Services for their cooperation in supplying information to the committee, and to Professor R. R. Bourassa for preparing the analysis of costs on which this report is based.

(Note: Cost Analysis Sheet not attached.)

William H. Maehl, Jr., Chairman

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

PROPOSED STATEMENT OF FACULTY RESPONSIBILITIES

In his progress report, Dr. David Levy, Chairman of the University Senate Committee on Faculty Personnel, reported the receipt and continuing study by that Committee of pertinent policy statements from other universities. A final report will be presented as soon as possible. (See page 8 of the University Senate Journal for November 8, 1971.)

ADJOURNMENT

The University Senate adjourned at 5:20 p.m. The next regular meeting will be held at 3:30 p.m., on Monday, February 14, 1972, in Room 165 of the Student Union on the Norman campus. Items for the Agenda for that meeting should reach the Secretary of the University Senate (Box 456, Central Mail Service, Norman campus) by Wednesday, February 2, 1972.

Anthony S. Lis
Secretary

A Proposal from the University Senate on the Purposes and Structure of University Wide Councils and Committees (submitted by Dr. Wm. Maehl, Jr.)

The University Senate recommends the President accept the following statement as a basis for the Council and Committee Structure of the University.

Purposes of the University Council and Committee Structure

The University Senate believes that an effectively organized system of councils and committees is essential to the efficient and harmonious operation of an organization as large, as complex and as varied as the University of Oklahoma.

Councils and committees serve a variety of functions which contribute to the achievement of our goals as an educational institution. They keep the several elements of the university informed of the conditions, policies and decisions which vitally affect their responsibilities and welfare. They are a means of marshalling the wide range of knowledge and expertise on all subjects available in the University so that it can contribute to decision making at the appropriate levels. They provide a liaison between officers of the administration and other portions of the university, especially the faculty. Through consultation, explanation of policy, and frank expression of disagreements a healthy operating relationship can be maintained among all members of the university. Of particular importance, the councils and committees bring the appropriate groups in the university together at an early stage in the process of planning and development of policy and program, so that the maximum range of view is considered and later disagreements are minimized.

To achieve their full effectiveness, University councils and committees should be broadly representative of the groups appropriate to their particular functions, they should be consulted regularly, they should have full and immediate access to the information relevant to their interest, they should be able to exercise initiative and review actions as well as respond to proposals laid before them, and they should be entitled to a formal response from the appropriate administrative officer to any recommendations or actions they make. On the other hand, the number and size of committees should be kept as small as possible, so that committee work does not absorb an undue amount of faculty members' time. All councils and committees should be given clearly stated charges in writing and they should make periodic reports to their constituent bodies. The committee structure of the University should also be kept flexible enough to allow periodic review and revision.

Pattern of University Councils and Committees

The functions of University councils and committees will be of varying degrees of importance to the institution and will call for differing membership and operating procedures depending upon those functions. The University Senate recommends the following guidelines for the pattern of University councils and committees.

A. University Councils

1. Purpose: University Councils are to recommend to the President of the University on policy and program in areas of vital significance to the functioning of the University as an educational institution. These areas include curricula

and instructional program, research, budget, academic personnel, administrative structure, and physical resources. The University Senate recommends that the following Councils be established:

- a. Budget Council
- b. Academic Program Council
- c. Council on Research
- d. Academic Personnel Council
- e. Administrative and Physical Resources Council

2. Membership: Membership of the Councils should be drawn from the elements of the University relevant to their areas of interest, including, as appropriate, faculty, students and non-academic employees. Nine faculty members will serve on each council and they will constitute a majority of the membership of each council. The faculty members will be elected to three years terms by the University Senate, with one third retiring each year. The faculty council members may include members of the University Senate. An officer of the University administration whose duties are relevant to the work of each council shall be an ex-officio member of that council without vote.

3. Chairmanship: The chairman of each council shall be elected annually from among the faculty members of the council. The chairman shall be an ex-officio member of the University Senate, although without vote unless he is a regularly elected member of the Senate.

4. Charge to the Councils: Each council will be given a charge in writing. Charges to the councils shall be recommended by the University Senate and approved by the President of the University. The President as a member of the University Senate may suggest matter to be included in the charges.

5. Operating Procedures: Each council shall adopt its own set of operating procedures and shall inform the President of the University and the University Senate in writing of those procedures.

6. Report: The chairman of each council shall report at least once each semester to the University Senate on the work of the council, and to other constituent bodies of the council, as requested. The Councils may also recommend legislation to their constituent legislative bodies.

7. Change of Councils: Additional councils may be established upon recommendation from the Senate and approval by the President of the University, so long as they conform to the procedures in paragraphs 2-6. The President may suggest the Senate consider the establishment of new councils. Similarly, councils may be abolished on recommendation from the Senate and approval of the President.

B. Standing Committees of the University

1. Purpose: There are many areas of University activity which are of great importance to fulfillment of its educational mission, but yet are not of the primary significance as are the areas of responsibility of the councils. Examples of these are University libraries, the University Book Exchange, admissions, class schedule, inter-collegiate athletics, faculty awards and honors, special student awards, extension and public service, alumni and public relations, and university publications. Standing committees of the University should be established to provide the President and his staff with counsel and assistance from those sections of the University concerned with the committee's work.

2. Authorization: Standing Committees of the University shall be established by recommendation from the University Senate and approval from the President.

The President may suggest the establishment of specific committees to the Senate. Similarly, committees may be altered in their function or abolished upon recommendation of the Senate and approval of the President.

3. Membership: Membership of Standing Committees will vary with their function, but it is essential that there be faculty participation on all Standing Committees. Exact terms of membership will be stated in the legislation establishing each committee. The University Senate will nominate two faculty members for each faculty position on the committees and appointment will be by the President.

4. Operating Procedures: Each standing Committee will establish its own operating procedures, including the method of selecting a chairman. The procedures will be written and placed on deposit with the Office of the President and the University Senate. The primary duties of the committees will be to advise the President or the administrative officers he designates, but they may also initiate proposals to him and when requested, they shall inform the University Senate of their recommendations.

C. Administrative Advisory Committees:

1. Purpose: Occasion may arise when administrative officers of the University will find it desirable to seek the advice of members of the University on subjects not covered by the Council or Standing Committee structure. In such cases they should be authorized to establish and appoint members to special advisory committees, so long as they do not encroach on or duplicate the work of the councils and standing committees. To avoid duplication, the committees should inform the President and the University Senate in writing of their areas of activity and operating procedures. The number of these committees should be kept small and they should be regularly reviewed with a view to either eliminating or incorporating them with the council or standing committee structure.

2. Membership: These committees will be composed of members determined by the establishing official. The University Senate may act as a referral source for faculty nominees if requested to do so.

D. Task Forces: A Task Force is an ad hoc committee designed to accomplish a specific, written charge. The Task Force will be dissolved at the completion of the assigned task. Members of the Task Force will be selected by the appointing body or officer. The University Senate may act as a referral source for faculty nominees if requested to do so.

E. Administrative Search Committees: Few decisions are more important to the success of the University's educational role than the selection of qualified administrators who enjoy the confidence of the University as a whole. In the selection of the President, the Provost, Vice Provosts, Vice Presidents, and the academic deans, search committees should be established with membership drawn from the interested portions of the University. The committees should be established by the officer or authority in the University with direct responsibility for supervising the position to be filled. In all cases, faculty members should be in the majority on the search committees and the chairman should be a faculty member. Faculty members of the committee should be chosen by the University Senate.