

JOURNAL OF THE UNIVERSITY SENATE
The University of Oklahoma
Norman

3/72 (Page 1)

Regular Session -- March 13, 1972 -- 3:30 p.m.

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

Present:

Bibens, Robert	Hopla, Cluff E.	Snow, James B.
Bourassa, Ronald	Levy, David	Stone, George
Brown, Homer A.	Love, Tom	Stuart, Chipman
Burwell, James	Lutz, Raymond	Truex, Dorothy
Christian, Sherril	Maehl, William H.	Upthegrove, Wm. R.
Costello, James F.	Marshall, Geoffrey	Walker, Dallas R.
Crim, Sarah	Milby, T. H.	Weinheimer, A. J.
Daniels, Raymond	McNichols, William	Weiss, A. Kurt
Eliason, Stanley	Norton, Spencer	Whitney, David
Feaver, J. Clayton	Olson, Ralph E.	Wilcox, Stewart C.
Frueh, Forrest	Owens, Mitchell	Wilson, William H.
Gregory, Helen	Potter, Emma	Zahasky, Mary C.
Grunder, J. Richard	Prickett, Wilson	Zelby, Leon W.
Hall, Rufus	Sims, James H.	

Absent:

Abell, Creed	Hardin, Neal H.	Shahan, Robert W.
Bogart, George A.	Johnson, B. Connor	Shepherd, Gene
Eek, Nat S.	Kuhlman, Richard	Sokatch, John R.
Gibson, Arrell M.	Lynn, Thomas N.	Taylor, K. L.
Hansen, Robert	Miller, Fred	

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

The Journal of the University Senate for the regular session on February 14, 1972, was approved.

ACTION TAKEN BY PRESIDENT PAUL F. SHARP

Deletion of Scholarship Restriction in College Bulletins: On February 17, 1972, Dr. Paul F. Sharp, President of the University, approved the deletion of the scholarship restriction appearing in college bulletins as recommended by the University Senate. (Please see page 8 of the University Senate Journal for February 14, 1972.)

Faculty Representative - Publications Board: On March 1, 1972, the Secretary of the University Senate was notified that on December 11, 1971, Dr. Paul F. Sharp, President of the University, had appointed Professor David Vann Smith (Business Communication) as the faculty representative to the Publications Board on Organization and Management of Student Publications. (Please see pages 1 and 2 of the University Senate Journal for December 13, 1971.)

ACTION TAKEN BY THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE OF THE UNIVERSITY SENATE

Luncheon Meeting with Executive Committee of the Faculty Council, Oklahoma State University: The Executive Committees of the University Senate, University of Oklahoma, and the Faculty Council, Oklahoma State University, on February 18, 1972, held an informal luncheon meeting in the Faculty House on the campus of the University of Oklahoma Health Sciences

Center in Oklahoma City. Those in attendance included Drs. Hall, Lis, Love, Snow, and Truex of the University of Oklahoma, and Drs. Thomas, McCroskey, and Williams of Oklahoma State University. This initial, exploratory session covered policies and procedures of both groups on their respective campuses. No formal action was taken. However, periodic meetings are being planned concerning areas of mutual interest regarding faculty participation in University governance.

Senate Ad Hoc Committee on Implementation of the Plan to Reorganize University Councils and Committees: On February 14, 1972, the University Senate approved a proposal for the reorganization of University councils and committees. The proposed revision of the University Senate By-Laws stipulates that appropriate charges be prepared for each of the councils. Accordingly, on February 25, 1972, the Executive Committee of the University Senate appointed the following ad hoc Committee to prepare appropriate charges to the University Councils:

Wm. Maehl, Jr., (History) Chairman
 Forrest L. Frueh (Business Law)
 Tom Love (Aerospace, Mechanical, and
 Nuclear Engineering)
 Geoffrey Marshall (English)
 Robert Shahan (Philosophy)

Senate Ad Hoc Committee To Study the University Fringe Benefit Program: On February 7, 1972, Dr. Richard Wells submitted the following proposal to Dr. Rufus Hall, Chairman of the University Senate:

"It is my view that a special committee of the University Senate should be appointed and be given a specific charge to examine the adequacy of the present process, to make proposals for an improved process, and to examine the adequacy of fringe benefits other than medical ones. For example, what has been the delay in adopting a TIAA retirement plan? How satisfactory in actual operation is the current retirement plan from the viewpoint not of the administrators but rather that of those who have retired? What is the actual state of events in regard to the fringe benefits other state employees enjoy? This committee should ascertain such matters of fact and should be charged with a report no later than six months after March 1 of this year. With that accomplished, the remaining six months would exist and be available for the faculty and employees to take adequate actions in regard to subsequent negotiations of vital fringe benefits."

The Executive Committee of the Senate on March 2, 1972, appointed the following ad hoc committee to study the University Fringe Benefit Program:

Richard Wells, (Political Science) Chairman
 Forrest Frueh (Business Law)
 Kenneth Taylor (History of Science)
 Thomas Wiggins (Education)
 Jerome Weber (Physical Education)

Expressing concern over the recently approved faculty option concerning final examinations, Professor Wilson B. Prickett suggested reconsideration of that action. In his opinion, faculty members still giving final examinations will, in time, be pressured into eliminating their final examinations; otherwise, enrollments in their classes will obviously suffer.

Dr. Cluff E. Hopla, quoting Dr. Pete Kyle McCarter, reported that between one-third and one-half of the faculty members already are giving their finals before the start of the final examination period. Some faculty members are not giving final examinations. He did not think that the recent change will affect those faculty members who want to continue giving final examinations. Dr. Tom Love then moved that, in line with the recent elimination of compulsory final examinations for all faculty, the final examination period also be eliminated from the academic calendar.

Dr. A. J. Weinheimer subsequently moved that this matter be referred to the University Senate Committee on Courses and Curricula. The Senate approved the motion with some dissent.

UNIVERSITY FINANCIAL SITUATION

Background Information:

Dr. Ronald Bourassa on October 21, 1971, submitted a request for University Senate investigation of the University's financial situation. At its December 13, 1971, meeting, the Senate considered the recommendation of its Committee on University Organization, Budget, and Publications that the Senate investigate the distribution of the current budget, the distribution criteria, and the decision process. Later at that meeting, this question was tabled pending Senate consideration of current proposals to reorganize the University Councils. (See page 3 of the University Senate Journal for December 13, 1971.)

Senate Action:

Professor David Whitney, Chairman of the University Senate Committee on University Organization, Budget, and Publications, moved the adoption of a new recommendation, (superseding the one that had been made at the December 13, 1971, meeting), that Dr. Bourassa's request not be acted upon in view of the current favorable operation of the University Budget Council. The Committee feels that the regular schedule of Budget Council meetings, the better data being supplied the Council, and that Council's responsiveness to the desires of the University Senate are all in the spirit of Dr. Bourassa's request. With some dissent, the Senate approved the Committee recommendation to take no further action in this matter.

In this connection, Dr. Rufus Hall, Chairman of the University Senate, called attention to the following two tabulations, furnished by Dr. Gene Nordby, Vice President for Finance, and distributed to Senate members at this meeting:

- (a) Percentage of Current Educational and General Expenditures by Function (1957-72)
- (b) Comparison of Current Educational and General Expenditures (1957-72)

Dr. Hall asked that any questions concerning these statistics should be directed to Mr. Dud Giezentanner of the Budget Office.

Later in the meeting, Dr. A. J. Weinheimer moved that the Chairman of the University Senate request Dr. Gene Norby to supply for the next Senate meeting a breakdown of the various categories of expenditures. The Senate approved the motion without dissent.

FALL MIDSEMESTER BREAK

Background Information:

On October 15, 1971, Dr. John Lancaster suggested to the University Senate that the Monday following the Dallas football game weekend be substituted for Labor Day as an official University holiday. After studying this question, the University Senate Committee on University Organization, Budget, and Publications recommended at the December 13, 1971, meeting that the suggestion be rejected. The Senate accepted the Committee recommendation. Subsequently, however, the Senate voted to refer this matter to its Committee on Courses and Curricula for further study of a possible midsemester break during the fall semester. (See page 4 of the University Senate Journal for December 13, 1971.)

Senate Action:

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

- "(1) That the Labor Day holiday be eliminated from the academic calendar, although every effort should be made to enable non-academic employees to continue to have the holiday.
- "(2) That the Friday of the seventh week of the fall semester be designated as a holiday in the academic calendar."

Dr. Maehl added that, although no formal poll of the faculty was conducted, an informal poll of various individuals on the campus indicated no consensus in this matter. The Committee itself felt very strongly that the Labor Day holiday is not very useful and really interrupts the start of a new semester instead of providing a desirable break.

Dr. Uptegrove reported informal student opinion in favor of extending the Thanksgiving recess instead of changing the Dallas game weekend. Dr. Maehl reported that two or three students recently had suggested to him that the Thanksgiving recess be lengthened to a full week. The Committee felt that lengthening the Thanksgiving break would bring the recess too close to the final examination period. Mr. Verner Ekstrom, a visitor at this meeting, stated that the final examinations during the fall semesters of both 1970 and 1971 concluded on December 23. The 1972 examination period will end on December 21; the 1973 date will be no later than December 22. He added that the fall semester pattern is to start classes on Wednesday and end classes on Friday.

At this point, Dr. Leon Zelby moved that this question be tabled for further study by the Committee, particular in view of this discussion of the Thanksgiving recess. The tabling motion was approved by the Senate in a tally of 17 affirmative and 15 negative votes.

PROPOSED STATEMENT OF FACULTY RESPONSIBILITIES

At the November 8, 1971, Senate meeting, the announcement was made that the University Senate Committee on Faculty Personnel was requested to prepare for Senate consideration an appropriate statement of faculty responsibilities.

At this meeting, Dr. David Levy, Chairman of the University Senate Committee on Faculty Personnel, distributed copies of the Committee's draft of the proposed

statement. After Senate members have an opportunity to study the draft, the Committee's statement will be considered by the Senate at its next regular meeting on April 10, 1972. Dr. Levy called attention to the fact that the local chapter of the AAUP will devote its entire meeting on Monday, April 3, 1972, to a discussion of the Committee's draft. The panel for that session will include Drs. Levy, Marshall, McCarter, and Upthegrove. He extended an invitation to all faculty members to attend the AAUP meeting.

When the question arose concerning the insertion of the statement in the new Faculty Handbook, Dr. Upthegrove commented that the new Handbook will be in loose-leaf format so that subsequent changes can be handled easily and conveniently.

PROPOSAL FOR MAKING THE UNIVERSITY SENATE
MORE RESPONSIVE TO THE ELECTORATE

Background Information:

On January 26, 1972, Dr. Ronald Bourassa addressed the following request to the Secretary of the University Senate:

I submit the following for consideration of the Faculty Senate.

As the only University body established to represent the view of the faculty, the faculty senate must make every effort to make itself responsive to its electorate. This obligation is particularly essential at a time in which the faculty member sees decisions regarding his welfare made without regard to his views.

In particular I refer to such issues as:

1. The much discussed possibility that the University policy on retirement benefits may be changed to the detriment of the faculty.
2. The recent administrative decision not to implement the TIAA-CREF plan despite approval by faculty and regents.
3. The regents' policy begun this year of allowing a separate Law budget resulting in Law school faculty raises at a time when the rest of the University was suffering severe financial cutbacks.
4. The Governor's request to the Legislature that the state pay all retirement costs for state employees with the exception of teachers.
5. The recent decision to begin charging faculty and staff for use of some University recreational facilities that had until this semester been free.
6. The adoption of an outside employment policy for faculty without consultation or approval of the faculty.
7. The recently approved 24% increase in faculty insurance rates without consultation or approval of the faculty. (This increase is effective beginning March 1.)

The Senate must be the voice of the faculty. In view of this obligation to represent the faculty, I make the following two motions:

1. That the faculty senate recommend to each college that election to the senate be made as representative as possible. For example if a college has 120 members and 8 senate positions, the college should be divided into groups of 15. Each group will elect a senator from its own members. To insure that the group has adequate day by day contact the basic unit of the group should be the department. Large departments may merit more than one representative. Small departments may share a senator.

This action would create a representative system which would be more direct and more responsive.

2. That the secretary of the faculty senate during the second month of each semester conduct a poll of the general faculty concerning their views on issues submitted to him by any member of the senate. This poll might take a form similar to the sample form shown on the next page. (This item is not included with this JOURNAL but was distributed at the February 14, 1972, meeting of the Senate.)

This motion is made to increase communication between the general faculty member and the Senate. The views gained in this poll will help the senate to become the responsive agent of the faculty that it should be.

The memorandum was forwarded to the University Senate Committee on University Organization, Budget, and Publications for study and report.

Senate Action:

Professor David Whitney, Chairman of the University Senate Committee on University Organization, Budget, and Publications, moved adoption of his Committee's recommendation that both proposals be rejected. The Committee felt that the individual colleges already had the option of designating departmental representatives to the Senate. The Committee questioned the value and the desirability of another faculty poll in view of the many methods already available for input of faculty ideas to the University Senate. Tabulation and interpretation of the data proposed by Dr. Bourassa would present many difficult problems. Professor Whitney stressed that the Committee's negative recommendation in no way implied that the Committee was out of sentiment with Dr. Bourassa's motions.

The Senate voted on both items separately. With some dissent, the Senate rejected both proposals.

CHANGE IN DESIGNATION OF THE SENATE

Dr. Geoffrey Marshall, Chairman of the Senate Committee on Committees, moved approval of that Committee's recommendation that the Charter of the General Faculty and the University Senate be amended as follows:

"That the name University Senate be changed to Faculty Senate in the Charter and in all subsequent references to the Senate in official University documents."

Without debate and without dissent, the Senate approved the proposed change that will next have to be considered by the General Faculty at its regular meeting on Thursday, April 20, 1972.

OKLAHOMA STATE REGENTS PLAN FOR THE 70's

Dr. Tom Love moved that the Chairman of the University appoint an ad hoc faculty committee to examine in detail the State Regents Plan for the 70's, particularly the relationship of the University of Oklahoma to the State Regents and the Chancellor's Office. He stated that a number of state colleges in Oklahoma are paying salaries that are higher than those at this University and that the state colleges are receiving a higher percentage of their income from the State Regents than the Universities. He cited recent press reports about plans to include state and junior colleges also in the distribution of Title 13 funds. In his opinion, these actions degrade and lower the status of the universities. He considered this matter to be of great concern not only to the University administration but also to the faculty.

In a voice vote without dissent, the Senate approved the motion.

Accordingly, the Chairman of the University Senate appointed the following ad hoc Committee:

Ronald Bourassa, Chairman
Paul Brinker
Tom Love
Gene Shepherd
Rufus Hall

UNIVERSITY SENATE CENSURE OF THE UNIVERSITY ADMINISTRATION

Professor David Whitney, Chairman of the University Senate Committee on University Organization, Budget, and Publications, recommended adoption of the following resolution prepared by that Committee:

"That the University Senate voices its disapproval of the University administration's failure either to consult or to inform the appropriate University Council in connection with the recent increase in insurance rates, the decision not to implement the TIAA-CREF retirement program, and the announcement by the Regents of the new policy concerning outside employment."

Without debate and without dissent, the Senate approved the censuring motion.

ADJOURNMENT

The University Senate adjourned at 5:02 p.m. The next regular meeting will be held in Room 165 of the Student Union at 3:30 p.m., on Monday, April 10, 1972.

Anthony S. Lis, Secretary
University Senate

Dear Mr. [Name] [Address] [City] [State] [Zip]

Reference is made to your letter of [Date] regarding [Subject]. [Text of the letter body]

Very truly yours,
[Signature]

[Name]
[Title]
[Company Name]
[Address]
[City] [State] [Zip]

Enclosed for you are [Number] copies of [Document Name]

If you have any questions, please contact [Name] at [Phone Number]

Sincerely,
[Signature]

[Name]
[Title]
[Company Name]
[Address]
[City] [State] [Zip]

Thank you for your interest in [Product/Service]

Very truly yours,
[Signature]