

JOURNAL OF THE UNIVERSITY SENATE  
The University of Oklahoma  
Norman

Regular Session -- May 8, 1972 -- 3:30 p.m.

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

<u>Present:</u>	Bibens, Robert F. (4)	Levy, David (0)	Snow, James B. (4)
	Burwell, James (1)	Love, Tom (2)	Stone, George T. (0)
	Christian, Sherril D. (3)	Lutz, Raymond P. (2)	Stuart, Chipman (2)
	Crim, Sarah (1)	Maehl, William H. (0)	Taylor, K. L. (2)
	Feaver, J. Clayton (0)	Marshall, Geoffrey (0)	Truex, Dorothy (1)
	Gregory, Helen (2)	Olson, Ralph E. (0)	Walker, Dallas R. (0)
	Grunder, J. Richard (1)	Owens, Mitchell (1)	Weiss, A. Kurt (5)
	Hall, Rufus (0)	Potter, Emma J. (2)	Whitney, David A. (4)
	Hopla, Cluff E. (1)	Prickett, Wilson P. (0)	Zelby, Leon W. (1)
 <u>Absent:</u>	 Abell, Creed (9)	 Hansen, Robert (5)	 Shahan, Robert W. (3)
	Bogart, George A. (5)	Hardin, Neal H. (4)	Shepherd, Gene D. (7)
	Bourassa, Ronald R. (2)	Johnson, B. Connor (7)	Sims, James H. (8)
	Brown, Homer A. (1)	Kuhlman, Richard (5)	Sokatch, John R. (6)
	Costello, James F. (3)	Lynn, Thomas N. (4)	Upthegrove, William R. (5)
	Daniels, Raymond D. (3)	Milby, T. H. (3)	Weinheimer, A. J. (6)
	Eek, Nat S. (4)	Miller, Fred (5)	Wilcox, Stewart C. (6)
	Eliason, Stanley B. (1)	McNichols, William (2)	Wilson, William H. (2)
	Frueh, Forrest (3)	Norton, Spencer H. (2)	Zahasky, Mary C. (2)
	Gibson, Arrell M. (1)		

(Please note: The number in parentheses above indicates the total number of absences during the 1971-72 academic year. The University Senate met for a total of ten(10) sessions, nine regular and one special.)

ACTION TAKEN BY DR. PAUL F. SHARP, PRESIDENT OF THE UNIVERSITY

In his letter of April 20, 1972, to the Chairman of the University Senate, Dr. Paul F. Sharp, President of the University of Oklahoma, acknowledged the receipt of the proposed University Patent Policy approved by the University Senate on April 10, 1972. Dr. Sharp made the following additional comments: "The report has been distributed to key administrators here and at the Health Sciences Center for review. Upon receipt of their recommendations, I will take appropriate action. This action will be taken subject to approval by the University's Board of Regents."

PROPOSED RENOVATION OF BUCHANAN HALL AND THE CARNEGIE BUILDING

Background Information: On April 24, 1972, Dr. Dorothy Truex addressed the following memorandum to the Chairman of the University Senate:

"After the consternation caused last year by the opening of the new Science Building, it seems to me that there should be some faculty scrutiny of the plans for moving and renovation that are planned for this summer. It is rumored that when the Faculty Exchange vacates part of Carnegie that this space will be renovated for the University College and University Community, and possibly for the Graduate College. The space that will be vacated in Buchanan will be taken by the office of Admissions and Records and the Bursar's office.

The penetrating questions that need to be asked, it seems to me, are:  
1. Why do any of these offices, with the possible exception of the Graduate College, need to expand? Since their populations and functions

have been shrinking in recent years, what is the justification for the expense of renovation and relocating? Why should funds for expensive renovation be expended when there is not enough money for a reasonable amount of professional travel, or for needed supplies, or for telephones, or for dictaphones that would enhance the effective use of the unskilled clerical help now available to faculty members? Why do the non-academic, support services of the University need to occupy space that could be used for teaching facilities that are close to the Library? Why are these plans made without any review by the Faculty Senate???"

The Senate Executive Committee on April 27, 1972, forwarded the above memorandum to Dr. Gene Nordby, University Vice President for Administration and Finance, with the request that this matter be considered by the University Council on Planning and Development and that a report be made to the Senate.

Senate Action: Dr. Gene Nordby, University Vice President for Administration and Finance, accepted the Senate invitation to address the Senate and answer any questions from the floor.

He first outlined the history and the disposition of Section 13 funds, derived from state-wide rentals of state-owned grazing lands and distributed to selected institutions of higher learning. He called attention to recent pressure from other Oklahoma colleges to be allowed to participate in the distribution of such funds. According to Dr. Nordby, the Chancellor of the State Regents has restricted the use of such funds to large items of capital expenditure.

In his opinion, Section 13 funds, if not spent, could be lost to the University. The growing state junior college system, in his view, could mean reduced allocations to the University of Oklahoma and also less building activity on campus.

The University would like to spend the current accumulation of about \$500,000 of Section 13 monies for the renovation of Buchanan Hall and the Carnegie Building. Dr. Nordby displayed a blueprint with details of the proposed remodeling that would provide additional space for the Bursar's office, as well as the Office of Admissions and Records. The Carnegie Building renovation would include air conditioning. The entire project will provide greater convenience and comfort for students, as well as the activities concerned. If not financed by Section 13 funds, such renovation would have to be paid for either by bond money or out of regular operating funds.

HERO bond money, still awaiting Federal matching funds, could not be used for renovating the two buildings in question. Dr. Nordby added that HERO priorities on the Norman campus are (1) Richards Hall and (2) the Law Center.

The renovation project would eliminate nine classrooms. However, Dr. Nordby stated that statistics show that classroom space on the Norman campus is adequate.

Several Senate members considered this proposed expenditure an item of conspicuous consumption and questioned this in view of the current, unfavorable faculty salary situation. Other members raised questions concerning the condition of other buildings--including Adams Hall, Gittinger Hall, Kaufman Hall, and others.

A few times, Dr. Nordby called attention to the fact that these renovation plans had been considered and approved by the University Council on Planning and Development.

Dr. Nordby left the meeting after concluding his 45-minute presentation to the Senate.

#### ✓ ATHLETIC DEPARTMENT BUDGET

Background Information: Professor Norman L. Crockett addressed the following request to the Chairman of the University Senate on March 12, 1972:

"As you know I am deeply concerned with what I consider to be an atmosphere at the University of Oklahoma which at times seems to place athletic programs above scholastic endeavors. In my opinion traces of

to the faculty and administration. Of all groups, the faculty possesses a responsibility to create and to maintain a healthy balance between intercollegiate sports and the academic goals of the university.

"Therefore, would you please ask the Faculty Senate, either by the creation of an ad hoc committee or by referral to one of its standing committees, to consider the institution of a study to examine the following areas:

- "1) The relationship of the athletic budget to the university budget relative to the degree of actual separation between the two and the desirability of merging the athletic budget with the total university budget in the future.
- "2) The degree to which the faculty and administration supervise the operation of intercollegiate athletic programs and the desirability of more or less control by the faculty and administration in the future.
- "3) The relationship of the individual budgets to the total university budget, of other programs at the university which must seek their own funding and which generate revenue above that necessary to continue their operations. (For example, it is my understanding that one program, which is required to seek its own funds, met operational expenses last year and generated over \$20,000 worth of new revenue. Yet, the new money went into the general fund and the employees of the program were not permitted salary increases."

On April 7, 1972, the Executive Committee of the Senate referred this matter to the Senate Committee on University Budget, Organization, and Publications for study and report.

Senate Action: Professor David Whitney, Chairman of the University Senate Committee on University Budget, Organization, and Publications, presented his informal, oral report in this matter.

After reporting some difficulty with getting information, Professor Whitney addressed himself to the following three points raised by Professor Crockett.

- (1) Relationship of the athletic budget to the University Budget: There is an almost complete separation between the two budgets. No hidden support of any kind by the University was discovered. On the basis of this cursory examination, apparently the Athletic Department pays its full way. In addition, that Department pays all expenses of the intramural program of athletics and pays \$10,000 for band scholarships. According to reports, the Athletic Department at this University is the only one in the Big Eight Conference that is not subsidized by the University and the only one that is making money. The University does not want to collect any Athletic Department surplus because, by the same token, the University would then be obligated to absorb any deficit in the future.
- (2) Faculty and administration supervision: In conversations with Professor Whitney, many former and present members of the Athletics Council expressed the feeling that the faculty had a good deal of control over the policies at this University regarding the Athletic Department.
- (3) Budgets of auxiliary units: Professor Whitney reported that, as far as he could ascertain, the University does not have a standard policy concerning the absorption of surpluses and deficits of the numerous auxiliary units at this University. Actions in this matter are evidently based on political and economic considerations

In conclusion, Professor Whitney reported Professor Crockett's satisfaction with the results of this investigation.

## ELECTION OF CHAIRMAN-ELECT, FACULTY SENATE, 1972-73

In accepting a motion by Dr. J. Clayton Feaver, the Senate elected Dr. William Maehl as the Chairman-Elect of the Faculty Senate for 1972-73 by acclamation.

## RE-ELECTION OF SECRETARY, FACULTY SENATE, 1972-73

In accepting a motion by Dr. Geoffrey Marshall, the Senate re-elected Dr. Anthony S. Lis as the Secretary of the Faculty Senate for 1972-73 by acclamation.

## UNIVERSITY ADMISSIONS POLICY

Dr. Rufus Hall, Senate Chairman, reported that the Senate Executive Committee had forwarded to the University Committee on Academic Regulations a recent request from Dr. Dorothy Truex to study the matter of admitting freshman on a routine, first-come, first-served basis to the possible detriment of the University as well as any outstanding applicants who, for various reasons, delay making application for admission to this University.

## NEW FACULTY HANDBOOK

Dr. Rufus Hall, Senate Chairman, called attention to the fact that the new University Faculty Handbook now being distributed includes the old tenure regulations that will continue to be in effect until the Regents approve the revised policy recommended by the Senate last year. When published, the new tenure regulations, as well as the statement concerning faculty responsibilities, will be printed in the loose-leaf format of the new faculty handbook for convenient replacement.

## DISPOSITION OF "I" GRADES

Dr. Rufus Hall, Senate Chairman, read the following memorandum of May 4, 1972, from Dr. Ed Crim, Jr., Acting Dean of the Graduate College, concerning the disposition of "I" grades:

At the request of the Graduate Council and of the Graduate Faculty I am sending to you for Senate consideration a recommendation for change in our present regulation concerning "I" grades. The recommendation of both groups is as follows.

Any student receiving an "I" (except for thesis or dissertation work) must remove the "I" within two regular resident semesters after he returns to the University of Oklahoma or the "I" will remain unchanged. Under no circumstances is reenrollment in the course acceptable as a means of removing the "I" during the two regular resident semesters.

The effects of such a change if approved by the Senate and the President of the University would be at least two in number. First, an "I" grade would no longer revert to an "F". Second, after two regular resident semesters a student could in fact reenroll in a course in order to receive a grade other than "I".

This recommendation is made in connection with graduate students only. Whether or not the Senate would wish to consider such a change for undergraduates is obviously its prerogative. The fact that we might have different regulations for undergraduates as compared to graduate students should be no real problem since such a situation already exists.

Although we do not have statistics to support the following statement, it appears to the Graduate College office that the reversion of an "I"

to "F" simply is not effective. Time after time students and/or professors submit petitions requesting that an "I" grade which has reverted to an "F" be changed back to an "I" and that the student be given additional time to complete the work necessary for the removal of the "I" grade. We have not encountered any case so far as I know in which a professor was unwilling to support the request that the "F" be changed back to "I" in order for the student to complete the work. What we have no information about are those cases in which an "I" grade has reverted to "F" and no petition is submitted either by the student or by a professor for any kind of change to be made.

Dr. Hall then suggested referring this matter to an appropriate committee. Dr. George Stone, however, at this point moved that the recommendation recently approved by the Graduate College by approved by the Faculty Senate as a general recommendation to include the undergraduates as well. After some discussion, Dr. Raymond P. Lutz moved to table this motion. The University Senate, with some dissent, approved the tabling motion.

#### EXPENDITURE OF SECTION 13 FUNDS

Expressing dissatisfaction with the explanations given by Dr. Nordby, University Vice President, at the beginning of this session, Dr. George Stone questioned the rationale of the administration's decisions concerning the expenditure of Section 13 funds. He cited the example of air-conditioning classrooms versus providing additional administrative offices. He added that he would like to know exactly who has the authority to make such decisions and establish those priorities. Accordingly, he moved that an ad hoc committee be appointed to study the situation and subsequently give the Senate an opportunity to make appropriate recommendations for establishing priorities and spending Section 13 funds. After Dr. Cluff E. Hopla had suggested the utilization of the appropriate University Council on Planning and Development, Dr. Stone revised his motion to stipulate that the University Council on Planning and Development be requested to investigate this matter and report to the Senate next fall. That Council should also be requested to study a pertinent letter from the Chancellor of the State Regents concerning a recent report on space utilization at state universities and colleges. The University Senate approved the motion without dissent.

#### IMPLEMENTATION OF STATEMENT CONCERNING FACULTY RESPONSIBILITIES

Referring to the Senate action in the preceding matter and citing the statement of faculty responsibility approved by the Senate on April 10, 1972, (see pages 4 and 5 of the University Senate Journal for April 10, 1972), Dr. George F. Stone urged the faculty to take some formal, organized action to consider and evaluate the objectives of a university education. He suggested that a group be appointed to study the desirability of setting aside either a few days or an entire week during the academic year for a serious study of what we are trying to do and how we will do these things. Distinguished speakers could be invited to the campus to help with this positive action by the faculty to call attention to University goals and objectives, particularly those dealing with students.

Accordingly, he moved that the incoming Chairman of the Senate appoint an ad hoc committee to consider the desirability of establishing some formal, organized means of calling attention to the ways, means, and objectives of the faculty's meeting its responsibilities to the students, as well as perhaps include the broader perspective of University education and methods. Dr. William Maehl, the incoming Senate Chairman, supported the suggestion as being good and productive within the University community internally and also very useful in demonstrating to the community at large the responsibility and the concern of the faculty in this matter. The Senate approved the motion without dissent.

VOTE OF APPRECIATION: Dr. Rufus Hall

The Senate accepted without dissent Dr. William Maehl's motion to express its sincerest thanks to Dr. Rufus Hall, outgoing Senate Chairman, for his leadership of the University Senate during the 1971-72 academic year.

ADJOURNMENT

The University Senate adjourned at 5:25 p.m. The next regular session will be held at 3:30 p.m., on Monday, September 18, 1972, in Room 218, Dale Hall.

Anthony S. Lis  
Secretary