

ACTION TAKEN BY THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE, FACULTY SENATE

On March 9, 1973, the Dean of the College of Arts and Sciences resubmitted the recommendation of that College's ad hoc Committee made a few years ago regarding procedures to be used in cases involving misconduct in academic matters, specifically that the Faculty Senate consider the establishment of similar procedures for the entire University.

Accordingly, on March 15, 1973, the Faculty Senate Executive Committee approved the establishment of an appropriate ad hoc Committee consisting of the following faculty members:

Professors D. Egle (AMNE)
 Homer Brown (Accounting)
 M. Buchwald (Drama)
 George Letchworth (Education)

ANNOUNCEMENT OF SPRING (1973) SEMESTER JOINT MEETING
 OF THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEES OF THE FACULTY SENATE (OKLAHOMA
 UNIVERSITY) AND FACULTY COUNCIL (OKLAHOMA STATE UNIVERSITY)

Dr. Wm. Maehl, Senate Chairman, announced that, in accordance with precedent set last year, the Executive Committees of the Faculty Senate, Oklahoma University, and the Faculty Council, Oklahoma State University, will meet in Norman in a joint session on Wednesday, April 11, 1973. The meeting, hosted by the Faculty Senate Executive Committee, will be devoted to a discussion of common problems and interests. Dr. Maehl will report on that joint meeting at the May 7 session of the Faculty Senate.

UNIVERSITY COUNCIL REPORTS TO THE FACULTY SENATE (concluded)

At the March 12, 1973, meeting of the Faculty Senate, eight reports of University Councils and the Publications Board were formally presented. (See pages 2-7 of the Faculty Senate Journal for March 12, 1973.)

At this meeting, Dr. Maehl called for the following three remaining Council reports:

Report of Dr. Gail de Stwolinski, Chairman of the University Academic Program Council, dated March 29, 1973:

The Academic Program Council was called to a first meeting November 2, 1972, at which time a faculty chairman was elected and a schedule of weekly meetings was established.

Before responding to the Faculty Senate charges for revision of policy, it was necessary to act on an accumulation of proposals for changes, deletions or adoptions of courses and programs. These were acted on under existing policies.

The Council was also asked to respond to the recommendations of the President's Task Force for Resource Review. This was accomplished in two meetings that totaled approximately thirteen hours.

The remaining meetings have been directed toward a revision of Council policy and procedures. The following statements represent the annual responsibilities that this Academic Program Council believes that it should assume.

- I. Encouraging and recognizing superior and improved teaching.
 - A. The Council will assist the Budget Council in establishing recognition of effective teaching as a factor equal to research and public service in determining merit salary increases and academic advancement.
 - B. Efforts will be made to establish general criteria for recognizing effective and superior teaching.
 - C. A study of the summary of faculty activity reports may reveal the need for guidelines to a more equitable distribution of the teaching work load.

- D. The Council will attempt to make available "in service" education on presentation, goal analysis, use of audiovisual aids, testing and measurements, etc., for all university teaching faculty.
- E. Academic units will be asked to report on existing or desirable intern programs for graduate teaching assistants, such information to be forwarded to academic units for their consideration.

II. Encouraging planning, innovation, and development of the instructional program.

- A. The Council will solicit annual reports of short- and long-range goals and priorities from academic units and their associated colleges. As a result of the study of all reports and data, the Council may recommend to an academic unit or a college that their goals or priorities need reconsideration.
- B. The administration will be requested to make available funds to support activities such as the following: invited lecture on educational innovation, travel expenses for information gathering trips by delegated faculty, subsidizing outside consultants in particular areas, subsidizing an annual award for programs judged worthy of recognition, subsidizing the initial costs of experimental programs judged worthy of support, and subsidizing the revision of existing instructional programs. Such funds should be comparable at least to those now afforded faculty research.

III. A continuing evaluation of the total University program.

- A. The Council will study data prepared annually by administrative offices. These data will include departmental information concerning credit hour totals, FTE, student-faculty ratios, numbers of majors and graduates, as well as other relevant information about degree programs.
- B. The Council will study a summary of faculty activity reports compiled annually by the Office of the Provost.
- C. The Council will consider those proposals referred to it by the Subcommittee of Student Pleas, such subcommittee to be appointed as approved by the Council in the minutes of March 8, 1973.
- D. Representatives from the Office of the Vice President of Continuing Education and Public Service will be invited to present an annual report of all programs in Continuing Education.
- E. Recommendations from the above considerations will be forwarded to the President and the Office of the Provost, such recommendations to be included in the report to the Faculty Senate when action has been finalized.

IV. Encouraging and assisting the colleges, schools and departments in evaluation.

- A. Academic units will be asked to forward to the Council a list of all related accrediting agencies and to include a copy of accrediting studies, outside evaluations and any other formal or informal studies bearing on the educational process that has been done in the past ten years. Accompanying these reports should be the actual cost of the study as well as an estimate of the indirect costs involved in preparation and/or maintenance of accreditation.
- B. Academic units and selected university officials (Alumni Relations, Employment Services, etc.) will be asked to supply a listing of the nature and scope of their postgraduate follow-up and feed-back.
- C. Academic units will be asked to consider the Graduate Record Examination or an appropriate standardized national test as part of a requirement for graduation.

- V. A review and recommendation on proposed changes, deletions, or adoptions of courses and programs.
- A. Subject to the consent of the Council, proposed changes or deletions of existing courses will be recommended for approval by a qualified person in the Office of the Assistant Provost for Academic Records, such person to be appointed jointly by the Council and the Assistant Provost.
 - B. Subject to the consent of the Council, proposed course adoptions will be recommended for approval by the same appointed representative and one appointed member of the Council.
 - C. Proposed changes or deletions of existing degree programs will be approved internally by the appropriate college, and a report of the changes or deletions will be forwarded to the Council and filed with the Office of Admissions and Records.
 - D. The Council will continue to review and recommend on all proposed new degree programs. Proposed course adoptions that relate to a proposed new degree program should be presented at the same time.
 - E. The Council may request that certain programs or courses be consolidated, especially in those areas where there is duplication.
 - F. The Council will explore with the appropriate bodies arrangements by which experimental curricula can be given internal and provisional approval.
 - G. Prior to the Council recommendation for approval of new courses or programs, public announcement (The University Today, the student newspaper, and duplicated notices to department chairmen) of the proposals will be made in order to disseminate the information and to avoid duplication of efforts. There will follow, then, a two-week protest period.
 - H. Procedures for proposing course changes and adoptions or new degree programs will be revised to include a statement as to the level of the course, a realistic evaluation of increased cost to the department and the means of meeting this cost, a description of internal adjustments necessary to add the course or degree, a statement of the efforts made by the department to avoid duplication with existing courses or programs, the indication of student interest, and certification of career possibilities.
 - I. Academic units will receive annual notification of the schedule for consideration of course and degree proposals.
- VI. A review of proposed new academic positions, departments, schools or colleges.
- A. Since the Council is to attempt to anticipate future educational needs which the University has a responsibility to fulfill, proposals for new academic positions, departments, schools or colleges should come before the Council for review at the planning stage.
 - B. The Council should also feel a responsibility to propose new academic positions, departments, schools or colleges, or to recommend the combining or deleting of existing units if any of these actions seem necessary to fulfill the educational needs or to respond to budgetary situations of the University.
- VII. Anticipate future educational needs which the University has a responsibility to fulfill.
- A. The Council will maintain a continuing program of monitoring new educational needs and the means by which they are to be met. Examples are: individually prescribed instruction; self-paced instruction; computer aided instruction; competence testing; interrupted formal learning; continuing education; junior college developments; space free - time free educational concepts; counseling for alternatives; the three-year Carnegie program.

- B. The Council will communicate formally or informally with such state bodies as the Alumni organization and the Higher Education Committees of the Oklahoma House and Senate in order to assess current needs of the state from these viewpoints.

VIII. Establishing liaison with other University Councils.

- A. With the Budget Council, this Council has determined a need for joint review and recommendation on all proposals for new course adoptions, degree programs, academic positions, departments, schools, and colleges.
- B. The Council will furnish recommendations as needed by the Budget Council, the Academic Personnel Council, and others for their deliberations.

Respectfully submitted,

Gail de Stwolinski, Chairman

Report of the Chairman, University Budget Council, dated April 2, 1973:

The University Budget Council as reorganized by the Faculty Senate consists of nine faculty members, four students, and four professional/classified employees. Ex officio members of the council are the Provost and the Vice President for Administration and Finance. The Budget Director also attends council meetings. The full council has met twenty-one times this year; each member is also on one or more subcommittees which have met several times.

I. We have a new charge entailing both new powers and new responsibilities. This first year has been exceedingly difficult. We have had fine cooperation from the administration. We have, we feel, given tough advice--often unsolicited. Our access to budget data is complete; in one or two instances the timing has been unfortunate. With one notable exception, we have had an opportunity to advise the President prior to a decision. We shall later have an opportunity to determine to what extent our advice is incorporated in the FY 73-74 budget. We are hopeful.

II. Subcommittees:

1. Athletic Program (Chmn. Ron Bourassa). Concern is often voiced about the relation of Athletic Program funds to E and G funds. Later in the year the Athletic Director and the Chairman of the Athletics Council will report to the Budget Council. This subcommittee is to prepare the council for that report; it is also charged with considerations of the intramural programs, the involvement of the Development Office and the Office of University Relations in athletic promotion and fund solicitation, etc.

2. Learning Resources Center (Chmn. William McGrew). Each new building constructed entails considerable annual maintenance costs. In the past, these costs appear to have been largely ignored in decisions to build new units. Three different proposals have been advanced to solve the current critical space needs of the library. One of these entails enormous maintenance and personnel costs. This committee is to gather the several prior reports on library needs with a view to assuring that maintenance/personnel costs are fully considered in the final deliberations of the administration.

3. Women Library Faculty (Chmn. Herbert Hengst). An ad hoc committee of women librarians has reported that the salaries of women library faculty are discriminatory. After reviewing that report and carrying out an investigation of its own, this subcommittee has provided its analysis to the Provost as a part of the very important University-wide review of salaries of women and minorities.

4. Procedures (Chmn. Richard Hilbert). The charge requires the Council to work out its operating procedures. This committee is attempting to develop procedures fully consistent with the powers and responsibilities established by the charge and fully acceptable to our parent body, the Faculty Senate, and to the Provost and President.

5. Graduate Appointment Definitions (Chmn. Irvin Wagner). Some graduate appointments "count" as part of a department's instructional staff; others do not. Some departments have exploited this fact for statistical purposes. Some appointment titles include automatic in-state tuition, others do not. Departments are tempted, therefore, to use titles which do not, in fact, describe the student's activities. This problem has been referred to an ad hoc committee of the Deans Council.

6. Subcommittees will shortly be formed to examine some matters pertaining to the Summer Budget, to attempt to sound the mysteries of the new "program budgeting" procedures developed by the staff of the State Regents, to explore the relation of externally funded research to the E and G instructional funds, etc.

III. Resource Review

On December 3, 1971, the President requested the Budget Council and the Academic Program Council to advise him on the development of objective criteria that should be used during a University-wide resource review. The council submitted an 11-page document to the President on February 10, 1972. That report listed seven general "aims" of the University, six "Principles of evaluation," sixteen specific questions to be asked, six criteria for evaluating the responses, and fourteen recommendations. This report, the report of the Academic Program Council, and the report of the North Central Association Review Team served as points of departure for the Task Force review. On August 28, 1972, Mr. Ray briefed the council on the resource review process and the calendar which the Task Force would follow. Step 16 of that process ("Informing Budget Council and Council on Instruction and securing reaction") was to follow "Tentative Decisions." We received the Task Force report on November 29, however, no decisions were reported to the Council by the President. We were given advance notice of the University School decision at a later time. We have not been further informed of the "adoption" of all or part of that report. Our "reaction" was submitted to the President on December 5.

IV. Budget Target Planning

The Provost, Budget Director, and Vice President of Administration and Finance have attempted to estimate what additional annualizable resources the University may expect for next year. They have further suggested (for themselves and the other Vice Presidents) some thirty-five "needs" for which this sum might be expended. These items are drawn from Task Force recommendations, from requests from the Administration, Regents, other committees, departments, Deans, etc. The Council has ranked these items and suggested levels of funding it feels appropriate to those ranks.

To date, the President has established the following budget targets. "Target" here is used in various ways: "What we reluctantly settle for," "What we devoutly hope for," etc. These are working figures based on estimates of income and of the relative importance of present needs. In short, they are not to be understood either as commitments or as actual budget figures.

1. An increase in the salary levels of classified staff and support personnel received first priority. \$594,000.
2. A sum for raises for faculty, administrative and professional employees equal to 5.3% of the present salary total. First priority will be given to rectify inequities, particularly in women's salaries (est. \$40,000). \$750,000.
3. Other salary and benefit items total \$323,000. These include mandatory Social Security increases (\$70,000), retirements (\$30,000), health insurance premium increase and extending coverage to additional employees (\$90,000), distinguished professorships (\$10,000), and TIAA improvement (\$123,000).

Operations cost increases must be met. A mandatory natural gas rate increase of \$40,000 is upon us. \$150,000 is targeted for C Budget increases. The Chancellor requires that we assume a share of the administrative costs of the Talk-back TV network (\$8,260).

5. Approximately \$488,000 is targeted for Program Resource funds. We can offer no details here inasmuch as the Deans and Vice Presidents have not yet received their allocations. These sums include personnel transfers (2 new Deans and a Provost), new positions, matching funds for grants, some additional staff in the Provost office, etc. (\$387,000). \$101,000 is targeted for non-Provost areas. The bulk of these funds are assigned to recruitment efforts and to minimizing the effect of SB115. We shall, as charged, review the allocations at the program level once they are announced. A small sum (\$40,000) is targeted for the library acquisitions budget. We also shall have to upgrade the computer.

V. The Budget Council has received no communications from 1) the Research Council, 2) the Administrative and Physical Resources Council, or 3) the Senate Committee on Faculty Welfare.

VI. We still have a lot to do this year. At upcoming meetings we shall: 1) discuss research funding with Ray Daniels and Dean Gentile, 2) discuss Development Office activities with Vice President Burr, 3) discuss the computer facility needs with Bob Shepherd, 4) invite representatives of the Deans Committee to discuss budget problems, 5) discuss OCCE funding with Vice President White, 6) receive the remaining committee reports, and 7) review the final FY 73-74 budget.

We shall quite probably hold some meetings this summer.

Robert Shahan, Chairman

The discussion concerning the above report dealt mainly with the question as to whether or not the Budget Council is, in effect, a lobbying group for the faculty. Dr. Shahan felt that the Council, designed to give advice to the President on budget matters, was constituted in such a way that its membership is representative of the opinions of the major elements of the University community. In his opinion, the Council is not indifferent to the interests of the faculty. He added that the charges given the University Budget Council explicitly provide for input from the Senate standing Committee on Faculty Welfare. The Senate Committee on Faculty Welfare should regularly consider the condition of the faculty and then communicate accordingly to the Budget Council, as well as the President and any others concerned.

Report of the Chairman, University Research Council, dated March 26, 1973:

The Research Council held its initial meeting on November 9, 1972. The Council is a newly-created body and, as such, has been concerned with interpretation of its charge. Council members have been concerned about items in the charge that appear to conflict with or duplicate functions assigned to existing units within the University Community. It is also not clear to what extent the Council should seek to acquire and administer funds to support research. It was concluded that the Council should seek consultation with and advice from representatives of the following organizations: (1) The ad hoc committee that wrote the Council's charge; (2) The faculty research committee; (3) Media information; (4) The executive board of ADF; and (5) The Budget Council. Adoption of operating procedures by the research council must await the results of consultations with the organizations listed.

The Council was asked to serve as an advisory body to review proposals submitted to the University of Oklahoma Research Institute for Junior Faculty Summer Research Fellowships. Service in such a capacity is consistent with items one, four, and seven of the charge to the Council. The Council reviewed 35 proposals and recommended ten fellows and four alternates to OURI.

The Council was asked and agreed to serve in a similar capacity to review applications submitted to the Graduate College for six OURI graduate fellowships. The Council reviewed 37 applications and recommended six fellows and six alternates to the Graduate College.

The deadlines for the review of applications and notification to the candidates imposed deadlines on the Council. All other activities of the Council were consequently deferred. The Council is now returning to the task of interpreting its charge and

establishing operating procedures.

This summarizes the activities of the Research Council to date. I will be pleased to answer any questions that you may have.

Respectfully submitted,

Walter L. Dillard, Chairman

In concluding the presentation of the reports of the various University Councils, Dr. Maehl, Senate Chairman, reminded the Senate members that an ad hoc Committee of the Senate is now studying appropriate formal guidelines to be followed by Council chairmen in preparing and submitting future Council reports.

REGENTS' POLICY ON OUTSIDE EMPLOYMENT

Background Information:

On December 9, 1971, the Regents of the University of Oklahoma approved a revised policy on outside employment and extra compensation within the University of Oklahoma. (See pages 2-4 of the University Senate Journal for January 10, 1972.) In response to requests from several faculty members, the Faculty Senate approved the appointment of an ad hoc Committee to study proposed revisions in the Regents' policy. (See page 6 of the Faculty Senate Journal for September 18, 1972.) The report of the ad hoc Committee was published on pages 11-13 of the Agenda for the March 12, 1972. Senate meeting.

Senate Action:

Dr. Chipman Stuart, Chairman of the Senate ad hoc Committee, acknowledged the efforts of the members of that Committee; Professors Jim Laguros, C. R. Hayden, Drew Kershen, and Paul Tharp.

He then moved approval of the changes proposed by the Committee. The Senate, considering each paragraph separately, took the following actions:

Faculty Handbook, dated April, 1972:

- 5.5.1: No change.
- 5.5.2: No change.
- 5.5.3: No change.
- 5.5.4: No change.
- 5.5.5: Approved in a tally of 21 affirmative and 13 negative votes. Some faculty misgiving was expressed over the implication that faculty members work a four-day week. The revision specifies a maximum of 40 days for the nine-month contract; 55 days for the 12-month contract.
- 5.5.6: Approved with some dissent. In this revised section, weekends and holiday periods are excluded and the 25 per cent limit on extra compensation is based on the salary of the highest paid professor in the University system.
- 5.5.7: Approved without dissent. The amended section provides for the appointment of a special committee to investigate and negotiate payments exceeding the 40/55 day limits.
- 5.5.8: Approved without dissent. In this revision, administrative details are detailed.
- 5.5.9: Dr. Stuart proposed the following change in the revision as published in the Agenda:

6th sentence deleted and the following substituted therefor:

"Over the period of the academic semester, absences may not exceed the following schedule: 1-hour course: 2 absences
2-hour course: 4 absences
3-hour course: 6 absences, etc.

"The faculty member will be responsible for providing an appropriately qualified substitute for all absences. Absences should not happen at the beginning and the end of semesters."

The proposed revision, as further amended by Dr. Stuart, was rejected by the Senate.

Later in the meeting, Dr. Stuart proposed changing the current section 5.5.9 as follows:

- (a) Add the word usually in the parenthetical sentence at the end of the the paragraph as follows: (. . . and will not usually be approved.)
- (b) Add the last two sentences in the revision (5.5.9) proposed by the ad hoc Committee and rejected by the Senate earlier in this session.

The Senate approved without dissent these two changes in 5.5.9 as published in the 1972 Faculty Handbook.

5.5.10: No change.

5.5.11: No change.

5.5.12: Approved without dissent. The only change is the addition of "within the University system."

5.5.13: No change.

5.5.14: No change.

5.5.15: No change other than the addition of the date of 1971.

The Senate subsequently approved the recommendation that the proposed revisions in the Regents' policy become effective immediately upon approval.

As thus revised, the proposed policy is presented below in its entirety:

REGENTS' POLICY ON OUTSIDE EMPLOYMENT AND EXTRA COMPENSATION

WITHIN THE UNIVERSITY OF OKLAHOMA

(Faculty Handbook - April, 1972 - with revisions approved by the Faculty Senate on April 9, 1973)

5.5.1. A person who accepts full-time employment in the University of Oklahoma owes his first duty and 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.

5.5.2. 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.

5.5.3. 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 foreign to, their professional qualifications for University work.

5.5.4. 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 of 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.

5.5.5. (Revised) 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 and fifty-five days for the twelve-months contract period, excluding weekends and holiday periods.

5.5.6. (Revised) 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 and fifty-five days for the twelve-months contract period, excluding weekends and holiday periods. The authorization of special payments within any contract period is also limited to 25 per cent of the annual salary of the highest paid full professor in the University system.

5.5.7. (Revised) Activities permitted by paragraphs 5.5.5. and 5.5.6. may not exceed a total of 40/55 days. If special payments are expected to exceed the 25 per cent limit and the activities are expected to exceed the 40/55 day limit, a special committee may be called to investigate and negotiate the problem. The committee will consist of (1) four members of the Senate appointed by the Executive Committee and (2) a colleague who will be chosen by the staff member who is affected by said rules. The committee may recommend to the President an adjustment of the faculty member's base salary and teacher/research responsibilities or they may recommend that the exception be allowed.

5.5.8. (Revised) 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. In the case of less than five-day notice, a written request in memorandum form may be approved by the department head or the dean of the college. Final approval remains in the hands of the President. In the case of a dispute, the committee as outlined in paragraph 5.5.7. may be called to negotiate. The decision of this committee will be used as a recommendation to the President. In any case (including applications after the fact), all applications must be made in writing on the forms provided and must bear the approval of the faculty member's department head and his dean before it comes to the President for his consideration.

5.5.9. (Revised) 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 chairmen 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 usually be approved.) If absences are expected to exceed the above, a committee (as outlined in paragraph 5.5.7.) may be called to investigate and negotiate the problem. The committee may or may not allow exceptions and their decision will be used as a recommendation to the President.

5.5.10. 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.

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

5.5.12. (Revised) No member of the University faculty or staff may hold regular multiple appointments within the University system which reflects more than a total of 1.0 full-time equivalent.

5.5.13. 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.

5.5.14. 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.

5.5.15. These regulations supersede the regulations on outside employment adopted by the Regents in 1931, 1948, 1958, and 1971.

"W" GRADES

Background Information:

On August 10, 1972, Mr. Verner Ekstrom, Assistant Provost, submitted several recommendations for changes in grade regulations (including the "W" grade). (See page 5 of the Agenda for the Faculty Senate meeting on September 18, 1972.) The Senate referred this matter to an ad hoc Committee chaired by Dr. James Costello (see page 7 of the Faculty Senate Journal for September 18, 1972.) The report of the ad hoc Committee was published on page 4 of the Agenda for this meeting.

Senate Action:

In the absence of the Committee Chairman, Professor Mitchell Owens commented on the report of the Committee. Considerable discussion ensued. Two student representatives addressed the Senate to plead for revisions in the Committee's proposal, particularly concerning the proposed eighth-week limitation on the "W" grade. Senate discussion revealed wide variation among faculty members in reporting "W" and "WF" grades as late as the 12th week under current regulations. Some faculty members questioned the enforceability of the proposed regulations; others questioned the apparent punitive

aspects of the proposed revisions in grade regulations. Dr. Gail de Stwolinski moved that the matter be returned to the ad hoc Committee for further study with the recommendation that the use of the "W" grade be reconsidered. The motion was approved with one dissenting vote.

PROPOSAL FOR 24-HOUR, CLASS "A" PARKING LOTS

Background Information:

On November 3, 1972, Dr. Paul F. Sharp, President of the University, requested Senate recommendations concerning various aspects of the campus parking problems. (See page 8 of the Faculty Senate Journal for December 18, 1972.) This matter was, in turn, referred to the Senate standing Committee on Faculty Welfare. (See page 7 of the Faculty Senate Journal for March 12, 1973.)

Senate Action:

In the absence of the Committee Chairman, Dr. Kenneth Taylor, a member of the Senate standing Committee on Faculty Welfare, moved approval of the following recommendation of that Committee for the establishment of three 24-hour, seven days week, Class "A" parking lots:

The Faculty Senate urges the Administration to effect a minor alteration in the present University staff parking policy, so as to provide some parking space for faculty and staff members whose work schedules bring them to the University in the late afternoon and evening.

Specifically, the Senate request that three small-to-medium-sized "A" parking lots be returned to the status of being reserved on a 24-hour basis, seven days a week, for holders of "A" parking decals. To provide such parking spaces conveniently near to offices, laboratories, and the Library, the following lots are recommended for 24-hour reserved status:

- (1) the lot immediately south of Nielson Hall (Physics Building)
- (2) the lot immediately west of the Old Science Hall, not including the larger lot extending to Elm Street
- (3) the lot south of the Nuclear Engineering Laboratory and north of the University Press Building.

In a voice vote without dissent, the Senate approved the above recommendation.

ELECTION OF FACULTY REPLACEMENT: University Academic Program Council

In accepting the nomination submitted by its Committee on Committees, the Faculty Senate elected Professor Raymond Mill (Environmental Health) to complete the unexpired 1973-75 portion of Professor James Merrill's term on the University Academic Program Council.

ADJOURNMENT

The Faculty Senate adjourned at 5:24 p.m. The next regular meeting of the Faculty Senate will be held at 3:30 p.m., on Monday, May 7, 1973, in Room 218, Dale Hall. Items for the Agenda should reach the Secretary of the Faculty Senate, Box 456, Central Mail Service, Norman campus, no later than Wednesday, April 25, 1973.

Anthony S. Lis
Secretary