

JOURNAL OF THE FACULTY SENATE  
The University of Oklahoma  
Norman

Regular Session -- October 8, 1973 -- 3:30 p.m., Dale Hall, 218

The Faculty Senate was called to order by Dr. Wm. H. Maehl, Jr., Chairman.

<u>Present:</u>	Anderson, Paul S.	Ford, Robert A.	Miller, Fred H.
	Beaird, Lolly	Graves, Wm. A.	Olson, Ralph E.
	Bogart, George A.	Haden, Clovis R.	Owens, Mitchell V.
	Calvert, Floyd A.	Hilbert, Richard	Pollak, Betty
	Chandler, Albert M.	Huneke, Harold V.	Shahan, Robert
	Christian, Sherril D.	Jischke, Martin C.	Staples, Albert F.
	Coussons, Timothy	Kraynak, Matthew	Starling, R. E.
	de Stwolinski, Gail	Laguros, Joakim	Stuart, Chipman
	Donnell, Ruth	Larson, Raymond D.	Sutherland, Patrick
	Eek, Nat S.	Lehrman, G. Philip	Whitecotton, Joseph
	Estes, James R.	Maehl, Wm. H., Jr.	Whitney, David A.
	Feaver, J. Clayton	Milby, T. H.	Wilson, Wm. H.

OUSA representatives: Anderson, Mark  
Malcomb, C. A.  
Tabor, Tim

<u>Absent:</u>	Braver, Gerald	Gibson, Arrell M.	Prickett, Wilson B.
	Brown, Homer A.	Letchworth, George	Reid, W. T.
	Duchon, Claude	McDonald, Bernard R.	Rubio, Tomas
	Felts, Wm. J.	Patnode, Robert E.	Swank, David
	Fife, James		

OUSA representatives: McDermott, Jo Ellen  
Perry, John

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

The Journal of the Faculty Senate for the regular session on September 10, 1973, was accepted.

ANNOUNCEMENT: Meeting of the General Faculty of the University

The General Faculty of the University of Oklahoma will meet at 3:30 p.m., Thursday, October 18, 1973, in Room 150, Adams Hall Annex (College of Business Administration). (For required advance notice of faculty consideration of a proposed change in the Charter of the General Faculty and the Faculty Senate, see page 10 of the Faculty Senate Journal for September 10, 1973.)

ANNOUNCEMENT: Special Meeting of the Faculty Senate

The Faculty Senate will meet in special session at 3:30 p.m., on Monday, October 22, 1973, in Room 218, Dale Hall, to consider the report of the Senate ad hoc Committee concerning implementation of the Faculty Career Development Program approved by the University Regents on December 14, 1972. (See page 4 of the Faculty Senate Journal for January 16, 1973.)

PROPOSED EVALUATION OF DEANS

On August 29, 1973, Dr. Leon Zelby submitted the following proposal to the Chairman of the Faculty Senate:

"I should like to submit for the consideration of the Senate the desirability of recommending a formal procedure for a periodic evaluation of deans. Such a procedure already established at some educational institutions would not

be inconsistent with other evaluation procedures, e.g. faculty and department heads, already well established here. Considerations of the desirability of recommending a procedure of this sort could include among others the establishment of a finite period of tenure with limits on self succession, the quality of leadership and inspiration provided, the degree to which student and faculty participation in some aspects of college activities were encouraged and invited, the innovations and progress of the college relative to its peers, etc."

The above proposal was referred by the Senate Executive Committee on September 27, 1973, to the following ad hoc Senate Committee for appropriate study and recommendation:

Cluff E. Hopla (Zoology), Chairman  
 Doyle Bishop (Management)  
 James Faulconer (Music)  
 Tom Love (Engineering)  
 Martha Primeaux (HSC)  
 Alfred J. Weinheimer (Chemistry)

Dr. Maehl, Senate Chairman, requested faculty members to submit any suggestions to the above Committee members.

#### UNIVERSITY PATENT POLICY

Dr. R. C. Fowler (Physics) submitted to the Senate Chairman on August 29, 1973, the following proposal for revising the first sentence of Article I of the University Patent Policy (see page 4 of the Faculty Senate Journal for February 12, 1973) to read as follows:

"All rights to and interests in discoveries or inventions, including patents thereon, which result from research or investigation carried out by any member of the faculty, staff or student body in any experimental station, bureau, laboratory, or research facility of the University or the University of Oklahoma Research Institute, or substantially through the use of facilities or funds provided by or through the University shall be the property of the University; and all rights therein shall be assigned as the President directs . . ."

The Executive Committee of the Faculty Senate on September 27, 1973, voted to forward this proposal to the University Patent Advisory Committee for its study and recommendation.

#### ELECTION OF SENATE REPLACEMENTS: College of Pharmacy and School of Architecture

Dr. G. Philip Lehrman, College of Pharmacy, has been elected by that College as its Senate representative for 1973-76. The Senate roster published on page 12 of the Senate Journal for September 10, 1973, erroneously reported the reelection of Dr. J. Richard Grunder, College of Pharmacy.

Dr. Floyd Calvert, School of Architecture, has been elected by that School as an interim Senator during 1973-74 while Professor Richard Kuhlman, School of Architecture, is on a one-year emergency leave of absence. Professor Kuhlman is expected to complete his remaining year, 1974-75.

#### ELECTION OF FACULTY REPLACEMENTS: Research Council and Faculty Appeals Board

The Faculty Senate accepted the recommendations of its Committee on Committees to elect the following faculty replacements:

Research Council: Wayne Morgan (History), 1973-76

Faculty Appeals Board: Gene Levy (Mathematics), 1973-76  
Charles Cameron (HSC), 1973-76

NOMINATION OF FACULTY REPLACEMENTS: University Committees

In accepting the recommendations of its Committee on Committees, the Faculty Senate nominated the following faculty replacements to fill vacancies on the University Committees indicated below:

University Book Exchange Oversight Committee, (1973-74):  
Ryan Amacher (Economics)  
Robert D. Van Auken (Education)

Academic Regulations Committee, 1973-75:  
Dragan Milivojevic (Modern Languages)  
John Te Selle (Law)

Rita H. Lottinville Prize for Men Committee, 1973-76:  
Gwen Davis (English)  
Margaret Swain (Music)

Rita H. Lottinville Prize for Women Committee, 1973-76:  
Mildred Andrews (Music)  
Geraldine Hargis (Home Economics)

UNIVERSITY COUNCIL REPORTS

The following additional University Council reports have been received in accordance with Senate directives covering activities during the spring semester, 1973:

Academic Personnel Council (Dr. Ed C. Nuttall, Chairman) - September 25, 1973:

On February 26 the Council concluded its hearings on the twelve cases in which there were disputes concerning the granting of tenure. The recommendations on nine of the twelve cases were concurred with by the Provost and the President.

The Council continued to meet Monday afternoons until April 16, 1973. The purpose of the meetings was to write a set of instructions for academic units to follow in determining their recommendations for tenure and to construct a form to be used in the tenure-recommending process. The reason for these two documents was to encourage uniform and legal procedures for determining tenure recommendations. The Council considered the documents important, particularly during the next few years when two different systems to determine tenure will be in effect.

Finally, the Chairman met with President Sharp to discuss means of improving the Council's effectiveness as an advisory body to the President. Dr. Sharp suggested that he meet with the Council in the future when such meetings might prove of value to the President or to the Council. This matter will be pursued by the Council during the 1973-74 year.

\* \* \* \* \*

Academic Program Council (Dr. Gail de Stwolinski, Chairman) - September 28, 1973:

The major actions of the Academic Program Council for the second semester of 1972-73 have been reported previously in the Faculty Senate Minutes of April 9, 1973. The following items represent the activities of the Council for the remainder of the 1972-73 academic year.

- I. The appointment of Dr. Hardin as the Council member to work with Mrs. Connie Boehme, Office of Admissions and Records, as a subcommittee for preliminary approval of proposed changes or deletions of existing courses and of proposed



new course adoptions (see items V-A and V-B of the Council report in the Faculty Senate minutes of April 9, 1973). For the remainder of the second semester such proposals were so processed.

- II. The appointment of Council members to the Subcommittee of Student Pleas. This subcommittee was established by action of the Council at the meeting of March 8, 1973, in response to a proposal by Mark Cantrell, student member. The essence of the proposal as approved establishes a five-member committee, of whom two shall be students and to whom will be submitted in writing any proposals of the student body regarding such matters as academic programs and policies of departments or courses of study. The subcommittee acts on a proposal to forward it and their recommendation to the Academic Program Council, or the subcommittee may vote to dismiss the proposal after due deliberation, therefore not sending it forward. The Council members appointed are recorded in the Council minutes of April 5, 1973, and they are as follows: Dr. Kraynak, Dr. Whitmore, Dr. Melby, Erich Evered and Mark Cantrell. The subcommittee had no occasion to function for the remainder of the semester.
- III. In response to the Faculty Senate charge to this Council to effect a liaison with the Budget Council and other councils, the Academic Program Council proposed a revised schedule for new programs or courses that included Budget Council action. This proposal was forwarded first to the Office of the Provost, and it was then presented by that office to the Council of Deans. Although response was vigorous, as yet no definitive action has been taken.

\* \* \* \* \*

Administrative and Physical Resources Council (Professor Arnold Henderson, Chairman)-  
September 25, 1973:

During the spring semester, 1973, the Administrative and Physical Resources Council met seven times, from February 23 to June 14. Our initial efforts were directed at developing policy guidelines relating to the charge to council. Described below is a policy statement outlining the function of the council. This represents the development of this statement to date. The policy statement does not make any reference to the naming of buildings and spaces within the University. This function, conceived as an important activity of the council, is currently under study and a statement will be incorporated as a part of the total document at a later date.

-----  
Functions of the Council relating to the administrative structure of the University:

1. The Council shall act as an advisory body to the President in regard to major changes in the administrative organization of the University, particularly in regard to changing roles or functions of administrative units or the creation of new units or deletion of existing units. The President will normally seek the advice of the Council before recommending major organizational changes to the Regents.
2. The Council shall act as an advisory body to the President in the creation of new administrative positions or the changing of existing administrative roles. Where the appointment of a special search committee is not used, the President will seek the advice of the Council on major administrative appointments. The area of administrative salaries, in terms of equity and justice, may be presented to the Council.
3. The President may request the Council to review the performance of administrative offices. Under special circumstances, the Council may initiate the review of an administrative unit, but its first matter of business should be to consult the President for his views in regard to such a review.

Functions of the Council relating to the physical resources and development of the University:

1. The Council shall act as an advisory body to the President in regard to policies and other recommendations concerning the physical development of the Campuses of the University of Oklahoma at Norman. In the performance of this advisory capacity, the Council may require the assistance of various administrative staffs or any technical information which may be necessary to properly evaluate a general or particular project or assignment.
2. In the development of policies and recommendations in relation to the physical facilities of the University, the Council will require a comprehensive facilities plan that reflects the academic, research and public service responsibilities of the University of Oklahoma. Appropriate professional personnel will be responsible for the development of the comprehensive facilities plan which should include consideration for the following elements:
  - a. To analyze existing buildings and the functional relationships of academic units in order to determine the adequacies and deficiencies of the existing campuses.
  - b. Renovation and remodeling of existing buildings.
  - c. Location and site relationship of new buildings.
  - d. Provision for extension of necessary utilities.
  - e. Provide for pedestrian circulation, bicycle movement and storage, the movement and storage of automotive traffic and other means of transportation which may be desirable in the future.
  - f. To identify and protect those significant buildings, open spaces and other features which have the functional, structural and aesthetic qualities that should be preserved.
  - g. To coordinate the public facilities of the University with the various private and public uses of land in the Norman community in order to minimize conflict of function and to protect the variety of separate interests which are involved.
3. The Council shall act in an advisory capacity to the President in providing policy guidelines and recommendations in the allocation and re-allocations of space and facilities.

---

During the spring semester, we also spent considerable time discussing the planning process within the University community as it relates to physical resources, the source and kinds of data needed to structure priorities, and the various components of the decision-making process. We have been especially concerned with the development of guidelines for more effective space utilization and re-modeling criteria. This is an on-going activity and will undoubtedly receive major attention from the Council in the forthcoming year.

Late in the spring semester, a sub-committee of the Council addressed the question of the current organization of the College of Arts and Sciences. A preliminary recommendation was made to Dr. Sharp prior to interviews of candidates by the Dean's Search Committee. The Council recommended that, at the present time, no radical change in the organization of the College of Arts and Sciences should be made. The Council felt that any effort directed at re-structuring academic units should involve the new Dean.

Finally, the Council recommended the naming of the Golf Club House for Bruce Drake and the Dance Studio in the Fine Arts Center for Helen Gregory.



Athletics Council (Dr. Alan Velie, Chairman) - September 21, 1973:

During the Spring, 1973, Semester the Athletics Council met routinely once a month. In addition, the Council held a number of special meetings in which we participated in the selection of head coaches for the football and basketball teams. I have summarized the more important pieces of business we conducted. In addition, the Council dealt with minor routine tasks such as approving schedules and letter awards.

January: Head football coach Chuck Fairbanks left Oklahoma to become coach of the New England Patriots. The President appointed a special search committee composed of the Chairman of the Athletics Council, one student member, the Athletic Director, and two regents. The Athletics Council recommended assistant head coach Barry Switzer to the search committee. The search committee concurred with the selection, as did the President and the regents, and Mr. Switzer was chosen head coach.

February: The Council approved the addition of a 3% sales tax to the price of football and baseball tickets, and golf course purchases and rentals. This was to offset the 2% state tax and 1% city tax on the above items that the department had hitherto absorbed.

March and April: Head basketball coach John MacLeod accepted a job with the Phoenix Suns. The President appointed two regents to sit with the Athletics Council, with the group acting as a search committee. The committee screened over twenty applications, interviewed five applicants, and forwarded two names to the President, who selected Lester Lane, who was at the time coach of the Mexican Olympic Team.

May. The Council examined and accepted the Athletic Department budget.

\* \* \* \* \*

Budget Council (Dr. Shahan, Chairman) - September 28, 1973:

The Budget Council has already met twice this year. Dr. Nordby has provided a list of major budget transfers and expenditures processed since our final meeting last year. We have begun to review the configuration of the present budget and have scheduled appearances before the Council of two Directors and two Vice Presidents. We shall invite most of the Deans. Drs. Nordby, Hunsberger, and Marshall attend each meeting as ex officio members.

We are attempting to "finalize" our procedures as required by the charge to the Council. One point at issue is a claim by some Deans and higher administrators that Council review of proposed major expenditures will unnecessarily delay the decision making process. The Council's position is that major expenditures should not be authorized without a recommendation from a body representative of the major constituencies of the University. This claim speaks to the process of decision making, not the decision itself which rests entirely with the higher administration.

Most of our time this semester will be devoted to budget review, interviews, and discussions of policy. As soon as the administration is able to provide us with (1) an estimate of new and recoverable monies for FY 1974 and (2) a list including an estimate of fixed increases, proposed expenditures, requests by Deans and other administrators, etc., we shall begin to develop a set of priorities and to assign appropriate sums to each. Our conclusions will be reported to the President as a recommendation.

Finally, we wish to remind the Standing Senate Committee on Faculty Welfare that it is appropriate for them to provide the Budget Council for its consideration data relative to faculty salaries and benefits, recommendations on inequities, etc. The Employee's Executive Council communications to the Budget Council and to the President in respect to the needs of its constituents have been thorough and most effective. The effectiveness of the faculty representatives on the University Fringe Benefit Committee should also be a matter of considerable concern inasmuch as this group also provides recommendations to the Budget Council and to the President.

\* \* \* \* \*

Faculty Reactions: Dr. Laguros, a member of the Senate Committee on Faculty Welfare last year, called attention to the last paragraph of the report of the Budget Council. In his experience, the Senate Committee on Faculty Welfare did not have a clear understanding as to "who should do the shouting" on behalf of the faculty--the Committee or the Deans. In his opinion, that Senate Committee should have the sole purpose of regularly reviewing the posture of the faculty concerning salaries, without any confusion as to its constituency. He asked that the Senate Committee on Faculty Welfare be apprised of its proper role in speaking for the faculty alone.

Dr. Maehl, in response, stated that the Senate Executive Committee would look into this matter at its next regular meeting.

Dr. Shahan, Budget Council Chairman, commented on the thorough, detailed, and lengthy document presented to the President and the Budget Council by Mr. Leonard Harper on behalf of the non-academic employees of the University. He felt that similar documentation and presentation on behalf of the faculty is not the responsibility of the Budget Council.

At this point, Dr. Jischke injected the observation that substantive changes in the University administration (specifically, the Office of the Provost and the OURI) have been made during the past summer without consulting the University Council presumably charged with such matters. He added that the explanation given was that "the urgency of the situation" had precluded any Council involvement.

#### REGENTS' POLICY ON EXTRA COMPENSATION AND OUTSIDE EMPLOYMENT

Background Information: On April 9, 1973, the Faculty Senate proposed several changes in the University policy concerning outside employment and extra compensation that had been approved by the University of Oklahoma Regents on December 9, 1971 (see pages 8-11 of the Senate Journal for April 9, 1973). In acknowledging receipt of these recommendations, Dr. Paul F. Sharp, President of the University, indicated on April 25, 1973, that he was appointing a task force to study the Senate recommendations (see page 2 of the Senate Journal for May 7, 1973). Drs. I Moyer Hunsberger, Provost, Norman campus, and Gene Nordby, Vice President for Administration and Finance, on August 31, 1973, issued a memorandum announcing detailed procedures for the implementation of the Regents' policy.

At its regular session on September 10, 1973, the Faculty Senate agreed to invite Mr. Joseph Ray, Acting Provost during the past academic year, and Dr. I. Moyer Hunsberger, the new Provost, Norman campus, to address the Senate at the October 8 meeting concerning this matter (see pages 11 and 12 of the Senate Journal for September 10, 1973).

Remarks by Mr. Joseph Ray: After reviewing briefly the actions taken by the Senate and Dr. Paul Sharp last spring, Mr. Ray reported that President Sharp had appointed the following individuals to the task force studying the Senate proposals:

- Dr. Thurman White, University Vice President
- Dr. Arthur Gentile, Dean, Graduate College
- Dr. William Maehl, Jr., Senate Chairman
- Dr. Robert Shahan, Chairman, University Budget Council
- Mr. Joseph Ray, Acting Provost.

Immediately upon assuming his Provost duties, Dr. I Moyer Hunsberger became the Chairman of the Task Force.

Remarks by Dr. Hunsberger: In their joint memorandum of August 31, 1973, Dr. Nordby and he tried to provide some guidelines for the implementation of the Regents' policy. He added that this memorandum should not be regarded as being definitive at this point.



There is no question that the Regents' policy limits extra compensation to 25 per cent of the salary during the nine-month period. Most of the concern with the extra compensation is with respect to summer employment.

Dr. Hunsberger then announced that this matter will be the only item on the agenda for the October 24, 1973, meeting of the task force.

This matter has been complicated, in part, by the fact that on July 1, 1973, in accordance with the law passed by the State Legislature, OURI was brought into the University organization. Therefore, research appointments now must be processed as University research appointments. Previously, such research appointments were considered as outside employment. A faculty member on a twelve-month contract, therefore, cannot now be given a research appointment during his vacation; a faculty member on a nine-month contract, however, can be given a three-month research appointment.

Extra compensation, coming from overload teaching, will be limited to 25 per cent of the salary.

Dr. Hunsberger acknowledged the receipt of a large number of arguments pro and con and added that the task force will try to make a definitive interpretation of the Regents' policy before too long.

Questions from the floor: Dr. Hunsberger saw implementation of the policy as the first job this year. The first meeting of the task force will be devoted to the problem of implementing this policy during the summer. Then the task force will try to resolve other basic issues.

The restriction on outside employment is on time rather than salary.

In Dr. Hunsberger's opinion, the major problems do not arrive from considering both outside employment and extra compensation "in the same bag" but rather from trying to extend a policy that applies to nine-month appointments to those employed during the summer in either summer school or research.

When asked whether the 25 per cent limit was equitable for the lower-rate faculty, Dr. Hunsberger replied that, in his opinion, no other arrangement would be more equitable and that the limitation has considerable precedent.

Both Dr. Hunsberger and Mr. Ray indicated that additional faculty input would be welcome, particularly through contacting individual members of the task force.

Dr. Maehl announced that Dr. Sharp had given him the option of designating someone to replace him on the membership of the Task Force. He, therefore, has recently designated Dr. Gail de Stwolinski as his replacement and asked faculty members to contact her also concerning any additional faculty input in this matter.

#### RESTRICTION ON FACULTY WORKING TOWARD ADVANCED DEGREES IN DEPARTMENTS TO WHICH APPOINTED

Background Information: The Deans Council on June 6, 1973, recommended the addition in the Faculty Handbook of a University restriction on University faculty members' working on advanced degrees in the departments to which appointed. The Acting Provost forwarded this recommendation to the Senate Chairman on June 21, 1973. The Senate on September 10, 1973, voted to extend an invitation to Dr. I. Moyer Hunsberger, Provost, Norman campus, to address the Senate on this question. (See pages 9 and 10 of the Senate Journal for September 10, 1973.)

Remarks by Dr. I. Moyer Hunsberger: The major justification for such a restriction is a possible "conflict of interests" on the part of the individual who is both a faculty member and a graduate student in the same department. Calling the limitation a reasonable one, Dr. Hunsberger stated that many universities throughout the country have such a restriction.



Mr. Ray was then offered the opportunity to make additional pertinent comments. He reiterated the possible "conflict of interest" aspect as viewed by the deans, who also felt that such faculty members' colleagues could find themselves in awkward and embarrassing positions. The deans' concern was that the policy be made as clear as possible. Mr. Ray added that the proposed restriction may have some implication for hiring faculty with terminal degrees from this institution.

Dr. Hunsberger feels that the inbreeding aspect is an entirely separate issue.

The point was raised that some minority-group training programs at this University would suffer if departments were not allowed faculty members who were concurrently graduate students in those departments. Dr. Hunsberger suggested that a graduate student can be appointed as a teaching assistant or associate without resorting to faculty titles. He saw two separate, distinct problems--attracting minorities into terminal-degree programs and subsequently employing graduates with terminal degrees from this University.

Professor Beard of the College of Nursing described the unique problem of faculty recruitment in that College at the Health Sciences Center, which is the only institution in the state of Oklahoma offering graduate work in nursing. At times, unfilled positions are offered to their own outstanding graduate students, because of faculty recruitment problems. Dr. Hunsberger again suggested the utilization of graduate assistants and associates. In his opinion, full faculty status should not be given to those without terminal degrees unless they have an equivalency.

Dr. Hunsberger sees no particular need for a University policy on inbreeding. "We need to pursue affirmative action and try to appoint to each opening the most highly qualified candidate that can be found."

Dr. Kraynak commented that a policy against inbreeding exists under the guise of accreditation for degree programs and that accrediting agencies have traditionally been opposed to inbreeding.

Dr. Maehl, Senate Chairman, reminded the Senate that this question was tabled as the September 10, 1973, meeting of the Senate. He then indicated that if desired, a motion to remove the tabled motion would have been in order. No pertinent motion was offered from the floor at that time.

However, Dr. Maehl again called attention to the tabled motion later in the meeting. Professor Beard then moved that the question be removed from the table and referred to an ad hoc committee for further study and recommendation. The Senate approved the referral motion without dissent.

#### DISPOSITION OF "I" GRADES

Background Information: For several months during the 1972-73 academic year, a Senate ad hoc committee studied proposals for revising the "I" grade policy. On March 12, 1973, the Senate approved the recommendations of that Committee (see pages 7 and 8 of the Senate Journal for March 12, 1973).

In acknowledging the receipt of the Faculty Senate recommendations, Dr. Paul F. Sharp, President of the University, on May 8, 1973, requested Senate reconsideration on the basis of objections raised by Deans Council, as well as members of the faculty and staff (see page 2 of the Senate Journal for September 10, 1973). The matter was, in turn, referred to the Senate ad hoc Committee chaired by Dr. James Costello.

On September 4, 1973, Dr. Arthur Gentile, Graduate Dean, addressed the following memorandum to the Senate Chairman concerning "I" grades for graduate students:

I am once again referring to the Senate the change in ruling adopted by the Graduate Council and Graduate Faculty during 1971-72 for "I" grades for graduate students. 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 in reenrollment in the course acceptable as a means of removing the "I" during the two regular resident semesters.

The rationale of Dean Crim's memo of May 14, 1972, to Dr. Hall still applies.

I understand that this request might have been sidetracked during last year's committee discussions for a possible change in the "I" rule as it applies to all students. I would like for the above recommendation to be included (if it cannot be acted upon separately) in the ad hoc committee's current deliberations concerning the disposition of "I" grades.

At the time the above ruling was passed by the Graduate Faculty, the grade of "I" was still being used to denote enrollment, but not completion, in thesis or dissertation research. Beginning this fall semester, the grade of "X" will denote this, so the parenthetical phrase in the opening sentence of the ruling can be deleted.

Senate Action: In the absence of the ad hoc Committee Chairman, Dr. Sherril D. Christian, a member of that Committee, moved approval of the following new recommendation of that group:

Replace paragraph 4.5.5 of the Faculty Handbook and the corresponding paragraph in the section on "Scholastic Regulations and Standards" of the University bulletins with the following:

"I is a neutral mark and means Incomplete. It is not an alternative to a grade of "F," but is intended as a temporary grade to be used when a student, for reasons satisfactory to the instructor, is unable to complete certain requirements of a course and cannot be assigned any other grade. Typical instances might be absence from a final examination due to illness or inability to submit a term project due to extenuating circumstances.

"The instructor will indicate to the student what must be done to complete the course and set a time limit appropriate to the circumstances. However, the time allowed may not exceed one calendar year.

"If by the end of the year, no change in grade has been submitted, the grade of "I" will become permanent on the student's record. After a grade of "I" has become permanent, a student may reenroll in the course. Credit, for courses in which a student has received an "I" at the University of Oklahoma, cannot be transferred from another institution. If the student graduates with a grade of "I" on his record, it also becomes permanent."



In the ensuing brief discussion, several Senators raised the question as to how the student would become aware of the specific time limit and the subsequent satisfactory completion of his work. Student representatives present at this meeting considered this aspect to be a student rather than an administrative responsibility. One Senator questioned the denial of transfer credit for incomplete work at this University.

Mr. Mark Anderson, an OUSA representative, read the following pertinent resolution sponsored by himself and approved recently by the Student Congress:

WHEREAS 75% of the student body polled in the spring of 1973 favored allowing an "I" grade to become permanent if it is not removed within two semesters, and the proposal passed by the Faculty Senate on March 12, 1973, was rejected by Dr. Sharp and the Deans Council on the grounds that it would be difficult to administer, and a new proposal to come before the faculty Senate on October 8 resolves the difficulty while retaining the spirit of the mandate of the students, and both proposals were drafted by a faculty ad hoc committee with no direct student participation,

BE IT THEREFORE RESOLVED THAT the Student Congress urges the Faculty Senate and Dr. Sharp to pass this new proposal.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED THAT any future ad hoc committees of the Faculty Senate directly affecting the academic lives of the students should be composed of a combined faculty-student membership.

In a subsequent voice vote, the Senate approved the ad hoc Committee's proposal without dissent.

Dr. Christian then moved that the new regulation become effective with the grades earned this (fall, 1973) semester. This motion was also approved by the Senate without dissent.

#### PROLONGED PERIODS OF ADVANCE REGISTRATION

Dr. Matthew Kraynak called attention to Mr. Messer's memorandum of September 20, 1973, that lists four different periods during November and December, 1973, and January, 1974, for scheduled faculty advisement of students registering for next semester. He asked whether appropriate faculty input into the Registrar's Office is made concerning such matters as registration and advisement schedules. He also questioned the increasingly prolonged advance registration schedule.

Dr. Laguros reported the recent distribution of a memorandum request from the Registrar to all deans for administrative and faculty reactions to the University registration program.

Dr. Maehl, Senate Chairman, suggested that Drs. Kraynak and Jischke, Chairman of the Senate Committee on Committees, study this matter informally and present any appropriate recommendations.

#### ADJOURNMENT

The Faculty Senate adjourned at 5:20 p.m. The Senate will meet in a special session on October 22, 1973, at 3:30 p.m. in Dale Hall 218. The next regular meeting of the Faculty Senate will be held at 3:30 p.m., on Monday, November 12, 1973, in Dale Hall 218.

Anthony S. Lis  
Secretary



**The  
University of Oklahoma**

Central Mail Service, Box 456 Norman, Oklahoma 73069

Faculty Senate

November 6, 1973

TO: Members, Faculty Senate

FROM: *ash*  
Anthony S. Lis, Professor of Business Communication;  
Secretary, Faculty Senate

SUBJECT: Departmental reactions -- Career Development Plan

On October 22, 1973, the Faculty Senate postponed final action on the proposed Career Development Plan until the regular meeting on November 12, 1973, pending receipt of reactions from department chairmen on both campuses of the University.

For additional background information, please see both the Journal of the Senate for the special meeting on October 22, 1973, and the Agenda for the regular session on November 12, 1973.

Comments received from several departments and individual faculty members are attached for your information and consideration in connection with the November 12 meeting of the Senate.

Enclosure

CC: Dr. Paul Sharp, President  
Dr. I. M. Hunsberger, Provost



Reactions to the proposed Career Development Plan, University of Oklahoma:

- (1) The proposed program would lead to a massive increase in the amount of bureaucratic paper work required of the departments. In addition, it is insufficiently flexible. It might be useful - indeed, perhaps necessary - in large departments where there is little occasion for informal contact between senior and junior faculty, but it would be quite superfluous in a small department such as ours in which there is ample opportunity for interaction among all members. Further, at a time when there is an increasing national trend toward academic democracy, it would place entirely too much power in the hands of senior faculty. I would recommend rejection of the program in its present form.
- 

- (2) Page 32 - "Pre-Service" training periods each year of two to three days for new graduate assistants in departments has proven to be very useful aid in career development.

Pages 20-24 - Little is said about sabbatical leaves for mid-career development. The present policy for approval of a sabbatical leave requires that each department absorb the cost by either not offering the courses taught by the faculty member on leave or by shifting the burden to others. Sometimes neither of these two methods are possible. Under such circumstances funds should be made available for a temporary replacement.

V. H. Hutchison, Zoology

---

- (3) The Chairman of the Department of Naval Science has reviewed the Faculty Career Development Program and has no comment to offer.
- 

- (4) On surface, the document is very good. The problem is implementation. The basic problem is in the changing values of deans. Responsible academic units are at the mercy of tyrannical deans who, in general, do not know what a standard is, and, in turn, tend to float from one position to another. The end result is that junior faculty are exposed to a system where evaluation standards change and in the last analysis they will be judged on such criteria as how long is the hair, deference to the local business and political leaders, and whatever else may be nonacademic.
- 

- (5) I think the report is well developed and carefully planned. I agree with essentially all of the recommendations. My concern is in the area of potential reality for implementation.

Larry Canter, Civil Engineering

---

- (6) This is a superior report, well conceived and presented. However, it is difficult for me to believe that much of it can become operable due to the financial condition of the University. In addition, I am relatively sure the older faculty members will not accept that their

usefulness has reached the points listed by the Committee. Nevertheless, procedures must be found to utilize young doctorates, upgrade curricula, and make room for innovative developments throughout the Institution.

(7) Several of my faculty have called my attention to the provisions of the Faculty Career Development Program which relate to retirement. I have the following comments:

1. I disagree with the tenure provisions stated on page 27. I believe that a tenure-holding member of the faculty should hold his tenure until such time as he retires, whenever that may be.
2. I strongly urge that a sixth provision should be added on page 28 which would read somewhat as follows:

"6. that at the mutual option of the University and of a professor, based upon a recommendation from the particular department involved, a professor older than 70 years of age may continue to teach or engage in research to such an extent as is mutually agreeable, without salary, but with the other perquisites normally attached to faculty membership."

*be omitted*

In this latter situation, I am specifically thinking of such individuals as Maurice H. Merrill, George Lynn Cross Research Professor Emeritus. Dr. Merrill has been associated with the College of Law for a long time as a prominent professor and as Acting Dean, and he still continues to teach an occasional course and to perform research (though without salary). He receives only his retirement supplement. It may be that in the future other individuals will fall into this category and should be permitted to continue on this basis. Age alone does not necessarily mean that an individual is no longer capable of making a contribution in terms of teaching and research. Some people are incapable of making a contribution after age 50. On the other hand some highly productive individuals continue to do so after age 70. Maurice Merrill is one of those, but I know of others also at other institutions.

*beyond the mandatory retirement age*

I strongly recommend that this provision be added.

Robert R. Wright, Dean, College of Law

(8) Responding to your invitation to comment on the Oct. '73 REPORT. . . "A CAREER DEVELOPMENT PROGRAM FOR THE UNIVERSITY OF OKLAHOMA," which I understand is to be before the Faculty Senate today, I tender these observations regarding pp. 25-29.

The caption "Career Development for Older Faculty" might seem to some to violate the honesty-in-labelling laws, if only there were such laws applicable to academic institutions' internal labelling and packaging.

A more honest caption: A Proposal for . . . and for Reducing the Present Tenure-to-70 to a Tenure-to-65.

To better present my view on that, let me cite a non-hypothetical case which has come to my attention:



I had tenure at N. Y. U. when tenure for instructional staff stopped at the end of the academic year in which the teacher had become 65, with a chance to teach on a year-to-year basis (no tenure) for three additional years. Later the tenure age limit was advanced to, as I recall, 70 years of age, not merely 68.

When I was invited to join this faculty, one of the O. U. regulations of which I was apprised was that granting tenure to age 70. It was a highly important factor, since I was already 56 and had no interest in making a change which would at one blow knock off over 1/3 of the remainder of my budding career.

My comments on the above are:

- a. In my hurried reading of pages 25-29 I failed to notice any reference to whether this proposed lowering of the compulsory retirement age would or would not be inapplicable to persons already having tenure.

-I do not comment on whether it would be lawful for the University to break its previous undertaking by destroying tenure pro tanto to men who had understandably relied on the University's honor. That is a moot point while this report by the committee is merely a report, although litigation would almost inevitably test it if it ever were implemented, the fori including the courts, professional bodies concerned with this or that specific professional school, and possibly such groups as A. A. U. P. and the Legislature.

-Nor do I comment on the immorality and ethical poverty of breaking faith with faculty greybeards who had turned down earlier opportunities to move (or remain) elsewhere, relying on the security of a tenure either already gained or held out as obtainable and substantial.

- b. I wonder why N. Y. U., as the largest private university in the Nation, found it desirable to increase its tenure period from age 65 to age 70? This involved no question of breaking faith, but it does invite speculation that N. Y. U. found it was losing valuable faculty members in their fifties or early sixties who had become concerned at the specter of Compulsory Retirement at 65. I recall one distinguished N. Y. U. professor whom I knew personally, who suddenly left N. Y. U. to return to an upper midwestern university which he had previously left in order to successively better himself by moving first to another university and then to N. Y. U. Within two years of his departure, N. Y. U. had extended tenure to 70, but he did not come back.

On page 25, the second paragraph concludes: "Considering a number of attributes necessary for effective teaching--such as general health and physical energy, mental alertness, intellectual curiosity, interest in students, and personal ambition and drive--it seems obvious that the incidence of failure to meet adequately these criteria is higher among those who are older."

I'm afraid I find the above statement neither "obvious" nor persuasive; in fact, except that it must have been drawn up by scholars, I would hesitate to call it scholarly.

Obviously some teachers grow old before their time, and have lost their mental keenness, verve, zest, at 65, or at 60. . . . or at 55. Optional retirement before reaching 65 therefore has much to commend it, but the very creation of that option reduces the need to truncate careers at 65 in order to retire who--let's face it--had lost their keenness even earlier.

Beware that "physical energy" phrase. The University need not be concerned that professors in their sixties are not interested in playing tackle football, sky-diving, scuba-diving, rodeo riding. It might more profitably try to educate some professors in their forties to retire gracefully from some of the more hectic sports in order to increase their own prospects for reaching the fifties. A professor of whatever age who decides he does not need to spend his Christmas break on the ski-slopes suffering a leg injury quite aptly called just that--"a Christmas break"--, may get a lot more reading, studying and thinking done than his ski-slope colleague, particularly more than those skiing colleagues who, by not breaking a leg, do not acquire a period of reduced physical activity while mending.

Never having been 65 I cannot speak with assurance concerning those oldsters' "interest in students", "intellectual curiosity", and "personal ambition" but I venture the suggestion that some oldsters may have greater interest in students as they become less pressed by their own self-interest; that an older man may have given up "political ambitions" or a desire to move up to some higher paying institution does not necessarily mean his "ambition" is dead.

Insofar as the report states (p. 25) "Normally, financial pressures are less acute for the older teachers . . . . because their families are grown and their homes paid for", I know the financial status of only one professor . . . . myself. My mortgage-covered cottage is scheduled to become fully mine when the last monthly mortgage payment is made in 1996. My 9 year-old and 11 year-old children have indicated no willingness to accelerate their maturity merely to permit me to accelerate my retirement.

I do not comment on the "Sixty and Over Inter-Collegiate National Loan Plan" although it has some negative aspects which may have escaped those scholars still in their early or middle years of Career Development. I confine my own comments to the proposed acceleration of mandatory retirement.

Elmer M. Million, Professor of Law

- 
- (9) My comments on the October 1973 Report by the Faculty Senate Committee on Career Development, A Career Development Program For The University of Oklahoma, go primarily to that portion of the report entitled, "Career Development for Older Faculty."

The report divides the faculty into three groups, viz., the Young Faculty, Mid-career Faculty, and Older Faculty. Mid-career Faculty are designated as those between 35 and 50 years of age (page 12).

Thus, those over 50 years of age fall into the category of Older Faculty. In that portion of the report entitled, "Career Development of Older Faculty", the first page (page 25) contains such statements as:

"Considering a number of attributes necessary for effective teaching--such as general health and physical energy, mental alertness, intellectual curiosity, interest in students, and personal ambition and drive--it seems obvious that the incident of failure to meet adequately these criteria is higher among those who are older.

"Still another pertinent factor may tend to exert an adverse influence on the quality of teaching of some faculty members of the preretirement age group. Normally, financial pressures are less acute for older teachers . . . . because their families are grown and their homes paid for."

The remaining four (4) pages are devoted to ways of accelerating the retirement of the Older Faculty or of loaning them to other institutions. Particularly to be noted is the proposal to decrease the age when an instructor will go off tenure from the present age of 70 to 65 years of age.

The whole attitude expressed is that those 50 years of age or over have lost their effectiveness and value to the institution and ways should be found to "put them out to pasture" as soon as possible. This I find to be unfounded and offensive both in the premise upon which it is based and in its conclusion.

Directing my comments now to the proposal to lower the age when an instructor goes off tenure, I have this to say. My departure from the University of Tulsa (at less than 50 years of age) was prompted in a material way by the fact that the University of Tulsa limited tenure to age 65 while the University of Oklahoma does not. My youngest child is scheduled to receive her first college degree when I am 64 years old. The option to teach until age 70, thus, is of utmost importance to me either to permit me to finance advanced college work for her or to provide a financial cushion for retirement, or both. I believe lowering the tenure age to 65 would result in driving younger and mobile faculty members away from the University of Oklahoma just as I left the University of Tulsa, and thus would be unwise. Further, unless such change carried with it a "grandfather clause" excluding those presently on tenure from its coverage, it would appear to constitute a breach of at least a moral obligation. Hopefully, the need to test in the courts whether it would also constitute a breach of legally enforceable obligation will not be necessary.

John TeSelle, Professor of Law

- 
- (10) Our Faculty in Architecture wishes to express its gratitude to the Senate Committee on Career Development for its thoughtful, comprehensive report on a subject long overdue for study and action.

We do have serious objections to the Report, not for what it says or even for what we feel the committee intended to say, but rather for the way certain key words of the Report (as we know from experience) are likely to be interpreted by others in decision-making or evaluative roles.



I refer specifically to the criteria words of "teaching", "research" and "service". Such words, as often understood by university administrators, can have deadly consequences for professional programs such as Architecture which must satisfy the requirements of severe professional accreditation reviews and the specifications of various state laws, as well as satisfying the standards of the academic world.

Specifically, I urge that phrases be added to the report to make it absolutely clear that, when an evaluative word such as "research" is used, it is intended to mean "creative endeavor appropriate to the field or discipline" and is not limited to narrow academic methodology leading to "scholarly" publication.

Similarly, when the word "service" is used, the Report should clearly establish its intent as including the professional community and, in some circumstances, the public constituency of the University itself, not just the internal community of our institution.

Murlin R. Hodgell, Director  
School of Architecture

---

- (11) It seems that all can subscribe to the principle of a Career Development Program. However, where one reaches the specifics of such a program, considerable differences of opinion arise. There is much concern about sending the report of the Senate Committee to the Regents when there has been so little opportunity for faculty discussion and study. In particular, there is apprehension that the Regents might interpret some of the recommendations as being the consensus of the faculty when such is not the case.

Specifically, there is a feeling on the part of several that the cost of some of the recommendations would outweigh the benefits. Among those in that category are: (1) establishment of a Faculty Resource Center; (2) appointment of a Career Development officer; (3) creation of University Professorships. With the limited financial support enjoyed by The University of Oklahoma, many persons feel that implementation of these three suggestions would not represent the wisest use of available funds.

Another recommendation viewed with apprehension is the one which would lower the mandatory retirement age. One of our younger staff members suggests that it should be raised, not lowered. There is a general feeling that, if such a recommendation is to be made at all, some type of "grandfather clause" should be included.

Objections were raised to paragraph B.3 of Section 5. In my opinion it would be unwise to hem ourselves in with a set of inflexible regulations which leave no room for consideration of individual cases (or make such consideration inordinately difficult).

In paragraph B.4 of this same section one finds the statement "It may become necessary that a graduate student who accepts a teaching assistantship must commit himself to two consecutive years of residency." Is there to be a corresponding commitment on the part of the Department to support the student for two years?

Paragraph B.5 contains the statement that graduate assistants "be given an opportunity to experience the teaching of a more advanced level of courses." This raises the question: Who is going to teach the elementary courses?

Opposition was expressed to the proposal of reduced teaching load for young faculty. It was stated that young faculty are less burdened with committee work, direction of theses and dissertations, etc., than any other group and, hence, have more time to devote to their personal research, making a reduction in load unnecessary.

The idea of exchanging older faculty was regarded as impractical. A better suggestion would appear to be for an exchange of those in their middle years.

It was noted that while this was a career development program for The University of Oklahoma no recommendations were made for employees other than faculty.

Support was voiced for the idea of a review of the performance of administrators. However, such review should include all administrators, not just those in the academic chain of command.

While recognizing the current fashionableness of interdisciplinary programs, it was suggested that such programs should develop in a natural way without pressure from either the Board of Regents or the local administration.

One senior member of our staff expressed the belief that the report involves various fallacies. Two noted are:

1. The implicit assumption that it is possible by more and smarter administrative procedures to significantly improve the output of the faculty in teaching, research and service.
2. That it is the responsibility of the University through some such procedure to be heavily involved in the attempt to optimize each faculty member's progress up the ladder.

It is recognized that no report such as this can gain the unanimous support of the faculty. However, if the views of our staff members are representative, the Faculty Senate would be unwise to send this report to the Regents as representing recommendations of the University Faculty.

Gene Levy, Professor of Mathematics,  
and Chairman, Mathematics Department



teaching new courses.

C. Continuing Assistance of Committee A. In the pre-tenure years major concern should be given to assisting the faltering beginner. The principal responsibility for this assistance resides with Committee A and the chairman. However, a basic premise is that all teaching and research performance can be improved. Thus, it is recommended that Committee A meet in conference with each young faculty member at least once each pre-tenure year to review their research, service and teaching performance.

It is assumed that the department has engaged in effective evaluation of the individual and that Committee A is acquainted with these findings (evaluation is discussed in Section VII of this document). For the pre-tenure years, primary emphasis should be on teaching performance and research. This is not to say service should be neglected, but it should not be over-emphasized.

With regard to teaching, the department may attempt to provide differing patterns of development for different talents. Team teaching, utilization of a Teaching Resources Center (discussed in Section VII), advice, assistance and support services may improve teaching performance. New staff should be made aware of the level of instruction and the content of the courses they are expected to teach. Good performance should be praised and encouraged; deficiencies should be pointed out in private conferences with the faculty member.

Teachers cannot remain stimulating unless they continue to learn. The research of the young faculty member, that is, his efforts as a

administrative structure of the University. Insurance plans, retirement plans, etc. should be explained. In essence it should be made explicit how the University in its many interfaces and expectations touches the individual in his day-to-day existence.

Second, early in the first semester of the member's appointment, Committee A should clarify for the new faculty member in full, frank and open discussion the following:

1. The department's commitment to quality classroom performance.
2. The role and importance of research and scholarly production.
3. The past and present reward system in the department and college. Retention, tenure and promotion practices should be carefully explained.
4. The recent history, the customs, the current policies together with the administrative structure and committee system of the department.
5. The availability of departmental and University sources for aid in research and teaching. This should include a discussion of the support facilities which are available-- secretarial assistance, teaching aids, research administration, etc.

Above all the discussion should be fact--not theory; i.e., how life really works.

The department should be sensitive to the fact that a new staff member will be attempting to develop a research program together with

### III. Mid-career Faculty Development

"Mid-career" in a faculty member's professional life is more an attitude or state of mind than it is a definite age or term of service. It involves the faculty member who has been engaged in academic pursuits long enough to have established himself. He has worked through the entry problems to the profession which confront the young faculty member. He has developed his own style of teaching and probably his own emphases and commitments to research and service. In fact, a recent study of faculty in one state system suggests this is the group most concerned with research and scholarship, possibly somewhat to the neglect of undergraduate teaching. (Ruth E. Eckert study as quoted by Eble (1972), p. 119.) The stage or time at which a faculty member evolves these characteristics will vary enormously with the individual.

Many faculty members will experience no sense of transition from the early to mid-career phases of their professional development. Rather they will continue in the work patterns they have developed, possibly developing and changing patterns as time passes and as new demands or interests arise. For others, however, it is a period of re-examination and assessment of accomplishments which may be accompanied by unease ranging all the way from mild dissatisfaction to emotional crisis. For some, it may be a period of disappointment or even depression as they measure their achievements against the optimism of their early careers and recognize the probable limitations to their accomplishments during the rest of their professional lives.



On the other hand, some may experience it as a period of restlessness and renewed creativity once they are initiated into academic life and have established their professional credibility. They seek new challenges, change in their routine of activities and a redefinition of goals. Some even report mid-career "as a time of winning their freedom" from early pressures which gives them opportunity to move on to new and more varied pursuits. (Eble, (1971), p. 58.)

Mid-career in faculty life is also an historical, as well as a developmental or cyclical phenomenon. Any mid-career group will reflect the characteristics of its point in time. The Eckert study of Minnesota faculty shows not only variations in size between the young, middle and older groups of faculty, but also considerable difference in their personal and family background, age of decision to enter academic life, professional expectations and goals, and other factors. (Eble (1971) p. 56.) Clearly faculty members who entered college teaching in the 1950s differ in their outlooks and experiences from those who entered in the 1930s or the 1960s and all of these are likely to have differences from those entering in the apparently austere period of the 1970s. Any program of career development must take account of these variations and adjust to the differing characteristics. Significantly, however, the current mid-career group are presently the largest group of the three. With the prospect of smaller intake of new faculty in the future, the current mid-career group are likely to remain the preponderant element in faculties for some time to come and therefore, they constitute one of the most important targets for a program of career development.

they reached the age of 65.

4. that, in any event, beginning with appointments made after January, 1974, the University lower the mandatory retirement age for all faculty members (with exception noted in the succeeding paragraph) to the age of 67 and of all administrative personnel to 65.
5. that, upon the recommendation of a Department and with the explicit approval of the University of Oklahoma Regents, a faculty member who is capable of offering an exceptional contribution to the University and to a Department may be invited to continue his service to the University to such an extent as is mutually agreeable beyond the mandatory retirement age.

Other motivating measures should be considered for older faculty members to keep their interest in University affairs alive. Changes, or modifications in their purview of responsibilities need to be instituted where possible. Older faculty need new challenges, a new sense of being needed, new opportunities to contribute, a renewed feeling of belonging and new purpose. In a society which emphasizes youth, where the accepted thesis is to cast the old aside, it is little wonder that some of our most talented older professors become disillusioned. Every avenue of approach should be explored to find ways to keep this from happening.

The Sixty and Over Inter Collegiate National Loan Plan. Since every university has faculty members in this age group, it might add spice and enthusiasm for certain individuals to have the opportunity to teach at another university at least one year out of the last five before retirement.

A cooperative plan among universities in the Big Eight or even on

benefits in appropriate ratio to the degree of retirement would be initiated by the University.\* Under this plan, retirement would be mandatory at the age of 65.

2. that a policy of full retirement be instituted by the University permitting a faculty member to retire voluntarily at age 62 with the full retirement and fringe benefits for which he would have been eligible had he taught to the age of 65. This option would be available only to faculty members with at least fifteen years of service to the University.\*\*
3. that beginning with appointments made after January 1, 1974, tenure be granted by the University only to the age of 65 for all faculty members leaving an option with any given Department to employ a professor on a yearly basis beyond that age for an additional two years. Those professors not invited by the Department to continue teaching beyond the tenure holding years would be retired the year in which

---

\*Retirement benefits would necessarily have to be distributed over a four year period so that full retirement benefits would not be reached until the age of 65. The balance of the retirement benefits not paid during the three year period would be added to the professor's retirement entitlement after reaching 65.

\*\*It is anticipated that the cost to the University under this plan would, in part, be offset by the difference in the salary levels between the professor retiring and the younger faculty member who replaces him.