

JOURNAL OF THE FACULTY SENATE
The University of Oklahoma
Norman

Special Session . . . October 22, 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>	Braver, Gerald	Hilbert, Richard	Olson, Ralph E.
	Calvert, Floyd	Huneke, Harold V.	Pollak, Betty
	Christian, Sherril D.	Jischke, Martin C.	Prickett, Wilson B.
	Donnell, Ruth	Kraynak, Matthew	Reid, W. T.
	Duchon, Claude	Lehrman, G. Philip	Staples, Albert F.
	Feaver, J. Clayton	Letchworth, George	Starling, K. E.
	Fife, James	Maehl, Wm. H., Jr.	Whitecotton, Joseph
	Ford, Robert A.	McDonald, Bernard R.	Whitney, David A.
	Graves, Wm. H.	Milby, T. H.	Wilson, Wm. H.
	OUSA representatives:	Anderson, Mark	McDermott, Joe Ellen
		Malcomb, C. A.	Tabor, Tim
<u>Absent.</u>	Anderson, Paul S.	Eek, Nat	Owens, Mitchell
	Beaird, Lolly	Estes, James E.	Patnode, Robert E.
	Bogart, George A.	Felts, Wm. J.	Rubio, Tomas
	Brown, Homer	Haden, Clovis R.	Shahan, Robert
	Chandler, Albert	Laguros, Joachim	Stuart, Chipman
	Coussons, Timothy	Larson, Raymond D.	Sutherland, Patrick
	de Stwolinski, Gail	Miller, Fred R.	Swank, David
	OUSA representative:	Perry, John	

Dr. Maehl reported the excused absences of both representatives of the Law College and eight representatives of the Health Sciences Center. The Senate authorized Professor William McNichols of the Law College to act as spokesman for that group at this meeting. Due to a conflicting, important faculty meeting at the Health Sciences Center, Dr. Staples was designated by his group as spokesman for the HSC Senators absent at this Senate meeting.

, PROPOSED FACULTY CAREER DEVELOPMENT PROGRAM

Dr. Maehl first called attention to the 70-page report of the Faculty Senate Committee on Career Development that had been distributed during the previous week to all Senate members, as well as all other members of the University faculty on both campuses. He reviewed briefly the history of this proposal initiated by the University of Oklahoma Board of Regents (see page 7 of the Senate Journal for December 18, 1972, and page 4 of the Senate Journal for January 16, 1973). The Regents expressed their desire for a faculty proposal for a career development program to accompany and complement their recent approval of the faculty tenure and academic freedom policy, the program for student evaluation of teachers, and the faculty-initiated statement concerning faculty responsibilities. Dr. Maehl then introduced Dr. Sherril D. Christian, Chairman of the Senate Committee on Career Development.

Dr. Christian expressed his gratitude to the other members of that Committee (Drs. Gail de Stwolinski, Martin C. Jischke, John W. Keys, William H. Maehl, Bernard R. McDonald, and Dorothy Truex) and to the many other individuals who had contributed a great deal to the work and the final report of that Committee.

He outlined the activities of the Committee, as well as the rationale and the content of its report. One of the goals in writing the report was to make each section read as a self-contained unit. He highlighted the following Committee recommendations:

- (a) appointment of a University Career Development Officer
- (b) establishment of the system of University Professors
- (c) establishment of a faculty learning and teaching resource center

On behalf of the Committee, Dr. Christian then moved acceptance of the report.

Copies of the following pertinent memorandum from Professor Lolly Beard, College of Nursing representative, were distributed at this meeting:

October 19, 1973

The Senators on the Health Sciences Campus received a copy of the Report on October 18 and have reviewed it. Those who were available (Profs. Owens, Felts, Chandler, and Beard) met on October 19 and discussed the Report. In general the group recognizes that the report is an exceptional report in content, organization, and recommendations. The Faculty Senate Committee on Career Development is to be highly commended for preparing the Report.

Several of the group mentioned having difficulty interpreting the recommendations in the report to specific units at the Health Sciences Center due to the differences in organizational structures between the pre-clinical departments and the clinical departments. There was expressed concern as to the feasibility of implementing recommendations in situations where there was not in existence Committee A, but rather power centralized in the department chairman. It was observed that Committee A structures are being developed in several areas where they presently do not exist, therefore, this may not be a problem. At the same time, the group agreed that some specific and clear direction must be given to those responsible for the implementation within their departments in order for the recommendations to be effectively and properly effected.

The proposal for early retirement was questioned and discussed; however, no specific recommendations were offered. It was noted that age did not correlate with ability to teach; and, therefore, some persons would be retired long before loss of teaching effectiveness and others might be retained past the time when they should be retired. Some detrimental effects of forced early retirement were identified. The variations in utilization of faculty near retirement in the report appear to be sound and in fact creative.

The concept of University Professors was discussed. One Senator mentioned that a similar system had been established at another university which ended up being used to move unproductive faculty out of their previous setting and yet keep them on in some capacity. If this concept is to be implemented, the program should be clearly defined to prevent misuse of such a program as it would appear to have distinct values to the University as outlined in the Report.

The section on Graduate Assistants might need some modification to be appropriate to all departments. Some laboratory courses at the Health Sciences Center depend very heavily upon graduate assistants, while in other departments their use is prohibited by one means or another.

There was emphasis in the report on the selection of faculty, and the group felt that the effort should be extended to establish and abide by criteria for selection of a chairman and that a means for evaluation be established (such an Ad Hoc Committee now appointed is exploring).

In the section on the evaluation of faculty performance (page 46), there might be included a provision for common goal setting for faculty and supervisory persons. This was mentioned elsewhere in the report, but the group felt it should be identified in relation to faculty evaluation.

At the conclusion of our meeting, it was the feeling of the group that the Report was most acceptable and offers great potential to developing a sound and beneficial career development program for the University.

Action. It is our suggestion that the Senate consider postponing action on the report.

The reasons for this suggestion are that the group felt that faculty individually and by departments should have time to review it in terms of the various structures and possibilities that exist to determine the feasibility of the implementation of the recommendations. This time would permit Senators to collect and compile information from faculty so that the final plan would in fact be applicable to all departments with some degree of uniformity and effect.

The group felt that the Report would be more likely to be implemented if the faculty had an opportunity to be familiar with it before it was passed down for implementation.

Again, we commend the Committee on Career Development. Thank you.

During the ensuing discussion, many faculty members offered favorable comments concerning the report. Other comments concerning the report included the following topics:

- (1) Trend toward 'tightening up' on the campus, with an emphasis on departmental rather than individual goals.
- (2) Possible arbitrary use of program by senior faculty in passing on tenure cases of younger faculty.
- (3) Role of deans in goal formulation.
- (4) Implied de-emphasis on service as one of the promotion criteria.
- (5) Role of recruitment in the career development program.
- (6) Need to formalize some of tasks mentioned in the report.
- (7) Implementation of program of early retirements.
- (8) Emphasis on "quality of teaching" as one criterion of teaching effectiveness.

Drs. Christian and Maehl repeatedly stressed the point that this proposal is intended to offer recommendations for further study and possible policy decisions rather than offer specific, detailed solutions for particular problems.

Dr. Feaver moved that final consideration of this question be postponed until the regular Senate meeting on November 12, 1973, and that in the meantime department chairmen on both campuses be solicited in writing for their views, reactions, criticisms, and comments and that these comments be distributed to Senate members in advance of the meeting. The Senate approved this motion without dissent.

ADJOURNMENT

The Faculty Senate adjourned at 4:40 p.m. The next regular session of the Senate will be held at 3:30 p.m., on Monday, November 12, 1973, in Dale Hall 218.

Anthony S. Lis
Secretary