

JOURNAL OF THE FACULTY SENATE
The University of Oklahoma
Norman

Regular Session -- March 11, 1974 -- Dale Hall, 218

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

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

ANNOUNCEMENT: Spring Meeting of the General Faculty
of the University of Oklahoma

The General Faculty of the University will hold its spring semester, 1974, session at 3:30 p.m., in Adams Hall 150, on Thursday, April 18, 1974.

ACTIONS TAKEN BY PRESIDENT PAUL F. SHARP

Faculty Appointments: On February 19, 1974, Dr. Paul F. Sharp, President of the University, announced the following faculty appointments:

Athletics Council (to complete the unexpired 1973-76 term of William Nugent):
Dick Van der Helm (Chemistry)

Computer Advisory Committee (new faculty positions):
Gail Adams (HSC, Radiology), 1972-75
Leon Reiter (Geology and Geophysics), 1973-76

(See page 3 of the Faculty Senate Journal for February 11, 1974.)

Changes in Specific University Committees: On February 28, 1974, Dr. Paul F. Sharp, President of the University, approved the recommendations of the Faculty Senate for the dissolution of three University Committees, the redesignation of five scholarship committees, and the change in the title of the Council on University Libraries. (See pages 3 and 4 of the Faculty Senate Journal for February 11, 1974.)

Task Force on Women in the University: In approving the Senate recommendation (see preceding item) to dissolve the ad hoc Committee on Women's Inequalities, Dr. Paul F. Sharp, President of the University, addressed the following memorandum to the Senate Chairman on February 26, 1974:

"I have approved the action the Faculty Senate took at its meeting on February 11, 1974, to dissolve the ad hoc Committee on Women's Inequalities. I think that this action by the Senate is appropriate. First, discontinuance of the Committee was recommended by the Chairperson of the Committee. Second, the Committee had somehow come to be listed as a standing committee of the University, and this needed correction.

"Although some significant steps have been taken regarding women in the University and although some of the employment questions concerning women are being addressed by the Equal Employment Opportunity Committee on the Norman campus and the Affirmative Action Committee at the Health Sciences Center, there remains a need over the short term for a comprehensive study of women in the University centering on University personnel policies, University activities, and curriculum as they affect women. Consequently, I am establishing a Task Force on Women in the University, with the charge that it study and report back to me with such recommendations as it considers appropriate concerning the items listed above by December 31, 1974. Depending upon their nature, any recommendations that may come from this study may well require review by other standing bodies of the University. To the extent that they do this, they will be referred to those bodies before action is taken regarding them.

"The Task Force will include representatives from both the Norman campus and the Health Sciences Center and shall consider both campuses in its deliberations, making clear which campus or campuses are covered by each specific recommendation. I am considering appointing five faculty members, three staff members, and three students with at least one person in each category being from the Health Sciences Center. I would like to appoint the Task Force as soon as possible, and I ask for nominations for the faculty positions from the Senate. I would appreciate receiving two names for each position including the names of at least two Health Sciences Center faculty members."

ACTION TAKEN BY THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE, FACULTY SENATE

On February 28, 1974, the Faculty Senate Executive Committee discussed at some length the question of absences at Senate meetings. The following ad hoc Committee was then selected to study this matter and submit appropriate recommendations:

Nat S. Eek (Drama), Chairman
 Wilson B. Prickett (Finance)
 W. T. Reid (Mathematics)

FACULTY NOMINATIONS: Task Force on Women in the University

Background Information: As detailed earlier in this Journal, President Paul F. Sharp requested Senate nominations for the five faculty vacancies on the proposed Task Force on Women in the University. The Senate Executive Committee directed its Committee on Committees to present a slate of ten faculty nominees at this meeting.

Senate Action: Dr. Martin C. Jischke, Chairman of the Senate Committee on Committees, presented the following faculty nominations for Senate approval and submission to the President of the University:

Carol Bryce Carey (Music)
 Bill Carmack (Speech)
 Gwenn Davis (English)
 Ann Ellington (Home Economics)
 Michael Langenback (Education)
 Leon Leonard (AMNE)
 Jerry Muskrat (Law & Ethnic Studies)

Delete

Vicki Schoolcraft (Nursing, H.S.C.)
Katherine Sohler (Biostatistics, H.S.C.)
Irma Tomberlin (Library Science)

Additional nominations were not forthcoming from the floor. The Senate approved the above nominations of the Committee on Committees.

PROPOSED CHANGE IN SENATE BY-LAWS: President's Suggestions
for Faculty Nominations

Dr. Martin C. Jischke, Chairman of the Senate Committee on Committees, moved approval of the proposal of that Committee to amend the By-Laws of the Faculty Senate by deleting the following sentence concerning the Senate Committee on Committees in both the third paragraph of Section E (1) of the By-Laws and Section 11.1.5 of the Faculty Handbook:

"Before presenting the final nominations to the Senate, the Committee shall consider personnel suggested by the President of the University."

In accordance with the Senate By-Laws, this proposal must await final action by the Senate at its next regular session on April 8, 1974.

ANNOUNCEMENT: SOLICITATION OF FACULTY NOMINATIONS

In addition to the usual solicitation of department chairmen for suggestions for faculty nominations to University Councils and Committees, the Committee on Committees will also accept suggestions from individual faculty members who would like to have either themselves or other faculty members considered for nomination by the Senate. All such suggestions should be forwarded to Professor Martin Jischke, AMNE, Felgar Hall, before April 1, 1974.

PROPOSED COPYRIGHT POLICY ✓

Background Information: On October 5, 1973, Dr. C. R. Haden requested Senate consideration of a copyright policy that would cover faculty in the humanities and other literature-oriented disciplines. An ad hoc Committee consisting of Professors Elmer Million, Jack Bickham, Russell Buhite, Al Clark, and Michael Hennagin was appointed to study this matter and submit appropriate recommendations to the Senate. (See page 2 of the Senate Journal of November 12, 1973.)

Senate Action: Professor Million, ad hoc Committee Chairman, submitted to the Senate the following Committee report on January 23, 1974:

The ad hoc committee (consisting of Professors Elmer M. Million (Law), chairman; Jack Bickham (Journalism); Russell Buhite (History); Al Clark (CEMS); and Michael Hennagin (Music) has held three meetings:

1. Before the first meeting, members of the committee agreed to sample the opinions of some of their colleagues as to the need, or not, of a copyright policy. At the first meeting (all present except Prof. Hennagin, who 'phoned in a report to be read at the meeting), each member reported on what views he had come across, with reasons given, plus his own tentative views. It was agreed that the committee should seek to learn what other universities have done, or are contemplating doing, and the reasons given therefor.
2. At the second meeting (all present but Prof. Bickham, who had a previous medical appointment), reports were submitted as to the copyright policy (or lack of same) of a substantial number of universities, including the University of Michigan and New York University.
3. After the second meeting, the committee received the booklet, "Copyrights at Colleges and Universities; Guidelines for the Development of Policies and Procedures By Committee on Governmental Relations." NACUBO, 1972. 13 pp.

At its third meeting the ad hoc Committee adopted this Resolution which is respectfully submitted to you as its report:

It is the consensus of the ad hoc committee members that, in general, whatever royalties a member of the O. U. faculty, administration or staff may garner from the publication of his works should belong to him and no claim be made by O. U. to all or any part of it, except in special cases where either (1) the work is produced pursuant to a contract between the author and O. U. or one of its constituent units which expressly provides that the University is to have, or share, in the rights in and income from the copyrightable works which are or may be created under such contract, or (2) where such works are produced under a specific contract or grant having as its purpose, or one of its major purposes, the creation of such works and their publication.

Obviously, where the University hires someone to prepare a promotional booklet about the University, to be used and distributed by the University, this is a work "done for hire" and all property rights in the work, including the right or refusal to copyright it, reside in the University.

For O. U. to adopt a policy of claiming participation in royalties received by faculty, administrators, or staff members who happen to author works during their University connection, would seriously, if not catastrophically, reduce and discourage the impulse on the part of individuals connected with O. U. to undertake any publication activity except for contributions to non-royalty publications. This result would be a great disservice to the University.

O. U. has no moral claim to the royalties, whenever received, of works created by a member of the O. U. faculty, administration or staff, prior to his becoming affiliated with O. U. or after the severance of that affiliation.

Nor does O. U. have any basis for claiming participation in royalties arising from works created by a member of the O. U. faculty, administration or staff during the time of the O. U. affiliation, if such work is unrelated to his O. U. duties and is done on his own time and not on University premises.

If, during his University affiliation, such member creates works in his own time even though all or a great part of his work thereon occurs while he is in his assigned office room at O. U., and includes such incidental use of O. U. property as his room, an O. U. typewriter and paper, and even the use of an O. U. typist and the use of library or other facilities available generally to the faculty and staff, the committee feels that O. U. should make no claim to any share of the rights in such work.

Professor Elmer Million, Chairman of the ad hoc Committee, appeared before the Senate to present the Committee report and answer any questions from the floor. After moving adoption of the report, he commented briefly on the relationship between patents and copyrights and emphasized that the Committee report presents some guidelines rather than a specific copyright policy. With one dissenting vote, the Senate approved the Committee's report. Later, Professor Swank moved that the ad hoc Committee be retained to develop a specific University copyright policy. After some discussion of this question, Professor Eek moved the following substitute motion: "That the following excerpt from the Committee's Resolution be accepted as the University policy on copyrights: 'Whatever royalties a member of the Oklahoma University may garner from publication of his works should belong to him and no claim be made by Oklahoma University to any part of it, except in special cases where either (1) the work is produced pursuant to a contract between the author and O. U. . . . or (2) where such works are produced under a specific contract or grant having as its purpose, or one of its major purposes, the creation of such works and their publication.'"

The substitute motion failed to carry in a voice vote. In the subsequent discussion concerning the original motion, suggestions were offered from the floor that the ad hoc Committee membership include the University counsel and that the Committee in its deliberations examine carefully the recently approved University Patent Policy. Without dissent, the Senate approved the motion to continue the Committee for the task of developing an explicit policy regarding copyrights.

FALL SEMESTER REPORT: University Budget Council

On March 7, 1974, Dr. Robert Shahan, Chairman of the University Budget Council, submitted the following report to the Faculty Senate on the fall semester, 1973-74, activities of the University Budget Council:

 In addition to the routine activities of the Council, the following matters occupied a considerable portion of our time during the fall semester:

1. In November the report of the Procedures Committee (chaired by Dr. Hilbert) was approved and the procedures adopted and forwarded to the President of the University and the Chairman of the Faculty Senate. We have modified slightly the procedures for electing the Council chairman and defined the Council year as beginning with the first day of the fall semester. These actions fulfill one obligation stated in our charge.
2. Several significant issues required interviews with appropriate administrators:
 - A. Mr. Ed Shaw, Director of the University Press, and Dr. Art Gentile, Vice President for Research Administration, met with the Council to discuss Press operations, needs and prospects. It is widely contended that the University supplement to the Press is inadequate.
 - B. Dr. James Zink, Director of University Libraries, and Dr. Henry Tobias, Chairman of the Committee on University Libraries, met with the Council to discuss Library funding. The North Central Association accreditation team instructed the University to give immediate attention to Library acquisitions.
 - C. A good deal of time was spent on the various payment options for the IBM 370/158. We were quite properly not involved in the determination of performance and size requirements, appropriate hardware configurations, etc. We did review questions related to how to finance the CPU selected. Once we agreed with the Administration that it was wiser to purchase a CPU than to lease one, our principal objective was to avoid increasing the monthly cost of the computer facility (or, in other terms, to secure as large a down payment as possible). In all cases we necessarily relied upon the data from staff studies provided/transmitted by Mr. Raymond Geitka, Director of the Computing Center, and Dr. Robert Shapiro, Associate Vice President of Administration and Finance.
 - D. Dr. Thurman White, Vice President for Continuing Education and Public Service, Dr. Jesse Burkett, Assistant Vice President for Continuing Education and Public Service, and Mr. William Dunsworth, Director of Financial Services at OCCE, reported to the Council on the Continuing Education, Public Service and Professional Development activities of the University. We discussed at length the E & G support level of these activities.
 - E. Mr. Boyd Gunning, Director of the University of Oklahoma Foundation and University Trust Officer, reported on the Foundation's resources and various legal restraints under which it operates.
3. The Council tries to keep up with and spends a good deal of time discussing bills and resolutions before the Legislature. Examples are the much-maligned SB 115,

SB 421 (dealing with ownership of computers), HJR 623 (cost of living increases for University employees), etc.

4. The Council reviewed the summer budget after it was forwarded to us by Dr. Russell Mathis, Director of Summer Sessions.

The Budget Council is presently interviewing the academic deans (two each week) and reviewing the budget requests submitted to the President by the various Vice Presidents. The Deans' requests were presented to the Provost on February 20th. The Provost has not offered these documents to the Council for review. To date no budget calendar has been announced. Many deans are already consulting with departments on budget priorities in anticipation of a very tight schedule once allocations are made.

Many faculty are convinced that highly significant changes have been announced by various administrators both in respect of the budget process and of the criteria and weights for determining merit (i.e., reward). If that is true, the Budget Council was neither consulted in advance nor informed after the fact. If there are policy changes our charge would seem to require faculty involvement in such changes and/or "interpretations." I should like to remind the faculty that an announcement which includes the phrase "after consultation with Councils Y and Z, we have decided . . ." should not be interpreted to mean that the advice of the Councils was followed.

The Council is very concerned about the program-budget formula adopted by the State Regents. If this process is indeed merely to improve the "asking figure" when the Chancellor approaches the Legislature we shall be very relieved. There is some reason to believe that the data will be viewed by many Legislators as a cost-effectiveness analysis. That would be a disaster for the University unless cost effectiveness is defined to include program effectiveness; there is not much chance of that.

Here is some data to provide a context within which you may read the newspapers in the next several weeks. The total "new money requests" from the Vice Presidents after considerable culling plus the fixed increases is \$3,654,630. The best "new money" estimate by the Budget Director is \$2.1 million (assuming the Governor wins the revenue-sharing fracas). At this time, stated need exceeds anticipated income by \$1.55 million. Here are some examples of fixed increases (the list is by no means exhaustive):

TIAA-CREF	\$130,000.00
Social Security	85,000.00
Retirements	35,000.00
Utilities fuel (30%)	260,000.00
Motor fuel (40%)	19,000.00

A major effort must be made to meet the operations cost increases in the various C budgets. Here are some examples of costs which must be absorbed: postage \$66,880 (20% for first class and 18.18% for air mail), \$45,120 telephone rate increase (39%), paper costs (some classes of paper have increased 82% in cost). Fixed increases, operations funds to meet inflation and other traditional costs (Distinguished Professorships/Regents Awards) will require \$1.34 million. All program enrichment, development sums, research dollars, monies for the Library, the Press, new positions, the Computer facility, etc., and salary increases must come from what remains. It requires \$223,666 to increase the total salary-wage budgets (A and B excluding Continuing Education and Public Service, retirees, staff benefits, and work study) by 1%!!

Finally, we assume that our final report to the Faculty Senate, the Employee Executive Council and the University of Oklahoma Student Association will be after we have hard data and know what recommendations have been made to (and perhaps approved by) the University Regents. In that report I shall have some comments on the Council system in general and the difficulties facing the Budget Council in particular.

In the absence of the Council Chairman, Dr. Jonathan Spurgeon, a member of that Council, appeared before the Senate to answer any questions. Only one minor question was raised.

"F" GRADES

Background Information: On January 31, 1974, three representatives of the University of Oklahoma Student Association presented the following proposal to the Executive Committee of the Faculty Senate concerning grades of "F" in courses subsequently repeated:

Add to section 4.5.6 of the Faculty Handbook:

"When a student retakes a course which she/he failed and makes a higher grade, only the most recent grade shall be used to compute the cumulative grade-point average and the "F" grade shall be reported with 0 credit hours."

The Executive Committee referred this matter, in turn, to the following ad hoc Committee:

- Wilson B. Prickett (Finance), Chairman
- Harold K. Bone (Engineering)
- Richard Wells (Political Science)
- Audrey Bethel (Art)
- Mark Andersen, UOSA
- C. A. Malcomb, UOSA

On February 19, 1974, the Chairman of that ad hoc Committee submitted the following report to the Chairman of the Faculty Senate:

The ad hoc Committee makes the following recommendations to the Faculty Senate:

1. Recommends that the Colleges of Fine Arts and Pharmacy re-examine their policy concerning the calculation of grade points for graduation purposes. It is further recommended that these colleges attempt to make their policy consistent with the spirit of those now in effect in the Colleges of Arts and Sciences, Business, Engineering and Education.

There was unanimous agreement by the Committee on the above recommendations.

2. It is recommended that appropriate action be taken to change the existing policy of the Board of Higher Regents regarding the calculation of grades earned in courses repeated at the same institution as far as admission and retention are concerned. Recommend that the latest grade earned be used in computation of grade point averages for admission and retention purposes.

There was not unanimous agreement by the Committee on changing the Board of Higher Regents policy. The Committee consisted of four faculty members and two students. The faculty vote was split 2-2, and the proposal passed by a vote of 4-2.

Professor Prickett moved acceptance of the first recommendation. In the absence of any questions from the floor, the motion was put to an immediate vote. With one dissenting vote, the Senate approved the first recommendation of the Committee.

After moving approval on behalf of the Committee of the second recommendation, Professor Prickett stepped aside as Committee Chairman to voice his strong opposition to the proposal. He based his opposition on the grounds that (1) considerable effort would be required to obtain State Regents' approval of their policy that applies to all state institutions (2) in his long tenure as Assistant Dean of the College of Business Administration, he did not observe any hardships imposed on students

concerned by the present policy, (3) a laborious task would be thrust upon Admissions and Records and other administrative personnel at this University to screen meticulously the transcripts of students transferring from a myriad of institutions, and (4) in his opinion, the proposed change in policy would have the tendency of lowering scholarship standards.

Dr. Richard Wells, a member of the ad hoc Committee, with the permission of the Senate, addressed the Senate in support of the proposed change. His strong endorsement of the proposal was based on the desirability of having grades reflect demonstrated ability on part of the student, without placing a handicap on that demonstration by virtue of previous performance that may have many explanations. He also felt that a student's mistake should be viewed as something that can be benefited from rather than an opportunity to exact a penalty. As a matter of educational philosophy, the student should be entitled to the fullest measure of his task, whereas the present policy penalizes the very effort on the part of the student to improve in the course. In his opinion, admission and retention regulations should be made consistent with graduation requirements.

Several members of the Senate and one UOSA representative participated in the discussion of this question. In the subsequent voice vote, the Senate rejected the second recommendation of the ad hoc Committee.

PROPOSED CHANGE IN THE SPEAKERS BUREAU

Background Information: On January 30, 1974, Dr. Paul F. Sharp, President of the University, requested Senate consideration of the following student proposal approved by the Student Congress, UOSA, for revising the Speakers Bureau:

STUDENT CONGRESS UNIVERSITY OF OKLAHOMA STUDENT ASSOCIATION
October 9, 1973

Title. AN ACT TO ESTABLISH STRUCTURE AND GUIDELINES FOR THE UNIVERSITY OF OKLAHOMA SPEAKERS BUREAU.

- Section 1: This act shall be known and may be cited an AN ACT TO ESTABLISH STRUCTURE AND GUIDELINES FOR THE UNIVERSITY OF OKLAHOMA SPEAKERS BUREAU.
- Section 2: The purpose of this act shall be to establish structure and guidelines for the University of Oklahoma Speakers Bureau.
- Section 3: The purpose of the Speakers Bureaus shall be to provide the student and university community at the University of Oklahoma with the opportunity to hear prominent, competent, or interesting speakers at the University of Oklahoma.
- Section 4: The Speakers Bureau shall be composed of 7 student members and a student chairperson appointed by the President of the Student Association with the advice and consent of Congress, two faculty members appointed by the Faculty Senate, one staff member appointed by the Vice President of the University Community and the Director of Student activities who shall serve ad advisor with no vote.
- Section 5: The Speakers Bureau shall establish no policy that restricts or excludes speakers on the basis of race, color, creed, religion, national origin, political belief, sex, or sexual orientation.
- Section 6. The Speakers Bureau shall be required to hold open and regularly scheduled meetings throughout the school year for the purpose of hearing any and all requests from any student or student organization on the University of Oklahoma campus.

- Section 7: Having heard the request Speakers Bureau is charged with the responsibility of:
- a. High profile-deciding whether the requested speaker(s) has (have) significant campus-wide appeal and
 - b. Low profile-providing recognized student organizations insofar as is financially feasible with low-profile special interest speakers, and
 - c. making a publicly distributed decision as to the requests, and
 - d. allowing any organization or students dissatisfied with the above dispositions an opportunity for a rehearing of their case.

Section 8: Decisions regarding the bringing of speakers by the Speakers Bureau shall be made primarily with regard to the wishes and interests of members of the UOSA and only secondarily according to the interests of individual members of the Speakers Bureau. * *

-----*

The Senate Executive Committee, in turn, referred this matter to the following ad hoc Committee for study and recommendation:

James H. Sims (English)
Floyd Calvert (Architecture)
Paul Tharp (Political Science)

On February 28, 1974, the Chairman of the ad hoc Committee submitted the following report to the Senate:

"We recommend that the Faculty Senate advise the President of the University to disapprove the Student Congress Bill, dated 9 October, 1973, entitled, An Act to Establish Structure and Guidelines for the University of Oklahoma Speakers Bureau.

"We believe that the original Act to establish a Speakers Bureau, dated 11 June 1969, is an adequate document which has served its purpose well, though the prohibition against discrimination in Section 4 should probably be broadened by amending the last phrase to read: "national origin, sex, or political, economic, or sociological beliefs."

"On the other hand, we submit that the new Act of 9 October 1973 is so ill-conceived and hastily worded as to defeat its generally laudable purposes. For example, in Section 4, we can think of no defensible reason for denying the Director of Student Activities a vote; the phrase "sexual orientation" in the latter part of Section 5 is too susceptible of narrow interpretation when the intent is doubtless to prohibit discrimination against speakers whose views and practices run counter to those dominant in the culture in other areas as well; Section 7 is excessively verbose and obscure, and it may establish (perhaps unintentionally) a rigid priority system for selecting speakers which would limit the Bureau's flexibility; Section 12 makes no provision for the approval of the President of the University, who, as chief legal officer of the institution, must ultimately be responsible for actions on this campus."

Senate Action: Professor Floyd Calvert, a member of the ad hoc Committee, in the absence of the Committee Chairman, moved acceptance of the above report of that Committee.

Mr. Mark Andersen, a UOSA representative and author of the proposal in question, outlined the background, the language, and the intent of the Student Congress proposal. He expressed displeasure at not being invited to participate in the Committee deliberations.

Dr. Maehl, Senate Chairman, reported on recent conversations with Dr. John Morris, Vice President of the University, concerning the apparent misunderstanding over the method of selecting faculty representatives. Hereafter, the Senate will be involved as provided for in the original legislation enacted several years ago.

In a voice vote without dissent, the Senate accepted the recommendation of the ad hoc Committee to disapprove the Student Congress proposal.

✓ SABBATICAL LEAVES FOR FACULTY ON 12-MONTH APPOINTMENT

Background Information: On February 15, 1974, Dr. Paul F. Sharp, President of the University, addressed the following request to the Senate Chairman concerning the sabbatical leave policy for faculty on 12-month appointment:

As you know, the current sabbatical leave policy limits sabbatical leaves of a 12-month faculty member to two semesters at half pay by specifically excluding extending the length of the sabbatical to include summer sessions. A number of questions have been raised concerning this policy and the awkwardness it creates. Consequently, I send the suggestions described below to you for consideration by the Faculty Senate. These suggestions have been considered preliminarily by the Provost Offices on both the Health Sciences Center campus and the Norman campus. I am also asking that they be reviewed by the Dean's Council for their advice.

- 1) Replace the second paragraph of Section 3.11.1 by the following:

"Sabbatical leave of absence may be granted by the President of the University, with the approval of the Regents of the University, to any tenure-holding faculty member who has completed six years of service in the University, provided that the time shall be given to study and travel approved by the President. For faculty on 9-month appointment a sabbatical leave may be granted at half pay for a period not to exceed two semesters or at full pay for a period not to exceed one semester. For faculty on 12-month appointment a sabbatical leave may be granted at half pay for a period not to exceed 12 months or at full pay for a period not to exceed 6 months."

- 2) Replace the third paragraph of Section 3.11.1 by the following:

"After six semesters of full-time service another alternative is available, namely a one-semester sabbatical leave at half pay for 9-month faculty or a 6-month sabbatical leave at half pay for 12-month faculty. Initial eligibility for this sabbatical leave is established after a faculty member's first twelve semesters of full-time service."

- 3) Delete the paragraph of Section 3.11.1.

"Because we have several sabbatical cases that would be affected by this pending policy, I ask that the Senate address this question at its next meeting if at all possible so that the faculty involved can complete their plans."

This matter was then, in turn, referred to the following ad hoc Committee for study and recommendation:

- R. Janice Donnell (Library), Chairperson
- George Letchworth (Education)
- Oscar Parsons (Psychiatry and Behavioral Sciences, HSC)

On February 26, 1974, Professor Donnell submitted the following Committee report to the Senate:

"For the reasons mentioned in Dr. Sharp's opening and closing paragraphs the Committee respectfully recommends the adoption of the three changes to the January, 1974, edition of the Faculty Handbook.

"In addition, the Committee recommends the addition of the phrase, 'or the Health Sciences Center committee equivalent,' to the first sentence of subparagraph (1) immediately following the eleventh paragraph of Section 3.11.1 so that the revised sentence reads as follows: 'The faculty member shall apply to his department's Committee A, or the Health Sciences Center committee equivalent, for a sabbatical leave.'"

Senate Action: Professor Donnell moved acceptance of the Committee recommendations. After a brief discussion of this question, the Senate approved the motion without dissent.

UNIVERSITY SYSTEM OF FACULTY AWARDS AND HONORS

Background Information: As its February 11, 1974, meeting, the Faculty Senate accepted without endorsement the report of its ad hoc Committee concerning an overall study of the University system of faculty awards and honors. After considerable discussion of the disposition of that report, the Senate voted to lay the motion on the table. (See pages 6-9 of the Faculty Senate Journal for February 11, 1974.)

Senate Action: Inasmuch as Dr. Tom Wiggins, ad hoc Committee Chairman, could not attend the February 11 meeting, the Senate Executive Committee requested him to appear at the March 11 session in the event that the Senate chose to reopen the debate on this question.

Dr. Graves moved that the Committee report be removed from the table for discussion at this meeting. The Senate approved the motion.

Dr. Wiggins attempted to answer some of the questions raised at the February 11 meeting. In his opinion, dropping the titles from the honors would, in essence, make them awards rather than professional titles. He called attention to the Committee's frustrations in coming to grips with the problem and attempting to arrive at possible solutions and recommendations. Several Senate members expressed the feeling that more faculty honors were needed.

Dr. Haden then moved that paragraphs 3 A and B (changing the Boyd, Cross, and Regents' Professorships to awards) be deleted from the Committee report. With some dissent, the Senate approved the motion to delete that portion of the report that had been accepted without endorsement at the February 11 meeting of the Senate.

At this point, Dr. Maehl, Senate Chairman, called the attention of the Senate to alternatives available to the Senate for the disposition of the report--either forward the report to the President of the University, refer the report to the University Council on Faculty Awards and Honors, or do nothing further in this matter and simply leave the report as an expression of Senate opinion. There were no additional questions from the floor. The Senate took no further action in this matter.

PROPOSED REVISION: Charter of the General Faculty and the Faculty Senate

Background Information: Dr. Maehl reported on the continuing deliberations of the ad hoc Committee (consisting of Drs. Hunsberger and Maehl of the Normal campus and

Drs. Brown and Parsons of the Health Sciences Center campus) appointed by President Sharp to study the separate faculty governance system for the Health Sciences Center proposed by the HSC faculty. From the HSC faculty point of view, their representation on the University Faculty Senate has not proved to be as effective as desirable. Accordingly, they have proposed the establishment of their own governance system with some provision for liaison with the Norman campus Faculty Senate.

Senate Action: Dr. Maehl then presented the following proposal for four changes in the Charter of the General Faculty and the Faculty Senate:

- (1) Change the title to: "CHARTER OF THE GENERAL FACULTY AND THE FACULTY SENATE (NORMAN CAMPUS)*"

"*All succeeding references to the General Faculty and the Faculty Senate shall be taken to apply to the General Faculty and the Faculty Senate on the Norman campus of the University of Oklahoma.

- (2) Revise the second paragraph only in Section 10.1.7 to read as follows:

"In the Faculty Senate, seats shall be allocated as follows: one seat to each degree-recommending division and the balance of the seats according to a triennial apportionment proposed by the Faculty Senate and approved by the General Faculty."

- (3) Add a new Section 10.1.11 as follows:

"10.1.11 LIAISON WITH FACULTY SENATE - Health Sciences Center (Oklahoma City). The Faculty Senate (Norman) shall maintain liaison with the Faculty Senate (Health Sciences Center, Oklahoma City) through an Inter-Senate Liaison Committee composed of the Chairmen, the Chairmen-Elect, and the Secretaries of the two Senates. The purpose of the Inter-Senate Liaison Committee is to exchange information between the Senates on either campus on concerns and actions of mutual interest and to recommend actions to the respective bodies on either campus. The respective chairmen of the two Faculty Senates should arrange for the meetings of the Inter-Senate Liaison Committee."

(4) Renumber the present Section 10.1.1 (Amendment) as a new Section 10.1.12 Professor Prickett moved the recommended changes in the Charter be approved for submission to the General Faculty of the University at the spring meeting on April 18, 1974. Health Sciences Center representatives urged that close relationships between the two campuses be continued. Some discussion ensued concerning the membership total for the Norman campus desirable for the future. There was sentiment favoring the retention of the 50-member Senate while some Senate members felt that a 40-member Senate would be preferable. Professor Swank then moved that the Charter be further revised to provide for a 40-member Senate on the Norman campus. In a voice vote, the Senate rejected the proposal for reducing the Senate membership to 40. Later, the Senate accepted without dissent the original motion to recommend approval by the General Faculty of the proposed Charter revisions. (The required 30-days is hereby given.)

TRIENNIAL REAPPORTIONMENT OF THE SENATE: 1974-77 ✓

Background Information: In accordance with the provisions of the Charter of the General Faculty and the Faculty Senate of the University, the Senate Executive Committee selected the following ad hoc Committee to propose the triennial reapportionment of Senate seats for 1974-77:

J. G. Laguros (Engineering) Chairman
J. C. Feaver (Philosophy)
M. W. Owens (Health Sciences Center)

The report of that Committee was published on pages 9-11 of the Agenda for the March 11, 1974, Senate meeting.

Senate Action: A question was raised from the floor concerning the inclusion of personnel in the University Libraries and the School of Library Science in the "Provost Direct" category. In the absence of the Committee Chairman, this question could not be answered satisfactorily. Dr. Feaver moved that final consideration of the Committee proposal be delayed until the April 8 meeting of the Senate. The Senate approved without dissent the motion to postpone final action.

PROPOSED FACULTY SANCTIONS: Library Materials

Background Information: Dr. Nat S. Eek, a member of the University Council on University Libraries, has forwarded to the Senate the following proposal of the University of Oklahoma Libraries on behalf of the Council:

PROBLEM: Various segments of the university community have expressed concern over the apparent abuse of library privileges by the faculty, especially the laxity in returning or renewing overdue materials and not returning overdue books being requested by other library users. Also, a significant number of overdue materials cannot be recovered because faculty and staff have left the University without returning library materials.

FACULTY LOAN POLICIES: In response to this concern the library is attempting to establish methods of circulation to faculty which will produce better accountability and recall of library materials. Beginning with the fall semester, 1974, the length of the faculty checkout period for books will be changed from one month to a semester, as our experience indicates the latter is more appropriate to faculty needs. Books will be subject to recall after one month if requested by another library user. Return or renewal of all materials at the end of each semester will be required.

RECOMMENDED SANCTIONS: (1) As stated in the present circulation policy, approved by the Council on University Libraries in 1971, failure to comply with circulation policies can result in suspension of library privileges until records have been cleared. The present library council at their December meeting encouraged the library to proceed with enforcement of this policy as one means of reducing the 9,000 overdue records currently held and of eliminating this problem.

(2) In recognition of the additional problem of faculty and staff leaving without returning library materials, the Council and the library request Senate approval of the following proposal: "That all faculty and staff having terminated their employment with the University shall be required to return all library materials before receiving their final paychecks."

Dr. Eek cited statistics on books still charged to faculty and staff and later moved that sanction (2) recommended above be approved by the Senate. With one dissenting vote, the Senate approved the motion.

ADJOURNMENT

The Faculty Senate adjourned at 5:49 p.m. The next regular meeting of the Faculty Senate will be held at 3:30 p.m., on Monday, April 8, 1974, in Room 218, Dale Hall. Items for the Agenda should reach the Secretary of the Faculty Senate, EAP Division, 307 W. Brooks, 9-A, Norman campus, not later than Wednesday, March 21, 1974.

Respectfully submitted,

Anthony S. Lis, Secretary