

JOURNAL OF THE FACULTY SENATE
The University of Oklahoma
Norman

Regular Session -- April 8, 1974 -- 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.	Graves, Wm. A.	Morgan, David
	Beaird, Lolly	Hilbert, Richard	Olson, Ralph E.
	Braver, Gerald	Huneke, Harold V.	Owens, Mitchell V.
	Calvert, Floyd	Jischke, Martin C.	Pollak, Betty
	de Stwolinski, Gail	Laguros, Joachim	Prickett, Wilson B.
	Donnell, Ruth	Lehrman, G. Philip	Reid, W. T.
	Duchon, Claude	Maehl, Wm. H., Jr.	Shahan, Robert
	Eek, Nat S.	McDonald, Bernard R.	Starling, K. E.
	Emanuel, Floyd W.	Milby, T. H.	Stuart, Chipman
	Feaver, J. Clayton	Miller, Fred H.	Swank, David
	Fife, James		Wilson, Wm. H.
	UOSA representatives:	Bake; Betsy	Tabor, Tim
<u>Absent:</u>	Bogart, George A.	Ford, Robert A.	Rubio, Tomas
	Brown, Homer	Haden, Clovis R.	Staples, Albert F.
	Chandler, Albert M.	Kraynak, Matthew	Sutherland, Patrick
	Christian, Sherril D.	Larson, Raymond D.	Whitecotton, Joseph
	Coussons, Timothy	Letchworth, George	Whitney, David A.
	Felts, William J.	Patnode, Robert E.	
	UOSA representatives:	Andersen, Mark	Perry, John
		Malcomb, C. A.	

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

The Journals of the Faculty Senate for the regular sessions on February 11, 1974, and March 11, 1974, were approved.

INTRODUCTION OF VISITORS: Members of the Executive Committee,
Faculty Council, Oklahoma State University

In connection with the annual joint meeting in Norman of the Executive Committees of the Faculty Senate, Oklahoma University, and the Faculty Council, Oklahoma State University, the following members of the OSU Faculty Council were guests at the Senate meeting that was followed by a dinner and business session that evening:

James Kirby (Humanistic Studies), Chairman
Earl Ferguson (Industrial Engineering), Vice Chairman
John E. Thomas (Botany and Plant Pathology), Secretary
Lavoy Croy (Agronomy)
Elaine Jorgenson (Home Economics)
Helen Reynolds (Physical Education)

ANNOUNCEMENT: Spring Meeting of the General Faculty

The spring, 1974, meeting of the General Faculty of the University will be held at 3:30 p.m., Thursday, April 18, 1974, in Adams Hall 150.

ACTIONS TAKEN BY PRESIDENT PAUL F. SHARP:

Sabbatical Leaves for Faculty on 12-month Appointments: On March 13, 1974, Dr. Paul F. Sharp, President of the University, approved for presentation to the University Regents the recommendation of the Senate concerning sabbatical leaves for faculty members on twelve-month appointments. (See pages 10 and 11 of the Faculty Senate Journal for March 11, 1974.)

On March 15, Dr. Sharp wrote as follows to the Chairman of the Faculty Senate:

"I wish to thank you and the Faculty Senate for the rapid way the Senate considered the recommendations concerning changes in the Faculty Handbook regarding sabbatical leaves for faculty members on twelve-month appointments. I have approved the Senate's action for recommendation to the University Regents.

"The rapid response from the Faculty Senate will enable the Regents to consider the proposed revised policy and several sabbatical recommendations stemming from it at their April meeting.

"Again, thank you for the rapid and careful consideration by the Senate."

Return of Library Materials by Faculty and Staff. Dr. Paul F. Sharp, President of the University, approved on March 18, 1974, the Senate recommendation to require faculty and staff terminating their University employment to return all library materials before receiving final pay checks. (See page 13 of the Faculty Senate Journal for March 11, 1974.)

Faculty Nominations - Task Force on Women in the University. In his memorandum of March 18, 1974, to the Senate Secretary, acknowledging receipt of Senate nominations for the proposed Task Force on Women in the University, Dr. Paul F. Sharp, President of the University, included the following comments:

"I plan to await receipt of the nominations from several of the other groups who have been asked to provide nominations if possible before making the appointments.

"I appreciate the Senate responding as rapidly as it has to my request for faculty nominations. I hope to be able to appoint the Task Force soon."

(See pages 2 and 3 of the Faculty Senate Journal for March 11, 1974.)

University Speakers Bureau. On March 18, 1974, Dr. Paul F. Sharp, President of the University, addressed the following letter to Mr. Joseph W. Streatly, President of the University of Oklahoma Student Association, concerning the UOSA proposal to restructure the University Speakers Bureau:

"As I informed you, on January 30 I sent the Bill entitled 'An Act to Establish Structure and Guidelines for the University of Oklahoma Speakers Bureau' which you sent me under a letter dated January 22, 1974, to the Faculty Senate for its advice.

"The Faculty Senate has now responded with the recommendation that the proposed legislation be disapproved.

"Under these circumstances, I ask that the University of Oklahoma Student Association and the Faculty Senate create a Conference Committee composed of an equal number of representatives from each body (presumably two or three representatives each) to prepare a single recommendation that has been approved by both bodies and that is acceptable to both for presentation to me. Since the legislation initiated with the University of Oklahoma Student Association, I ask that the UOSA take the lead in arranging for the Conference Committee to meet and accomplish its work."

(See pages 8-10 of the Faculty Senate Journal for March 11, 1974.)

Calculation of Grade Points for Graduation Purposes. Dr. Paul F. Sharp, President of the University, addressed the following memorandum on March 15, 1974, to the Deans of the Fine Arts College and the College of Pharmacy:

"A copy of a recommendation enacted by the Faculty Senate at its March 11, 1974, meeting concerning calculation of grade points for graduation purposes

is attached. I have approved it so that it might be sent to each of your Colleges for their consideration."

(See pages 7 and 8 of the Faculty Senate Journal for March 11, 1974.)

ACTION TAKEN BY THE FACULTY, FINE ARTS COLLEGE

On March 21, 1974, Dr. F. Donald Clark, Dean of the College of Fine Arts, reported to President Sharp the following action taken by the faculty of that College:

"The Faculty of the College of Fine Arts at its monthly meeting on March 20, 1974, decided by a large majority that the College of Fine Arts should continue to compute grade-point averages for graduation purposes as has been the practice for many years. The Faculty has asked me to report that in their opinion we should be consistent with the grade point computation policy of the State Regents for retention.

"Therefore, our policy will be to average the grades for all attempted courses for graduation purposes."

(See preceding report of action taken by President Paul F. Sharp.)

ACTION TAKEN BY THE UNIVERSITY PATENT ADVISORY COMMITTEE

Dr. Arthur C. Gentile, Dean of the Graduate College, advised the Faculty Senate Secretary of the following action taken by the University Patent Advisory Committee:

"The Executive Committee of the Faculty Senate, on September 27, 1973, requested the Patent Advisory Committee to consider the proposed revision of the University patent policy submitted to the Faculty Senate by Professor R. G. Fowler.

"The Patent Advisory Committee has discussed this proposed change at great length and has also consulted legal counsel for the University on this matter.

"The Patent Advisory Committee, on March 15, 1974, voted to recommend no change in the policy."

(See page 2 of the Faculty Senate Journal for October 8, 1973.)

ACTION TAKEN BY THE NORMAN CITY COUNCIL -- UNIVERSITY BLOOD DRIVE

On March 18, 1974, the City Clerk of Norman forwarded to the Senate Chairman a copy of the following resolution of appreciation:

A RESOLUTION OF THE COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF NORMAN COMMENDING THOSE PARTICIPATING IN THE UNIVERSITY OF OKLAHOMA BLOOD DRIVE

"WHEREAS, heretofore, students, faculty and staff of the University of Oklahoma were responsible for leading and consummating a university-wide blood drive that resulted in the collection of 1,034 pints of blood, and,

"WHEREAS, the efforts and generous contribution to the health and welfare of the community by those participating in and the giving of blood deserve commendation by the council.

"NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED BY THE COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF NORMAN:

"1. That the students, faculty and staff of the University of Oklahoma participating in the recent blood drive aforementioned shall be and they are hereby commended for efforts in keeping with the highest traditions of public service."

FACULTY NOMINATIONS: University Councils and Committees

Dr. Martin C. Jischke, Chairman, Senate Committee on Committees, presented the following nominations of that Committee for faculty vacancies on the University Councils and Committees as listed below:

<u>Academic Personnel Council:</u>	Sarah Crim (Home Economics)	1974-77
	George Fraser (Law)	1974-77
	Richard Baker (Political Science)	1974-77
<u>Academic Program Council:</u>	Cecil Lee (Art)	1974-77
	Howard Day (Geology/Geophysics)	1974-77
	Michael Devine (I. E.)	1974-77
	Kenneth Taylor (Hist. Sci.)*	1974-76
	William Wilson (Architecture)*	1974-75
(* To be appointed if Health Sciences Center resignations are accepted.)		
<u>Administrative and Physical Resources Council:</u>	Charles Mankin (Geology/Geophysics)	1974-77
	R. Dale Vliet (Law)	1974-77
	James Kenderdine (Marketing)	1974-77
<u>Athletics Council:</u>	C. Phillip Colver (CEMS)	1974-77
	Rex Inman (Meteorology)	1974-77
	Thomas Curtis (Economics)	1974-77
	Roy Male (English)	1974-77
<u>Budget Council:</u>	F. Ted Hebert (Political Science)	1974-77
	Michael Hennagin (Music)	1974-77
	Donald Perkins (Zoology)	1974-77
	Nelson Nunnally (Geography)	1974-75
<u>Faculty Awards and Honors:</u>		
David Ross Boyd Professor:	John Ezell (History)	1974-77
	Paul Ruggiers (English)	1974-77
Regents Professor:	George Goodman (Bot./Micro.)	1974-77
	Glenn Snider (Education)	1974-77
Faculty at Large:	Robert Patnode (Microbio., H.S.C.)	1974-75
	Inez Hayes (Nursing, H.S.C.)	1974-75
<u>Research Council:</u>	Robert Magarian (Pharmacy)	1974-77
	Donald Cox (Botany/Micro.)	1974-77
	Karl Bergey (SPP, AMNE)	1974-77
	Jitendra Mohanty (Philosophy)	1974-76
	Jack Renner (Educ.)	1974-76
<u>Academic Regulations Committee:</u>	V. Stanley Vardys (Pol. Sci.)	1974-78
	Paul Risser (Bot./Micro.)	1974-78
	Norman Byrd (Architecture)	1974-78
	Tom Enis (Law)	1974-78
<u>Class Schedule Committee:</u>	Lloyd Iverson (Mathematics)	1974-78
	Neal Huffaker (Physics)	1974-78
	Tom Miller (Psychology)	1974-78
	Sabetai Ungaru (Hist. Sci.)	1974-78
	Frank Seto (Zoology)	1974-77
	Mary E. Saxon (Library)	1974-77
<u>Commencement Committee:</u>	Tim Ragan (Education)	1974-77
	Eugene Cates (Education)	1974-77
	Ben Taylor (Econ.)	1974-77
	Edwin Mumma (Mgt.)	1974-77
<u>Computer Advisory Committee:</u>	Henry Critchlow (P. & G.E.)	1974-77
	Jack Stoughton (EE)	1974-77
	Roger Frech (Chemistry)	1974-77
	Gary Schnell (Zoology)	1974-77

	C. G. Gunn (Medicine, H.S.C.)	1974-77
	Neil Hardin (Env. Hlth., H.S.C.)	1974-77
	Lauren Wispe (Psych.)	1974-75
	William Graves (Education)	1974-75
<u>Faculty Advisory Committee to the President:</u>	David Kitts (Geology/Geophysics)	1974-76
	Tom Wiggins (Education)	1974-76
	Seymour Feiler (Mod. Lang.)	1974-76
	Victoria Leigh (Drama)	1974-76
	Charles Bert (AMNE)	1974-76
	Ray Mill (Env. Hlth., H.S.C.)	1974-76
	Harold Huneke (Math.)	1974-75
<u>Patent Advisory Committee:</u>	Darrel Harden (AMNE)	1974-78
	Marion Phillips (Marketing)	1974-78
<u>ROTC Advisory Committee:</u>	James Faulconer (Music)	1974-77
	Ray Larson (Drama)	1974-77
	Ann Kelly Wood (Human Rel.)	1974-77
	J. F. Harp (CEES)	1974-77
	John Fletcher (Bot./Micro.)	1974-77
	Arthur Myers (Geol./Geophys.)	1974-77
	Casey Robinson (Pharmacy)	1974-75
	Fred Shellabarger (Arch.)	1974-75
	Dennis Crites (Marketing)	1974-76
	Burt Scanlan (Mgt.)	1974-76
	Guadalupe Thompson (Mod. Lang.)	1974-76
	Jane Zingale (Art)	1974-76
<u>Scholarships and Financial Aids:</u>	Osborne Reynolds (Law)	1974-76
	James Henkle (Art)	1974-76
	Donald Menzie (P. & G.E.)	1974-76
	Seun Kahn (EE)	1974-76
	Richard Williams (Education)	1974-76
	John York (Arch.)	1974-76
	Eugene Menke (Comm. Dis., H.S.C.)	1974-76
	Lorraine Singer (Nursing, H.S.C.)	1974-76
<u>University Book Exchange Oversight Committee:</u>	Dortha Henderson (Home Econ.)	1974-77
	Robert Emory (Mod. Lang.)	1974-77
<u>University Libraries Committee:</u>	Roger Routs (Psych.)	1974-77
	Carolyn Swan (Mod. Lang.)	1974-77
	Fritz Schmitz (Chemistry)	1974-77
	William Huff (Mathematics)	1974-77
	George Stone (Geology/Geophysics)	1974-77
	Joseph Fritz (English)	1974-77
<u>Faculty Appeals Board:</u>	Richard Fowler (Physics)	1974-78
	Davis Egle (AMNE)	1974-78
	Robert Bell (Anthro.)	1974-78
	Celia Mae Bryant (Music)	1974-78
	Jay Shurley (Psychiatry, H.S.C.)	1974-78
	Wilson Prickett (Finance)	1974-78
	Larry Ganter (CEES)	1974-76
	W. Nelson Peach (Econ.)	1974-76
<u>Equal Employment Opportunities Committee:</u>	Jose Maldonado (Law)	1974-75
	Bing Fung (Chemistry)	1974-75

<u>Speakers Bureau:</u>	Robert Shalhope (History)	1974-76
	Al Nicewander (Psych.)	1974-76
	Jack Catlin (Classics)	1974-77
	Tom Wilbanks (Geography)	1974-77

<u>Judicial Tribunal:</u>	Charles Carpenter (Zoology)	1974-77
	Juneann Murphy (Bot./Micro.)	1974-77

Final action by the Senate will be taken at the next meeting on May 6, 1974. Additional nominations may be made at that time from the floor. Members of the Senate are urged, however, to obtain permission of any nominees in advance of the Senate meeting.

ELECTION OF FACULTY REPRESENTATIVES: Admin. Advisory Committee on Parking

The Chairman of the Faculty Senate has recently received a request from the Office of the Vice President (Finance and Administration) for Senate election of a faculty representative and a faculty alternate to serve on the University Administrative Advisory Committee on Parking.

Voting by written ballot, the Senate elected the following individuals:

Member: D. B. Turkington (Engineering)
Alternate: Charles Suggs (Drama)

ELECTION OF FACULTY REPRESENTATIVES: University Task Force on the Noble Arena

The Senate Chairman received a few days ago a request from the President's Office for the Senate election of two faculty representatives to serve on the University Task Force on the Noble Arena. This group will consider the many administrative questions relating to the operation of the Noble Arena.

Voting by written ballot, the Senate elected the following faculty representatives:

Leonard Haug (Music)
Ted Herrick (Accounting)

PROPOSED EVALUATION OF DEANS

Background Information: Dr. Leon Zelby, on August 29, 1973, suggested that the Senate study the desirability of recommending a procedure for periodic evaluations of deans. On September 27, 1973, the Senate Executive Committee referred this proposal to the following ad hoc Committee for study and recommendation:

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

The report of that Committee dated March 24, 1974, was published on pages 5-7 of the Agenda for the April 8 meeting of the Senate.

On April 4, 1974, Professor Gloria R. Smith, Interim Dean, College of Nursing, HSC, submitted the following pertinent comments to the Senate Chairman for distribution to Senate members at the April 8 meeting:

I have reviewed the report of the Ad Hoc Committee to Study the Proposal for Faculty Evaluation of College Deans. Frankly, I cannot find the specific recommendations alluded to in the first paragraph of the report. Hidden in the content I do find some inferences that are quite unsettling since they are hostile in nature and not constructive.

I am quite in agreement that the evaluation process can lead to growth in performance. I also believe that administrators benefit from the evaluation process. I cannot determine that this Committee has identified what that process should be or who is to be a part of it. Are students a part of the process? It is also obvious that the Committee has not determined the objectives of evaluation. I can't believe that the objective evaluator participates in the evaluation process so that he may benefit from the cathartic effect of "the hit and run syndrome" which can be the only result of evaluation without direct confrontation and accountability. Nor do I believe that a faculty should seek to achieve by the evaluation process what must be achieved by meaningful dialogue between faculty, students and the administrator to the end of sharing power and if all fails, responsible political action.

Why is it an issue as to who should receive the results of the evaluation, if the process is designed to benefit the person who is being evaluated? If, of course, the ulterior motive is to provide catharsis for the faculty, then there is a problem, for that result can be heightened by more public pronouncement or is it castigation?

Evaluation of the individual is serious business, the goal of which is to improve the quality of the service rendered through facilitating the provider of the service to reach his maximum potential as a professional person. When a person assumes the responsibility of evaluator, he also is assuming the full responsibility for his own actions and the consequences. This includes confronting the person who is being evaluated. It is my personal view that this degree of accountability holds for anyone who is evaluating another, whether he is a student, peer, the supervised or the supervisor. If members of Committee A or one of its subcommittees are responsible for distributing faculty evaluation forms, they can also assume responsibility for collating the forms and for discussing them with the administrators involved. Recommendations could then be forwarded to the Provost.

I'm afraid that I don't understand the references to "coming up through the ranks" being in direct proportion to scholarly achievement and success as a Dean. At the risk of sounding mundane, I place as high value on administrative skill as I do on academics and research. The large complex university needs persons who have skills in many areas. University administration can no more be traditional than teaching strategies. Rather, we see a blend of tradition, current philosophy and trends of the future.

I sincerely hope that further study of the evaluation of administrators does not proceed until the objectives for such evaluation are clearly defined. The Deans cannot be "principal beneficiaries" of a process which is designed to provide "a stabilizing effect within a College when Deans are changed" and "therapeutic effect" for the faculty.

Senate Action: During the ensuing discussion of that Committee's report, the Senate approved the following deletions in the report as published in the Agenda:

Dr. W. T. Reid's motion

accepted without dissent (last sentence, second paragraph, Section I):

"A review by the hoipolloi can have a sobering effect."

Dr. J. Clayton Feavers' motion

accepted with some dissent

(last sentence, first paragraph, Section I): "Constructive criticism is good for all, including deans."

(entire third paragraph, Section I): "While not a major concern, the 'beleaguered' faculty member, evaluated by students, Committee A, deans, vice presidents, provosts, etc., might appreciate the opportunity to make an evaluation without a direct confrontation. In other words, the therapeutic effect might prove to be considerable."

As thus amended, the Committee report was approved by the Senate without dissent.

Subsequently, Dr. Martin Jischke moved that the President of the University be requested to appoint a committee, with one-half of its membership drawn from the full-time faculty, to develop a questionnaire for the purpose of faculty evaluation of deans and, further, that this questionnaire be administered in the various colleges of this University no later than the fall semester of the 1974-75 academic year. The Senate approved without dissent the recommended implementation of the Committee report.

The full text of the Committee report, as amended by the Senate at this meeting, follows: (The questionnaire mentioned in par. 1 (Section II) below is not included.)
 - - - - -

I. What ends are served by such an evaluation?

The membership of the committee were unanimous that such an evaluation be established. A clear consensus evolved that the principal beneficiaries would be the deans inasmuch as they would have a guide as to how effective they are from the faculty's point of view. Such an evaluation is seen as helping the deans to be effective in carrying out his/her responsibilities.

A stabilizing effect within a college when deans are changed should be enhanced by such a procedure. A dean should be less inclined to change the orientation within a college without sufficient discussion with and input by the faculty, knowing an evaluation program is in effect.

II. What activities should be evaluated?

The attached questionnaire is an example of what is considered relevant in at least one institution of higher learning. It is not meant to imply that this is the procedure that we should follow. It is submitted for informational purposes only. In our minds the effectiveness of a dean as an academician, who can assist departments in the development of curricula, and provide the synergist for a scholarly attitude within the college is of paramount importance. The dean's ability to properly evaluate the faculty is germane.

The ability of the dean to represent the college and the university to the "outside" community is of only slightly less importance than what is done within the university. He should be able to present the goals and needs of the college to the citizens within the state with consummate skill. Indeed, it is not enough that he understands the university community, but also the milieu from which the financial support and parental aspirations stem.

It is difficult, if not impossible, to deal with several specific questions of probable relevance here. For example, we could find no written canons outlining a dean's responsibilities. How long does an individual serve in a deanship? As nearly as we could ascertain, there are no formal guidelines. In the past, as long as a dean satisfied the university administration, it has been the dean's decision. This practice may be in the best interest of the college. We suggest, however, that it should be evaluated and clear guidelines established.

A related problem is the "automatic" granting of professorships within a department. In the past, at least in part, this has been to recognize the past scholarly contributions of the individual. This no longer is necessarily the case. A new trend in selecting deans is appearing on the university scene, one who has neither established an outstanding record as an academician or as a researcher. The managerial acumen of the latter type of individual is of prime importance. It was unanimous among the members of this committee that if a dean receives a professorship in a department he should make direct scholarly contributions to that department by teaching, research, or the publication of scholarly papers which have had peer evaluation.

The role of a dean is a difficult one; this fact must be appreciated by all. As we perceive a deanship, the dean is, in essence, a person with dual responsibilities: He (1) represents the viewpoints of the higher administration to the faculty and (2) represents the viewpoints of the faculty to the higher administration. These two responsibilities are of equal importance. There is a growing concern among the faculty that a dean who has not come up through the traditional academic route is more of an "organizational" representative than a faculty one. A "lock-step" type of administration is unquestionably expeditious, but communication from the faculty up through the administrative echelons is not only of paramount importance to the faculty of this university, but has been traditional.

III. To whom should the results be given?

If such an evaluation is to be effective for the individual concerned and the faculty involved, a serious commitment on the part of the Provost and the President is necessary. Conferences with Provost Hunsberger and President Sharp have shown that both of them are not only agreeable to the evaluation in concept, but see considerable merit if a proper questionnaire is developed.

The most logical person to receive the results is the next higher administrative official, which at this university is the Provost. He, in turn, should discuss the results with the dean.

The question as to who should tabulate the results arose in our discussions but was not formally resolved. A consensus was reached that a small select faculty committee established by the Faculty Senate working with the computer programmer had considerable merit. This problem may need additional study.

Discussion as to whether the results should be made public were undertaken. Although not clearly resolved, the majority of the committee agreed that results should be handled equivalently to that of the faculty evaluations.

IV. Should the evaluation be included as part of a general review of deans for purposes of reviewing appointments?

It was our opinion that this should be done. However, as mentioned in II., the terms under which a dean is appointed are nebulous. For example, what mandates, if any, is the dean given by the higher administration at the time of the original appointment? What guidelines are furnished to the faculty members of the search committee by the Faculty Senate? We see the evaluation as being of assistance in the general review of renewing appointments, but do not necessarily feel that it is the only criterion or even the most important single factor. There are unknown qualities that cannot now be ascertained. For example, broad support or participation by the faculty and the objectiveness with which the questionnaire is completed are essential.

General Considerations: We did not discuss the concept of evaluation with the deans as a group. However, individuals of the committee contacted deans and found an interest and support for the evaluation. Provost Hunsberger discussed the concept of evaluation at a Deans' Council meeting during February and reported that they were favorable to the idea. The deans did express a desire to the Provost that they have representation on the committee at the time the questionnaire is written.

Within limits, a general questionnaire can be developed, but certain questions may not have the same value in all colleges.

The limited scope of our survey revealed one university in the Southwest has a faculty evaluation of all university administrators, starting with chairmen. A few other institutions elsewhere were contemplating a program to evaluate deans. Purdue University developed a manual and questionnaire in 1950.

Several faculty outside the committee suggested that a regular evaluation be established for other university administrators (vice presidents and provosts). We did not undertake serious discussion of this concept because it was not our charge. It is submitted for informational purposes.

REVISION OF SENATE BY-LAWS: Solicitation of President's
Nominations for Faculty Vacancies

Background Information: At its March 11, 1974, meeting the Senate received the required thirty-day notice of the following proposed change in its By-Laws:

Delete 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."

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

Senate Action: With a single dissenting vote, the Senate approved the above change in its By-Laws following a short discussion of this question.

TRIENNIAL REAPPORTIONMENT OF THE SENATE: 1974-77

Background Information: At its March 11, 1974, meeting, the Senate postponed until the April 8, 1974, meeting final action on the triennial (1974-77) reapportionment of the Senate as proposed by its ad hoc Committee. (See pages 12-13 of the Faculty Senate Journal for March 11, 1974).

Senate Action: Dr. J. Laguros, ad hoc Committee chairman, called attention to revised Tables 1 (Plan A) and 2 (Plan B) distributed at this meeting to replace those published with the Agenda for the March 11, 1974, meeting. He then moved acceptance of Table 2 (Plan B) for recommendation to the General Faculty on April 18, 1974. Without further discussion, the Senate approved the proposed reapportionment of the 50 seats on the Norman campus, as indicated in Table 2 (Plan B) of the full report of the Committee reproduced below.

REPORT ON SENATE REAPPORTIONMENT FOR 1974-1977

1. Scope & Authorization

Pursuant to Dr. M. Jischke's memo of November 29, 1973, the committee composed of the undersigned was authorized to recommend to the Faculty Senate the reapportionment plan for the period 1974-77 consistent with the Charter of the Faculty Senate (Faculty Handbook, Sec. 10.1.7.).

The committee presented its report to the Faculty Senate at the March meeting (Faculty Senate Agenda 3/11/74). Because it was not clear whether or not the Libraries were included in the figures given by the Provost, action on the reapportionment was tabled and the report was referred back to the committee for further clarification (Faculty Senate Journal 3/11/74). Further study by the committee indicated that the Libraries had not been included in the proposed reapportionment. Also, it was decided to consider the College of Environmental Design, of which Architecture is a part, a degree granting division-which it is-and exclude it from Provost Direct.

2. Reapportionment Plans

The present report includes recommendations under two plans.

Plan A is based on the current Faculty Senate constituency as outlined in the Faculty Handbook Sec. 10.1.7.

Plan B is a contingency plan, the need of which arises from the likelihood that the Health Sciences Center (HSC)--beginning next year--will have its own governance and, therefore, it will not be a part of the Faculty Senate at the Norman Campus.

By considering and acting on both plans, the Faculty Senate will be ready to fully operate in September 1974, by following that plan which will be applicable at that time.

3. Requests for Procedural Change

The College of Business Administration requested that, in view of the commitment on the part of the University Administration to reinforce the faculty of the College, beginning September 1974, the expected FTE for the College will be 68 instead of the current 56 and, therefore, the former figure be used in the reapportionment.

This Committee regretfully recommends the denial of the request because:

- (a) to avoid any discrimination, the same treatment should be accorded to the other constituent bodies of the Faculty Senate,
- (b) and if the procedure in (a) is adopted, complicated problems arising from unfulfilled promises and uneffected predictions will probably mar the workings of the Senate for some time,
- (c) the 1971 reapportionment was based on the logic of current rather than expected FTE.

4. Plan A

The FTE faculty figures were supplied by the Provost's Office and they pertain to 1/73-74. They agree fairly well with those of the Budget Director's Office.

Table 1 presents data pertinent to Plan A.

TABLE 1. PLAN A

Unit	Faculty, FTE	% of total	Seats	Total Seats	Present
Arts & Sci.	383	51.00	15.30	15 + 1 = 16	17
Bus. Adm.	56	7.46	2.24	2 + 1 = 3	3
Educ.	53	7.06	2.12	2 + 1 = 3	3
Engr.	80	10.65	3.20	3 + 1 = 4	5
Env. Des.	14	1.86	0.56	1 + 1 = 2	2
F. Arts	66	8.79	2.64	3 + 1 = 4	4
Law	25	3.33	1.00	1 + 1 = 2	2
Pharmacy	13	1.73	0.52	1 + 1 = 2	1
Provost Direct	61	8.12	2.44	2 + 0 = 2	1
	<u>751</u>		<u>30.02</u>	<u>30 + 8 = 38</u>	
Liberal Studies				1 = 1	1
Grad. Coll.				1 = 1	1
				<u>30 + 10 = 40</u>	<u>40</u>
HSC				10	10
				Total 50	50

Provost Direct includes: Library Sci. (8), Libraries (26), Aviation (5), Human Relat. (6), ROTC (16).

5. Plan B

The Committee studied two alternatives which automatically result from the withdrawal of HSC: 1) the 40-seat, 2) the 50-seat Senate. Of the two, it recommends the 50-seat Faculty Senate and Table 2 has been prepared on that basis.

TABLE 2. PLAN B

Unit	Faculty, FTE	% of total	Seats	Total Seats
Arts & Sci.	383	51.00	20.40	20 + 1 = 21
Bus. Adm.	56	7.46	2.98	3 + 1 = 4
Educ.	53	7.06	2.92	3 + 1 = 4
Engr.	80	10.65	4.26	4 + 1 = 5
Env. Des.	14	1.86	0.74	1 + 1 = 2
F. Arts	66	8.79	3.52	4 + 1 = 5
Law	25	3.33	1.33	1 + 1 = 2
Pharmacy	13	1.73	0.69	1 + 1 = 2
Provost Direct	61	8.12	3.25	3 + 0 = 3
	<u>751</u>		<u>40.09</u>	<u>40 + 8 = 48</u>
Liberal Studies				1 = 1
Grad. Coll.				1 = 1
			Total	<u>40 + 10 = 50</u>

6. Additional Recommendations

The Committee would like to present the following additional recommendations:

- a) If HSC has its own Faculty Senate, the two senates cooperate in matters of mutual concern and to effect this, the system of representative Senators be established.
- b) The numerical calculations and the rounding up of decimal points to full numbers create some inconvenience; therefore, it is worthwhile to consider the change of the Charter to "50 senators plus or minus one."

Respectfully submitted,

J. C. Feaver, A. & Sci.

M. V. Owens, HSC

J. G. Laguros, Engr., Chairman

PROPOSAL FOR FALL SEMESTER BREAK

Background Information: At the February 11, 1974, Senate meeting, Mr. Mark Andersen, a UOSA representative, suggested further consideration of a fall midsemester break to coincide with the OU-Texas football game. He was requested to submit a formal proposal for subsequent Senate consideration. (See page 9 of the Senate Journal for February 11, 1974.) On March 11, 1974, Mr. Andersen submitted a proposal that was published on page 4 of the Agenda for the April 8 meeting.

Senate Action: Questions were raised from the floor concerning Mr. Andersen's proposal as published in the Agenda. Inasmuch as Mr. Andersen was not present at this meeting, Dr. Graves moved that final consideration of this question be postponed until the May 6 meeting of the Senate, pending Mr. Andersen's submission of more extensive and detailed information. The Senate approved the motion without dissent.

ADJOURNMENT

The Faculty Senate adjourned at 4:48 p.m. The next regular meeting of the Faculty Senate will be held at 3:30 p.m., on Monday May 6, 1974, in Room 218, Dale Hall.

Respectfully submitted,

Anthony S. Lis, Secretary