

2
7/24/74

JOURNAL OF THE FACULTY-SENATE
The University of Oklahoma
Norman

Regular Session -- May 6, 1974 -- 3:30 p.m., Dale Hall, 200

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

<u>Present:</u>	Anderson, Paul S. (5)	Fife, James (1)	Miller, Fred H. (2)
	Beaird, Lolly (1)	Ford, Robert A. (5)	Olson, Ralph E. (1)
	Braver, Gerald (2)	Graves, Wm. A. (2)	Owens, Mitchell V. (3)
	Brown, Homer (7)	Hilbert, Richard (5)	Pollak, Betty (1)
	Calvert, Floyd (1)	Jischke, Martin C. (0)	Prickett, Wilson B. (2)
	Christian, Sherril (2)	Kraynak, Matthew (2)	Reid, W. T. (1)
	de Stwolinski, Gail (4)	Laguros, Joachim (2)	Shahan, Robert (7)
	Duchon, Claude (1)	Lehrman, G. Philip (2)	Stuart, Chipman (3)
	Eek, Nat S. (1)	Maehl, Wm. H., Jr. (0)	Sutherland, Patrick (4)
	Emanuel, Floyd W. (1)	McDonald, Bernard (3)	Wilson, Wm. H. (3)
	Feaver, J. Clayton (1)		

UOSA representatives: Andersen, Mark Bake, Betsy

<u>Absent:</u>	Bogart, George A. (8)	Huneke, Harold (2)	Rubio, Tomas (10)
	Chandler, Albert M. (5)	Larson, Raymond (5)	Staples, Albert F. (4)
	Coussons, Timothy (7)	Letchworth, George (4)	Starling, K. E. (7)
	Donnell, Ruth (1)	Milby, T. H. (3)	Swank, David (4)
	Felts, William J. (9)	Morgan, David (1)	Whitecotton, Joseph (6)
	Haden, Clovis R. (5)	Patnode, Robert E. (5)	Whitney, David A. (6)

UOSA representatives: Malcolm, C. A. Perry, John Tabor, Tim

(Please note: The numbers in parentheses above indicate the total number of absences during the 1973-74 academic year. The Faculty Senate met for a total of ten (10) sessions--nine regular and one special.)

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

The Journal of the Faculty Senate for the regular session on April 8, 1974, was approved with the following deletion, on page 3 (Action Taken by the Faculty, Fine Arts College) requested by Dr. F. D. Clark, Dean of the College of Fine Arts:

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

(Also see page 3 of this Journal (Action Taken by the Dean, College of Fine Arts.)

ACTIONS TAKEN BY PRESIDENT PAUL F. SHARP

Presidential Nominations for Faculty Vacancies: On April 18, 1974, President Paul F. Sharp approved the Senate action taken on April 8 to delete references in the Senate By-Laws and the University Faculty Handbook to Presidential nominations to the Senate Committee on Committees for faculty vacancies. (See page 10 of the Faculty Senate Journal for April 8, 1974.)

Task Force on Women in the University: On April 10, 1974, President Paul F. Sharp appointed the following faculty representatives to the Task Force on Women in the University:

William Carmack (Speech Communication)
Gwenn Davis (English) - Chairperson of the Task Force
Ann Ellington (Home Economics)
Leon Leonard (AMNE)
Vicki Schoolcraft (Nursing, HSC)

(See pages 1-3 of the Faculty Senate Journal for March 11, 1974.)

Proposed Evaluation of Deans: In acknowledging receipt of the Senate action concerning the proposal for evaluating deans, Dr. Paul F. Sharp added the following comments in his April 18, 1974, memorandum to the Senate Secretary:

"Before taking action regarding the proposal, I am requesting the advice of the Provost and the deans. As soon as I have received that advice and have had a chance to evaluate it, I shall be back in touch with you."

(See pages 6-9 of the Senate Journal for April 8, 1974.)

Task Force on Management of the Lloyd Noble Multi-purpose Arena: On April 17, 1974, President Paul F. Sharp appointed Professors Leonard Haug and Ted Herrick as Senate representatives to the Task Force on Management of the Noble Arena. (See page 6 of the Senate Journal for April 8, 1974.)

On April 17, President Sharp addressed a memorandum to the Task Force members. Pertinent excerpts from that memorandum follow:

It is my hope that the Task Force will address the following questions:

- 1) How should the Arena fit into the present administrative structure of the University? What area or department should have management responsibility?
- 2) What are the anticipated operational costs of the Arena and how should they be met?
- 3) What qualifications should the Arena manager have, what salary range, and how should the search be carried out? When should a manager be on board?
- 4) Should there be an Executive Committee for the Operation of the Arena to develop and administer guidelines and policies for Arena use, a committee with which the manager would consult about scheduling and budget matters? How should the committee be composed if recommended?

The only constraint which should limit the Task Force's discussions and recommendations is the commitment that the Arena shall be multi-purpose. Athletic activities, concerts, public speeches, entertainment and cultural events, and University ceremonies are all appropriate activities for the Arena. Within the reality of operational costs and scheduling commitments, student organizations and faculty groups should be encouraged to utilize the fine facility.

I have asked that the Task Force begin its work as soon as a majority of the members have been appointed.

Although I expect that the deliberations of the Task Force may well extend into the next academic year, I should like to receive a progress report from the Task Force by May 15, 1974. I realize that this does not provide a great deal of time, but I do believe that we should have some directions defined by the end of this academic year.

ACTION TAKEN BY THE DEAN, COLLEGE OF FINE ARTS: Computation of Grades for Graduation Purposes.

Dr. F. D. Clark, Dean of the College of Fine Arts, addressed the following request on April 18, to the Senate Secretary:

"This is to correct an apparent misunderstanding of my communication to you in March regarding the action of the faculty of the College of Fine Arts pertaining to the computation of grades for graduation.

"Please strike the second paragraph of item 5b in the Senate Agenda for April 8, 1974, which reads: 'Therefore, our policy will be to average the grades for all attempted courses for graduation purposes.'

"It is true that we will average all grades for graduation but, in compliance with University policy, grades transferred from other institutions will be valued differently from those taken here at the University of Oklahoma."

(See pages 2 and 3 of the Senate Journal for April 8, 1974, and Approval of Minutes on page 1 of this Journal.)

REPORT ON JOINT MEETING OF EXECUTIVE COMMITTEES, OU FACULTY SENATE AND OSU FACULTY COUNCIL

Dr. Wm. H. Maehl, Jr., Senate Chairman, reported on the discussion held at the April 8, 1974, joint meeting in Norman of the Executive Committees of the Oklahoma State University Faculty Council and the Oklahoma University Faculty Senate. (See page 1 of the Senate Journal for April 8, 1974.)

The after-dinner session covered the following topics:

- Procedure used at OSU for dealing with faculty grievances.
- Establishment at OSU of a computerized personnel data bank for reporting to various governmental agencies. Some concern among OSU faculty is being expressed regarding possible invasion of privacy.
- OSU investigation of retirement programs at other institutions throughout the country. One of the questions being studied is the possibility of offering faculty members the option of voluntary withdrawal from participation in the Oklahoma Teacher Retirement System.
- Concern of both OU and OSU faculties about obtaining additional support for higher education in Oklahoma.
- Greater need for increased cooperation between the faculties of the two Universities.

In Dr. Maehl's opinion, these joint meetings have now reached such a point of frankness, openness, and candor that a strong basis exists for continuing this mutually desirable and beneficial relationship in the future.

ACTION TAKEN BY SENATE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE: Designations of Academic Rank

In its report on the Deans Council proposal concerning faculty members working on post-baccalaureate degrees in departments in which appointed, the Senate ad hoc Committee called the Senate's attention to two related matters -- definition of "faculty" and designations of academic rank. (See page 7 of the Senate Journal for December 10, 1973.) The Senate Chairman, in turn, referred this matter to the

Academic Personnel Council for further study and recommendation. On April 8, 1974, the Council Chairman suggested that a comprehensive study be made of all academic titles being used by the University and some attempt made toward their standardization. The Senate Executive Committee on April 25, 1974, accepted the Council's offer to study the matter in greater depth with a final report to be submitted to the Senate late in the fall, 1974.

(Note: The question of definition of "faculty" mentioned by the ad hoc Committee received separate consideration by the Senate later at this meeting.)

FINANCING THE NOBLE MULTI-PURPOSE ARENA

Attention of the Senate was called from the floor to page 8 of the Agenda for this meeting concerning President Sharp's memorandum to the Task Force on the Management of the Noble Multi-Purpose Arena. Specific reference was made to item 2 regarding operational costs of the Arena. The suggestion was then made that the Senate call to the attention of President Sharp the pertinent comments made to the Senate by Vice President Burr on February 14, 1972. At that time, Vice President Burr stressed that no "Educational and General" funds would be used for the maintenance of the Arena and added that President Sharp had agreed to all statements made by Mr. Burr at the February 14, 1972, Senate meeting. (See pages 4 and 5 of the Senate Journal for February 14, 1972.)

The Senate Chairman announced that the suggested action would be taken.

PROPOSED REVISION OF SENATE BY-LAWS: Composition of Executive Committee

The Senate Executive Committee has recommended that the following underscored changes in the Senate By-Laws be made in the paragraph concerning the composition of the Executive Committee of the Faculty Senate (Faculty Handbook, Section 11.1.5 (E), Committees, paragraph (2)):

"The standing committees of the Senate shall consist of: (a) Executive Committee, (b) Committee on Committees, and (c) Faculty Welfare Committee. The Executive Committee shall consist of the following seven members: the Chairman, the Chairman-Elect, the Secretary, the Chairman of the Faculty Welfare Committee, and three members elected by the Faculty Senate in the spring to be widely representative of the University and to serve one-year terms. The three elected members may not succeed themselves. In addition, the Chairmen of the University Councils sit as ex-officio members, without vote, on the Executive Committee."

In accordance with the provisions of the Senate By-Laws, final action on this proposal will be taken by the Faculty Senate at its September 9, 1974, meeting.

ELECTION OF FACULTY REPLACEMENTS: University Councils and Committees.

At its April 8, 1974, meeting, the Senate was notified of the slate presented by its Committee on Committees for faculty replacements on various University Councils and Committees. (See pages 3-6 of the Senate Journal for April 8, 1974.)

Following additional nominations from the floor at the May 6, 1974, meeting, the Senate voted by written ballot with the following results:

ELECTIONS:

<u>Academic Personnel</u> <u>Council</u>	Sarah Crim (Home Economics)	1974-77
	George Fraser (Law)	1974-77
	Richard Baker (Political Science)	1974-77
<u>Academic Program</u> <u>Council</u>	Cecil Lee (Art)	1974-77
	Howard Day (Geol. & Geophysics)	1974-77
	Michael Devine (Ind. Engineering)	1974-77
	Kenneth Taylor (History of Science)	1974-76
	William Wilson (Architecture)	1974-75
<u>Administrative and</u> <u>Physical Resources</u> <u>Council</u>	Charles Mankin (Geol. & Geophy.)	1974-77
	R. Dale Vliet (Law)	1974-77
	James Kenderdine (Marketing)	1974-77
<u>Budget Council</u>	F. Ted Hebert (Pol. Science)	1974-77
	Michael Hennagin (Music)	1974-77
	Donald Perkins (Zoology)	1974-77
	Nelson Nunnally (Geography)	1974-75
<u>Research Council</u>	Robert Magarian (Pharmacy)	1974-77
	Donald Cox (Botany/Micro.)	1974-77
	Karl Bergey (AMNE)	1974-77
	Jitendra Mohanty (Philosophy)	1974-76
	John Renner (Education)	1974-76
<u>Faculty Advisory</u> <u>Committee to the</u> <u>President</u>	David Kitts (Geol./Geophysics)	1974-76
	Tom Wiggins (Education)	1974-76
	Seymour Feiler (Modern Lang.)	1974-76
	Lee Poole (Drama)	1974-76
	Charles Bert (AMNE)	1974-76
	Ray Mill (HSC)	1974-76
	Harold Huneke (Mathematics)	1974-75
<u>Faculty Appeals Board</u>	Richard Fowler (Physics)	1974-78
	Davis Egle (AMNE)	1974-78
	Robert Bell (Anthropology)	1974-78
	Celia Mae Bryant (Music)	1974-78
	Jay Shurley (HSC)	1974-78
	Wilson B. Prickett (Finance)	1974-77
	Larry Canter (CEES)	1974-76

NOMINATIONS:

<u>Athletics Council</u>	Russell Buhite (History)	1974-77
	Rex Inman (Meteorology)	1974-77
	Thomas Curtis (Economics)	1974-77
	Roy Male (English)	1974-77

Faculty Awards and Honors Council

David Ross Boyd	John Ezell (History)	1974-77
Professor:	Paul Ruggiers (English)	1974-77
Regents Professor:	George Goodman (Botany/Micro.)	1974-77
	Glen Snider (Education)	1974-77
Faculty at Large:	Robert Patnode (HSC)	1974-75
	Inez Hayes (HSC)	1974-75

Academic Regulations
Committee

V. Stanley Vardys (Pol. Science)	1974-78
Paul Risser (Botany/Micro.)	1974-78
Norman Byrd (Architecture)	1974-78
Fred Miller (Law)	1974-78

Class Schedule
Committee

Lloyd Iverson (Mathematics)	1974-78
Neal Huffaker (Physics)	1974-78
Tom Miller (Psychology)	1974-78
Sabetai Ungaru (History/Science)	1974-78
Frank Seto (Zoology)	1974-77
Mary E. Saxon (Library)	1974-77

Commencement Committee

Tim Ragan (Education)	1974-77
Eugene Cates (Education)	1974-77
Ben Taylor (Economics)	1974-77
Edwin Mumma (Management)	1974-77

Computer Advisory
Committee

Henry Crichlow (P G & E)	1974-77
Jack Stoughton (EE)	1974-77
Roger Frech (Chemistry)	1974-77
Gary Schnell (Zoology)	1974-77
C. G. Gunn (HSC)	1974-77
Neal Hardin (HSC)	1974-77
Lauren Wispe (Psychology)	1974-75
William Graves (Education)	1974-75

Equal Employment
Opportunities Committee

Jose Maldonado (Law)	1974-75
Bing Fung (Chemistry)	1974-75

Patent Advisory Committee

Darrel Harden (AMNE)	1974-78
Marion C. Phillips (Marketing)	1974-78

ROTC Advisory Committee

James Faulconer (Music)	1974-77
Ray Larson (Drama)	1974-77
Ann Kelly Wood (Human Relations)	1974-77
J. F. Harp (CEES)	1974-77
John Fletcher (Botany/Micro.)	1974-77
Arthur Myers (Geol./Geophysics)	1974-77
Casey Robinson (Pharmacy)	1974-75
Fred Shellabarger (Architecture)	1974-75
Dennis Crites (Marketing)	1974-76
Burt Scanlan (Management)	1974-76
Guadalupe Thompson (Modern Lang.)	1974-76
Jane Zingale (Art)	1974-76

<u>Scholarship and Financial Aids Committee</u>	Osborne Reynolds (Law)	1974-76
	James Henkle (Art)	1974-76
	Donald Menzie (P&GE)	1974-76
	Seum Kahng (EE)	1974-76
	Richard Williams (Education)	1974-76
	John York (Architecture)	1974-76
	Eugene Menke (HSC)	1974-76
	Lorraine Singer (HSC)	1974-76
<u>University Book Exchange Oversight Committee</u>	Dortha Henderson (Home Economics)	1974-77
	Robert Emory (Modern Language)	1974-77
<u>University Libraries Committee</u>	Roger Fouts (Psychology)	1974-77
	Carolyn Swan (Modern Language)	1974-77
	Francis J. Schmitz (Chemistry)	1974-77
	William Huff (Mathematics)	1974-77
	George Stone (Geol./Geophysics)	1974-77
	Joseph Fritz (English)	1974-77
<u>Judicial Tribunal</u>	Charles Carpenter (Zoology)	1974-77
	Juneann Murphy (Botany/Microbiology)	1974-77
<u>Speakers Bureau</u>	Jack Catlin (Classics)	1974-77
	Tom Wilbanks (Geography)	1974-77
	Robert Shalhope (History)	1974-76
	Al Nicewander (Psychology)	1974-76
	James Yoch (English)	1974-75
	Paul Barefield (Speech)	1974-75
	(one holdover member to provide continuity in membership of this Bureau)	

FACULTY HANDBOOK DEFINITION OF "GENERAL FACULTY"

Background Information: As mentioned in "Action taken by Senate Executive Committee," on page 3-4 of this Journal, a Senate ad hoc Committee called the Senate's attention to the inadequate definition of General Faculty used in the Faculty Handbook. (See also page 7 of the Senate Journal for December 10, 1973.)

After studying this matter at some length, the Academic Personnel Council submitted the following proposal to the Senate:

"The term General Faculty which is defined at 3.1 in the Faculty Handbook is the only definition which is to be used for regular faculty members of the University of Oklahoma. This definition shall be used in interpreting the meaning of General Faculty, faculty, teaching staff, and staff whenever these terms are employed in the Faculty Handbook or in relation to the faculty of the University of Oklahoma. In the next revision of the Handbook, the word 'Faculty' shall be substituted whenever any of the above terms are employed."

Senate Action: After a brief discussion of this question, particularly the second sentence of the proposal, the Senate accepted Professor Fred Miller's motion to accept the proposal of the Academic Personnel Council, subject to further appropriate rewording by the Senate Executive Committee before submission to the President of the University.

PROPOSED UNIVERSITY COPYRIGHT POLICY

Background Information: Dr. C. Haden on October 5, 1973, requested Senate consideration of a copyright policy. The Senate ad hoc Committee studying this question reported to the Senate on January 23, 1974, with general guidelines rather than a specific copyright policy. On March 11, 1974, the Senate requested the ad hoc Committee to continue its deliberations with a view of presenting a recommendation for a specific copyright policy. (See pages 3-5 of the Senate Journal for March 11, 1974.)

On April 11, 1974, the ad hoc Committee Chairman addressed the following report to the Faculty Senate:

The Copyright Policy Committee met on April 4, and agreed in substance on the content of two memoranda, which were thereafter typed in D-R-A-F-T form and submitted to each member of the Committee and to Mr. Tom Tucker, Chief University Counsel. Thereafter the Committee met again on April 11, each member of the Committee having been notified in advance, and each member also indicating his satisfaction with the D-R-A-F-T version of both memos, and Mr. Tucker's office having been invited to attend the meeting or send a representative or a comment. Nothing having been heard from Mr. Tucker, the Committee adopted, without substantial change from the D-R-A-F-T form, each of the two memoranda, which are set out in full below.

Ad hoc Committee's Response to
Prof. Haden's March 12, 1974, memo objecting to variations between
the Patent Policy and the Copyright Policy

With one exception, no member of the Copyright Policy Committee is a Member of the Patent Policy Committee. The ad hoc Committee, in considering whether it should recommend that the University establish a copyright policy, was aware of the patent policy, and in now drafting a proposed Copyright Policy, the Committee believes:

1. The fact that there is a difference between the Patent Policy and the Copyright Policy does not necessarily mean there is something wrong with either the one, or the other, or both. The Copyright Policy committee expresses no views on the Patent Policy, which, however, it has read and discussed. The Committee can, however, see distinct differences between using university laboratories and allied facilities to develop a patentable invention or process, and using the university library in connection with writing a book or other copyrightable item. First of all, most of the library facilities are open to the whole faculty and student body, which is presumably unlike the situation regarding university laboratories. One feels free to go to the library to look at a book on auto mechanics or chemistry, but not to take his car to the University shops to make repairs, nor to use the University chemistry labs to experiment with or develop a new glue, solvent, firework, etc.

2. When a professor is out of his office, there is usually no one else who would be using his chair and his desk. Therefore, when he sits there, he is not using university facilities which are intended to be used by someone else at any time that the professor is not actually at work on university duties. Moreover, his very being there makes him accessible to students and to inter-office telephone calls from colleagues, University Committees, etc.

3. In fine: The Copyright Policy Committee has studied Professor Haden's March 12, 1974 memo to Dr. Hunsberger concerning the difference between the Patent and the Copyright policies, and has read the university's Patent Policy. Without presuming to judge the soundness of the Patent Policy or of the Senate's decision to adopt it, the Copyright Policy Committee cannot see any reason why the two policies must be identical or in all situations parallel. The Committee senses distinctions between

a professor sitting at his University office desk or reading University library books which are available to all faculty members and students, and a professor conducting experiments and tests in a University laboratory to which unrelated faculty and students have no access and in which one or more persons doing a sustained work might sharply reduce the amount of space available for other persons to use the laboratory and its facilities, and which laboratory equipment may in addition be very expensive and highly specialized, even if not required to be constructed for that very experiment or project.

Recommendation of an O. U. Copyright Policy

The Copyright Committee recommends the adoption of the following Copyright Policy for the University of Oklahoma, and further suggests that the accompanying Explanatory Comment might be adopted as an integral part of the policy statement:

In General, whenever a member of the University of Oklahoma faculty, administration or staff has produced or hereafter shall produce, any written or other copyrightable material, no claim shall be made by the University of Oklahoma to all or any part of either the property therein or the royalties therefrom, except in special cases where either: (1) the work is produced pursuant to a contract between the author and the University of Oklahoma or one of its constituent units which expressly or by unavoidable implication provides that the University is to have, or share in, the rights in or 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 agreement between the University and governmental or other agency or organization, having as its purpose, or one of its major purposes, the creation of such works and their publication.

This Explanatory Comment is hereby adopted as an integral part of the above stated Copyright Policy:

- (a) Obviously, where the University hires someone to prepare a promotional or instructional 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.
- (b) For the University 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 the University to undertake any publication activity except for contributions to non-royalty publications. The result would be a great disservice to the University.
- (c) The University has no moral claim to the royalties, whenever received, of works created by a member of its faculty, administration or staff, prior to his becoming affiliated with it or after the severance of that affiliation.
- (d) Nor does the University have any basis for claiming participation in royalties arising from works created by a member of its faculty, administration or staff during the time of the University of Oklahoma affiliation, if such work is unrelated to his University duties and is done on his own time and not on University premises.
- (e) 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 the University, and includes such incidental use of University property as his room, a University typewriter and paper, and even the use of a University typist and the use of library or other facilities available generally to the faculty and staff, the University should make no claim to any share of the rights in such work.

Senate Action: Professor Elmer M. Million, ad hoc Committee Chairman, appeared before the Senate to discuss the Committee report and to answer any questions from the floor. His motion to accept the Committee report and recommendations was followed by considerable discussion of several aspects of the report. Dr. Sherril Christian subsequently moved that all paragraphs other than the second paragraph of the recommendations of that Committee be deleted. With one dissenting vote, the Senate approved the amendment to the original motion to accept the recommendations of that Committee. Later, in a voice vote without dissent, the Senate approved the Committee recommendation as thus amended; i.e., only the second paragraph of the Committee recommendation.

STUDENT CHEATING AND PLAGIARISM

Background Information: On December 10, 1973, the Faculty Senate approved the recommendations of its ad hoc Committee regarding proposed revisions in the Student Code and the Faculty Handbook on the subject of student misconduct. (See pages 4-6 of the Faculty Senate Journal for December 10, 1973.) On January 28, 1974, President Sharp indicated that further review of this matter appeared to be warranted and promised to keep the Senate posted in this matter. (See page 2 of the Senate Journal for February 11, 1974.)

On April 10, 1974, Dr. Paul Sharp, President of the University, addressed the following memorandum request to the Senate Chairman:

You may recall that on January 28, I wrote Professor Anthony Lis, Secretary of the Faculty Senate, that I was asking for further review of the proposed changes enacted by the Faculty Senate on December 10, 1973, concerning student cheating and plagiarism. I asked Acting Assistant Provost Geoffrey Marshall, Dr. Beverly Ledbetter (Legal Counsel's Office), Mr. Jack Stout (Center for Student Development), and Mr. Robert Legg (UOSA) to make the review in light of some questions which had arisen.

Following their report and additional review by my staff, I propose the attached changes in place of those approved by the Faculty Senate on December 10, 1973. The essence of the Senate revisions remains unchanged, and the new version primarily clarifies ambiguities and matters of procedure. The major differences from that passed by the Senate include:

- a. Clarification of the role of the Judicial Tribunal concerning decisions regarding grades to make it clear that that is a faculty matter.
- b. Retention of the concept that the dean recommends to the President, rather than takes final action, regarding such matters as expulsion.
- c. Excludes the College of Law from review by the Judicial Tribunal because of the opinion of the College of Law that the language of the American Bar Association Standards for Legal Education dictates against such review outside of the College of the College faculty's actions.
- d. Emphasizes further the notification of the student of the charges against him and his right to a hearing.

I wish to thank the Senate for raising this matter through its action of December 10. I hope that the Senate will give these further revisions very serious consideration, and I look forward to receiving the Senate's advice after it has made its review.

CHANGES IN THE STUDENT CODE AND FACULTY HANDBOOK
CONCERNING STUDENT CHEATING AND PLAGIARISM

Changes to the Student Code:

- (1) Section XI.A., revise the last sentence to read - "When dishonesty is primarily related to an academic matter such as cheating or plagiarism, the provisions of the Faculty Handbook shall apply."
- (2) Section XIX, paragraph numbered 1, add - "In the event of an appeal involving cheating or plagiarism, at the request of the student the board must grant a hearing."
- (3) Section XX.C.2. (fourth line) Insert following the word member: "(excepting decision involving grades)."

The entire paragraph would then read: "The University Judicial Tribunal shall have jurisdiction to decide an appeal by any member of the University community from a decision of any court adverse to that member (excepting decisions involving grades) concerning."

- (4) Section XX.C.2., add the following new paragraph following sub-section d: "A student appeal of a recommendation to the President by a dean for censure, disciplinary probation, suspension, or expulsion as the result of cheating or plagiarism shall be heard by the University Judicial Tribunal. This provision shall not apply to the College of Law."

Changes to the Faculty Handbook:

- (1) Section 4.11, add a new paragraph to the paragraph numbered 1 - "However, in the event of an appeal involving cheating or plagiarism, at the request of the student, the board must grant a hearing. Further, in a case of cheating or plagiarism, the burden of proof rests with the faculty member."
- (2) Section 4.12, add a new paragraph - "Prior to recommending further disciplinary action to the President the dean shall (1) notify the student of the charges against him and of his right to a hearing and (2) if the student chooses to have a hearing, provide an opportunity to be heard either by an ad hoc Committee appointed by the dean or by the dean privately. A copy of this notice should (in accordance with the Student Code XXVI.A.1.a) be forwarded to the Director of Student Development."
- (3) Section 4.12, add a new final paragraph - "A student appeal of a recommendation to the President by a dean for censure, disciplinary probation, suspension, or expulsion as the result of cheating or plagiarism shall be heard by the University Judicial Tribunal. This provision shall not apply to the College of Law."

Senate Action: After a brief discussion of this question, Dr. Duchon moved acceptance of the revisions as proposed by President Sharp. The Senate approved the motion without dissent.

PROPOSAL FOR FALL MIDSEMESTER BREAK

Background Information: At the February 11, 1974, meeting of the Senate, Mr. Mark Andersen, a UOSA representative, suggested consideration of a fall midsemester break to coincide with the OU-Texas football game. The Senate considered a formal proposal from Mr. Andersen at its April 8, 1974, session. Inasmuch as he was not present at that meeting to answer questions from the floor, the Senate postponed final action until the May 6, 1974, meeting. (See page 12 of the Senate Journal for April 8, 1974.)

Senate Action: In his comments to the Senate, Mr. Andersen referred to Mr. Verner Ekstrom's comment at the February 11 meeting that he hopes to phase out Tuesday as a day of registration by fall, 1975-76. Mr. Andersen suggested that the fall semester classes begin on Tuesday and thus allow for a day off during the semester. He proposed that either the Friday preceding or the Monday following the game be established as a holiday to provide a fall midsemester break that would coincide with the OU-Texas football game.

After several questions from the floor, the Senate Chairman asked for a faculty motion to bring Mr. Andersen's proposal officially before the Senate for final consideration. No such motion was forthcoming from the floor and the proposal lapsed.

DAVID ROSS BOYD PROFESSORSHIPS

Background Information: Last fall, Dr. Jim E. Reese suggested Senate consideration of secretarial help for the Boyd Professors and a separate budget for all distinguished professors. This suggestion was forwarded, in turn, by the Senate Executive Committee to the Council on Faculty Awards and Honors for study and recommendation. Dr. F. Mark Townsend, Council Chairman, submitted the following report to the Senate on March 19, 1974:

A subcommittee of the Council attempted to contact every Boyd Professor on campus. All could not be reached for various reasons, but most were contacted and gave their views on the two items given above.

With respect to secretarial help, most Boyd Professors had no special need for such help, but several expressed needs which ranged from moderate to extreme. Several reported spending much time in routine secretarial duties such as filing, typing, and messenger service. In one case, a greater need was expressed for teaching assistance in the form of preparing teaching aids and conducting library reference work.

With respect to a separate budget, most Boyd Professors did not see any need or advantage for a separate budget. Several expressed the opinion that a more important need was to raise the very low salaries being paid to some Boyd Professors. The initial financial benefit resulting from the appointment was acknowledged, but there was no advantage shown to the Boyd Professor in subsequent years. In fact, two were rather bitter about their experiences and asserted that this appointment really meant nothing after the first year.

The Council considered the material gathered by the subcommittee and, after an extended discussion, reached these conclusions:

1. Every effort should be made to meet the need of a David Ross Boyd Professor for secretarial and other assistance to support his teaching functions.
2. Although a separate budget for David Ross Boyd Professors is not required, some special procedures should be instituted to review the teaching and counseling loads, the merits of the performance and the salaries of these distinguished professors.

To implement these conclusions the Council recommends the following procedure--which should be added to Paragraph 3.10.1, Part (a), Faculty Handbook (January, 1974):

1. The chair of David Ross Boyd Professor shall carry with it suitable teaching, counseling and guidance aids as are approved by the President upon recommendation of the Provost.
2. Each year the Dean of the College in which a David Ross Boyd Professor is budgeted shall consult with the chairman of the appropriate department or school and with any other Dean who may have knowledge of these matters, and shall determine with respect to each Boyd Professor and recommend to the Provost:
 - a. An evaluation of the Professor's teaching, research and counseling effectiveness;
 - b. The amount of the instructional load,--including the research, counseling and guidance of students--which the professor shall carry each semester during the ensuing year;
 - c. The amount and kind of secretarial help, teaching assistance, counseling or guidance aids needed; and
 - d. The appropriate salary.
3. Consonant with the Provost's decision, the chairman of the department or school (or Committee or other body usually assigned such responsibilities) will determine (a) the courses which the David Ross Boyd Professor shall teach each semester, and (b) the counseling and guidance tasks to be assigned.

Senate Action: The Senate Chairman formally presented the above Council report and its recommendations for Senate consideration. During the ensuing discussion, the consensus of the Senate was that the words "and Committee A" should be added after the word "chairman" in paragraph 2 of the Council recommendations so that the revised paragraph should read as follows:

"2. Each year the Dean of the College in which a David Ross Boyd Professor is budgeted shall consult with the chairman and Committee 'A' of the appropriate department or school and with any other Dean who may have knowledge of these matters, and shall determine with respect to each Boyd Professor and recommend to the Provost:"

As thus amended, the report of the Council was accepted and the recommendations were approved by the Senate without dissent.

ELECTION: Chairman-Elect, Faculty Senate, 1974-75

In accepting a motion by Dr. Bernard MacDonald, the Senate elected by acclamation Dr. Gail de Stwolinski (Music) as its Chairman-Elect for 1974-75.

RE-ELECTION: Secretary, Faculty Senate, 1974-75

In accepting a motion by Dr. J. Clayton Feaver, the Senate re-elected by acclamation Dr. Anthony S. Lis (Business Communication) as its Secretary for 1974-75.

RESOLUTION OF APPRECIATION: Dr. Wm. H. Maehl, Jr.

Professor Lolly Beaird moved adoption of the following resolution of thanks to the outgoing Senate Chairman, Dr. Wm. H. Maehl, Jr.:

WHEREAS Professor William Maehl has participated as a member of the Faculty Senate for many years and has provided leadership as Chairman of the Faculty Senate for the past year and one-half, and

WHEREAS Professor Maehl has been most generous with his time and energy on behalf of the faculty and the Faculty Senate, and

WHEREAS Professor Maehl has been an articulate spokesman on behalf of the faculty, and

WHEREAS the past year and one-half have been particularly critical for the University in relation to budgetary and administrative matters, and thus a particular challenge for faculty representation, and

WHEREAS the Senate has made substantial accomplishment under Professor Maehl's capable leadership particularly in the academic and administrative arenas,

THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that the faculty publicly express its appreciation to Professor Maehl for his outstanding leadership in the Faculty Senate and for his personal and professional contributions to the University of Oklahoma and the University community.

The Senate approved the resolution by acclamation.

ADJOURNMENT

The Faculty Senate adjourned at 5:03 p.m. The next regular meeting of the Faculty Senate will be held at 3:30 p.m., on Monday, September 9, 1974, in Dale Hall 218. Items for the Agenda should reach the Secretary of the Faculty Senate, EAP Division, Adams Hall 9-A, no later than Wednesday, August 28, 1974.

Respectfully submitted,

Anthony S. Lis, Secretary