

JOURNAL OF THE FACULTY SENATE (Norman campus)
The University of Oklahoma

Regular Session -- October 14, 1974 -- 3:30 p.m., Dale Hall, 218

The Faculty Senate was called to order by Dr. Martin C. Jishcke, Chairman.

<u>Present:</u>	Baker, Marvin	Huff, William	Reid, William T.
	Barefield, Paul	Huneke, Harold V.	Reynolds, Osborne
	Bell, Digby	Jischke, Martin C.	Scheffer, Walter
	Bethel, Audrey	Kendall, Jack L.	Schmitz, Francis
	Braver, Gerald	Kidd, Gerald	Shahan, Robert
	Buhite, Russell	Kraynak, Matthew	Sterling, K. E.
	Calvert, Floyd	Larson, Raymond	Streebin, Leale
	de Stwolinski, Gail	Lehrman, G. Philip	Sutherland, Patrick
	Duchon, Claude	Letchworth, George	Swank, David
	Estes, James	Levinson, R. Saul	Tolliver, Lennie-Marie
	Fife, James	Marchand, Alan	Unruh, Delbert L.
	Ford, Robert A.	Mouser, James W.	Uptegraft, Jo Ellen
	Fowler, Richard	Pollak, Betty	Wells, Richard
	Graves, Wm. H.	Prickett, Wilson B.	Whitecotton, Joseph
	Henderson, Bob		
	UOSA representatives:	none	
<u>Absent:</u>	Blair, Laura B.	Kondonassis, Alex	Tolson, Melvin B.
	Cronenwett, Wm. T.	Shellabarger, Fred	Tomberlin, Irma
	Donnell, Ruth		
	UOSA representatives:	Ahmed, Zia	Bake, Betty
		Andersen, Mark	Collins, Mark

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

The Journal of the Faculty Senate for the regular session on September 9, 1974, was approved.

REMINDER NOTICE: Award Program for Innovative Teaching Techniques

Dr. Jischke, Senate Chairman, called attention to Ms. Cathy Kidd's (President, University of Oklahoma Student Association) establishment of a \$2,000 fund to recognize innovative teaching techniques (see page 8 of the Senate Journal for September 9, 1974). He urged faculty members to give serious consideration to this commendable program and to submit their proposals to Ms. Kidd.

ANNOUNCEMENT: Fall meeting of the General Faculty

The General Faculty of the University of Oklahoma will meet at 3:30 p.m., on Thursday, October 24, 1974, in Room 150, Adams Hall Annex (College of Business Administration).

ACTIONS TAKEN BY PRESIDENT PAUL F. SHARP

- (1) Faculty Replacement - Administrative and Physical Resources Council: On September 16, 1974, Dr. Paul F. Sharp, President of the University, approved the Senate election of Professor Robert Lehr as the one-year (1974-75) replacement for Professor Goins on the Administrative and Physical Resources Council. (See page 14 of the Senate Journal for September 9, 1974.)
- (2) Search Committee - Graduate Dean: On September 24, 1974, Dr. Paul F. Sharp, University President, appointed the following University-wide Graduate Dean Search Committee:

Professors Digby Bell
Robert Bell
Doyle Bishop
Robert DuBois

Tom Love
 Joanna Rapf
 Paul Risser
 Tom Wiggins
 Messrs. Henry Kidd
 Robert H. Ross
 Ms. Bea Nelson

President Sharp's charge to the above Committee included the following comments:

"The person selected will have responsibilities of the Graduate Dean for the Norman campus and Research Administration for the Norman campus. These responsibilities will be similar to those held by Dean Gentile except that consistent with the separate academic organization for the Health Sciences Center--a separate Provost for the Health Sciences and the new Faculty Senate there--the responsibilities at the Health Sciences Center will be handled by others within the Health Sciences Center academic organization.

"I ask that you begin a thorough search appropriate to the position and consistent with the affirmative action obligations of the University. I would like to receive from you the names and supporting materials for at least three and not more than five candidates, any of whom the Search Committee believes would be suitable to fill the position.

"I hope that the work of the Committee can be carried on expeditiously so that you may have your recommendations to me by mid-February. I would like to be able to present my recommendation to the Regents at their March meeting."

(See pages 13 and 14 of the Faculty Senate Journal for September 9, 1974.)

- (3) Task Force on Personnel Policy: In line with his remarks at the September 9 meeting of the Senate (see page 7 of the Senate Journal for September 9, 1974), Dr. Paul F. Sharp, President of the University, appointed the following Task Force on Personnel Policy:

Provost I. Moyer Hunsberger, Chairman (non-voting)
 Dean Paige E. Mulhollan
 Associate Dean Malcolm Morris
 Professor Gail de Stwolinski
 Professor Thomas J. Wilbanks
 Professor Daniel G. Gibbens
 Professor Jerry L. Pursewell
 Professor Kenneth L. Taylor
 Professor Arrell M. Gibson
 Professor Don Cox
 Professor Melvin B. Tolson, Jr.
 Mr. Walter O. Mason (non-voting)
 Assistant Provost Geoffrey Marshall (non-voting)

In his memorandum of September 9, 1974, to the members of the Task Force, Dr. Paul F. Sharp, President of the University, presented the following charge to that group:

The Task Force should conduct a thorough reexamination of the current faculty personnel policy and should recommend desirable improvements in any aspects of this policy. The chief objective of our policy should be to insure the recruitment, retention, and professional development of a faculty capable of carrying out all aspects of OU's mission at a level of quality which will enable the University to be compared in more favorable terms with those state universities throughout the country (and, in particular, with those in the Big Eight) which are members of the American Association of Universities. Hence, the Task Force probably will wish to study the personnel policies of selected state universities worthy of evaluation and to be guided, where appropriate, by their experience.

The resulting personnel policy should be flexible enough to accommodate legitimate differences among the various departments, schools, and colleges, but firm enough to insure that all academic units insist on a level of quality which is consistent with the mission I have already mentioned.

The final report of the Task Force should contain proposed language suitable for use in a future revision of the Faculty Handbook. If at all possible, the final report should be submitted no later than May 15, 1975, so that the Faculty Senate could be asked to consider the report in the Fall of 1975 and so that the new policy could be presented to the Regents in late 1975 or early 1976.

The establishment of this Task Force constitutes a response to a request made several months ago by the OU Board of Regents, as well as a major step toward "...campus-wide implementation of extant good programs for evaluating, rewarding, and improving faculty accomplishments," as urged by the Faculty Senate Committee on Career Development.

In order that the Task Force may accomplish the assigned task in the proposed time frame, we suggest that much of its work be conducted by sub-committees, each of which might concentrate on one of the following areas:

- (1) Functions of departmental, college, and university administrators, committees, and councils.
- (2) Term appointments and reappointments, salary increases.
- (3) Promotions and tenure.
- (4) Distinguished professorships, teaching and research awards and fellowships, leaves, etc.
- (5) Academic freedom, benefits, working conditions, welfare, appeals, and grievances.

Two voting members of the Task Force also will be members of each sub-committee, and one of them will serve as Sub-Committee Chairman. Each sub-committee Chairman will select four to six additional members so as to obtain representation of a broad spectrum of faculty viewpoints. The Faculty Senate will be asked to assist the Chairman in selecting members for the sub-committees. In this way, more than thirty faculty members will be involved intimately in this important work. The Task Force will coordinate the work of the sub-committees and will prepare the final report.

The Provost has compiled a rather long list of proposals for consideration by the Task Force. Perhaps chief among these is the need to improve processes for evaluation of faculty, including the use of outside evaluators, as recommended by the Faculty Senate Committee on Career Development; this, in turn, requires the development of clearer criteria for awarding promotion, tenure, and salary increases. As I pointed out at the April, 1974, Faculty Meeting, many faculty colleagues believe the tenure decision should be made in the sixth, rather than the fourth, year of service, in accord with AAUP tenets and the practice of most universities. Consideration should be given to the need for college-wide committees to review promotion and tenure recommendations and to their functions vis-a-vis the university-wide Academic Personnel Council. Consideration should also be given to what limitations a high proportion of tenured faculty may have on developing new academic programs in response to changing needs. The implications of the relationship between salary and rank must be studied. The concepts of Equal Employment Opportunity and Affirmative Action need to be incorporated explicitly into all Faculty Handbook procedures for appointing, promoting, retaining, and rewarding faculty. The desirability of making separate provision for hearing faculty complaints involving academic freedom, due process, or sex or ethnic discrimination also seems worthy of investigation. Improved criteria

and procedures for selecting and for providing special support for distinguished professors seem desirable, as I emphasized in my response of August 19, 1974, to the Faculty Senate proposal concerning David Ross Boyd Professorships.

The Task Force need not consider the subject of outside employment and extra compensation because the proposals generated by last year's task force on this subject currently are before the Faculty Senate. Similarly, the subject of retirement is being studied by a separate, ongoing committee.

ANNOUNCEMENT: Fall, 1974, joint meeting of the Executive Committees of OU and OSU faculty groups.

In accordance with precedent established a few years ago, the Executive Committee of the Oklahoma University Faculty Senate and the Oklahoma State University Faculty Council will hold their fall, 1974, joint meeting in Stillwater on Wednesday evening, November 20, 1974.

Dr. Jischke, Senate Chairman, solicited faculty suggestions for appropriate agenda topics.

ELECTION RESULTS: Senate replacements

The Senate Secretary has been notified of the following results of recent elections of Senate replacements for 1974-77:

College of Business Administration: Alexander J. Kondonassis (Economics)
 College of Engineering: Leale E. Stresbin (CEES)
 College of Environmental Design: Fred Shellabarger (Architecture)

REPORTS OF UNIVERSITY COUNCILS: Spring semester, 1974

Academic Program Council: On September 3, 1974, Dr. Gail de Stwolinski, Chairman of the Academic Program Council, submitted the following report to the Faculty Senate for the spring semester, 1974:

- I. The routine of considering and recommending action on course adoptions, deletions, and changes can now be handled with greater efficiency and, generally, greater dispatch. Information concerning the process of initiating new courses or course changes needs wider dissemination to departments. Particularly, departments should be encouraged to take all necessary steps to avoid duplication of existing courses through preliminary checking and consultation before the course proposal is sent forward.
- II. As a result of the revised procedures for Council recommendation on course adoptions, deletions and changes, the Council would now be able to focus attention on item I (A, B and C) and item II (A and B) of the revised policies as stated in the Faculty Senate minutes of April 9, 1973. In order to accomplish any University-wide encouragement of superior and improved teaching and of program development, however, the Council must seek funds from the administration.
- III. The Council of 1973-74 began a limited study of data prepared by the Office of Admissions and Records. The objective of the study was to recommend to departments that apparently defunct courses be deleted from their curricula. This study was never completed. Additional data requested by the Council could not be supplied at the appropriate time because of other immediate and more urgent demands on the Office of Admissions and Records. Completion of the study is recommended to the 1974-75 Council, who may wish also to request that future data need be supplied on a regular basis.
- IV. It is recommended that the Council policies and procedures as revised in 1972-73 be amended to include the election of the new Council chairman at the last meeting of each academic year rather than at the first meeting.
- V. Consideration of OHETIS and the economic and curricular burden that it imposes on departments.

A question was raised from the floor concerning the lack of appropriate publication of course changes, deletions, and additions. Dr. Gerald Kidd, incoming Chairman of the Academic Program Council, announced that public notice will henceforth be given in the Today publication.

Administrative and Physical Resources Council: On September 18, 1974, Professor Arnold Henderson, Chairman of the Administrative and Physical Resources Council, submitted the following report for the spring semester, 1974, to the Faculty Senate:

During the Spring Semester, 1974, the Administrative and Physical Resources Council met eight times from January 3 to June 25. A primary effort this past semester focused on the development of policies relating to University building renovation, new construction, and the organizational responsibility for space allocation. The attached policy statement on building and space priorities which was formulated by the Council has been approved by President Sharp. The Council is presently engaged in developing procedures for operationalization of these policies.

A continuing and on-going effort was directed at reviewing space priorities and the Capital Improvements Program, including projects funded by both HERO Bonds and Section 13 funds.

Policies relating to the naming of buildings and spaces within the University were also considered and are undergoing continuing study. The Council recently recommended the Wind Tunnel be named the L. A. Comp Wind Tunnel in recognition of the contributions to the University by Professor Emeritus Comp.

Finally, the Council elected Professor John Francis, AMNE, as chairman for the 1974-75 year.

* * * * *

POLICY STATEMENT ON BUILDING AND SPACE RESOURCES

Administrative and Physical Resources Council

1. No University space is proprietary; space is a university-wide resource.
2. Office, teaching, and laboratory space for a discipline should be contiguous to the degree possible and desired.
3. The organizational responsibility for space allocation should follow the usual administrative channels. For academic areas this would be through the department chairman, to the dean, and the Provost. For other vice-presidential areas it would go from the department head through appropriate administrative officers to the appropriate vice-president.
4. The Administrative and Physical Resources Council shall make a review of the standards and priorities as described in this policy at least as often as indicated.
- *5. The classification system for space used by the Vice-President for Administration and Finance and the Provost should be reviewed annually. (Appendix A)
- *6. Equitable standards for space allocations developed by the Vice-President for Administration and Finance and the Provost should be reviewed annually. (Appendix B)
7. A survey of current space configuration and use should be maintained on a current basis.
- *8. Institutional priorities for new construction developed by the Vice-President for Administration and Finance and the Provost should be reviewed annually. (Appendix C)
- *9. Institutional priorities for renovation developed by the Vice-President for Administration and Finance and the Provost should be reviewed annually. (Appendix D)
- *10. Institutional priorities for the use of Section 13 monies developed by the Vice-President for Administration and Finance and the Provost should be reviewed annually. (Appendix E)

11. In reviewing the priorities, the Council will consider such questions as: What criteria were used in forming the priorities? What are alternatives to the presented plans, listed in priority order? How will these plans be affected by long-range plans? How will construction affect surrounding activities? How will the appearance of the facility or renovation relate to surrounding buildings and spaces?

*Appendices are currently being prepared by the Vice-President for Administration and Finance and the Provost for review by the Council.

Budget Council: Dr. Robert Shahan, Chairman of the Budget Council, submitted the following report for the spring semester, 1974, to the Faculty Senate:

The Budget Council met twenty-three times in 1973-74 as a part of its regular review, evaluation, and planning activities. The Council met during the Spring semester with Dr. James Zink (Director of the OU Libraries), and Dr. Henry Tobias (Chairman of the Committee on Libraries) with Mr. Ed Shaw (Director of the University of Oklahoma Press), with Vice President Thurman White, and with all Budget Deans except Law and those at the Health Sciences Center. The Council also met with Graduate Dean Gentile to discuss the OURI-ORA modification and the general problem of research funds at the University. All of the deans were very cooperative and highly specific in their discussions with the Council. The reports of the two new deans, Drs. Baloff and Mulhollan, were especially well prepared and useful.

During the planning sessions for the 1974-75 budget, the Council recommended to the President quite unequivocally that the salary and wage profile at the University must be improved even at the cost of stand-still (or even cutting back) of worthy programs. The President reported to the Council at its last meeting (May 16, 1974) that approximately \$500,000 had been "saved" for 1974-75 by cutbacks in operations and administrative budgets. He assured us that the substantial portion of the recovered monies and of new monies would be used for salary and wage increases. He indicated that the Council's strong stand on this matter, coupled with similar recommendations from the Dean's Council, was a great help to him in arriving at a similar conclusion.

The Council must report that in one or two instances substantial sums of money (upwards of \$50,000) were committed both for 74-75 and for 75-76 without Council review. Indeed, one such commitment was made in February while the Council was notified only in late April. The Council has unequivocally and repeatedly stated to the President that program evaluation must precede such decisions and that the Academic Program Council and the Budget Council are properly parties to such evaluations.

The Council has reiterated its conviction that the computer management at the University is less than adequate. Territoriality appears to be as significant a variable as long-range objectives and efficiency. The faculty interests are in this instance no more global (that is, less provincial) than those of the ADP personnel. Some organizational changes have occurred over the summer in the computer management/services team at the University.

The Council long ago alerted the President that the University's posture in respect to funding women's varsity and intramural sports would surely be reviewed and that we would surely be found lacking. The Council feels that it shares the credit for the progress made in this area with interested students and faculty groups.

The Council has reported that we feel that the data base for program evaluation, cost analysis, and judgments concerning program effectiveness are often misleading and often available only long after the time when it would be useful in either making changes or planning for the future.

There were, in fact, no summer meetings of the Budget Council since the Provost's office did not provide the information requested and promised that could have allowed

the Council to begin its review of the current budget. Dr. Leon Zelby was elected Chairman of the Budget Council for 1974-75. Dr. Zelby intends to make substantial use of subcommittees to try to get at a number of issues and problems still confronting the University.

Publications Board: Professor Jack Bickham, Board Chairman, on September 26, 1974, submitted the following report for the Publications Board for the second semester, 1973-74:

The Publications Board completed action on setting up a new major staff position for the Oklahoma Daily, that of Ethnic Minority Affairs Editor. This paid position sets up a special editor near the top of the Daily's student administrative echelons with an eye toward assuring that a member of an ethnic minority can screen copy for unintended slurs against minorities, and to suggest coverage of minority affairs in the student newspaper. This editor also was given charge of special minority affairs pages in the paper each week, although care was exercised to point out that this guaranteed space was not intended to create a journalistic "ghetto" for news which properly should appear on page 1 or elsewhere. The first minority affairs editor was a black Journalism major, Charles Coulter. He had limited success in recruiting members of other minorities to serve as his advisory board, an ad hoc group intended to provide maximum input from minorities other than blacks.

The board selected new editors for the Daily and the yearbook under prescribed procedures.

Given adverse comments from the Oklahoma Press Association about language that sometimes appeared in The Daily, the board commended the paper's adviser and staff for improvements in news coverage in 1973-74, but asked for a stricter interpretation of existing Daily procedural rules which state, in effect, that vulgar language will be printed only when necessary for reader understanding of a given story.

In other actions, the board gave the Daily editor some further discretion in allocating his limited budget for payments to staff members, special editors, etc., rejected a proposal for format experimentation with the Daily at this time, approved budgets, and accepted recommendations for bookkeeping detail changes from an audit group commissioned by the board to study business office procedures.

Research Council: Dr. Betty Pollak, Council Chairman, submitted the following report on September 24, 1974, on the activities of the Research Council during the spring semester, 1974:

The Research Council met weekly during most of the 1973-74 year. Several meetings were held with President Sharp and/or Provost Hunsberger as well as individual meetings with most of the deans. Discussions with administrative officers centered largely around concerns about the importance of research. Our discussions concentrated on 1) the institutional support available for research activities, 2) policies, procedures, and priorities for the allocation of available funds, 3) policies and procedures for encouraging and rewarding research as these relate specifically to promotion, salary, and tenure considerations, and, 4) the most effective role for the Research Council in promoting and encouraging research and other creative activities within the University.

During the year, the Council (1) distributed a survey instrument (Survey of Research and Creative Activities and Capabilities) which is presently being studied and analyzed by the Office of Research Administration (2) reviewed applications and made recommendations to the Vice-Provost for Research on Junior Faculty Summer Fellowships (these funds were made available by the Executive Committee of OURI), (3) reviewed applications and made recommendations to the Vice-Provost for Research on Sabbatical Leave Awards (these funds were made available by the Executive Committee of OURI), (4) submitted a

policy statement regarding research to President Sharp (Enclosure 1), submitted a list of specific recommendations to President Sharp (Enclosure 2), and (6) the chairman and chairman-elect (Dr. Thomas M. Murray) spent considerable time in discussions with Provost Hunsberger regarding expenditure of research funds. These discussions resulted in the memorandum of August 23, 1974, to the Office of the Graduate Dean. (Enclosure 3).

ENCLOSURE 1: On February 1, 1974, Dr. Betty Pollak, Chairman, Research Council, addressed the following letter to Dr. Paul F. Sharp, President of the University:

The University Research Council has been concerned with finding ways to actively encourage and promote research and other creative activities within the entire university community. It is the view of the Council that one of the most serious hindrances at the present time is the absence of a clear statement from the administration on the role of research not only as it relates to the primary mission of the University of Oklahoma, but also its relationship to the academic reward system.

The University Research Council is submitting a policy statement regarding research which we feel should be communicated to the entire faculty. The Council would appreciate a response from the administration regarding the general thrust of our statement as well as your views on the appropriateness of presenting this to the general faculty.

Research Policy Statement

One of the primary missions of the University of Oklahoma is to foster, develop and encourage basic and applied research and creative activities in all areas of endeavor. Research and publication are fundamental to the University's life, not only to further the growth of knowledge, but also to support genuinely creative and great teaching at all levels. In order to provide an environment conducive to productive scholarship, the university must reward research with the understanding that excellence in teaching and research are inextricably related. The encouragement of research must be a continuing proposition and must involve as comprehensive a system as possible.

The University must commit itself to building the financial support necessary for research and creative activities. In addition to seeing that productive scholarship is rewarded in salary, promotion, and tenure considerations, the University must provide research stipends, support services and facilities, and funds for travel to do research and to attend professional meetings. A total plan for encouraging and rewarding research will require leadership and forthright acknowledgement at the highest echelons of university administration of the importance of research and publications to university life.

The Council will present a number of specific recommendations within two weeks in support of our general statement.

On February 14, 1974, President Paul F. Sharp acknowledged Dr. Pollak's letter with the following comment:

We have studied the research policy statement which you recently submitted. All of us are enthusiastic about it as a policy statement and I am delighted to endorse it as carrying my approval and commitment.

ENCLOSURE 2: In her letter of February 15, 1974, to Dr. Paul F. Sharp, concerning research activities, Dr. Betty Pollak, Research Council Chairman, submitted the following recommendations:

(1) Develop a line-item budget for the support of research to be submitted to the Budget Council for consideration by the President and the Board of Regents. It is recommended that this be accomplished by transferring the functions of the present Faculty Research Committee to the University Research Council and expanding both

the functions and the budget to more adequately serve the needs of researchers. The present budget of the Faculty Research Committee is about \$25,000 - the Research Council recommends that this be increased to a minimum of \$100,000.

- (2) Develop a vigorous program of private support for research, not only for specific projects but for general research purposes. This must include an annualized private contribution system coordinated by an individual or office solely responsible for such efforts through the Office of Research Administration, the Office of University Development, the University of Oklahoma Foundation, and the Alumni Development Fund. The University must devote considerable effort to developing private funds for research that is commensurate with its efforts to obtain private support for stadium seats, sports arenas, and swimming pools.
- (3) There must be direct encouragement at all levels from the central administration to the department for individual faculty to seek outside funding for research. The present efforts of the Office of Research Administration to build a strong base of federal research funding should be continued. Greater efforts should be made to inform the faculty of available programs well in advance of deadlines for proposal submission.
- (4) Establish mechanisms for soliciting faculty research proposals and for allocating internal research funds. It is the recommendation of the Research Council, that as a means to provide incentives, a portion of the unallocated funds generated by sponsored research be returned to the generating departments and colleges based on an annual allocation by the Vice-Provost for Research Administration with the advice of the Research Council. In all cases, such funds should be used solely for the purpose of supporting and encouraging research and other scholarly activities. A specific proposal to accomplish this is attached as a separate item.
- (5) Attention must be paid to the organizational effectiveness of research administration so that services and resources are maximized. In addition, it is essential that the operation of other administrative support services be such that they effectively serve the needs of individual researchers. In particular, attention must be given to the many complaints being voiced regarding the Purchasing, Accounting, and Personnel Offices.
- (6) The University should continue existing specific programs once coordinated through the University of Oklahoma Research Institute: summer research fellowships, pre-doctoral research assistantships and sabbatical leave grants. There needs to be a long-range commitment to these programs so that their availability can be made known and well-defined procedures developed for application and allocation.
- (7) The University must foster inter-disciplinary cooperation for research purposes and more extensive interchange between the Health Sciences Center and the Norman campus.
- (8) There should be a concerted effort to achieve more effective dissemination of information on research needs and accomplishments through coordination between the Office of Research Administration and the Media Information Office.
- (9) The University should support all research aspects of the current Career Development Plan.
- (10) Individual departments should be encouraged to take advantage of more flexible budget procedures to reallocate resources to support research through adjustments of teaching loads and "C" budget expenditures.
- (11) Since the library represents an important resource for research, every effort should be made to increase support for research holdings.

* * * * *

RECOMMENDATION FOR ALLOCATION OF AVAILABLE RESEARCH FUNDS ✓

The Dean of each college should appoint a faculty committee to serve in an advisory and review capacity for allocating research funds and reviewing proposals. It is essential that available research funds be allocated largely on the basis of

competitive proposals. These advisory committees should be composed of faculty at all ranks who have keen research interests and records of research productivity. They should solicit and review competitive research proposals for each college and assist respective Deans in the promotion, reward, and encouragement of research. Such an arrangement acknowledges a major thrust for research encouragement at the college level, but it should not operate without regard to specific departmental needs. Each department should establish research "D" budgets which will be composed of research funds allocated by each Dean and the advisory committee. These individual department budgets should also include unallocated indirect cost recovery generated by sponsored research through the Office of Research Administration. Funds allocated to each college Dean may in turn be reallocated by the Dean with advice of the advisory committee to individual department "D" budgets. Recommendations for "D" budget support may come directly from individual departments; however, individual faculty members should be encouraged to offer specific proposals directly to each college with funds returned to departmental "D" budgets earmarked for the specific research proposed. Deans should be responsible for submitting annual reports to the Research Council outlining the use of the previous year's allocation. The University Research Council, in conjunction with the Vice-Provost for Research Administration, the deans of the various colleges, and their respective advisory committees, shall be responsible for recommending an allocation plan of state monies to each college. Line-item budget proposals for each year shall originate with college advisory committees and respective deans to be coordinated by the University Research Council which will send specific recommendations to the Budget Council for consideration by the President and Board of Regents.

* * * * *

Letter dated April 10, 1974, from President Paul F. Sharp
to Dr. Betty Pollak, Research Council Chairman:

Both Provost Hunsberger and I greatly appreciate the large amount of effort the Research Council has devoted this year to the consideration of improved policies and procedures for stimulating and supporting increased research efforts by members of our faculty. Your own leadership role has been commendable.

Perhaps the best way to begin my response to your letter of February 15 is to outline some problems we have faced this year in supporting faculty research and some actions we have taken to overcome these problems and to begin to implement the research-related recommendations contained in the Career Development Plan.

The amount of money available to support research this year has fallen off considerably because the cash surplus of OURI has not yet been transferred, thereby depriving the faculty of a sizable amount of research support. For example, one year's interest on \$500,000 of surplus would have yielded \$30,000 for research without decreasing the principal. The long negotiations between OURI and our Regents now seem about to be concluded, and we expect this surplus to be transferred soon. When this happens, the University hopes to continue the research programs formerly supported by OURI.

As you may know, earlier this year \$35,000 was allocated to Vice Provost Gentile for support of research. This amount was based on an estimate of overhead which should accrue to the University from research grants and contracts obtained since July 1, 1973. Already Dean Gentile has disbursed a large portion of these funds to individual faculty members. Furthermore, in the College of Arts and Sciences, Dean Mulhollan has reserved \$40,000 of salary funds recovered from unfilled positions to support research activities of his faculty. He is being assisted in this effort by \$10,000 supplied by the Provost. In this way, certain recommendations of the Career Development Plan have been implemented during the current fiscal year. For next year, we are exploring the possibilities of using private funds for some of the activities (including faculty research) recommended in the Career Development Plan.

Next, I should like to comment on some of the specific suggestions contained in your letter.

First of all, I agree that both the functions and the budget of the Faculty Research Committee should be transferred to the University Research Council. It seems perfectly logical--and I know Vice Provost Gentile agrees--that the Research Council should be the sole University advisory group concerned with faculty research. Consequently, it is appropriate for the Council to be responsible for these funds. This transfer should be worked out with the Faculty Research Committee and Provost Hunsberger in such a way as to honor commitments already made by that Committee, and it should be accomplished no later than August 31, 1974. I also ask that you work with the Faculty Research Committee to insure that the essential functions now performed by that Committee are not lost in the transfer or discontinued until they have been studied carefully.

With respect to Item 2 in your letter, it would seem that Vice Provost Gentile, working with Vice President Burr, would be the logical person to coordinate any University-wide plan for raising private funds for research. Perhaps I should point out that each year in the past the University has received sizable private contributions to its research program, but these usually are earmarked for individual departments. These fund-raising efforts are coordinated through Vice President Burr. You can be certain that such programs will continue in the future and will be given added emphasis wherever that seems possible.

Your Item 3 concerning the encouragement of faculty research and the dissemination to faculty of information about outside programs for supporting research would seem to be an extension of Vice Provost Gentile's current responsibilities. Item 4 of your letter recommended a fairly detailed mechanism for allocating available research funds. While these recommendations certainly are useful and will be considered thoroughly, it would be inappropriate at this time to decide in detail on the mechanics of allocating such funds. Suffice it to say that both Provost Hunsberger and Vice Provost Gentile wish to give the budget deans as much responsibility as possible for allocating research funds within their colleges. Whether or not a separate "D" budget should be established in each department can be discussed, but there would seem to be no fundamental problem in labeling funds within each college and within each department to assure that they are spent to support research. It may be advisable to attempt to increase our "C" budget before requesting a separate "D" budget for research, particularly since "C" budget funds may be spent for research.

It is difficult to decide in advance the total amount of money which will be available for research in a given year because research funds come from a variety of sources and in amounts which may vary considerably from year to year. The device of using, wherever possible, funds behind unfilled faculty positions to support faculty research is one we plan to encourage throughout the University in the future. I have no doubt that the Provost and most of the deans are extremely interested in scraping up every available dollar for use in promoting faculty research. With this kind of commitment it seems certain that appropriate mechanics can be worked out as we go along, rather than trying to decide on the mechanics in advance.

We are aware that the transfer of purchasing, accounting, and personnel (as these functions relate to research) from OURI to the Vice President for Administration and Finance has caused some inconvenience to faculty researchers. However, Vice President Nordby is alert to these problems, and I know he is trying to solve them as rapidly as possible.

With respect to Item 6, as mentioned earlier, we have every intention to continue many of the specific programs which once were coordinated through OURI. However, in the future, these programs will be under the supervision of the Graduate Dean, who in turn will be advised by the Research Council.

The Vice Provost for Research Administration and Graduate Dean also seems to be the logical officer to assume responsibility for the activities mentioned in Items 7 and 8 of your letter. With respect to Item 9, the Provost, as mentioned earlier, hopes to implement as soon as possible some of the research-related recommendations contained in the Career Development Plan.

Many departments currently do assign faculty time to grant or contract research through adjustments of teaching loads and "C" budget expenditures and through use of private funds available to them.

All of us in responsible positions in the University are unceasing in our efforts to obtain more funds for the Library. We are anxious to insure that our position relative to the libraries of other Big Eight Universities does not deteriorate. However, it looks as if no major advances can be made next year with respect to Library acquisitions if we are to provide the kind of money we know is needed to finance increases in faculty salaries and fringe benefits.

Provost Hunsberger, Dean Gentile, and I stand ready to meet with the Research Council after you have had sufficient time to consider the contents of this letter. I shall count on you to contact our office and arrange a meeting if you consider that desirable.

ENCLOSURE 3: Memorandum of August 23, 1974, from Provost I. Moyer Hunsberger to the office of the Graduate Dean:

This is a memorandum of understanding and definition with respect to faculty research funds.

1. All non-restricted funds for faculty research will be under the account sponsorship of the Graduate Dean.
2. Routine expenditures (for example, purchase of offprints, manuscript preparation, some graphics) will be detailed in written reports which will be submitted monthly for review to the Research Council.
3. Non-restricted research funds will be awarded in all other instances only with the prior advice and judgment of the Research Council.
4. The Graduate Dean will be expected to consult the Research Council whenever appropriate in the selection and use of restricted research funds.
5. It is our aim to utilize existing research support capabilities in the Office of Research Administration to replace those previously associated with the Faculty Research Committee in the interest of releasing further resources through the processes mentioned above for distribution to faculty engaged in research.

ELECTION: Faculty Replacement, Budget Council

Voting by written ballot, the Faculty Senate elected Jack Kanak (Psychology) to complete the unexpired portion (1974-75) of Nelson Nunnally's (Geography) term on the Budget Council.

NOMINATIONS: Faculty Replacements, University Fringe Benefits Committee

Voting by written ballot, the Faculty Senate nominated the following faculty replacements to fill existing vacancies on the University Fringe Benefits Committee:

To replace David Whitney (Sociology), 1974-78:

William Eick (Physical Education)

Betty Pollak (Physics)

To complete the unexpired term of J. Laguros (Engineering), 1974-76:

Lennie-Marie Tolliver (Social Work)

Irvin Wagner (Music)

NOMINATIONS: Faculty Vacancies, on Subcommittees, Task Force on Personnel Policy

In accordance with the September 23, 1974, request from Provost Hunsberger, the Senate Committee on Committees prepared a slate of nominees for filling faculty vacancies on the five subcommittees of the Task Force on Personnel Policy. Additional nominations were made from the floor. In accepting a motion made by Professor David Swank, the Senate approved the following nominations for submission to President Sharp:

- Subcommittee 1 - Functions of departmental, college, and university administrators, committees, and councils:
 Frank Appl (AMNE)
 Oliver Benson (Political Science)
 Robert Bauer (English)
 Charles Harper (Geology)
 James Payne (Information and Computer Science)
 Dan Wren (Management)
 Lois Pfiester (Botany/Microbiology)
- Subcommittee 2 - Term appointments and reappointments, salary increases:
 Robert Bryson (Journalism)
 Russell Buhite (History)
 Larry Canter (CEES)
 David Johnson (Law)
 Cecil Lee (Art)
 Dragan Milivojevic (Modern Languages)
 Gene Pingleton (Education)
- Subcommittee 3 - Promotions and tenure:
 David Branch (Physics)
 Glen Dryhurst (Chemistry)
 Kathleen Harris (Music)
 Jeff Kimpel (Meteorology)
 Alex Kondonassis (Economics)
 Tillman Ragan (Education)
 Mary Esther Saxon (Library)
 John Wickham (Geology)
- Subcommittee 4 - Distinguished professorships, teaching and research awards and fellowships, leaves, etc.:
 Arnold Henderson (Architecture)
 Cluff Hopla (Zoology)
 Michael Langenbach (Education)
 Maurie Rasmussen (AMNE)
 J. K. Greer (Stovall Museum)
 Jack White (Political Science)
- Subcommittee 5 - Academic freedom, benefits, working conditions, welfare, appeals, and grievances:
 Charles Bert (AMNE)
 Kenneth Merrill (Philosophy)
 James Mouser (Business Law)
 Richard Nostrand (Geography)
 Christine Smith (Music)
 Junetta Davis (Journalism)

ATTENDANCE OF SENATE MEMBERS AT SENATE MEETINGS

Background Information: After some discussion of the matter, the Senate Executive Committee on February 28, 1974, appointed an ad hoc Committee (Professors Nat Eek, Chairman, W. B. Prickett, and W. T. Reid) to study the question of attendance of Senate members at Senate meetings and to report its recommendations to the Senate in the fall. (See page 2 of the Senate Journal for March 11, 1974.)

At the Senate meeting on October 14, 1974, copies of the following report of that Committee were distributed:

 A survey of Senate attendance records indicates that the overall attendance averages about 65% or 33 persons. Our committee feels it is highly desirable to have a greater attendance at each Senate meeting since they determine the policies which govern

almost one thousand faculty members. Accordingly, we make the following three specific recommendations.

1. Each college should elect on an annual basis alternates to their groups of senators. We recommend a ratio of one alternate to two senators.

Under that recommendation when a senator anticipates an absence, he should arrange for an alternate to represent him at the Senate meeting. The alternate should report whom he is representing to the Secretary of the Senate at the time of the meeting.

2. The Secretary of the Faculty Senate will continuously monitor absences. When in any given academic year a senator has accumulated five absences, he is to be dropped automatically from membership of the Senate. The Secretary will notify the appropriate dean to take immediate steps to provide a replacement. It would be appropriate, for continuity purposes, for one of the alternates to be designated as a replacement.
3. In view of their heavy administrative commitments, we would recommend that division directors and departmental chairmen not be eligible for election to the Faculty Senate.

Senate Action: Professor W. B. Prickett, a member of the ad hoc Committee, moved adoption of recommendation No. 1. The Senate rejected that recommendation in a voice vote.

Professor Swank then moved that the phrase five absences in the second sentence of recommendation No. 2 be changed to three absences. The amendment was rejected by the Senate. Professor Larson then moved that the number five in that same sentence be changed to four. The Senate approved that reduction to four absences. Professor de Stwolinski then moved that the last sentence in recommendation No. 2 be deleted and that the preceding (third) sentence be amended to include the following additional phrase at the end of that sentence: "for the remainder of that Senator's term." The Senate approved the second change in recommendation No. 2. Immediately thereafter, the Senate approved Professor Prickett's motion to accept the Committee's second recommendation as amended, which now reads as follows:

- "2. The Secretary of the Faculty Senate will continuously monitor absences. When in any given academic year a Senator has accumulated four absences, ~~he~~ ^{she} is to be dropped automatically from the membership of the Senate. The Secretary will notify the appropriate dean to take immediate steps to provide a replacement for the remainder of that Senator's term."

Professor Prickett then moved adoption of the third recommendation of the Committee. The Senate rejected the proposal to make division directors and departmental chairmen ineligible for Senate membership.

When discussion focused on the effective date of the new directive, the Chairman of the Senate called attention to the fact that the approved recommendation is, in effect, a proposal for changing the Charter of the General Faculty and the Faculty Senate and, as such, must be voted upon by the General Faculty at the spring, 1975, meeting following the required minimum thirty days' notice in the Journal of the Senate. Official notice is hereby given in connection with the April, 1975, meeting of the General Faculty of the University.

POLICY ON OUTSIDE EMPLOYMENT AND EXTRA COMPENSATION

Background Information: On April 9, 1973, the Faculty Senate proposed to the President of the University several changes in the University policy on outside employment and extra compensation that had been approved by the University Regents on December 9, 1971. President Sharp then appointed a Task Force to study the Senate recommendations. The report of that Task Force, dated June 3, 1974, was forwarded to the Senate by President Sharp on July 10, 1974. At the request of the Senate Chairman, the Senate standing

Committee on Faculty Welfare reviewed the Task Force report and on August 28, 1974, submitted its report to the Senate. At its September 9, 1974, meeting, the Senate approved recommendations Nos. 1 (with the term, "full-time effort," changed to "full-time professional effort,") 2, and 3. Later, the Senate deferred further discussion of this question until the October 14, 1974, meeting. (See pages 15-20 of the Senate Journal for September 9, 1974.)

On September 20, 1974, Dr. Richard Fowler submitted for Senate consideration the following revision of the preamble to the Task Force Report:

The missions of the University are teaching, research, and service. As professionals, University of Oklahoma faculty are individually and primarily responsible for arranging their time among such academic functions as teaching assignments, research, service, continuing education, and consultation. Such arrangements will be subject to evaluation and approval by appropriate authorities as part of a faculty member's total professional activity during the year with reference to department, college, and University criteria for merit salary increases, tenure, and promotion.

It is expected that the professional expertise of the University faculty is available to the State and its citizens for incidental and minor services without compensation. When, however, the services desired from outside the University exceed a reasonable and mutually agreed limit, direct extra compensation may be accepted, provided the extent of the involvement does not infringe on the consultant's regular University duties.

A person who accepts full-time employment in the University of Oklahoma owes his first duty and his first loyalty to the University. Any other employment or enterprise in which he engages for income must be understood to be definitely secondary to his University work, and he must be willing to accept the judgment of the President and the Regents as to whether he may engage in such outside employment and retain full-time employment on the University faculty or staff. In addition, the chairman should be informed and approve of arrangements which are made to dismiss classes or provide substitute teachers for them when the faculty members are to be absent from these duties. Absence from the campus for more than a week at a time will be approved only in the most exceptional circumstances and then only with the prior approval of the President.

All professional activities, whether within the University or without, whether for extra compensation or for no compensation of any kind, should contribute to the faculty member's professional growth or efficiency, and to his teaching or scholarly competence.

Senate Action: Dr. Fowler moved the adoption of his proposed revision of the preamble to the Task Force Report. After considerable discussion, he moved that the word "normally" precede the word "available" in the first sentence of the second paragraph. The Senate approved this addition. Dr. Richard Wells then moved that the third paragraph of the preamble be amended as follows:

Delete the entire first sentence.

Reword the second sentence to read as follows: "Any outside employment or enterprise in which an individual engages must be understood to be definitely secondary to his University work, and that individual must be willing to accept the judgment of the President and the Regents as to whether he may engage in such outside employment and retain full-time employment on the University faculty or staff."

The Senate approved the changes in the third paragraph with some dissenting votes. Professor Prickett next moved that paragraph (7), under Policy, of the Task Force Report be deleted. Considerable discussion ensued particularly concerning the time-versus-compensation basis for reporting such faculty activity, possible economic consequences for OCCE, and the rationale and the intent of the entire policy on outside employment and extra compensation. With some dissent, the Senate subsequently approved the deletion of paragraph (7). Shortly thereafter, Dr. Baker moved that this question be tabled. The Faculty Senate approved the tabling motion without dissent.

PARKING VIOLATION APPEALS COMMITTEE

Background Information: Dr. Paul F. Sharp, President of the University, in a letter to the Senate Chairman on August 20, 1974, requested faculty nominations for a proposed Parking Violation Appeals Committee to provide for the faculty and staff a channel for appealing any parking tickets. At the September 9, 1974, meeting, the Senate Committee on Committees requested Senate discussion before making any faculty nominations. (See pages 14-15 of the Senate Journal for September 9, 1974.)

Senate Action: The Senate Chairman requested the Senate to consider the request for nominations as a matter separate from any faculty objections to the rationale and the mechanics of the proposed garnishment of salaries for nonpayment of parking fines.

Professor Swank then moved that the Senate Committee on Committees be requested to prepare a slate for presentation to the President of the University. Without dissent, the Senate approved the motion. Because of the late hour, there was no discussion of the objection raised by some faculty members to signing the authorization on the parking sticker application for payroll deduction of any parking fines. This topic will be placed on the Agenda for the November meeting.

ADJOURNMENT

The Faculty Senate adjourned at 5:37 p.m. The next regular meeting of the Senate will be held at 3:30 p.m., on Monday, November 11, 1974, in Room 218, Dale Hall.

Respectfully submitted,

Anthony S. Lis, Secretary