

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

Regular Session -- February 10, 1975 -- 3:30 p.m., Dale Hall, 218

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

<u>Present:</u>	Baker, Marvin	Huff, William	Schmitz, Francis J.	
	Barefield, Paul A.	Jischke, Martin C.	Shellabarger, Fred	
	Bell, Digby B.	Kendall, Jack	Starling, K. E.	
	Blair, Laura B.	Kidd, Gerald	Sutherland, Patrick	
	Calvert, Floyd O.	Kondonassis, Alex	Swank, David	
	de Stwolinski, Gail	Kraynak, Matthew	Tolliver, Lennie-Marie	
	Duchon, Claude E.	Larson, Raymond D.	Tolson, Melvin B.	
	Estes, James E.	Lehman, G. Philip	Tomberlin, Irma	
	Fife, James	Letchworth, George	Unruh, Delbert L.	
	Ford, Robert A.	Levinson, R. Saul	Uptegraft, Jo Ellen	
	Fowler, Richard G.	Marchand, Alan	Wells, Richard S.	
	Graves, Wm. H.	Prickett, Wilson B.	Whitecotton, Joseph	
	Henderson, Bob	Reynolds, Osborne M.		
	UOSA representatives:	Andersen, Mark	Bake, Betsy	
	AUOPE representatives:	Anderson, Kenneth	Guyer, Dan	
<u>Absent:</u>	Bethel, Audrey	Donnell, Ruth	Reid, William T.	
	Braver, Gerald	Eliason, Stanley	Scheffer, Walter F.	
	Buhite, Russell D.	Huneke, Harold V.	Shahan, Robert W.	
	Cronenwett, Wm. T.	Mouser, James W.	Streebin, Leale	
	UOSA representatives:	Ahmed, Zia	Collins, Mark	Parks, Ann
	AUOPE representatives:	Flowers, Joe	Stith, Mary	
		Shinert, Gregory	Taylor, Floyd	

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

The Journal of the Faculty Senate for the regular session on January 13, 1975, was approved.

ACTIONS TAKEN BY PRESIDENT PAUL F. SHARP

Faculty Replacements -- Academic Personnel and Budget Councils: On January 16, 1975, Dr. Paul F. Sharp, President of the University, approved the Senate election of Professors Neal Huffaker and Joe Hobbs as replacements on the Academic Personnel Council and the Budget Council, respectively. (See page 2 of the Senate Journal for January 13, 1975.)

Faculty Replacement -- ROTC Advisory Committee: On January 16, 1975, Dr. Paul F. Sharp, President of the University, selected Professor Jerlene Hargis as the faculty replacement on the ROTC Advisory Committee. (See page 2 of the Senate Journal for January 13, 1975.)

Additional Faculty Representation, Subcommittee 2, Task Force on Personnel Policy: In accordance with Senate instructions, the Senate Committee on Committees on January 20, 1975, submitted directly to President Paul F. Sharp the name of the following individual to serve as an additional faculty representative on Subcommittee 2 of the Task Force on Personnel Policy: Dr. Virginia Morris (HPER)

On February 4, 1975, President Sharp approved the above selection. (See page 5 of the Senate Journal for December 9, 1974.)

Search Committee for the University Registrar: On January 29, 1975, Dr. Paul F. Sharp, President of the University, approved the Senate election of Professors Virginia Gillespie (HPER) and Don Patten (Mathematics) to serve as faculty representatives on the Search Committee for the University Registrar. (See page 5 of the Senate Journal for December 9, 1974.)

In accordance with Senate instructions, the Senate Committee on Committees on January 20, 1975, submitted directly to President Paul F. Sharp the names of the following individuals to serve as additional faculty representatives on the Search Committee for the University Registrar:

- Class Schedule Committee: Dr. Alan Velie (English)
- Committee on Academic Regulations: Professor Earl Carpenter
(University College)

On January 29, 1975, President Sharp approved the above selections for the Senate (See pages 2 and 3 of the Faculty Senate Journal for January 13, 1975.)

ANNOUNCEMENT OF CHANGE IN DATE FOR THE MARCH SENATE MEETING

Because of the midsemester break, the Faculty Senate will meet on Monday, March 17, 1975, instead of March 10, 1975, as previously announced.

CLASS SCHEDULE COMMITTEE GUIDELINES CONCERNING EVENING EXAMINATIONS

On November 25, 1974, the University Class Schedule Committee approved the following list of guidelines for scheduling evening examinations:

The committee addressed itself to the general problem which has been created by conflicts which arise from the scheduling of departmental exams during the semester in the evening at the same time that some night classes meet and conflicts which arise between uniform final exams during finals week. After some discussion, the committee decided to recommend to the Provost the following Guideline Statements:

1. In the event of an evening departmental exam creating a conflict for a student between the exam and a regularly scheduled night course, the night course would have priority, and the department giving the exam would be responsible for allowing the student to make-up the exam within one week.
 2. In the event of a conflict arising from the scheduling of two evening departmental exams simultaneously, the student will attend the examination for the course that meets first during the week, according to the student's class schedule.
 3. In the event a student is required to take a make-up exam for an evening departmental exam, that make-up exam shall be given to the student within a period not to exceed one week after the time of the examination.
 4. In the event of a conflict arising from the scheduling of two uniform final examinations at the same time, the student will attend the examination for the course that met first during the week, according to the student's class schedule.
-

The Class Scheduling Office has also reported that, according to precedent in matters of this nature, the recommendations of that Committee become University policy.

FALL SEMESTER (1974) REPORTS OF UNIVERSITY COUNCILS

In accordance with Senate directives, the Chairmen of all eight University Councils submitted the following reports to the Faculty Senate for the fall semester, 1974:

Academic Personnel Council: (submitted by Dr. Norman L. Crockett, Chairman, on January 30, 1975):

The Academic Personnel Council conducts almost all its business during the second semester of each year. As a consequence, we have very little to report for the first semester. Our efforts were limited to establishing procedures to be followed by the Council in disputed tenure cases and beginning consideration of the tenure cases to be heard before our March 1 deadline.

This year, the Council will review all tenure cases in an effort to assure consistency and place each disputed case in its proper perspective.

ACADEMIC PERSONNEL COUNCIL PROCEDURES, 1974-75

1. Each candidate will be given one hour to present his or her case to the Council.
2. Committee "A" members will be asked to limit their presentation to fifteen minutes.
3. If they wish, candidates may ask the Council to call three extra witnesses in their behalf to appear separately at a later date. The candidate should provide the Council chairman with the names of the three witnesses to be called. The presentation of extra witnesses will be limited to fifteen minutes each.
4. If the candidate wishes, an attorney may be present during the time that the candidate presents his or her case to the Council. The attorney, however, may not ask questions or take part in any of the discussion.
5. No transcript of the Council proceedings will be permitted and all discussion, information, or questions either between witnesses and the Council or between Council members will be strictly confidential.
6. Unless a witness before the Council objects, the Provost will be present at all Council meetings. Each witness will be notified in advance of his or her appearance that the Provost will be in the room.
7. Council members will not let the candidate know the exact vote of the department, Committee "A", or the Deans in his or her case, only that the recommendation of at least one of the voting parties disagrees with others.
8. Candidates, witnesses, or the Deans will not be told the recommendation of the Council--only the President can release that information.

Academic Program Council: (submitted by Dr. Gerald Kidd, Chairman, on February 1, 1975):

The Executive Committee of the Faculty Senate requested that the Academic Program Council examine alternative methods of teacher evaluation which go beyond the existing program of faculty appraisal. Kenneth Taylor accepted the responsibility of chairperson of a sub-committee, composed of faculty and students, to study alternative programs and to prepare the appropriate recommendations. It is anticipated that a report of the subcommittee will be made to the Faculty Senate at the March Senate meeting.

Professor Holland was appointed to review new courses submitted to the Council during the fall semester, 1974. It was decided to use the newsletter, TODAY, to inform faculty of course additions being requested. The courses are listed in the newsletter by title and by number.

Recently, questions have been asked regarding guidelines governing "University Courses." William Wilson agreed to chair a subcommittee to re-examine the intent of these courses and to make this information available to the various departments and colleges.

Provost Hunsberger met with the Council to discuss the Five-Year Plan of the University. The Council hopes to remain aware of program formulation included within the various Five-Year Plans to assure more effective coordination of the total education curriculum of the University.

Administrative and Physical Resources Council: (submitted by Dr. John B. Francis, Chairman, on January 31, 1975):

The main endeavor of the Administrative and Physical Resources Council for the fall semester has continued to be the development of policy relating to University building renovation and new construction and procedures for implementing this policy. The Council is working with the offices of the Provost and Vice President for Administration and Finance to develop appendices for the policy statement approved by President Sharp and reported in the October 10, 1974, Journal of the Faculty Senate. Specifically, these appendices include a system of classification for space, standards for space allocation, priorities for new construction and space renovation, and priorities for Section 13 funds. We hope to present these appendices to President Sharp before the end of the spring semester.

In October, the Council recommended to President Sharp the following procedure for requesting new or remodeled space or physical resources:

The Council suggested the unit initiating the request write a memo with a specific request and justification for its needs. The memorandum would be sent to the appropriate Dean or Department head for his judgements on the merits of the request and its relative priority within his area of responsibility. The requests would then be forwarded to the Provost or appropriate Vice President for his priority listing. The Provost and the Vice President would, in turn, send their lists of priorities to the Vice President for Administration and Finance, who would present the lists for annual review to the Administrative and Physical Resources Council. An important part of each of the priority decisions indicated above would be the reporting back of the decision to the originating department at each step.

President Sharp approved of this procedure that was published in the Dec. 6, 1974, issue of TODAY.

The Council unanimously endorsed the recommendations of the Department of Physics and Provost Hunsberger to name the Physics Lounge (Room 301, Nielson Hall) the "Keith Carroll Memorial Student-Faculty Lounge" in honor of Dr. Carroll. On Nov. 14, 1974, the University Regents at the President's request approved this recommendation.

On Oct. 25, 1974, President Sharp requested the advice of the council on the course that the University should take regarding cable T.V. Our recommendations have been presented to the President for his perusal.

The Council continued to review space priorities and the capital improvements program, including projects funded by HERO bonds and Section 13 funds.

We are continuing our efforts to formalize a recommendation to Dr. Sharp for a policy relating to naming buildings and spaces within the University, and we have just begun to address the Council charge relating to administrative structure.

Athletics Council: (submitted by Dr. Virginia Morris, Chairman, on January 30, 1975):

During the first semester of the 1974-75 fiscal year, the Athletics Council met on three occasions.

At the first meeting, the chairman read a letter from President Sharp requesting that the Athletics Council consider and recommend a distribution system for 1,200 faculty football seats that have been earmarked for faculty and staff use in the new stadium deck. A committee was appointed and, after consultation with the athletic ticket manager and athletic business manager, made a recommendation to the Council, which, in turn, recommended the plan to the president.

During the first semester meetings, the 1974 golf, cross country, and football awards were considered and approved by the Council.

During this same period, the Council reviewed and approved the 1974-75 women's basketball schedule, 1974 women's swimming schedule, the 1974 fall golf schedule, the 1975 baseball schedule, and the 1975 tennis schedule.

Scheduling policies and class-cut policies were reviewed and discussed early in the year.

The 1974-75 public reserved and general admission basketball prices were reviewed and discussed since they involved action by the Big Eight Conference and since both prices established by the conference were the same (\$3.00).

At the October meeting, the secretary reported that the minutes of the original reorganization of the Council that occurred in 1953, the revised functions recommended by the Athletics Council charter committee in 1969, and the charge to the Council by the Faculty Senate dated December 17, 1973, would be circulated with the October minutes.

At the December meeting, Ms. Cathy Kidd, President of the University of Oklahoma Student Association, was present and presented her views and opinions regarding the student court action concerning the rights of student athletes. Ms. Kidd reviewed for the Council the history of the court action, including the issues that led to the presentation of the declaratory judgment on the status of rights of the athletes. Ms. Kidd also reviewed her opinions

and views regarding the rights and privileges of students. As a result of her appearance, it was recommended by the Council that the coaches and athletic director be heard concerning the judgment and bring forth their recommendations in response. This was done at the January meeting, and a committee was appointed by the chairman to review the existing rules and regulations of the Athletic Department governing student athletes.

The Council reviewed and recommended to the President the 1975 salaries for the football coaching staff as recommended by the Athletic Director.

- - - - -
Budget Council: (submitted by Dr. Leon Zelby, Chairman, on January 30, 1975):

- - - - -
The Budget Council met fourteen times during this period to transact its business as specified in the charges. In order to utilize the weekly meetings efficiently and to have broad inputs and participation, a number of subcommittees were appointed. Several of the subcommittees visited with representatives of the various constituencies, groups, and/or individuals to obtain inputs for the Council's deliberations.

Representatives of the Research Council visited the Budget Council on two occasions to discuss fiscal matters related to several research related issues.

The Council responded to several of the President's requests for advice on a variety of items relating to past, present, and future financial commitments. The Council also formulated and forwarded to the President a set of goals and priorities reaffirming its views on the salary and wage profile indicated in the previous report (9 September 1974).

The Council is currently engaged in 1975-76 budget proceedings and also in reviews. A more complete and comprehensive report will be submitted at the end of the current semester. That report will include the work of the several subcommittees whose assignments will have been completed, as well as the work of subcommittees whose assignments are of continuing nature.

- - - - -

Faculty Awards and Honors Council: (submitted by Dr. F. M. Townsend, Chairman, on January 27, 1975):

Three meetings of the Council on Faculty Awards and Honors were held in the fall semester 1974. Sessions generally lasted two hours; in addition, members spent additional hours studying the material to be discussed in Council. Meetings were well attended.

Recommendations were made to the Provost on nine applications for sabbatical leaves of absence. Also, a recommendation was made to the Provost for deadlines for applications for sabbatical leaves.

Nominations for the David Ross Boyd Professorship, Regents' Award for Superior Teaching, and Amoco Foundation Good Teaching Award were received. Recommendations will be made during the next semester.

Publications Board: (submitted by Professor Paul Dannelley, Chairman, on January 23, 1975):

The Board of Student Publications held its requisite number of meetings (eight) during 1974. Jack Bickham served as board chairman until spring of 1974, at which time Paul Dannelley was elected by the journalism faculty to serve on the board. Dannelley subsequently was elected chairman by the Board of Student Publications.

Despite rising costs of operation for publications, the Board of Student Publications recorded another year "in the black." (The price of newsprint used by The Oklahoma Daily, for instance, has risen 60 per cent in the past year). However, as of Sept. 30, the accounts for which the Publications Board is responsible had an operating margin of \$15,889 (as compared to \$28,658 for the same period a year ago). The difference is almost exactly the positive surplus of Student Publications in 1973.

The production area of Student Publications (north portion of Copeland Hall) was remodeled in the past year at a cost of \$25,553.21. This included lowering the ceiling, painting the walls, adding new walls, supplying new lighting, building new cabinetry and installing a new layout carousel for paste-up work. As a result of the higher degree of efficiency achieved, the organization was able to perform more work at a net expenditure of 6.4% fewer hours of labor (4,981 hours as compared with 5,328 for the year before). The "more work" reference applies to the fact that -- for the first time -- Student Publications produced the first 160 pages of Sooner Yearbook, produced the telephone book and a class schedule booklet. (Student Publications also will produce the balance of the Yearbook; the 160 pages referred to were done during the calendar year just ended).

The Regents have approved remodeling of the editorial areas for Student Publications. An amount of \$35,000 has been approved for this purpose.

Research Council: (submitted by Dr. Thomas M. Murray, Chairman, on January 30, 1975):

On August 15, 1974, the Research Council replaced the Faculty Research Committee as the administrator of the Faculty Research Fund. A Research Council study was immediately initiated to determine if a cost savings could be realized by closing the Committee's office in the Library and by using the Office of Research Administration personnel to perform all services. It was determined that a savings of approximately \$5,000 could be realized if ORA personnel handled the administration of the Fund and the ORA typing pool, with the addition of one typist, handled all manuscript preparation.

The Research Council then prepared policy statements concerning the use of both the Faculty Research Fund and the Research Development Fund. On September 30, 1974, a memo explaining the changes and the policy statements were distributed to the general faculty. Procedures were developed for submitting proposals. On the second Monday of each month, the Research Council reviewed submitted proposals and recommended action to the Vice Provost for Research Administration. To date, all of the Research Council's recommendations have been accepted without question.

In November, the Council prepared and submitted to the Budget Council twelve recommendations for increased budgets or establishment of new budgets in areas related to research. These recommendations included funding for new faculty, equipment purchases, equipment maintenance, the library, travel, and page costs among others. The Budget Council has not responded to the recommendations.

In December, announcements for the Jr. Faculty Summer Fellowships and Sabbatical Leave awards programs were distributed to the general faculty. On January 31, 1975, the Research Council reviewed the Summer Fellowship proposals and made recommendations to the Vice Provost for Research Administration.

During the week of January 20, 1975, the Research Council reviewed seventy proposals directed to the research portion of the Career Development program. A priority list of thirty proposals was forwarded to the Provost for possible funding.

The members of the Research Council has spent hundreds of man-hours in developing funds, reviewing proposals, and making awards to stimulate research within the University.

The Senate Chairman called attention to each of the above reports individually and requested Senate reactions and/or questions. There were no questions raised from the floor.

PROGRESS REPORT: Task Force on Evaluation of Deans

Dr. Jischke, Senate Chairman, presented an informal progress report on the activities of the Task Force on the Evaluation of Deans (see page 3 of the Senate Journal for September 8, 1974). The Task Force has completed its deliberations and has recently submitted its final report (including the proposed instrument) to President Paul F. Sharp. Public announcement may be made in this matter by President Sharp as early as next month.

ANNOUNCEMENT: Temporary Assignment of Office Space
to the Faculty Senate

Pending subsequent permanent assignment of office space, the Faculty Senate is now occupying Room 106-C, Evans Hall. The office telephone number is 325-6874.

SELECTION OF FACULTY SENATE REPLACEMENT: College of Arts and Sciences

Dr. Paige E. Mulhollan, Dean of the College of Arts and Sciences, has informed the Secretary of the Faculty Senate that, as the first alternate from the last election, Dr. Stanley Eliason (Mathematics) will complete the unexpired portion of the term of Dr. Betty Pollak (1972-75) on the Faculty Senate.

PROPOSAL FOR AN ADVISORY COMMITTEE FOR STATE LEGISLATORS

Background Information: At its December meeting, the Senate considered an AUOPE request that two faculty representatives be elected to serve on a proposed Advisory Committee requested by Ms. Mina Hibdon, local Representative to the State Legislature. At that time, the Senate Chairman volunteered to have this question studied further by the Senate Executive Committee for any appropriate recommendations to be brought to the Senate subsequently. (See page 9 of the Senate Journal for December 9, 1974.)

Senate Action: The Senate Chairman reported on recent conversations with Ms. Hibdon. She feels that the present informal communication is adequate and is not sure whether there is a need for formalized communication. She objects to the term "lobbying" used by some and hoped that any such advisory committee, if established, could help her deal with the massive flood of proposed legislation.

Dr. Jischke, Senate Chairman, then reported on the Senate Executive Committee's deliberations. In their view, if the Senate were to become involved in direct communication with politicians, such action would be a departure from the stance taken by the Senate last year when a request was turned down for the Mayor of Norman to address the Senate in connection with a city bond issue. The Committee felt that our (faculty) problems were not with the Legislature as such and that our primary concern should be the academic programs of the University. Our desire to communicate with the Legislature might be misguided and even a waste of time. The proposed Committee would hardly be in a position to screen the hundreds of bills proposed to the Legislature every session. The faculty should instead be involved with academic problems and should make its views known to the larger public and not just the Legislature.

He then presented the Committee recommendations that (1) the Senate not pursue any participation in legislative advisement and (2) a Senate ad hoc Committee be appointed to assess the University's academic problems and propose (a) a statement and (b) methods by which that statement could be made known to the larger public throughout the state.

Dr. Patrick Sutherland called attention to the current development of the 5-year plan for the University and objected to the creation of additional committees to develop objectives. Dr. Jischke added that the Committee's recommendations grew out of a growing feeling that there is an increasing managerial leadership on this campus. The current problem, therefore, is to call attention to what some feel is an erosion of academic values of the University and the need for the faculty to assert itself. Dr. Wells, a member of the Senate Executive Committee, spoke in favor of that Committee's recommendations. In his opinion, the strictly academic conditions of the University tend to be a little out of focus and dispersed in such expressions as the State of the University Address and such drafts as the Five-Year Plan. The faculty, a duly constituted body, is the one group that has the standing and the responsibility to speak to the specific and narrow question as to where the University stands, what is its stage of development, what are its weaknesses and strengths, and what opportunities are available for its future development. In his opinion, recent statements concerning the state of the University are overblown and rosy.

In a voice vote with a single dissenting vote, the Senate then approved the appointment of the ad hoc Committee as proposed by the Senate Executive Committee.

✓ PROPOSAL FOR EXTENDING THE FACULTY PROBATIONARY PERIOD

Background Information: At its January meeting, the Senate received a recommendation from its Executive Committee to extend to seven years the probationary period for faculty tenure in accordance with 1940 and 1968 statements of AAUP. After considerable discussion that evidenced Faculty Senate consensus that this issue involved both the probationary period itself and the criteria for granting tenure, the Senate voted to refer this question to a committee of the Senate Chairman's choice for further study and recommendation.

For information of all concerned, the Senate Executive Committee has requested the publication of the following pertinent excerpt from the AAUP 1940 Statement of Principles and Interpretive Comments concerning Academic Tenure as published on page 2 of AAUP Policy Documents and Reports, (1971 edition):

After the expiration of a probationary period, teachers or investigators should have permanent or continuous tenure, and their service should be terminated only for adequate cause, except in the case of retirement for age, or under extraordinary circumstances because of financial exigencies.

In the interpretation of this principle it is understood that the following represents acceptable academic practice:

(1) The precise terms and conditions of every appointment should be stated in writing and be in the possession of both institution and teacher before the appointment is consummated.

(2) Beginning with appointment to the rank of full-time instructor or a higher rank, the probationary period should not exceed seven years, including within this period full-time service in all institutions of higher education; but subject to the proviso that when, after a term of probationary service of more than three years in one or more institutions, a teacher is called to another institution it may be agreed in writing that his new appointment is for a probationary period of not more than four years, even though thereby the person's total probationary period in the academic profession is extended beyond the normal maximum of seven years. Notice should be given at least one year prior to the expiration of the probationary period if the teacher is not to be continued in service after the expiration of that period.

(3) During the probationary period a teacher should have the academic freedom that all other members of the faculty have.

(4) Termination for cause of a continuous appointment, or the dismissal for cause of a teacher previous to the expiration of a term appointment, should, if possible, be considered by both a faculty committee and the governing board of the institution. In all cases where the facts are in dispute, the accused teacher should be informed before the hearing in writing of the charges against him and should have the opportunity to be heard in his own defense by all bodies that pass judgment upon his case. He should be permitted to have with him an adviser of his own choosing who may act as counsel. There should be a full stenographic record of the hearing available to the parties concerned. In the hearing of charges of incompetence

the testimony should include that of teachers and other scholars, either from his own or from other institutions. Teachers on continuous appointment who are dismissed for reasons not involving moral turpitude should receive their salaries for at least a year from the date of notification of dismissal whether or not they are continued in their duties at the institution.

(5) Termination of a continuous appointment because of financial exigency should be demonstrably bona fide.

Senate Action: Recalling the interrelatedness of the two aspects of this question (the probationary period itself and the criteria for granting tenure), Dr. Jischke, Senate Chairman, requested Senate sentiment toward the separation of the probationary period and the tenure criteria aspects. Dr. Marchand then moved that the probationary period be discussed as a separate issue. Without dissent the Senate approved the motion to confine the discussion to the probationary period, with the presumption that the criteria issue could be discussed later as appropriate.

To broaden the base of Senate recommendations that will eventually be offered to the Task Force on Personnel Policy, Dr. Wells suggested the possibility of establishing a renewable tenure system. Upon initial employment, tenure would be granted for a period of perhaps 5 years, subject to renewal at the end of that period. Periodic renewals would also be made during the entire period of employment.

A large number of Senate members participated in the ensuing discussion that reflected varying views concerning the purpose of tenure. To some, historically, tenure has been and should continue to be academic freedom--viz., the freedom of speech. To others, tenure is meant to provide job security.

There was strong Senate sentiment for guaranteeing current options for those now on the tenure track.

In an effort to obtain Senate sentiment for the benefit of the Committee now studying this question, the Senate Chairman requested "straw votes" of three specific items with the following results:

- (1) Renewable tenure as proposed by Dr. Wells: 4 favorable votes
- (2) Extension of probationary period to 7 years: strong Senate consensus favoring extension
- (3) Relative importance of recommending bodies in the tenure-granting process: strong Senate consensus favoring deemphasis of role of administration

The Senate took no final action in this matter. Dr. Jischke stated that discussion of this question would be resumed at the next (March) meeting.

PROVOST'S OFFICE REPRESENTATIVE AT FACULTY SENATE MEETINGS

Background Information: At its January meeting, the Senate considered the proposal that a representative from the Provost's office be authorized to

attend Senate meetings in a non-voting status with speaking privileges. The Senate authorized its Executive Committee to prepare an appropriate amendment to the Charter of the General Faculty and the Faculty Senate.

The Executive Committee has recommended approval of the following change in the Charter as published in the Faculty Handbook (January, 1974):

The last sentence in the third paragraph of Section 10.1.7 (Composition of the Faculty Senate) to be amended by the addition of the following underscored phrase:

"Six representatives of the Association of the University of Oklahoma Professional Employees and one representative of the Provost's Office also attend meetings and participate, without voting privileges, in Senate discussion."

Senate Action: In a voice vote with some dissent, the Senate approved the above recommendation of its Executive Committee for amending the Charter.

This announcement will also serve as the required advance notice of this Senate recommendation to be considered by the General Faculty of the University at its March, 1975, general meeting.

PROPOSED CHANGE IN REGULATIONS CONCERNING REAPPOINTMENT OF INSTRUCTORS

Background Information: The Academic Personnel has requested approval of the following change in the University tenure regulations:

Section 3.2.9, subsection (1) (a), Faculty Handbook (January, 1974):

Change from: "A person with the rank of instructor is not eligible for tenure. He may serve a maximum of five years in this rank except in special circumstances when, upon recommendation by his academic unit and approval by the Academic Personnel Council, he may be re-appointed on a year-to-year basis."

to: "A person with the rank of instructor is not eligible for tenure. He may serve a maximum of five years in this rank except in special circumstances when, upon recommendation by his academic unit and approval by appropriate administrative officials, he may be re-appointed on a year-to-year basis."

The Academic Personnel Council feels that this section gives powers to the Council that exceed its charge.

The Executive Committee of the Senate recommends approval of the above proposal.

Senate Action: The Senate approved without dissent the above proposal for changing University regulations concerning the reappointment of instructors.

ALLEGED SHORT-ORDERING OF TEXTBOOKS BY THE UNIVERSITY BOOK EXCHANGE

Dr. James Fife reported several instances in his department of insufficient textbooks for students enrolled in classes. He cited one case a short order

of textbooks for a course with 133 students enrolled. In checking with the various bookstores, he learned that Varsity had ordered 6 copies; Rickner's, 41; and the University Book Exchange, 140. If these figures were correct, then the 133 should have had no trouble in purchasing textbooks; however, 30 students have not been able to purchase their copies of the text. If rumors are true, the Book Exchange traditionally short-orders textbooks for a number of reasons. Accordingly, Dr. Fife offered the following motion:

"RESOLVED: that the Book Exchange honor a request from the Faculty Senate, to wit: the number of textbooks ordered for each course will either equal or exceed the estimated enrollment for the course as provided by the responsible academic unit..

Professor Prickett urged the Senate to hear the Book Exchange management's story in his matter before taking any censuring action. Perhaps some of the responsibility for this problem lies with the individual faculty members concerned.

Professor Swank moved that further consideration of this question be deferred until the March 17 meeting and that the Manager of the Book Exchange be invited to appear before the Senate at that time. With one dissenting vote, the Senate approved the deferral.

UNIVERSITY-WIDE DISTRIBUTION OF GRADES

Dr. Baker called attention to the recent distribution of University-wide grades for the various departments and colleges for the 1974 summer session. Finding some of the data quite disturbing, he expressed amazement at the paucity of discussion in the Faculty Handbook concerning grading. In view of the very poor guidelines offered in the Faculty Handbook concerning a grading philosophy, he would like to see a study by an appropriate committee of the adequacies and the inadequacies of the University policy regarding grading. The Senate Chairman commented that the Academic Program Council would be a most appropriate group to study this suggestion. Dr. Kidd, Academic Program Council Chairman, agreed to take this matter up with the Council.

ADJOURNMENT

The Faculty Senate adjourned at 4:45 p.m. The next regular meeting of the Senate will be held at 3:30 p.m., on Monday, March 17, 1975, in Room 218, Dale Hall. Items for the Agenda should reach the Senate Secretary by Wednesday, February 26, 1975.

Respectfully submitted,

Anthony S. Lis, Secretary

March 5, 1975

Report of the Senate ad hoc Committee on OCCE Policy 3.10:

(See page 2 of the Agenda for the Senate meeting on March 17, 1975.)

Introduction

Policy 3.10 refers to that section of the OCCE procedural regulations involving communications between OCCE and the "main campus" in development and execution of programs conducted by OCCE. (See pages 5-9 of the Senate Agenda for December 9, 1974.) The issue being reviewed arose as a result of revisions made by OCCE in their operating procedures. There is some question as to whether the request for change in 3.10 originated within OCCE and was communicated to the Deans or whether the Deans initiated a request for change.

The subcommittee (consisting of Professors Lee, Crim, Wells, Shahan, and Reese) has met once a week for over a month. Interviews were conducted with Deans Baloff and Mulhollan, with Jess Burkett (representing Vice President White), and with Professors Kondonassis and Scheffer (representing the Executive Committee of Advanced Programs).

The subcommittee considers many elements in policy 3.10 desirable, but difficulties seem to exist with regard to many of the implementing features of the scheme. For that reason, we offer initially a set of critical comments about the proposal and make recommendations in light of our commentary.

General Critique

1. The proposal provides that the Vice President for Continuing Education and Public Service shall initiate meetings with the Deans of the academic units at the beginning of each calendar year. The purpose of such meetings is "to review programs of Continuing Education for the preceding academic year involving the faculty or academic content related to the respective academic units and to review and consult on programs and faculty participation planned for the following academic year." (page 6 of the Senate Agenda for December 9, 1974.) This meeting is to include review of inload and overload participation by faculty and provides for procedures that are discussed at another point in this critique.

As a general matter, closer coordination of the "on-campus" academic units with OCCE is a needed and desirable situation. The mutual benefits possible from this element of the proposal are desirable. In addition, it is very likely that inload teaching activities must be planned in such a way that the best use is made of time from the viewpoint of each party to the relationship. Clearly, the program planning of each Dean must develop in light of the possibility that faculty within his college may wish to engage in OCCE activities as a part of their normal academic responsibilities. While the Committee strongly endorses the principle of closer and mutual program planning between OCCE and the Dean of academic units, actual personnel assignment is the responsibility of departments, divisions, and schools.*

2. The proposal calls for procedures by which specific program planning may be conducted, especially as it affects OCCE activities involving overload teaching by faculty. In addition to the first-of-each-year meeting (see above), the proposal calls for the Vice President for Continuing Education to provide each Dean with a list of faculty members whose services are sought for teaching assignments on an overload basis for the ensuing

* Throughout the report, reference to "departments" is meant to denote instructional units, whether they are called "departments," "divisions," "schools," etc.

academic year. This list is to include the type of teaching activity, credit hour involvement, clock hours (or fraction of full-time equivalent), and the maximum total dollar amounts of overload payment involved in the requested assignment. Deans may respond by either signifying approval, disapproval or listing alternative names and types of assignments not appearing on the Vice President's proposal list. After concurrence of the Dean, program managers in OCCE may then negotiate mutually agreeable assignments with faculty, consistent with the proposals on the list submitted by the Vice President.

The subcommittee feels that there are several difficulties with this procedure. First, it provides for a Dean's veto over a faculty member's opportunity to participate in OCCE on an overload basis. In the absence of procedural safeguards, the faculty member stands in some danger of being capriciously denied opportunities to teach in programs of his and OCCE program managers' choice.

Second, the procedure seems to invert what might be considered a "normal" set of academic administrative relationships. It is desirable to have higher administrative levels coordinate program development, specifying goals, general commitments of resources, etc. This involvement, followed by detailed development of program content and faculty participation, is a normal, desirable administrative process, and we strongly support it. (See #1, above). While there is some rationale for such mutual consultation for inload activity, it is difficult to support such consultation for overload activity. Under the proposed procedure, control over many elements critical to successful programs is denied to those responsible for the specific conduct of a program.

Third, the subcommittee feels that it is a poor practice to place as much program control as this proposal does in the hands of an administrator who has neither formal nor budgetary responsibility for the program. OCCE's success rests largely upon its ability to be self-supporting; this has been its major source of innovation. No action should be taken that would disturb such an ability.

3. The proposal outlines distinctly different procedures for assignment of faculty, depending upon the factor of inload or overload teaching. Procedures for inload teaching arrangements amount to rather obvious matters involving "procedures applicable to all E and G budgets of the University." (page 7) It is stated that all inload assignments are to be voluntary. Coordination of such assignments through the Office of the Provost is required in the interests of budget-making and revision. Procedures for overload have been treated in the first paragraph of item two above; it is needless to repeat the careful detail by which the proposed policy potentially controls overload activity of faculty.

The subcommittee believes that such a balance of attention to the overload problem makes it reasonable to wonder whether a fundamental purpose of the "3.10" policy is to establish a policy on extra compensation by some route, in addition to the one recently examined by the Senate. The remarks of one Dean partially supported such an interpretation. If, indeed, it is the case that this is no more than an extra compensation policy in disguise, then the Senate should consider whether this is the best means to deal with that problem. Many activities are affected by this proposal; and if meeting such a limited objective has such far-reaching effects, alternative routes should be examined. We propose some alternatives in the "Recommendations" section below.

4. The proposal calls for considerable advanced planning of OCCE activity. Exceptions are made in the cases of short courses, but only in

the procedural sense of consulting the Dean about deviations from previous arrangements. Based upon comments by several people interviewed, it is reasonable to assume that such a long-range operation would impose rigidities that should be avoided. Certainly in the case of Advanced Programs activities, more flexibility is required than is possible under the proposed arrangement. In that program, changing circumstances on both sides of the contractual relationships have necessitated and will continue to necessitate abilities to make rapid changes in scheduling and personnel.

5. Given the procedures contained in the proposal, active arrangements between OCCE program managers and individual faculty members are practically the last activity undertaken. The subcommittee explicitly is of the opinion that such an ordering of activities in an educational enterprise is impractical. Among the initial matters to be ascertained are interest, willingness, and competence of faculty to participate in proposed programs. Program managers can operate successfully only if they can have reasonable assurance that people they think can do the job as they conceive of it are available. We do not propose that such initial overtures be tantamount to obligations of a quasi-contractual sort, but rather arrangements that have some probability of enabling further program planning within OCCE. The proposed procedures would seem to impose needless difficulties for program planning, if not make it impossible.

Recommendations:

In making recommendations, the subcommittee considers three factors to be of particular importance. First, it is critical that no action be taken that would either reduce or interfere with the flexibility necessary to the University's ability to respond in a timely and innovative way to issues and events. The proposal would have this effect, given many of its features. Second, faculty should have procedural safeguards against potentially whimsical decisions by administrators in matters regarding participation in activity vital or useful to professional development. While no assumption of mischief or bad faith is made by the Committee, the license given administrators under this proposal has such a potential. Third, the subcommittee is sensitive to the growing awareness among faculty that the University is becoming administratively overbearing. Where such a tendency endangers academic quality and the faculty's proper responsibility for such quality, it should be subject to careful scrutiny. The subcommittee is of the opinion that such is the case in the "3.10" issue. We, therefore, recommend that:

1. In the case of inload teaching for OCCE, the "mutual agreement" or "concurrence" provisions of the policy should be left intact, but with the provision that an administrator's decision to preclude a faculty member's desired participation in a proposed program must be conveyed to the faculty member by the administrator. Such information should be conveyed so that the faculty member may either pursue other options or take actions that might make his inload involvement more acceptable to the Dean.

2. In the case of overload teaching for OCCE, the "mutual agreement" and "concurrence" provisions should be deleted. In their place should be language which provides for the administrator's opportunity to state opposition to such participation by the faculty member. The information on such proposed participation should be conveyed to the administrator by the appropriate official of OCCE, after prior consultation has taken place between interested faculty and program managers. The conveying of such

information to the administrator should be advisory in nature. Except in the cases of violation of University regulations or departmental rules, no administrator--Dean or departmental chairman--should be in a position to veto desired participation in overload activity.

3. All departments must, in terms of this policy, be placed under a positive obligation to fashion a program for the regulation of their faculty's use of overload opportunities. Such a program must be reported within a specified time to the Dean of the college housing the department, and any subsequent changes in that departmental program must also be reported to the Dean. The general standards of such a program would be: (1) that University regulations regarding extra compensation are binding upon the individual faculty member and (2) that faculty overload activity not interfere either with the individual's professional development or with the department's ability to meet its obligations to other members of the department and to students. Upon a departmental finding of violation by a faculty member, the department may veto subsequent overload activity. The department would be under an obligation to report such action to the appropriate Dean.

The subcommittee is strongly of the opinion that it is the faculty's responsibility and obligation to police itself in the matter of extra compensation. This recommendation is considered to be especially important.

Respectfully submitted,

Jim Reese (Economics) Chairman -
Advanced Programs
Cecil Lee (Art)
Robert Shahan (Philosophy) - BLS
Richard Wells (Political Science) -
Advanced Programs
Sarah Crim (Home Economics) - other