

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

Regular Session -- April 14, 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	Fowler, Richard G.	Reynolds, Osborne M.
	Barefield, Paul	Graves, Wm. H.	Scheffer, Walter
	Bethel, Audrey	Huff, William	Schmitz, Francis J.
	Blair, Laura	Huneke, Harold V.	Shahan, Robert W.
	Braver, Gerald	Jischke, Martin C.	Shellabarger, Fred
	Calvert, Floyd O.	Kondonassis, Alex	Starling, K. E.
	Cronenwett, Wm. T.	Kraynak, Matthew	Streebin, Leale
	de Stwolinski, Gail	Lehrman, G. Philip	Sutherland, Patrick
	Donnell, Ruth	Letchworth, George	Swank, David
	Duchon, Claude E.	Levinson, R. Saul	Tolliver, Lennie-Marie
	Eliason, Stanley	Marchand, Alan	Tomberlin, Irma
	Estes, James E.	Mouser, James W.	Unruh, Delbert L.
	Fife, James	Prickett, Wilson B.	Uptegraft, Joe Ellen
	Ford, Robert A.	Reid, William T.	Wells, Richard S.
	UOSA representatives:	Ahmed, Zia	Bake, Betsy
		Andersen, Mark	Collins, Mark
	AUOPE representative:	Anderson, Kenneth	
<u>Absent:</u>	Bell, Digby	Kendall, Jack L.	Tolson, Melvin B.
	Buhite, Russell	Kidd, Gerald	Whitecotton, Joseph
	Henderson, Bob	Larson, Raymond D.	
	UOSA representative:	Parks, Ann	
	AUOPE representatives:	Flowers, Joe	Stith, Mark
		Guyer, D.	Taylor, Floyd
		Shinert, Gregory	

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

The Journal of the Faculty Senate for the regular session on March 17, 1975, was approved.

ACTIONS TAKEN BY PRESIDENT PAUL F. SHARP

- (1) Reappointment of Instructors: On March 21, 1975, Dr. Paul F. Sharp, President of the University, notified the Provosts on both campuses that the University Regents on March 20, 1975, had approved the Senate proposal concerning the reappointment of instructors on a year-to-year basis, effective immediately. (See page 12 of the Senate Journal for February 10, 1975.)
- (2) Senate Proposals concerning Tenure: Acknowledging receipt of recent Senate proposals concerning tenure, Dr. Paul F. Sharp, President of the University, made the following pertinent comments in his March 21, 1975, letter to Dr. Martin C. Jischke, Senate Chairman:

"I wish to express my appreciation to the Faculty Senate for the action that it has taken in preparing the proposals concerning tenure which the Senate passed on March 17, 1975, which were transmitted to me by a memorandum from Professor Lis on March 18, 1975. I have approved the request of the Senate that these be forwarded 'to the Task Force on Personnel Policy for its consideration of pertinent faculty views in an area of vital faculty concern and interest.'

"By a copy of this letter, I am asking Provost Hunsberger to see that the action of the Faculty Senate is called to the attention of the Task

Force, that it is given full and complete consideration by the Task Force, and that it is taken into consideration when the Task Force presents its recommendations."

(See page 5 of the Senate Journal for March 17, 1975.)

- ✓ (3) Faculty Evaluation of Academic Administrators: On March 18, 1975, Dr. Paul F. Sharp, President of the University, addressed the following letter to the Senate Chairman concerning faculty questionnaire evaluation of academic administrators (Provost, deans, and department chairmen):

"I am pleased to inform the Faculty Senate that we are now prepared to move forward with the evaluation of the deans and other academic administrators in accord with the recommendations approved by the Faculty Senate on April 18, 1974. As I mentioned to you in my May 17, 1974 letter, I followed the recommendation of the Faculty Senate and appointed a Task Force, half of which was drawn from full-time faculty nominated by the Faculty Senate and half from the administration. That Task Force provided me with a report on January 31, 1975, and a copy of that report is attached for your information.

"I have approved the recommendations of the Task Force. I would like to call your attention specifically to the recommendations that questionnaires be distributed regarding not only the deans but also department chairmen and that the questionnaires be distributed initially during the spring semester and subsequently during the fall semester every two years thereafter.

"I am asking Provost Hunsberger to see that the procedures described in the Task Force's report are implemented. Copies of the three questionnaires are also attached for your records.

"As I mentioned in May 17 letter, I believe that the review can be beneficial to all concerned, and I look forward to it being undertaken."

(See page 8 of the Faculty Senate Journal for February 10, 1975.)

(Faculty members interested in seeing the report of the Task Force and the three questionnaires mentioned above should contact Dr. Martin C. Jischke, Senate Chairman.)

- ✓ (4) Conference Committee on the Proposed University Copyright Policy: On April 1, 1975, President Paul F. Sharp announced the membership of the Conference Committee on the Proposed University Copyright Policy, including the following faculty members from the Norman campus:

Professors Elmer Million (Chairman)
Arrell M. Gibson
Donald Woolf

(See page 2 of the Senate Journal for March 17, 1975.)

In his memorandum to the Committee members, Dr. Sharp stated that the purpose of the Committee is to (a) review the discussion draft and (2) recommend to him what policy should be sent to the two Faculty Senates for their formal consideration. Hopefully, the two Senates will receive a draft for their consideration early in the fall semester, 1975-76.

- ✓ (5) Task Force to Study the University Press: On April 4, 1975, President Paul F. Sharp appointed a Task Force (Drs. James Kenderdine and Ron Stafford and Mr. Mark Lemons) to study the University Press. Dr. Sharp's charge to that Task Force included the following comment:

"For some time, the Press has been facing some cash flow and other financial problems. I would like you to study these problems and

recommend ways of handling them as a first phase of the study of the Press and then for you to turn to the broader questions of how we can best deal with the problems of the Press so as to enable it to fulfill its mission."

ANNOUNCEMENT: Spring (1975) semester joint meeting of the Executive Committees, OU and OSU Faculty Senate and Council.

The spring (1975) semester joint meeting of the Executive Committees of the Oklahoma University Faculty Senate and the Oklahoma State University Faculty Council will be held on the Norman campus in the Faculty Club immediately following the Faculty Senate meeting on Monday, April 14, 1975.

ANNOUNCEMENT: Spring (1975) semester meeting of the General Faculty (Norman campus).

The General Faculty on the Norman campus will hold its spring (1975) semester meeting at 3:30 p.m., on Thursday, April 17, 1975, in Room 150, Adams Hall.

REPORT ON MEETING OF INTER-SENATE LIAISON COMMITTEE

Dr. Martin C. Jischke, Senate Chairman, reported briefly on the meeting of the Inter-Senate Liaison Committee held on March 20, 1975, on the Health Sciences Center campus in Oklahoma City.

The following topics were discussed:

- Review of the work of both Senates during the current academic year
- Role of the Task Force on Personnel Policy and its impact on the Health Sciences Center
- The problem of deciding on either one inter-campus Faculty Handbook or separate Handbooks for the two campuses. Another possibility is an overriding document such as a University Constitution.
- Inter-campus interest in a single Fringe Benefits Committee, particularly from an actuarial point of view.

In Dr. Jischke's opinion, these meetings are beneficial and should be continued.

RECENT ANNOUNCEMENT OF UNIVERSITY OF OKLAHOMA FACULTY PARTICIPATION IN A STUDY OF COLLECTIVE BARGAINING

Dr. Martin C. Jischke, Senate Chairman, referred to a recent announcement, made after publication of the Agenda for this meeting, of a Norman campus faculty group's participation in a study of collective bargaining.

Dr. Jischke emphatically disclaimed any relationship between that group and the Faculty Senate. In his opinion, official faculty participation would require concurrence of the Faculty Senate.

PROPOSED FACULTY SENATE STUDY OF APPROPRIATE POLICY IN ANY FUTURE ENTRENCHMENT

Dr. Martin C. Jischke, Senate Chairman, reported recent faculty interest in a Faculty Senate study of appropriate guidelines and policy to be followed in the event of any University retrenchment in the future. He relayed the Senate Executive Committee's desire to ascertain faculty sentiment for such a study to be conducted "soberly and dispassionately" before the retrenchment question arises on this campus, if ever. Several members of the Senate expressed their strong endorsement of such a study, particularly in view of what is occurring on other campuses throughout the country and pending legislation in the State Legislature concerning a proposed reduction in the number of state employees, including higher education.

Dr. Jischke announced that the Senate Executive Committee would appoint an ad hoc committee to study this matter and report to the Senate next fall.

FACULTY REPLACEMENTS: University Councils and Committees

Dr. Gail de Stwolinski, Chairman of the Senate Committee on Committees, presented the following slate of faculty nominees recommended by that Committee to fill end-of-year vacancies on the following University Councils and Committees:

Academic Personnel Council:

Continuing members:

J. Neal Huffaker
Marion Council
Charlyce King
Sarah Crim
George Fraser
Richard Baker

Nominees:

Doyle Bishop (Management) - 1975-78
Jack Kanak (Psychology) - 1975-78
Wm. H. Maehl (History) - 1975-78

Academic Program Council:

Continuing members:

Joseph Holland
Paul Brinker
Kenneth Taylor
Cecil Lee
Howard Day
Michael Devine

Nominees:

Mary Dewey (Education) - 1975-78
Mary Warren (Home Economics) - 1975-78
Ken Merrill (Philosophy) - 1975-78

Administrative & Physical Resources Council:

Continuing members:

John E. Francis
Ancil Payne
Robert Petry
Charles Mankin
R. Dale Vliet
James Kenderdine

Nominees:

Fred Shellabarger (Architecture) - 1975-78
Gene Braught (Music) - 1975-78
Irwin (Jack) White (Science & Public Policy) -
1975-78

Athletics Council:

Continuing members:

Dick Van der Helm
Virginia Morris
Russel Buhite

Nominees:

Frank Miranda (HSC) - 1975-78
Wilson D. Steen (HSC) - 1975-78
Charles Harper (Geology) - 1975-77
Keever Greer (Stovall) - 1975-77

Budget Council:

Continuing members:

Patrick Sutherland
Billie Holcomb
Joe Hobbs

Nominees:

Homer Brown (Accounting) - 1975-78
Rex Inman (Meteorology) - 1975-78
T. H. Milby (Univ. Lib.) - 1975-78
Cluff Hopla (Zoology) - 1975-77
Sam Kirkpatrick (Political Science) - 1975-77
Ronald R. Bourassa (Physics) - 1975-76

Faculty Awards and Honors, University Council on:

Continuing members:

Joseph Rarick
Tom Love

Nominees:

Dorothy Fritz (English-RTA) - 1975-78
Alex Kondonassis (Economics-RTA) - 1975-78

John Ezell
Glenn Snider

Paul Ruggiers (English-GLC) - 1975-78
C. M. Sliepevich (CEMS-GLC) - 1975-78

Ron Nanda (HSC) - 1975-78
Kurt Weiss (HSC) - 1975-78

Research Council:

Continuing members:

Wayne Morgan
John Renner
Robert Magarian
Donald Cox
Karl Bergey

Nominees:

Robert Dubois (Geology) - 1975-78
Michael Hennagin (Music) - 1975-78
Jim Reese (Economics) - 1975-78
Yoshikazu Sasaki (Meteorology) - 1975-76

Academic Regulations Committee:

Continuing members:

Richard Goff
Matthew Kraynak
Jack Wright
Jill Kimrey
Paul Risser
Fred Miller

Nominees:

Ronald Lewis (Social Work) - 1975-79
Clovis Haden (EE) - 1975-79
Alan Nicewander (Psychology) - 1975-79
Tom Hill (Math) - 1975-79

Class Schedule Committee:

Continuing members:

Robert Richardson
Alan Velie
Claude Duchon
Mary Saxon
Neal Huffaker
Sebetai Unguru

Nominees:

Abraham Scherman (Education) - 1975-79
Guadalupe Thompson (Modern Languages) - 1975-79
Frank Appl (AMNE) - 1975-79
Judy Norlin (Social Work) - 1975-79

Commencement Committee:

Continuing members:

Donald Secrest
Mary Warren
Tim Ragan
Edwin Mumma

Nominees:

Phillip Lehrman (Pharmacy) - 1975-78
Monte Cook (Philosophy) - 1975-78

Computer Advisory Committee:

Continuing members:

Stefan Feyock
Jack Fuller
Leon Reiter
Henry Crichlow
Roger Frech
Neal Hardin

Nominees:

Wayland Cummings (Speech Comm.) - 1975-78
James Horrell (EAP) - 1975-78
James Bohland (Geography) - 1975-78
Larry Toothaker (Psychology) - 1975-78
Gail Adams (HSC) - 1975-78
Don Parke (HSC) - 1975-78

Faculty Advisory Committee to the President:

Continuing members:

Tom Wiggins
Seymour Feiler
Lee Poole
David Kitts

Nominees:

Tim Covington (Pharmacy) - 1975-77
Dwight Morgan (Law) - 1975-77
David Levy (History) - 1975-77
Irma Tomberlin (Library Science) - 1975-77

Charles Bert
Ray Mill

James Hibdon (Economics) - 1975-77
James Merrell (HSC) - 1975-77

Fringe Benefits Committee:

Continuing members:

Lennie-Marie Tolliver
Donald Childress
W. B. Prickett

Nominees:

Virginia Gillespie (HPER) - 1975-79
Nadine Roach (Social Work) - 1975-79
Tom Smith (History of Science) - 1975-78
Barton Turkington (AMNE) - 1975-78

Patent Advisory Committee:

Continuing members:

Gail Adams
Robert St. John
Darrel Harden

Nominees:

John TeSelle (Law) - 1975-79
John McAdams (Law) - 1975-79

ROTC Advisory Committee:

Continuing members:

William Carmack
Burt Scanlan
Jerlene Hargis
Ray Larson
Jimmy F. Harp
John Fletcher

Nominees:

Loy Prickett (Education) - 1975-78
Hiram Davis (Univ. Lib.) - 1975-78
James Goodman (Geography) - 1975-78
Marvin Baker (Geography) - 1975-78
William Eick (HPER) - 1975-78
Leonard R. Rubin (Math) - 1975-78

Scholarships and Financial Aids Committee:

Continuing members:

James Henkle
Donald Menzie
Richard Williams

Nominees:

Marilyn Flowers (Economics) - 1975-77
Dan Kolhepp (Finance) - 1975-77
Melvin Tolson (Modern Languages) - 1975-77
Frank Seto (Zoology) - 1975-77
Jean Hernick (Classics) - 1975-77
Ruth Hankowsky (Speech Comm.) - 1975-77

Speakers Bureau:

Continuing members:

Robert Shalhope
Tom Wilbanks

Nominees:

Robert Richardson (Law) - 1975-78
Wayne Rowe (Education) - 1975-78

University Book Exchange Oversight Committee:

Continuing members:

Russell Buhite
Dortha Henderson

Nominees:

Bert McCammon (Marketing) - 1975-78
James Faulconer (Music) - 1975-78

University Libraries Committee:

Continuing members:

LaVerne Hoag
Jack Cohn
Nelson Nunnally
Carolyn Swan
Francis Schmitz
Joseph Fritz

Nominees:

Dan Wren (Management) - 1975-78
B. G. Schumacher (Management) - 1975-78
Michael Buchwald (Drama) - 1975-78
Digby Bell (Music) - 1975-78
Tillman Ragan (Education) - 1975-78
Laura Blair (Education) - 1975-78

Equal Employment Opportunity Committee:Nominees:

Michael Cox (Law) - 1975-76
 Carol Beasley (Art) - 1975-76

Faculty Appeals Board (with Tenure):Continuing members:

David French
 William Keown
 Charles Cameron
 Gene Levy
 Albert Staples
 Ruth Donnell
 Mary Clare Petty
 Larry Canter
 Wilson Prickett
 Richard Fowler
 Jay Shurley
 Davis Egle
 Robert Bell
 Celia Mae Bryant

Nominees:

Vera Gatch (Human Relations) - 1975-79
 Andrew Heisserer (History) - 1975-79
 Harold Young (Law) - 1975-79
 Blanche Sommers (Pharmacy) - 1975-79
 Ed Crim (Economics) - 1975-79
 L. R. Wilson (Geology) - 1975-77

Judicial Tribunal:Continuing members:

Forrest Freuh
 Juneann Murphy

Nominees:

Peter Kutner (Law) - 1975-78
 Jerry Muskrat (Law) - 1975-78
 Donald Lipski (Art) - 1975-78
 David Morgan (Political Science) - 1975-78

Additional nominations may be made at the May 5 meeting of the Senate. Senators are urged to obtain the consent of any nominees in advance of that meeting.

UNIVERSITY POLICY ON OUTSIDE EMPLOYMENT AND EXTRA COMPENSATION

Background Information: On December 9, 1974, the Faculty Senate approved for submission to President Paul F. Sharp its latest proposal for revising the University policy concerning outside employment and extra compensation. (See pages 6-8 of the Faculty Senate Journal for December 9, 1974.)

Following President Sharp's unfavorable reaction to several items in that Senate proposal, Dr. Martin C. Jischke in several conferences with the President and other administrators, attempted to effect a compromise in this matter. Accordingly, on April 7, 1975, Dr. Jischke addressed the following memorandum to the members of the Senate in advance of the April 14 Senate meeting:

The Policy on Outside Employment and Extra Compensation adopted by the Senate in December has been reviewed by President Sharp. There are features of that policy that the President is unable to approve. I have discussed this with the President with the hope that a compromise can be reached that will meet with the approval of both the Senate and the President. Enclosed is a revised version of the Senate's proposal that I believe would be acceptable to the President.

This revised proposal has four significant changes from the policy adopted by the Senate in December:

- (1) The need for Presidential approval for absences for more than one week has been reinstated in the third paragraph of the preamble.

- (2) The policy has been changed so as to refer to twelve-month rather than eleven-month appointments in paragraph (2) and thereby does not allow for payment for performing sponsored research in the summer to faculty with twelve-month appointments.
- (3) Paragraph (6) has been changed so that extra compensation activities are paid at the same rate as one's base salary.
- (4) A new paragraph (13) has been inserted to allow for exceptions to the policy to be granted by the President in response to a written request.

While these changes are significant -- especially that in paragraph (6) -- there still remain many important differences between this policy and that of the Task Force on Outside Employment and Extra Compensation. In particular, I would call your attention to the changed wording in the preamble and the treatment of the twelfth month (the enclosed revision treats the twelfth month just like the other eleven).

There are two options open to the Senate at this time. We can either reaffirm our commitment to the policy adopted in December or adopt the enclosed revision. If we continue to support the December proposal, it is my opinion that the President will reject the Senate proposal and follow the interim policy of the Task Force on Outside Employment and Extra Compensation which has been described to the Regents. If we endorse the revised policy, I believe it will be forwarded by the President to the Regents with a recommendation for approval. Thus, it is my recommendation to you that we accept the compromise proposal. The resulting policy, while not ideal, is from the faculty viewpoint, the best solution possible. A motion to endorse the revised proposal will be presented during the Old Business part of our meeting on April 14.

Proposed Revision:

UNIVERSITY OF OKLAHOMA POLICY ON OUTSIDE EMPLOYMENT AND EXTRA COMPENSATION

FACULTY

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.

The professional expertise of the University faculty is normally available to the state and its citizens for incidental and minor services without remuneration. When, however, the services desired from outside the University exceed a reasonable and mutually agreed limit, direct extra remuneration 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 assumes a primary professional obligation to the University. Any other employment or enterprise in which he or she engages for income must be understood to be definitely secondary to his or her University work, and, after consultation with those reviewing requests for outside employment and extra compensation, he or she must be willing to accept the judgment of the President and Regents as to whether he or she may engage in such 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 remuneration or for no remuneration of any kind, should contribute to the faculty member's professional growth or efficiency and to his or her teaching or scholarly competence.

POLICY: Subject to the above principles.

- (1) After prior arrangement, faculty members on nine-month contracts (whether on 9 or 12 payment options) may engage in professional activities for extra remuneration (from within the University or from outside sources or in any combination of the two) to a maximum of 25% of their nine-month full-time professional effort.
- (2) After prior arrangement, faculty members on twelve-month contracts may engage in professional activities for extra remuneration (from within the University or from outside sources or in any combination of the two) to a maximum of 25% of their twelve-month full-time professional effort. Faculty on twelve-month contracts may not receive extra compensation for teaching Summer Session or for performing sponsored research.
- (3) For faculty members on nine-month contracts, summer activities involving funds administered by or through the University may be formed by negotiation into an amended contract for a period up to twelve months and for assignments up to 1.0 full-time professional effort.
- (4) During any portion of the summer in which a faculty member is not on contract with the University, he or she may engage in outside employment without restriction.
- (5) Faculty members on amended full-time contracts during the summer months may engage in professional activities for extra remuneration (from within the University or from outside sources or in any combination of the two) up to a maximum of 25% of their full-time professional effort.
- (6) Within the University the time required for all extra compensation assignments during the entire year and for all professional assignments during the summer will be determined by those responsible for the various programs as an appropriate fraction of the faculty member's full-time professional effort and the University will pay him or her the corresponding fraction of his or her base salary rate. The time required for all professional activities for extra remuneration outside the University will be determined by the faculty member as an appropriate fraction of his or her full-time professional effort when approval for such activity is requested.
- (7) Approval of outside employment is requested on a form "Application for Permission to Engage in Outside Employment" available from the Deans' Offices or the Office of Personnel Services. Such applications and arrangements must be resubmitted at the beginning of each contract year. Resubmission is the responsibility of the faculty member. All activities performed inside the University for extra compensation must be arranged, as all in-load assignments are, with the agreement of the department chairman and dean.
- (8) Faculty should also be concerned to avoid possible conflict of interest with the University in all outside employment. Questions regarding potential conflict of interest should be addressed to the dean who may wish to consult the University's Legal Counsel.
- (9) No faculty member may hold a split (joint) appointment which reflects more than a total of 1.0 full-time equivalent.
- (10) The Regents look with disfavor upon any University employee's accepting either part-time or full-time employment in any political organization or in connection with the campaign of any candidate for public office.

STAFF

(11) The policy for faculty with twelve-month contracts shall apply to the University Staff who are not classified personnel. With prior approval, such individuals may engage in professional activities for extra remuneration (within the University or from outside sources or in any combination of the two) to a maximum of 25% of their twelve-month full-time professional effort, but they may not receive extra compensation for teaching in Summer Session or for performing sponsored research.

(12) University staff who are not classified personnel may request approval of outside employment on a form, "Request for Permission to Engage in Outside Employment," available from the Office of Personnel Services. All activities performed inside the University for extra compensation must be arranged, as regular assignments are, with the agreement of the appropriate department head and vice president.

GENERAL

(13) If this policy creates a demonstrable hardship for a University program, exceptions can be granted by the President in response to a written request.

(14) These regulations for both faculty and staff supersede the regulations on outside employment adopted by the Regents in 1931, 1948, 1958, and 1971.

- - - - -
The ensuing discussion was centered, for the most part, on item (6) of the proposed revision, which some faculty members felt could cause some difficulty in the future if interpreted too literally. Several individuals called attention to the close relationship between item (6) and the proposed OCCE Policy 3.10 to be discussed as the next item on the Agenda for this meeting.

Dr. Francis Schmitz moved the addition of the phrase, "or a person," in item (13) so that this item would read as follows:

"(13) If this policy creates a demonstrable hardship for a University program or a person, exceptions can be granted by the President in response to a written request."

The Senate approved the addition to item (13) in a vote of 20 affirmative and 13 negative votes.

The Senate next approved with some dissent the revised proposal concerning outside employment and extra compensation.

OCCE POLICY 3.10

Background Information: On November 15, 1974, President Paul F. Sharp requested Faculty Senate consideration and reaction to the proposed Policy 3.10 (Continuing Education and Public Service) that had been submitted to him by Vice President White on November 12, 1974. On December 9, 1974, the Senate elected an ad hoc Committee to review the proposal and present its recommendations to the Senate. (See page 5 of the Senate Journal for December 9, 1974.)

The ad hoc Committee Chairman submitted the following Committee report to the Senate on March 5, 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 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

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

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

Dr. Jim Reese, ad hoc Committee Chairman, was present at this meeting to move adoption of the Committee report and to answer any questions. Without further discussion, however, the Senate approved the report of the ad hoc Committee for submission to President Paul F. Sharp.

✓ ALLEGED SHORT-ORDERING OF TEXTBOOKS BY UNIVERSITY BOOK EXCHANGE

Background Information: At the February 10, 1975, meeting of the Senate, Dr. James Fife called attention of the Senate to several instances in his department of insufficient textbooks for students enrolled in their classes. He then proposed a Senate resolution calling upon the Book Exchange to honor the request from the Senate that the number of textbooks ordered for each course at least equal the estimated enrollment provided by the academic unit concerned. The Senate tabled further discussion until the March 17 meeting to give the Senate an opportunity to invite Mr. Jim Stafford of the Book Exchange to address the Senate on this question. (See pages 12-13 of the Senate Journal for February 10, 1975.)

Accordingly, Mr. Stafford appeared before the Senate on March 17 and explained in some detail the problems of the Book Exchange operation. Later in the meeting, Dr. Fife amended his original resolution by the addition of a provision that would permit the Book Exchange to take into consideration the orders placed by the other bookstores in Norman. The Senate agreed to postpone final action until the April 14 meeting. (See page 6 of the Faculty Senate Journal for March 17, 1975.)

Senate Action: Dr. Fife reported on two informal conversations following the March 17, 1975, Senate meeting with Mr. Stafford concerning the various problems and procedures in ordering textbooks. Both times, Mr. Stafford gave assurances of cooperation in this matter. Nevertheless, Dr. Fife urged unanimous Senate support of his resolution. In a voice vote, the Senate approved without dissent the following resolution:

"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. The orders may be made taking into consideration the orders placed by local, private bookstores."

✓ ROLE OF ADMINISTRATORS IN DECISIONS REGARDING FACULTY TENURE, PROMOTION, AND SALARY INCREASES

Background Information: At the February 10, 1975, Senate meeting, a strong consensus was expressed in favor of de-emphasizing the role of administrators in the tenure-granting process. (See page 11 of the Senate Journal for February 10, 1975.) Further consideration of this matter was postponed until a later Senate meeting.

Senate Action: As soon as this question was brought to the attention of the Senate in accordance with the Agenda for this meeting, Dr. Glenn Snider requested and received Senate permission to address the Senate.

According to Dr. Snider, a considerable amount of what is regarded as low morale now reported among faculty probably exists chiefly as a result of institutional practices that seem to bear a direct relationship to decision making. He mentioned two items-- (1) the administrative efforts to create conditions in which decision making at the departmental level is intimidated and to increase the amount of influence that is brought to bear on the decision-making process from the higher levels of the University and (2) the inclusion of the Graduate Dean and the University College Dean in the decisions regarding tenure and promotions. The original logic for including these two administrative officers -- if it ever existed -- does not hold true today. The former point is threatening one of the genuine prerogatives of the University faculty and urged the faculty to take positive action in this matter. In his opinion, the Senate is a most appropriate group to express the faculty's deep concern with regard to the consequences that are currently being felt all over the campus as a result of these procedures.

Dr. Patrick Sutherland countered with the reaction that tenure and promotion over the years have become more or less automatic. Current efforts to upgrade the quality of faculty being brought in are commendable and provide for overall University-wide standards. Interpreting Dr. Snider's remarks as a plea for each department to make these tenure and promotion decisions without outside review and approval, if all departments were to make complete decisions in these matters, there would be no necessity for standards and mediocre departments would hire mediocre faculty. In the best interests of the University and of those who would like to see the regional and national reputations of the University improve, there is a need for some objective evaluation of tenure and promotion procedures. Without outside evaluation, these matters would get down to personality levels.

Dr. Ford called attention to the fact that no department has all the authority in these personnel matters because the budget dean and the Provost are still in the decision-making process. He agreed with Dr. Snider that an orderly, logical process needs to be set up. In his view, the logical procedure is being circumvented when these decisions are channeled through the Graduate Dean and the University College Dean--two individuals who could not possibly know all departments on the campus.

Seven other members of the Senate added comments concerning determination and evaluation of criteria, as well as the lack of feedback to the originating departments in matters of tenure and promotion.

In a subsequent rebuttal, Dr. Snider expressed the opinion that originally the thought was that the University College Dean would have access to the capability of many faculty members and that his judgment might be appropriate. The Graduate Dean's role may have had some relevance once, but in recent years the frequent shifting of Graduate Deans has made this procedure highly inappropriate. Denying any implication that tenure and promotion policies have always been correct, he stated that in his view the major responsibility of the President and the Provost should be one of leadership in the constant effort to re-examine and improve the procedures.

Subsequently, Dr. Fowler moved that the Senate suggest to the Task Force on Personnel Policy that it look closely into the role of administrators in decisions concerning personnel matters. The Senate rejected that suggestion.

Next, Dr. de Stwolinski moved that departmental recommendations concerning tenure, promotion, and salary increases be sent forward to the budget dean and then to the Office of the Provost. During the discussion of this question, Dr. Streebin moved that the motion be amended by the addition of the following: "Any recommendation that is in disagreement with the original recommendation of the academic unit be documented and relayed to the academic unit at the same time that the recommendation is being forwarded to the next higher echelon." The Senate approved first without dissent the amendment offered by Dr. Streebin and later with one dissenting vote the original motion as amended.

GRADUATE ASSISTANT REMUNERATION

On March 26, 1975, Dr. James Fife addressed the following proposal to the Faculty Senate concerning remuneration for graduate assistants:

That the Chairman of the Faculty Senate ask either the Faculty Welfare Committee or an ad hoc Committee to develop for the consideration of the Faculty Senate a policy on remuneration for graduate assistants at the earliest possible meeting and that this committee consider the plan outlined below, in addition to any suggestions from other faculty members and concepts generated by the Committee itself.

THE PLAN: That the base salary for graduate assistants equal thirty-five percent of the average salary for O.U. instructors for the previous year computed to the nearest \$50. Add two-and-one-half percent of this base salary for each year of teaching

experience whether at the University or at another accredited educational institution; add five percent for graduate assistants holding the M.A. Let the additions accumulate until a level twenty-five percent above the base salary has been reached. This would constitute a maximum salary.

Here is an example, based on the average salary for instructors at the University of Oklahoma during 1974-75, of how this plan would affect graduate assistant salaries:

Base salary for graduate assistants with a B.S./B.A. degree: \$3,350.00

Base salary for graduate assistants with an M.A. degree: \$3,518.00

Maximum graduate assistant salary: \$4,188.

In commenting on his proposal, Dr. Fife called attention to the following points:

- (1) The current Oklahoma University minimum figure of \$2,500 for graduate student stipends is drastically below the regional minimum. (Dr. Fife distributed copies of a comparison of graduate stipends at the following Universities: Colorado, North Texas State, New Mexico, Texas at Austin, Kansas, Alabama, Ohio State, Texas at Arlington, Kansas State, and Oklahoma.)
- (2) Many graduate assistants are being forced to use Federal food stamps and other welfare programs.
- (3) The composition of the Oklahoma University corps of graduate assistants is being significantly altered. Fewer of them are coming from outside Norman proper. Wives of locally employed men can afford graduate work at Oklahoma University; many others cannot do so.
- (4) The academic quality of graduate assistants in some cases has deteriorated and will continue to do so if stipends remain low. Because graduate assistants form the nucleus of most graduate programs and the totality of some, the quality and the educational level of graduate programs eventually will drop.
- (5) If the graduate assistant base salary is tied to a percentage of the average instructor salary and increments, these junior colleagues (who have no AAUP or any other organization to promote their welfare) would see their income inflate automatically with the economy at the same rate that instructor salaries inflate.
- (6) The salary schedule would relieve departments of budget juggling; the University administration would be bound to support the number of graduate assistants justified by departmental needs.

Mr. J. Markham Collins, a UOSA representative to the Senate and a graduate assistant in economics, expressed gratitude to Dr. Fife for his interest and initiative in this matter. He urged the Faculty Senate to support the proposal to improve the "dismal" economic plight of the graduate assistants on this campus.

Dr. Ford suggested that the Budget Council might be the appropriate group to study the proposal.

In a voice vote without dissent, the faculty approved the graduate assistant stipend proposal.

ADMINISTRATIVE USE OF ANONYMOUS STUDENT EVALUATIONS OF TEACHERS

On March 25, 1975, Dr. James Fife requested Senate consideration of the following resolution concerning the administrative use of anonymous student evaluations of teachers:

"RESOLVED that administrative and academic units of the University shall neither solicit, collect, compile, nor in any way make use of anonymous student evaluations of faculty performance and that any evaluations collected to date be destroyed."

Regarding himself as being, in general, in favor of student evaluation of faculty performance, Dr. Fife expressed concern for the abuses that have crept into the present system of student evaluation of teachers. He then offered the following arguments to support his proposal:

Student anonymity fosters irresponsibility.

- (1) Student hostility for a subject is often transferred to the teacher.
- (2) There have been many examples of vulgar verbal abuse.
- (3) There is evidence that a professor can raise his "popularity" rating by raising grades and/or decreasing the work load.
- (4) There is evidence of wide differences between evaluations by currently enrolled students and by former students.
- (5) Response patterns show that many students make little attempt to evaluate carefully each questionnaire item.

The purpose of the evaluation form is not clear.

- (1) Ostensibly, the evaluation program was designed to help instructors get student feedback for the purpose of improving their teaching. In fact, they tend to tell instructors what they already know about their teaching. An in-service program in subject areas to improve teaching would be more positive than the nonconstructive and sometimes ego-shattering evaluations.
- (2) There is mounting evidence that the evaluations are being used by departments and colleges to make decisions regarding salaries, promotions, firing, and tenure. Such use is understandable inasmuch as student evaluations often constitute the only available "objective" criteria. Nevertheless, such use is unacceptable in view of the faults of these evaluations. There is a possibility that the use of anonymous questionnaires in matters of salaries, promotions, and so forth, may be illegal and may subject the University to lawsuits.

In his opinion, the evaluation forms have a limited value and must be used with a great deal of discretion. With the increasing administrative use of the results of the evaluations, there will be a tendency among faculty to avoid techniques and methods that might be best educationally but will instead teach with those methods that will give them the best ratings. In the long run, the evaluation process will work against the best interests of the University -- high-quality education. He then moved approval of his resolution.

Mr. Mark Andersen, a UOSA representative, commented that he had found himself in agreement with some of the points raised by Dr. Fife. He called attention, however, to the fact that there was no University-wide evaluation form. In his view, Dr. Fife raised two basic problems--use of the forms by the students as a teacher popularity contest and by the administrators in faculty personnel decisions. Agreeing that the present system needs some study and improvement, he proposed a one-year moratorium on student evaluations pending further consideration rather than abolishment of the evaluation

system. He suggested a University-wide task force to study the matter. He added that faculty evaluations should include undergraduate and graduate students, as well as faculty peers.

Dr. Marchand commented that student evaluations, although limited in value, are extremely important. He reported that the Chemistry Department is instituting a program of peer-group faculty evaluations to enhance its evaluation system.

Dr. Sutherland noted that the motion under discussion abolishes student evaluations but makes no provision for any alternatives. Because of the serious nature of this matter, he moved that this question be referred to an appropriate committee for study and recommendations. The Senate then approved without dissent the referral motion.

ADJOURNMENT

The Faculty Senate adjourned at 5:26 p.m. The next regular meeting of the Senate will be held at 3:30 p.m., Monday, May 5, 1975, in Room 218, Dale Hall.

Respectfully submitted,



Anthony S. Lis, Secretary