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

Regular Session -- May 5, 1975 -- 3:30 p.m., Dale Hall 218.

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

Present:

Barefield, Paul	(1)	Graves, Wm. H.	(0)	Schmitz, Francis	(1)
Bell, Digby B.	(2)	Jischke, Martin C.	(1)	Shahan, Robert	(2)
Bethel, Audrey	(2)	Kendall, Jack L.	(1)	Starling, K. E.	(1)
Blair, Laura B.	(1)	Kidd, Gerald	(4)	Streebin, Leale	(1)
Buhite, Russell	(3)	Kondonassis, Alex	(2)	Sutherland, Patrick	(1)
Cronenwett, Wm. T.	(2)	Lehrman, G. Philip	(2)	Swank, David	(2)
de Stwolinski, Gail	(0)	Levinson, R. Saul	(0)	Tolliver, Lennie-Marie	(1)
Donnell, Ruth	(2)	Marchand, Alan	(2)	Tomberlin, Irma	(1)
Duchon, Claude E.	(0)	Prickett, Wilson B.	(0)	Uptegraft, Joe Ellen	(1)
Eliason, Stanley	(1)	Reid, Wm. T.	(1)	Wells, Richard S.	(1)
Estes, James E.	(3)	Reynolds, Osborne M.	(0)	Whitecotton, Joseph	(2)
Ford, Robert A.	(1)	Scheffer, Walter F.	(2)		

UOSA representative: Andersen, Mark

AUOPE representatives: Anderson, Kenneth Guyer, D. Stith, Mary

Absent:

Baker, Marvin	(1)	Henderson, Bob	(4)	Letchworth, George	(1)
Braver, Gerald	(2)	Huff, William	(1)	Mouser, James W.	(1)
Calvert, Floyd	(1)	Huneke, Harold V.	(3)	Shellabarger, Fred	(2)
Fife, James	(1)	Kraynak, Matthew	(1)	Tolson, Melvin B.	(6)
Fowler, Richard G.	(1)	Larson, Raymond D.	(2)	Unruh, Delbert L.	(3)

UOSA representatives: Ahmed, Zia; Bake, Betsy; Collins, Mark; Parks, Ann

AUOPE representatives: Flowers, Joe Shinert, Gregory Taylor, Floyd

(Note: The figure in parentheses above denotes the total number of absences during the 1974-75 academic year. The Senate met nine (9) times in regular sessions.)

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

The Journal of the Faculty Senate for the regular session on April 14, 1975, was approved.

ACTIONS TAKEN BY PRESIDENT PAUL F. SHARP

Proposals of the Task Force on Women in the University regarding language of University documents: On April 16, 1975, Dr. Paul F. Sharp, President of the University, approved the following recommendations of the Task Force on Women in the University regarding the language of University documents:

Studies have shown that the language of documents does make a difference so that, when the generic term 'man' is used, most people believe that only men are being referred to. The Task Force, therefore, recommends:

1. Great progress has been made in revising job titles to eliminate sex designation, and we would like to commend Personnel Services for their efforts. There are, however, some titles that still need to be changed (e.g. "Seamstress") and some inconsistencies (e.g. in the University Duplicating Services, some employees hold the title "Draftsperson" while others are referred to as "Typewriter Repairmen"). We recommend that Personnel Services continue their review of these titles.

2. The University should adopt a consistent style to designate the heads of committees, councils, and departments. At present, when a man heads one of these bodies, he is referred to as "Chairman" while a woman is called "Chairperson" or "Chairwoman." The Task Force suggests that a neutral term be adopted. The simple form "Chair" would suffice, or in some cases, the title "Convenor" could be substituted.

3. We recommend that, as each University publication is revised, special attention be given to removing sex designation where it is inappropriate or where reference to both men and women is intended. The most recent Arts and Sciences Bulletin, for example, has few instances, but retains in several places the masculine pronoun where students of both sexes are meant. As the Faculty Handbook is being rewritten, we would like to recommend that careful attention be given to its language. The consistent designation of faculty and administrative officers as "he" undercuts the University's policy of equal opportunity for all.

In his April 16 memorandum to administrators and officers of various groups (including the Faculty Senate) on both campuses, Dr. Sharp suggested the following pertinent guidelines to provide some consistency throughout the University:

(1) "Person" or "individual" wherever possible and appropriate instead of "man," "women," etc.

(2) "Chairperson" or "chair" in place of "chairman."

(3) "He or she" or "s/he" in place of "he" or "his."

(In commenting on this action by President Sharp, Dr. Martin C. Jischke, Senate Chairperson, announced that the Faculty Senate would implement the new policy immediately.)

Faculty Senate Proposals concerning OCCE Policy 3.10:
In acknowledging Senate action of April 14 concerning the OCCE Policy 3.10, President Paul F. Sharp made the following pertinent comment in his April 18 memorandum to the Chairperson of the Faculty Senate:

> "Obviously there a number of important questions involved here which will take some time to review and react to. After we have had a chance to review this matter carefully, we shall be back in touch with you."

(See pages 10-14 of the Faculty Senate Journal for April 14, 1975.)

Regents' Policy on Outside Employment and Extra Compensation: On April 25, 1975, President Paul F. Sharp addressed a letter to the Senate Chairperson in which he thanked the Senate for the action taken on April 14 concerning the proposed revision of the policy on outside employment and extra compensation. Expressing pleasure with the policy as it addresses the faculty, President Sharp anticipates taking the matter to the Regents at their June meeting. Dr. Sharp's letter of April 25 included the following observations:

> "First, I assume that although the policy is labeled a 'university' one, it is intended to address only the Norman campus since the current policy in the Faculty Handbook, which it would replace, addresses only the Norman campus, since many of the faculty at the Health Sciences Center are covered by the practice plan there, and since the question of applicability of the proposed policy has not been addressed by those at the Health Sciences Center.
>
> "Second, the Employee Executive Council has indicated an interest in reviewing that portion of the policy that would affect members of the Council and its constituent organizations. Consequently, I have forwarded a copy of the proposed policy to the EEC for the Council's comments concerning that portion that addresses 'staff.' I have indicated my satisfication with the policy as it relates to faculty, and I have asked for a response in time for the matter to be placed upon the agenda for the June meeting of the University Regents."

(See pages 7-10 of the Senate Journal for April 14, 1975.)

Alleged Short-ordering of Textbooks by the University Book Exchange: On May 7, 1975, President Paul F. Sharp approved the Senate resolution of April 14, 1975, concerning the alleged short-ordering of textbooks by the University Book Exchange. (See page 14 of the Senate Journal for April 14, 1975.)

ACTIONS TAKEN BY THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE, FACULTY SENATE

Ad Hoc Committee concerning Appropriate Retrenchement Policy: The following ad hoc Committee has recently been appointed to study an appropriate policy for the University to be followed in the event of any future retrenchment:

Michael Langenbach (Education)
Beverly Ledbetter (Legal Counsel)
Cecil Lee (Art)
Robert Shahan (Philosophy) - Chairperson
Bart Ward (Accounting)
Leon Zelby (Electrical Engineering)

(See pages 3 and 4 of the Senate Journal for April 14, 1975.)

Administrative Use of Anonymous Student Evaluations of Teachers: Dr. Martin C. Jischke, Senate Chairperson, reported that the President of the University is planning to appoint a faculty-student task force to study the question of student evaluation of teachers and prepare appropriate recommendations for subsequent consideration by the Faculty Senate. Accordingly, Dr. Jischke indicated that the Senate Executive Committee will hold in abeyance any further action concerning the appointment of an apparently overlapping Senate ad hoc committee to study the various aspects of the same problem. (See pages 17 and 18 of the Senate Journal for April 14, 1975.)

1974-75 REPORT OF THE UNIVERSITY BUDGET COUNCIL

Background Information: On April 24, Dr. Leon Zelby, Chairperson of the University Budget Council, submitted the following report covering the 1974-75 activities of that Council:

Report of the Budget Council for the academic year, 1974-75, submitted to the Faculty Senate on April 24, 1975, by Dr. Leon Zelby, Council Chairman:

A. Introductory Comments

1. The Council met regularly once a week, addressing itself to a wide variety of issues through a subcommittee structure. The workload was quite heavy, and a conservative estimate would put the minimum hourly effort per member at about six hours per week. The results of subcommittee deliberations, regularly reviewed by the entire Council, are presented in several different categories.
2. Several appointments to the Council were made very late, and several members missed a very substantial number of meetings. This combination deprived the Council of potentially valuable inputs.
3. The major goal of the Council has been to establish long-range objectives which could serve as the baseline for judgment of the relative merits of fiscal activities brought to the attention of the Council.

B. Long-Range Objectives

In January, 1975, the Council communicated to President Sharp a list of priorities established for the purpose of reaching the following set of goals:

1. Upgrading of salaries and wages (faculty salaries to levels comparable to those of the more prestigious Big Eight Universities, others to levels comparable to those in the Greater Oklahoma City area).
2. Increasing the support for the Library and "C" budgets.

The Council recommended further that all programs, whether academic or not, should be reviewed periodically. It was the feeling of the Council that marginal programs should be phased out.

In order that the salary and wage recommendations be implemented as soon as practicable, the Council recommended that no new positions be created, nor programs established, until the priority recommendations are met. In order not to inhibit the establishment of a particularly meritorious program, or position, the Council suggested reallocation of vacancies and/or funds rather than new appropriations in such instances.

C. 1976 Budget

In March, 1975, the Council transmitted to President Sharp its recommendations for the fiscal 1976 budget and material supporting these recommendations. It was the feeling of the Council that delay in presenting budgetary recommendations until the final appropriation figures would be available would result in hasty, sometimes not consistently presented sets of priorities. As a result, the recommendations were made IN PRINCIPLE, using the then estimated figure of slightly less than three million dollars, concluding that additional funds (or shortfall), if any, be prorated according to the priorities listed.

In order to provide a minimum 10% salary rise, on the average, it was necessary to recommend the freezing of all salaries above a certain level, instituting economy measures to reduce utility costs, and dipping into a reserve fund.

In addition to the necessary increases in fixed costs, a 10% increase in academic and a 2½% increase in non-academic "C" budgets were also recommended.

In the material supporting the Council's recommendations, the Council urged a realistic budget preparation and fund allocations in order that transfers from one class of budget items to another become exception rather than a rule. It also urged a curb on tendencies to inflate personnel needs, on overlapping services, and on unnecessary duplication of effort in academic, as well as non-academic programs.

D. Review

In the review of past actions, the Council reviewed various salary statistics:

1. Review of 1974-75 salary increases, based on the printed budget, showed that about 30% of those listed under Administration received salary increases of 11% or more; about 15% of those listed under General Expense received 11% or more rises; and about 7% of those listed under Instruction received 11% or more rises (eliminating from this list persons with administrative responsibilities in provost's, deans', or departmental offices, e.g. administrative assistants, reduces the 7% to 5.4%, increasing correspondingly the other categories).

2. The average salary increase was sightly over 7% among administrative officers and about 5½% for the faculty.

3. Comparison of selected administrative salaries (vice presidents, deans, etc.) among the Big Eight Universities showed the OU average to fall above the corresponding Big Eight average whereas for the faculty salaries, the OU average is at the bottom of the Big Eight average. In the comparison, it is recognized that some OU officers' salaries are paid partly from HSC funds; but, then, their effort is also prorated.

E. Miscellaneous Responses

In its responses to various requests for suggestions, advice, and recommendations, the Council based -- in large measure -- its decision on the merits of the requests and their effect on the implementation of the long-range goals (described in Section B of this report).

1. In September, 1974, President Sharp asked for advice on an average goal for percentage salary increase, as well as apportionment between merit and cost-of-living increases. In October, the Council responded recommending an average of 24% salary rise. This figure was based on an aspect of long-range planning enunciated by a subcommittee of this Council in February, 1974, and relating to OU salaries level within the Big 8 (see also section B of this report). Further, the Council recommended that whatever funds would be available for salary increases, one-half should be used for a flat, across-the-board, cost-of-living adjustment with the remaining one-half for merit increases.

2. Responding to President Sharp's request for advice on Cable Television, the Council recommended the option which would allow installation of the system and initiation of programming on two channels without expenditure of funds (utilizing equipment available in Speech Communications and in Journalism).

3. Responding to President Sharp's inquiry on the EEC Wage and Salary Plan, the Council recommended that it be implemented on a self-supporting basis, i. c., as the Plan was originally prepared by the EEC and presented to the Council in May, 1974.

4. The Council recommended the fulfillment of commitments made in previous years to the Science and Public Policy Program by reallocation of vacancies in the Provost's area.

5. The Council endorsed the request for a program in Women's Studies compiled by the Task Force on Women in the University and recommended to the Provost that he assign the requested FTE from vacancies in his area.

6. The Council provided inputs for the questionnaire distributed by the State Senate's Higher Education Committee (Senator Murphy).

7. The Council recommended creation of an Office of Institutional Research in the Provost area, stipulating that funds therefor be made available through reallocation of vacancies and not through the distribution of new money. The need for such an office became quite evident in pursuit of routine business: some needed data were unavailable; some, available in forms not suitable for immediate use. Although in several areas the situation improved somewhat during the past few months, an office of this sort would be extremely helpful in program review, projections, and analyses.

8. The Council reviewed women's salaries with the assistance of Women's Caucus and recommended that funds be set aside to provide for equalization of salaries without infringing upon the functions and responsibilities of the respective committees A, departmental heads, and deans.

9. Since 20 March 1975, the Council has been operating under a revised set of procedures approved by President Sharp.

10. The Council did not endorse "one-time" expenditures for equipment and library mechanization since it could not determine how these requests corresponded to potential long-range plans, and since no alternative uses for the funds were presented.

11. The Council supported a central computing facility, recommending strict justification for any acquisition of peripheral, or stand-alone equipment, urging at the same time the establishment of a limit on the expenditure by, or for, the central computing facility; development of a rank-order priority list for such expenditures; and establishment of a review process. Later, the Council recommended the establishment of a computer-time allocation procedure, and strict enforcement thereof, in order to slow down what seems an unbridled growth of computer utilization.

12. The Council endorsed the recommendations of the Research Council contained in their "Recommendations for Research Funding" dated 2 December 1974 in the event that funds become available.

F. Review of Administrative Action on Council's Recommendation

Review of administrative decisions as related to Council's recommendations may not necessarily represent a significant input. The Council represents one of many

advisory bodies, and its recommendations are primarily related to issues of fiscal nature and distribution of funds based on such policies. It would indeed be flattering to the Council if all its recommendations were followed. Since its input, however, is relatively narrow and represents only one link in the decision process, a point-by-point analysis would not serve a useful purpose. The Council's constituencies would undoubtedly be able to judge the results much better on the basis of the reports of all the Councils and the resulting administrative decisions and actions.

It might be desirable to suggest that, in view of the number of Councils, committees, and ad hoc task forces, a procedure for better coordination, interaction, and communication be established in order that specific issues be analyzed collectively rather than individually. This might lead to a more consistent set of recommendations.

G. Discussion

The Council, in all its activities and deliberations, kept in mind that ours is an educational institution, with all its activities subordinate to this primary mission. It initiated, but has been unable to complete, review of various programs, as well as overlapping functions and duplication of effort from the fiscal point of view. In the process, it observed that there are some ancillary activities which, although self-supporting on the basis of income-expenditure type of analysis, carry some indirect costs in the sense that they divert some administrative effort which would otherwise have been devoted to activities more closely connected with the educational process.

Throughout the year, it became evident that one of the problems affecting the effectiveness of the Council is lack of communication between the Council and its constituencies. It is expected that the new operating procedures and semester reports prepared under these procedures, will rectify this situation.

This report would not be complete without the acknowledgment of the many invaluable contributions of Ms. Kathleen Anderson to the efficient operation and meticulous record keeping of this Council.

Senate Action: Dr. Leon Zelby, Council Chairperson, was present to answer a number of questions from the floor. Considerable discussion ensued concerning primarily (a) the relative proportion of the Norman campus budget being devoted to academic versus administrative functions and (b) the above-average ranking of University of Oklahoma administrative salaries and the below-average ranking of faculty salaries of the University of Oklahoma in the Big Eight Conference. Several Senators referred to recent pertinent studies by Oklahoma State University and University of Nebraska. Dr. Robert Ford moved that the Faculty Senate extend an invitation to the President of the University to comment specifically on these and other aspects of the Norman campus fiscal and budgetary policies when Dr. Sharp is scheduled to address the Senate at its first meeting of the 1975-76 academic year on Monday, September 8, 1975.

In a voice vote without dissent, the Senate approved the invitation to President Sharp.

Dr. Jischke, Senate Chairperson, then requested Dr. Zelby to convey the Senate's appreciation to the Council for its efforts.

REPORT ON JOINT MEETING OF OU-OSU EXECUTIVE COMMITTEES

Dr. Jischke presented an informal report on the April 14, 1975, joint meeting in Norman of the Executive Committees of the Oklahoma University Faculty Senate and the Oklahoma State University Faculty Council. The following faculty members attended the meeting:

Oklahoma State University:
Earl J. Ferguson (Industrial Engineering)
David A. Sander (Agronomy)
John E. Thomas (Plant Pathology)
Elizabeth T. Gaudy (Microbiology)
Richard D. Hecock (Geography)
John D. Hampton (Psychology)

University of Oklahoma:
Gerald Braver (Zoology)
William Cronenwett (Engineering)
Gail de Stwolinski (Music)
Martin C. Jischke (AMNE)
Anthony S. Lis (Business Communication)
Wilson B. Prickett (Finance)
Richard Wells (Political Science)

Discussion topics included the following:

(1) Fringe benefits (retirement pay).
(2) The University of Nebraska study of Big Eight academic and administrative expenditures. (OSU was not included in the Nebraska report.)
(3) Recent policy statement of Oklahoma State Regents concerning research proposals.
(4) The role of the two state universities in the state system and faculty perceptions of that role.

There was strong consensus in the group representing both Universities that greater attention must be given to the maintenance of high quality in the academic programs at both institutions to avoid their becoming merely four-year colleges in a large state system of higher education.

In Dr. Jischke's view, the Faculty Senate should seriously concern itself during the next academic year with the status of its academic program. Calling the joint meeting fruitful and beneficial, he concluded with the belief that continuing this relationship would be in the best interests of both Universities.

STATE REGENTS POLICY STATEMENT CONCERNING RESEARCH PROPOSAL

Background Information: On March 24, 1975, the Oklahoma State Regents for Higher Education adopted the following policy statement:

POLICY STATEMENT ON INSTITUTIONAL APPLICATIONS FOR FUNDS TO SUPPORT CERTAIN PROJECTS OF SPONSORED RESEARCH AND OTHER SPONSORED PROGRAMS

State System policy currently permits and encourages public institutions to carry out programs of instruction, public service, and research under the sponsorship of external agencies such as the Federal Government, provided that such come within the purview of institutions' previously assigned functions and educational programs, and provided that sponsored programs do not inhibit the ability of institutions to accomplish their own budgeted objectives. Currently, Sponsored Research and Other Sponsored Programs are normally approved by the State Regents after institutions have been successful in obtaining external funding for a program or project, and are accounted for by being classified separately under Part II of each institution's Educational and General current operating budget.

During the decade just past, external funds to support programs of instruction and research were made available to institutions on a broad and generous scale, particularly by the Federal Government. Such funds helped to accomplish the purposes of institutions and the Federal Government alike, and created a true partnership based on mutual benefit. In more recent days, federal funds have become more difficult for institutions to obtain, and the focus of federal programs has narrowed to the point that the benefits to be derived by the nation are much more apparent than those accruing to public institutions. In this kind of funding climate, institutions need to guard against the temptation to subvert their own purposes in the process of competing for funds to maintain personnel, programs or facilities established or developed primarily as a result of past federal funding.

In order to ensure the state's ability to carry out its funding commitment to institutions for the accomplishment of their basic purposes in future years, the State Regents have established a procedure for reviewing applications by institutions developed for submission to external funding agencies for underwriting Sponsored Research and Other Sponsored Programs projects. Those kinds of proposals which should be submitted to the State Regents for their consideration and possible approval are outlined below:

1. Those which obligate an institution to increase the size, scope or content of an already approved instructional program by a substantive margin or amount.

2. Those which obligate an institution to develop a new instructional program not yet approved by the State Regents.

3. Those which obligate an institution to provide matching funds or "in-kind" matching, whenever such matching funds or "in-kind" matching are not currently budgeted for the purposes envisioned by the proposed project.

4. Those which obligate an institution to carry on a program or project beyond the time when external funds have been exhausted.

5. Those which lie outside the currently assigned functions of the institution.

6. Those which obligate the institution to build from other than the sponsor's fund a new capital structure or undertake substantial remodeling or refurbishing of an existing structure.

The state will not undertake to assume responsibility for research, public service or instructional activities established and supported with external funds following the exhaustion of those funds, unless such programs have received prior approval by the State Regents pursuant to this policy.

Senate Action: Dr. Jischke, Senate Chairperson, reported that the Senate Executive Committee had discussed this matter at a recent meeting and had approved for Senate consideration the following pertinent resolution:

> "The Faculty Senate of the University of Oklahoma (Norman campus) expresses its deep concern that the recent policy adopted by the Oklahoma State Regents for Higher Education on March 24, 1975, will undermine to a considerable extent the ability of the faculty of the University to respond in a timely and uninhibited fashion to opportunities for external funding.
>
> "The Faculty Senate is additionally concerned that this policy is yet another example of a continuing process whereby the autonomy and the responsibilities of institutions within the state system of higher education are being decreased to the detriment of administration, faculty, and most important our students. Such policies not only add to the non-academic administrative expenses and bureaucratic layering of higher education but also severely constrain the ability of the local administration to carry out its duties and further remove the faculty from those making decisions. This surely is not in the best interests of higher education in Oklahoma."

Some members of the Senate opposed the Committee resolution on the grounds that the State Regents have some interest and prerogatives in their need to be kept informed about research activities at the various institutions. Others, however, saw the policy statement as further undesirable bureaucratic encroachment on the autonomy of individual institutions, particularly in view of the vagueness in some of the language of the statement.

Subsequently, the Senate approved the resolution without dissent.

PROPOSAL FOR LENGTHENING THE TIME ALLOWED FOR REPORTING FINAL GRADES

Background Information: Associate Dean James Burwell and Assistant Dean Rufus Hall of the College of Arts and Sciences on April 14, 1975, requested Senate consideration of their proposal to lengthen the time allowed faculty to report final grades at the close of each semester. They substantiated their request as follows:

> "Several reasons prompt this request: 1) We are told that term papers are frequently required to be turned in early so faculty can meet present deadlines. 2) We find that final exams are not given or are less than comprehensive so that they can be graded in the allowed time. 3) Particularly in the fall semester, faculty frequently must grade during Christmas if any substantial examination or term paper assignments are given. 4) Upper-level and graduate-level courses are the most affected.
>
> "We, of course, are not trying to delay faculty who can and do submit final grades early in the presently allowed period. We would hope that they would continue to do so. On the other hand, after spending 15 weeks teaching a course a faculty member should be allowed an appropriate amount of time to evaluate the performance of the students enrolled. We feel that

the present requirement does not do this and that the time can be extended without causing undue hardship on any other segment of the University."

On April 24, the Senate Executive Committee approved the above proposal and further agreed to recommend to the Senate that the time allowed for reporting final grades be extended from the current 96-hour period to a one-week period.

Senate Action: In discussing this matter informally with Dr. M. Messer, the Acting Registrar of the University, Dr. Jischke, Senate Chairperson, invited Dr. Messer to appear before the Senate at this meeting to make any remarks he deemed appropriate. Assuring the faculty of the concern of the Office of Admissions and Records in being of greatest possible service to the faculty and the students, Dr. Messer urged the Senate to consider the following aspects of this problem viewed from the perspective of the Admissions Office:

(1) The current computer program is geared to the "batch process" and, therefore, all grades must be fed into the computer before any printout is possible.

(2) Further delays in grade reporting would mean additional problems in advising students of any probationary status. Even now, in some cases, students' registrations must be canceled after the start of classes.

(3) Any delay in grade reporting would create additional problems in the prompt delivery of transcripts to students either entering professional schools or starting employment.

(4) University public relations are affected in delaying the delivery of grade reports to students and their parents.

(5) Additional overtime for computer and personnel would be required.

(6) Further delays would occur in the delivery of diplomas and other documents to students concerned.

(7) The usual practice in the Big 8 for reporting final grades is a 48-hour deadline after final examinations.

In answering questions from the floor, Dr. Messer stated that any revisions in the computer programing for processing final grades would require additional study and funds. One faculty member noted that current regulations provide for faculty action in unusual situations; another called attention to the initiating Deans' implication of lowered grading standards.

Dr. Kondonassis later moved that this question be tabled until the September 8 meeting of the Senate. With some dissent in a voice vote, the Senate approved the tabling motion.

PROPOSAL FOR UNIVERSITY-WIDE FRINGE BENEFITS COMMITTEE

Dr. Martin C. Jischke, Senate Chairperson, introduced the recommendation of the Senate Executive Committee that a University-wide Fringe Benefits Committee with representatives from both the Norman campus and the Health Sciences Center be established.

Without further discussion and without dissent, the Senate approved the Committee proposal.

PROPOSAL FOR INCREASING FACULTY RETIREMENT BENEFITS

Background Information: One of the topics discussed at the April 14, 1975, joint meeting of the OU Faculty Senate and OSU Faculty Council Executive Committees was the subject of retirement payments to faculty retiring before the TIAA-CREF program is fully funded. This problem is becoming even more acute during the current inflation throughout the country. The Faculty Senate Executive Committee agreed to parallel the action recently taken by the OSU Faculty Council in recommending to its University administration and Regents an increase in the retirement benefits paid to faculty retirees.

Senate Action: Accordingly, Dr. Martin C. Jischke, Senate Chairperson, introduced for Senate consideration the following recommendations of the Executive Committee:

(1) That the base for retirement be calculated from the three highest salary years instead of five years.

(2) That a retiree with more than 25 years of service be given 1% additional retirement for each year up to a maximum of 35 years' service instead of the present 1/2%.

Dr. Jischke noted that, if approved, the recommendations would be forwarded to President Sharp for appropriate study of the cost involved and would be in concert with similar action recently taken at Oklahoma State University.

Without further discussion, the Senate approved the proposal.

ELECTION OF FACULTY REPLACEMENTS ON UNIVERSITY COUNCILS, ADVISORY COMMITTEE TO THE PRESIDENT, AND APPEALS BOARD

Voting by written ballot, the Senate elected the following faculty replacements to fill end-of-year vacancies on the following Councils, Board, and Committee:

Academic Personnel Council:	Doyle Bishop (Management)	1975-78
	Jack Kanak (Psychology)	1975-78
	William H. Maehl, Jr. (History)	1975-78
Academic Program Council:	Mary Dewey (Education)	1975-78
	Mary Warren (Home Economics)	1975-78
	Kenneth Merrill (Philosophy)	1975-78
Administrative and Physical Resources Council:	Fred Shellabarger (Architecture)	1975-78
	Gene Braught (Music)	1975-78
	Irwin (Jack) White (Science and Public Policy)	1975-78
Budget Council:	Homer Brown (Accounting)	1975-78
	Rex Inman (Meteorology)	1975-78
	T. H. Milby (University Libraries)	1975-78
	Cluff E. Hopla (Zoology)	1975-77
	Sam Kirkpatrick (Political Science)	1975-77
	Ronald R. Bourassa (Physics)	1975-76
Research Council:	Robert M. Dubois (Geology)	1975-78
	Michael Hennagin (Music)	1975-78
	Jim Reese (Economics)	1975-78
	Yoshikazu Sasaki (Meteorology)	1975-76

Faculty Advisory Committee to the President:	Tim Covington (Pharmacy)	1975-77
	Dwight Morgan (Law)	1975-77
	David Levy (History)	1975-77
	Irma Tomberlin (Library Science)	1975-77
	James Hibdon (Economics)	1975-77
	James Merrell (HSC)	1975-77
Faculty Appeals Board:	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

NOMINATION OF FACULTY REPLACEMENTS FOR UNIVERSITY COUNCILS AND COMMITTEES

Voting by written ballot, the Senate nominated the following faculty members for consideration by President Paul F. Sharp in filling end-of-year faculty vacancies on the following Councils and Committees:

Athletics Council:	Frank Miranda (HSC)	1975-78
	Wilson D. Steen (HSC)	1975-78
	Charles Harper (Geology)	1975-77
	Keever Greer (Stoval)	1975-77
University Council on Faculty Awards and Honors:	Dorothy Fritz (English-RTA)	1975-78
	Alex Kondonassis (Economics-RTA)	1975-78
	Paul Ruggiers (English-GLC)	1975-78
	C.M. Sliepcevich (CEMS-GLC)	1975-78
	Ron Nanda (HSC)	1975-78
	Kurt Weiss (HSC)	1975-78
Academic Regulations Committee:	Ronald Lewis (Social Work)	1975-79
	Clovis Haden (EE)	1975-79
	Alan Nicewander (Psychology)	1975-79
	Tom Hill (Mathematics)	1975-79
Class Schedule Committee:	Abraham Scherman (Education)	1975-79
	Guadalupe Thompson (Mod. Lang.)	1975-79
	Frank Appl (AMNE)	1975-79
	Judy Norlin (Social Work)	1975-79
Commencement Committee:	Phillip Lehrman (Pharmacy)	1975-78
	Monte Cook (Philosophy)	1975-78
Computer Advisory Committee:	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 Parker (HSC)	1975-78
Fringe Benefits Committee:	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:	John TeSelle (Law)	1975-79
	John McAdams (Law)	1975-79
ROTC Advisory Committee:	Loy Prickett (Education)	1975-78
	Hiram Davis (University Libraries)	1975-78
	James Goodman (Geography)	1975-78
	Marvin Baker (Geography)	1975-78
	William Eick (HPER)	1975-78
	Leonard R. Rubin (Mathematics)	1975-78
Scholarships and Financial Aids Committee:	Marilyn Flowers (Economics)	1975-77
	Dan Kolhepp (Finance)	1975-77
	Melvin Tolson (Modern Languages)	1975-77
	Frank Seto (Zoology)	1975-77
	Jean Herrick (Classics)	1975-77
	Ruth Hankowsky (Speech Comm.)	1975-77
Speakers Bureau:	Robert Richardson (Law)	1975-78
	Wayne Rowe (Education)	1975-78
University Book Exchange Oversight Committee:	Bert McCammon (Marketing)	1975-78
	James Faulconer (Music)	1975-78
University Libraries Committee:	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:	Michael Cox (Law)	1975-76
	Carol Beasley (Art)	1975-76
Judicial Tribunal:	Peter Kutner (Law)	1975-78
	Jerry Muskrat (Law)	1975-78
	Donald Lipski (Art)	1975-78
	David Morgan (Political Science)	1975-78

ELECTION OF SENATE CHAIRPERSON-ELECT, 1975-76

Dr. Alexander Kondonassis (Economics) was elected Chairperson-Elect of the Faculty Senate for 1975-76 by acclamation.

ELECTION OF SENATE SECRETARY, 1975-76

Dr. Anthony S. Lis (Business Communication) was re-elected Secretary of the Faculty Senate for 1975-76 by acclamation.

PROPOSED SEARCH COMMITTEE FOR DEAN, COLLEGE OF LIBERAL STUDIES

Background Information: Dr. Jischke, Senate Chairperson, announced the receipt of a recent request from the President's Office for Senate nomination of faculty representatives on the proposed Search Committee for the Dean of the College of

Liberal Studies. The eight members of the Search Committee will include five faculty members, two students, and one representative of the University administration.

Senate Action: Dr. Walter Scheffer moved that the Senate Committee on Committees be empowered to select and submit directly to the President's Office the names of ten faculty nominees for the five faculty vacancies on the proposed Search Committee. The Senate approved the motion without dissent.

On May 13, 1975, the following Committee on Committees' nominations were accordingly submitted to President Paul F. Sharp:

James Constantin (Marketing)
Sarah Crim (Home Economics)
Rufus Hall (Political Science)
Martin C. Jischke (AMNE)
Stan Neely (Chemistry)
Mary C. Petty (Education)
Paul Risser (Microbiology)
Paul Ruggiers (English)
Jonathan Spurgeon (History)
Charles Suggs (Drama)

PROPOSAL FOR FACULTY GRIEVANCE PROCEDURES

Background Information: On December 9, 1974, the Faculty Senate voted to refer to an ad hoc committee for further study and recommendation a proposal for the establishment of faculty grievance procedures. (See pages 3 and 4 of the Senate Journal for December 9, 1974.)

The ad hoc Committee (consisting of Professors Ron Snell (Chairperson), Kathleen Harris, Arnold Henderson, Leon Leonard, Dorothy Fritz, Mac Reynolds, and Alfred Weinheimer, as well as Mr. Walter Mason) submitted its final report to the Senate on April 22, 1975. (See pages 2 and 9-11 of the Agenda for the May 5, 1975, Senate meeting.)

Senate Action: Without any discussion and in a voice vote without dissent, the Senate approved the ad hoc Committee proposal.

The complete text of the proposal follows, with appropriate changes in language to avoid discrimination on the basis of sex:

Proposal for Faculty Grievance Procedures

I: STATEMENT OF PURPOSE

The Faculty Grievance Procedure shall consist of a hearing before a Faculty Grievance Committee which shall hear the alleged grievance and recommend action to the President of the University.

1. A Faculty Grievance Committee shall hear and recommend decisions in the case of a grievance on the part of a faculty member when such a grievance

   a. cannot be resolved informally through discussion between the aggrieved person and the departmental chairperson, deans, or the Provost, and which

   b. does not fall within the jurisdiction of the Academic Personnel Council or the Faculty Appeals Board.

2. A Faculty Grievance Committee shall not be a board of appeal from decisions or recommendations made by either the Academic Personnel council or the Faculty Appeals Board, and shall not hear a case which has previously received a full hearing from either of those bodies.

3. A Faculty Grievance Committee shall have a broadly construed jurisdiction empowering it to hear the grievance or grievances of any member of the faculty who feels that he or she has sustained injury.

   a. through discrimination because of race, creed, ethnic origin, national origin, sex, age; or

   b. having to do with benefits, working conditions, appointment, reappointment, termination of employment, promotion, salary, assignment of teaching load, reassignment of duties, or retirement; or

   c. through any infringement of civil rights or liberties within the University, or any circumstances not set forth above which are detrimental to the faculty member's rights as a teacher, scholar, and member of the university community, or any treatment which the faculty member feels redounds unfavorably to him or her as the result of partial, unfair, or arbitrary action on the part of some other faculty member or members, or administrator or administrators, or both.

II: SELECTION OF THE COMMITTEE

A Faculty Grievance Committee(hereafter called a hearing committee) will be established for each individual case. The process of the selection of a hearing committee will be set in motion by the grievant after he or she has exhausted the regular channels in an attempt to resolve the grievance. If the grievant cannot obtain satisfaction from the Provost, the grievant will notify, in writing, the Chairperson of the Faculty Senate, that he or she wishes to employ the Faculty Grievance Procedure. The grievant will accompany the notice with a written statement of charges. The Chairperson of the Faculty Senate shall deliver a copy of the written statement of charges to the party against whom the charges are lodged (the respondent) and shall notify the grievant and the respondent to select members of a hearing committee as described below. When the hearing committee has been assembled, the Chairperson of the Faculty Senate shall deliver to it a copy of the written charges.

A hearing committee will consist of five faculty members. The grievant will choose two committee members, the respondent will choose two committee members, and the four so chosen will select a fifth committee member to serve as chairperson. The committee members may be chosen from among all regular faculty members, including visiting faculty but excluding adjunct faculty members. The replacement for a faculty member who declines to serve will be chosen by the party who chose that faculty member in the first place. The grievant and the respondent shall notify the Chairperson of the Faculty Senate in writing when they have made their choices of hearing committee members, and the Chairperson of the Faculty Senate shall call the four committee members together to choose a chairperson and to inform them of procedural guidelines.

III: PROCEDURE

1. A hearing cannot begin until all five committee members have been chosen.

2. The hearing committee may decide to dismiss the case, if it finds it to be frivolous or trivial; and a case which has been dismissed shall not be reopened.

3. Within sixty days after the choice of a chairperson, the committee must reach a decision in the case and report its decision to the President of the University. From the date of the receipt of the report, the President shall have thirty days to announce his or her decision.

4. Decisions in the hearing committee shall be made by majority vote, the chairperson of the committee voting as one of the committee. Decisions made by the hearing committee shall be final.

5. The grievant and the respondent each may choose from among the faculty a person to act as his or her adviser, or each may select counsel to advise him or her on legal matters, or each may, at his or her discretion, be assisted by both an adviser and a legal counselor.

6. Within one week of receiving the grievant's written statement of charges, the respondent shall make a written reply to the charges, directed to the hearing committee, and to be kept in safekeeping by the Chairperson of the Faculty Senate if the hearing committee has not then been assembled. The grievant shall receive a copy of the written reply to the charges.

7. The following regulations shall apply to the hearing before the hearing committee:

   a. The grievant and the respondent shall each have the right to be present and be accompanied by his or her adviser, counsel, or both throughout the hearing.

   b. The hearing shall be open unless the grievant or the respondent requests it be closed.

   c. Both parties to the hearing shall have the right to present and to examine and cross-examine witnesses.

   d. The University administration shall make available to the parties to the hearing such authority as it possesses to require the presence of witnesses and shall bear any reasonable cost attendant upon the appearance of witnesses at the hearing.

   e. The University administration shall make available to the hearing committee such records as the hearing committee requests. Either party to the hearing may instruct the hearing committee to obtain necessary records from the administration. The administration shall make available to either party such authority as it possesses to supply any necessary records which are not in its custody.

   f. The principle of confrontation shall apply throughout the hearing.

   g. A transcript of the hearing will be made by tape recorder. The Chairperson of the Faculty Senate or his or her designated representative (who is not to be a party to the dispute or a member of the hearing committee) will make and keep in his or her custody the official taped record of the hearing. It will be available to all parties as required, by taped copy if necessary.

      If the hearing committee wishes to have portions of the official tape transcribed, it will be done at University expense. Any portions so transcribed will be duplicated and copies delivered to the contending parties. After the hearing committee's decision is reported to the President, the official tape will be in the permanent custody of the Chairperson of the Faculty Senate.

If either of the contending parties requests a transcript after the hearing is completed, the transcript is to be made at that party's expense.

8. The full text of the findings, the conclusions, and the recommendations of the hearing committee shall be made available in identical form and at the same time to the contending parties and to the President. The full cost shall be borne by the University.
9. Any procedural matters within the hearing which are not covered by the preceding guidelines are to be decided by majority vote of the hearing committee.

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

Background Information: On April 14, 1975, the Senate approved a proposal that departmental recommendations concerning tenure, promotion, and salary increases be forwarded to the budget dean and then directly to the Office of the Provost. (See pages 2 and 3 of the Senate Journal for April 14, 1975.)

Senate Action: Dr. Francis Schmitz moved that the April 14 Senate recommendation be revised to include the Graduate Dean of the University as an intermediate reviewing authority between the budget dean and the Office of the Provost. The ensuing brief discussion focused on the nature and the validity of any such reviews by the Graduate Dean. In a voice vote, the Senate rejected the proposed amendment to its April 14 recommendation.

RESOLUTION OF THANKS: Dr. Martin C. Jischke, Senate Chairperson

Dr. William Cronenwett moved approval of the following resolution of thanks to Dr. Martin C. Jischke, Chairperson of the Faculty Senate, 1974-75:

- -

WHEREAS Professor Martin C. Jischke has diligently and generously devoted time and effort to the Faculty Senate during his year of leadership, and

WHEREAS Professor Jischke has consistently and articulately spoken on behalf of the faculty, and

WHEREAS Professor Jischke has thoughtfully and effectively led the faculty toward an active and anticipatory approach to University policy decisions, and

WHEREAS the Faculty Senate has made substantial accomplishments under Professor Jischke's leadership,

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

- -

The Senate approved the resolution of thanks by acclamation.

ADJOURNMENT

The Faculty Senate adjourned at 4:58 p.m. The next regular meeting of the Senate will be held at 3:30 p.m., on Monday, September 8, 1975, in Room 218, Dale Hall. Items for the Agenda should reach the Secretary of the Faculty Senate (Room 106-C, Evans Hall) before Wednesday, August 27, 1975.

Respectfully submitted,

Anthony S. Lis

Anthony S. Lis, Secretary