

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

Regular Session -- February 9, 1976 -- 3:30 p.m., Dale Hall 218.

The Faculty Senate was called to order by Dr. Gail de Stwolinski, Chairperson.

Present:

Barefield	Donnell	Hibdon	Mouser	Shellabarger
Bell	Duchon	Joyce	McDonald	Snider
Blair	Fife	Kendall	Pento	Streebin
Bohland	Ford	Kitts	Reid	Swank
Braver	Fowler	Kondonassis	Reynolds	Tolliver
Buhite	Goff	Kraynak	Rice	Tomberlin
Crim	Graves	Lee	Scheffer	Verrastro
Cronenwet	Gross	Levinson	Schmitz	Whitcotton
de Stwolinski	Henkle	Marchand	Shahan	York

Provost's Office representative: Pollak

AUOPE representatives: Anderson Cowen Guyer Spaulding

UOSA representatives: Carnes Scott

Absent:

Cox Kidd Larson Rasmussen Starling Unruh

AUOPE representatives: Thompson

UOSA representative: Bode

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
Replacement of Arts and Sciences' Senators	2
Presidential Action -	
Search Committee, Graduate Dean, HSC	2
Search Committee, Law School Dean	2
Announcements -	
State Regents' presentation on 1976-77 budget.	2
Spring semester meeting - General Faculty	2
Spring semester joint meeting - OU and OSU	
Executive Committees.	2
Reports (fall, 1975) of University Councils	
and Student Publications Board	2-12
Election of Faculty Replacements -	
Academic Personnel Council.	13
ROTC Advisory Committee	13
Search Committee, Dean, College of Business	
Administration	13
Faculty Personnel Policy	13-20

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

The Journal of the Faculty Senate for the regular session on January 12, 1976, was approved, with the following correction: Page 4, paragraph two (Composition of Search Committees), first sentence should read: "For example, the College of Pharmacy faculty is being represented by only three members on the Dean's Search Committee for that College."

ACTION TAKEN BY PRESIDENT PAUL F. SHARP

Dr. Paul F. Sharp, President of the University, recently approved the Senate election of Professor Seymour Feiler as a replacement for Professor Richard Baker on the Academic Personnel Council (1975-77).

President Sharp, also selected the following faculty replacements from nominations submitted by the Faculty Senate:

Search Committee, Graduate Dean, Health Sciences Center: Professors
J. Thomas Pento and John Francis

Search Committee, Law Dean: Professors Frank Elkouri, George Fraser,
Nancy Kenderdine, Simeon McIntosh, and Harold Young

(See page 2 of the Senate Journal for January 12, 1976.)

ANNOUNCEMENT: State Regents' Office slide presentation
on the 1976-77 budget request

At the request of the State Regents' Office, representatives from that office will appear at the Senate meeting on Monday, March 15, 1976, at 3:30 p.m., to make a 17-minute slide presentation concerning the 1976-77 budget request. All interested faculty members are cordially invited to attend.

ANNOUNCEMENT: Spring meeting of the General Faculty

The General Faculty on the Norman campus of the University will hold its regular spring (1976) semester meeting on Thursday, April 15, 1976, at 3:30 p.m. in Adams Hall 150.

ANNOUNCEMENT: Spring semester joint meeting in Norman of
Executive Committees, OU Faculty Senate,
and OSU Faculty Council

The spring semester (1976) joint meeting of the Executive Committees of the Faculty Senate of the University of Oklahoma and the Faculty Council of Oklahoma State University will be held in Norman on Monday, March 15, 1976, following the regular meeting of the Senate (Norman campus).

REPLACEMENT OF SENATORS: College of Arts and Sciences

The Dean of the College of Arts and Sciences has announced the selection of the following Senate replacements from that college:

- (1) Dr. James Bohland (Geography) (1974-77) replacing Dr. Richard Wells (Political Science) on sabbatical leave and (2) Dr. David Gross (English) (1974-77) replacing Dr. Melvin Tolson (Modern Language) dropped from Senate rolls after four absences in accordance with the Charter of the General Faculty and the Faculty Senate.

FALL (1975) SEMESTER REPORTS OF COUNCILS
AND PUBLICATIONS BOARD

The Chairpersons of the seven University Councils and the Student Publications Board submitted the following reports to the Faculty Senate for the fall (1975) semester:

Report of the Academic Personnel Council for the fall semester, 1975, submitted to the Faculty Senate on December 12, 1975, by Professor Sarah R. Crim, Chairperson:
 The Academic Personnel Council is involved in most of its activities during the second semester of each academic year. Procedures were established to be followed by the Council in disputed cases, and consideration of tenure cases in the review process was initiated. The President has requested Council recommendations on disputed tenure cases one month earlier in 1976 than in 1975.

ACADEMIC PERSONNEL COUNCIL PROCEDURES, 1975-76

1. Each candidate will be given one hour to present his or her case to the Council.
2. Committee "A" members will be asked to appear separately and to limit their appearances to fifteen minutes.
3. If they wish, candidates may ask the Council to call three extra witnesses in their behalf to appear separately at a later date. The candidate should provide the Council chairperson with the names of the three witnesses to be called as soon as possible after candidate's notification to appear before the Council.
4. If the candidate wishes, an attorney or other adviser may be present during the time that the candidate presents his or her case to the Council. But the attorney or other adviser may not ask questions or take part in any of the discussion.
5. No transcript of the Council proceedings will be permitted and all discussion, information, or questions either between witnesses and the Council or between Council members will be strictly confidential.
6. Unless called as a witness, no Council meetings will be attended by Administrative Personnel.
7. Council members will not let the candidate know the exact vote of the department, Committee "A," or the Deans in his or her case, only that the recommendations of at least one of the voting parties disagrees with others.
8. Abstention from voting on recommendation(s) will be accompanied by a statement indicating reason for this action by Council member(s).
9. Candidates, witnesses, or deans will not be told the recommendation of the Council. The Council recommendations will only be transmitted to the President.

Report of the Academic Programs Council for the fall semester, 1975, submitted to the Faculty Senate on December 19, 1975, by Professor Paul A. Brinker, Chairperson:
 This fall semester, a subcommittee under the chairmanship of Professor Kenneth Taylor, submitted the following to the Senate: "Report of the Various Types of Teacher Evaluation Submitted by the Academic Program Council to the Faculty Senate". Included with the report were several recommendations endorsed by the Academic Programs Council, and later the Senate, and sent to President Sharp.

Subcommittees are currently at work on grading, course offerings, and interdisciplinary studies.

The possibility of evaluating selective programs was discussed at our last meeting.

Report of the Administrative and Physical Resources Council for the Fall Semester 1975 submitted to the Faculty Senate on January 28, 1976, by Dr. James Kenderdine, Council Chairperson: Attached is an outline of the activities of the Administrative and Physical Resources Council for the Fall Semester 1975. It is written to conform to the guidelines set forth by the Faculty Senate and includes significant recommendations made by the Council only after subsequent administrative decisions have been made. Recommendations are not included for items which are pending.

The Administrative and Physical Resources Council met eight times in the Fall Semester. Attendance on the part of members was only fair; one student and one staff member did not attend a single meeting, while some members missed as many as five meetings. The OU Student Association has requested that councils inform the President of the Student Association when student members miss three consecutive meetings. Perhaps other constituent bodies may wish to consider making a similar request in order to assure representation of their groups in council activities.

In addition to making recommendations on matters referred to the Council by the President, the Administrative and Physical Resources Council is engaged in a continuing effort to develop policies and procedures for executing its charge and reviewing University policies with regard to physical facilities and administrative structure.

ADMINISTRATIVE AND PHYSICAL RESOURCES COUNCIL
(9/19/75 APRC: 9/24/75 Approved by President)

Functions Relating to the Administrative Structure of the University

1. The Council shall act as an advisory body to the President in regard to major changes in the administrative organization of the University, particularly in regard to changing roles or functions of administrative units or the creation of new units or deletion of existing units. The President will normally seek the advice of the Council before recommending major organizational changes. Major organizational changes are defined as those affecting the academic or non-academic activities of the University which, because of their importance, come to the attention of the President.
2. The Council shall act as advisory body to the President in the creation of new administrative positions or the changing of existing administrative roles. Where the appointment of a special search committee is not used, the President may seek the advice of the Council on major administrative salaries in terms of equity and justice.
3. The President may request the Council to review the functions of administrative offices. The primary concern will be the appropriateness of and/or need for the activities of the office or of the office itself.
4. The Council may, on its own volition, initiate a review of the functions of an administrative unit, but before proceeding with such a review the Council will obtain the consent of the President.

Activities of the
ADMINISTRATIVE AND PHYSICAL RESOURCES COUNCIL
Fall 1975

SUBJECT	SOURCES OF INFORMATION	RECOMMENDATION MADE	FINAL ACTION TAKEN
April 1975. Council formed a subcommittee to study the Council charge as it relates to administrative resources	Former definitions and current charge to the Council, conferences with President Sharp	5/12/75 Draft submitted to President Sharp. Minor modifications suggested by President Sharp 6/19/75. Revised by Council 9/19/75	9/24/75 Approved by President Sharp (copy attached).
7/3/75 Council informed of tentative plans for a Recreation and Physical Education Center	David Walters, Administration and Finance, distributed the preliminary space program and funding possibilities	7/18/75 Council made some recommendations on the need for such a facility and the funding plans.	No final action taken. President Sharp acknowledged receipt of the Council's recommendation on 7/23/75 and indicated he would discuss it with the Regents Facilities Planning Committee.
9/4/75 Capital Improvements Plan Subcommittee was established to study the priorities for new construction and renovation	Subcommittee will use the current capital improvements plan and call upon Provost's Office and Architectural and Engineering Services	None	Not Applicable
9/22/75 Council received a list of commitments of Section 13/New College funds for the 1975-76 fiscal year and tentative commitments for 1976-77. Council was asked for advice on 1976-77 priorities and additional projects.	Capital Improvements Plan and requests which may come to Administration and Finance and the Provost	None	Not applicable

Administrative and Physical Resources Council
Fall 1975

SUBJECT	SOURCES OF INFORMATION	RECOMMENDATION MADE	FINAL ACTION TAKEN
10/7/75 President Sharp referred to the Council the question of whether University House might be placed on the National Register of Historic Places	Supporting information from Beverly Ledbetter, University Legal Counsel regarding the legal implications of having a facility placed on the register.	11/3/75 Council recommended that the University concur with the recommendation that University House be placed on the National Register of Historic Places	Not known. Recommendation was to be made by a group of citizens of Norman.
10/24/75 President Sharp referred to the Council a recommendation that the Housing Commissary be named the Garner Collums Commissary	Conferences with those on campus who knew Mr. Collums when he was in charge of University housing and food service	11/21/75 Council recommended that the Housing Commissary be named the Garner Collums Commissary	12/11/75 Upon President Sharp's recommendation the University Regents voted to name the Housing Commissary the Garner Collums Commissary.
10/31/75 President Sharp referred to the Council the problem of parking in the Puck Pond area on home football game days.	Letter from a concerned faculty member and President Sharp's response citing a report of the Athletic Department tracing the history of this practice	11/18/75 Council indicated that it will study alternatives for football parking for next season in conjunction with the Task Force on Sporting Event Parking. Study in progress.	Not applicable
10/31/75 President Sharp referred to the Council the problem of the use of herbicides in weed control.	Letter from a concerned faculty member and President Sharp's response including a statement from the Physical Plant regarding the particular herbicide in question	12/2/75 Council indicated that we did not feel technically competent to advise the President in the use of chemicals and suggested that a University wide committee of experts be formed to study the problem.	12/18/75 President Sharp requested that the Administrative and Physical Resources Council could create a subcommittee to study the use of chemicals and call upon experts within the University for assistance.

Report of the Athletics Council for the Fall Semester 1975 submitted to the Faculty Senate on January 7, 1976, by Dr. Russell Buhite, Council Chairperson:

During the fall semester of the 1975-76 academic year, the Athletics Council held three meetings. In these proceedings it discussed and acted upon a variety of matters, including women's athletics, men's and women's team schedules, and the Athletic Department's proposed capital improvement program.

The capital improvement program and a memorandum from the U.S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare containing guidelines for implementing Title IX regulations occasioned the most discussion. On the former, the Athletic Director pointed out that dormitory improvements and stadium expansion in the south end zone had been proposed to upgrade facilities and that the Regents had authorized a feasibility study and had requested a recommendation on a method of financing the projects. On the latter, the chairman appointed a subcommittee to work with the Office of the Vice President for the University Community and Athletic Department in establishing procedures for implementing Title IX.

Report of the Budget Council for the Fall Semester 1975 submitted to the Faculty Senate on January 28, 1976, by Dr. Patrick K. Sutherland, Council Chairperson:

Attached is a report in outline form of the activities of the Budget Council for the Fall 1975 semester. We have attempted to work within the guidelines set forth by the Faculty Senate and have reported significant recommendations only after the subsequent administrative decisions have been made. Specific recommendations have not been included for any subjects which are pending.

The Budget Council held eleven meetings during the Fall Semester. Faculty and staff attendance was much improved over the past year. Council members reported spending an average of five hours per week on Council activities; subcommittee chairpersons, seven hours; and the council chairperson, 15 hours.

The Council adopted a procedure to inform the head of a member's constituent body if the member was absent from three consecutive meetings. The Council received such a request from the President of UQSA with regard to student attendance, and it was decided that this policy would benefit all constituent groups.

One student member resigned before the beginning of the semester and was not replaced until November 25, thus depriving the student body of one representative for eight meetings. As of this date, two other student members have resigned and have not yet been replaced.

The Council is operating with fewer subcommittees this year than in the past. There are three standing subcommittees: (1) Budget 1976-77, charged with making recommendations and priority lists for next year's budget, (2) University Services, charged with studying major service units such as the Physical Plant and the Computer Center, and (3) Long-Range Planning, charged with making long-range recommendations for budgetary priorities. Other subcommittees are formed on an ad hoc basis as shown in the attached report.

SUBJECT	SOURCES OF INFORMATION	RECOMMENDATION MADE	FINAL ACTION TAKEN
5/1/75 Proposal for Graduate Assistant Compensation based on a percentage of the average faculty salary for the previous year with additions for experience and advances degrees. Faculty Senate Executive Com. forwarded to Budget Council and Graduate Council	5/1/75 letter from Chair of Faculty Senate to Budget Council with proposal attached	5/6/75 Budget Council sent recommendation to President Sharp that proposal be sent to Provost for evaluation and recommendation and returned to Council later if appropriate.	5/13/75 President indicated he would forward proposal to Provost for evaluation and recommendation. Upon completion of the review he would get in touch with the Council.
5/22/75 Student Association request to fund either the Intramural Program or the Center for Student Development from E & G funds was referred to the Budget Council by President Sharp	Letter of 5/12/75 from UOSA to President Sharp. 5/22/75 response from President Sharp to UOSA Budget Council Subcommittee on Intramurals studied the Intramurals Program budget and the Athletic Department Budget and met with members of both departments	12/9/75 Budget Council sent recommendation to President Sharp.	12/19/75 President Sharp responded in detail to the Budget Council. In related action, on 12/15/75 President Sharp vetoed UOSA Bill #1507 Moving Funding Responsibility for Intramural Athletics from the Student Activity Fee to the Athletic Department. UOSA overrode President's veto and issue is currently before the Univ. Regents 12/15/75 President also vetoed UOSA Bill #1512 requesting President Sharp to release the Budget Council's recommendation concerning funding of intramurals.
9/23/75 President Sharp sent Proposed Schedule for Preparation of 1976-77 Budget to the Budget Council and asked for preliminary recommendations and priority lists.	Budget 1976-77 Subcommittee studied proposed budget schedule and budget requests for each vice presidential area which were supplied by the Budget Office.	10/7/75 Budget Council sent preliminary recommendations to President Sharp. Budget Subcommittee is working on final recommendations.	11/19/75 President Sharp responded to Budget Council preliminary recommendations and priorities. No final budget allocations have been made yet.

SUBJECT	SOURCES OF INFORMATION	RECOMMENDATION MADE	FINAL ACTION TAKEN
Indirect Cost Reallocation to Generating Departments Originated by the Budget Council October 18, 1975	Council met with Vice Provost for Research Gordon Atkinson on October 28 and received copies of a proposal sent to the Research Council. Plan was studied in detail by the Budget Subcommittee	11/6/75 Budget Council recommended a variation of the Vice Provost's proposal to President Sharp	11/25/75 President Sharp notified Budget Council the University Regents Budget Committee agreed such a plan could be put into next year's budget. However, any additional funds for research would have to be judged and re in priority with other budget needs.
Criteria for Expenditure of one-time allocation of funds for Library and Instructional Equipment - 10/21/75	Criteria list submitted by Dr. Betty Pollak to the Council outlined how the decisions on allocation of instructional equipment funds would be made. Criteria studied in detail by Budget Subcommittee.	10/30/75 Budget Council endorsed the list of criteria submitted by Dr. Pollak	11/5/75 President Sharp acknowledged Budget Council endorsement of criteria and indicated allocation are being made.
Centralized Computer Based Building Control System - Hiring Outside Consultant	Council met with representatives of the Physical Plant and studied feasibility study by Bob White 6/17/75. Proposal was to hire an outside consultant to do another study. at an estimated cost of \$18,000.	6/23/75 Council recommended that we not hire an outside consultant but that University staff continue studying the types of control systems available.	7/25/75 President informed Council that, upon his recommendation, University Regents voted to contract with the outside consultant to perform the study.

SUBJECT	SOURCES OF INFORMATION	RECOMMENDATION MADE	FINAL ACTION TAKEN
Computer Based Building Control System - Implementation of the System. Subcommittee started this study at the beginning of the Fall Semester, anticipating a request for advice.	University Services Subcommittee studied reports by the Physical Plant and the outside consulting firm and interviewed Physical Plant staff.	11/12/75 Budget Council recommended that the University not implement a computer based system but instead proceed with a time-clock system described in a report by Bob White. Also recommended that immediate steps be taken to conserve energy.	11/18/75 President Sharp responded, agreeing with the general thrust of the recommendations and stating that he would work with Task Force on Energy Conservation and Vice President Nordby to determine the precise steps to be taken.
11/10/75 President Sharp asked the Budget Council for advice on a proposal made by the Deans' Council to change the method by which academic year appointments are converted to 12 month appointments.	10/20/75 memo to President Sharp from Provost Hunsberger stating objections to the Deans' Council proposal. Excerpts from the 10/15/75 Deans' Council minutes and 7/7/75 memo from Dean Upthegrove to Provost Hunsberger on Nine Month Appointment Conversions.	11/25/75 Budget Council constituted an ad hoc subcommittee which is now studying various alternatives.	NA
11/12/75 Expenditure of Increased Income from Tuition.	11/12/75 letter from President Sharp outlining his decision to fund various unmet needs from increased income from tuition expected to amount to about a half million dollars. Sent for information purposes and asked for any advice as soon as possible.	11/26/75 Budget Council Subcommittee on Budget 1976-77 studied list and endorsed most of the expenditures. Recommended that future long-range matching commitments and research and development money allocated to department be based on amount of indirect costs which would be returned to the department under the Indirect Cost Reallocation policy recently proposed. Also recommended conserving fuel rather than allocating more funds to fuel costs.	12/9/75 President Sharp responded that his memo of 11/12/75 was largely for information purposes. Explained the reasons for his decisions and asked the Budget Council to concur on long-range recommendations.

SUBJECT	SOURCES OF INFORMATION	RECOMMENDATION MADE	FINAL ACTION TAKEN
11/18/75 Budget Council initiated an inquiry regarding the overdraft in the College of Business Administration budget for 1974-75.	Dr. Sutherland met with Dean Baloff and also the Council heard comments from Dr. Nordby at a regular meeting regarding this matter	11/26/75 Budget Council wrote to President Sharp recommending that colleges not be allowed to overdraw their accounts to any significant degree.	1/29/76 President Sharp responded giving his reasons for approving the overdraft
12/2/75 Vice President Nordby presented to the Council at President Sharp's request, a "Prospectus for Steady State Budgeting" which provided for internal reallocation of resources in the predicted absence of significant increases in new money.	Budget Subcommittee studied prospectus distributed by Dr. Nordby	12/9/75 Council wrote to President recommending priorities and ways to deal with steady state budgeting.	12/11/75 President Sharp thanked the Council for its recommendations and expressed an interest in any further advice the Council may wish to give

Report of the Council on Faculty Awards and Honors for the Fall Semester 1975 submitted to the Faculty Senate on January 27, 1976, by Dr. Glenn R. Snider,

Council Chairperson: Three meetings of the Council on Faculty Awards and Honors have been held to date. Sessions generally lasted approximately two hours but the members have spent much additional time in reviewing the materials submitted for consideration of the Council regarding sabbatical leaves, special teaching awards, and recommendations for distinguished professorships. Recommendations have been made to the Provost on fifteen applications for sabbatical leaves of absence.

Materials are being studied and recommendations will be made soon for the Regents Award for Superior Teaching and the AMOCO Foundation Good Teaching Award.

Report of the Board of Student Publications submitted to the Faculty Senate on January 19, 1976, by Professor Paul Dannelley, Board Chairperson: The budget of the Board of Student Publications is on an annual basis. In the fiscal year ended June 30, the student publications operated in the black -- despite a \$4,500 loss for the student yearbook. This loss was more than offset by The Oklahoma Daily and the printing operations.

A \$9,000 deficit for the student yearbook was budgeted for the current fiscal year. From present indications, the operation will be comfortably in the black despite that loss.

The board has named a study committee which is now reviewing the rationale for publishing yearbooks generally and the Sooner Yearbook in particular.

A remodeling program was carried out for The Oklahoma Daily, the Sooner Yearbook offices, and the production plant serving student publications. This remodeling program was completed early in January, 1976.

Report of the Research Council for the Fall semester, 1975, submitted to the Faculty Senate on January 21, 1976, by Dr. Donald C. Cox, Chairperson: The Council was very gratified to receive substantial increases in the budgets of the Research Development Fund and the Faculty Research Fund, the two primary sources of internal research funding for the University distributed by the Council. The Council feels this increased funding represents a significant acknowledgement of and commitment to the research function of the faculty of the University. Such a financial commitment greatly facilitates our accomplishment of the charge of the State Regents for Higher Education that the University of Oklahoma serve as a major center for research and graduate education.

The Council submitted revised guidelines to the faculty concerning policies and procedures for grants from internal funds. The revision emphasized that the term "research" refers to scholarly and creative activities in humanities and creative arts, as well as the more traditional concepts of research as used in the scientific and professional disciplines.

The Council communicated to President Sharp its unanimous support for the proposal of Dean Atkinson for indirect cost reallocation. Implementation of this proposal would considerably increase the funding for internal support of faculty research.

The Council is currently preparing a report to be submitted to the Budget Council which will be concerned with an estimation and itemization of recurring research needs of the faculty of the University.

ELECTION OF FACULTY REPLACEMENT: Academic Personnel Council

The Senate elected Mary Esther Saxon (University Libraries) to complete the unexpired portion of the 1973-76 term of Charlyce King on the Academic Personnel Council.

NOMINATION OF FACULTY REPLACEMENTS: ROTC Advisory Committee

The Senate nominated the following faculty members for the following two vacancies on the ROTC Advisory Committee:

John TeSelle (Law) and
Frank Rinehart (Botany-Microbiology) - to complete the 1973-76 unexpired term of William Carmack

Donald Childress (Finance) and
Ruth J. Donnell (University Libraries) - to complete the 1975-78 unexpired term of Hiram Davis

NOMINATION OF FACULTY REPRESENTATIVES: Search Committee for the Dean,
College of Business Administration

Dr. Levinson moved that a moratorium be declared on selecting search committees for deans until the Senate takes action on the forthcoming pertinent proposal from its Committee on Committees in accordance with Senate action on January 12. Dr. Ford called attention to the current situation in the College of Business Administration and urged the Senate not to delay action on President Sharp's request for faculty nominations for a search committee for the dean of that College. In a voice vote with some dissent, the Senate rejected the moratorium proposal.

In response to President Paul F. Sharp's request, the Senate nominated the following faculty members of the College of Business Administration for the six faculty vacancies on the Search Committee for the Dean, College of Business Administration, in view of Dr. Nicholas Baloff's recent resignation:

Roger Atherton - Management	Jim Horrell - Environmental Analysis
L. Doyle Bishop - Management	& Policy
Homer Brown - Accounting	Jack Kasulis - Marketing
Horace Brown - Dean Emeritus	Donald Murry - Director, CEMR
Dennis Crites - Marketing	Jim Reese - Economics
Marilyn Flowers - Economics	Michael Walker - Finance
Ted Herrick - Director, Accounting Division	

ELECTION OF FACULTY REPLACEMENT: Senate Committee on Committees

The Senate elected Laura Blair (Education) to complete the unexpired portion of the 1974-76 term of George Letchworth on the Senate Committee on Committees.

PROPOSED REVISION: Faculty Personnel Policy

Background Information: At the special session on December 1-2, 1975, the Senate approved a proposed revision of the University faculty personnel policy. (See pages 1-27 of the Senate Journal for the special session on December 1-2, 1975.)

Senate Action: Dr. Gail de Stwolinski, Senate Chairperson, reviewed events subsequent to the December 1-2 special session.

On January 23, 1976, the leadership of both Senate received the preliminary administration draft of the revision from the Provost's Office. The Inter-Senate Liaison Committee met with the President and his staff on January 28 to discuss that preliminary draft. At this sole meeting, final decision was not made on several important items.

On January 30, the leaders of both Senates received a copy of the supposedly final draft. However, a few minutes before the start of the February 9, Senate meeting, Senate officers received copies of a revised draft dated February 5, 1976.

On February 2, the officers of the Senate on the Norman campus requested the Provost's Office to make available copies of the January 30 draft for Senate distribution to the other four elected members of the Senate Executive Committee, the four ex-officio Committee members concurrently serving as Senate members, and the three Chairpersons of the three pertinent Senate ad hoc Committees that last fall had reviewed specific portions of the reports of the Task Forces on both campuses.

The Senate officers prepared for distribution at the February 9 Senate meeting a four-page summary of significant differences between the Inter-Senate Liaison Committee and the University administration version. (That summary appears on pages 17-20 of this Journal.) The Senate then went through that summary, item by item, page and page.

At one point, Dr. Paul David, Emeritus Professor of Zoology, received permission to address the Senate. He raised questions concerning the Academic Personnel Council (3.7.5, q) and the Faculty Appeals Board (third paragraph 3.8.5).

After the Senate had finished its review of the summary, Dr. Glenn Snider moved adoption of the following statement distributed to Senate members at the meeting:

- - - - -

The Charter of the General Faculty and the Faculty Senate provides that

The Faculty Senate shall exercise the legislative powers of the Faculty of the University as delegated by the General Faculty. The Faculty Senate shall have the power to initiate any legislation requiring the Board of Regents approval . . .

In spite of this, the Faculty Senate has been permitted only token participation in the revision of faculty personnel policy:

The President's Task Forces, charged with preparing the initial recommendations, were allowed approximately a year to accomplish their assignments. Senate committees, charged with reviewing these recommendations, with conducting hearings, and with reconciling differences between recommendations from the two campuses, were required (presumably under pressure from the Board of Regents) to complete their work in two weeks; and the Senate itself was granted only two days to deliberate and act upon the consolidated report of its committees. The Administration has taken two months to revise the recommendations for presentation to the Board of Regents. The Administration made available to the Executive Committee of the Senate advance copies of its revised recommendations only in time for the Senate to be advised of them at its February 9th meeting--just three days before scheduled presentation to the Regents, thus making it impossible to attempt to negotiate any changes on revisions the Senate found unacceptable.

If the incredibly severe time limitations imposed on the Senate's participation in the revision of the regulations suggest an intention that the Senate was to have only a token role in this process, any doubt on this question is dispelled

by examination of the Administration's revisions, dated January 30, 1976. Virtually every substantive recommendation that originated in the Senate has been either rejected or radically altered. Rejected or radically altered recommendations include those relating to criteria for tenure and promotion, and others not noted below.

The issue here goes far beyond merely offending the sensibilities of the Senate membership. It deeply involves the vital interest of the entire faculty in the degree to which democratic participation in University government has any real meaning at the University of Oklahoma. In bypassing the Senate, the Administration has ignored the only body elected by the entire faculty and the only voice authorized to speak for that faculty. Moreover, in nearly every instance in which the Administration has either rejected or radically altered a substantive recommendation of the Senate, the effect has been to conspicuously reduce or eliminate the effective participation of elected faculty representatives in a decision-making process and/or the accountability of administrators to faculty. For example:

1. The Inter-Senate Liaison Committee recommended (3.7.5 q) retention of the present role of the Academic Personnel Council in the adjudication of tenure cases in which there are conflicting recommendations--a safeguard against capricious or irresponsible recommendations by either an academic unit or an administrator--and further stipulated that the President should be accountable to the Council in those instances in which he or she is unwilling to accept its recommendation.

The Administration's revision abolishes any role of the Academic Personnel Council in the tenure-deciding process.

2. The Senate accepted the recommendation of the Task Force to establish a Campus Tenure Committee but stipulated (3.7.5 m) that this committee be called a council and elected by the Faculty Senate.

The Administration rejects this provision and recommends that committee members be selected by the President from nominations provided by the Senate.

3. The Senate recommended (3.7.5 k, footnote) that, on the Norman campus, the Campus Tenure Council should review recommendations of administrative officers, as well as those provided by academic units.

The Administration rejects this recommendation.

4. The Senate approved (3.7.5 p) the recommendation of the Norman Task Force (Task Force Report, 3.7.5 k) that, if the President disagrees with a recommendation of the Campus Tenure Council/Committee, he or she shall allow time and opportunity for a "thorough discussion of the case" with the Council/Committee before presenting a final recommendation to the Regents.

The Administration (3.7.5 o) substitutes for this a provision that, in such a situation, "The President at his or her discretion may wish to meet with the Committee to discuss any divergent views."

The Senate vigorously protests the total ignoring by the Administration of the Senate's chartered prerogatives; it explicitly dissociates itself from any responsibility for the recommendations on faculty personnel policy that the Administration proposes to present to the Regents; and it expresses gravest concern over the Administration's apparent disposition to reduce significantly the effective participation of elected faculty representatives in decision-making processes.

Dr. Reid then moved that Dr. Snider's proposal be tabled for further consideration at a subsequent Senate meeting. The Senate rejected this tabling motion.

In the ensuing discussion various views were expressed. Dr. Kitts felt that the proposal was vague regarding the alleged violations of Senate prerogatives. Others expressed the opinion that the vagueness also applied to what the Regents were expected to do. Dr. Schmitz expressed a preference for citing specific instances of Senate displeasure with the proposed revision. Dr. Lee, agreeing with Dr. Kitts, added that he was sympathetic with the spirit of the proposal "but not on those grounds." Dr. Cronenwett commented that the "somewhat intemperate" language used be "toned down a bit." Dr. Scheffer expressed concern that as the proposed policy is implemented, faculty service to the state will be inevitably cut down.

Subsequently, Dr. Fife moved that the proposal be amended by the addition of the following final paragraph: "The Senate requests the Regents to reject the proposed revision because it does not reflect the judgements of the Faculty Senate." With some dissent, the Senate approved the amendment.

Shortly thereafter, the Senate approved in a 33-to-8 vote Dr. Snider's proposal, as amended. Dr. Shahan moved that the Senate reconsider its approval. The Chair ruled his motion out of order inasmuch as he was not among those voting on the prevailing side of the question.

Dr. Gerald Braver then moved acceptance of the following separate statement:

 The faculty needs to know in specific terms the Administration's position with respect to the powers and function of the faculty in the government of the University. If there are fundamental differences between the viewpoints of faculty and Administration, it is of utmost importance for the faculty to know of these, so that an attempt can be made to work out some kind of a modus vivendi.

As a first step toward this end, the Faculty Senate (Norman campus) urgently requests that the President and/or the Board of Regents inform the University Faculty, in clear and unequivocal terms, of

1. The areas of decision making in which the faculty, acting through its duly elected representatives, shall have
 - (a) primary responsibility*
 - (b) joint responsibility with the Administration
 - (c) no more than an advisory role
 and
2. The degree to which the President is accountable, in each of these areas, to duly elected faculty bodies when he or she is disposed to reject their recommendations.

*In matters where the faculty has primary responsibility, "the governing board and the president . . . should concur with the judgment of (a duly elected body of) the faculty except in rare instances and for compelling reasons which should be stated in detail." (1966 Statement on Government of Colleges and Universities, AAUP Bulletin 52: 375-79.)

Following a brief discussion of this question, the Senate, in a voice vote without dissent, approved Dr. Bravers' statement.

ADJOURNMENT

The Faculty Senate adjourned at 5:46 p.m. The next regular meeting of the Senate will be at 3:30 p.m., on Monday, March 15, 1976, in Dale Hall 218.

Respectfully submitted, *Anthony J. Leo*
 Secretary, Faculty Senate

SUMMARY OF SIGNIFICANT CHANGES IN PROPOSED REVISION OF FACULTY PERSONNEL POLICY

Item	Inter-Senate Liaison Committee version (Senate Journal, December 1-2, 1975)	University administration version (January 30, 1976)
3.3 (Faculty Accountability)	First sentence, third paragraph, page 6: "Each academic unit, in concert with the Dean and the Provost, shall establish and publish specific criteria for evaluating faculty performance in that unit."	Deleted.
3.6 (Professional Activities of the Faculty.)	First sentence: "The faculty plays <u>the major role</u> in defining the University's academic policies . . ."	Third sentence: "Faculty members play a <u>central role</u> in the <u>realization</u> of these functions . . ."
3.6.1 (Teaching.)		Following two sentences added subsequently at the recommendation of the Inter-Senate Liaison Committee: "Teaching, which is the transmission of knowledge and cultural values, focuses upon helping students to learn. As a part of its mission, the University is dedicated to undergraduate, graduate, and continuing education."
3.6.2 (Research or Creative Achievement.)	Opening sentence: "As a means by which the faculty expresses its originality, participates in the extension of knowledge and human capabilities, and maintains its professional vitality, creative endeavor is both good in itself and necessary for the University teacher's intellectual renewal and development."	Substitute sentence added subsequently at the recommendation of the Inter-Senate Liaison Committee: "Research, which is the development and validation of new knowledge focuses upon faculty participation in the extension of knowledge and maintenance of professional development and vitality."
3.6.3 (Professional Service)	"Service in conjunction with an academic or professional discipline is an important contribution the University makes to the world of learning and to society at large. Included in <u>public or professional services</u> are . . ."	Added by Inter-Senate Liaison Committee: "Service, which is the application of knowledge gained through research or creative achievement, focuses upon resolving contemporary problems, identifying new areas for inquiry and development, and sharing knowledge with the larger community." Added by administration: "The term professional service always refers to activities directly related to the faculty member's discipline or profession." Included in <u>professional services</u> are"
3.6.4 (Participation in University Governance.)	Second sentence: "The faculty should have <u>primary responsibility</u> in making and carrying out decisions affecting the educational and scholarly life of the University."	Second sentence revised as follows: "The faculty has a <u>major responsibility</u> in making and carrying out decisions affecting the educational and scholarly life of the University."
3.7 (Faculty Tenure.)	Second paragraph cites AAUP 1940 Statement, subsequent rulings, and recommendations.	Second paragraph deleted Final sentence added: "In those exceptional cases, when it is recommended that a faculty member be permitted to reduce his or her employment to less than full-time and maintain a tenured status, specific regential approval must be granted."
3.7.1 (Definitions)		(a) Reference to AAUP 1940 Statement <u>deleted</u> .

Item	Inter-Senate Liaison Committee version	University administration version 2/76 (Page 18)
<p>3.7.4 (Criteria for Tenure Decision)</p>	<p>The choices that the University makes in granting tenure are crucial to its endeavors toward academic excellence. A decision to grant tenure must reflect an assessment of high professional competence, aptitude, and promise in a faculty member. Tenure should not be regarded as a routine reward.</p> <p>The tenure decision is primarily based on the candidate's professional qualities within the framework of the university's needs and resources. The award of tenure should indicate an expectation that the University will continue to need the services that the faculty member is capable of performing and that the University will have adequate resources for his or her continued employment.</p> <p>The tenure decision must be made in light of a thorough evaluation of the candidate's performance in all the areas of faculty activity. The tenure candidate's performance is judged by all recommending parties against the academic unit's written statement of tenure criteria, as modified in those individual cases where there are special conditions pertaining to the candidate's appointment. (See section 3.7.3, a)</p> <p>Each academic unit, in concert with the dean and the Provost, shall establish and publish specific criteria for tenure in that unit.</p> <p>Qualifications for the award of tenure in all units shall, except in highly unusual cases, include attainment of a high standard in at least two of the three following areas: teaching, research or creative achievement, and public or professional service. (See Section 3.6.1, 3.6.2, and 3.6.3).</p> <p>The award of tenure should indicate that the faculty member is of comparable intellectual stature to others in the same field outside the University who might be considered as alternate candidates for the position.</p>	<p>The choices that the University makes in granting tenure are crucial to its endeavors toward academic excellence. A decision to grant tenure must reflect an assessment of high professional competence and performance measured against national standards. Tenure should never be regarded as a routine award.</p> <p>The tenure decision shall be based on a thorough evaluation of the candidate's total contribution to the mission of the University. While specific responsibilities of faculty members may vary because of special assignments or because of the particular mission of an academic unit, all evaluations for tenure shall address the manner in which each candidate has performed in:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> (1) Teaching (See Section 3.6.1) (2) Research or Creative Achievement (See Section 3.6.2) (3) Professional Service (See Section 3.6.3) (4) University Service (See Sections 3.6.4 and 3.6.5) <p>Above all else, it is essential to any recommendation that tenure be granted that the faculty member has clearly demonstrated scholarly attainment, primarily but not exclusively through teaching and research or creative achievement.</p> <p>In those cases, in which specific assignments might limit the faculty member's involvement in any area of faculty responsibility, a written understanding to this effect should be filed in the Provost's office, approved by the dean and the chair of the academic unit at the time the assignment is made.</p> <p>The award of tenure carries with it the expectation that the University shall continue to need the services the faculty member is capable of performing and that the financial resources are expected to be available for continuous employment. It also carries the expectation that the faculty member will maintain or improve upon the level of attainment which characterized the qualifications for tenure.</p>
<p>3.75 (Procedures for Tenure Decisions)</p>	<p>In par. (l) and subsequent pars., reference is made to the Campus Tenure Council (HSC and Norman campuses).</p> <p>(g)</p>	<p>In par. (j) and subsequent pars., reference is made to the Campus Tenure Committee (HSC and Norman campuses).</p> <p>Deleted with consent of Inter-Senate Liaison Committee.</p>

Item	Inter-Senate Liaison Committee version	University administration version 2/76 (Page 19)
7.5 Procedures for Tenure Decisions) (continued)	(j) All recommendations must be in writing and, with the exception of the Faculty recommendation yielded by the secret polling of tenured faculty members, all must include a statement of reasons for the recommendation made. Copies of all such recommendations made above the level of the academic unit, up to and including the President, must be provided at the time of the recommendations to the unit's Committee A and the individual concerned. Committee A should monitor the recommendations as they are received. Committee A is entitled, if it sees fit, to make a representation concerning a tenure case originating in the academic unit at any level up to and including the Regents.	(i) All recommendations shall be in writing and, with the exception of the faculty recommendation resulting from the secret poll, reasons for the recommendations must be stated. At the time recommendations are made at any stage of the review process, notification of such recommendations must be provided the chair and the individual candidate. It shall be the responsibility of the chair to inform the faculty of the unit about recommendations made at the various stages of the review process.
	(k) First paragraph	Deleted with consent of Inter-Senate Liaison Committee.
	(k) Footnote, at end of second paragraph	Deleted. (See (j) at bottom of page 15.)
	(l) Line 3: ". . . and is consistent with the academic unit's approved tenure criteria."	(k) Line 3 substitution: ". . . and is consistent with the approved tenure criteria."
	(o) Upon submitting recommendations on tenure cases to the President, the Provost will simultaneously notify both the academic unit and the individual concerned of the decision recommended.	Deleted.
	(p) ". . . allowing sufficient time and opportunity for the President and the Council mutually to conduct a thorough discussion of the case before the President presents his or her final recommendation to the Regents.	(o) Substitution -- last sentence: "The President at his or her discretion may wish to meet with the Committee to discuss any divergent views."
	(q)	Deleted with consent of Inter-Senate Liaison Committee with the understanding that APC functions would be incorporated into the FAB.
	(r) At any time during the tenure-recommending process, the concerned faculty member may appeal to the Faculty Appeals Board or the Committee on Discrimination if he or she believes: that procedural violations have occurred in the case; that violations of his or her academic freedom have taken place; or that discrimination has occurred on the basis of race, sex, creed, color, age, or ethnic or national origin. Such appeals must be made promptly after discovery of the alleged infringement on the rights of the candidate, and the review process will be suspended until a resolution is effected. Such an appeal may also be made on behalf of the tenure candidate by any person or group having participated officially in the tenure-recommendation procedure, provided that the concerned faculty member concurs in this action.	(p) At any stage of the tenure review process, the concerned faculty member may appeal to the Faculty Appeals Board if it is believed that procedural violations have occurred in the case or that violations of academic freedom have occurred. If it is believed that there has been discrimination on the basis of race, sex, age, creed, or ethnic or national origin, the faculty member may appeal to the Committee on Discrimination. Such appeals must be made within 14 days after discovery of the alleged violation, and the review process will be suspended until a resolution is effected. Such an appeal shall not have the effect of extending the faculty member's terminal year, should tenure be denied.
7.2 Grounds	(d) Serious violation of law admitted or proved before a competent court, preventing the faculty member from satisfactory fulfillment of professional duties or responsibilities.	Underscored addition (d) . . . duties or responsibilities, or violations of a court order, when such court order relates to the faculty member's proper performance of professional responsibilities.
7.3 Promotion, (continued)	Next-to-last par. lists reasons for severe sanctions. Last par. cites AAUP Statements of 1940, 1958, and 1972.	Both paragraphs deleted.
		Par. (e) added: Changes in the University's educational function through action of the Regents of the University and/or the State Regents for Higher Education which results in the elimination of an academic unit. In such instances the University will make every reasonable effort to reassign affected faculty members to positions for which they are properly qualified before dismissal results from such elimination.
7.4	(No title). Lines 3-4: ". . . the appropriate administrative officers within the academic unit shall discuss . . ."	(Initial Procedures) Deleted in line 4: ". . . the appropriate administrative officer(s) shall ordinarily discuss . . ."

Item	Inter-Senate Liaison Committee version	University administration version
8.5 (Faculty Appeals Board)	(a) The FAB is a standing body which responds to matters of tenure abrogation, dismissal, severe sanctions, alleged violations of academic freedom or academic due process, and alleged grievances concerning working conditions or personnel relations.	(Substitution underscored) (a) The FAB is a standing body academic due process and other grievances unresolved through administrative procedures.
	Third par.: The FAB is specifically empowered to entertain appeals referred to it by the Academic Personnel Council.	Deleted.
Disposition of charges)	3.8.10 (Second par.): In the event that the Board of Regents chooses to review the case itself, its review shall be based on the record of the formal hearings, accompanied by the opportunity for oral and written argument by the principals in the case of their representatives.	3.8.9 (Second par.): In the event that the Board of Regents chooses to review the case itself, its review shall be based on the record of the formal hearings, plus additional information which they wish to consider, accompanied by the opportunity for written argument by the principals in the case or their representatives. Oral arguments will be presented only upon request by the Regents.
9 (Appeals & Grievances) or has an alleged grievance concerning working conditions or personnel relations, the faculty member may seek redress. . .	(Substitution underscored) . . . or if there are other grievances which have not been resolved administratively, the faculty member . . .
10 (Fac. Eval., advancement, and promotion)	Deserving faculty should be rewarded for their meritorious accomplishments each year through increases in salary commensurate with funds available. Since review for salary increases occurs each year and encompasses all faculty, it is the University's most consistent reflection of regular and continuing faculty evaluation. It is, therefore, incumbent upon departmental Committees A and the deans to rigorously collect and evaluate information about faculty performance before reaching a final recommendation on merit increases in salary.	Faculty evaluation is a continuous process, both prior to and following the granting of tenure. An annual review of each faculty member's performance is the responsibility of the academic deans and the specific academic units. A systematic procedure for accomplishing such evaluations shall be developed in each college by the Provost working with the deans and the academic units, and approved by the President. The criteria for evaluation shall be carefully and clearly stated. Although the criteria stated in Section 3.7.4 are basic to an on-going faculty evaluation system, specific faculty assignments and the specific mission of the unit may modify the relative weight given to any one area of professional activity. All salary adjustments and promotions in rank shall be based on systematic evaluation of faculty performance. Substitution: Pars. (a) and (b) deleted. Substitute par. (a): The most frequent reflection of a continuing faculty evaluation system is in the annual recommendations for merit salary increases. Deserving faculty should be rewarded, within the limits of the financial resources of the University for meritorious performance.
10.1 (Salary Adjustments)		Pars. (a) and (b) deleted. Substitute par. (a): The most frequent reflection of a continuing faculty evaluation system is in the annual recommendations for merit salary increases. Deserving faculty should be rewarded, within the limits of the financial resources of the University for meritorious performance.
11.1 (Promotion Criteria)	(a) Qualifications for promotion in all units should, except in highly unusual individual cases, include attainment of high standard in at least two of the following: teaching, research or creative achievement, and service. (See Sections 3.6.1, 3.6.2, 3.6.3, 3.6.4, and 3.6.5)	Substitution: (a) Qualifications for promotion in all units should include attainment of high standards in teaching, research or creative achievement, and professional service and University service, and the evaluation should be substantially the same process as followed in tenure considerations (Section 3.7.4).