

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

Regular Session -- March 15, 1976 -- 3:30 p.m., Dale Hall 218

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

Present:

Barefield	Duchon	Joyce	McDonald	Snider
Bell	Fife	Kidd	Pento	Starling
Blair	Ford	Kitts	Rasmussen	Swank
Braver	Fowler	Kondonassis	Reid	Tolliver
Buhite	Graves	Larson	Reynolds	Tomberlin
Crim	Gross	Lee	Scheffer	Verrastro
Cronerwett	Henkle	Levinson	Schmitz	Whitecotton
de Stwolinski	Hibdon	Marchand	Shahan	York

AUOPE representatives: Anderson Cowen Guyer

UOSA representatives: Bode Carnes

Absent:

Bohland	Donnell	Kendall	Mouser	Shellabarger	Unruh
Cox	Goff	Kraynak	Rice	Streebin	

Provost Office representative: Pollak

AUOPE representatives: Spaulding Thompson

UOSA representative: Scott

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Presidential Action: Faculty Replacements	2
Card of Thanks	2
State Regents; Office Presentation:	
1976-77 Budget Request	2-3
Faculty Personnel Policy	3-5
Social Security Program.	6
State Regents' Policy on Articulation of Students among State Institutions	7-10
Search Committees for Deans	12-13
Proposed University Policy in Event of Retrenchment	13-14
Proposed University Constitution	15

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

The Journal of the Faculty Senate for the regular session on February 9, 1976, was approved.

ACTION TAKEN BY PRESIDENT PAUL F. SHARP: Faculty Replacements

Dr. Paul F. Sharp, President of the University, recently approved the Senate election of Mary Esther Saxon (University Libraries) as a faculty replacement on the Academic Personnel Council.

At the same time, President Sharp selected the following faculty representatives from nominations submitted by the Senate:

ROTC Advisory Committee: John Te Selle (Law)
Ruth J. Donnell (University Libraries)

Search Committee for the Dean,
College of Business Administration: Roger Atherton
Dennis Crites
Marilyn Flowers
Ted Herrick
Donald Murry (Chairperson)
Michael Walker

(Other members of that Search Committee include Vice President Thurman White; Joe G. Boyce, Darrell Moore, and Sheryl A. Walker, UOSA representatives; and Ben D. Floyd, Jr., and James R. Tolbert III.)

(See page 13 of the Senate Journal for February 9, 1976.)

ANNOUNCEMENT: Spring Meeting of the General Faculty

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

CARD OF THANKS: Family of the late Dr. Gerald A. Porter

The following message of appreciation was received by the Senate Secretary on March 9, 1976, from the family of the late Dr. Gerald A. Porter:

To the members of the University of Oklahoma Faculty Senate:

Thank you for your kind expression of condolences in remembrance of Gerald's years of service to the University of Oklahoma and to the Faculty Senate as its Secretary. We all appreciate your thoughtful consideration.

Fran, Marcia, Ann, and Dick Porter

(See page 5 of the Senate Journal for January 12, 1976.)

STATE REGENTS' OFFICE SLIDE/TAPE PRESENTATION: 1976-77 Budget Request

In accordance with arrangements made last January by the President's Office and the State Regents' Office, the officers of the Senate scheduled for March 15, 1976, the State Regents' Office 17-minute slide/tape presentation on the 1976-77 budget request of the State Regents for Higher Education.

The following members of the Chancellor's staff were present to answer questions concerning the slide/tape presentation that covered such topics as: enrollment trends, selection of new programs, improvement of quality, program budgeting.

Dr. Ed Coyle, Vice Chancellor for Fiscal Affairs
 Dr. Dan Hobbs, Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs
 Mr. David Blakeman, Assistant to the Chancellor for
 Communications Services
 Ms. Kathy Kidd, Assistant to Mr. Blakeman

Before answering questions from the floor, Dr. Coyle called attention to the four-page leaflet, "Facts about Oklahoma Higher Education," published by the State Regents in December, 1975. Copies were distributed to Senate members at this meeting. (Interested individuals may pick up copies while they last at the Office of the Faculty Senate, Evans Hall 100-A, extension 5-6874.)

The leaflet includes the following topics:

student enrollment
 percentage of high school graduates in college
 number of public and private institutions
 degrees conferred
 trends in undergraduate and graduate degrees
 current operations budgets
 faculty salaries (past 10 years)
 higher education budgets (past 10 years)

During the 10-minute question-and-answer period, Drs. Coyle and Hobbs commented on a wide variety of subjects, including the following:

- (1) The State Regents' Office defines a "program" as "sequentially organized instruction culminating in either a degree or a certificate."
- (2) A downturn in full-time enrollments should begin about 1983. The large number of veterans currently enrolled should begin to taper off within two years.
- (3) The State Regents' Office defines full-time equivalent students as undergraduates = 30 hours and graduate students = 24 hours.
- (4) By 1983, institutions will face the challenge of offering adult education programs to offset decreasing full-time enrollments.
- (5) Citing the Chancellor's recent public statement that a 10-25 per cent tuition hike might not be out of line, both staff members were vague and noncommittal as to any future action by the State Regents in this matter.
- (6) Rationally and politically, the chances are nil for closing any of the smaller institutions.
- (7) State Regents will not unilaterally approve new doctoral programs at other institutions, particularly in view of the developing surplus in doctorates. Dr. Hobbs added that he would never recommend another doctoral program at any other institution.

REPORT OF SENATE OFFICERS: Faculty Personnel Policy

Background Information: Following the February 9, 1976, Senate meeting, the Senate Secretary forwarded to President Sharp the official report of the Senate action. (See pages 13-16 of the Senate Journal for February 9, 1976.)

Concurrently, on February 10, the Senate Secretary addressed the following letter to Mr. Tom Brett, Chairman, Academic Affairs Committee on the Board of Regents:

"At the request of the Senate officers, I am forwarding to you information copies of statements approved by the Faculty Senate on February 9, 1976, concerning (a) the proposed revision of the faculty personnel policy and (b) the role of the faculty in University governance.

"We understand that the Academic Affairs Committee is meeting on the Norman campus on Wednesday, February 11, 1976.

"At your pleasure and if your schedule permits, the officers of the Faculty Senate (Norman campus) would be glad to meet with your Committee to discuss informally the two statements at any time between 2:15-3:30 p.m."

On the morning of February 11, the Senate officers were invited to meet with the Regents' Committee at 5:00 p.m., that afternoon. The Senate officers met on schedule with the Committee, as well as with President Sharp and several members of his staff. Because of other commitments, the Committee members concluded the meeting at 6:15 p.m.

However, before adjourning, the Committee members requested the Senate (Norman campus) leadership to prepare a list of several items of greatest concern to the Senate and to meet with the Regents at 9:00 a.m., on Thursday, February 12, preceding the 10:30 a.m. monthly meeting of the Board of Regents.

Action taken by Senate officers: For the Thursday (February 12) morning session, the Senate officers prepared the following statement incorporating six items of vital interest to the Senate (Norman campus):

- - - - -

Statement of the Officers of the Faculty Senate (Norman campus)
February 12, 1976

We sincerely regret the administration's disappointment over the actions taken by the Faculty Senate (Norman campus) on February 9, 1976.

The Faculty Senate in its deliberations has always had a genuine concern for a high quality of standards at the University of Oklahoma.

A primary resource for a University's excellence is its faculty. Faculty excellence is fostered and enhanced, in part, by sound personnel policies. Of great importance in attaining academic excellence is an environment that is conducive to maximizing the available faculty resources.

In this regard, the Senate input toward an appropriate faculty personnel policy at the University of Oklahoma has emphasized the best possible utilization of the multiplicity of talents among the faculty in meeting the stated missions of this University as a public institution.

In this spirit, therefore, we respectfully request that the administration and the Regents consider the following amendments to the faculty personnel policy:

(1) In view of the fact that the preamble to the administration's proposal specifically cites the mission of the University of Oklahoma to be teaching, research, continuing education, and public service, we recommend that the third paragraph of 3.7.4 (Criteria for the Tenure Decision) be amended to read as follows: "Above all else, it is essential to any recommendation that tenure be granted that the faculty member has clearly demonstrated scholarly attainment."

(2) Because of the multi-faceted nature of each unit, we recommend that the following be added as a new fourth paragraph in 3.7.4: "Each academic

unit, in concert with the dean and the Provost, shall establish and publish specific criteria for evaluating faculty performance in that unit."

(3) In the best interests of mutual effort, accountability should pervade all areas of the University. Therefore, we recommend that paragraph (o) of 3.7.5 be replaced by the following:

"In any tenure case in which the President plans to submit to the Regents a recommendation contrary to that of the Campus Tenure Council, the President shall so notify the Tenure Council 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."

(4) At present, there is no recourse to appealing a substantive evaluation during the process of a tenure review. We request, therefore, that the following be added to the first sentence in paragraph (p), 3.7.5 (Procedure for the Tenure Decision): ". . . or that there has been an irresponsible or a capricious evaluation of a substantive nature."

(5) Inasmuch as the Academic Personnel Council has been removed from the tenure-decision process and the activities of the Campus Tenure Committee now include substantive causes, we recommend that the term Committee be replaced by the term Council (3.7.5) as is appropriate to the responsibilities involved.*

(6) Because there are no criteria^{LA} specified for salary adjustments, we recommend that the following be added as a new paragraph (b) in 3.10.1 (Salary Adjustments): "Each academic unit, in concert with the dean and the Provost, shall establish and publish specific criteria for evaluating faculty performance in that unit. The Unit's faculty and Committee A, the dean, and the Provost should be in full agreement as to the specific criteria so that any ensuing disagreements on salary recommendations will arise only through differences of opinion concerning evaluation and application of the criteria rather than over the criteria themselves." The remaining three paragraphs would then be redesignated as (c), (d), and (e), respectively.

In response to the Regents' concern that accountability for decisions be identified, we feel that the best interests of the decision-making process at the University of Oklahoma would be served if the Faculty Senate were viewed as the channel through which faculty input is made into the University deliberations.

*At 3:35 p.m., on February 9, 1976, the Senate leadership received the administration's February 5 version of the personnel policy proposal for Regents' consideration on February 12. Par. 3.7.5 (k) of that February 5 version included the following underscored addition:

"The main purpose of the Campus Tenure Committee is to provide faculty advice on whether or not the academic unit's recommendation with regard to both substance and process is sustained by the accompanying documentation and is consistent with the approved tenure criteria."

President Sharp recommended the approval of items (2), (3), (5), and (6).

The Board of Regents, however, took the following action on the above items:

- | | |
|---|--|
| (1) Rejected | (4) Rejected |
| (2) Accepted with some language modification | (5) Rejected |
| (3) Accepted with substitution of Committee for Council | (6) Accepted with some language modification |

Dr. Gail de Stwolinski, Senate Chairperson, added that President Sharp has recently responded to both Senate actions of February 9. The Senate leadership, however, has requested an early meeting with Dr. Sharp to clarify some points. A full and final report will be made to the Senate at the April 12 meeting.

REPORT OF FACULTY WELFARE COMMITTEE: Social Security Program

A few months ago, the Senate Executive Committee requested the Senate Committee on Faculty Welfare to study the advisability and the feasibility of withdrawing from the national Social Security Program. Dr. R. Saul Levinson, Chairperson of the Subcommittee, presented a progress report in this matter.

At present, most faculty members contribute \$895.00 annually to the Social Security program; the University of Oklahoma contributes a matching sum for a total of \$1,790 annual contribution. Dr. Levinson feels that a private insurance program would be more advantageous. He added that about one-half of the state universities in the country are members of the Social Security program; the others either offer Social Security on an optional basis or do not participate at all. Oklahoma University classified and nonclassified staff are beginning to study alternatives to the Social Security program.

Dr. Levinson then distributed copies of a March 15, 1976, memorandum (reproduced below) from Ms. Beverly E. Ledbetter, University Legal Counsel, reviewing the history and the nature of the State agreement to participate in the Social Security program.

- - - - -

Per your request, I have reviewed the circumstances surrounding the inclusion of the University of Oklahoma employees in the Social Security system. Additionally, I have reviewed the agreement entered into by the Governor of the State of Oklahoma, Roy J. Turner, and James H. Bond, Regional Director of the Federal Security Administration.

I. The agreement is legally binding. The authority to enter into agreements on behalf of state employees is given to the Governor of the State of Oklahoma by Article VI, Section 8 of the Oklahoma Constitution. The agreement defines those state employees who will be covered by the system, contributions by the state, and conditions under which the agreement may be terminated. Obviously, we are covered by the agreement and, thus, only the provisions relating to "termination by the state" are of concern at this time.

II. Termination of the Agreement - The original agreement was made between the State of Oklahoma and the Federal Security Administration. The University of Oklahoma was not a party to the agreement and has no rights under the agreement with respect to termination of the same. Thus, a decision by the University not to participate in the Social Security system would have no effect, unless further action is taken by the State itself.

III. Notice of Termination Required - The State must give a minimum of two years' advance notice of intent to terminate coverage with respect to any subdivision of the state. There is a further provision requiring, in essence, that the agreement remain in force for a minimum of five years prior to the giving of notice. That minimum period has now expired and notice may be given by the state at any time.

The calendar quarter referred to in the agreement means that the two year period between the time notice is given and the time termination becomes effective is determined by the end of the fiscal quarter in which the notice is given. This

method of determining the time for termination is in accordance with the method used by Social Security for granting credit or units of coverage.

IV. Summary - The agreement by which University of Oklahoma employees are covered under the Social Security system is subject to amendment or modification by state action. Any modification which would terminate coverage with respect to a subdivision of the state would require the giving of two years' notice before such modification would become effective.

The modification itself can only be effected through state action, although the Board of Regents is initially entrusted with the authority to determine what fringe benefits shall be available for its University employees. Thus, any request for a modification of the system with respect to University employees would presumably come from the Board. The state, however, would reserve the right to grant or deny such a request.

I hope this brief evaluation of the system is of some value to you. As I mentioned earlier, an in-depth review of the issues would be necessary to definitively comment on the legal problems inherent in changing the scope of coverage.

ARTICLE 6 & 8

Execution of laws - Intercourse with other states and United States - Conservator of peace. -

The Governor shall cause the laws of the State to be faithfully executed, and shall conduct in person or in such manner as may be prescribed by law, all intercourse and business of the State with other states and with the United States, and he shall be a conservator of the peace throughout the State.

Dr. Levinson added that any changes subsequently approved would not jeopardize any benefits already earned by individual faculty members.

Professor Larson, Committee Chairperson, moved that an ad hoc Committee be appointed with expertise in the areas of law, investments, and insurance to investigate all legal ramifications of withdrawal from the Social Security system and to provide an alternate investment and security program. The Senate approved the motion without dissent.

STATE REGENTS' POLICY ON ARTICULATION OF STUDENTS
AMONG STATE INSTITUTIONS

Background Information: At the January 12, 1976, Senate meeting, Dr. James Fife called attention to the "Policy Statement on the Articulation of Students among Institutions in the Oklahoma State System of Higher Education," published in the December, 1975, Oklahoma Higher Education Report. After reading excerpts from that policy statement, he offered a Senate resolution requesting the State Regents to rescind their policy statement. The Senate deferred final action pending a report from the Academic Program Council. (See pages 2-4 of the Senate Journal for January 12, 1976.)

The Senate Secretary secured the full official text (reproduced below) of the Regents' statement and distributed copies to Senate members on January 21, 1976.

Article XIII-A of the Constitution of Oklahoma provides that the Oklahoma State Regents for Higher Education shall constitute a coordinating board of control for

all State System institutions with certain specified powers including (a) the prescribing of standards of higher education for each institution, (b) the determination of functions and courses of study in each of the institutions to conform to the standards prescribed, and (c) the granting of degrees and other forms of academic recognition for completion of prescribed courses in all of such institutions.

Oklahoma currently operates 26 public institutions of higher education, including 14 two-year colleges, 10 four- and five-year universities, and two comprehensive graduate universities. One of the primary goals of The Oklahoma State System of Higher Education is to provide access at some public institution for all Oklahoma citizens whose interests and abilities qualify them for admission. Given the large number of individuals who annually seek admission to the State System, it is recognized that no single institution can physically accommodate the total student body, nor can any institutional type meet the diverse needs and demands of all the students for various kinds of educational programs. Therefore each institution and each institutional type has been assigned a specialized role within the total State System, in order that all qualified individuals may be accommodated at some institution, although not necessarily at the institution of first choice.

Oklahoma two-year colleges currently enroll one-half of the entering freshman students in the public sector, with the regional universities and comprehensive graduate universities sharing the remainder of the entering student load. Given this division of labor at the entering level, it is important that continuing access be provided for students in the two-year colleges who desire to pursue an upper-division program at a public baccalaureate institution. The policy statement to follow is designed to guarantee an orderly transition for students in programs leading toward the Associate of Arts and the Associate of Science degrees at institutions in The Oklahoma State System of Higher Education.

I. Standards of Education for Completion of Associate Degrees - The minimum requirements for the Associate of Arts or the Associate of Science degree at any institution in The Oklahoma State System of Higher Education shall include the following:

1. The completion of 60 semester credit hours exclusive of basic required physical education or military science courses with an overall grade point average of 2.0.
2. The completion as a portion of the overall 60 semester credit hours of a basic general education core of a minimum of 33 semester credit hours which shall include the following:
 - a. English and Language Arts 6 hours
(This must include the two basic college level courses in English Grammar and Composition or evidence that the student has "tested out" of these courses or established proficiency by advanced standing or other acceptable means.)
 - b. Social Studies 6 hours
(This must include American History and Government)
 - c. Science 6-8 hours
(This must include one 3-4 hour course in Life Science and one 3-4 hour course in Physical Science.)
 - d. Humanities 5 hours
(Chosen from courses defined as humanities by the institution granting the associate degree.)

- e. At least one two-hour course from each of two of the following areas 4 hours
Mathematics, Psychology, Foreign Languages, Fine Arts
(Art, Music, Dramatics) Practical Arts (Agriculture,
Business, Home Economics, Industrial Arts)
No more than 12 hours in any one area will count toward the basic
33 semester hours of general education.

3. The remaining minimum of 27 semester credit hours of academic work shall be applicable to the student's major objective including any prerequisite courses necessary for his/her anticipated upper-division program. A majority of such student credit hours shall be taken in courses classified as liberal arts and sciences.

4. The general education core of 33 semester credit hours shall be considered minimal and each institution may, with the approval of the State Regents, develop additional lower-division general education requirements for its own students.

II. Guidelines for the Transfer of Students Among Institutions - In order that students completing the above degree requirements may move vertically through the State System with a minimum loss of time and financial outlay, the following guidelines for transfer of students among institutions are hereby adopted for The Oklahoma State System of Higher Education:

1. After a public institution of higher learning in Oklahoma has developed and published its program of general education, the integrity of the program will be recognized by the other public institutions in Oklahoma. Once a student has been certified by such an institution as having completed satisfactorily its prescribed general education program culminated by an Associate of Arts or Science degree, no other public institution of higher learning in Oklahoma to which he may be qualified to transfer shall require any further lower division general education courses in his program.

2. It is understood, however, that it might be necessary for teacher education candidates to take additional courses in General Education to meet minimum certification requirements, as defined by the state, i.e., health and physical education, geography, Oklahoma History, etc., or similar additional requirements of other professional fields. It is also understood that the completion of these requirements does not preclude requirements of senior institutions of particular grade points for admission to professional departments or fields.

3. It is further understood that it is the responsibility of the transferring institution to provide adequate counseling to enable a student to complete during the freshman and sophomore years those lower division courses which are published prerequisites to pursuit of junior level courses in his/her chosen major disciplinary field.

4. The baccalaureate degree in all Oklahoma senior level institutions shall be awarded in recognition of lower division (freshman-sophomore) combined with upper division (junior and senior) work. The lower division general education requirement of the baccalaureate degree shall be the responsibility of the institution awarding the associate degree providing the general education requirements specified herein are met. If, for any reason, a student has not completed an approved general education program prior to his transfer to another institution, the general education requirements shall become the responsibility of the receiving institution.

5. Lower division programs in all state institutions enrolling freshmen and sophomores may offer introductory courses which permit the student to explore

the principal professional specializations that can be pursued at the baccalaureate level. These introductory courses shall be adequate in content to be fully counted toward the baccalaureate degree for students continuing in such a professional field of specialization. The determination of the major course requirements for a baccalaureate degree, including courses in the major taken in the lower division, shall be the responsibility of the institution awarding the degree. However, courses classified as junior level courses yet open to sophomores at senior institutions, even though taught at a junior college as sophomore level courses, should be transferable as satisfying that part of the student's requirement in the content area.

6. Other associate degrees and certificates may be awarded by institutions for programs which have requirements different from the aforementioned degrees, or a primary objective other than transfer. Acceptance of course credits for transfers from such degree or certificate programs will be evaluated by the receiving institution on the basis of applicability of the courses to the baccalaureate program in the major field of the student. Each receiving institution is encouraged to develop admission policies that will consider all factors indicating the possibility of success of these students in its upper division.

7. Each baccalaureate degree granting institution shall list and update the requirements for each program leading to the baccalaureate degree and shall publicize these requirements for use by all other institutions in the State System. Each baccalaureate degree granting institution shall include in its official catalog information stating all lower division prerequisite requirements for each upper division course. All requirements for admission to a university, college, or program should be set forth with precision and clarity. The catalog in effect at the time of the student's initial full-time enrollment in a college or university shall govern lower division prerequisites, provided that he has had continuous enrollment as defined in the college or university catalog.

8. An advisory articulation committee composed of representatives of the various types of institutions within The Oklahoma State System of Higher Education shall be established to work with the State Regents' staff to review and evaluate articulation policies and practices and to make recommendations for improvement as needed.

Effective Date of Policy - This policy shall be effective for institutions granting the associate degree beginning with the 1976 fall semester. Those institutions offering baccalaureate programs shall be expected to implement the policy effective with the fall semester of 1978.

Adopted by the Oklahoma State Regents for Higher Education in meeting on December 15, 1975.

On February 2, 1976, Dr. Paul Brinker, Chairperson, Academic Program Council, submitted the following report to the Senate:

In response to the Faculty Senate's request dated January 14, 1976, the Academic Program Council hereby submits its views concerning the State Regents' "Policy Statement on the Articulation of Students Among Institutions in the Oklahoma State System of Higher Education," adopted on December 15, 1975.

1. Through the Office of the Provost, we requested University Counsel to provide advice regarding the extent of the State Regents' authority to prescribe standards of higher education in all Oklahoma institutions. We made this inquiry because the State Regents' Policy Statement appears to offer the prospect of unprecedented intrusion on their part into the academic affairs of the University. Are the State Regents entitled to set maximum as well as minimum standards for each institution? Are there any limitations on their legal power to set standards

for an institution's constituent parts, such as the University's colleges and even individual programs? We have been informed that University Counsel thinks there is no reason to believe that the State Regents' Policy Statement exceeds their legal authority.

2. Many questions have been raised concerning the specific ways in which implementation of this policy might affect academic programs and procedures at the University of Oklahoma. We understand that the office of the State Regents has agreed to provide further information in answer to some of these questions. In the absence of any present clarification, it is not yet possible to determine fully the consequences of the Regents' policy for our campus. Therefore, we direct our remarks primarily to matters of general principle.

3. The University of Oklahoma should support all reasonable measures to facilitate the orderly transfer of students among the State system's institutions. It is evident that the University has cooperated in a broad range of such measures. The Office of College Relations was created in part to help solve transfer and articulation problems. As part of a statewide articulation policy, the establishment of minimum general education requirements for associate and baccalaureate degrees is a positive step.

4. It is plain that the State Regents' Policy Statement is only the latest in a series of actions by which academic authority is being shifted from the individual institutions to the Office of the State Regents. We do not doubt that a certain amount of integration and centralization of authority in the higher education system is good. We do believe that the State of Oklahoma would not be well served by a complete centralization and integration of the system. The various institutions differ not only in function, in accord with the determinations of the State Regents, but also in the average achievement levels of their students and in the professional qualifications and achievements of their faculties. To deny the various institutions the right to set their own standards higher than the minimum standards of the state system will inevitably mean that the lowest commonly acceptable standards will prevail.

5. A critical passage in the State Regents' Policy Statement evidently seeks to impose maximum limits on the nature and number of general education courses which a college faculty may require for graduation:

"II. 1. After a public institution of higher learning in Oklahoma has developed and published its program of general education, the integrity of the program will be recognized by the other public institutions in Oklahoma. Once a student has been certified by such an institution as having completed satisfactorily its prescribed general education program culminated by an Associate of Arts or Science degree, no other public institution of higher learning in Oklahoma to which he may be qualified to transfer shall require any further lower division general education courses in his program."

Implementation of this policy would be a usurpation of the University of Oklahoma faculty's traditional prerogative, within certain guidelines, to set graduation requirements in accord with its best academic judgment. While we favor the State Regents' setting of minimum standards, we take strong exception to their apparent intent to prevent the faculties of our colleges from setting standards above the minimum if they see fit to do so. We also register our disagreement with the State Regents' apparent conviction that mutual recognition of program integrity among institutions can be a one-way street. It is difficult to see how our University's program integrity is respected if our requirements can be ignored by students transferring from other institutions.

6. One obvious consequence of implementation of the State Regents' policy would be to create a double standard among our upper-division students. In many

cases, students doing lower-division work at the University of Oklahoma would be obliged to meet higher requirements than those fulfilled by students transferring from other institutions with an Associate degree. Continued maintenance of such a double standard would probably be intolerable. The practical effect would almost certainly be that the general education requirements for all University of Oklahoma students -- those who do all their undergraduate study here, as well as transfer students -- would be determined by the state institutions choosing to maintain the lowest standards acceptable to the State Regents.

7. It should be clear from these remarks that the Council's views on the State Regents' Policy Statement are in many respects similar to those presented by Dr. James Fife in the resolution he offered at the January 12, 1976, meeting of the Faculty Senate. In particular, the Council regards adoption of this policy as a challenge to the traditional authority of the University of Oklahoma faculties to exercise their professional judgment in setting graduation standards. We urge the Senate to register strong opposition to those aspects of the State Regents' policy which are inconsistent with this traditional principle. We also encourage the Senate to enlist the cooperation of the University's administration and the University Regents in attempting to modify the policy. We do think that the Senate's present resolution could profit from slight moderation of its language in a few parts.

Senate Action: Dr. Gail de Stwolinski, Senate Chairperson, reported that the Faculty Council at Oklahoma State University on February 10, 1976, voted to request President Kamm (a) to appoint a task force to work with faculty and administration at the University of Oklahoma to bring a joint response to the State Regents' actions and (b) request the State Regents not to act until the two Universities have completed their consideration of this matter.

Dr. Fife reiterated his previous objections to the articulation policy and, in addition, mentioned for the first time the adverse effects of such a policy on his department, as well as other departments of the University. He cited recent opposition to the policy from the Arts and Sciences Executive Committee and Dean, as well as the President of the University, in their attempts to have the policy either revised or rescinded. He expressed satisfaction with the desire of Oklahoma State University to join Oklahoma University in some sort of action because "the more force that can be brought to bear, the better." He then offered the following substitute motion to replace his original motion of January 12:

"That the Faculty Senate join with the Faculty Council at Oklahoma State University in planning a concerted action that would include, in substance, the content of the protest of the original proposal, with the purpose of eliminating those portions of the State Regents' articulation policy that, in the judgment of both faculties, are detrimental to quality education."

The Senate approved the substitute motion without dissent.

SEARCH COMMITTEES FOR DEANS ✓

Background Information: At the January 12, 1976, meeting of the Senate, apparent inconsistencies were mentioned in the composition of various dean search committees on this campus during the past year or two. At that time, the Senate voted to refer this matter to its Committee on Committees for appropriate study and recommendation. (See pages 4 and 5 of the Senate Journal for January 12, 1976.)

Senate Action: Dr. Alex Kondonassis, Committee Chairperson, moved approval of the following two resolutions concerning dean search committees, as well as the appointment of interim deans:

-
- (1) WHEREAS there appears to have been some variation in the percentage representation of different constituencies on dean search committees, the Faculty Senate recommends that in the future the guidelines for constituting dean search committees be uniformly applied in all cases. The Senate recommends that all dean search committees have representation from the following:
- (a) the faculty of the college in question;
 - (b) the student body (undergraduate and/or graduate, whichever is appropriate);
 - (c) the faculty at large;
 - (d) the central administration; and
 - (e) the outside constituency whenever appropriate.

The Senate further recommends that the faculty of the college in question be given majority representation on the committee.

- (2) WHEREAS persons appointed to deanships on a temporary basis affect college policy and faculty affairs just as do permanent deans, the Faculty Senate recommends that the central administration consult with the faculty of a college, or a representative group thereof, in making acting dean appointments.
-

The Senate approved without dissent both resolutions for submission to the President.

PROPOSED UNIVERSITY POLICY IN EVENT OF RETRENCHMENT

Background Information: At its April 14, 1975, meeting, the Senate agreed to the appointment of an ad hoc Committee to study proposals for a University policy in the event of retrenchment. (See page 3 of the Senate Journal for May 5, 1975, and pages 3-4 of the Senate Journal for April 14, 1975.)

Senate Action: Dr. Lee, Committee Chairperson, presented the following two-part report:

Proposed Section 3.8.1, "Termination of Regular Appointments on Grounds of Financial Exigency," of the Faculty Personnel Policy:

It is the role of each department in as far as possible to be self-determining as to the application of their resources in fulfilling their needs, within the framework of the following guidelines:

- (a) It is the obligation of the departmental chairman and Committee 'A' to address the allocation of the distribution of funds between the A, B, and C budgets as it relates to non-continuous teaching appointments.
- (b) The department may make recommendations in light of the available funds as to how they might wish to handle the emergency situations with the possibility of seeking other activities for their faculty, distributed salary reduction, as well as the dismissal of individuals. It is the responsibility of the departmental faculty to recommend the closing out of positions held either by tenured faculty or by those approaching tenure.
- (c) Should it be necessary to terminate continuous employment on the grounds of financial exigency, the following consideration will be made:
 - a. Alternate employment in the University will be offered when possible.
 - b. Those faculty declining alternate employment will not lose their priority to return to original positions.
 - c. Positions, or related positions, which are subsequently added must first be offered to transferred or terminated faculty.
- (d) All cases of termination of a continuous appointment position will be reviewed by the Faculty Appeals Board.

To forestall as much as possible the termination of continuous appointments at the time of financial exigency, the following guidelines should be used:

- a. Regular appointments should not be based on short-term monies.
- b. Administrative needs of the department and support services and utilities must be demonstrated to be minimal prior to reduction of regular appointments.
- c. Early retirement should be encouraged.

Recommendations:

1. The percentage of the budget of administrative services should not be permitted to increase.
2. Capital funding authorizations should be sufficient to cover both construction costs and an additional endowment capable of generating income in support of the operating budget for completed facilities.
3. A standing faculty council should review the efficiency of the administrative budget and in financial exigency recommend curtailment of specific administrative services.
4. Departments with approval of the appropriate deans and Provost should be permitted to establish mechanisms which would limit their enrollment to a size appropriate to their funding.
5. A moratorium should be placed on super-structure departments: Those for example, which could be either housed in a single department or done as interdisciplinary programs.
6. Course offerings in departments be examined for duplication to the end of possible cross listing and jointly-instructed courses.
7. Remedial high school level courses and courses inappropriate to university level should be discontinued or relegated to agencies outside the University.
8. Departments should define their roles and the criteria by which their effectiveness can be achieved.
9. Departments should state precise priorities of their discipline so as to clearly indicate programs which might be removed in retrenchment.
10. Weak departments should be identified and duly notified so that outside evaluation can be made as to the feasibility of their continuance. This should be done with as little publicity as possible so as not to endanger the viability of a thriving program.
11. The administration should not mandate cost-of-living salary increases. This would permit each departmental Committee 'A' to have maximum effectiveness in encouraging high faculty productivity.
12. Paraprofession positions should be made available so that services not requiring faculty involvement can be available at the lowest possible cost.
13. Ancillary services not directly related to the University's teaching-research function should be curtailed or discontinued prior to reducing primary functions.
14. When financial exigency is anticipated, all funds gained from faculty vacancies should be assigned to the Provost's office where with advice of the appropriate committee they might be reassigned where need best justifies.

In responding to a question, Dr. Lee stated that the two parts of the Committee report are to be treated as separate items.

Dr. Fowler moved that this question be tabled until the April 12 meeting of the Senate. The Senate approved the tabling motion without dissent.

PROPOSED UNIVERSITY CONSTITUTION ✓

Background Information: Dr. de Stwolinski, Senate Chairperson, briefly reviewed the following history of the proposed University Constitution.

- November, 14, 1968 Oklahoma University Regents authorized the appointment of a University Constitution Drafting Committee.
- April, 1969: Document recommended by that Committee was published and distributed to all faculty members.
- April 6, 1970 Drafting Committee produced a revision with an extensive commentary.
- May 25, 1970 Revision approved by the three constituent bodies of the University and forwarded to University Regents.
- November, 1971: Committee resubmitted another revision in response to questions raised by the Regents.
- July, 1973: President Sharp raised the question of reactivating the Drafting Committee.
- April, 1975: Oklahoma Daily revived the issue of the proposed University Constitution.

Senate Action:

Dr. de Stwolinski then presented the following recommendation of the Executive Committee:

"The Senate requests that the University Regents either (a) act upon the proposed University Constitution as revised in 1971 or (b) return that document to the Drafting Committee for any further revisions before taking final action."

The ensuing discussion was focused on (a) the advisability of raising the issue at this time, (b) the suggestion that the Regents be also requested to include their criticisms if they chose to return the document for further revisions, and (c) the advisability of having the faculty study the revised document.

Professor Swank then made a substitution motion that the Faculty Senate request the University Regents to return the proposed University Constitution to the Faculty Senate and other constituent bodies for further revision and investigation. The Senate approved with some dissent the substitute motion.

ADJOURNMENT

Lacking a quorum, the Faculty Senate adjourned at 5:10 p.m. The next regular meeting will be held at 3:30 p.m., on Monday, April 12, 1976, in Room 218, Dale Hall.

Respectfully submitted,

Anthony S. Lis
Anthony S. Lis, Secretary