

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

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

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

Present:

Barefield	(0)	Duchon	(0)	Joyce	(0)	Reynolds	(1)
Blair	(0)	Fife	(2)	Kondonassis	(0)	Rice	(2)
Braver	(0)	Ford	(2)	Kraynak	(0)	Scheffer	(2)
Buhite	(1)	Fowler	(3)	Lee	(0)	Schmitz	(0)
Cox	(3)	Graves	(0)	Levinson	(0)	Shellabarger	(0)
Crim	(0)	Gross	(0)	Marchand	(0)	Snider	(0)
Cronenwett	(0)	Henkle	(0)	Mouser	(1)	Streebin	(2)
de Stwolinski	(0)	Hibdon	(0)	Rasmussen	(1)	Tolliver	(1)
Donnell	(0)						

AUOPE representatives:

Cowen

Guyer

UOSA representative:

Scott

Absent:

Bell	(1)	Kitts	(2)	Shahan	(2)	Verrastro	(1)
Bohland	(3)	Larson	(1)	Starling	(4)	Whitecotton	(1)
Goff	(2)	McDonald	(2)	Swank	(2)	York	(2)
Kendall	(1)	Pento	(1)	Tomberlin	(0)		
Kidd	(4)	Reid	(0)	Unruh	(2)		

Provost representative:

Atkinson

AUOPE representatives:

Anderson
Spaulding

Thompson

UOSA representatives:

Bode

Carnes

(NOTE: The numbers in parentheses indicate the total number of absences during the 1975-76 academic year when 9 regular and 3 special sessions were held. Attendance at special sessions has been used to offset other absences as reported on page 3 of the Senate Journal for December 8, 1975.)

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
Actions by President Sharp:	
Search Committees	2
Budget Decision Procedures	2
Regents' Commitment of Funds	3
Elimination of Academic Units	3
Election/Nomination of Faculty Replacements	3
Retrenchment Policy	6
State Regents' Policy on Articulation	7
Final Report: Collective Bargaining	8
Elimination of Catalog Listing of Courses	11
Correcting Grade Inequities	12
Exterior Evaluation of Student Proficiency	13
Joint Session: Faculty Senate & UOSA Congress	13
CR/NCR Grading System (Arts & Sciences College)	14
Election, Senate Chairperson-Elect	15
Election, Senate Secretary	15
Resolution: Dr. Gail de Stwolinski	16

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

The Journal of the Faculty Senate for the regular session on April 12, 1976, was approved.

ACTIONS TAKEN BY PRESIDENT PAUL F. SHARP

(1) Composition of Search Committees: On April 12, 1976, Dr. Paul F. Sharp, President of the University, wrote as follows to Dr. Gail de Stwolinski, Senate Chairperson:

"I have approved with reservations the two Senate resolutions concerning search committees for deans and the appointment of interim and acting deans.

"I have no reservations about the second of the two resolutions which deals with the consultation with the faculty of a college before someone is appointed to a deanship on a temporary basis. This is a practice which we have followed routinely in most cases.

"With regard to the first resolution that deals with the composition of search committees, my reservations go to the sentence in which the Senate recommends that the faculty of the college in question be given majority representation on the committee. I have long concurred and have always followed the principle of having the majority of a search committee be faculty, and for the most part this majority has been faculty of the college in question. There are, however, situations in which exceptions need to be made to that practice. For instance, when a faculty of a college is extremely small it may be impossible to meet all of the search committee composition requirements in this resolution and in legislation from the UOSA that I have approved and still insure that the faculty of the college represents a majority on the committee. I see no problem, however, in insuring that faculty represents a majority on the committee. Another exception may result from our practice of trying to secure when possible representation on search committees of faculty members from minority groups and faculty who are women. Finally, there may be special circumstances, such as the move of the College of Pharmacy from the Norman campus to the Health Sciences Center, which require a representation that takes into account other factors.

"A copy of Professor Lis' March 16 memorandum showing my approval with reservations is attached for your records. Subject to these reservations, I shall do all that I can to implement the recommendations made by the Senate."

(See pages 12 and 13 of the Senate Journal for March 15, 1976.)

(2) University Budget Decision Procedures: Dr. Paul F. Sharp, President of the University, addressed the following letter to the Senate Chairperson on April 20, 1976:

"This is in response to Professor Lis' April 15 memorandum in which he describes the approval by the Faculty Senate of the Executive Committee's recommendation that a faculty Senate ad hoc committee be appointed to study budget decision procedures at the University of Oklahoma and that the President of the University be requested to authorize the participation and cooperation of the University's Internal Auditing Office in this regard.

"I certainly have no objection to the Faculty Senate undertaking a study of the budget decision procedures, and I am willing to ask the Provost and the Vice Presidents to cooperate in this study to the extent our resources permit.

"On the other hand, I am not able to approve the request that the University's Internal Auditing Office be involved in this matter.

Such a study is not within the scope of that office's charge, and it would be inappropriate to ask the office to become involved in such a study.

"My decision regarding the Internal Auditing Office in no way diminishes my willingness to assist in this study and to ask the Provost and Vice Presidents to do that, too."

(See page 9 of the Senate Journal for April 12, 1976.)

(3) Regents' Advance Commitment of Funds: On April 19, 1976, President Paul F. Sharp accepted and forwarded to the Board of Regents, University of Oklahoma, the pertinent Senate action of April 12, 1976. (See pages 7 and 8 of the Senate Journal for April 12, 1976.)

SENATE RESOLUTION: Consultation prior to Elimination of Academic Units

Background Information: On April 20, 1976, the Senate Executive Committee approved the following resolution for consideration by the Faculty Senate on May 3:

"Any decisions to eliminate academic units should be made only after extensive consultation with the appropriate University Council or Councils."

Senate Action: Dr. Gail de Stwolinski, Senate Executive Committee Chairperson, formally presented the above resolution for Faculty Senate consideration. The Committee felt that some type of "holding action" was appropriate in view of the current Senate deliberations and possible Senate action concerning a proposed University policy on retrenchment. The Senate immediately approved the resolution without dissent.

FACULTY REPLACEMENTS: University Boards, Committees, Councils, and the Judicial Tribunal.

Dr. Alex J. Kondonassis, Chairperson of the Senate Committee on Committees, formally presented that Committee's slate of nominees to fill faculty vacancies on University Boards, Committees, Councils, and the Judicial Tribunal. This list was distributed to Senate members several days in advance of the May 3 meeting. Dr. Kondonassis expressed his public appreciation to the members of that Committee, (Professors Blair, Braver, Ford, Reynolds, and Schmitz) for their hard work, dedication, and cooperation during the past year. He next called for additional nominations from the floor.

Dr. Rice then moved that the Committee slate reproduced below be accepted as presented. The Senate approved the motion without dissent.

ELECTIONS (subject to approval by President Sharp):

<u>Academic Personnel Council</u> :	Mary F. Saxon (Univ. Libs.) 1976-79 Leale Streebin (CEES) 1976-79 Miguel Terekhov (Drama) 1976-79
<u>Academic Program Council</u> (Norman):	Malcolm Morris (Mktg.) 1976-79 V. Stanley Ward Vardys (Pol. Sci.) 1976-79 Ralph Olson (Geog.) 1976-79
<u>Administrative & Physical Resources</u> <u>Council (Norman)</u> :	Frank Appl (AMNE) 1976-79 Jack Parker (Ed.) 1976-79 Dortha Henderson (Home Ec.) 1976-79
<u>Budget Council (Norman)</u> :	Raymond White (Ed.) 1976-79 Marilyn Affleck (Soc.) 1976-79 - Richard Fowler (Physics) 1976-79
<u>Research Council (Norman)</u> :	Joakim Laguros (CEES) 1976-79 John Pulliam (Ed.) 1976-79 Eddie Smith (Chemistry) 1976-79

Faculty Appeals Board:

Richard Kuhlman (Arch.) 1973-77
 William McNichols (Law) 1974-78
 Roy Male (Eng.) 1976-79
 Leon Zelby (Elec. Engr.) 1975-79
 Irma Tomberlin (Lib. Sci.) 1975-79
 Fred Shellabarger (Arch.) 1976-80
 Donald Woolf (Management) 1976-80
 Stanley Eliason (Math.) 1976-80
 Carl Locke (Chem. Engr.) 1976-80

New:

Hillel Kumin (Ind. Engr.) 1976-77
 Alan Nicewander (Psych.) 1976-77
 Ralph Olson (Geog.) 1976-77
 Gary Schnell (Zoology) 1976-77
 James Wainner (Music) 1976-77
 Loy Prickett (Ed.) 1976-78
 Dennis Crites (Mktg.) 1976-78
 Ruth Hankowsky (Sp. Com.) 1976-78
 Nadine Roach (Soc. Work) 1976-78
 Matthew Kraynak (Home Ec.) 1976-78

Frank Elkouri (Law) 1976-79
 Ed Crim (Econ.) 1976-79
 Herb Hengst (Ed.) 1976-79
 Charles Goins (Reg. & City Planning) 1976-79
 Cecil Lee (Art) 1976-80
 Eddie Smith (Chemistry) 1976-80
 Karlen Mooradian (Journalism) 1976-80
 Sam Olkinetzky (Art) 1976-80
 Kenneth Merrill (Phil.) 1976-80
 Charlyce King (Ed.) 1976-80

NOMINATIONS (subject to final selection by President Sharp of one individual from two nominees for each vacancy):

Athletics Council:

Clovis Haden (Elec. Engr.) 1976-79
 Carl Locke (Chem. Engr.) 1976-79
 Francis Peirce (Soc. Work) 1976-79
 Michael Cox (Law) 1976-79

Faculty Awards and Honors Council:

Yoshikazu Sasaki (Meteor.) (GLCR) 1976-79
 V. Slipevich (Chem. Engr.) (GLCR) 1976-79
 James Reese (Econ.) (DRB) 1976-79
 Gail de Stwolinski (Music) (DRB) 1976-79

Publications Board:

Ferdinand Johns (Arch.) 1976-79
 Drew Kershen (Law) 1976-79

Academic Regulations Committee
(Norman):

Marvin Baker (Geog.) 1976-79
 Brooks Hill (Sp. Com.) 1976-79
 Frank Seto (Zoology) 1976-79
 David Branch (Astronomy) 1976-79

Campus Tenure Committee
(Norman) (new):

Roger Atherton (Mgmt.) 1976-79
 Travis Goggans (Acct.) 1976-79
 Thomas Smith (Hist. of Sci.) 1976-77
 Jonathan Spurgeon (History) 1976-77
 Bart Turkington (AMNE) 1976-78
 M. L. Rasmussen (AMNE) 1976-78
 Walter Scheffer (Pol. Sci.) 1976-79
 Richard Wells (Pol. Sci.) 1976-79
 James Henkle (Art) 1976-79
 Joe Hobbs (Art) 1976-79

Peter Brueckner (Mod. Langs.) 1976-78
 Gene Levy (Math.) 1976-78
 Richard Goff (Zoology) 1976-78
 Roger Frech (Chem.) 1976-78
 Fred Miller (Law) 1976-77
 Mack Palmer (Journalism) 1976-77
 Billie Holcomb (Ed.) 1976-77
 Bess Hood (Univ. Libs.) 1976-77

<u>Class Schedule Committee (Norman):</u>	Charles Butler (Ed.) 1976-79 Hugh Jeffers (Ed.) 1976-79 Lloyd Iverson (Math.) 1976-79 Gary Thompson (Geog.) 1976-79
<u>Commencement Committee:</u>	Bill Sorenson (Bot./Micro.) 1976-79 Arthur Altag (Chem. Engr.) 1976-79 Marilyn Breen (Math.) 1976-79 Eugenia Zallen (Home Ec.) 1976-79
<u>Computer Advisory Committee:</u>	John Fagan (Elec. Engr.) 1976-79 Sam Lee (Elec. Engr.) 1976-79 Jim Horrell (EAP) 1976-79 Alexander Holmes (Econ.) 1976-79 Joseph Bastian (Zoology) 1976-79 Don Hurst (Univ. Libs.) 1976-79
<u>Equal Employment Opportunity Committee (Norman):</u>	Laura Gasaway (Law) 1976-77 John McAdams (Law) 1976-77
<u>Faculty Advisory Committee to the President:</u>	Sam Sofer (Chem. Engr.) 1976-78 Larry Canter (CEES) 1976-78 Charlyce King (Ed.) 1976-78 Glenn Snider (Ed.) 1976-78 Jerry Smith (Music) 1976-78 Digby Bell (Music) 1976-78 Jim Abbott (Mod. Langs.) 1976-78 Lennie-Marie Tolliver (Soc. Work) 1976-78 Vic Hutchison (Zoology) 1976-78 Bernard McDonald (Math.) 1976-78
<u>Film Review Committee:</u>	Ned Hockman (Journalism) 1976-77 John Catlin (Classics) 1976-77
<u>Fringe Benefits Committee:</u>	Bobbie Foote (Ind. Engr.) 1976-78 Benjamin Taylor (Econ.) 1976-78
<u>Intramural Committee (new):</u>	Alan Velie (Eng.) 1976-77 Bill Eick (HPER) 1976-77 James Hoover (Law Library) 1976-77 James Hibdon (Econ.) 1976-77 Marion Phillips (EAP) 1976-77 Richard Hilbert (Soc.) 1976-77
<u>Judicial Tribunal:</u>	James Mouser (Bus. Law) 1976-79 Robert Richardson (Law) 1976-79
<u>Parking Violation Appeals Committee (Norman):</u>	Peter Kutner (Law) 1976-78 Elmer Million (Law) 1976-78 Arnulf Hagen (Chem.) 1976-78 John Klingstedt (Acct.) 1976-78 Albert Hackler (Music) 1976-78 James Kenderdine (Mktg.) 1976-78

ROTC Advisory Committee:

John TeSelle (Law) 1976-79
 Joe Long (Law) 1976-79
 Donald Childress (Fin.) 1976-79
 William McGrew (Acct.) 1976-79
 Sue Harrington (Univ. Libs.) 1976-79
 Judy Nordin (Soc. Work) 1976-79

Scholarships and Financial Aids
 Committee:

Robert Ragland (Ed.) 1976-78
 William Graves (Ed.) 1976-78
 James Robertson (CEES) 1976-78
 Seun Kahng (Elec. Engr.) 1976-78
 Kathleen Harris (Music) 1976-78
 Carol Carey (Music) 1976-78

Speakers Bureau (Norman):

Herbert Hengst (Ed.) 1976-79
 J. Kirker Stephens (Econ.) 1976-79

University Book Exchange
 Oversight Committee (Norman):

Loy Prickett (Ed.) 1976-79
 Hugh Jeffers (Ed.) 1976-79

University Libraries Committee
 (Norman):

William Cronenwett (Elec. Engr.) 1976-79
 Robert Nelson (CEES) 1976-79
 Charles Carpenter (Zoology) 1976-79
 Stanley Babb (Physics) 1976-79
 James Goldsmith (History) 1976-79
 Douglas Calhoun (History) 1976-79

PROPOSED UNIVERSITY POLICY ON RETRENCHMENT

Background Information: On April 12, the Senate tabled until May 3 further discussion of its ad hoc Committee's proposal for a University policy in the event of retrenchment. (See pages 8 and 9 of the Senate Journal for April 12, 1976.)

Senate Action: Professor Crim moved approval of the first part of that Committee's report to be added to the Faculty Personnel Policy as Section 3.8.1, "Termination of Regular Appointments on Grounds of Financial Exigency." The Senate approved without dissent the proposal that, in final form, reads as follows:

1. 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 chairperson 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, distributing salary reductions, and dismissing individuals. It is the responsibility of the departmental faculty to recommend the closing out of positions held by either tenured faculty or those approaching tenure.
- c. Should it be necessary to terminate continuous employment on the grounds of financial exigency, the following considerations will be made:

- (1) Alternate employment in the University will be offered whenever possible
 - (2) Those faculty declining alternate employment will not lose their priority to return to original positions.
 - (3) 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 position will be reviewed by the Faculty Appeals Board.
2. 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.

In commenting on the second part of the Committee's report, Dr. Lee, Chairperson, reiterated his feeling that there was "no way of collectively dealing with the two parts of the report." He added that many of the recommendations were intended to avoid "an exigency situation." Dr. Fowler then moved that the Senate acknowledge receipt of and forward to President Sharp without further formal action the accompanying list of the ad hoc Committee's 14 recommendations as published on page 14 of the Senate Journal for March 15, 1976. The Senate approved the motion without dissent.

STATE REGENTS' POLICY ON ARTICULATION OF STUDENTS AMONG STATE INSTITUTIONS

Background Information: At its January, February, March, and April sessions, the Faculty Senate discussed the implications of the December, 1975, policy statement of the State Regents concerning articulation of students among state institutions. On April 5, 1976, the Senate Executive Committee requested the Academic Program Council to prepare a proposal for appropriate, unilateral University of Oklahoma action in this matter (see pages 2 and 7 of the Senate Journal for April 12, 1976). On April 27, 1976, the Senate Executive Committee approved the Council's proposed letter to be forwarded to President Sharp for transmittal to Chancellor Dunlap.

Senate Action: Dr. Snider moved approval of the proposed letter reproduced below. The Senate approved the motion without dissent.

Draft of proposed letter to Chancellor E. T. Dunlap approved by the Faculty Senate (Norman campus) on May 3, 1976:

The Faculty Senate (Norman campus) of the University of Oklahoma agrees with the effort that the State Regents for Higher Education have made to improve coordination among the programs of the various junior colleges, four-year colleges, and the two Universities in the Oklahoma system of higher education. We applaud the setting of minimum standards throughout all colleges by the State Regents as enunciated in the policy adopted by the State Regents on December 15, 1975.

The University of Oklahoma has supported 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.

We are in disagreement with only one statement with far-reaching implications in the Articulation Policy. The critical passage, which we strongly oppose, reads as follows:

"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 the apparent attempt on their part 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 apparent conviction that mutual recognition of program integrity among institutions can be a one-way street. It is difficult to see how our University program integrity is respected if our requirements can be ignored by students who transfer from other institutions.

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 requirements higher than those fulfilled by students transferring from other institutions with an Associate's 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 lower standards acceptable to the State Regents.

In view of our strong objections to Part II (1) of the Articulation Policy, we request that a representative of the University of Oklahoma administration meet with the Chancellor at his earliest convenience in an attempt to resolve the issue that we have raised.

 FINAL REPORT: Ad hoc Committee on Collective Bargaining

Background Information: At their fall meeting on October 22, 1975, the General Faculty of the University (Norman campus) approved the appointment of an ad hoc Committee to study collective bargaining possibilities for the Norman campus and to report to the General Faculty no later than the spring, 1976, meeting of the General Faculty.

The members of the ad hoc Committee included the following:

Roger Frech (Chemistry)
 Bernard McDonald (Mathematics)
 Simeon McIntosh (Law)
 David Morgan (Political Science)
 Fred Shellabarger (Architecture)
 David Swank (Law)
 Benjamin J. Taylor (Economics) - Chairperson

On March 22, 1976, the Committee presented its 12-page report (including a one-page faculty questionnaire) for publication and distribution to the General Faculty in

advance of the April 15, 1976, meeting of the General Faculty. (A copy of the 12-page report is attached to the record copy of this Journal.)

At that meeting of the General Faculty, Dr. David Morgan, Committee member, in the absence of the Chairperson, highlighted the report and requested members of the faculty to return the completed questionnaires to Dr. Taylor by April 20, in connection with an AAUP meeting that evening and a final report to the Faculty Senate.

Senate Action: Dr. Taylor, ad hoc Committee Chairperson, appeared before the Senate to present formally the final report of that Committee distributed at this meeting. He reported that only 120 questionnaires had been returned and that approximately 650 faculty members apparently did not bother to respond. Most, in his opinion, did not even read the entire report distributed with the Agenda for the April 15 General Faculty meeting. In some cases, faculty members undoubtedly did not receive copies of the report. No formal action was taken by the Senate.

Dr. Taylor added that the Committee had completed its task and had no plans for any follow-up efforts. He suggested that the study be replicated next fall with the same or a comparable questionnaire. Dr. Snider suggested that a more intensive survey be conducted next year that would involve Senate members directly in the distribution and the collection of the completed questionnaires.

Dr. de Stwolinski, Senate Chairperson, expressed the Senate's appreciation to Dr. Taylor and the Committee for their efforts and comprehensive reports.

The full text of the ad hoc Committee's report follows:

Final Report of ad hoc Senate Committee to Study the Possibilities
of Collective Bargaining

One hundred twenty-one of 780 faculty members filled out the questionnaire mailed to them as a part of the first report made by the Committee. The results of those returns have been tabulated for your information. It is cautioned from the beginning that the returns were insufficient in number to draw statistically significant conclusions. They are, however, interesting and are reported for that reason.

Question #1: How well informed do you feel that you are on the subject of collective bargaining in higher education?

	<u>Number</u>	<u>Percent</u>
a) Very well informed	9	7.7
b) Rather well informed	32	27.4
c) Have some knowledge of it	44	37.6
d) Have only a little knowledge	28	23.9
e) Know almost nothing about it	4	3.4
Missing observations	4	

Question #2: Check the statement that comes closest to your feelings about collective bargaining as a general practice in colleges and universities.

a) Wholly inappropriate: absolutely against it.	24	20.5
b) Generally undesirable; might be justified in a few cases.	28	23.9
c) Depends on the institution; desirable for some, not for others.	27	23.1
d) Will accept it as an inevitable trend.	14	12.0

	<u>Number</u>	<u>Percent</u>
e) It is desirable and should be widely adopted.	24	20.5
Missing observations	4	.

Question #3: Indicate your status:

a) Tenured faculty member	94	80.3
b) Untenured faculty member	23	19.7
Missing observations	4	

Eighty percent of all returns were from tenured faculty; and 30.8 percent considered collective bargaining either desirable or an inevitable trend, compared to 39.1 percent of the untenured faculty. The same percentage of untenured faculty were of the opinion that collective bargaining was either wholly inappropriate or generally undesirable. About 46 percent of the tenured faculty were generally negative.

	<u>Number</u>	<u>Percent</u>
<u>Question #4: Returns by College</u>		
Arts and Sciences	75	65.8
Business Administration	8	7.0
Education	2	1.8
Engineering	18	15.8
Fine Arts	4	3.5
Law	7	6.1
Missing observations	7	

Question #5: Do you think the faculty should adopt collective bargaining now?

a) Yes	37	31.6
b) No	70	59.8
c) No opinion	10	8.5
Missing observations	4	

Question #5 reported by College

	<u>Yes</u>	<u>Percent</u>	<u>No</u>	<u>Percent</u>	<u>No opinion</u>	<u>Percent</u>
Arts and Sciences	25	34.2	42	57.5	6	8.2
Business Administration	1	14.3	6	85.7	0	0
Education	2	100.0	0		0	
Engineering	3	16.7	14	77.8	1	5.6
Fine Arts	2	50.0	1	25.0	1	25.0
Law	0	0	6	85.7	1	14.3

Question #6: Which statement comes closest to your opinion?

	<u>Number</u>	<u>Percent</u>
a) Against collective bargaining in any college, including own college.	26	23.2
b) Some places need collective bargaining, but unsuited for O.U.	11	9.8
c) Should resort to collective bargaining only after exhaustion of all other means to improve faculty situation.	37	33.0
d) Collective bargaining will come eventually, but we should await,	3	2.7
e) Collective bargaining should be adopted as soon as possible	35	31.3
Number of missing observations	9	

Question #7: Do you think your own economic situation would be improved by collective bargaining?

	<u>Number</u>	<u>Percent</u>
a) It would improve my situation	33	28.2
b) It would weaken my situation	13	11.1
c) It would not make any difference	29	24.8
d) Do not know	42	35.9
Missing observations	4	

Question #8: Do you think that your own professional situation would be improved by collective bargaining?

a) It would improve my situation	19	16.0
b) It would weaken my situation	39	32.8
c) It would not make any difference	33	27.7
d) Do not know	28	23.5
Missing observations	2	

There are many other interesting features of the data assembled from the questionnaire. Each question was crosstabbed with respect to all other questions.

A copy of the print-out is attached to the official copy of the report for any future reference that might be desired by the Senate.

ELIMINATION OF CATALOG LISTING OF COURSES NOT OFFERED DURING PRECEDING FIVE YEARS

Background Information: During the past several months, a subcommittee of the Academic Program Council, at its own initiative, studied listings of courses that have not been offered during the past five years. The subcommittee found that about 11 percent of all courses have not been offered during that time period. A few departments had a much higher percentage. Because it may be misleading to students to have courses listed in the catalog but not taught, the Academic Program Council submitted the following recommendations subsequently approved by the Senate Executive Committee on April 20, 1976, for Senate consideration:

-
1. Barring unusual circumstances, if a course has not been scheduled during the past four years, it will be temporarily deleted from the catalog. The change shall become effective September 1, 1977. That is, if a course has not been offered during the 1973-74, 1974-75, 1975-76, and 1976-77 school years, it will be temporarily deleted from the next catalog. However, if the course will be offered during the fall 1977 semester, it will not be deleted.
 2. A course may remain temporarily deleted during the next two years. It may remain deleted during a seventh year only with the approval of the Provost. At the end of the seventh year, barring unusual circumstances, the course will be dropped.
 3. Before the 1977-78 school years, departments are encouraged to drop those courses that they have no intention of offering in the future.
 4. Before any course is deleted from the catalog, the matter will be discussed with each department involved.
 5. A course will be deleted only if it has not been scheduled. Accordingly, a course listed in the schedule, but not taught because of insufficient enrollment, will not be considered for deletion.
-

Senate Action: Dr. de Stwolinski, Senate Chairperson, presented the above proposal of the Academic Program Council for Senate consideration. Dr. Brinker, Council Chairperson, appearing before the Senate to answer any questions, emphasized that the 5 items of the proposal were intended to provide as much flexibility as possible.

Dr. Blair subsequently moved that the word "temporarily" in the first sentence of item (2) be deleted. The Senate approved the deletion without dissent. Dr. Lee then moved that the introductory phrase, "before the 1977-78 school years," in item (3) be deleted. The Senate approved this deletion also, without dissent. Following a short discussion of the question, the Senate approved without dissent the original motion as amended.

PROPOSAL FOR CORRECTING GRADE INEQUITIES

Background Information: During the discussions last spring concerning student evaluation of teachers, the Faculty Senate suggested that the Academic Program Council study various aspects of the teaching evaluation question. Accordingly, a subcommittee of that Council during the past academic year studied grading at the University of Oklahoma and elsewhere. In its report to the Senate Executive Committee, the subcommittee confirmed "what has been well known; namely, that there has been grade inflation in colleges throughout the country during the past few years."

As a first step in attempting to correct grade inequities on this campus, the Academic Program Council recommended the following actions: - - - - -

- (1) Each chairperson of a department will apprise each faculty member and teaching staff of his or her grades in each multiple-section class. The grades of all other staff will be shown also, but identified by the letters "A", "B," "C," etc., instead of by name.
- (2) The chairperson will apprise each faculty member of his or her grades in all courses taught by the faculty member. The grades of all courses taught at each level (1000, 2000, 3000) will be compared with those of all other departmental staff, again with the other staff designated by letter rather than by name.
- (3) Each department or division will release to every other department within the college information on the percentages of each grade given for each level of courses. For example, in the College of Business Administration, each division will release information to every other division of the number of A's, B's, C's, etc., given on all 1000-level courses combined, all 2000-level courses, all 3000-level courses, etc. This information will be forwarded to each staff member.
- (4) Each college will release to all other colleges in the University the percentages of A's, B's, etc., for all courses combined at each level (1000, 2000, etc.) This information will be forwarded to chairpersons who will, in turn, release it to the individual faculty members.

- - - - -
At its monthly meeting on April 20, the Senate Executive Committee rejected the above proposal of the Academic Program Council and voted to refer this matter to the Senate for disposition.

Senate Action: Eight members of the Senate raised objections to the Council's recommendations. Some denied the existence of grade inflation and saw the increased number of A and B grades resulting from the fact that many students in the D and F categories are withdrawing from courses late in the semester and thus affecting the distribution of final grades in those courses. Others reiterated the Senate Executive Committee's objections on the grounds of subtle, implied social and professional pressures on faculty members. Another saw the proposals as "dangerous" to faculty members on the tenure track. Others felt the the recommended actions would serve no useful purpose.

Another Senate member commented that grade-distribution data were being made available to departments but that apparently the data were not being shared with all faculty members.

Professor Crim moved that the Council's recommendations be rejected. In a voice vote with some dissent, the Senate approved the motion and thus rejected the proposal.

PROPOSAL FOR EXTERIOR EVALUATION OF STUDENT PROFICIENCY

Background Information: Last month, the Academic Program Council presented to the Senate Executive Committee the recommendation that departments be encouraged to consider establishing exterior evaluation of the proficiency of their students (by GRE, URE, and other examinations). On April 20, 1976, the Senate Executive Committee rejected the proposal but voted to refer this matter to the Senate for disposition.

Senate Action: Four Senate members voiced approval of the recommendation; one member expressed some reservations. Subsequently, Dr. Graves moved that the parenthetical statement be deleted. In his opinion, tests like the GRE and the URE are basically IQ tests and should not be used to evaluate cognitive development. With one dissenting vote, the Senate approved the deletion. Dr. Barefield then moved that the proposal be further amended by the addition of the phrase, ". . . but at no cost to the students." This amendment carried in a 14 and 13 tally. The Senate then in a 17 to 10 vote approved the amended motion that, in final form, reads as follows:

"Departments shall be encouraged to consider establishing exterior evaluation of the proficiency of their students but at no cost to the students."

PROPOSAL FOR JOINT SESSION OF FACULTY SENATE AND UOSA CONGRESS

Background Information: On April 20, 1976, Mr. Bill Worthington proposed the following UOSA Congress Resolution 1612:

A RESOLUTION CALLING FOR ESTABLISHMENT OF A FACULTY SENATE AND UOSA CONGRESS JOINT SESSION

WHEREAS: The OU Faculty Senate helps create, in part, policies concerning OU students, and

WHEREAS: The UOSA Congress helps create policies for OU students, and

WHEREAS: The important policies affecting OU students are administered to the students with very little student input, and

WHEREAS: The establishment of a regular joint session of the Faculty Senate and UOSA Congress would stimulate faculty and student relations,

BE IT THEREFORE RESOLVED BY THE STUDENT CONGRESS OF THE UNIVERSITY OF OKLAHOMA STUDENT ASSOCIATION THAT:

Section 1: The UOSA proposes a joint legislative session with the OU Faculty Senate.

Section 2: A combined University voice can offset State Regents' interference of academic policy making.

Section 3: The UOSA proposes that this type legislative session will help streamline and modernize the University of Oklahoma by re-establishing the policy-making role back to the University community.

Section 4: Copies of this resolution be sent to the following:

- a. Faculty Senate Chairperson, Dr. Gail de Stwolinski
- b. OU President, Dr. Paul F. Sharp
- c. Members of the OU Board of Regents
- d. Members of the State Regents for Higher Education

The Student Congress tabled the proposal pending study and recommendation by the UOSA Congress External and Inter-University Committee.

Senate Action: With permission of the Senate Executive Committee, Mr. Worthington, sponsor of the above resolution, appeared before the Senate.

In his remarks, he stated that a definite gap exists between the faculty and the students, with variations therein from college to college. Pleading for faculty-student cooperation, he saw "great potential on campus for the establishment of real harmony between the two groups of the University community." Citing campus and Oklahoma City press reports, he called attention to the increasing interference from the State Legislature and the State Regents. He expressed the hope that a summer committee could study the possibility of the proposed joint session of the Senate and the Congress. He requested the appointment of a Faculty Senate committee of two or three individuals to meet with the student counterparts, to study the feasibility and the implementation of his proposal.

Dr. Cox then moved that a Faculty Senate committee of two or three members be appointed to work with the Student Congress Committee during the summer and to submit their recommendations to both the Faculty Senate and the Student Congress. In a voice vote without dissent, the Senate approved the motion.

PROPOSAL FOR ESTABLISHING A CREDIT/NO CREDIT GRADING SYSTEM
FOR THE COLLEGE OF ARTS AND SCIENCES

Background Information: At the request of Dr. Paige E. Mulhollan, Dean of the College of Arts and Sciences, the Senate Secretary on April 29, 1976, distributed copies of the following memorandum (dated April 27, 1976) to Senate members from the Executive Committee, College of Arts and Sciences, as an additional Agenda item for the May 3 meeting:

SUBJECT: Request for the establishment of a Credit/No Credit (CR/NCR) grading system for the College of Arts and Sciences.

Pending a vote by the Arts and Sciences faculty, the Executive Committee will appreciate the Senate's concurrence in the establishment of a Credit/No Credit (CR/NCR) grade to be selected at the option of the student with CR defined as a C or higher grade. Neither the CR nor the NCR should be calculated as part of the student's grade-point average. The CR/NCR option would replace the P/F option for courses offered in the College of Arts and Sciences.

Although regulations governing the use of CR/NCR would, of course, be the province of the College faculty, for the information of the Senate, the Executive Committee will make the following recommendations with regard to CR/NCR in the College of Arts and Sciences:

1. Students may present for graduation a maximum of 16 credit hours of courses graded CR/NCR, P/F taken outside the College of Arts and Sciences, or P/F courses taken previously in the College of Arts and Sciences.
2. A student may select CR/NCR grading for courses that satisfy college requirements, as well as elective courses, but may select such grading for courses to satisfy major requirements only with the permission of the department concerned.
3. Students who take a course CR/NCR may retake the course for graded credit.
4. Students may change from CR/NCR to graded status any time during either the first 12 weeks of a semester or the first six weeks of a summer session, but may not change to CR/NCR from graded status after either the second week of classes in a semester or the first week of classes in a summer session.
5. The Pass/Fail (P/F) grade will no longer be given in courses taught in the College of Arts and Sciences.

Senate Action: At the invitation of the Senate Executive Committee, Dr. Milford Messer, University Registrar, appeared before the Senate to offer his views in this matter. He sees the proposal as doing two things-- raising the passing grade level from D to C and eliminating the negative factor of F from the Pass/Fail option. He objected to the introduction of a still another set of symbols. He suggested instead a Pass/No Pass system as a neutral grade and saw no administrative objections to raising the passing level to the grade of C. He urged that this question be referred to a study group before final action is taken.

Dr. Barefield moved that the question be tabled until the Academic Program Council studies the matter and submits its recommendations to the Senate. In a voice vote without dissent, the Senate approved the tabling motion.

ELECTION OF
SENATE CHAIRPERSON-ELECT, 1976-77

Voting by written ballot, the Senate elected Dr. Donald C. Cox (Microbiology-Botany) to the office of Senate Chairperson-elect for 1976-77.

RE-ELECTION OF
SENATE SECRETARY, 1976-77

In accepting a motion by Dr. Ford, the Senate re-elected Dr. Anthony S. Lis (Business Communication) to his eighth consecutive term as the Senate Secretary, 1976-77.

RESOLUTION OF APPRECIATION: Dr. Gail de Stwolinski

The Senate approved by acclamation the following resolution of appreciation presented by Dr. Barefield:

RESOLUTION

- WHEREAS Dr. Gail de Stwolinski, David Ross Boyd Professor of Music, served as the Chairperson-Elect (1974-75) and the Chairperson (1975-76) of the Faculty Senate (Norman campus) of the University of Oklahoma; and
- WHEREAS she spared neither effort nor time, nor energy in leading the faculty governance system on this campus; and
- WHEREAS under her capable leadership the Faculty Senate on the Norman campus increased its effectiveness among the faculty, administration, students, and staff; and
- WHEREAS she epitomized the role of the Faculty Senate as the duly elected, responsible, and responsive voice of the General Faculty on this campus; and
- WHEREAS her leadership of the Senate Executive Committee was reflected in the effective relationships with the Inter-Senate Liaison Committee, as well as with the Executive Committees of the Faculty Governance systems on the Health Sciences Center and Oklahoma State University campuses; and
- WHEREAS she contributed to the effectiveness of the Faculty Senate (Norman campus) as an important and vital channel of faculty expression, interests, and concern in the common goals of this University; and
- WHEREAS she provided the Faculty Senate with leadership exhibited by impartiality, professionalism, sincerity, and dedication:
- BE IT THEREFORE RESOLVED that the Faculty Senate (Norman campus) on this, the 3rd day of May, 1976, take this opportunity to express publicly its sincere appreciation to Dr. Gail de Stwolinski for her outstanding service to the Faculty Senate, the University of Oklahoma, and Higher Education in the state of Oklahoma.

Dr. Alex J. Kondonassis, incoming Senate Chairperson, then presented an inscribed plaque to Dr. de Stwolinski in recognition of her service to the Faculty Senate.

ADJOURNMENT

The Faculty Senate adjourned at 5:15 p.m. The next regular meeting of the Senate will be held at 3:30 p.m., on Monday, September 13, 1976, in Room 218, Dale Hall. Items for the Agenda should reach the Secretary of the Faculty Senate, Evans Hall 100-A, before Wednesday, September 1, 1976.

Respectfully submitted,

Anthony S. Lis

Anthony S. Lis, Secretary