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

Regular Session -- January 22, 1979 -- 3:30 p.m., Dale Hall 218

The Faculty Senate was called to order by Dr. Bernard R. McDonald, Chairperson.

Present:

Atherton	Christian	Herrick	Lewis	Rinear	Sorey
Bishop	Coulter	Hill	Lis	Rowe	Thompson, G.
Blick	Davis, J.	Hockman	McDonald	Saxon	Thompson, S.
Braver	Davis, R.	Hood	Merrill	Scheffer	Toothaker
Brown	Etheridge	Huettner	Morris	Seaberg	Walker
Caldwell	Foote	Kunesh	Murray	Sloan	Welch
Carpenter	Gabert	Kutner	Neely	Snell	Whitmore
Catlin	Gillespie	Lancaster	Reynolds	Sofer	Yeh

AUOPE representatives: Guyer, Cowen

UOSA representatives: Fail, Niemeyer, Snyder

Provost's Office representative: Glenn

Absent:

Artman	Carmack	Dewey

UOSA representatives: Carter, O'Rear

TABLE OF CONTENTS

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

The Journal of the Faculty Senate for the regular session on January 22, 1979, was approved.

ACTIONS TAKEN BY PRESIDENT WILLIAM S. BANOWSKY

(1) Faculty Replacement - Budget Council: On December 19, 1978, President William S. Banowsky approved the Senate election of Professor Leale Streebin (Civil Engineering) to complete the unexpired portion of the 1977-80 term of Professor Davis M. Egle on the Budget Council. (See page 3 of the Senate Journal for December 11, 1978.)

(2) Faculty Personnel Policy - Appeal Limitations: On November 30, 1978, President William S. Banowsky included the following self-explanatory comments in a letter to the Executive Secretary, University Regents, with copies to both Senates:

"As a result of a question raised by Professor Laura Gasaway on behalf of the Norman Committee on Discrimination, the two Provosts have reviewed the sections of the Faculty Personnel Policy that provide time limitations regarding appeals. This review was to see whether or not these appeal limitations could not be standardized to the same time limitation. The limitations now are fourteen days in one place in the Policy regarding one kind of appeal and twenty days in two other places in the Policy regarding other situations.

"Based upon the recommendations of the Provosts, I shall recommend to the University Regents that we make the appeal times standard and that the time limitation be thirty calendar days. The three places where the changes need to be made are Sections 3.7.5(p), 3.9.1 (1st paragraph), and 3.9.2 (2nd paragraph)."

On December 15, President Banowsky reported that the University Regents had approved the above changes on December 14, 1978.

REMARKS BY THE SENATE CHAIR

(1) Senate "position papers" - 1978: The Senate Chair announced that he would be calling on selected Senate members within a few days to solicit their services as chairpersons of Senate subcommittees to develop appropriate "follow up" statements concerning progress, if any, made thus far in implementing the various recommendations included in the Faculty Senate "position papers" prepared during the 1977-78 academic year. Professor Caldwell has already accepted the chair of the group to report on the area of educational priorities.

In Professor McDonald's opinion, the 1979 progress reports will serve to remind the administration of the importance of the 1978 reports and should be of particular value to the incoming University Graduate Dean and the Norman campus Provost.

(2) Recent Presidential change in Student Code: At their regular meeting in December, 1978, the University Regents approved President Banowsky's unilateral

request to change the Student Code provisions concerning approval of student organizations on campus.

Professor McDonald, Senate Chair, reported that he had received expressions of concern from several faculty members over the method used by the President in effecting the change desired by him. Senators Christian and Whitmore approached the Senate Chair with the request that an appropriate protest be registered with the administration -- not so much with the specific change itself but with the manner in which this matter was handled by the administration.

Accordingly, last Wednesday (January 17), Professors McDonald (Senate Chair), Lewis (Senate Chair-Elect), Christian, and Whitmore (Senate members), as well as Messrs. Chuck Springer (Chair, Student Congress) and Mike Carter (President, UCSA , visited with President Banowsky about this matter. The two Senate officers and the two Senate members emphasized the point that the Student Code, as well as the Senate Charter and the EEC Charter, provide a due process for effecting any changes therein. The group expressed their concern and their criticism of the manner in which the matter had been handled.

Professor Christian commented that the Code is a contractual obligation between the students and the Regents and, therefore, that the manner of change was illegal. Professor Lewis expressed a grave concern for all due processes on this campus, regardless of the group involved.

President Banowsky assured the group that the recent action "was a mistake" on his part and that he is now much more sensitive to due process.

Professor McDonald called attention to the recent press reports regarding President Banowsky's reactions and his announced sensitivity to the "due process" aspect.

(3) TV program - OU Library: Last Thursday (January 18), President William Banowsky, University Libraries Director Sul Lee, and Senate Chair Bernard McDonald traveled to Stillwater to tape a special program about the OU Library for the TV program, "Candid Campus," sponsored by HEACO. At that time, President Banowsky discussed the proposed 15-story addition to the Bizzell Library.

The taped program will be televised in this area as follows:

11:00 a.m., Sunday, February 25, 1979: KTVY (Channel 4), Oklahoma City
5:30 p.m., Sunday, March 4, 1979: OETA (Channel 13), Oklahoma City

(4) Search Committee - University Graduate Dean: Senate Chair McDonald reported that a letter, awaiting President Banowsky's signature, will request the Senate, among other groups, to nominate individuals for service on the Search Committee for the University Graduate Dean and the Vice Provost for Research Administration (Norman campus). The request, expected momentarily, will solicit six nominations for three Norman campus faculty vacancies.

The nine-member Search Committee will also include two Health Sciences Center faculty members, two graduate students, and two administrative appointees.

The Norman campus Graduate Deanship will be combined with the HSC Deanship. Furthermore, the new University Graduate Dean will also hold the position of Vice Provost for Research Administration for the Norman campus. In responding

to a question from the floor, Professor McDonald related that he felt that the two-campus Graduate Deanship is a move to consolidate the University administration.

According to the Senate Chair, every effort will be made to present the slate to the Senate at the February 12 meeting, together with appropriate vitae.

PROPOSED INDOOR PRACTICE FACILITY (Norman campus)

Background information: On December 15, 1978, Dr. Bernard R. McDonald, Senate Chair, addressed the following self-explanatory message to Senate members on the topic of the proposed multipurpose indoor practice facility for the Norman campus:

On December 14, 1978, the University Regents, upon the recommendation of President William S. Banowsky, authorized "the development of plans for the funding, design, and construction of a multipurpose indoor practice facilty containing approximately 65,000 square feet of area at an estimated cost of $3,900,000."

The building, to be located on the football practice field south of the stadium, is "to contain a large, column-free multipurpose practice space (including a 150-meter track), space for the head football coach and his staff, meeting rooms, recruiting staff offices, locker rooms, showers, weight rooms, equipment storage area, a training room, and other related support spaces."

Several individuals in the University community have already expressed to me and other Senators their concern over this proposed building. For example:

(1) Can a legitimate need be justified for a facility of this cost?
(2) What impact will this project have on the funding of women's athletics?
(3) Will the fund drive for this facility compete for funds for the proposed student recreation center?

During the Regents' discussion, the building was described as a facility to be utilized by the University community; e.g., intramurals, HPER, and faculty and staff recreation. This project raises serious concerns over duplication of the roles of this building and the proposed recreation center (budgeted at somewhat over $5 million). For example, the recreation center is also planned with an indoor track.

I believe that this project, because of its impact on the University community, deserves to be discussed by the Faculty Senate.

I have been informed that this project will be considered by the Athletics Council on January 16, 1979. Therefore, the Senate officers have decided to postpone the January Senate meeting for one week -- from January 15 until January 22. This matter will be placed on the Agenda for the January 22 session, at which time the Chair of the Athletics Council will report on their deliberations. I will also invite the representatives of the Athletic Department and the football program to our meeting.

This timetable seems reasonable inasmuch as I am assured by the Office of the President that the Regents approved only a feasibility study for plans for private funding and an authorization for the Office of Administrative and Financial Services to initiate an architect search that will require 60-90 days.

The construction of this facility will not be approved until the recommendations of the Athletics Council, the architect selection, and the feasibility study are completed. The earliest approval date is estimated to be March, 1979.

Dr. Catherine Bennett, Chair of the Athletics Council, accepted the invitation to attend this meeting. Mr. Wade Walker, Athletic Director, conveyed his regrets at being unable to attend but did send Mr. Leon Cross of his staff to represent that department. Coach Barry Switzer neither responded to the request nor appeared at the Senate meeting.

(Secretary's note: One January 29, Coach Switzer acknowledged, with thanks, the Senate Chair's invitation with the additional comment, "Due to prior commitments involved in our recruiting program, however, it was not possible for me to attend.")

Professor Bennett, Council Chair, reported on the last two meetings of the Athletics Council. At the December meeting, the Council members discussed rumors about the indoor practice facility. Dr. Morris, Interim Provost, joined the Council at its January meeting and presented some details concerning the proposed facility. The Council discussion took two directions -- the decision-making process that never involved the Athletics Council and the nature of the facility itself. At that meeting, the Council gave an oral message to President Banowsky, through Provost Morris, that the Council would be happy to assist in any way possible with the planning phase of the project.

Mr. Leon Cross of the Athletics Department reported the receipt of a directive -- initiated by the Regents and relayed by Provost Morris -- from Mr. Wade Walker, Director of Athletics, to ascertain whether sufficient private funding would be available for a proposed indoor facility. His initial report was made to the Regents at their January meeting and a more detailed one is to be presented at their next meeting. At present, the proposed facility is only a survey.

Mr. Cross next outlined the history of the STEP donors' program for funding the stadium expansion. The new and expanding women's athletic programs during the last few years have required the use of funds previously planned to be set aside for capital improvements. The proposed facility has been "in the talking stage" for the past three years as an item greatly needed by all athletic teams -- not only the football that, in Mr. Cross's words, "is the newsworthy part of this matter." Such a facility would be "a big factor in the recruiting of athletes."

In response to a question from the floor, Mr. Cross felt that Mr. Wade must have been misquoted in the press recently that "there were no plans for sharing the proposed facility with faculty, students, and staff." Mr. Cross felt that such a facility would be available to others when not used by either the varsity teams or the Physical Education Department. He noted that present facilities are used by the intramural program.

In response to another question, Mr. Cross stated that increased football revenues go into the general operating budget of the Athletics Department, including women's athletic programs. He added that the Athletic Department shares some of its funds with other University departments; e.g., free football tickets to the Office of the Vice President for University Relations and to the President's Office, as well as the various athletic scholarships.

Although he has not yet seen the plans for the proposed student recreation center, he has seen the preliminary plans for the indoor practice facility. In Mr. Cross' opinion, there might be some duplication in the two buildings -- e.g., the track area.

The ensuing discussion was centered on the decision-making process regarding the proposed structure and the apparent lack of any coordination with the Athletics Council. Professor Robert Davis, objected, in particular, to the pattern that he feels is developing recently -- i.e., "the administration presents something as a fait accompli and then excuses such actions with the explanation that all this was a mistake and that we will never do it again on this issue." He cited the recent controversy with the Student Congress concerning recognition of student groups and the current question of the indoor practice facility.

Professor Christian twice expressed his opposition to the Regental philosophy that "as long as you can get money from private donors, it is all right to do so." He questioned the lack of a formal process for considering such projects through the various segments and channels of the University community.

Professor Sloan objected to the "piecemeal approach" and stressed the need for integrated funding for athletic and academic programs. At this point, Mr. Cross cited the recent sharing with HSC and the Law Center of funds generated by the athletic programs.

In response to a question from the floor, Professor Bennett reported that the expansion of the south end zone of the stadium has been included in the capital improvements schedule for the past few years.

Professor Gabert then moved adoption of the following resolution:

Senate Resolution: Joint Funding and Development of a University of Oklahoma Physical Activity, Recreation, and Indoor Athletic Complex

Whereas, the University of Oklahoma is a comprehensive university, attempting to develop and improve its programs and facilities for all students and the University community,

Whereas, the information presented to date seems in certain aspects to duplicate facilities and services in both the indoor athletic building and the physical activity-recreation center, i.e., large multi-purpose indoor practice area, indoor track, and jogging area,

Whereas, funding is a critical problem for both buildings, necessitating revisions and delays of development plans,

Whereas, combining the solicitation of funding and resources allows for the integration of programs that has, heretofore, usually not occurred at the University of Oklahoma, yet is essential in a major comprehensive university with a developing academic structure and a highly successful and prosperous athletic program,

Be It Therefore Resolved that the Faculty Senate on the Norman Campus of the University of Oklahoma propose that the University develop a major comprehensive physical activity - recreation - athletic center, enriching the recreation, physical education, and athletic opportunities of all students and the University community by combining the funding and the building of the proposed indoor athletic complex with the proposed student physical activity center.

During the subsequent discussion, Professor Foote moved that the resolution be amended by adding the following underscored clause:

> BE IT THEREFORE RESOLVED THAT the Faculty Senate on the Norman campus of the University of Oklahoma propose that, if it is a distinct financial advantage to do so, the University . . . .

Shortly thereafter, Professor Gillespie moved that the question be tabled until such time as additional information is made available to the Senate. The tabling motion was approved in a 34 to 7 vote.

The consensus of the Senate was that the Chair should invite Regent Richard Bell of the appropriate Regents subcommittee and President William S. Banowsky to address the Senate on this topic at its next meeting. Professor McDonald promised to do so as soon as possible.

ADJOURNMENT

The Senate adjourned at 4:40 p.m. The next regular session of the Faculty Senate will be held at 3:30 p.m., on Monday, February 12, 1979, in Dale Hall 218.

Respectfully submitted,

Anthony S. Lis

Anthony S. Lis
Professor of Business Communication
Secretary

The University of Oklahoma 900 Asp Avenue, Rm. 242 Norman, Oklahoma 73019

Faculty Senate

February 23, 1979

TO: Members, General Faculty, Norman campus

FROM: Bernard R. McDonald, Professor of Mathematics;
Chair, Faculty Senate, Norman campus

SUBJECT: Minutes of the Faculty Senate meeting - February 12.

I would like to call your attention to the minutes (Journal) of the Faculty Senate meeting of February 12, 1979, that you will be receiving in your mail within a few days.

There are several items that may be of more than passing interest to you, including the following:

(1) Pages 2-10: The reports of the fall semester, 1978, activities of the University Councils and the Publications Board.

(2) Pages 10-11: The remarks by Professor Richard Fowler, Chair of the Budget Council, concerning President Carter's seven percent wage guidelines and observations that the University needs a commitment to at least a nine percent increase to redress past salary declines and to move toward average Big Eight salary levels.

(3) Pages 13-16: The remarks of Regent Richard Bell concerning the proposed indoor practice facility, as well as the related Senate discussion and action.

If for any reason you do not receive the February 12 Senate Journal, please contact the Senate office, OMU 242 (5-6874).

Sincerely,

Bernard R. McDonald
Professor of Mathematics
Chair, Faculty Senate