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

Regular Session -- April 9, 1979 -- 3:30 p.m., Dale Hall 218

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

Present:

Artman	Carmack	Foote	Huettner	Merrill	Saxon
Atherton	Carpenter	Gabert	Kutner	Morris	Scheffer
Bishop	Catlin	Gillespie	Lancaster	Murray	Seaberg
Braver	Christian	Herrick	Lewis	Neely	Snell
Brown	Davis, R.	Hockman	Lis	Reynolds	Thompson, G.
Caldwell	Etheridge	Hood	McDonald	Rinear	Whitmore
AUOPE:	Cowen	Provost's Office representative:			Glenn

Absent:

Blick	Dewey	Rowe	Thompson, S.	Welch
Coulter	Hill	Sloan	Toothaker	Yeh
Davis, J.	Kunesh	Sorey	Walker	

UOSA:	Carter	Fail	Niemeyer	O'Rear	Snyder

TABLE OF CONTENTS

page

Announcements:

General Faculty Meeting, Norman Campus, April 19 2

Inter-Senate Liaison Committee Meeting, April 10 2

Joint Meeting of OSU and OU Executive Committees, April 12 . . . 2

Actions Taken by President Banowsky:

Tuition and Fee Waivers for Faculty and Staff Spouses and Children 2

Insurance Coverage - Drug-Alcohol Dependency 3

Faculty Salaries, 1979-80 3

Action Taken by Senate Executive Committee:

Faculty Salaries, 1979-80 3

Remarks by Dr. Elbert, Vice President, Administrative Affairs . . 4

Follow-Up Reports - 1978 "Faculty Position Papers":

Budgetary Priorities 5

Salary and Fringe Benefits 6

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

The Journal of the Faculty Senate for the regular session on March 19, 1979, was approved with the following addition on page 2 thereof: "The Journal of the Faculty Senate for the regular session on February 12, 1979, was approved."

ANNOUNCEMENTS

(1) General Faculty meeting, Norman campus: The General Faculty on the Norman campus will hold its spring meeting on Thursday, April 19, 1979, at 3:30 p.m., in Adams Hall 150.

(2) Inter-Senate Liaison Committee meeting: The Inter-Senate Liaison Committee (consisting of the officers of the Norman campus and the HSC Faculty Senates) will hold its spring meeting on the Norman campus on Tuesday, April 10, 1979.

(3) Joint meeting of the OSU and OU Executive Committees: The Executive Committees of the Oklahoma State University Faculty Council and the Oklahoma University Norman campus Faculty Senate will hold their spring joint meeting in Stillwater on Thursday, April 12, 1979.

ACTIONS TAKEN BY PRESIDENT WILLIAM S. BANOWSKY

(1) Tuition and fee waivers for faculty and staff spouses and children: On March 20, 1979, President Banowsky disapproved the Senate proposal for waiving tuition and fees for spouses and children of faculty and staff. (See page 2 of the Senate Journal for May 1, 1978.) President Banowsky's memorandum to the Chairs of the Norman campus Faculty Senate and EEC, as well as the Director of Personnel, reads as follows:

- -

I have reviewed the recommendation of the Norman Campus Faculty Senate concerning the development of a plan to allow children and spouses of faculty members to attend the University of Oklahoma without paying tuition. President Sharp, at the time of the original recommendation, had directed that a plan be developed for consideration and that the spouses and children of staff members also be included in consideration of such a plan.

Although I see some merit in the recommendation, I cannot approve it at this time. There are several factors which would affect the possibility of a tuition waiver for children and spouses. Any plan permitting individuals to attend the University of Oklahoma without paying tuition would require not only the approval of the University of Oklahoma Regents but also the approval of the Oklahoma State Regents for Higher Education.

The State Regents would, of necessity, have to approve such a waiver for all institutions in the State system. It would be very difficult, if not impossible, to determine how many individuals would take advantage of the opportunity. The present policy of the University, approved by the State Regents in 1967, which allows full-time, permanent employees of the University to enroll at one-half the regular fee for up to six credit hours of class per semester, is being utilized by over 300 employees each semester at an approximate cost of $44,000 annually to the University. If we were to estimate conservatively that 1,000 spouses and children were to take advantage of a total tuition waiver plan at an average semester cost of $253 (full-time resident student), we would be looking at a cost of $500,000 annually. This cost would be borne by the University. The institutions within the State system would multiply this cost appreciably.

A tuition waiver for children and spouses, included as a fringe benefit to employees, would be unequal in its application, applying only to children and spouses of those able to take advantage of it. Further, there has been considerable debate recently, on a national basis, as to the taxability of such tuition waivers to the individual receiving the benefit.

Present financing and other factors mentioned above cause me to disapprove such a plan at the present time. Perhaps at some time in the future circumstances will merit reconsideration of this matter.

- -

(2) Insurance coverage - drug-alcohol dependency: On March 26, 1979, President Banowsky acknowledged receipt of the Senate resolution with the following comment: "I am forwarding the resolution to the Chair of the Committee for the Committee's consideration. I want to have the advice of the Committee concerning this matter, including the costs that would be involved." (See page 4 of the Senate Journal for March 19, 1979.)

(3) Faculty Salaries, 1979-80: On March 15, 1979, President Banowsky responded as follows to the Senate Executive Committee's communication of March 8, 1979 (see related item immediately following), concerning faculty salaries for 1979-80:

- -

I appreciate very much the letter that you, Barbara Lewis, Tony Lis, Roger Atherton, Susan Caldwell, John Catlin, and Ken Merrill have written me concerning faculty salaries.

Please rest assured that I have made a strong commitment personally, and my staff has too, regarding the need to improve faculty salaries at the University of Oklahoma. We have been working on this for many months and are emphasizing many of the points that you make in your letter. Let me assure you that we will continue to make these points and to make as strong a case as possible to the State leadership regarding this need.

I want you to know that we are together on this, that we will continue to present a strong case, and that we will do all we possibly can to improve faculty salaries. I concur wholeheartedly that we must move them along significantly if we are to meet our stated goals.

- -

ACTION TAKEN BY SENATE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE: Faculty Salaries 1979-80.

All seven members of the Faculty Senate Executive Committee (Professors McDonald, Lewis, Lis, Atherton, Caldwell, Catlin, and Merrill) addressed the following self-explanatory message on March 8, 1979, to President William S. Banowsky:

- -

On behalf of the faculty on the Norman campus of the University of Oklahoma, we, the members of the Faculty Senate Executive Committee, would like to emphasize the importance of and the need for a vigorous commitment by you and your staff regarding faculty salaries in your discussions with our State legislators.

As you know, President Carter's seven-percent guidelines on salary increases contain provisions for "hardship" or "catch-up" situations.

Furthermore, Dr. Barry Bosworth, Executive Director of the President's Council on Wage and Price Stability, has stated that colleges (when compared to the private sector) "don't generally grant excessive wage and fringe benefit increases and, therefore, would not be held accountable if they fail to observe the President's inflation standard of holding wages to seven percent annually." (AAUP, Chapter Conference Letter, February, 1979)

On the national level, AAUP officers, as well as the Chronicle for Higher Education, have presented data attesting to the national decline in faculty salaries and apparently are lobbying effectively against the application of the guidelines to the salaries of faculty in higher education.

On the local level, comparative salary surveys continue to show that Oklahoma University and Oklahoma State University rank at the bottom of Big Eight averages. Furthermore, the Faculty Senate (Norman campus) has documented a steady decline in our real salary levels at a rate that exceeds the national decline.

At the Senate-AAUP reception for Chancellor Dunlap last fall, you spoke positively about the expected budget and salary possibilities. You reiterated your views concerning the importance of faculty salaries and the need for substantial increases, as reported in the Norman Transcript (September 24, 1978) and the Daily Oklahoman (November 1, 1978).

Also last fall, Professor Richard Fowler, Chair of the Budget Council, presented evidence to show that a "hardship" or "catch-up" case can and should be made by the University to the State Legislature. Professor Fowler reiterated those points in his remarks to the Faculty Senate on February 12 and indicated that a minimum increase of nine percent was necessary to bring our salaries nearer to the Big Eight averages.

On March 3, during a panel discussion of higher education, State Regent Patten and representatives of HEACO and FOCUS commented, with optimism, that 1979-80 may be one of our best budget years. Furthermore, if the State Regents maintain their 20 percent (approximate) allocation to the Norman campus, the next fiscal year could be one of substantial progress.

Indeed, in the light of the above, our faculty would be very discouraged if, in a year of maximum allocations, the Legislature were to "mandate" a salary increase of only seven percent. Morale would suffer even more if the faculty were to perceive that our case either had not been presented at all or had not been presented effectively by our administrators.

In the words of Mr. Gene Torbett following the approval of the $42.9 million figure by the House subcommittee (Tulsa World - February 28, 1979), "Excellence in education is not cheap . . . As long as our faculty salaries at Oklahoma State University and the University of Oklahoma rank lowest in the Big Eight . . . we are not likely to see progress."

- -

(See preceding, related item on page 3 of this Journal.)

REMARKS BY DR. ARTHUR ELBERT, VICE PRESIDENT, ADMINISTRATIVE AFFAIRS

At the invitation of the Senate Executive Committee, Dr. Arthur Elbert, Vice President for Administrative Affairs, addressed the Senate.

In his 13-minute, informal remarks, Dr. Elbert outlined his academic and administrative backgrounds and his perception of his role on this campus.

He stressed that all of his experience has been in higher education. He added that, with his academic rank of Associate Professor of Psychology, he is looking forward to the opportunity of teaching a class at least once a year. "I can understand the importance of good students, quality faculty members, and good facilities in which individuals can work and learn. Hopefully, I will stay in contact with faculty members and the eleven departments on this campus, interpret your needs to the outside public, and see that the services that you need are provided."

In his opinion, his administrative position includes these two aspects: (1) coming into contact with the outside (Regents, State Regents, the legislators, auditors, the public, private corporations, and "a lot of people who do not understand higher education") and (2) providing services through the eleven units that report to him.

He hopes to draw whenever possible on the expertise of the faculty to help with "our own deficiencies." He cited an example from his previous position at Chicago State University. In respose to an obvious need, a special course for full credit was set up for seven department heads with the cooperation and encouragement of a faculty member in the business communication area to conduct a special course in correspondence and report writing. The class produced marked results in on-the-job performance.

In responding to a question from the floor, Dr. Elbert reported that they had changed his title from "Vice President for Administrative and Financial Services" to "Vice President for Administrative Affairs" because of the association of that title with prior, permanent holders of that position.

Other questions from the floor were concerned with budgetary controls and the new budgeting system (with about 10 categories rather than the current system of A, B, and C budgets) being implemented at the directive of the State Regents.

In conclusion, Dr. Elbert expressed his eagerness to return to the Senate at any time.

FOLLOW-UP REPORTS: 1978 "Faculty Position Papers"

Background information: At the January 22, Senate meeting, Professor McDonald, Senate Chair, announced the appointment of Senate ad hoc Committees to prepare "follow-up" reports on the 1978 "faculty position papers." (See page 2 of the Senate Journal for January 22, 1979, and page 11 of the Senate Journal for February 12, 1979.)

Senate action - Budgetary Priorities: Professor Mary Esther Saxon called attention to her ad hoc Committee's report distributed at this meeting. She expressed appreciation to Professors Bishop and Brown for their cooperation. Following a short discussion of the report, Professor Robert Davis moved acceptance of the report. Without dissent, the Senate approved the motion. As approved, the ad hoc Committee report reads as follows:

- -

In last year's original report, background information explaining the budget-making process was defined. This information is still valid.

At that time, concern was expressed at the apparent decline in influence of the Budget Council in "recommending and advising the President and other appropriate administrators on matters concerning fiscal policies and resources of the University." Happily, this review committee is able to report on improved dialogue between the Budget Council and all levels of administration. Liaison subcommittees have been established with the offices of the Provost and all Vice Presidents. Informative discussions have been held with State Regent John H. Patten, President Banowsky, the Interim Provost, the Interim Vice Provost for Research, and the Interim Vice President for Administrative and Financial Services. Budgeting priorities have been established by the Budget Council as recommendations for final budget allocations. These improved relationships seem likely to continue.

Six budgetary priorities were established in the original (1978) report. The priorities and an update follow:

1. Salaries of OU employees. Acknowledgement of increased support is verbalized at every level. However, the 7% salary guidelines requested by President Carter will probably prevent much improvement during the next fiscal year, and the University of Oklahoma will probably remain at the bottom of the Big Eight in faculty salaries.

2. Library funding. The necessity for increased funding for acquisitions, staff support, and new and improved facilities has been recognized by the administration. This is an encouraging sign. President Banowsky has publicly stated his commitment to a new library building program and increased support for library resources.

3. Student scholarships. In so far as can be determined, no new scholarship programs have been explored. Discussion of the critical salary situation for graduate assistants is currently underway by departments, deans, and the Office of the Provost, but definitive steps to improve the graduate assistants' salaries are unknown.

4. Research and career development. No new support for career development has been initiated. Recognition of the necessity for improved research support has been acknowledged but no new monies are yet forthcoming.

5. New programs. No new programs have been discussed by either the administration or the Budget Council of which this review committee is aware. Statements have been made at administrative levels indicating a desire to improve substantially and support those programs already in existence. This supports the original report's endorsement of strengthening existing programs and carefully evaluating new programs before they are initiated.

6. Faculty hiring and retention. The position paper recognized the need for reallocation of faculty positions to respond to enrollments and research needs. New positions may, however, be required when faculty resources are already stretched thin and overextended. No response from the administration in the past year has addressed this issue.

In summary, this review committee feels that the administration has indicated a positive attitude toward addressing the needs expressed in the Budgetary Priorities Position Paper. However, the first budget that will demonstrate a positive commitment to these recommendations is not yet finalized. Hopefully, a year from now, the administration's budgetary commitments will demonstrate by action, as well as words, positive redress of these concerns. At the time this report is made, the jury is still out.

Committee Members:

L. Doyle Bishop (Management)
Homer Brown (Accounting)
Mary Esther Saxon (University Libraries), Chair

- -

During the discussion of the report, Professor Foote moved that the Senate Chair appoint a Senate ad hoc Committee to study the desirability and the feasibility of establishing some type of an instructional media center on campus to assist interested faculty members in making full use of modern technology to improve their teaching techniques. Without dissent, the Senate approved the motion. Professor McDonald, Senate Chair, added that a Senate ad hoc Committee would be appointed to study this question and report to the Senate next fall.

Senate action - Salary and Fringe Benefits: Professor Gary Thompson, Chair of the ad hoc Committee, acknowledged with appreciation the cooperation of Professor Gabert, a member of the Committee, as well as the expertise and the counsel of Professor Richard Fowler, Chair of the Budget Council.

During the discussion of this report, the Senate Chair reported (1) that all seven members of the Senate Executive Committee last month had addressed an appeal to President Banowsky to seek faculty raises for 1979-80 in excess of the seven percent guidelines and (2) that President Banowsky had responded to that communication on March 15, 1979. (Secretary's note: Both communications are reported in full on page 3 of this Journal.)

Professor Bishop subsequently moved that the ad hoc Committee report be accepted. Without dissent, the Senate approved the motion. The full text of the report reads as follows:

Neither the faculty nor the various constituencies of the University need to be apprised of the corrosive effects of inflation during the past two years. What appeared to be significant salary increases in 1978-79 were largely nullified by inflation before the year's end. Raises averaged 8.45 percent for Professors, 9.01 percent for Associate Professors, and 8.82 percent for Assistant Professors.

Financial status relinquished during the disastrous year 1977-78, when raises averaged 1.5 percent, was not restored by these salary increases. The combination of underfunding and the inflation during the past two years has meant that, on an average, faculty members have suffered a salary reduction of about 5.0 percent in real income. This deterioration has led to a convergence between average faculty salaries and costs of providing for a family of four members.

OU Faculty Salaries and Inflation Rates

From	To	Average Salary Increment($)	Average Percentage Increase in Salaries	Percentage Change in Consumer Prices	Difference (%)
1969/70	1971	$ 550	4.2	5.9	-1.7
1971	1972	71	.5	4.3	-3.8
1972	1973	1,188	8.6	3.3	+5.3
1973	1974	582	3.9	6.2	-2.3
1974	1975	879	5.6	11.0	-5.4
1975	1976	1,303	7.9	9.1	-1.2
1976	1977	270	1.5	5.8	-4.3
1977	1978/79	1,591	8.8	6.5	+2.3

Sources: OU Budget Council
U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics, Monthly Labor Review

According to estimates of the OU Budget Council, the goal of achieving parity with median salaries at other Big Eight universities would require an additional increment of about 7.0 percent in 1979-80 or some future year. With inflation rates estimated at 12.0 percent for 1979, plus a federal wage ceiling of 7.0 percent on increases, the goal of improving individual salaries or the collective status of salaries seems bleak. While other sectors of the economy struggle to improve their shares of the national wealth, the academic profession waits in frustration. Since 1972, salaries in the profession at large in the United States have fallen behind at the rate of about 3.5 percent a year, resulting in a cumulative deficit of 18.0 percent by 1978. Continuation of these trends will obviously result in lower faculty morale and quality of services produced. The raises granted in 1978/79 are acknowledged as a very positive development in a situation which was becoming a critical issue among OU faculty.

Somewhat in contrast to salary trends through the 1970's has been a marked improvement in fringe benefits. Largely, this represents increased contributions to TIAA-CREF accounts. For this reason, average total compensation (fringe benefits included) rose 10.2 percent in 1978/79. This moved the University's total compensation figure to approximately 99.4 percent of the national average for all institutions of higher education. Comparable figures are not yet available to allow a comparison with other Big Eight institutions. Also, in the area of fringe benefits, the Faculty Senate sponsored a proposal to waive tuition for dependents of faculty and to incorporate benefits for alcohol and drug dependency medical treatment into next year's group health insurance policy. The fee waiver was considered by President Banowsky as infeasible at this time. A canvass of faculty interest in pre-paid legal benefits failed to indicate either interest in or support for such coverage.

Committee Members:

Stan Neely (Chemistry)
Gary Thompson (Geography), Chair

The Senate Chair then announced that the three remaining Committee reports would be considered at the May 7 meeting of the Senate.

ADJOURNMENT

The Senate adjourned at 4:41 p.m. The next regular session of the Faculty Senate will be held at 3:30 p.m., on Monday, May 7, 1979, in Dale Hall 218.

Respectfully submitted,

Anthony S. Lis

Anthony S. Lis
Professor of Business Communication
Secretary, Faculty Senate