JOURNAL OF THE FACULTY SENATE (Norman campus)

The University of Oklahoma

Regular Session -- March 17, 1980 -- 3:30 p.m., Dale Hall 218

The Faculty Senate was called to order by Professor Barbara Lewis, Chairperson.

Present:

Acock	Covich	Hill	Lis	Self
Artman	Davis	Hoag	Menzie	Smith
Bishop	Eick	Huettner	Morris	Sorey
Brown, H.	Etheridge	Karriker	Neely	Thompson
Brown, S.	Flowers	Kunesh	Pfiester	Walker
Caldwell	Foster, J.	Kutner	Reynolds	Welch
Carmack	Foster, T.	Lancaster	Rinear	Whitmore
Carpenter	Gabert	Lehr	Rowe	Whitney
Catlin	Hardy	Lewis	Saxon	Wickham
Coulter	Herrick	Lindstrom	Seaberg	

Provost's Office representative: Ray

AUOPE representatives: Alonso Cowen Guyer

Absent:

Hockman	Murray	Peters	Yukihiro	

AUOPE representatives: Chism Donwerth

UOSA representatives: Graham Heldenbrand Hill Parr

TABLE OF CONTENTS

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

The Journal of the Faculty Senate for the regular session on February 11, 1980, was approved.

ANNOUNCEMENTS

Spring meeting, Norman campus General Faculty: At the request of President William S. Banowsky, the spring semester meeting of the General Faculty on the Norman campus has been rescheduled for Thursday, April 10, in Adams Hall 150. Professor Lewis, Senate Chair, urged the faculty to attend this meeting that will feature the presentation of various faculty awards and the announcement of several distinguished professorships.

Spring joint meeting of OSU and OU Executive Committees: The Executive Committees of the Oklahoma State University Faculty Council and the Oklahoma University Faculty Senate will hold their spring joint meeting in Stillwater on Thursday evening, March 27, 1980.

Spring meeting, Oklahoma Conference of Faculty Organizations: The Oklahoma Conference of Faculty Organizations, representing private and state institutions of higher education throughout Oklahoma, will hold its spring meeting at Southwestern State University in Weatherford on Friday, March 28, 1980. Senate members interested in attending this event were asked to contact the Senate Secretary as soon as possible for further details.

ACTIONS TAKEN BY PRESIDENT WILLIAM S. BANOWSKY

Task Force on Discretionary Funding: In acknowledging Senate action of February 11, President William S. Banowsky addressed the following message on February 21 to Professor John H. Lancaster, Chair of the Senate Task Force on Discretionary Funding: (See pages 10-12 of the Senate Journal for February 11, 1980.)

> "I appreciate the work that you and your Task Force of the Faculty Senate have done on the matter of discretionary funding. I have read your recommendations and I find them to be reasonable and helpful. It will require a period of study before we can respond specifically to them, particularly since we are in the process of rethinking the kinds of procedures which should be established with regard to the allocation of the University of Oklahoma Associates' funds. The Board of Regents has also established its own practices with regard to supplemental funding and it will be necessary to submit formal recommendations to the Regents in moving to implement the kind of recommendations you have made.
>
> "I am going to ask Provost Morris to review these recommendations with the hope that we can work out a set of recommendations for the Regents consistent with the spirit and the intent of your recommendations.
>
> "Again we thank you and members of the Task Force for the work that you have given to this matter."

Faculty replacements: On February 18, President Banowsky approved the Senate election of the following faculty replacements: Leon Zelby (Academic Program Council), Joakim Laguros (Research Council), and Michael Devine (Faculty Appeals Board).

At the same time, President Banowsky selected Julia Norlin from the nominations submitted by the Senate for the vacancy on the Intramural Committee.

(See page 4 of the Senate Journal for February 11, 1980.)

FALL SEMESTER, 1979, REPORTS OF UNIVERSITY COUNCILS AND PUBLICATION BOARD

The following fall semester, 1979, reports of the seven University Councils and the Publications Board were distributed to Senate members in advance of the meeting:

Report of the Academic Personnel Council (Norman campus) for fall semester, 1979, submitted by Dr.Robert Petry, Chair, on February 21, 1980:

The Academic Personnel Council exists for the sole purpose of considering tenure cases under the pre-1976 rules where there has not been unanimous agreement among the various recommending bodies and officers. It is the charge of the Council to review each of these cases and make an independent recommendation to the President.

This year the Council considered two cases which were given to us by the Provost's office on December 18. Beginning January 9, seven meetings were held in which the candidates, six witnesses, the department chairs and Committee A members, the budget dean, the Dean of University College, and the Dean of the Graduate College were individually interviewed. After final discussion of the cases,the Council's recommendations were delivered to President Banowsky's office on February 7.

The new chair of the Academic Personnel Council for the 1980-81 year will be Richard Hilbert. Faculty membership on the Council included:

Roger Atherton	Stanley Eliason	Gene Pingleton
Sidney Brown	Richard Hilbert	R.E.L. Richardson
Junetta Davis	Robert Petry, Chair	D. Barton Turkington

Report of the Academic Program Council (Norman campus) for fall semester, 1979, submitted by Dr. Ray Dacey, Chair, on March 6, 1980:

The Council treated three primary issues: (1) a memo by Jerome Weber concerning his plan for providing instructional services to the University community, (2) a request from the Provost's office concerning potential changes in the Summer School Schedule, and (3) the usual array of proposed course changes.

Faculty membership on the Council included:

Ray Dacey, Chair	David Gross	Thomas Miller	Mary Nye
David Etheridge	Penny Hopkins	Stanley Neely	Leon Zelby

Report of the Administrative and Physical Resources Council (Norman campus) for fall semester, 1979, submitted by Prof. Robt.Goins, Chair, on March 6, 1980:

The Administrative and Physical Resources Council held eight meetings during the Fall Semester 1979-80.

Following is a summary of the items with which the Council was concerned at these meetings:

Review of Current Building Projects. At the first meeting in the fall, Dr. Arthur Elbert, Vice President for Administrative Affairs, reviewed for the Council the various building projects that are currently underway or are being planned on the campus. They are:

Physical Fitness Center	South entrance to the Campus on Jenkins Street
Library Expansion	Baseball Park
Stadium Addition	Renovation of Richards Hall
Renovation of Jefferson House	Renovation of Nielsen Hall
Parking for Lloyd Noble Center	Renovation of DeBarr Hall
Improvement of Jenkins Street	

Library Addition. Beginning in September the Council devoted a considerable amount of time during the fall to reviewing administrative proposals for expansion of Bizzell Memorial Library. This review process included the appointment of a sub-committee to study the implications upon design of the new addition that were reflected by the data developed by the library staff. Joint meetings were held with the University Libraries Committee during which time discussion centered on issues of site selection, scale, energy conservation and functional relationships of the proposed addition. On November 15, both the Council and the Libraries Committee jointly agreed upon the concept that called for a structure four floors above ground and two floors below ground located on the west side of the present library complex.

Development of the L. Dale Mitchell Baseball Park. On November 1, 1979, the Council reviewed and approved plans for the development of a new baseball complex to be located on a site north of Lloyd Noble Center. Part of the funding for the project will come from the family of L. Dale Mitchell, a former major league and OU baseball player.

Trolley Bus System. On November 29, 1979, Dr. Arthur Elbert presented plans to purchase two trolley buses to be used to introduce a bus system between Lloyd Noble Center and the Main Campus. The Council voted to support the trolley bus system as a part of an overall comprehensive transportation and traffic plan.

Laboratory Safety. The Council received a report from Dr. Victor Hutchison on the progress of the sub-committee on laboratory safety. He reported that the sub-committee had made several recommendations and follow-up suggested that progress was being made.

Budget Council Liaison. The Council received a report from Dr. Hutchison concerning activities of the Budget Council. He reported that discussion centered on the point that high priority had been given budget needs to provide a 12% salary raise for 1980-81.

Council membership included the following faculty members:

Roger Atherton	Larry Canter	Beverly Joyce
Marvin Baker	Victor Hutchison	Ray Larson
Floyd Calvert		Judy Norlin
		Robert Goins, Chair

Report of the Athletics Council for fall semester, 1979, submitted by Dr. Samuel G. Chapman, Chair, on February 7, 1980:

With nominal exception, the issues addressed by the OU Athletics Council during the semester were routine. These included reviewing proposed schedules, acting on a proposed change in the management of the OU golf course, hearing Big Eight activities reports, hearing requests for athletic ticket privilege extensions, overseeing the expansion of the women's athletic programs, reviewing requests made by several persons or groups to solicit football crowds for funds, and making athletic awards to team members.

Two issues were unusual in the sense that their kind do not often come before the Athletics Council. One involved the nature of spirit groups at OU athletic events and their funding. The other related to reviewing details of the football stadium's end-zone expansion project.

The spirit group issue was given over to an ad hoc study committee under the aegis of the Vice President for University Affairs. A report will be made in February, 1980. The south end-zone project was in good order and work began about an hour after OU defeated Nebraska in Owen Stadium on November 24. It should be set for September, 1980, occupancy.

Athletic Department data, the business office staff and, as appropriate, meetings with coaches, were the principal information sources upon which decisions were made. Moreover, Big Eight regulations, earlier Athletics Council minutes and policies were important to our deliberations, too.

It is estimated that each faculty member committee about 15 hours a month to Athletics Council business. The Chairman averaged about 30 hours a month. The time factor will intensify during the spring as fiscal matters, including budgeting, become paramount.

There were no issues which prompted significant recommendations to President Banowsky.

The OU Athletics Council is comprised of five faculty (all voting) nominated by the Faculty Senate; four alumni (two voting members) nominated by the OU Alumni Association; four students (two voting) nominated by the University of Oklahoma Student Association; and one non-voting member nominated by the OU Employee Executive Council. The faculty members include:

Samuel G. Chapman, Chair	Joseph Rieger
Paul Risser	Laura Gasaway
	Herbert Hengst

Report of the Budget Council for fall semester, 1979, submitted by Dr. Donald T. Perkins, Chair, on February 20, 1980:

During the fall semester, the Budget Council met seven times. Due to sub-committee structure and activities of the Budget Council, an approximation of 250 man hours were consumed in Budget Council business.

Needs Budget: The proposed 1980-81 Educational and General Budget Needs (Needs Budget) was received and reviewed by the Budget Council. The primary impact the Budget Council had on the Needs Budget was the inclusion of a $500,000 request for Instructional Equipment prior to the presentation of the Needs Budget to the Higher Regents. Also the Budget Council endorsed and recommended the priorities given to salaries, wages, and library enrichment.

Recommendation for Allocation of New Money for 1980-81: In the past, the recommendation of the Budget Council for the allocation of new money has been generated within the Budget Council. For the 1980-81 Budget, we are seeking support and input from the other University Councils. This will provide a broader data base for evaluating priorities and also acquaint the other Councils with this facet of the budgetary process.

Report to the Faculty Senate: A proposal for the distribution of new money and total estimated revenue for 1979-80 was summarized and forwarded to the Faculty Senate. This report ("Where Did the Money Go?") was prepared for the purpose of illuminating the allocation of funds and also to give the members of the Faculty Senate a general survey of percentage change for the broad categories of the University's fiscal structure.

Council Charge: Through the use of a member of both Councils, the Budget Council is communicating with the Administrative and Physical Resources Council. The Faculty Senate Committee on Faculty Welfare has reported to the Budget Council and detailed their concerns for salary and wage improvement. Thus, the Budget Council has been involved with other Councils/Committees which are involved in the budgetary process.

Non-Academic Programs Discontinuance Policy: The recommendation for a Non-Academic Programs Discontinuance Policy was submitted to the President in March, 1978. This recommendation (a joint effort of the Budget Council and the Administrative and Physical Resources Council) represented a considerable effort and usage of man hours. This recommendation was not accepted by the Administration, but there is the potential that the policy and/or some portions of it have merit. Currently, an ad hoc committee, composed of two members from each of the above Councils, is evaluating the original policy and the Administration's comments and action with the intent of ascertaining if a rewrite and/or resubmission is of value.

Research Support: The Budget Council is presently engaged in several on-going projects which include: (1) an evaluation of Budget Transfers, (2) a review of salary increases in the past for the purpose of determining if there have been potential and/or overt inequities, and (3) interaction with individuals and groups primarily interested in research/creative achievement for the purpose of determining what impact the Budget Council may have in the funding of these activities.

SJR-9: The Budget Council reviewed SJR-9 and discussed the University's response to SJR-9 with the Executive Officers and their representatives. These discussions, although historical in nature, established a perspective and foundation for future Budget Council activity if homologous constraints are placed on salary and wage increases in the allocation of funds for 1980-81.

Vice Chair: Professor Doyle Bishop was elected Vice Chair for 1979-80.

Council membership included the following faculty members:

L. Doyle Bishop	Donald Perkins, Chair	Leale Streebin
Trent Gabert	Mary Esther Saxon	Henry Tobias
James Kenderdine	Eddie Smith	V. Stanley Vardys

Report of the Council on Faculty Awards and Honors for fall semester, 1979, submitted by Dr. A. J. Kondonassis, Chair, on February 8, 1980:

The University Council on Faculty Awards and Honors has received several fine nominations for the various Faculty Awards and Honors. Since its recent expansion, the Council includes an equal number of members from the Norman and Health Science Center Campuses.

The work of the Council, in my opinion, has been quite productive this year. The roster of the faculty on the Council included:

Constance Baker	Alex Kondonassis, Chair
Timothy Coussons	Jack Metcoff
Lowell Dunham	Oscar Parsons
Arrell Gibson	Joseph Rarick
Charlyce King	Kelly West

Report of the University Research Council (Norman campus) for fall semester, 1979, submitted by Dr. Loren G. Hill, Chair, on February 6, 1980:

During the first six months of fiscal year 1980, the Research Council received 47 non-routine applications requesting $96,252.38. The Council recommended funding 36 awards totaling $53,364.35. As of January 1, $32,311.65 remained available for non-routine faculty research awards. Additionally, 45 sets of reprints were purchased for faculty members at a cost of $4,780.81, and another 94 sets costing $7,095 have been ordered.

The Council has continued several programs initiated last year and implemented new programs this year in an attempt to address research needs of the University. Under the Dissertation-Aid Fellowship program, the previous Council selected one student from the School of Music and one from the School of Electrical Engineering and Computing Sciences to receive $4,000 fellowships during FY1980. If this program is continued, the Council will consider new fellowship requests in May, 1980. These fellowships will be awarded on a competitive basis and recipients must devote full time to the completion of their dissertation research.

A companion program which provides Discretionary Aid to graduate students of full-graduate standing has been allocated $3,000 for small grants again this year. To date, 19 applications have been received requesting $5,600, and six awards were recommended totaling $1,579. The remaining funds ($1,421) should be distributed to meritorious applicants in February.

The Junior Faculty Summer Research Fellowship program received 26 applications, and the Council recommended that 13 fellowships be awarded. Twelve fellowships of $2,500 each were funded from the OURI Trust Fund allocations, and President Banowsky and Provost Morris provided $2,500 of special funds to support a thirteenth fellowship.

Initiated this year, the Specialized Research Equipment program was supported by funds from the Vice Provost for Research Administration and Associates funds provided by President Banowsky. Under this program, 19 applications were received from departments on the Norman campus requesting $132,981.75. The Council recommended awards to six departments (Aerospace, Mechanical, and Nuclear Engineering, Biological Station, Chemistry, Electrical Engineering and Computing Sciences, History of Science, and Music) totaling $50,000.

The Council reviewed nominations for George Lynn Cross Research Professorships and forwarded their recommendations to the Provost. Later this year, we will complete a survey on the present levels of activity and support given to these professors and will make recommendations for future funding considerations.

Assuming the University again receives a Biomedical Research Support Grant from the National Institutes of Health, the Council will review applications to this program and make recommendations for awards. If the schedule is similar to previous years, the University grant should be received about April 1, and the individual BRSG awards should be made in May.

The current membership of the Research Council includes the following individuals:

Loren G. Hill, Chair	Arn Henderson	W. G. Steglich
John Biro	Carl E. Locke	Dick van der Helm
Mary Dewey	Morris L. Marx	William Weitzel
Betsy Gunn	Jane Ashley Scroggs	

Report of the Board of Student Publications (Norman campus) for fall semester, 1979, submitted by Professor Ed Carter, Chair, on February 20, 1980:

The decisions to appoint a full-time yearbook supervisor and to adopt a more traditional format have been successful in placing the SOONER yearbook on more solid footing. Student participation has doubled from the previous year, and all production deadlines were met. Yearbook sales at the end of the semester totaled approximately 2,500, compared with 1,900 the previous year.

An IBM Series I computer was added to the Student Publications operation in September. Although it is still being implemented, the accounts receivable and report writing programs have been completed.

A Student Publications Open House was held on December 7. It was very successful in introducing the University community to the Student Publications operation and in generating student interest in Student Publications.

Uncontrollable material and supply costs increased by more than 15 percent during the first six months of the fiscal year. This situation is expected to worsen during the second six-month period, and Student Publications is expected to complete the fiscal year with very little margin.

Council membership included faculty members L. Edward Carter and John Renner.

REPORT OF SENATE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

Professor Barbara Lewis, Senate Chair, reported on the following recent activities of the Senate Executive Committee:

Meeting with President Banowsky regarding his possible candidacy for U.S. Senate: At its own initiative, the Senate Executive Committee met with President Banowsky on February 12 concerning speculations about his running for the U.S. Senate this year. The Committee conveyed to him their impression that the general feeling among the Norman campus faculty is that the best interests of this University would be served if he were to continue as President. This visit was not an attempt either to apply pressure on the President, to force him in any way to make a decision, or to affect the timing of his anticipated announcement in this matter. President Banowsky told the Committee members that he had not yet made up his mind and expressed his appreciation for the Committee's views.

Professor Lewis reported that President Banowsky had called her last Friday, March 14, to report that he had just decided not to become a candidate for the U.S. Senate. In the ensuing conversation, he expressed his commitment to the University and his feeling that he should remain in his present position. He further requested that she convey to the Senate and the faculty his sincere appreciation for the faculty support.

Presentation of faculty/staff petition concerning 12% pay raise, 1980-81: On February 14, Dr. Dorothy Foster, Chair of the Employee Executive Council, Norman campus, and the Senate Chair presented to the President of the University and to the President of the University Board of Regents the joint faculty/staff petition concerning the announced goal of a 12 percent salary increase for 1980-81. At that time, Mr. K.D. Bailey, President of the Regents, stated that the faculty and the staff had the full support of the University Regents. In his opinion, all that is needed now is the support of the State Legislature. (See page 5 of the Journal for Feb. 11, 1980) (See page 12 of this Journal for letter text.)

AAUP solicitation of contributions: Professor Lewis, Senate Chair, relayed the request of Professor Stanley Eliason, President of the local chapter of AAUP, for faculty voluntary contributions to help that group in its task of providing copies of its annual report on Norman campus faculty salaries. Any such contributions should be sent to Professor Jean McDonald (Political Science), Secretary-Treasurer of the AAUP chapter.

Election of Senate members, Senate Executive Committee: Professor Lewis announced that, after consulting with the other Senate officers, she had decided to schedule for the May 5 Senate meeting the election of Senate members to serve on the Senate Executive Committee, 1980-81. This procedure, authorized by Senate By-Laws, will enable the Executive Committee to organize itself during the summer in readiness for the approaching fall semester.

UOSA representatives: Professor Lewis reported the recent appointment of the following four University of Oklahoma Student Association representatives to the Faculty Senate: Todd Graham, Mark Heldenbrand, Annetta Hill, and Debby Parr.

The letter of notification from Mr. Richard Wintory, UOSA President, indicated that these appointments had been made sometime ago but that the announcement had been delayed because of some administrative breakdown in communication.

FINAL REPORT: Norman campus survey of faculty views regarding salary issues.

Background information: During January, the Senate Committee on Faculty Welfare conducted a mail-questionnaire survey of Norman campus faculty views regarding salary issues. (See page 3 of the Senate Journal for January 14, 1980.)

. ofessor Gary Thompson, Committee Chair, presented a preliminary report at the February 11 meeting of the Senate. (See page 5 of the Senate Journal for February 11, 1980.) At that time, he promised a final tabulation of the survey results at the next Senate meeting.

Senate action: Professor Thompson formally presented the final tabulation of the results of the Norman campus survey, with a 60+ percent return. He noted that the Committee did not have an "official" interpretation of the results and urged Senate and faculty members to make their own "personal" interpretations.

He moved that the final tabulation be forwarded to President William S. Banowsky and Provost J. R. Morris. Without dissent, the Senate approved the motion. (For the text of the final report, see page 13 of this Journal.)

PROPOSED REVISIONS OF TITLE/CHARGE: Senate Committee on Faculty Welfare

Background information: For the past several months, the Senate Faculty Welfare Committee has been studying proposals for changing its title and charge. (See page 5 of the Senate Journal for December 10, 1979.)

In advance of this meeting, copies of the Committee's proposed revisions were distributed to Senate members.

Senate action: Professor Thompson, Committee Chair, formally presented the Committee's proposal for revising the title and the charge of that Committee, which, according to Senate By-Laws, must be tabled for one month.

Considerable discussion ensued. Professor Davis repeatedly urged that a separate committee be established to consider other non-economic areas, particularly faculty rights and responsibilities. In his view, some type of a "watchdog committee" is needed to look after various aspects of tenure, particularly pertinent changes that seemingly are published "mysteriously" in the Faculty Handbook without first being discussed in the Senate.

Mr. Ray, Provost's Office representative, agreed that a standing, "oversight" committee might be an effective way to ensure publication of such items in the Faculty Handbook only after appropriate coordination with the Faculty Senate.

Professor Lewis stated that a Senate ad hoc Committee (representing faculty, staff, and the Provost's Office) is currently studying proposals for dealing with professional conduct. That Committee, however, is not yet ready to issue its report.

Professors Saxon, Kunesh, and Rinear also offered comments about the Committee charge.

The consensus was that the Executive Committee should study this question and prepare appropriate changes in the Faculty Welfare Committee's proposal. Professor Lewis agreed to this procedure and promised to have appropriate recommendations for Senate consideration at the April 14 meeting.

SCHOOL OF MUSIC ACTIONS: Proposed Annual Faculty Professional Activities and Evaluation Record

Background information: On March 4, 1980, the Dean of the College of Fine Arts distributed to the faculty of that College a "working draft" of a campus-wide "Annual Faculty Professional Activities and Evaluation Record" prepared by the following ad hoc Committee of the Dean's Council: Deans William Upthegrove (Engineering), Chair, James Burwell (A&S), Richard Wisniewski (Education), and Nat Eek (Fine Arts).

The form was devised to meet the following stipulations:

(a) adhere to current Faculty Handbook policy,
(b) not conflict with current college or school policy,
(c) be a peer evaluation within the unit, normally Committee A,
(d) be a one-page document,
(e) provide for specific assignment and job descriptions, and
(f) provide both quantitative and verbal evaluations.

This ad hoc Committee recommended that the form be used this spring on a trial basis with subsequent recommendations for a final form next spring.

Dean Eek added the following comments in his memorandum of March 4:

"Unfortunately, whether we like it or not, faculty and group litigation over merit increases, promotion, and tenure are forcing the creation of such a form. It is essential that our faculty help develop a form which we all feel we can best live with and which fairly documents a faculty career while assisting Committees A and the administration to make the best judgments in the constant pursuit of faculty and program excellence."

The School of Music on March 5 took the following action, with a unanimous vote, on the above proposal:

(1) That page 2 (all of item II) be deleted, with the departmental Committee A continuing the process of faculty evaluation as it does now and in the immediate past.

(2) That the School of Music Committee A be instructed by the faculty of the School to refuse to use page 2 (all of item II) of the proposed Annual Faculty Professional Activities and Evaluation Record on a trial basis this year.

(3) That the departmental representative to the Faculty Senate be instructed to convey the actions of the School of Music faculty to the Faculty Senate.

(The Fine Arts College evaluation form is reproduced on page 14 of this Journal.)

Senate action: Professor Etheridge formally presented for Senate discussion the action taken by the School of Music. He stressed the apparent lack of faculty input in the formulation of this instrument and felt that some Senate-level dialogue is needed with the Provost's Office. He raised objections to the use of numerical ratings on page 2 of the form in question. The fact that other departments may be using similar forms adds to the need for some dialogue with the Provost's Office to ascertain the extent of use of the form.

Professor Davis countered with the comment that the Fine Arts form, in comparison with the one being used in the Arts and Sciences College, is "a model of lucidity." Professor Caldwell commented that the School of Art had also rejected the form and questioned the term "collegiality." She also objected to the attempt to rate numerically individuals who perform quite different functions.

Mr. Joseph Ray, Associate Provost, volunteered to explain the present status of the form in question. In attempting to ascertain any salary and rank inequities, particularly concerning women and minority groups, the Provost's Office is having a difficult time in assessing differences in performance. The Provost requested the Deans, therefore, to look at this question to see whether they could come up with some sort of summary form that would provide an explicit statement as to how a faculty member came out in that department on the basis of accepted criteria. That evaluation should provide both an opportunity for some kind of numerical designation and some written comments. After submission to the Provost, the instrument would then be ome a topic of discussion with the Faculty Senate. At the moment, obviously, there is no form to consider He reiterated the Provost's desire to seek Faculty Senate reaction and input subsequently.

Professor Kunesh reported that the Dean of Fine Arts discussed the form with the School Directors and all Committee A members. He added that all three Schools had discussed the need for such a form, suggested modifications, and agreed to use the form on a trial basis this year. Noting faculty apprehension about having rankings put on paper, he cautioned against "kidding ourselves that such a ranking does not, in fact, now exist." He expressed a personal preference for using a form rather than "being kept in the dark" about performance ratings.

Professors Pfeister, Rinear, Flowers, Huettner, Covich, Davis, Saxon, and Artman voiced varying objections to either the instrument itself or the procedure. Arts and Sciences ulty representatives made additional negative comments about the different form being used in that College.

At one point, Mr. Ray noted that the Provost's Office, to date, has not issued any statement about implementing the form in question. He indicated their desire to obtain

documentation of any performance evaluations.

According to his recent participation in the ACE conference in Memphis, Professor Kunesh expressed the opinion that one of the major changes in the next decade will be the use of initial contracts that will spell out what the individual faculty member will be expected to do within the department and the university. Promotion and salary increases will be based on the detailed"spelling out of the contract." Contract revisions will also become increasingly important in the future.

Professor John Foster mentioned the Army system of rating individuals numerically and qualitatively through the use of a standard form. In contract situations, each rating period defines the depth of each area of performance. Professor Caldwell commented, "We are dealing with an educational process and with people. The University is different from either business or military organizations."

Subsequently, Professor Flowers moved that an ad hoc Committee be appointed to discuss the question with the Provost and to present appropriate recommendations to the Senate at the next meeting. During the ensuing discussion, Professor Terri Foster offered the substitute motion that an ad hoc Committee study the question and report to the Senate at the next meeting. With one dissenting vote, the Senate approved the substitute motion.

ADJOURNMENT

The Senate adjourned at 5:08 p.m. The next regular session of the Faculty Senate will be held at 3:30 p.m., on Monday, April 14, 1980, in Dale Hall 218.

Respectfully submitted,

Anthony S. Lis

Anthony S. Lis
Professor of
Business Communication
Secretary

Text of letter, February 14, 1980, from the Chairs of the Faculty Senate (Norman campus) and the Employee Executive Council to Dr. William S. Banowsky, University President, and Mr. K.D. Bailey, President, University Regents:

"The Faculty Welfare Committee of the Norman campus Faculty Senate and the Employees Executive Council have recently circulated the following petition among faculty and staff members:

"The retention and the recruitment of a superior faculty and staff are essential to the realization of the University's goal of attaining membership in the prestigious Association of American Universities. The effects of inflation and the inadequate salary raises in past years have caused the faculty and the staff of this University to suffer serious deterioration in living standards and professional morale, have made the recruitment of new faculty and staff more difficult, and have inhibited the achievement of academic excellence.

"Therefore, we, the undersigned faculty and staff on the Norman campus of the University of Oklahoma,

(1) strongly support President William S. Banowsky's announced goal of a minimum 12% average raise for faculty and staff for 1980-81,

(2) strongly support President William S. Banowsky's statement that this goal will have the highest priority on any new funds made available to the University, and

(3) hold that adherence to federal or state guidelines regarding maximum salary increases cannot be justified in the case of the University of Oklahoma bec se of the historically inadequate salary levels."

"The above petition was signed by a total of 670 faculty members and 1482 staff members.

"We are also attaching a report prepared by the Senate Faculty Welfare Committee on the comparative 1977-78 rankings of Oklahoma University faculty salaries, by departments, among 70 member schools of the National Association of State Universities and Land-Gran Colleges, and 2 non-member institutions. This comparison shows that 32 of OU's 38 departments rank in the bottom third and that none rank above the 55 percent level. We hope that this additional information will be of value to you.

"In addition, a report comparing OU staff wages and salaries with the appropriate labor markets is attached.

"The attached petition and the related data are being offered to you at this time to demonstrate support for the University's efforts to obtain the funding to achieve the academic excellence we all seek."

PERFORMANCE/ACHIEVEMENT EVALUATION | Research; 3. Professional Service; 4. University Service; 5. Collegiality | Name _____ (Page 1 of 2)

A. Evaluation of Teaching — Weight ____%

High 7 6 5 Average 4 3 2 Low 1

Rationale:

B. Evaluation of Research or Creative Achievements * — Weight ____%

High 7 6 5 Average 4 3 2 Low 1

Rationale:

The past three years' activity should be considered.

C. Evaluation of Professional Service — Weight ____%

High 7 6 5 Average 4 3 2 Low 1

Rationale:

D. Evaluation of University Service/Other — Weight ____%

High 7 6 5 Average 4 3 2 Low 1

Rationale:

E. Evaluation of Collegiality — Weight ____% (5% or 10%)

High 7 6 5 Average 4 3 2 Low 1

Rationale:

. Evaluation Summary/Overall Performance and Achievement — Weight 1.0%

Weighted Average Score _____

ecommendations:

. Jative Rank: Upper 1/3 __ Middle 1/3 __ Lower 1/3 __ of __ faculty members in budget unit.

valuation completed by _____ Budget Unit Head _____ Committee A Member _____ Committee A Member

pproved: _____ Budget Unit Head _____ Reviewed: _____

March 17, 1980

FINAL TABULATION OF RESULTS: Norman campus faculty salary survey

(Results are expressed as percentages of responses to each category. These figures are based on 440 returned questionnaires, approximately 60 percent of the faculty.)

(1) In general, which one of the following methods would you prefer be used to distribute new money for faculty salary increases?

19.0 (a) Solely on the basis of merit.

11.5 (b) Across the board to all faculty, regardless of merit.

32.1 (c) 1/2 on the basis of merit and about 1/2 across the board.

23.7 (d) 2/3 on the basis of merit and about 1/3 across the board.

13.8 (e) 1/3 on the basis of merit and about 2/3 across the board.

(2) Which distribution method would you prefer if the amount of the new money allocated for the 1980-81 salary increase were:

	Type of distribution				
	(a) merit	(b) across board	(c) ½ merit; ½ across board	(d) 2/3 merit; 1/3 across board	(e) 1/3 merit; 2/3 across board
Less then 5% of the 1979-80 salary total	26.5	50.7	12.9	5.3	4.6
Between 5-10% of the 1979-80 salary total	18.2	21.4	34.2	16.2	10.7
Greater than 10% of the 1979-80 salary total	16.1	9.4	29.4	32.0	13.1

(3) If all or part of the new money were to be distributed across the board, would you prefer to add to each faculty member's salary:

51.0 (a) A percentage of his/her present salary,
or

49.0 (b) An equal dollar amount?

(4) Give your rank order (1,2,3, etc.) of the following individuals or groups that, in your opinion, should have the most to say about the amount of merit increase given to each faculty member:

(weighted average of responses to each category)

2.98 The faculty member's entire department

2.20 The chair (head of the budget unit)

1.57 Committee "A"

3.12 The budget dean (when distinct from head of budget unit)

4.40 The Provost

5.63 The President

6.30 The Board of Regents

(5) What has been your personal experience concerning the allocation of salary increases:

	Usually fair	Open to improvement	Usually unfair	No opinion
(a) The criteria used in salary decisions	44.0	40.6	11.7	3.7
(b) The process for distributing funds within your budget unit	44.6	37.6	14.7	3.0
(c) The distribution of funds within your college	23.8	40.9	20.2	15.0
(d) The distribution of funds among all colleges on campus	7.2	41.1	24.3	27.5
(e) Treatment given your individual case in the distribution of funds	51.0	31.2	13.8	4.0