JOURNAL OF THE FACULTY SENATE (Norman campus)
The University of Oklahoma
Regular session -- January 19, 1981 -- 3:30 p.m., Physical Sciences Center 108

The Faculty Senate was called to order by Professor Greg Kunesh, Chairperson.

Present:

Baker	El-Ibiary	Kiacz	Patten	Unguru
Biro	Etheridge	Kunesh	Pfiester	Vardys
Brown, H.	Flowers	Lehr	Rinear	Wainner
Brown, S.	Gabert	Lindstrom	Rowe	Ward
Carpenter	Graves	Lis	Self	Welch
Covich	Hardy	Locke	Smith	West
Cozad	Hayes	Menzie	Sorey	Whitmore
Davis	Hibdon	Moriarity	Thompson	Wispe
Eick	Karriker			

Provost's Office representative: Ray

PSA representatives: Guyer, Eichenfield, Little, Edwards

Absent:

Catlin	Dunn	Foster, T.	Kantowski	Neely
Cheung	Foster, J.	Hebert	Lanning	Scherman
Christy				

PSA representative: Cowen

TABLE OF CONTENTS

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

The Journal of the Faculty Senate for the regular session on December 8, 1980, was approved with the following correction requested by Dr. Carl Locke:

Page 2, second paragraph (Faculty Role in Athletics Council Decisions)

from: "He noted that two years ago one of his students had to miss the final examination because of the men's basketball team schedule . . . . ."

to: "He noted that two years ago one of his students had to miss the final examination because of the women's basketball team schedule . . . . ."

ACTIONS TAKEN BY PRESIDENT WILLIAM S. BANOWSKY

(1) University Copyright Policy: On November 14, President William S. Banowsky notified the Chairs of both Senates that the University Regents on November 13, 1980, had approved the University Copyright Policy as proposed by both Senates. He also indicated that the new policy would become effective immediately and requested both Senates to submit their nominations for the faculty vacancies on the new University Copyright Committee. (Please see page 2 of the Senate Journal for November 10, 1980.)

(2) Selection of faculty replacements: On December 16, President Banowsky selected the following replacements from the nominations submitted to him by the Senate for the faculty vacancies listed below:

Faculty Awards and Honors Council: John Pulliam
University Judicial Tribunal: Hugh Jeffers
Academic Regulations Committee: Rosetta Jordan
Commencement Committee: Carol Carey
University Employment Benefits Committee: William Eick

(Please see page 4 of the Senate Journal for December 8, 1980.)

(3) Schedules of athletic teams: On January 5, President Banowsky acknowledged receipt of the Senate's message of concern over the athletic teams' scheduling procedures and policies. (Please see page 5 of the Senate Journal for December 8, 1980, and two items immediately following.)

ACTION TAKEN BY SENATE OFFICERS: Schedules of athletic teams.

In accordance with Senate instructions, the Senate officers prepared the following communication for submission to President William S. Banowsky on December 16.

At the December 8, 1980, meeting of the Faculty Senate, several questions were raised concerning the University athletic teams' scheduling procedures and policies. The Senate approved, without dissent, a motion directing the Senate officers to communicate to you its concerns in this matter.

Expressing dismay over current athletic schedules that go far beyond published University guidelines and policies, the Faculty Senate strongly objects to the recent decisions of the Athletics Council in approving team schedules that either call for excessive absences from classes (one-fourth of the semester in one case) or conflict with regularly scheduled final examinations. In fact, for the past

three years, the men's basketball team scheduled games during the final examination period.

A growing concern is evident among the faculty on this campus regarding the administration, scheduling, and control of intercollegiate athletics. Unless some action is taken in the near future to reverse the trend, assuage these concerns, and answer some of these questions, there may well be a call for an in-depth investigation regarding these matters.

In a separate action at the December 8 meeting, the Senate also directed its Executive Committee to investigate the role of the faculty in the decision-making process of the Athletics Council, particularly in view of the non-voting status of the faculty chair and the lack of faculty alternates.

In the midst of the University's renewed commitment to quality education, the faculty is raising some legitimate and serious questions about the universality of that commitment and goal.

- -

Copies of the above message were sent to Provost J. R. Morris, as well as the Chair and the Vice Chair of the University Athletics Council.

(Please see page 5 of the Senate Journal for December 8, 1980, as well as the item immediately preceding and the item immediately following.)

REMARKS BY SENATE CHAIR: Administration's reactions to Senate communication of December 16, 1980, concerning athletic schedules.

Dr. Greg Kunesh, Senate Chair, commented on the administration's prompt and multi-faceted reactions to the Senate communication of December 16 (see the two items immediately preceding) concerning schedules of athletic teams.

"During my four years on this Senate, I have never seen such a prompt response and action on the part of the administration to a communication," he said.

President Banowsky has informed the Chair of the Athletics Council that the Regents had always intended that all faculty members of the Council (including the Chair) vote on all issues.

Vice Provost Weber on December 22, 1980, wrote to Mr. Wade Walker, Director of Athletics, "I think your personal assurance that such a situation will not be repeated is really quite critical." Vice Provost Weber noted in his letter that he had conferred with Coach Tubbs in this matter and that Director Walker last year had "instructed all head coaches that such conflicts were to be avoided."

In his response the following day, Mr. Walker "apologized for the situation that has drawn so much attention from the faculty and the Faculty Senate." He added that the Athletic Department "will be very aware of scheduled contests during the exam periods."

ANNOUNCEMENT: Senate replacement, College of Arts and Science.

Professor Lauren Wispe (Communication) has been selected to complete the unexpired portion of the 1979-82 term of Professor David Whitney as a Senate representative of the College of Arts and Sciences.

SENATE PROPOSAL: Faculty alternates, Athletics Council

The Senate Chair noted that the only remaining item in this matter is the lack of any faculty alternates on the Athletics Council, whereas both the students and the alumni have two alternates authorized to vote in the absence of the appointed members. In the case of the controversial Council approval of the basketball team's schedule, the faculty was not in the majority.

Dr. Kunesh reported receiving a telephone call recently from Ms. Barbara James, Executive Secretary, University Regents, concerning the issue of the Athletics Council. He received the impression that the administration and the Regents "would be more than pleased to have a hearing on any Senate recommendation regarding faculty alternates on that Council."

Professor Rinear then moved that the University document, Structure, Descriptions, Charter, and Purposes of University and Campus Councils, Committees, and Boards appointed by the President (dated June 28, 1978), be amended as follows:

Adding the underscored words on page 15 (Athletics Council):

"MEMBERSHIP: 5 Faculty Members (including the chairman)
and 5 Faculty Alternates."

Without further discussion, the Senate approved the motion without dissent.

REPORT ON SENATE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE MEETING WITH PROVOST J. R. MORRIS

Professor Greg Kunesh, Senate Chair, reported on the Executive Committee meeting on January 16 with Provost J.R. Morris.

Proposed Honors College: An Advisory Task Force has been appointed with four of its members selected from the Academic Program Council membership. Professor Ray Dacey is chairing the Task Force that is expected to submit its final report to Provost Morris late in the summer session.

Budget, 1981-82: The administration remains committed to the 12 percent salary raise. Professor Kunesh added, "Until we hear differently as we get closer to the final allocations, we should support the administration."

Proposed revision of Academic Misconduct Code: Provost Morris mentioned this topic to the Committee. Associate Provost Joseph Ray briefed the Senate on the activities in the Provost's Office concerning a proposed "streamlining of the Code" that will not only preserve the students' rights but also provide a "straight forward and swift procedure" for settling such matters. Because of the extremely complicated procedure detailed in the current policy, apparently many are hesitant to become involved in this process. Five individuals are now working on the project whose aim is to produce a one-page policy with an additional one-page flow chart.

The final proposal will be cleared with the Chief Legal Counsel before presentation by the Provost to both the Deans Council and the Faculty Senate.

REPORT OF SENATE COMMITTEE ON COMMITTEES

Professor Gary Thompson, Committee Chair, reported on the following items:

Administrative Search Committees: Originally, the Committee on Committees planned to present to the Senate at this meeting its recommendation concerning the formation of administrative search committees on this campus. However, the Senate Chair and the Chair-elect attended the President's staff meeting this morning (January 19), at which time this topic was discussed at some length. Consensus appeared to be that the better approach in this matter would be to form a joint committee consisting of administration, Senate, and EEC representatives and charged with the responsibility of writing a completely new set of procedures for search committees for provosts, vice presidents, and deans. Subsequently, the proposed policy will be submitted to the Faculty Senate, as well as the Employee Executive Council, for appropriate review and recommendation. The various administrative offices have valid and varied constituencies; consequently, because of inherent difficulties, formulating a search policy has proved to be rather difficult. Hopefully, the final report of the joint committee will be ready for presentation to the Seante at the March 16 meeting.

Proposed University Policy on Unprofessional Conduct: According to a recent communication from President Banowsky, the administration's review of the proposed policy will be high on its priorities this summer. Provost Morris, at his meeting with the Senate Executive Committee last week, reported some of the administration's apprehensions about the proposal in its present form. Some modifications can be expected when the proposal is returned to the Senate this spring.

The American Council on Education is sponsoring a pertinent workshop in Memphis on Monday, February 9. Two representatives from the Provost's Office will attend that meeting, along with Professor Teree Foster (Law), who will be joining the group as a Senate representative in response to Provost Morris' invitation.

REPORT OF SENATE COMMITTEE ON FACULTY COMPENSATION

Professor William Eick, Committee Chair, reported on plans to conduct a mail-questionnaire survey early in February of Norman campus faculty concerning salary and fringe benefits issues. The questionnaire will be a composite of items submitted by the Senate Faculty Welfare and Faculty Compensation Committees, including the so-called tax-sheltering of OTRS contributions. The Committee is securing pertinent information from the University Employment Benefits Committee.

REPORT OF SENATE COMMITTEE ON FACULTY WELFARE

Professor Stephen Whitmore, Committee Chair, commented on the following topics:

Mail questionnaire - Norman faculty survey: Referring to the composite questionnaire mentioned earlier by Professor Eick of the Senate Committee on Faculty Compensation, Professor Whitmore reported that one item to be included by his Committee will be the question of dental care plan.

The questionnaire will outline a representative dental care plan and will solicit faculty reactions to four choices.

Copies of a few existing plans are being placed on file in the Faculty Senate Office (OMU 242 - 5-6789) for faculty perusal and study.

Professor Whitmore noted that, if a dental care plan is to materialize on this campus, strong faculty interest and support will be required. In his view, employees are generally either apathetic or indifferent about this issue. He urged interested faculty members to encourage colleagues to express their support.

Early retirement plans: The Committee is continuing its deliberations of proposals for early retirement of faculty. Professor Whitmore reiterated his request for faculty input.

SELECTION OF FACULTY REPLACEMENTS

In accepting the slate presented by its Committee on Committees, the Senate selected by acclamation the following faculty replacements:

Elections:

Academic Personnel Council: Alan Nicewander (Psychology)
replacing R. E. L. Richardson, 1979-82

Administrative and Physical Resources Council: Robert Lusch (Marketing)
replacing Victor Hutchison, 1978-81

Nominations:

Athletics Council: Jim Artman (Modern Languages) and
Jim Estes (Botany)
replacing John Radovich, 1980-83

University Copyright Committee: (two new positions, 1981-84)

Joseph Long (Law) and
Leo Whinery (Law)

Paul Tharp (Political Science) and
Dick Van Der Helm (Chemistry)

SENATE INVITATION: Provost J. R. Morris' appearance before the Senate concerning the proposed Honors College

Professor Baker called attention to the apparent lack of either background or current information for the faculty concerning the proposed Honors College on this campus. In his opinion, the faculty needs some orientation for following subsequent developments in this matter. He suggested that the Senate extend a formal invitation to Provost J. R. Morris to address the Faculty Senate at the next meeting, if possible. The Provost's remarks could well include the rationale of the proposal, as well as some historical perspective and expectations for such a project.

There was consensus in the Senate that Provost J. R. Morris be invited formally to address the Senate at its next meeting on February 9.

PROPOSAL FOR MASUA EXCHANGE PROGRAM: Out-of-state tuition waivers, faculty dependents

Background information: The Senate Committee on Faculty Welfare has been considering a proposal for a Mid-America State Universities Association (MASUA) exchange program for waiving out-of-state tuition for faculty dependents. (Please see page 4 of the Senate Journal for December 8, 1980.)

The Committee has contacted the chairs of comparable committees at other institutions and has received favorable reactions from them.

This topic was mentioned to Provost Morris at the recent Senate Executive Committee meeting. He volunteered to check into this matter (if approved by the Senate at this meeting) at a MASUA Council meeting in Kansas City within a few days.

Copies of the following proposal of the Committee were distributed at this meeting:

The Mid-America State Universities Association (MASUA) sponsors the following three programs designed to stimulate interaction among the faculty and the students of member institutions: the Honor Lecturers, the Distinguished Foreign Scholars, and the Traveling Scholars Programs.

This proposal for a new program would have the same effect by providing out-of-state tuition waivers for faculty dependents from member institutions. Under the proposed program, dependents of faculty at one university would be permitted to enroll as full-time students at another university, if qualified for admission, and would pay the in-state tuition at the host institution. The host institution would waive the out-of-state tuition for those students. Such a program would directly stimulate student exchange within the Association and would also encourage faculty interest in the educational programs at other member universities.

The program would also be of direct benefit to the students involved. For some faculty children, there is a disadvantage in attending an institution at which one or both of their parents teach. This proposed program would enable such students to go to college away from home without having to pay the premium of either the out-of-state tuition or the tuition at a private university. The program can also be construed as a fringe benefit to the faculty at no cost to the institution.

Obviously, such a program would require the cooperation of several institutions and their governing boards. MASUA provides a natural vehicle for its implementation. Perhaps at a later date, other state universities could be included.

A method could be found for ensuring an approximately equal exchange over a period of time among the several member institutions. A tuition-exchange program among private colleges and universities has operated successfully since 1954 and now includes about 180 schools. This proposal for a similar program within MASUA would benefit students and faculty in public higher education.

Senate action: Professor Whitmore moved approval of the Committee proposal. Professor Biro asked whether other institutions would be allowed to join such an exchange program. In response, Professor Whitmore expressed the hope that other schools would be welcome to join the program. Expressing support, Professor Davis urged that the existing organization be utilized to the greatest extent possible rather than forming a new group.

Without dissent, the Senate approved the proposal to be forwarded to President Banowsky and Provost Morris.

PROGRESS REPORT: Joint Committee preparing form for evaluating faculty performance.

Professor Alan Covich reported on the deliberations of the joint Deans Council and Faculty Senate Committee preparing a proposed University form for evaluating faculty performance. (Please see page 4 of the Senate Journal for December 8, 1980.) The fifth meeting of that group was scheduled for the following week.

The required evaluation of faculty performance was begun in 1976. Budgetary units give annual reviews on a department-by-department basis. Last year, Provost J. R. Morris indicated a desire for some type of standardized University form that could be used for such evaluations at the departmental level.

The Committee has completed a survey of current practices at the other Big Eight institutions. Oklahoma State and Iowa State Universities have submitted copies of their comprehensive University-wide forms. Those copies are available for faculty perusal in the Faculty Senate Office (Oklahoma Memorial Union 242 - telephone 5-6789).

In Professor Covich's opinion, the proposed form will not be as comprehensive as the OSU and ISU models. The Committee is striving to produce a one-page summary sheet that will give the relative ranking of each faculty member within that member's department in the areas of teaching, research, and service on the basis of departmental criteria used in recommendations for merit raises. The form will be a "relatively simple one" so that the faculty member concerned may know where he or she stands and what specifically needs improvement. He feels that there is a need to improve communication between Committe "A" and the faculty of the department. The form will not be intended for any type of faculty comparisons outside the department concerned. To emphasize the intended intradepartmental use, phrases like "for your department" and "for this unit" will be used.

Professor Covich reported the Committee's difficulty in finding suitable and satisfactory terms to reflect faculty ranking. Such words as "above average/average/below average" and "mean/median" have been considered.

The evaluation form will not be ready for use this spring. The final proposal will be brought to the Faculty Senate for its consideration and approval.

Associate Provost Ray commented that the proposed form will "substantiate and support peer reviews" and will not be intended for use in University-wide comparisons of faculty members. He added, "We are not suggesting that numbers be made a part of the form."

Professor Moriarity suggested that departments be given the option to use any type of numbering scheme desired.

PROPOSED SENATE RESOLUTION: OMU booth policy.

Background information: At its November 10 session, the Senate tabled a resolution offered by Professor Davis to protest the recent change in the Oklahoma Memorial Union policy regarding lower-lobby booths in the Union. (Please see page 28 of the Senate Journal for November 10, 1980.) Because Professor Davis was not present, the question was not raised at the December 8 Senate meeting.

Senate action: Professor Davis noted that after the December 8 session a "very elaborate" solution had been worked out to the satisfaction of the campus First Amendment Committee. In his opinion, the two situations last semester could have been avoided. He asked that this question remain on the table should circumstances warrant further consideration in the future.

DISSOLUTION OF SENATE ad hoc COMMITTEE ON INTERDISCIPLINARY PROGRAMS

Background information: During 1979-80, several Senate ad hoc Committees were appointed to study areas of particular concern to the Norman faculty. One of those areas was the uestion of interdisciplinary courses and programs. (See page 6, Journal, Arpil 14, 1980)

Senate action: Professor Tom Sorey, Committee Chair, reported that last semester, Dr. Kenneth L. Hoving, University Graduate Dean, had mailed to all faculty members a "taxonomy of interests" questionnaire. In the opinion of the ad hoc Committee, Dean Hoving's action indicated an administrative awareness of the increasing need for "dealing with problems from an interdisciplinary perspective." Futhermore, the Committee feels that, inasmuch as this is the kind of action that the Committee was trying to accomplish, there is no reason for the Committee to continue to function. Professor Sorey recommended that the Committee be dissolved. The Senate approved without dissent Professor Rinear's motion to dissolve that Committee.

PROPOSED STANDARDIZATION OF CRITERIA: Faculty Personnel Policy

Background information: On January 5, 1981, Provost John R. Morris requested Faculty Senate consideration of his recommendation for correcting an inconsistency in the Faculty Personnel Policy.

Section 3.7.4 (tenure criteria) requires academic units to develop criteria with the participation of the unit and the approval of the Dean and the Provost. On the other hand, Section 3.10 (faculty evaluation, advancement in salary, and promotion in rank) requires that a systematic procedure for accomplishing such evaluations be developed in each college by the Provost working with the deans and the academic units and approved by the President. Final approval, therefore, is to be given by the Provost in tenure cases and by the President in the other instances.

In actual practice, departments develop all criteria for tenure, advancement, and promotion in one document approved by the dean and the Provost. In Provost Morris' opinion, this procedure makes sense because the criteria are very closely related.

To make both statements alike, Provost Morris recommended that the third sentence of Section 3.10 be changed by substituting the underscored words for those deleted, as follows:

> "A systematic procedure for accomplishing such evaluations shall be developed in each ~~college by the Provost working with the deans and the academic units and approved by the President~~ academic unit, with the participation and approval of the dean and the Provost."

Senate action: The Senate Chair formally presented the recommendation of the Senate Executive Committee that this proposal be approved. The Senate approved the proposed standardization in a voice vote without dissent.

ADJOURNMENT

The Faculty Senate adjourned at 4:45 p.m. The next session of the Senate will be held at 3:30 p.m., on Monday, March 16, 1981, in Physical Sciences Center 108.

Respectfully submitted,

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