

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

Regular session -- May 4, 1981 -- 3:30 p.m., Physical Sciences Center 108.

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

Present:

Baker(0)	Dunn(0)	Graves(0)	Lehr(0)	Rinear(0)
Biro (1)	Eick(0)	Hardy(0)	Lindstrom(0)	Rowe(0)
Brown, H.(0)	El-Ibiary(0)	Hayes(0)	Lis(0)	Self(0)
Brown, S.(0)	Etheridge(1)	Hebert(0)	Menzie(0)	Smith(1)
Carpenter(0)	Flowers(0)	Hibdon(0)	Moriarity(0)	Thompson(0)
Cheung(0)	Foster, J.(1)	Karriker(0)	Murphy(0)	Ward(0)
Cozad(0)	Foster, T.(1)	Kunesh(0)	Neely(2)	Welch(0)
Davis(0)	Gabert(0)	Lanning(0)	Patten(0)	West(0)
			Pfiester(1)	Whitmore(0)

Provost's office representative: Ray

PSA representatives: Cowen Edwards Eichenfield  
Guyer

Absent:

Catlin(4)	Kiacz(3)	Scherman(1)	Unguru(0)	Wainner(3)
Christy(1)	Locke(2)	Sorey(0)	Vardys(2)	Wispe(1)
Covich(2)				

UOSA representatives: Graham Lee

PSA representatives: Clinkenbeard Little

(NOTE: The numbers in parentheses indicate the total number of faculty absences during the 1980-81 academic year when 9 regular and 2 special sessions were held.)

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Actions taken by President Banowsky:	
✓ Program discontinuance, HSC . . . . .	2
✓ Revisions, Admin./Physical Resources and Budget Councils . . . . .	2
✓ Tax sheltering of OTRS contributions . . . . .	2
✓ Academic Misconduct Code . . . . .	2
✓ Dental insurance plan . . . . .	2
✓ Dissolution of the Academic Personnel Council . . . . .	3
✓ Voting Eligibility: May 4 session . . . . .	3
✓ Faculty Replacements: end-of-year vacancies, University groups . . . . .	3
✓ Report of Senate Committee on Faculty Compensation . . . . .	6
✓ Election of replacements: Senate Standing Committees . . . . .	8
✓ Follow-up Report III: "1981 Faculty Position Papers"	
Academic Standards . . . . .	10
Budgetary Priorities . . . . .	13
Educational Priorities . . . . .	15
University Governance . . . . .	18
✓ Proposed Sexual Harassment Grievance Procedure (Norman campus) . . . . .	19
✓ Proposal for joint OSU/OU faculty study: foreign-language requirement . . . . .	28
✓ Presentation of certificates to Senators completing three-year terms . . . . .	28
✓ Election of Senate Chair-Elect, 1981-82 . . . . .	28
✓ Re-election of Senate Secretary, 1981-82 . . . . .	28
✓ Resolution of appreciation: outgoing Senate Chair . . . . .	29

## APPROVAL OF MINUTES

The Senate Journal for the regular session on March 16, 1981, was approved.

## ACTIONS TAKEN BY PRESIDENT WILLIAM S. BANOWSKY

- (1) Program discontinuance, HSC: On March 19, President Banowsky acknowledged receipt, without comment, of the Senate resolution of March 16, 1981, concerning the proposed discontinuance of two HSC programs. (Please see page 13 of the Senate Journal for March 16, 1981.)
- (2) Revisions, Administrative/Physical Resources and Budget Councils: On April 10, President Banowsky approved the Senate proposal for changing the title and the charge of the Administrative and Physical Resources Council, as well as the charge of the Budget Council, effective July 1, 1981. (Please see pages 8 and 9 of the Senate Journal for March 16, 1981.)
- (3) Tax sheltering of OTRS contributions: On March 26, President Banowsky acknowledged, without comment, receipt of the Senate proposal to tax shelter the Oklahoma Teacher Retirement System contributions. (Please see page 9 of the Senate Journal for March 16, 1981.)
- (4) Academic Misconduct Code: On April 14, 1981, President Banowsky responded to the Senate's approval of the Academic Misconduct Code with the following letter to the Senate Chair: (Please see pages 12-15 of the Senate Journal for the special session on March 30, 1981.)

"Professor Lis has sent me the action of the Norman Faculty Senate concerning the proposed revision of the Academic Misconduct Code for the Norman campus excluding Law. I am delighted that the Senate recommends approval of this major revision.

"We have incorporated the changes proposed by the Faculty Senate and have made a few other changes of an editorial nature to make the policy read more smoothly and accurately.

"Under the terms of the Oklahoma Administrative Procedures Act, the Code will be published in the Oklahoma Gazette with a waiting period of twenty days and a hearing before being presented to the University Regents for adoption at their May meeting. This schedule will permit us to put the Code into effect, assuming Regents' approval, with the 1981-82 academic year.

"For your records, a copy of the proposed revision that incorporates the Senate's changes, together with the editorial modifications, which I understand Associate Provost Ray has discussed informally with Professor Lis, is attached.

"Again, thank you for the Senate's help."

- (5) Dental insurance plan: President Banowsky addressed the following message to the Senate Secretary on April 17, 1981:

"I have asked Mr. Leonard Harper, Chair of the University Employment Benefits Committee, to have the Committee investigate the implications of the dental program suggested by the Faculty Senate. Hopefully, we will receive their review in the not too distant future."

(Please see pages 6 and 7 of the Senate Journal for March 16, 1981.)

(6) Dissolution of the Academic Personnel Council: President Banowsky, on April 23, acknowledged receipt, without comment, of the Senate recommendation for dissolving the Academic Personnel Council. (Please see page 5 of the Senate Journal for April 13, 1981.)

VOTING ELIGIBILITY: May 4 session

Professor Kuresh, Senate Chair, reported that the Senate Executive Committee had invited the incoming members of the 1981-82 Senate to attend this session to acquaint themselves with Senate personnel and procedures. He next introduced those incoming Senators who had accepted that invitation and were present at this session.

He then suggested that only the members of the 1980-81 Senate be allowed to vote on matters brought before the Senate at this meeting. Professor Moriarity made a motion to that effect. With one dissenting vote, the Senate approved the motion.

SELECTION OF FACULTY REPLACEMENTS: End-of-year vacancies,  
University groups

Dr. Thompson, Chair, Senate Committee on Committees, next presented that Committee's slate of faculty nominees to fill end-of-year vacancies on various University councils, committees, and so forth. Additional nominations were made from the floor.

Voting by written ballot, the Senate selected the following individuals for the vacancies designated below:

ELECTIONS

Academic Program Council

Gwenn Davis (English) 1981-84	)	replacing	Raymond Dacey
Hillel Kumin (Ind Engr) 1981-84	:		Mary Jo Nye
Benjamin Taylor (Economics) 1981-84	)		Richard Wells
Jay C. Smith (Education) 1981-83	:		Loy Prickett

Budget Council

Travis Goggans (Acctg) 1981-84	)	replacing	L. Doyle Bishop
Beverly Joyce (Univ Libs) 1981-84	:		Trent Gabert
Jeff Kimpel (Meteorology) 1981-84	)		Mary Esther Saxon
Ronald Evans (Petrol Engr) 1981-82	:		Eddie Smith

Committee on Discrimination

Ann Hamilton (Univ Libs) 1981-84	)	replacing	Rosario Galura
Robert Spector (Law) 1981-84	:		Theodore Robinson
Donna Young (Architecture) 1981-84	)		Dan Timmons

Faculty Advisory Committee to President

Sidney Brown (History) 1981-83	)	replacing	Homer Brown
John Catlin (Classics) 1981-83	:		Lenore Clark
Penny Hopkins (Zoology) 1981-83	:		Sarah Crim
Leale Streebin (Civ Engr) 1981-83	)		Anthony S. Lis

Faculty Appeals Board

James Abbott (Mod Lang) 1981-85	)	replacing	Susan Caldwell
Abel Aly (Ind Engr) 1981-85	)		John Catlin
Yousif El-Ibiary (Elec Engr) 1981-85	)		Sarah Crim
Raymond Daniels (Chem Engr) 1981-85	)		James Goodman
Norman Fogel (Chemistry) 1981-85	:		Laverne Hoag
David Gross (English) 1981-85	:		C. Ned Hockman
Claren Kidd (Univ Libs) 1981-85	)		Lois Pfeister
Edwin Klehr (CEES) 1981-85	)		V. Stanley Vardys
John Lancaster (Bot/Micro) 1981-85	)		David Whitney
David Morgan (Pol Science) 1981-85	)		Lloyd Williams
Janet Bentz (Human Rels) 1981-82	:		Lowell Dunham
Susan Caldwell (Art) 1981-82	:		Harold Huneke
Fred Silberstein (Sociology) 1981-83	:		Frances Dunham
Thomas Wiggins (Education) 1981-83	:		Mary Esther Saxon

Faculty Awards/Honors Council

L. Doyle Bishop (Management) 1981-84	:	replacing	Arrell Gibson
Seymour Feiler (Mod Lang) 1981-84	:		John Pulliam

Physical Resources/Campus Planning Council (Norman)

Wayland Bowser (Architecture) 1981-84	)	replacing	Floyd Calvert
James Goodman (Geography) 1981-84	:		Jeanne Howard
Jeanne Howard (Univ Libs) 1981-84	)		Robert Lusch

Research Council

Charles Bert (AMNE) 1981-84	)	replacing	Leonard Beevers
N. Jack Kanak (Psychology) 1981-84	:		Joakim Laguros
Henry Tobias (History) 1981-84	)		Morris Marx

## NOMINATIONS

Academic Regulations Committee

Stephen Anderson (Soc Work) 1981-85	)	replacing	Richard Gipson
Harvey Blatt (Geology) 1981-85	:		Neal Huffaker
Allan Gold (Architecture) 1981-85	:		
Timothy Schroeder (HPER) 1981-85	)		

Campus Tenure Committee

Edward Blick (Engr) 1981-84	)	replacing	Charles Butler
John Dunn (Anthrop) 1981-84	)		Gwenn Davis
Linda Kaid (Journ) 1981-84	:		Stanley Eliason
Lloyd Korhonen (Education) 1981-84	:		
Robert Lehr (Regnl/City Plan) 1981-84	)		
Barbara Lewis (Law) 1981-84	)		

Class Schedule Committee

L. D. Fink (Liberal Studies) 1981-85	)	replacing	Judson Ahern
Jerlene Hargis (Home Econ) 1981-85	:		Subramanyam Gollahalli
William Kuriger (Engr) 1981-85	:		
Donald Patten (Mathematics) 1981-85	)		

Commencement Committee

Virginia Gillespie (HPER) 1981-84 : replacing Theodore Robinson  
 T. H. Milby (Univ Libs) 1981-84 :

Computing Advisory Committee

Judson Ahern (Geology) 1981-84 ) replacing William Bentz  
 Harry Benham (Econ) 1981-84 ) Kenneth Starling  
 John Cheung (Comp Science) 1981-84 : Larry Toothaker  
 Robert Hogan (Architecture) 1981-84 :  
 Kenneth Meier (Pol Science) 1981-84 )  
 Thomas Smith (Hist/Science) 1981-84 )

Employee Benefits Committee

Rod Hersberger (Univ Libs) 1981-85 : replacing Michael Cox  
 Stephen Whitmore (Physics) 1981-85 :  
 Jeffrey Pannel (Law) 1981-83 : Gary Thompson  
 Harriet Turkington (Home Econ) 1981-83 :

Equal Opportunity Committee

Djebbar Tiab (Petrol Engr) 1981-82 : replacing Penny Hopkins  
 Alexis Walker (Home Econ) 1981-82 :

Film Review Committee

Frank Kirkland (Philos) 1981-83 : replacing Norman Fogel  
 David Rinear (Drama) 1981-83 :

Intramural Committee

Gordon Drummond (History) 1981-84 : replacing Phyllis Philp  
 Ronald Sylvia (Pol Science) 1981-84 :

Patent Advisory Committee

Theodore Roberts (Law) 1981-85 : replacing Ronald Kantowski  
 Francis Schmitz (Chemistry) 1981-85 :

ROTC Advisory Committee

Terry Patterson (Architecture) 1981-84 ) replacing Marilyn Flowers  
 John Pulliam (Education) 1981-84 ) Virginia Gillespie  
 John Purcupile (AMNE) 1981-84 : Ned Hockman  
 Gerald Tuma (EECS) 1981-84 :  
 Dale Vliet (Law) 1981-84 )  
 Bill Walker (Elec Engr) 1981-84 )

Scholarship/Financial Aids Committee

Dale Campbell (Mil Science) 1981-83 ) replacing Duaine Lindstrom  
 Barbara Davis (Women's Studies) 1981-83 ) Philip Lujan  
 Robert Dubois (Geology) 1981-83 : Gaye McNutt  
 Leslie Miller (Elec Engr) 1981-83 :  
 Daryl Morrison (Univ Libs) 1981-83 )  
 Eden Yu (Economics) 1981-83 )

Speakers Bureau

David Gross (English) 1981-84 : replacing John Wickham  
 Donald Maletz (Pol Science) 1981-84 :

University Book Exchange Oversight Committee

John Harlin (Geography) 1981-84 : replacing Sue Harrington  
 Tibor Herczeg (Phys/Astron) 1981-84 :

University Judicial Tribunal

George Cozad (Bot/Micro) 1981-83 : replacing Hugh Jeffers  
 David Jaffe (Journ) 1981-83 :

University Libraries Committee

Amos Eddy (Meteorology) 1981-84 ) replacing Edward Crim  
 George Emmanuel (AMNE) 1981-84 ) Jay Smith  
 James Goldsmith (History) 1981-84 : Gail de Stwolinski  
 Ted Hebert (Pol Science) 1981-84 :  
 Bernard McDonald (Mathematics) 1981-84 )  
 Robert Shahan (Philos) 1981-84 )

## REPORT OF SENATE COMMITTEE ON FACULTY COMPENSATION

Professor Eick, Chair of the Senate Committee on Faculty Compensation, formally presented that Committee's final report for 1980-81 and moved its acceptance by the Senate. He called special attention to the recommendations concerning TIAA-CREF.

Without dissent, the Senate approved the motion to accept the Committee report that is reproduced in full below.

-----

FINAL REPORT (1980-81)  
 FACULTY COMPENSATION COMMITTEE

Throughout the year, the Faculty Compensation Committee held a number of meetings to deal with compensation problems.

A survey was again conducted to ascertain faculty priorities as to distribution of new salary monies. Approximately 70 percent of the faculty felt that some percentage of new money should be awarded across the board, with the 50 percent/50 percent formula being the most popular (36 percent). (See table following.)

FINAL TABULATION OF RESULTS: Norman Campus Faculty Salary Survey, 1981

(Results are expressed as number of votes in each category. These figures are based on 456 returned questionnaires, approximately 56 percent of the faculty.)

- (1) In general, which one of the following methods would you prefer to be used to distribute new money for faculty salary increases?
- |            |  |
|------------|--|
| <u>77</u>  | (a) Solely on the basis of merit   |
| <u>56</u>  | (b) Across the board to all faculty, regardless of merit                 |
| <u>163</u> | (c) $\frac{1}{2}$ on the basis of merit - $\frac{1}{2}$ across the board |
| <u>84</u>  | (d) $\frac{2}{3}$ on the basis of merit - $\frac{1}{3}$ across the board |
| <u>71</u>  | (e) $\frac{1}{3}$ on the basis of merit - $\frac{2}{3}$ across the board |
- (2) 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:
- |            |   |
|------------|---|
| <u>243</u> | (a) A <u>percentage</u> of his or her present salary? |
| <u>198</u> | (b) An <u>equal</u> dollar amount?                    |
- (3) Are you in favor of "sheltering" your Oklahoma Teacher Retirement contribution?
- |            |         |
|------------|---------|
| <u>357</u> | (a) Yes |
| <u>54</u>  | (b) No  |
- (4) Would you be willing to give up 1 or 2 percent of salary increase monies for research, library acquisitions, and faculty career development?
- | <u>1%</u>  |         | <u>2%</u>  |         |
|------------|---------|------------|---------|
| <u>180</u> | (a) Yes | <u>112</u> | (a) Yes |
| <u>189</u> | (b) No  | <u>220</u> | (b) No  |
- (5) Would you be willing to give up 1 or 2 percent of salary increase monies for research, library acquisitions, and faculty career development if the money were guaranteed to return to your department?
- | <u>1%</u>  |         | <u>2%</u>  |         |
|------------|---------|------------|---------|
| <u>177</u> | (a) Yes | <u>164</u> | (a) Yes |
| <u>157</u> | (b) No  | <u>180</u> | (b) No  |

The Committee also worked on the program of "Tax Sheltering" the Oklahoma Teacher Retirement contribution. The Senate passed a resolution favoring this program and forwarded it to the President. The same action was taken by the University Employment Benefits Committee, and it has been recommended that this "Tax Sheltering" become effective July 1, 1981.

In discussions involving "Tax Sheltering," the University's TIAA-CREF Program received some attention. Unfortunately, we could not decide whether a study of this program was in the jurisdiction of the Faculty Compensation or Employment Benefits Committee. Regardless, we do feel that a study should be made during the coming year by one of the Senate committees of the TIAA-CREF Program. Some possible areas of study are:

1. Removal of present \$9,000 base.
2. Continuation of TIAA-CREF after 65.
3. Imposition of a possible "lid" on University contributions.
4. Construction of possible percentage decrease after 15 percent contribution to a maximum salary figure has been reached.

The Committee believes that the University administration will be addressing the above-listed problems soon; therefore, the Committee recommends that a sub-committee be appointed to consider the above issues and make recommendations to the Faculty Senate.

Two members of the Compensation Committee (Eick and Self) served on the Faculty Advisory Committee for the Provost's Salary Review Committee (Equity Review). While it was clear that progress was being made in the institution of a systematic program of review of all faculty salaries, it was felt that the Compensation Committee should have a representative on the Committee involved in the actual review of faculty salaries, rather than involved in simply an advisory capacity. In order to further assure equity for faculty salaries and to ensure input from the faculty in such review processes, the Committee recommends that a member of the Compensation Committee be appointed to any subsequent Faculty Salary Review Committee.

William Eick, Chair  
James Hibdon

Stan Neely  
Patricia Self

ELECTION OF REPLACEMENTS: Senate standing committees

The following replacements were elected to fill vacancies on Senate standing Committees:

Executive Committee

(1981-82):

John Biro (replacing Sidney Brown,  
Carol Locke Marilyn Flowers, and  
Donald Perkins Teree Foster)

Committee on Committees

(2, 1981-82  
2, 1981-83--  
terms to be drawn by lot):

Sherril Christian (replacing Tom Hill,  
Robert Davis Carl Locke,  
David Etheridge Heidi Karriker, and  
Robert Ford Mary E. Saxon)

Committee on Faculty Compensation

(1981-84):

Marvin Baker (replacing James Hibdon  
Deirdre Hardy and Gary Thompson)

Committee on Faculty Welfare

(2, 1981-83  
2, 1981-84--  
terms to be drawn by lot):

Harold Conner (replacing Lois Pfeister,  
Alan Covich John Seaberg,  
John Foster Stephen Whitmore,  
David Levy and David Whitney)



FOLLOW-UP REPORT III: "1981 Faculty Position Papers"

Background information: During the 1977-78 academic year, Senate ad hoc Committees prepared "Faculty Position Papers" on the following five areas of faculty interest: (1) Budgetary priorities, (2) Educational priorities, (3) Faculty governance, (4) Faculty salaries and fringe benefits, and (5) Image of the University.

The full text of each final report, after Senate approval, was published in the Senate Journal. (See pages 9-25 of the Senate Journal for May 1, 1978.) The "Faculty Position Papers" were published in bound, booklet format and distributed to all Norman campus faculty members at the beginning of the fall semester, 1978.

During the 1978-79 academic year, similar Senate ad hoc Committees prepared the Follow-up Report I on the "1978 Faculty Position Papers." (See pages 5-8 and 7-13 of the Senate Journals for April 9, 1979, and May 7, 1979, respectively.) Follow-up Report I was also published in bound, booklet format and distributed to Norman campus faculty members.

During the 1979-80 academic year, similar Senate Committees prepared the Follow-up Report II. (Please see pages 2-14 of the Senate Journal for the special session on June 16, 1980.) The usual distribution of the booklet was made to all Norman campus faculty during August, 1980.

During the fall semester, 1980, the Senate Executive Committee decided to revise the list of study topics for the 1981 Follow-up report as follows: (1) Academic standards, (2) Budgetary priorities, (3) Educational priorities, (4) Faculty career development, and (5) University governance. (Please see page 2 of the Senate Journal for October 6, 1980.)

Copies of the final reports of the following four ad hoc Committees were distributed to Senate members in advance of this meeting: (1) Academic standards, (2) Budgetary priorities, (3) Educational priorities, and (4) University governance.

Senate action: The Chairs of the four ad hoc Committees, in turn, formally presented their final reports and moved their acceptance. Without dissent, the Senate accepted all reports.

The final report of the Committee on Faculty Career Development should be ready for Senate consideration at the special session this summer.

## I. Report of the Faculty Senate ad hoc Committee on Academic Standards

The academic standards of a university are among the most important elements that separate universities into mediocre or great. The University of Oklahoma has set membership in the Association of American Universities as a short-term goal. This will be accomplished through strengthening academic standards on the Norman campus by improvements in faculty, students, and the physical facilities in which they work.

The University of Oklahoma is in a dilemma. It has been charged with providing an education for the masses of Oklahoma high school graduates and with being a research and graduate studies leader. The open-enrollment policy creates a very broad intellectual grouping of students in the classroom. These broad groupings have caused many of the faculty to lower or compromise their academic standards. This has been tacitly supported by the University administration and Regents through the full-time equivalent student funding policy and the antiquated budgeting process. To improve the academic standards of the University, the ad hoc Committee on Academic Standards recommends the adoption of the following five points:

1. The faculty should adopt a strict grading policy that will enable the ordinary student to make progress and will identify with an appropriate grade the truly outstanding student. The grading policy should be uniform across all schools and faculties. A survey of College General Catalogs found that most universities state that grades indicate the grasp of the course as measured by the instructor. The ad hoc Committee on Academic Standards recommends that the second and third paragraphs of page 12 of the University of Oklahoma General Catalog "GRADES - Interpretation" be changed to provide guidance to the faculty. The following paragraphs are suggested:

"The passing grades are A, B, C, D, P, and S. Non-passing grades are F and U. W is a neutral grade given for students who are passing at the time of withdrawal. The grades are an assessment of a student's work as judged by the professional standards of the faculty. The grades have the following meanings:

- A - exceptional, top-quality work
- B - an essential grasp of the material plus significant insight into complexities of the course
- C - all essentials of the course plus command of the material
- D - some essentials of the course but lacking command of the material
- P - acceptable work in a pass/fail graded course
- S - satisfactory work in a satisfactory/unsatisfactory graded course
- F - failure

The grade of I may be given students who provide satisfactory reasons to the instructor as to why they have not completed the course."

2. The policy of awarding the grade of W should be changed. This grade should be available for the first 1/3 of the term. The grade W should be given to students who withdraw from a course with a passing grade during the first 1/6 of a course. Students in the second 1/6 shall

receive a grade of W or F, depending upon the instructor's judgment of their progress in the course. After the first 1/3 of the course, the grade of F shall be mandatory for all students remaining in school and withdrawing from a course. A grade of W will not be given to any student who wishes to avoid receiving an F. The University should publish the cut-off date for W and F grades for each semester. The grade of W may also be given to a student who withdraws from all courses and the University.

3. The development of effective communication skills at the lower-division level should be encouraged and supported. A corollary point is the promotion and increased use of remedial classes to assist those students who enter the University with less than adequate skills. Credit toward graduation should not be given for remedial courses.
4. Entrance into upper-division courses should be by additional qualifications other than classwork prerequisites, and final comprehensive examinations in the major field should be required of all bachelor's degree candidates. The concept of sophomore proficiency examinations or junior-level entry exams is not addressed in the catalogs of Big Eight institutions. However, such examinations do exist at a number of institutions as "in-house" methods of ensuring that students are properly prepared to complete successfully such upper-division courses or programs of study.

One problem area in establishing such examinations here could easily concern the junior college articulation policy as it currently applies to in-state institutions. Another problem area concerns the administration and the evaluation of such an intermediate examination. Would such an exam be constructed and evaluated by a faculty committee within each discipline? Are there such exams available from national testing services that might be applicable (and affordable) to certain disciplines? Would the examination be departmental for all majors within a broad area (all engineering students as opposed to chemical engineering students separately)? Would the fact that a significant percentage of lower-division courses is taught by graduate assistants have an effect on the outcome of such an examination?

Some type of qualifying examination to the upper-division course level would seem to be a practice worth further investigation. At a time when students should be evaluating their own goals and professional aspirations (the end of the sophomore or the beginning of the junior year), individual departments might find this type of examination a means to control better the academic standards and the quality of students in upper-division courses.

The same catalogs mentioned above were consulted regarding comprehensive examinations upon the completion of the undergraduate degree program. Little information was available even from institutions that are known to require such examinations. The lone exception in Big Eight institutions was the catalog of the University of Colorado, Boulder campus, for 1980-81. In the College of Arts and Sciences section, page 26, the following statement is the only reference to such an examination: "Departments may require candidates for degrees to pass comprehensive examinations in their major during the senior year." From the same catalog, College of Music section, page 203, comes this statement: "Students are required to write a senior thesis in accord with their goals and interests."

Some institutions seem to satisfy requirements for this type of comprehensive examination within a competency-based curriculum structure that appears to have limited value for the Norman campus of the University of Oklahoma at this time.

The College of Education will have provided a comprehensive examination for education majors with the advent of the "intra-year" program in January 1982. Following completion of required courses for the bachelor's degree, the prospective teacher will serve a year of field experience under the supervision/evaluation of a three-member committee (a public school teacher, a University supervisor, and a public school administrator), after which the candidate will take a "state board" examination in the field of teaching expertise.

Several faculty members, contacted at random about instituting a comprehensive final examination in major fields at the University of Oklahoma, were enthusiastic about the possibility but also expressed concern over the added work load that this type of examination would present. Some suggested a senior thesis as an alternative to a comprehensive exam.

It appears that individual departments might consider the possibility of instituting such an exam or thesis project as a means of upgrading the academic standards within the department, but it would also seem advisable from several viewpoints, among them legal, that such an exam, as well as any junior-level proficiency exams, be "advertised" in the college catalogs.

5. The funding policy of the University should be guided by the principle of supporting by all necessary means (including, but not limited to, financial means) those schools, colleges, departments, and disciplines to which the University has stated commitments and of continually strengthening those programs that, though not necessarily carrying great appeal with the public or the legislature, make a university worthy of its name. Without such support, a university ceases to be an instrument for disseminating and increasing worthwhile knowledge, and the striving to achieve membership in prestigious, higher-education organizations then becomes a mirage in the minds of those lacking proper intellectual direction.

The above paragraph represents a statement of principle. Repeated attempts to obtain factual information from the Provost's office (Dr. Ronald Stafford) concerning the University's funding policies were unsuccessful in spite of the verbal promise (over the telephone) to the contrary.

In summary, the Committee believes that the faculty are the persons primarily responsible for inflating the grades and lowering the academic standards. Without the approval of anyone--our peers, our department Chair or Director, Dean, or Regents-- we have the opportunity and the obligation to conduct our courses at a university level, to stimulate the students, and to ensure grades that bear true witness to the fact that the University of Oklahoma student is capable of meeting high academic standards.

Respectfully submitted,

Deirdre Hardy (Architecture)  
 Alice Lanning (Music)  
 Don Patten (Math)  
 Sabetai Unguru (History of Science)  
 Leonard West (Civil Engineering), Chair

## II. 1981 Report of the ad hoc Committee on Budgetary Priorities

The original 1978 report contained background information explaining the budget-making process. That information is still valid.

This review committee feels that the administration has indicated a positive attitude toward addressing the needs expressed in last year's position papers, but there is still a long way to go. We hope that the lines of communication will continue to remain open.

Six budgetary priorities were established in the original (1978) report. We have added a seventh (M and O budgets). The priorities and an update follow:

### 1. Salaries of OU employees:

The second consecutive proposed 12 percent salary increase is a commendable effort of all University personnel responsible for seeking University funding. Coupled with the fringe benefit package of the University, including the recommendation of tax sheltering of state retirement contributions, the compensation for University employees has show better-than-average rates of progress. However, it should be noted that the increases still fall short of compensating individuals fully for inflation rates in excess of 14 percent. Concerns which have surfaced this year and need to be addresssed include: (a) comparison of average OU salaries to regional AAU university salaries; (b) a base salary for all faculty members, commensurate with degree and experience; (c) salary inequity corrections for full, associate, and staff members who were discriminated against during the low-raise or zero-raise years; (d) continued salary adjustments to lower the attrition rate of personnel in key areas; and (e) elevation of the base and total salary range for teaching and research graduate assistants in order to attract superior students and to allow current students to commit total effort to the academic process. If annual state funding is not sufficient to achieve the above concerns, select concerns may be addressed through the use of private endowment.

### 2. Library Funding:

With the new library building program underway and increased attention to new acquisitions, the future looks promising. Addition of periodicals should receive emphasis, along with further consideration of electronic information retrieval systems.

### 3. Student Scholarships:

University sources for the support of student scholarships are expected to increase. However, a significant portion of funds traditionally available for student loan and fellowship support is likely to be lost to the University in years to come because of cutbacks at the federal level.

As the University strives for academic excellence, it will need to turn its attention to increased funding of fellowships and graduate assistantships in support of talented graduate students. The long-run success of the University as a center for excellence depends on the abilities of the graduate faculty and hence on the robustness of graduate programs. Excellence in graduate programming requires a much greater attention to the funding of high-quality graduate students at the University. The administration should consider a comprehensive study of relative support given by AAU institutions to graduate students in the form of scholarships, fellowships, assistantships, grants, and loans.

The University's administration, distribution, reporting, and control of undergraduate and graduate scholarships and fellowships are presently quite decentralized and diverse. Attention should be given to the development of one reporting and control system capable of monitoring all scholarships, fellowships, and loan activities within the University.

#### 4. Career Development:

Often, career development has been considered as synonymous with the vague category of travel and has been given low priority in University or Departmental budgets. However, it must be recognized that career or professional development means much more than merely travel.

In many professional areas, including some represented at the University, continuing education credits must be accumulated each year to maintain certification. This practice is likely to expand. Career development includes attendance and participation in meetings, workshops, and symposia and conferences. Evidence of career development through some form of continuing education should be expected of each faculty member, and thus provision should be made in University and departmental budgets for achieving this. Career development allocations could be a percentage of revolving funds.

Limited support for professional development, academic quality, and research productivity is presently available from several sources, including the various colleges, Office of Vice Provost for Research Administration, and the Research Council. Summer research fellowships have provided needed support on a limited basis for junior faculty. Likewise, senior faculty research fellowships should also be available.

#### 5. New Programs:

The University must respond to the changing needs of society while preserving its fundamental, scholarly role. Perceived needs and opportunities must be critically examined to determine if and how they might be met by strengthening, expanding, or re-grouping existing programs. A new program is a major commitment that must have a consensus of support and a range of independent resources to ensure its vitality and resilience as it gains momentum and develops autonomy. The faculty must play a major role in the planning and development of any new program.

#### 6. Faculty Hiring:

The University is using new funds to create additional faculty positions in the areas of high student/faculty ratios. In filling these positions, the University must observe its commitment to excellence and exercise extra care in attracting faculty of the highest caliber and potential, as well as making every effort to encourage minorities to compete in the process.

#### 7. M and O Budgets:

Constantly rising costs of supplies, contractual services, and communications have eroded the maintenance and operations budgets. While consumer prices increased by 56 percent during the 5-year period, 1975-1980, M and O budgets increased by 23 percent in that same time period. Increases in this area show a very significant decrease in the face of double-digit inflation.

In addition to providing funds for supplies and materials, M and O budgets are linked to career development through the funding of travel. Astronomical fuel prices have curtailed drastically the opportunities for scho-

larly enrichment through participation in professional conferences. This area is marked by a fundamental need for immediate and substantial increases.

In summary, this Committee feel that progress has been made toward fulfillment of objectives set forth in previous position papers, but there remain vital and urgent needs to be met.

Some areas of emphasis include the following:

1. Allocation of scholarship funds to support graduate candidates.
2. Increased University efforts to develop private and state funding sources for the purpose of supplementing diminishing federal support for loans and scholarships.
3. The definition of a minimum salary for faculty (assistant professors and above).
4. Improvement of Graduate Teaching Assistantship stipend.
5. Recommendation to seek more endowments for professorships and use the released funds to bring full professors' salaries in line with national standards and thus make up for the shortfall in raises in the 70's.
6. Career development allocation to be a percentage of revolving funds.

Respectfully submitted,

George Cozad (Botany/Microbiology), Chair  
 Yousif El-Ibiary (Electrical Engineering)  
 Trent Gabert (HPER)  
 Heidi Karriker (Modern Languages)  
 Bart Ward (Accounting)

### III. 1981 Report of the ad hoc Committee on Educational Priorities

This report is based on individual interviews with Provost J. R. Morris, Vice Provost for Instructional Services Jerome Weber, Vice Provost for Research Administration Kenneth Hoving, Vice Provost for Continuing Education and Public Service William Maehl, and Vice Provost for Student Affairs Jack Stout. The ad hoc Committee on Educational Priorities wishes to thank each one of these chief academic officers of the University for the time spent with the Committee and also for the spirit of cooperation and willingness to help that each one of them demonstrated.

#### EDUCATIONAL PRIORITIES: GENERAL

This is the fourth year a Faculty Senate report on educational priorities has been written, and most of the priorities mentioned during our interviews are not new ones but are ones which are consistent with the quest for a quality university --reaffirmation of the educational mission of the University, increasing the quality of the University's education programs (undergraduate and graduate), increased library and research support and a budget which, in these times of high inflation, at least acknowledges the need for adequate faculty and staff salaries and maintenance and operating budgets for the Departments/Colleges of the University. What does seem to

be a pattern which has developed over the past four years is an attitude which is a positive one about the University, its prospects for the future, some satisfaction with what has been accomplished within the recent past, and some pride in the way things are in the present. The 1978 report contained the following sentence: "There was an obvious feeling of frustration expressed by the administrators and the faculty representatives interviewed." The 1981 ad hoc Committee on Educational Priorities did not find those same feelings present this year. While each area within the academic structure of the University was far from totally satisfied with their present level of attainment, over and over there was expressed a feeling that the University was "on the move." The Library addition and the increased support for the Library, the use of the University Associates funds to support instruction and research, the faculty and staff salary support of the past two years, and President Banowsky's drive for membership in the Association of American Universities were all given as examples of the University's improving climate of academic excellence.

One question within the general area of the educational priorities of the University that was not answered to the complete satisfaction of the ad hoc Committee had to do with the "announced" establishment of new programs and areas of special consideration, i.e., the College of Geosciences and the Honors College. The question asked was simply, "How were these areas established as areas needing special attention and were faculty involved in those decisions?" During the interviews, it became obvious that the establishment of these educational priority areas was based more on apparent, perceived needs than on studied needs and that when faculty were involved it was "after the fact" or at least "after the announcement." While other faculty and administration committees are studying the merits and implications of the proposed establishment of these programs and will, no doubt, report their findings to the general faculty, a note of concern should be raised about initial general faculty involvement and the procedures followed and, most importantly, the procedures which might be (or should be) followed in the future.

#### EDUCATIONAL PRIORITIES: SPECIFIC

Each Vice Provost of the University was given the opportunity to discuss the educational priorities of the University, within the Vice Provost's specific area of concern and responsibility, in terms of both accomplishments over the past year and goals and/or challenges for the future. Those responses are summarized below:

##### Instructional Services:

1. A faculty committee awarded \$200,000 of University Associates funds to faculty wishing to improve instruction. Requests for the funds were about \$5 for each \$1 available. The need is to increase funding and to make the program a continuing incentive for the improvement of instruction.
2. There is a need to make the now established writing/math/reading laboratory better known to students and faculty. This program is the University's response to some students' need for remedial academic help.
3. A campus-wide Instructional Services Center was established to help serve the instructional media/materials needs of the faculty. That program needs to be expanded and made more accessible to faculty.
4. There is some evidence that the ACT scores of undergraduates at OU have been going up over the past few years. There needs to be more and better recruiting of students, and Instructional Services will work with Student Affairs and University Relations on recruiting and the provision of special programs on campus for older students, women returning to school, minority students, etc.



5. A chair in composition has been established within the English Department and that program should be both encouraged and supported.
6. The work of the Faculty Consultant for teaching has been very successful and that work needs expansion and more support.

#### Research Administration:

1. \$300,000 of University Associates Funds were granted to fund faculty research requests (requests for the funds totaled over \$1,282,000). The need is to increase internal University funding and make the program a continuing incentive for the improvement of research.
2. A new Graduate Bulletin has been written and the graduate faculty has approved major rule changes for the graduate programs. There is a need for the faculty to work on the quality of the graduate programs in terms of faculty recruiting, tenure, and promotion, as well as graduate student recruiting.
3. There is a need for the establishment of a procedure for the evaluation of the quality of graduate programs--content, faculty, and students. Also special attention needs to be paid to the salaries of graduate student assistants.
4. There is a need to involve the private sector in the research/graduate programs of the University.
5. Space on the OU campus for research is in critically short supply and that problem must be considered.

#### Continuing Education and Public Service:

1. Learning is now generally viewed as being "cradle to grave." The mission of Continuing Education and Public Service is to provide learning opportunities and programs for the non-traditional student. The need here is that the entire University Community must be made aware of the diversity of, success of, and potential for the continuing education and public service programs of the University.
2. Comparisons of funding for continuing education and public services at OU with other universities and colleges demonstrate a pattern of underfunding at OU. The need here seems to be the improvement of internal University funding for these kinds of programs and services.
3. There is a continuing need to investigate and respond to additional continuing education and public service patron needs and to develop delivery systems designed to meet those needs. Non-traditional degree programs, different course structures and time formats, and use of technology are all things which must be considered and possibly implemented. Continuing Education and Public Service hopes to continue to have a vital working relationship with the entire University community and to strengthen that relationship during the next few years.

#### Student Affairs:

1. Attention needs to be paid to the needs of the older student and the non-resident student of the University.
2. There are a number of programs now established which are designed to be useful to both students and faculty, e.g., the test file service, study skills seminars, tutoring programs, etc. The need is for the development of a better information network for making those services known.

3. The Physical Fitness Center--a long-sought goal--will soon be completed, and there is a need to develop University community programs for that Center.
4. Student Affairs believes it is often the "first line" contact for the University with parents and other University patrons. Therefore, it has a vital role in terms of the IMAGE of the University. The need is to work in concert with the entire University community on problems of concern to all.

Respectfully submitted,

John Dunn (Anthropology)  
 Marilyn Flowers (Economics)  
 Dan Kiacz (Art)  
 Lois Pfiester (Botany/Microbiology)  
 Jay Smith (Education), Chair

#### IV. 1981 Report of the ad hoc Committee on University Governance

In addition to 50 positions on the Faculty Senate, faculty members hold 219 positions on various University councils and committees. While their influence on university governance may not be as large as is desired, their involvement in some of its aspects is substantial. These faculty members are due considerable credit and recognition for the many hours they commit to this responsibility.

Position papers of earlier years have contended that some of the councils and committees are used only to ratify decisions already made by administrators. While this remains the case, we detect that the present administration has become aware of faculty dissatisfactions with such treatment. There are, however, instances in which actions are taken without appropriate faculty consultation.

Of particular concern this year were the announcements of creation of two new colleges (College of Geosciences and Honors College) -- announcements made in a fashion having appropriate appeal to the University's external supporters and potential supporters. Unfortunately, the announcements were surprises to large segments of the faculty serving on councils and committees that should participate in such decisions, e.g., Budget Council, Academic Program Council, Administrative and Physical Resources Council. It appears to us that administrators feel either that the councils cannot be trusted to participate faithfully in such important matters or that they cannot act with sufficient speed. We think neither is the case and urge the administration to consult the faculty and get recommendations before public announcements are made. We must add that we are pleased that faculty are involved in working out details of the proposed colleges.

A second matter of grave concern was the action of the University Regents to suspend program discontinuance policy in order to discontinue programs in clinical dietetics and cardiorespiratory sciences. In doing so they rejected a policy that, in the words of the policy statement itself, "is intended to reflect broad, long-term needs and goals of the University." The policy further states that "establishing the review process ahead of time, rather than reaching in haste after a problem has developed, is of considerable merit." Ignoring this, the Regents "reached in haste," making use of the authority they have

to suspend the procedures. Program discontinuance is never pleasant. When found necessary, it will usually be because of some unforeseen development. The urgency that such a development produces is likely to make the temptation to suspend the procedure very strong. We view the Regents' action with alarm and fear that, despite assurances that the present case will not set precedent, care must be taken to prevent a recurrence.

Concerning a matter mentioned in last year's report, we are pleased that consultative procedures have been established by both the Vice Provost for Research and the Vice Provost for Instructional Services for review of applications for Associates funds. We urge the administration to continue involving faculty in this process and to adhere as closely as possible to faculty recommendations.

During the past year, faculty have been members of two committees considering a Uniform Reporting Form for faculty evaluations. While it was necessary for faculty to insist upon a consultative process, the result was generally satisfactory. The work of both the faculty and the administrators is appreciated.

In the Spring of 1980, Faculty Senate members received a list of all University council and committee members, a list that demonstrated the extensive faculty involvement in the governance process. We urge that a similar list and a list of members of the Faculty Senate be distributed to all faculty each fall to serve as a reference source for everyone either confronting a problem or desiring to relay information through the governance system.

To facilitate coordination of Faculty Senate activities with those of the councils, we urge that the council chairs be members of the Faculty Senate or, if not members, be encouraged to attend Senate meetings and comment upon any matter under consideration that relates to the work of their councils.

Respectfully submitted,

Homer Brown (Accounting)  
 Sidney Brown (History)  
 Maggie Hayes (Home Economics)  
 Ted Hebert (Political Science), Chair  
 Duaine Lindstrom (AMNE)

#### PROPOSED SEXUAL HARASSMENT GRIEVANCE PROCEDURE (Norman campus)

Background information: Late in 1979, Provost J. R. Morris requested the Faculty Senate to propose a Norman campus policy for handling sexual harassment complaints.

A Senate ad hoc Committee studied this question and, early in its deliberations, decided to broaden the scope of its proposal to "unprofessional conduct." After extensive discussions in both the Committee and the Senate, as well as public hearings open to all segments of the University community, the Committee presented its final report to the Senate last October.

The Senate at that time decided to postpone final action for a month, pending receipt of another proposal that would embody the ombudsperson approach to this problem. (Please see pages 9-18 of the Senate Journal for October 6, 1980.)

On November 10, 1980, the Senate approved for submission to the administration the original proposal for an "unprofessional conduct policy." (Please see pages 18-28 of the Senate Journal for November 10, 1980.) This proposed policy was subsequently approved by both the Student Congress and the Employee Executive Council.

In April, 1981, Provost Morris requested Senate consideration of an alternate "Norman campus Grievance Procedure for Addressing Sexual Harassment Complaints" prepared by his staff. Copies of that document were distributed to Senate members on April 22, 1981.

Senate action: Professor Moriarity moved approval of the proposed procedure.

Professor Davis next requested Professor Teree Foster for her comments, particularly in view of her participation in the recent ACE workshop on this subject in Memphis. Basing her comments also on her recent conversations with Dean Barbara Lewis, Professor Foster reported their agreement "with the spirit and the intent of the proposal." Some questions about the wording of the procedure were discussed with Associate Provost Ray. Professor Foster felt that such questions could be resolved without difficulty and advised the Senate "to act now rather than delay this matter until next year."

Mr. Greg Eichenfield, PSA representative, called attention to the following list of questions submitted to the Senate Chair by Dr. Dorothy Foster of the Counseling Center:

-----  
 I have gone through the Administration's proposed sexual harassment grievance procedure and find several points, noted below, which I think need clarification. I'd like to be at the Senate meeting when this is brought up, but I will be out of town Monday.

- (1) In 3.4.3D, if an investigating subcommittee of the Council finds that there is sufficient evidence of sexual harassment by a faculty member, does the case go to the Faculty Appeals Board?
  - (2) In a complaint against a staff person, if the investigating administrator or the council subcommittee finds that evidence of sexual harassment is sufficiently clear, does it proceed to the Council, to a V.P. level, or is it handled within departmental level?
  - (3) To whom, under what circumstances, and to what extent are the sealed records of previous cases made available? Only names of complainant and accused or total records? To any administrator who might be investigating a complaint? To Council members?
  - (4) With regard to records kept to ascertain possible patterns of complainants or accused, is the record of a case dismissed for lack of cause available for determination of patterns of complainant (3.7) but not for patterns of being the accused? (I read it that way, but it seems very unequal.) Complaints which go to the Faculty Appeals Board under 3.4.3D seem to not be included with other cases and, therefore, those complainants and accused would not be available for consideration of patterns.
  - (5) If an administrator finds that sexual harassment has occurred and the accused does not appeal, is there a record of the complaint and its disposition?
-

Copies of the above list were distributed at this meeting. Mr. Eichenfield suggested that, instead of postponing final action until next fall, the Senate approve the proposal with the rider that a committee be formed to meet with the administration during the summer to clarify some of the points raised by Dr. Foster.

Associate Provost Ray then introduced Ms. Ann Glenn of the Provost's office, and both proceeded to answer the five questions. Their answers, in substance, were as follows:

- (1) No. This section is applicable only when a complaint against a faculty member is raised with an administrator. This section permits the administrator to do his or her job if there is sufficient evidence for taking prompt action. However, any case in which a faculty member disputes the imposition of a sanction must go to the Faculty Appeals Board.
- (2) If the administrator or the Council subcommittee is unable to resolve the complaint against the staff member to the satisfaction of both parties, the complaint moves to the Council's formal hearing stage according to the provisions of Section 3.5.
- (3) See the second sentence of the second paragraph, Section 3.10: "The record (excluding cases dismissed for lack of cause) is to be opened only upon authorization of the Chair of the Investigative Council on Sexual Harassment and only if a subsequent allegation of sexual harassment is brought before a Council hearing panel." The complete sealed record would be made available.
- (4) First Question: There may be a problem on this point. The language of Section 3.7, specifically the restriction imposed by the last sentence of the second paragraph, may require an interpretation by the Investigative Council on Sexual Harassment. The intent was that the Council should know at the formal hearing stage about previous complaints against the accused, excluding those complaints dismissed for lack of cause or which resulted in a finding of no sexual harassment. Similarly, the Council should know if there is a pattern of frivolous or malicious allegations by the complainant.

Second Question: Although the Faculty Appeals Board records would be held in a separate location, the Council should be provided information required to properly discharge its responsibilities.

- (5) Yes. If the administrator finds that sexual harassment has occurred and both parties agree to the proposed settlement of the complaint, the record is transmitted to the Director of the Counseling Center according to the provisions of Section 3.4.3(B).

In responding to a question from Mr. Eichenfield concerning the applicability of the proposed procedure to staff members, Ms. Glenn called attention to the first sentence in the fourth paragraph of Section 1 (Statement concerning Sexual Harassment): "The grievance procedure embodied herein shall be available to any person who, at the time of the acts complained of, was employed by, or was enrolled as a student at the University of Oklahoma."

The Senate subsequently approved without dissent the proposed grievance procedure. The full text of the approved proposal follows:

---

## NORMAN CAMPUS GRIEVANCE PROCEDURE

## FOR ADDRESSING SEXUAL HARASSMENT COMPLAINTS

(approved by the Faculty Senate, Norman campus, on May 4, 1981)

## 1 Statement Concerning Sexual Harassment

The University of Oklahoma explicitly condemns sexual harassment of students, staff, and faculty.

Since some members of the University community hold positions of authority that may involve the legitimate exercise of power over others, it is their responsibility to be sensitive to that power. Faculty and supervisors in particular, in their relationships with students and supervisees, need to be aware of potential conflicts of interest and the possible compromise of their evaluative capacity. Because there is an inherent power difference in these relationships, the potential exists for the less powerful person to perceive a coercive element in suggestions regarding activities outside those appropriate to the professional relationship. It is the responsibility of faculty and supervisors to behave in such a manner that their words or actions cannot reasonably be perceived as sexually coercive, abusive, or exploitive.

The University is committed to providing an environment of study and work free from sexual harassment and to insuring the accessibility of appropriate grievance procedures for addressing all complaints regarding sexual harassment.

The grievance procedure embodied herein shall be available to any person who, at the time of the acts complained of, was employed by, or was enrolled as a student at the University of Oklahoma. Nothing contained in this policy shall be construed either to limit the legitimate exercise of the right of free speech or to infringe upon the academic freedom of any member of the University community. Nor shall the use of these Grievance procedures constitute a waiver by the complainant or respondent of any other legal rights they may have.

## 2 Definition of Sexual Harassment

Sexual harassment shall be defined as unwelcome sexual advances, requests for sexual favors, and other verbal or physical conduct of a sexual nature in the following context:

- (A) when submission to such conduct is made either explicitly or implicitly a term or condition of an individual's employment or academic standing,
- (B) when submission to or rejection of such conduct by an individual is used as the basis for employment or academic decisions affecting such individual, or
- (C) when such conduct has the purpose or effect of unreasonably interfering with an individual's work or academic performance or creating an intimidating, hostile, or offensive working/academic environment.

### 3 Procedures

#### 3.1 Filing of Complaint

Persons who have a complaint alleging sexual harassment are encouraged to raise their complaint through the normal administrative channels. Persons empowered to receive initial complaints through the normal administrative channels shall include department heads/chairpersons, academic deans, or administrative supervisors. These individuals are referred to as "administrator."

If the complainant feels uncomfortable in raising the complaint through the normal administrative channels, the complaint may be brought to the attention of any member of the Investigative Council on Sexual Harassment. The Investigative Council on Sexual Harassment shall be composed of eight (8) staff members elected by the Employee Executive Council and eight (8) faculty members elected by the Faculty Senate. The terms of appointment shall be for three (3) years with initial terms of 1, 2, and 3 years in each category to provide for staggered membership.

In an affirmative effort to insure that members of the University Community are adequately informed and served by the Grievance Procedures embodied herein, a counselor in the University Counseling Center shall also be available as a permanent contact point for complaints and concerns. This person will be responsible for advising University Community members on the grievance procedures and shall be available to provide appropriate assistance to complainants or respondents upon request, but will not be in a position to take any action on a complaint.

#### 3.2 Timing of Complaint

Any complaint (either verbal or written) must be filed with the appropriate administrator or with any member of the Investigative Council on Sexual Harassment within 45 calendar days of occurrence of the act of alleged sexual harassment.

#### 3.3 Retaliation

Any attempt to penalize or retaliate against a person for filing a complaint of sexual harassment will be treated as a separate and distinct, additional charge of sexual harassment.

#### 3.4 Initial or Informal Proceeding

**3.4.1 Administrative Process** - Upon receipt of a complaint of sexual harassment, the appropriate administrator is empowered to interview the parties involved, to hear testimony pertaining to the matter, and to gather any pertinent evidence.

**3.4.2 Council Process** - Upon receipt of a complaint of sexual harassment, a Council member shall refer the complaint to the Chair of the Council who shall appoint an investigative subcommittee composed of two members of the Council acceptable to both parties. This subcommittee is empowered to interview parties involved, to hear testimony pertaining to the matter, and to gather any pertinent evidence.

**3.4.3 Outcomes** - Upon completion of the initial investigation, the administrator or the council subcommittee is authorized to:

- (A) Find that no sexual harassment occurred and dismiss the complaint, giving written notice of said dismissal to each party involved. The complainant has the right to appeal said dismissal in writing within 15 calendar days of the date of the notice of dismissal to the Chair of the Investigative Council on Sexual Harassment and request a formal hearing according to the provisions of Section 4. If no appeal is filed within the 15 day period said dismissal becomes binding on both parties and the case shall be closed and the sealed record shall be transmitted to the Director of the University Counseling Center for safekeeping according to Section 3.10.
- (B) Resolve the matter to the satisfaction of both the complainant and the party accused of sexual harassment. If a resolution satisfactory to both parties is reached through the efforts of the administrator or the Council subcommittee, a written statement, a copy of which shall be attached to the investigator's report shall indicate the agreement reached by the parties and shall be signed and dated by each party and by the administrator or the Council subcommittee. At that time the investigation and the record thereof shall be closed, sealed, and transmitted to the Director of the University Counseling Center for safekeeping in accordance with Section 3.10.
- (C) Find that the parties are unable to resolve the matter informally. Written notice of such finding shall be given each party involved, except as noted in Section 3.4.3(D). Any party has the right to request in writing within 15 calendar days of the date of that notice a formal hearing before the Investigative Council on Sexual Harassment, according to the provisions of Section 3.5. If no such request is made within the 15 day period, the opportunity for such hearing shall be forfeited and the case shall be closed, sealed, and transmitted to the Director of the Counseling Center for safekeeping in accordance with Section 3.10.
- (D) In the case of a complaint against a faculty member, the administrative investigator may determine that the evidence of sexual harassment is sufficiently clear to warrant the immediate commencement of formal proceedings as provided in Section 3.8 of the Faculty Handbook. If the President concurs with the administrator's findings and so informs the Chair of the Faculty Appeals Board, the case shall be removed from the grievance proceedings contained herein and further action in the case shall be governed by Section 3.8 of the Faculty Handbook.

3.4.4 If an appeal or request for a formal hearing is made, a written report of the informal proceedings shall be transmitted to the Chair of the Council. Any records that the administrator or subcommittee may have elected to keep shall be included in or appended to the report transmitted to the Chair of the Council.



3.4.5 Individual allegations of sexual harassment that are dismissed for lack of cause without appeal, shall not be considered in personnel decisions such as salary, promotion, or tenure. Similarly unless such decisions are a part of the settlement, complaints settled at the informal stage shall not be considered in subsequent personnel decisions, and no mention of such complaints shall be made in the personnel or student records of either party.

3.4.6 Each investigator is individually charged to preserve confidentiality with respect to any matter investigated.

3.4.7 The informal investigation shall be completed within 30 days of receipt of the complaint. This time period may be extended either by mutual agreement of the parties involved or by the Chair of the Investigative Council on Sexual Harassment in the case of a subcommittee proceeding.

3.4.8 Either party has an absolute right to refuse to participate in the initial or informal proceeding and shall be so advised by the person(s) conducting the initial investigation of the charge of sexual harassment. Such refusal shall result in a formal hearing as provided in Section 3.5 if either party so requests, with the exception of cases covered by Section 3.4.3(D).

### 3.5 Formal Proceeding

3.5.1 Written Complaint In addition to appeals, cases where either party refuses to participate in the initial or informal investigation, and cases unresolved at the informal stage shall result in a formal hearing before the Investigative Council on Sexual Harassment if either party so requests in writing with the exception of cases covered by Section 3.4.3(D). A written and signed complaint addressed to the Chair of the Council setting forth the particulars of the facts upon which sexual harassment is alleged must be filed by the complainant as a condition to convening a hearing before the Council.

3.5.2 Formal Hearing A formal hearing before the Investigative Council on Sexual Harassment shall be conducted by a five member council panel chosen from the sixteen-member council as a whole, by the parties to the complaint. The selection process shall be in the following manner: the complainant shall select two panel members, and the respondent shall select two panel members with the fifth person being chosen by the other four panelists. The fifth person shall chair the panel. If the four panelists cannot agree on the fifth, the names of five additional Council members will be drawn by lottery. Each panelist will alternately strike two names off the list of five names. The remaining person shall be the fifth panelist. Either party to the complaint may request the Chair of the Council to disqualify any member of the hearing panel upon a showing of cause. Furthermore, no panelist shall be expected to serve if he/she feels that a conflict of interest exists. Replacements shall be selected in the same manner as the original panel.

3.5.3 The hearing panel procedures in conducting formal proceedings shall be established by the Council and shall provide that the parties to a proceeding may be represented by legal counsel and that the parties may present all of the evidence that they consider germane to the investigation. Further, the parties may call witnesses to testify and may cross-examine witnesses called by the other party. The formal proceeding shall be closed to the public unless both the complainant and respondent agree otherwise. A written record of the proceedings shall be maintained.

### 3.6 Actions by the Council

3.6.1 In the event the matter is resolved to the satisfaction of both parties prior to completion of the formal proceedings of the hearing panel, a written statement shall indicate the agreement reached by the parties and shall be signed and dated by each party and by the Chair of the hearing panel. In a case heard initially by an administrator, or when administrative action is necessary to implement the agreement, the administrator shall be informed confidentially of the resolution. The case shall then be closed and the sealed record transmitted to the Director of the University Counseling Center for safekeeping in accordance with Section 3.10.

3.6.2 In the event that no solution satisfactory to both parties is reached prior to the completion of the formal proceedings of the hearing panel, the panel shall make its findings and recommendations known to the proper administrative officer (as designated by the President of the University of Oklahoma), a complete and full record of the proceedings shall accompany said report to the proper administrative officer.

### 3.7 Factors To Be Considered

In arriving at a determination of the existence of sexual harassment, at any stage of the proceedings, the evidence as a whole and the totality of the circumstances and the context in which the alleged incident(s) occurred shall be considered. The determination of the existence of sexual harassment will be made from the facts on a case by case basis.

At the formal stage, the Council may take into consideration the history of complaints that have been filed by the complaining party, and any history of formal findings of unprofessional conduct or patterns of informally settled complaints. However, allegations that were dismissed for lack of cause at the initial or informal stage without appeal or which resulted in a finding of no sexual harassment shall not be taken into consideration.

### 3.8 Sanctions

Within 10 working days of receipt of the Council's findings and recommendations, the proper administrative officer shall inform the complainant and the respondent of the findings of the hearing panel and the officer's decision regarding the sexual harassment complaint. A copy of the officer's decision shall be transmitted to the chair of the hearing panel. In a case heard initially by an administrator, the administrator also shall be informed of the officer's decision. If the recommendations of the Council are rejected, the administrative officer shall state the reasons for such rejection.

The sexual harassment grievance procedures contained herein are preliminary to any formal disciplinary sanctions the proper administrative officer may determine is warranted upon a finding of sexual harassment. Appropriate disciplinary action that may be imposed upon such finding shall include any of the sanctions contained in Section 5.8 of the Faculty Handbook or Section 3.11 of the Staff Handbook. The imposition of all sanctions shall be governed by the process contained in Section 3.8 of the Faculty Handbook or Section 3.11 of the Staff Handbook.

Except in cases that ultimately go before the Faculty Appeals Board, all records upon conclusion of a case shall be transmitted to the Director of the University Counseling Center for safekeeping in accordance with Section 3.10.

### 3.9 Summary Action

Upon a clear showing at any stage in the grievance procedure that immediate harm to either party is threatened by the continued performance of either party's regular duties or University responsibilities, the proper administrative officer may suspend or reassign said duties or responsibilities pending the completion of the grievance procedure.

### 3.10 Confidentiality of Proceedings and Records

The disclosure of information obtained during the investigation of a complaint of sexual harassment by the appropriate administrator or by any member of the Investigative Council on Sexual Harassment constitutes a serious violation of University policy and procedures. Any person who discloses such confidential information shall be subject to severe disciplinary measures contained in Section 3.8 of the Faculty Handbook or Section 3.11 of the Staff Handbook. These sanctions shall be in addition to any civil liability the person making such disclosure may have as a result thereof to the parties, the complaint, and/or the witnesses interviewed during the informal or formal proceedings.

A record of the complaint and all informal and formal proceedings shall be maintained under seal for a period of five years. The record (excluding cases dismissed for lack of cause) is to be opened only upon authorization of the Chair of the Investigative Council on Sexual Harassment and only if a subsequent allegation of sexual harassment is brought before a Council hearing panel. In the event that the opening of the record is warranted, the Chair of the Council must give written notice to the person whose record is to be opened no less than seven calendar days prior to the opening of the record.

The records shall be maintained in the locked test storage area of the Counseling Center of the University. The Director of the Counseling Center shall be responsible for the safekeeping, confidentiality, addition, removal, or destruction of the records, in accord with this policy. The Director shall maintain a confidential reference log of the cases currently contained in the files. This log shall identify the date the complaint was filed and the names of the complainant and the respondent. This log shall also be kept confidential.

### 3.11 Destruction of Records

Upon termination of a five-year period without additional complaint, all records maintained by the Director of the Counseling Center regarding the complaint shall be destroyed, and no record is to be maintained that would indicate that there had ever been such a record.

Professor Biro expressed his apprehension and misgivings about two aspects of the grievance procedure -- (1) the separation of sexual harassment from the broader topic of unprofessional conduct and the Provost's unexplained conviction "that it is imperative that the Norman campus adopt a separate, clearly accessible, and widely publicized grievance procedure for dealing with sexual harassment complaints" (third paragraph of Provost Morris' memorandum of April 17) and (2) the process itself, specifically the separation of the investigative function from the sanction or action phase of the procedure.

There is no provision for any recommendation for action on the part of the investigative council. In effect, the proposal provides for a two-track procedure. In his opinion, previous proposals had some virtue by providing for faculty involvement beyond the fact-finding stage.

Expressing reluctance to oppose the proposal, he moved that the Senate go on record as reserving for itself the option to reconsider at some time in the future the broader topic of an unprofessional conduct policy. With one dissenting vote, the Senate approved the motion.

#### PROPOSAL FOR JOINT OSU/OU FACULTY STUDY: Reinstituting foreign-language requirement

Professor Kunesh suggested that the incoming Senate Executive Committee proceed with the selection of a Norman campus delegation to a joint OSU/OU Faculty Task Force to study the appropriateness of reinstituting a foreign-language requirement at both Universities. He noted that this subject had been introduced by OSU representatives at the April retreat in Shawnee. (Please see page 3 of the Senate Journal for April 13, 1981.)

Professor Davis moved that the Senate Executive Committee be authorized to proceed with the selection of the Norman campus faculty representatives. Without dissent, the Senate approved the motion.

#### PRESENTATION OF CERTIFICATES TO SENATORS COMPLETING THREE-YEAR TERMS

Professor Kunesh, Senate Chair, next presented certificates of appreciation to the following Senators completing their three-year terms, 1978-81:

Homer Brown (Accounting)	Stanley Neely (Chemistry)
Charles Carpenter (Zoology)	Wayne Rowe (Education)
Robert Davis (English)	Thomas Sorey (Architecture)
David Etheridge (Music)	Robert Welch (Naval Science)
Trent Gabert (HPER)	Stephen Whitmore (Physics)

#### ELECTION OF SENATE CHAIR-ELECT, 1981-82

Professor Teree Foster (Law) was elected by acclamation to the position of Senate Chair-Elect for 1981-82.

#### RE-ELECTION OF SENATE SECRETARY, 1981-82

Professor Anthony S. Lis (Business Administration) was re-elected by acclamation to his thirteenth consecutive term as Senate Secretary, 1981-82.

RESOLUTION OF APPRECIATION: Outgoing Senate Chair

The Senate approved by acclamation the following resolution of appreciation presented by Professor Whitmore:

---

 RESOLUTION OF APPRECIATION

WHEREAS Dr. Gregory D. Kunesh, Professor of Drama and Director of the School of Drama, has served the Faculty Senate on the Norman campus of the University of Oklahoma for five consecutive years--as a representative of the College of Fine Arts (1976-79), as its Chairperson-Elect (1979-80), and as its Chairperson (1980-81),

WHEREAS Professor Kunesh, during his term as Senate Chairperson, was a dynamic, effective, and articulate leader of both the General Faculty and the Faculty Senate,

WHEREAS Professor Kunesh was eminently successful in his untiring endeavors to maintain and enhance a harmonious and productive relationship, based on mutual respect and trust, between the faculty and the University administration, as well as the University Board of Regents,

WHEREAS Professor Kunesh exemplified, in both word and deed, the high aspirations of an effective and responsible faculty governance system on this campus.

WHEREAS Professor Kunesh fostered the mutually beneficial relationship existing among the faculty governance leaders on this campus, at the Health Sciences Center, and on the Stillwater campus of Oklahoma State University, as evidenced by his initiating the spring weekend retreat of faculty governance representatives from the three campuses,

WHEREAS Professor Kunesh was always dedicated to the task of promoting a more favorable rapport among the various segments of the University community on this campus--i.e., the administration, the faculty, the staff, and the student body,

BE IT THEREFORE RESOLVED THAT the Faculty Senate on the Norman campus of the University of Oklahoma hereby express its sincerest appreciation and gratitude to Professor Gregory D. Kunesh for his many noteworthy contributions to the effectiveness of faculty governance on this campus.

---

Professor Thompson, incoming Senate Chair, presented to Professor Kunesh, outgoing Senate Chair, an inscribed, commemorative plaque.

## ADJOURNMENT

The Senate adjourned at 5:16 p.m. The next regular session of the Senate is scheduled for 3:30 p.m., on Monday, September 14, 1981, at a site to be announced. The Senate will meet in special session, however, at 3:30 p.m., on Monday, June 29, 1981, in Adams Hall 104.

Respectfully submitted,

*Anthony S. Lis*

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