

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

Regular meeting -- February 8, 1982 -- 3:30 p.m., Dale Hall 218

The Faculty Senate was called to order by Dr. Gary Thompson, Chair.

Present:

Baker	El-Ibiary	Heaston	Lis	Scharnberg
Biro	Ford	Hebert	Locke	Schleifer
Brown, H.	Foster, J.	Hibdon	Love	Seaberg
Brown, S.	Foster, T.	Howard	Maletz	Self
Christian	Gollahalli	Huseman	Menzie	Sonleitner
Conner	Graves	Lanning	Murphy	Thompson
Covich	Gross	Lehr, Robert	Ragan, J.	West
Driver	Hardy	Lehr, Roland	Ragan, T.	Whitmore
Dunn	Hayes	Levy	Rinear	

Provost's office representative: Ray

PSA representatives: Cowen McNeil Powers

Liaison, Women's Caucus: Morgan

Absent:

Christy	Kiacz	Patten	Stock	Wainner
Fishbeck	Moriarity	Smith		

PSA representatives: Clinkenbeard Guyer Little

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Announcements	
Retreat, Executive Committees, April 2-4 . . . . .	2
General Faculty meeting, April 8 . . . . .	2
Action taken by President William S. Banowsky:	
Proposed child care facility, Norman campus . . . . .	2
Election of faculty replacements:	
Judicial Tribunal and Speakers Bureau . . . . .	2
Fall (1981) semester reports, University Councils . . . . .	3
Preliminary report: Senate Committee, General Education . . . . .	10
Proposed revision: University Patent Policy . . . . .	14
Remarks by Dean Wayne Alley, College of Law . . . . .	19
Report of Senate Executive Committee:	
Items awaiting Senate consideration/action . . . . .	20
Report of Senate Committee, Faculty Compensation	
Faculty questionnaire survey, salary issues . . . . .	21
Annual faculty salary audit . . . . .	21
Report of Senate Committee, Faculty Welfare	
New University retirement policy . . . . .	21
Proposal for MASUA tuition waivers, faculty dependents . . . . .	21
Postal Service Contract: University dormitory space . . . . .	21
University decision regarding KGOU . . . . .	21
Introduction of new PSA representative . . . . .	21

## APPROVAL OF MINUTES

The Journal of the Faculty Senate for the regular session on February 8, 1982, was approved with the following addition on page 4 to the membership of the Task Force on Employment Assistance: Carol Polk (REC).

## ANNOUNCEMENTS

(1) 1982 Weekend retreat of Executive Committees, OSU, Norman campus, and HSC faculty governance groups: The Executive Committees of Oklahoma State University Faculty Council and the Oklahoma University Norman campus and Health Sciences Center Faculty Senates will hold a weekend retreat at the Kerr Conference Center in Poteau on April 2-4. Matters of mutual concern and interest will be discussed, and plans for any appropriate joint action will be drawn.

(2) General Faculty spring meeting/reception: The spring meeting of the General Faculty on the Norman campus will be held at 3:30 p.m., on Thursday, April 8, in the Ballroom of the Oklahoma Memorial Union. A faculty reception (hosted by President William S. Banowsky) will follow immediately thereafter in Dining Rooms 5 and 6, OMU, to honor faculty members receiving distinguished professorships and awards.

ACTION TAKEN BY PRESIDENT WILLIAM S. BANOWSKY - Senate resolution:  
Proposed child care  
facility, Norman campus.

On January 22, President William S. Banowsky acknowledged receipt of the Senate resolution concerning the proposed child care facility on the Norman campus with the following message to the Senate Secretary:

"I have received the resolution concerning a proposed child care facility on the Norman campus. The cost of such a facility is being further investigated by Dr. Art Elbert. After this review, a more definitive response can be made to the proposal."

(Please see the Senate Journal for January 18, 1982.)

ELECTION OF FACULTY REPLACEMENTS: University groups

The Faculty Senate (Norman campus) nominated the following individuals for the faculty vacancies on the University groups listed below:

Judicial Tribunal: Marc Faw (University Libraries)  
 Judy Katz (Human Relations)  
 to replace Bonnie Johnson, 1980-82

Speakers Bureau: Joe Hobbs (Art)  
 Kenneth Little (Art)  
 to replace Carol Beasley, 1979-82.

FALL SEMESTER (1981) REPORTS: University Councils and Publications Board

The following reports for the fall semester, 1981, have been submitted to the Faculty Senate by the Chairs of the seven University Councils and the Student Publications Board.

Report of the Academic Program Council for the fall semester, 1981,  
submitted by Dr. Penny Hopkins

The Academic Program Council includes in its membership nine faculty members and two ex-officio, non-voting members. Connie Boehme, Editor of Academic Bulletins, confers regularly with the Council at its meetings. The two ex-officio members are Drs. J. R. Morris and Milford Messer. It was a matter of concern for the Council that no student representatives were appointed to the Council during the fall semester. It is the opinion of this Council that student input is both useful and necessary. The Council urges the President of the O.U. Student Association to appoint students to this and other Councils.

During the summer and fall of 1981, the Council met five times. Major curriculum changes that received special attention and discussion from the Council resulted in the approval of the EdM, PhD, and EdD degrees with a major in Adult and Community Education; the approval of an MFA degree in Drama (with Directing, Acting and Design options); the approval of an MS and PhD in Physics with an emphasis in Astronomy; the approval of the discontinuance of the academic program in Home Economics Education; the approval in the change of the name of the School of Home Economics to the School of Human Development. The Council also approved a number of course changes and additions in several areas.

One curriculum proposal rejected by the Council was the proposed course addition of Physics 0301 (Problem Solving for Physics 2514) and Physics 0311 (Problem Solving for Physics 2524). The Council concluded that these new courses were not remedial and, therefore, should have designations other than the zero prefix. The Council expressed concern regarding the lack of a university-wide policy on remedial and intervention courses.

Another matter discussed by the Council was the overlap of the Graduate Council and the Academic Programs Council in reviewing the Graduate College curriculum. It had earlier been concluded (see Academic Programs Council Report, Faculty Senate Journal, 11/81) by this Council that the functions of the two Councils differ sufficiently to merit their continued separate considerations of curriculum matters. However, some duplication of effort does occur and often results in slowing of the procedural process. It was suggested by this Council that a permanent liaison be established. A joint appointment of one faculty member to both Councils would serve such a function.

Respectfully submitted,

Thomas Carey

Gwenn Davis

Penny Hopkins, Chair

Hillel Kumin

Joakim Laguros

Stanley Neely

Richard Nostrand

Jay Smith

Benjamin Taylor

-----  
Report of the Athletics Council for fall semester, 1981, submitted by Dr.  
Herbert R. Hengst, Chair, on January 25, 1982:

I am pleased to report to you and the Senate on the activities of the Athletics Council for the fall semester, 1981.

As you know, this is the first year for the Council to operate with its enlarged membership. We now have six regular and three alternate faculty members, two regular and one alternate student members, one regular and one alternate staff (EEC) members, and two regular and one alternate alumni members. The Council also includes three ex-officio members and a staff secretary.

A first order of business, then, was to consider organizational questions. Two agreements were reached quickly: First, alternate members were urged to attend all meetings and are expected to participate in all discussions. The Vice Chair determines immediately before each meeting the voting members and informs the Chair and the secretary. As a result, the plurality of the faculty membership has not been in question. The second agreement dealt with the student alternate. The Norman campus has two student members and the Health Sciences Center one. A rotation was designed that satisfied the then current student membership. Every other year, the Health Sciences Center member is the student alternate.

With this preliminary statement completed, the remainder of the report will follow the pattern suggested by the current policy of the Senate.

### 1. Significant Recommendations to the President

- a) All athletic ticket prices have been changed, including the Texas game. The President has acknowledged and implemented each recommendation.
- b) All athletic contest schedules and schedule changes have been screened by the Council and recommended to the President. All recommendations were accepted.
- c) Awards to football and volleyball players for fall participation have been recommended to the President and accepted.

### 2. Subjects Addressed by the Council

- a) The Council's internal organization was modified by establishing four standing committees--the Committee on Awards, Budget Committee, Personnel Committee, and Schedules Committee. In addition, a Policies and Procedures Manual was compiled by the secretary.
- b) The financial health of the Athletic Department has been and remains under review and study. Fall semester activities in this area resulted in the ticket price increase recommendations mentioned above. Spring semester activities will result in a balanced budget proposal. Information for these studies has been supplied by the Business Manager (primarily) and by the Faculty Representative. It has included detailed studies of departmental expenditures and revenues, as well as comparative information from Big 8 and other universities.
- c) The academic status of athletes has been addressed by the Council. Assistant Athletic Director Robertson reported on the services provided by the Department and the concern felt by the Department regarding the needs of several athletes.
- d) The recruiting practices of the Department have been addressed. Athletic Director Walker reported to the Council on the provisions of the Department designed to exercise control over recruiting activities.
- e) The policy of "no Sunday contests" scheduled at home is currently under study.
- f) The CFA-NCAA controversy that came to the fore during the fall semester was also addressed by the Council. A preceding Council had authorized the University to pursue the CFA interests. Consequently, the Council received regular reports from the Athletic Director and the Faculty Representative on developments.

3. Time Spent on Council Activities, Fall Semester, 1981

a) Five regular monthly meetings were held by the Council (first Wednesday of each month, September through January). In addition, a facility tour and a reception for all coaches were held. Ten hours were involved.

b) Three of the Subcommittees had reason to meet during the fall semester. The Budget and Schedule Committees were most active. A total of eleven or twelve hours were involved in these activities.

c) The Chair and subcommittee Chairs were involved in numerous planning and follow-up conferences and phone calls. I estimate that approximately six and one-half hours were so used.

d) The secretary (a staff secretary in the Athletic Department, Lyn McCarty) has invested many hours in the work of the Council. The preparation of the Policy/Procedures Manual alone took untold hours, and she uses a minimum of five hours in the preparation for and follow-up of each monthly meeting. Additional hours are used by Business Manager Smith and his staff, as well as by Athletic Director Walker, in developing materials requested by the Council. I have no way to estimate fairly the hours contributed by the Department, but I must say that the number would be large.

4. Important Decisions Made by The Council

(Most of the following comments merely repeat an item of information first presented above)

a) Organized a set of four standing committees to facilitate the work of the Council.

b) Approved all schedules and schedule changes with the provision to safeguard the "class cut" policy.

c) Denied request for Sunday contests scheduled at home.

d) Authorized the Schedule Committee to act for the Council between meetings on routine changes that violated no policy.

e) Took action to improve the revenue of the Department by recommending ticket price increases in all sports.

f) Authorized the Athletic Director to negotiate for the "best available" football bowl game.

g) Initiated action to review the policy or the practice that permitted an "evangelical" presentation during an athletic contest.

h) Modified the nature of awards given to women athletes.

In conclusion, it should be added that all actions reported above have been taken following consultation with interested and concerned parties. This includes a general or open meeting of the Budget Committee to air the question of football ticket prices. Also, representatives of the press are welcome and have attended each meeting of the Council.

Respectfully submitted,

Jim Artman  
John Catlin  
Jim Estes

Laura Folsom  
Laura Gasaway  
Herbert Hengst, Chair

Jack Kasulis  
Michael Rohrer  
Sharon Sanderson

-----

Report of the Budget Council for fall semester, 1982, submitted by Dr. V. Stanley Vardys, Chair, on January 5, 1982:

The Council currently is composed of 19 members and includes 9 faculty representatives, 4 staff, 4 students, and two ex-officio members (The Provost and the Vice President for Administrative Affairs). Faculty represent the College of Arts and Sciences (4), the School of Engineering (1), College of Fine Arts (1), College of Business Administration (2), and the Library (1). The 1981-82 Council began meeting in July, 1981, and continued every month, with the exception of August, but meeting twice in September. In July, the Council reviewed the budget adopted for 1981/82. In September, the Council discussed and approved the needs budget, which the Administration submitted to the University Regents. Currently, the Council is taking budget testimony from University administrators.

This year, the Council is more closely studying (a) budgetary requests and expenditures for research, libraries, and computers and (b) the question of state funding of OCCE activities. For this purpose, a Task Force for R-L-C has been organized, composed of faculty, staff, and student members, and a joint Budget Council-Faculty Senate Task Force was established for the study of OCCE request for increased state funding. Both groups will report in the spring of 1982. In addition, the Council continues its Long-Range Budget Study Committee.

On September 15, 1981, attending press representatives (Tulsa World and Oklahoma Daily) challenged the Council's long-established right to hold closed meetings and lodged a suit against Budget Council Chair and OU Legal Counsel before the Judicial Tribunal of the University of Oklahoma. On November 6, 1981, President Banowsky wrote to the Tribunal that he accepts "the interpretation of the application of the (State) Open Meeting Law to the OU Budget Council." The Tribunal continued to claim jurisdiction but dismissed the case.

In August and September, the Chair participated in the budget meetings held by OU Deans and the Provost. On November 6, 1981, the Chair represented the Council at the State Conference of Faculty Organizations at East Central University in Ada, Oklahoma, where he held a session on OU Faculty participation in budget making.

Respectfully submitted,

Ronald Evans	Beverly Joyce	Stan Neeley
Travis Goggans	James Kenderdine	Gail de Stwolinski
Brooks Hill	Jeff Kimpel	V. Stanley Vardys, Chair

Report of the University Council on Faculty Awards and Honors for fall semester, 1982, submitted by Dr. Joe Rarick, Chair, on January 28, 1982:

The Council met formally three times and has completed its regular work for the year. The regular meetings took only about five hours but the members individually spent many hours, impossible to estimate, studying thirty dossiers many of which were over an inch thick and some were several inches thick. Fourteen nominations in five categories will be forwarded through the Provosts to President Banowsky.

In reviewing its work for the year, the Council strongly recommended continuing having the dossiers of all nominees available to members of

the Council in the offices of the Provosts on both the Norman and the Health Science Center campuses and recommended continuing alternating the meetings of the Council between the campuses. The Council expressed the desirability of having firm deadlines for the submission of recommendations to the Provost. The chair would note that it was his experience that greater attendance at the Council meetings resulted from setting the meetings for earlier evening than in the late afternoon.

The Council selected Tom Hill to receive the records of the Council and to call the organizational meeting in the year 1982-83.

Respectfully submitted, Karl Bergey, Doyle Bishop, Seymour Feiler, Tom Hill, and Joe Rarick, Chair; and Don Counihan, Jo Frazer, Jack Metcoff, Robert Patnode, Martha Primeaux, HSC.

-----  
Report of the Physical Resources and Campus Planning Council for fall semester, 1981, submitted by Professor R. D. Larson, Chair, January 25, 1982:

In the Fall Semester 1981, operating under its new title, the Physical Resources and Campus Planning Council met in four regular sessions and six special sessions.

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

1. Energy Center Program and Site:

Several sessions of the Council were devoted to consideration of the program and site of the new Energy Center. During these sessions, the Council called upon the expertise of the following:

Dr. Martin Jischke, Dean, College of Engineering  
 Dr. Roy Knapp, Director, School of Petroleum & Geological Engr.  
 Dr. Charles Mankin, Director of the Energy Resources Center  
 Dr. John Wickham, Director, School of Geology and Geophysics  
Architects for the Energy Center:  
 Mr. Glenn Sullivan and Mr. Tom Gunning from the Benham Group  
 Dr. J.R. Morris, Provost

After lengthy discussion and failing to endorse the two block area bounded by Jenkins to the west, Boyd to the north, Trout to the east and University to the south as the site for the Energy Center, the following criteria was endorsed:

- 1) The site be reasonably proximate to the College of Engineering
- 2) The walking distances between the new Energy Center and the remaining academic areas of the University be held to a minimum insofar as possible.
- 3) No surface parking be provided on the immediate site of the new facilities, except as required for faculty, staff, off-campus visitors, handicapped, and service vehicles.

2. Parking and Traffic Consultants:

In a special meeting, the Council met with Messrs. Joseph W. Guyton, Senior Vice President, and Michael C. Ritz, representatives of Harland Bartholomew & Assocs. The scope of the project was presented to the Council and the Council voiced their individual and collective concerns. The Council requested the possibility of reviewing the immediate recommendations concerning the Oklahoma Memorial Union Parking Garage prior to the time they were sent to the Board of Regents. The completion of the study is scheduled for the end of May with monthly progress reports being given to the Council.

3. Oklahoma Memorial Union Parking Garage:

On October 6, 1981, the Council had its initial meeting related to the proposed Oklahoma Memorial Union Parking Garage. For this session the Council called on the expertise of the following:

Jack Guthrie, Director, Oklahoma Memorial Union  
Jerry Farley, University Controller  
Jack Stout, Vice President, Student Affairs  
Allen Cook

Because an outside firm was to study the traffic and parking problems of the campus, the Council recommended to President Banowsky, "that no decision be made in regard to the possible construction of a parking structure in the parking lot north of the Oklahoma Memorial Union until such time as the report from the consulting firm studying the circulation, traffic and parking patterns and problems of the campus is completed." The initial report from Harland Bartholomew and Associates, Inc., did not oppose the construction of the Memorial Union parking facility although they did not address the problem of visual and aesthetic environment as requested by the Council. On December 7, 1981, the Council sent a final recommendation to President Banowsky "that the parking structure proposed for north of the Oklahoma Memorial Union not be built on this site."

4. Music Building Site:

Although the Council had previously approved the site of the new School of Music Building, the Council learned there were other site considerations. To review the School of Music program and site proposal the Council met with Dr. Nat Eek, Dean; College of Fine Arts, Dr. Allan Ross, Director, School of Music; and Professor Richard Gipson, Professor of Music. Following the discussion, the Council recommended that "as part of the total Music Center site, the area on the southeast corner of Boyd and Elm west of the Fred Jones Art Center and north of the Rupel Jones Theatre" be considered.

5. Library Landscaping/Parking:

The Council became extremely concerned over future parking on the west side of campus with both the landscaping west of the new Library addition and the proposed new School of Music building eliminating parking on these sites. With this in mind, the Council proposed that President Banowsky not proceed with the Library landscaping and to consider the possibility of a subsurface parking facility in that area. The President indicated that although "an interesting idea" - "The solution to our parking problem will have to come from another direction."

6. Sandblasting of Buildings:

Several sessions of the Council were devoted to the subject of the cleaning of buildings and the inappropriate and detrimental use of sandblasting. During these sessions, the Council called on the expertise of the following:

Mr. Ben Kinder, Director, Physical Plant  
Mr. Clendon Thomas, President, Chemical Products Corporation  
Mr. Kelly Curry, Physical Plant  
Ms. Melvena Thurman, Deputy State Historic Preservation Officer,  
State of Oklahoma  
Mr. Bill Peavler, AIA, Senior Preservation Architect,  
State of Oklahoma



A statement of concern and resolution by the Council will be forthcoming.

7. Memorial to Vietnam Veterans:

Mr. Bob Wilson requested support of the Council for a memorial for Vietnam Veterans on the Norman Campus. The Council did not object to the concept of this memorial but did request sketches and text (if any) prior to voting support.

8. Removal of Trash Receptacle:

On August 27, 1981, the Council requested the Director of the Physical Plant to consider the removal of the large trash receptacle, located in the paved area between Holmberg Hall and the Fine Arts Museum that constituted an environmental "eye sore" to the campus community. Physical Plant replaced the large trash receptacle with a smaller dumpster and relocated same as suggested by the Council in the area of the Art building behind the wall on the east side.

9. C.A.R.T. Oversight Committee:

On September 25, 1981, President Banowsky appointed the Chair (Charles Goins) of the Transportation Subcommittee to the C.A.R.T. Oversight Committee as a voting member. It was his "hope that the Transportation Subcommittee of the Physical Resources and Campus Planning Council would be constituted in such a way that all concerned would agree to its oversight of the C.A.R.T. system after this year."

Respectfully submitted,

Wayland Bowser  
Larry Canter  
Charles Goins

James Goodman  
Deirdre Hardy  
Jeanne Howard

Ray Larson, Chair  
John Lancaster  
Arnold Parr

-----  
Report of the Research Council (Norman Campus) for the fall semester, 1981, submitted by Professor Dick van der Helm, Chair, on January 11, 1982:

During the fall semester, requests for faculty support were evaluated. A total of 51 requests were received. A new system of evaluation was used, on a trial basis, in which written critiques are prepared by the Council members. A total of 19 awards were made. The statistics for the whole year will be given at the end of the spring semester.

Council members were also involved on subcommittees that evaluated the requests submitted for OU Associates Research/Creative Activity Funds.

Respectfully submitted,

Charles W. Bert  
John Biro  
Alexander B. Holmes

N. Jack Kanak  
Roger Mellgren  
Christine Smith

Patrick K. Sutherland  
Henry J. Tobias  
Dick van der Helm, Chair

-----

Report of the Board of Student Publications (Norman campus) for fall semester, 1981, submitted by Professor Ed Carter, Chair, on January 22, 1982:

The Oklahoma Daily ran about 6 percent behind in advertising linage for Fall Semester 1981, yet the operating margin for the Daily for Fall Semester 1981 compared with Fall Semester 1980 is up from \$8,782 to \$32,101. Fred Weddle, Student Publications Director, said the Daily is aggressively promoting advertising sales to state employers for job-recruiting ads. Also, Weddle said various classified ad sales promotions are being employed. About \$25,000 currently is being spent to replace copper-ink distribution rollers on the Daily's Goss Suburban Press.

Weddle reported it is too early to determine the progress of this year's Sooner Yearbook. Indications are, however, that book sales may increase over last year's total of 2,700.

The operating margin of the Journalism Press to date is \$36,885. The job printing volume through the Journalism Press has increased considerably compared with last year, Weddle said.

A Publications Board committee is at work revising the lengthy Policies and Procedures Manual, which serves as guidelines for the working staff of the Oklahoma Daily. Another Board committee is studying establishment of requirements for a minimum number of course hours in which students must be enrolled in order to work for the Oklahoma Daily. A third Board committee is studying changing the Board chairman's status from non-voting except in ties to voting.

Respectfully submitted,

Ed Carter, Chair  
John Renner

-----  
PRELIMINARY REPORT: Senate ad hoc Committee on General Education

For the past few months, the Senate ad hoc Committee on General Education has been considering the question of general education on this campus. (Please see pages 17-18 and 5 of the Senate Journals for November 9, 1981, and January 18, 1982, respectively.)

At the request of the University Regents, the Committee is presenting a preliminary report to the Board on Wednesday, February 10, at their monthly meeting at the Health Sciences Center.

Copies of the Committee report were distributed at this meeting. (Secretary's note: The Committee report was published in full on the editorial page of the Oklahoma Daily on February 10, 1982.)

Professor Dunn, Committee Chair, commented on the report, paragraph by paragraph.

Professor Thompson, Senate Chair, announced that the Senate officers and a delegation from the Committee, at the suggestion of Provost Morris, would attend the Regents' meeting on February 10. He further requested interested Senate members to contact the Senate Secretary about joining the Norman campus faculty delegation.

Professor Thompson next reported that the Senate office had recently begun an exchange of the minutes of monthly meetings of Faculty Senates at the Universities of Kansas (Lawrence) and Texas (Austin). Both institutions have been considering this topic. The Austin faculty

group, in fact, devoted a special meeting last December to the final report of their committee on general education.

Professor Baker commented that the Committee report "makes some interesting recommendations," particularly concerning the quality of entering students.

Professor Locke noted that, at the joint meeting of OSU and OU Executive Committees in Stillwater last fall, there was some discussion of the probable impact of any changes in the entrance requirements on admissions at both institutions.

Professor Whitmore labeled the Committee report as a "very impressive document" and commented favorably on the decision to discard the core in favor of the distribution system.

Professor Thompson, Senate Chair, expressed the feeling that the final report of the Committee may well be the sole agenda item for a special Senate meeting this summer. If such a meeting is held, Regent Dan Little, Chair of the Regents' subcommittee on Academic Affairs, would like to be invited to hear the deliberations.

Ms. Jean Marie Elliott, UOSA representative on the ad hoc Committee, was present at this Senate meeting.

At this point, Professor Dunn read the following pertinent resolutions presented to him at this Senate meeting by Professor Sid Brown, Chair of the Senate ad hoc Committee on the International Dimension of the University Curriculum:

"(1) RESOLVED that the foreign language requirement should be reinstated immediately at the University of Oklahoma, whereby five hours of an intermediate language course should be taken in the College of Arts and Sciences. Further, consideration should be given to a university-wide admissions requirement of two years of foreign language study in high school as an ultimate goal.

"(2) RESOLVED that the General Education component of the Bachelor of Arts degree should include a three-hour course in non-Western (or Third World) cultures. If the General Education Committee draws up a list of courses from which the student may select humanities and social science requirements, some of those should be courses on Africa, Asia, Latin America, or Russia, designed to acquaint the student with the arts, literature, religions, philosophies, and societies of one of those areas."

The complete text of the Committee report is reproduced below.

-----  
The following report constitutes a consensus among the members of the Faculty Senate ad hoc Committee on General Education about the nature, content, and delivery of general education. This consensus derives from the committee's survey of general education programs in American colleges and universities and from our own personal opinions. This report is presented to you at this time for your consideration. We hope, after appropriate consultation with the faculties of the various colleges on the Norman campus, to be able to bring these and other ideas to the Faculty Senate in the form of a set of recommendations for the improvement of the general education programs on the Norman campus.

A general education does not consist merely of the knowledge that enables a person to do his/her job, but rather it helps one attain a truly human awareness and responsibility, the ability to think critically, to communicate effectively, and to become a productive citizen of his/her community. A general education is a life-long quest. It can be achieved only partially by a set of undergraduate, lower-division course requirements. It should have begun before the college years. It should continue beyond the first year of college into upper-division course work and eventually into post graduate life-long learning.

Much of what now passes for college-level general education is, in fact, remedial education. The university should have substantial entrance requirements. When a student is admitted without adequate college-level preparation, both in terms of course work and level of achievement, he/she should be required to take remedial courses which are not considered part of college-level general education. College-level preparation should include English, mathematics, foreign language, history, government, biological and physical sciences, and the fine arts and humanities. A reasonable college preparation would include:

- (1) four years of secondary English, including both composition and grammar,
- (2) at least two years of mathematics,
- (3) at least two years of a foreign language, and
- (4) courses in the biological and physical sciences (with laboratory experience), in history and government, and in the humanities and fine arts.

General education should be fostered in two kinds of college curricular requirements:

- (1) distribution requirements which give breadth of knowledge and
- (2) major-concentration support requirements which relate the student's chosen major or profession to broader knowledge.

The committee believes distribution requirements are preferable to a rigid, uniform, core curriculum for several reasons.

- (1) A uniform general education experience for all students is not desirable. Students should have received the basic, common component of their education in the elementary and secondary schools. It is important that students have differing general education experiences they can communicate to one another.
- (2) Core curricula have met with little success in American colleges and universities. They have generally become sets of courses that lack the rigor of any discipline. They have generally tended to provide relatively weak, poor educational experiences that have been disappointing and frustrating to students, faculty, and administrators alike.
- (3) The problems of the delivery of a uniform core at a large university are great if not overwhelming. It is generally more expensive than a distributions system. It has enormous disruptive impact on a few departments. It is difficult to marshal broad-based faculty support for a common core.

Distribution requirements should give students the opportunity to learn about

- (1) the experimental, quantitative, and systemic methodologies of the physical, biological, and social sciences,
- (2) the foundations of Western Civilization (classics, history, philosophy),
- (3) the cultural heritage of Western Civilization (fine arts, literature),
- (4) The foundations and cultural heritage of at least one non-Western society.

The distributions requirement should also give students the opportunity to acquire communications skills

- (1) in English,
- (2) in a language other than English,
- (3) and in at least one of the formal communications systems, as e.g., computer languages, linguistics, logic, mathematics, statistics.

The distributions requirement component of the curriculum should include both lower-division and upper-division courses.

The college major should be more than a set of technical, specialized courses. It should include major-concentration support requirements:

- (1) at least one research tool, as e.g., a foreign language or one of several quantitative methods skills,
- (2) at least one area of concentration in a related field,
- (3) at least one upper-division course that places the major curriculum in its socio-historical milieu,
- (4) a senior project that will allow students to demonstrate their knowledge of their major field and their ability to apply this knowledge to the definition and solution of problems and issues in contemporary life.

Each college within the university should be expected to implement its own general education program within the framework of the distributions and support requirements outlined above. Each should develop a mechanism for

- (1) identifying those courses that have general education merit and that can thus be included in college's distributions list,
- (2) continuously monitoring the courses in their distributions list,
- (3) giving advice and encouragement in the development of new courses, including interdisciplinary ones, with general education value,
- (4) approving and monitoring the major-concentration support requirements developed by the individual departments and schools.

The charge to the Faculty Senate ad hoc Committee on General Education is to

- (1) survey general education programs at other universities,
- (2) study general education programs at the University of Oklahoma, and
- (3) make recommendations about general education on the University of Oklahoma Norman campus.

The committee has completed the first of these three charges; our work there has led us to the foregoing conclusions. We will now turn our attention to a study of general education at OU. This second charge will involve extensive consultation with the faculties of the various colleges to determine what general education for the Norman campus is perceived to be. We will then try to develop a set of proposals that will have broad faculty support.

Respectfully submitted,

Mary Whitmore (Zoology)  
 Robert Ford (Finance)  
 Alexander Holmes (Economics),  
Vice Chair  
 Claude E. Duchon (Meteorology)  
 Jay C. Smith (Instructional Services)  
 Tom J. Love (Aerospace, Mechanical and  
 Nuclear Engineering)  
 George W. Tauxe (Civil Engineering and  
 Environmental Science)  
 Thomas H. Selland (Architecture)  
 Susan Caldwell (History of Art)  
 Allan A. Ross (Music)

David S. Gross (English)  
 William H. Huseman (Modern Lang.)  
 Thomas J. Hill (Mathematics)  
 Gordon Atkinson (Chemistry)  
 John Dunn (Anthropology), Chair  
 Jean G. McDonald (Political Science)  
 Henry J. Tobias (History)  
 Beverly A. Joyce (University  
 Libraries, ex officio)  
 Jean Marie Elliott (University  
 of Oklahoma Student Association,  
 ex officio)

PROPOSED REVISION: University Patent Policy

Background information: On January 4, 1982, Dr. Kenneth L. Hoving, Vice Provost for Research Administration and Dean of the Graduate College, forwarded to the Senate Chair a proposal for revising the University patent policy. The proposal was approved unanimously by the Patent Advisory Committee on November 17, 1981, and was subsequently submitted to President William S. Banowsky who, in turn, forwarded copies to the two Faculty Senates for their review and recommendations.

Dean Hoving met with the Senate Executive Committee late in January. At that session, a few changes were made and later also approved unanimously by the Patent Advisory Committee.

Copies of the proposal were distributed to Senate members at this meeting.

The Senate Executive Committee invited Dean Hoving; Mr. Mark Elder, Chair of the Patent Advisory Committee; and Mr. Stanley Ward, University Chief Legal Counsel, to attend this Senate meeting to make any appropriate remarks and answer any questions from the floor.

Senate action: Dean Hoving first introduced Mr. Elder who briefly described the nature of patents and the involved process of applying for and securing patents, as well as the licenses "without which patents are not worth anything."

Dean Hoving next provided some background to his proposal for revising the current (1973) University policy. Upon his arrival on this campus two years ago, Dean Hoving was "struck by the fact that no patents were returning income to this University."

Mr. Dick Mason, an OU alumnus and the head of a large patent firm in Chicago, has been working with the Research Administration staff for the past several months "in an attempt to move the current University policy forward," particularly in view of the fact that OU has about 5 or 6 disclosures a year but no income therefrom. In Mr. Mason's opinion, as well as that of other members of his firm, the OU patent policy leaves a great deal to be desired. He volunteered to draft a policy that was reviewed by his firm and by Dean Hoving's counterpart at Arizona University, which processes about 80 disclosures each year and has a "very viable patenting program."

In Dean Hoving's words, "The proposed policy is the most generous of any that I am aware of at other universities throughout the country. I understand that any royalty income generated by a campus would be returned to the support the research arena of that campus."

Dean Hoving reported that Provost Morris and Vice President Burr had recently agreed to provide \$200, on a trial basis, to any faculty member who makes a disclosure on which the University would like to file a patent. He stressed the point that the patent application must be filed within one year after public disclosure is made and, therefore, the University needs a policy that responds quickly.

Professor Thompson, Senate Chair, presented the Senate Executive Committee's recommendation that the proposed policy revision be approved. He also indicated that the proposal did not receive the unanimous approval of the Committee. Professor Thompson plans to request budget units to provide interested faculty members to serve on a Senate ad hoc Committee to study the proposal, as well as any subsequent suggestions for further revisions.

Professor Howard asked about the role of the PAC under the new proposal. In response, Mr. Elder said, "This proposal does not make any significant changes in the role of the Patent Advisory Committee."

Professor Whitmore called attention to the last two paragraphs (Section F and "Conditions of Employment" of the Patent Policy.) In his opinion, the two paragraphs appear somewhat threatening to a faculty member who could interpret them as affecting his or her faculty position. Mr. Ward felt that nothing in these paragraphs would cause a faculty member to lose tenure or employment. "There was no intention to sandbag any individual over a patent situation."

After questioning some of the language in the proposed policy, Professor Christian moved that the question be tabled. Without dissent, the Senate approved the tabling motion.

-----

D-R-A-F-T

(Prepared by the Vice Provost for Research Administration)

(Approved by the Patent Advisory and the Senate Executive Committees)

DIRECTIVES

These Directives are issued pursuant to the Patent Policy adopted by the Board of Regents of the University of Oklahoma on \_\_\_\_\_ 1982, and pursuant to approval thereof by the President of the University. They are to be included in and made part of the University Faculty/Staff Handbooks and are incorporated by reference in each and every employment agreement entered into between the University and each employee, faculty member, and staff member of the University.

1. Any discovery or invention falling within the purview of Paragraph I(A) of the Patent Policy adopted \_\_\_\_\_ 1982, must be submitted in writing to the Office of Research Administration using the form attached hereto as Exhibit A.

2. The Vice Provost for Research Administration, following consultation with the Patent Advisory Committee when appropriate, shall direct that each such invention or discovery be either:

(a) Released outright to the discoverer or inventor in the event the Vice Provost for Research Administration determines that the discovery or invention does not meet the criteria set forth in Paragraph I(A) of the Patent Policy;

(b) Released outright to the discoverer or inventor in the event the Vice Provost for Research Administration determines that the discovery or invention does not merit or warrant exploitation on behalf of the University;

(c) Retained by the University for exploitation by the University;

(d) Transferred to a patent service organization with whom the University deals for commercial development by such organization;

(e) Released to the individual, organization or agency sponsoring the research in the course of which the discovery or invention was made if such action is required under the terms of the research contract with such individual, organization or agency, or is required by law; or

(f) Licensed by the University to another person, firm, or corporation.

3. The discoverer or inventor shall be required, if requested by the Vice Provost for Research Administration, to apply for patent protection on each such discovery or invention, title to which is retained by the University in such countries as may be designated by the Vice Provost for Research Administration and to assign his/her interest in and to any such applications for patent so filed to the University or its nominee. All costs involved in obtaining and maintaining patent protection, domestic and foreign, shall be borne by the University or its nominee.

4. The University will pay to the discoverer (or discoverers if more than one) or inventor (or inventors if more than one) at least thirty-five percent (35%) of the net consideration received by the University through exploitation of any invention meeting the criteria set forth in Paragraph I(A) of the Patent Policy of the University. Another fifteen percent (15%) of the net consideration received will accrue to the inventor's (or inventors') primary department (or divided between the inventors' primary departments, if more than one) for its research purposes. The remaining fifty percent (50%) of the net consideration received will accrue to the University for use in the furtherance of its research programs and goals.

Net consideration refers to that portion of the gross royalties returned to the University which remain after the costs involved in the research directly related to the patent plus those directly involved in processing the disclosure, patent, and licensing agreements, have been deducted. The costs directly related to the research, if University funds have been used in the support of the work, shall be determined at the time of filing for the patent if at all possible. The cost will include only those direct and indirect costs directly related to the invention. The cost figure will be mutually agreed to by the inventor(s) and the Vice Provost for Research Administration. Cases of disagreement may be appealed to the Patent Advisory Committee.

If only very nominal use of University facilities and resources was made in the creation of the invention, the President will consider a greater sharing of net consideration received with the inventor, and a lesser share of net consideration received by the department, if so recommended by the Patent Advisory Committee.

---



## PATENT POLICY

### General Statement

It is in the best of interests of the University of Oklahoma and the State of Oklahoma to encourage faculty and staff members of the University to undertake creative endeavors and to receive recognition therefor. The individual or individuals who make the discoveries or inventions that become the property of the University under this Policy will share in income derived by the University from the marketing of such inventions and patent rights based thereon on such terms as the President of the University shall direct. In general and as provided in Paragraph I(A) below, discoveries or inventions made or created by employees, faculty, students, and staff of the University will become the property of the University, and any and all benefits accruing to the University and derived from such discoveries or inventions will be used to further the research enterprise of the University. The University through its President, or an officer of the University designated by the President, may recognize and contract with one or more patent service organizations, for example, such as University Patents, Inc., or Research Corporation, in regard to obtaining, maintaining and marketing of patent rights (domestic and foreign) based on discoveries or inventions which are or shall become the property of the University pursuant to this Policy. It is not contemplated that this Patent Policy shall extend to and include questions of copyright ownership.

### Patent Policy

#### INVENTIONS AND PATENTS

(A) All discoveries or inventions, whether patentable or unpatentable, and including any and all patents (domestic and foreign) based thereon and applications for such patents, which are made or conceived by any member of the faculty, staff, or student body of the University of Oklahoma, either wholly or partially in the course of employment by the University of Oklahoma or wholly or partially through the use of facilities or funds provided by or through the University shall be the property of the University; and all rights therein shall be assigned, licensed or otherwise commercially exploited as directed by a duly authorized officer of the University, who shall be designated by the President of the University.

(B) The Vice Provost for Research Administration who shall have the responsibility for administering the research and patent affairs of the University in a manner consistent with this Policy.

(C) The Vice Provost for Research Administration shall issue written Directives to be approved by the President of the University (hereinafter called "Directives") to each member of the faculty and staff of the University, which shall govern the procedures to be followed in the processing of inventions and discoveries generated within the University as specified in Paragraph (A) hereof.

(D) The President of the University shall also appoint a Patent Advisory Committee, consisting of no more than nine (9) members, including the Vice Provost for Research Administration and/or his/her designee. The Vice Provost for Research Administration or his/her

designee shall act as Chair of the Committee. The Patent Advisory Committee functions shall be those of recommending to the President changes in the Directives and consulting with the Vice Provost for Research Administration in regard to the disposition and handling of specific inventions and discoveries falling within the purview of this policy. The Patent Advisory Committee shall meet at the pleasure of its Chair.

(E) The Patent Advisory Committee shall consist of the following eleven members:

the Vice Provost for Research Administration and/or his/her designee,  
 the Executive Director, University of Oklahoma Foundation, Inc.,  
 one member appointed by and serving at the pleasure of the President,  
 two staff members appointed for staggered terms by the President from nominations submitted by the Employee Executive Council, and  
 six faculty members (three from each campus) appointed for staggered terms by the President from nominations submitted by the two Faculty Senates.

Each member of the Committee shall have one vote. In the event that a student's interest is being considered, the President, at his/her discretion, may appoint a student to the Committee to participate in the deliberations and voting of the Committee in that particular case only.

If any member of the Committee fails to attend four consecutive meetings of the Committee and, if in the opinion of the majority of the Committee members, these absences have not been justified, the Committee Chair shall advise the President and request that this appointment to the Committee be terminated and a replacement appointed for the unexpired portion of the term.

The Committee may also review this Patent Policy from time to time and may recommend changes to the President.

(F) Regardless of the disposition of any invention or discovery made by the Vice Provost for Research Administration; the inventor or discoverer shall have no claim, demand, or recourse of whatever nature, legal or otherwise, against the University, its Board of Regents, its officers, or any member of its faculty based on a charge that the disposition made of the invention or discovery was not in the best interests of the inventor or discoverer.

#### CONDITION OF EMPLOYMENT

The terms of this Patent Policy and the Directives issued pursuant to Paragraph C hereof are a part of any contractual relationship of the University with any member of the faculty, staff, or student body. This Policy and the Directives, as amended from time to time, shall be deemed to be a part of the conditions of employment of every employee of the University and a part of the conditions of enrollment and attendance at the University by all students engaged in research using University facilities.

## REMARKS BY DEAN WAYNE E. ALLEY, COLLEGE OF LAW

In the continuing effort to enhance effective communication between faculty and administrative units on campus, the Senate Executive Committee invited Dean Wayne E. Alley, College of Law, to address the Senate.

Dean Alley assumed the deanship last summer following retirement as Brigadier General in the Judge Advocate General's Department, U. S. Army. His military background includes teaching assignments at Fort Lee and at the Judge Advocate General's School, Charlottesville, Virginia.

In his 18-minute, informal presentation, Dean Alley mentioned the following aspects of the Law College:

- (1) Relationships with both the Oklahoma Bar Association and the Senate Regents for Higher Education.
- (2) Separate financing.
- (3) Size of full-time student body (667) and faculty (28).
- (4) Nature of program: 3 years of study with 15 units each semester.
- (5) Curriculum.
- (6) Admission standards. (About 1,000 applications are expected this year for the 220 vacancies.)

In his words, "The curriculum has not been quite as specific as it could be." He mentioned the recent addition of a second faculty member specializing in oil and gas law and indicated the need to offer more in agricultural law, as well as American Indian (tribal) law. He goes not foresee any expansion of the College during the next 5-10 years.

The offerings in law should be--if not peculiar to Oklahoma--at least peculiarly significant to Oklahoma. In his opinion, the OU College of Law should not strive to become another Yale or Stanford law school. He stressed the need for giving law students a sound academic and theoretical background, as well as practical skills and "a glimpse of what law is all about."

Professor Baker suggested that some attention be given to environmental law. In response, Dean Alley reported his awareness of the problem and added that this matter will receive his continuing attention.

REMARKS BY THE CHAIR, EEC ad hoc COMMITTEE ON COMMUNICATIONS

Mr. Ronald Wilson, Assistant to the Vice President for Student Affairs and Chair of the newly established Employee Executive Council ad hoc Committee on Communications, addressed the Senate at the invitation of the Senate Executive Committee.

Mr. Wilson commented briefly on the following projects of the EEC Committee intended to improve communication among faculty, staff, and administrators on this campus:

- (1) Series of "Friday Focus" sessions at which University administrators address issues of interest to staff and faculty members, with an opportunity to ask questions. The first such session is scheduled for Friday, February 12, in the Couch Center Cafeteria with Dr. Arthur Elbert, Vice President for Administrative Affairs, as the breakfast speaker. Faculty and staff are invited to the \$1.50 breakfast event.

The second session will be a luncheon affair (\$3.50) on February 26 with the staff of the Personnel Services office discussing the new health insurance program offered University employees.

- (2) A monthly campus publication with short news items of interest to both faculty and staff that would supplement rather than replace existing University publications.

He expects EEC to recommend shortly that the ad hoc Committee be expanded to include two representatives of the Faculty Senate for its deliberations concerning the above-mentioned publication. Recommendations of that group will subsequently be referred to the Senate and the Employee Executive Council for their consideration.

REPORT OF SENATE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE: Items awaiting Senate consideration/action - spring - 1982.

Professor Gary Thompson, Senate Chair, announced the following list of items awaiting Senate consideration and/or action during the remainder of the current academic year:

- (1) Report of Senate ad hoc Committee on General Education.
- (2) Proposal for revising the University Patent Policy.
- (3) Proposal for revising W/F grade regulations.
- (4) Report of joint EEC/Senate ad hoc Committee studying the status of professional staff members with advanced degrees.
- (5) Proposal for revising the University policy on administrative search committees.
- (6) Proposal for revising the Faculty Appeals Board process.
- (7) Report of joint Budget Council/Senate ad hoc Committee studying the budgetary aspects of OCCE.
- (8) Report of University Task Force on Employment Assistance.
- (9) Report of Senate ad hoc Committee, Student Evaluation of Faculty.
- (10) Report of Senate ad hoc Committee, Traffic and Parking Problems, Norman campus.
- (11) Report of Senate ad hoc Committee, Teaching Environment.
- (12) Report of Senate ad hoc Committee, International Dimensions, University Curriculum.
- (13) Proposal for offering evening, non-credit, "personal/professional enrichment" courses for faculty.
- (14) Proposal for computer searches for non-funded research.

## REPORT OF SENATE COMMITTEE ON FACULTY COMPENSATION

Professor Hardy, Committee Chair, reported on the following items:

- (1) Faculty questionnaire survey, 1982-83 salary issues: Faculty participation was solicited in the third annual attempt to ascertain Norman campus faculty attitudes and suggestions regarding 1982-83 salary issues. The Committee has just approved the questionnaire that will shortly be distributed by the Senate office to all Norman campus faculty.
- (2) Annual faculty salary audit: The Committee Chair will participate in the annual faculty salary audit conducted by the Provost's office.

## REPORT OF SENATE COMMITTEE ON FACULTY WELFARE

Professor Whitmore, Senate Chair, reported on the following items:

- (1) New University retirement policy: The University Employment Benefits Committee recently approved the proposed new retirement policy, which includes the optional retirement program for faculty. The proposal has been submitted to President Banowsky with the recommendation that this document be returned to the various governance bodies on both campuses for their review and approval. (Please see page 2 of the Senate Journal for October 19, 1981.)
- (2) Proposal for MASUA tuition waivers for faculty dependents: Provost Morris informed the Senate Executive Committee last week that this matter had been discussed at a recent meeting of MASUA provosts and had met "with massive disinterest." The consensus of the group was that the proposal would be politically very difficult to implement. (Please see page 4 of the Senate Journal for March 16, 1981.)

POSTAL SERVICE CONTRACT: University dormitory space.

Professor Baker called attention to a topic discussed in one of the small-group sessions last fall but never mentioned since then; i.e., the United States Postal Service contract for use of dormitory space on campus. He asked whether anyone knew how much longer the contractual arrangement would continue and what benefits accrue to the University from the contract.

Professor Thompson indicated that the Senate Executive Committee would look into this matter.

## UNIVERSITY DECISION REGARDING KGOU

Professor Thompson noted with pleasure that the recent decision by Provost J. R. Morris to affiliate radio station KGOU with National Public Radio was in line with a Senate recommendation last fall. (Please see page 3 of the Senate Journal of October 19, 1981.)

## INTRODUCTION OF NEW PSA REPRESENTATIVE

Professor Thompson introduced Ms. Robin Powers (Counseling Service) as a new PSA representative.

## ADJOURNMENT

The Faculty Senate adjourned at 5:15 p.m. The next regular session of the Senate will be held at 3:30 p.m., on Monday, March 15, 1982, in Dale Hall 218.

Respectfully submitted,

*Anthony S. Lis*

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