

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

Regular meeting -- March 15, 1982 -- 3:30 p.m., Dale Hall 218

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

Present:

Baker	Foster, J.	Huseman	Murphy	Self
Biro	Foster, T.	Kiacz	Patten	Smith
Brown, H.	Gollahalli	Lanning	Ragan, J.	Sonleitner
Brown, S.	Graves	Levy	Ragan, T.	Stock
Christian	Hardy	Lis	Rinear	Thompson
Conner	Hayes	Locke	Scharnberg	Wainner
El-Ibiary	Hibdon	Maletz	Schleifer	West
Fishbeck	Howard	Menzie	Seaberg	Whitmore

Provost's office representative: Ray

PSA representatives: Cowen

Absent:

Christy	Dunn	Heaston	Lehr, Robert	Love
Covich	Ford	Hebert	Lehr, Roland	Moriarity
Driver	Gross			

PSA representatives: Clinkenbeard Little Powers
Guyer McNeil

Liaison, Women's Caucus: Morgan

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Announcements	
Weekend retreat of Executive Committees, OU/OSU/HSC	2
General Faculty spring meeting/reception	2
Action taken by President Banowsky	
Faculty Replacements: Judicial Tribunal	2
Speakers Bureau	2
Norman Faculty Survey: Salary issues, 1982-83	2
Action taken by Senate Executive Committee:	
EEC Committee on Communications	5
Selection of Faculty replacements:	
Budget Council	5
Investigative Council, Sexual Harassment	5
Report of Executive Committee: Meeting with Provost Morris	5
Search Committee for Dean, Environmental Design	5
Report of Senate/Budget Council Committee: OCCE	5
Report of Senate Committee on Faculty Welfare:	
University retirement plan	8
Remarks by Dean Sul Lee, University Libraries	8
Special report of University Libraries Committee:	
New circulation policy	9
Emergency Reapportionment, Senate Seats, 1982-83	10
Revision of University Patent Policy	11

ANNOUNCEMENTS

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 an appropriate joint action will be drawn.

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, CMU, to honor faculty members receiving distinguished professorships and awards.

ACTION TAKEN BY PRESIDENT WILLIAM S. BANOWSKY - Faculty replacements

On February 11, President Banowsky selected the following faculty replacements from the nominations submitted by the Faculty Senate:

Judicial Tribunal: Marc Faw (University Libraries)
Speakers Bureau: Joe Hobbs (Art)

(Please see page 2 of the Senate Journal for February 8, 1982.)

NORMAN CAMPUS FACULTY SURVEY: Salary issues, 1982-83.

Background information: In line with precedent, the Senate Committee on Faculty Compensation during February distributed a one-page questionnaire to 800 faculty members on the Norman campus in an attempt to ascertain faculty views and preferences concerning salary issues in connection with the 1982-83 budget.

The questionnaire contained the following prefatory comments:

Earlier this year, the administration recommended 13% faculty salary increases for next year. Their stated ultimate goal is to attain the AAU average within two years. This would require a similar increase the following year as well. The State Regents have proposed a 12% increase that would leave us 9% below the AAU average. The cost of living rose 8.9% last year.

At the announced deadline, faculty responses totaled 407 or 51 percent of the faculty. Questionnaires continue to trickle into the Senate office almost daily.

At a recent meeting of the Senate Executive Committee, Provost J. R. Morris was apprised of the results of the survey.

On March 5, the following final report was distributed to all Senate members:

Senate action: In commenting on the above-mentioned final report of the Committee, Professor Dierdre Hardy, Committee Chair, made the following observations:

Responses to question (1) proved to have 2 equally weighted preferences.

- 28 percent would like half the faculty salary increase money to be distributed on the basis of merit and 1/2 across the board.
- 28 percent would prefer that a percentage equal to last year's Consumer Price Index of 8.9 percent be distributed to all and the remainder used for merit increases.
- 20 percent expressed the opinion that 2/3 of the funds should be used for merit increases and 1/3 across the board.

The remaining categories scored 14 percent for distribution solely on the basis of merit, and 10 percent chose across-the-board distribution to all, regardless of merit.

Responses to question (2) revealed a choice by 56 percent of the faculty that all or part of the new money distributed across the board should be by percentage of the current salary and 44 percent considered an equal-dollar-amount distribution to be preferable.

It is of interest that the first choice of the 370 respondents to question (3), 112 or 30 percent chose "none of the above" and also chose not to suggest an alternate use, thereby saying, in effect, they were unwilling to find any of the options offered and preferred the money in their salaries. The other first-choice options selected were 19 percent for graduate students, 15 percent for departmental M&O budgets, 10-1/2 percent for additional insurance benefits, 10 percent for equity adjustments.

When tallied across horizontally combining first through ninth choices, 44 percent of the sample would be willing to spend extra money on graduate students and 42 percent on M&O budgets. Of these last percentages, 32 percent chose graduate students as their 1st or 2nd choice and 29 percent chose M&O budgets as their 1st or 2nd priority.

Professor Thompson, Senate Chair, noted that the Chair of the Budget Council on March 3, 1982, had reported the following related recommendation of that Council to President Banowsky:

"The Council further recommends that forty percent of salary and wage increase for 1982-83 be allocated across the board, leaving the balance of sixty percent to be allocated for equity, promotions and merit. The Council urges the Administration to continue addressing the issue of equity adjustments on the Norman campus."

Professor Thompson suggested that the final report of the Norman survey be submitted to President Banowsky without any interpretations.

Without taking formal action in the matter, the Senate expressed the consensus that Professor Thompson's suggestion be followed.

ACTION TAKEN BY SENATE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE: EEC Communications
Committee

The Employee Executive Council has recently invited the Faculty Senate to appoint two faculty representatives to serve on the Committee on Communications.

The task of that Committee is to pursue the possibility of establishing an all-campus publication, as well as prepare appropriate guidelines and procedures. Any recommendations will, of course, be addressed to the Senate and the EEC for support and approval.

On March 2, the Senate Executive Committee selected the following Senate representatives to serve on that group:

Tereë Foster, Chair-elect, Faculty Senate
Anthony S. Lis, Secretary, Faculty Senate

SELECTION OF FACULTY REPLACEMENTS: University groups

Professor Tereë Foster, Chair, Senate Committee on Committees, presented the following slate for the faculty vacancies on the University groups designated below:

Budget Council: Bob Carrell (Journalism)
Wayland Cummings (Communication)
replacing Brooks Hill (Communication), 1980-83

Investigative Council on Sexual Harassment:
Judy Katz (Human Relations)
replacing Dortha Killian (Human Development), 1981-83

Inasmuch as there were no additional nominations from the floor, the Committee slate was approved by acclamation.

REPORT OF SENATE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE: Meeting with Provost Morris

Professor Thompson, Senate Chair, reported as follows on the recent Senate Executive Committee meeting with Provost J. R. Morris:

- (1) At the moment, Provost Morris is much more optimistic about the 1982-83 Norman campus budget.
- (2) Provost Morris has recently issued a new proposal concerning the Honors College.

SEARCH COMMITTEE: Dean, College of Environmental Design

The Senate approved without dissent Professor Tereë Foster's motion to accept the following slate of faculty nominations for the five faculty positions on the proposed search committee for the Dean of the College of Environmental Design:

Floyd Calvert (Architecture)	Richard Kuhlman (Architecture)
Harold Conner (Const. Science)	Terry Patterson (Architecture)
Eugene Emery (Architecture)	Thomas Selland (Architecture)
Jerlene Hargis (Human Devel.)	Michael Wahl (Environmental Design)
Robert Hogan (Environ. Design)	Donna Young (Architecture)

REPORT OF SENATE/BUDGET COUNCIL COMMITTEE: OCCE

Background information: On March 1, the joint Budget Council and Faculty Senate ad hoc Committee on Continuing Education and Public Service issued the following report:

March 1, 1982

Charge: The Joint Committee on Continuing Education and Public Service was charged with examining the request for new money for 1982- submitted by the Vice Provost for Continuing Education and Public Service and for doing so in light of the University's responsibility for the provision of continuing education and public service. Because of the Budget Council's need for early recommendations, the Committee was required to report by March, 1982.

The University of Oklahoma presently engages in Continuing Education and Public Service as one of its assigned missions, with the purpose of serving the needs of the people of Oklahoma. Through this effort, the resources of the University are made available for addressing problems of the state. Further, the University's continuing education effort has reached important clientele groups outside Oklahoma, especially those in the armed forces and in both federal and private employment.

It is not our purpose here neither to outline in detail the programs offered nor to defend particular programs. Rather, we are reporting that we have examined the philosophy of Continuing Education and Public Service and found it sound. We believe that participation in these activities is appropriate for a modern state university; in fact, the University would be failing as a responsible institution should it limit itself to serving those who arrive on campus for degree programs.

Besides meeting a part of the University's responsibility, the continuing education and public service programs offer important opportunities for faculty from many disciplines to have contact with practitioners in their fields. We know that this does not include all disciplines, a fact that we regret. It should be a goal of the Vice Provost for Continuing Education and Public Service to broaden offerings in order both to better serve outside clientele and to afford greater opportunity to the University faculty.

Because we believe that Continuing Education and Public Service to be an important component of the total University, and because, along with instruction and research, it constitutes one of the three functions assigned by the State Regents for Higher Education, we have concluded that sufficient support should be provided to it from state-allocated money. We recognize that many of its programs can and should be self-supporting. Unfortunately, not all programs, although worthy, can accomplish this. Consequently, the University should adopt a goal of increasing its support for Continuing Education and Public Service.

In 1976, the staff of the Oklahoma State Regents for Higher Education recommended that State funding be supplied in an amount sufficient to support the administrative costs of extension operations, to include both credit and non-credit activities. Although this document was neither accepted nor rejected by the Regents, it has provided useful guidance.

The Office of the Vice Provost for Continuing Education and Public Service estimates that application of this guidance would increase support from \$612,000 to \$3,135,000. Such an increase would permit sharp expansion of public service programs, delivery of both credit and non-credit programs at a cost competitive with those offered by OSU and

other institutions, and the use of generated money to fund program development rather than to pay program overhead.

The Committee fully recognizes the impracticality of such a large increase in funds, as the Continuing Education and Public Service Staff seems to as well. Their request for \$2,039,873 for 1982-83, is considerably short of fully funding administrative costs.

Without attempting to set a specific amount, our committee recommends that an increase in funding of Continuing Education and Public Service be placed high in the University's list of priorities. We believe that the University of Oklahoma must increase its support, and we suggest that this is the year to begin. Over the next several years, it will be possible to attain a more appropriate level of funding, a level that will move the University out of the lower categories among institutions of our type. To accomplish this, the increases for 1983 and succeeding years must be large enough to assure that an expanding percentage of the Continuing Education and Public Service budget is supplied from state allocations. These increases will demonstrate the University's commitment--and reflect the state's commitment--to Continuing Education and Public Service.

Respectfully submitted,

F. Ted Hebert (Political Science) : Co-Chairs
 Gail B. de Stwolinski (Music)
 Travis P. Goggans (Accounting)
 Jay C. Smith (Education)

Senate action: In the absence of Professor Ted Hebert, Co-Chair of the joint Committee, Professor Jay Smith, a member of that group, made some personal observations.

The Committee was not sure of its charge. This was a new kind of task--essentially to review the OCCE request for state funds to defray the administrative costs of that Center.

The Committee decided to examine the overall, general policy of OCCE and to examine that philosophy in the light of the central mission of the University and its responsibility to provide continuing education and public service.

He then moved that the Senate approve the report of the joint Committee.

Questions were raised by Professors Locke, Teree Foster, Rinear, Fishbeck, Seaberg, West, and Whitmore regarding various aspects of the report, as well as the OCCE operation.

The Senate Chair noted an apparent consensus for the need for more information and even an unwillingness to adopt the report.

Professor West then moved that the report be tabled until such time as the Committee can provide additional, specific information concerning programs and finances. The tabling motion was approved without dissent.

REPORT OF SENATE COMMITTEE ON FACULTY WELFARE: New University retirement plan.

Professor Stephen Whitmore, Committee Chair, announced that a new retirement plan for the University had been approved by the University Employment Benefits Committee with the recommendation to the President that the plan be returned to the two Senates for their approval. The new plan provides for early retirement phased over a seven-year period. Copies of the new plan will be distributed to Senate members in advance of the April 12 Senate meeting.

REMARKS BY DEAN SUL LEE, UNIVERSITY LIBRARIES

At the invitation of the Senate Executive Committee, Dean Sul Lee, University Libraries, addressed the Senate.

Dean Lee began his 21-minute, informal presentation with an expression of appreciation to the University Libraries Committee, whose first faculty chair was Professor Jay Smith, a member of the Senate.

The remainder of his remarks dealt with national trends and issues, as well as accomplishments and plans of his administration.

Oklahoma University is the only Southwestern member of a consortium of 24 prestigious research libraries. Libraries throughout the country are experiencing and will continue to experience difficult times because of the national economy and inflation. In the future, a large number of networks and consortiums of all types will be developing.

Other issues that are emerging on the national scenes include:

- (1) Increasing volume of materials.
- (2) Preservation of materials. This problem will become very crucial with the rapid deterioration of national resources. The quality of paper since World War II has been changing for the worse.
- (3) The impact of developing technology on information transfer, storage, retrieval, and so forth.
- (4) More effective use and management of available resources including funding.

When he came to this University, Dean Lee articulated the following goals

- (1) Increased funding.
- (2) Improved space needs, particularly in the Bizzell Library.
- (3) Greater utilization of latest technology.
- (4) Improved faculty salaries.

In his opinion, "significant progress" has been made. Continuing effort will be made for even greater improvement in all areas.

He also noted these accomplishments:

- (1) Funding for book projects has been increased from \$750,000 in 1978 to \$1½ million in 1982 (excluding Law and HSC libraries).
- (2) Journal titles now total 16,000, with a goal of 20,000.

The automated library circulation system will be put into operation next fall.

On March 17, the Bizzell Library Society will be announced. Mr. Barry Galt of Tulsa will head the new fund-raising activity.

Dean Lee next introduced Professor William Cronenwett, the current Chair of the University Libraries Committee.

SPECIAL REPORT OF UNIVERSITY LIBRARIES COMMITTEE: New circulation policy

Professor William Cronenwett, Chair of the University Libraries Committee, distributed copies of the following report of that Committee:

 Background information

Replacement of lost books. Inflation in library materials has greatly exceeded the overall inflation rate for the last 5 years. The current \$10 replacement cost represented an average book cost at the time it was set; the current average price of a new book is \$25. Many publishers are no longer maintaining inventories of earlier publications; thus, older books may have to be bought from more expensive, out-of-print dealers.

The processing fee arises from the fact that the replacement of a lost book requires locating a source, writing a special order for one book, shipping, marking, shelving, and magnetic marking; the economics of scale of routine book purchase are lost. These administrative costs have also risen sharply.

Responsibility for return of books. The current system does not require or encourage care for books in keeping with their increasing value. The average cost of books is \$25 with many research texts at \$50 to \$75. A survey of comparable academic libraries in the region shows that we are one of the few institutions that do not charge faculty. We do charge students, staff, and courtesy borrowers, however.

Recall of needed books. We now have a much greater volume of scholarly activity than in earlier years, with a corresponding demand for library materials. At the same time, inflation has made it necessary to decrease the number of duplicate copies. Thus, we need to be able to keep our books available to all users.

Currently, a surprisingly high number of faculty ignore our requests for return of a book that a colleague or student has asked for. For example, about 60 percent of all faculty ignore the first two recall notices entirely and 40 percent never respond at all. We often have to borrow books on interlibrary loan to give to patrons because we cannot get our own books back. Other University libraries have confronted this problem; we have found that it is a common practice to impose fines for failure to return recalled materials.

Borrowing and on-line circulation. When the computer check-out system is installed, it will be very simple to keep track of recall notices, books returned, etc. We do not propose blocking borrowing privileges as a "punishment" but rather as a "third notice" that will be difficult to ignore.

Recommendations for changes in library circulation policies.

- (1) That the Libraries raise the amount charged for an out-of-print, lost book from \$10 to the average price of a book in the appropriate subject field, based on publisher's data, plus a \$10 processing fee. Furthermore, the price charged for the out-of-print book should be adjusted annually to take into account changes in the cost of publishing.
- (2) That the Libraries charge faculty members for any books that they report lost or that have not been renewed for 80 days. Faculty who fail to respond to bills sent by the Library for lost books will have their accounts sent to the Bursar's Office for collection.

(3) That faculty members who fail to respond to recall notices be fined in the same manner as students. The current fine rate is 25¢ per day with a \$10 maximum.

(4) That, after the new online circulation system is operational in the summer of 1982, the Library block the borrowing privileges of any patron (student, faculty, or other) who keeps a recalled book past the recall due date.

PROPOSED, EMERGENCY REAPPORTIONMENT OF SENATE SEATS, 1982-83

Background information: During its first year of existence, the new College of Geosciences has been without official representation in the Faculty Senate. Inasmuch as the next "regular" reapportionment of Senate seats is scheduled for the 1983-86 triennial, the Senate officers have proposed an emergency, one-year reapportionment of Senate seats to provide some representation for the Geosciences College. Final approval must await the spring meeting of the General Faculty on April 8, 1982.

Senate action: Professor Rinear moved approval of the proposed reapportionment for 1982-83 as published in the Agenda for this meeting. Without discussion and without dissent, the Senate approved the proposed reapportionment to be considered by the General Faculty on the Norman campus at its spring meeting on Thursday, April 8.

ALLOCATION OF SENATE SEATS

Division	1980-83				1982-83 (proposed)			
	Total faculty	%age of faculty	%age of seats*	seats allocated	Total faculty	%age of faculty	%age of seats*	Proposed seat allocation
Arts & Sciences	382	50.80	20.83	22	392	47.80	19.12	19 + 1 = 20
Business Admin.	71	9.44	3.87	5	83	10.12	4.05	4 + 1 = 5
Education	48	6.38	2.62	4	52	6.34	2.54	3 + 1 = 4
Engineering	92	12.23	5.01	6	83	10.12	4.05	4 + 1 = 5
Envir. Design	22	2.93	1.20	2	24	2.93	1.17	1 + 1 = 2
Fine Arts	68	9.04	3.71	5	78	9.51	3.80	4 + 1 = 5
Law	29	3.86	1.58	2	30	3.66	1.46	1 + 1 = 2
Provost Direct Univ. Libraries (25) ROTC (15)	40	5.32	2.18	2	42	5.13	2.05	2 + 0 = 2
Grad. College				1				1
Liberal Studies				1				1
Geosciences					36	4.39	1.76	2 + 1 = 3
Total	752			50	820			50

*40 seats (excluding 10 automatically assigned to colleges/other groups)

In the proposed one-year reapportionment, the College of Arts and Sciences loses two seats; the College of Engineering, one seat. These three seats are, in turn, assigned to the College of Geosciences.

The Senate Chair announced that Professor Donald Patten of the Mathematics Department had been requested to verify the mathematical computations in advance of the General Faculty meeting.

PROPOSED REVISION OF UNIVERSITY PATENT POLICY

Background information: On February 8, 1982, the Senate tabled a motion to approve the proposed revision of the University Patent Policy that had been approved by the Patent Advisory Committee and the Senate Executive Committee. (Please see pages 14-18 of the Senate Journal for February 8, 1982.) A Senate ad hoc Committee (Professors Sherril Christian, Donald Menzie, George Cozad, Le Roy Blank, and Stewart Ryan) has been studying further changes in the proposal.

Senate action: In response to Dean Kenneth Hoving's request, Professor Thompson, Senate Chair, invited Dean Hoving and Mr. Elder to appear before the Senate again to update the Senate regarding subsequent developments.

Dean Hoving introduced his guest, Mr. Dick Mason, a 1929 Oklahoma University graduate with a major in electrical engineering. Mr. Mason also has a master's degree from the Massachusetts Institute of Technology and a law degree from George Washington University. He is one of the founders of a very large patent firm in Chicago. Since his retirement seven years ago, he has been working closely with the research administration at Arizona and New Mexico Universities, as well as with faculty and research activities at Arizona State University. He has been working recently with Dean Hoving and Mr. Elder in an attempt to create a workable patent policy for the University of Oklahoma. He noted that his visit to the Senate was his first official contact with OU faculty in 53 years.

Dean Hoving next reported his approval of several changes in the proposed policy--primarily changes made in his meetings with the HSC Senate. Professor Rinear moved approval of the specific changes to be incorporated in the subsequent "final" version of the proposal. The Senate approved the motion without dissent.

During the ensuing discussion, Professor Christian appealed for more time "to polish" the language of the revised policy. Additional questions were raised from the floor by Professors Whitmore, West, and Biro. Professor John Foster moved that this question be tabled once again. With some dissent, the Senate approved the tabling motion.

Professor Thompson, Senate Chair, expressed the Senate's appreciation for Mr. Mason's interest in this matter and his willingness to appear before the Senate.

ADJOURNMENT

The Faculty Senate adjourned at 5:16 p.m. The next regular session of the Senate will be held at 3:30 p.m., on Monday, April 12, 1982, in Dale Hall 218.

Respectfully submitted,



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