

JOURNAL OF THE FACULTY SENATE (Norman campus)

The University of Oklahoma

Special session -- June 28, 1982 -- 3:00 p.m., Adams Hall 104

The Faculty Senate was called to order by Professor Teree Foster, Chair.

Present:

| | | | | |
|-----------|------------|--------------|--------------|------------|
| Baker | Ford | Hayes | Lehr, Roland | Nicewander |
| Christian | Foster | Hebert | Lis | Patten |
| Conner | Gollahalli | Hibdon | Love | Seaberg |
| Dumont | Goodman | Howard | McDonald | Sonleitner |
| Dunn | Grant | Lanning | Moriarity | Whitmore |
| Fishbeck | Graves | Lehr, Robert | | |

Provost's office representative: Ray

Absent:

| | | | | |
|----------|--------|-----------|------------|-----------|
| Bredeson | Hardy | Kleine | Ragan, T. | Slaughter |
| Buhite | Harper | Kutner | Scharnberg | Smith |
| Catlin | Hauser | Levy | Schleifer | Stock |
| Christy | Inman | Locke | Schmitz | West |
| Gross | Kiacz | Ragan, J. | | |

| | | | |
|----------------------|--------------|--------|--------|
| PSA representatives: | Clinkenbeard | Guyer | McNeil |
| | Cowen | Little | Powers |

Liaison, Women's Caucus: Morgan UOSA representative: Sevenoaks

(Secretary's note: In accordance with precedent, absences from special meetings of the Senate are not counted in the attendance records of Senators. However, Senate members have the privilege of utilizing their attendance at the special meeting on June 28 to offset an absence from a regular meeting during the 1982-83 academic year.)

TABLE OF CONTENTS

| | |
|--|----|
| Proposed Revision: University policy on student withdrawals . . . | 2 |
| Actions taken by President William S. Banowsky: | |
| Faculty Position Paper: Traffic/Parking | 6 |
| Faculty Position Paper: International Dimensions, University Programs | 6 |
| Senate Committee Report: General Education | 7 |
| Redesignation, Phys. Resources/Campus Planning Council | 7 |
| ✓ Action taken by State Legislature: Admission standards and general education requirements, OSU and OU | 7 |
| Report of Senate standing Committees: | |
| Executive Committee | |
| Scheduling of athletic events during finals | 7 |
| Senate Committee report on general education | 8 |
| Proposed study of admission requirements | 8 |
| Energy Conservation Committee | 8 |
| Proposed Senate/UOSA Committee on make-up policy | 8 |
| EEC/Senate review of Affirmative Action Policy | 8 |
| Committee on Faculty Welfare | 9 |
| Final reports of Senate special committees: | |
| Committee on Administrative Search Committees | 9 |
| Committee on Teaching Environment | 12 |
| Final reports: | |
| EEC/Senate Committee, problems of professional staff with advanced degrees | 16 |
| EEC/Senate Committee on proposed all-campus publication | 20 |
| Proposed revision, charge/membership, Research Council | 22 |

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

The Journals for the following sessions of the Faculty Senate were approved:

- (a) special session on May 3, 1982, and
- (b) regular session April 12, 1982, with the following correction:

The following item was inadvertently omitted from the Journal for the regular session on April 12, 1982:

PROPOSED REVISION: University policy on student withdrawals.

Background information: Last fall, Ms. Malia Connery, a law student and a graduate teaching assistant in the College of Business Administration, expressed a serious concern regarding faculty implementation of the campus policy on grades given to students upon withdrawal from classes. (Please see page 14 of the Senate Journal for November 9, 1981.)

During the past several months, this question was discussed repeatedly by the Senate Executive Committee with additional input from the Academic Regulations Committee, the Provost, the Graduate Dean, the College of Arts and Sciences Dean, the University College Dean, and the Engineering College faculty.

The Senate Executive Committee subsequently synthesized the various views and suggestions in the process of preparing its own proposal for revising the current University policy. The Agenda for the April 12 Senate meeting included the following self-explanatory table:

April 5, 1982

NORMAN CAMPUS POLICY: Student withdrawals from courses.

| Week of the term (fall and spring) | Present Policy | Revision proposed by Faculty Senate Executive Committee |
|--|--|---|
| 1 | Free withdrawals. | Free withdrawal. |
| 2 | No grade posted. | No grade posted. |
| 3 | All withdrawals | All withdrawals receive "W." |
| 4 | receive "W." | |
| 5 | "W" or "F" assigned at the discretion of the instructor. | Withdrawals not permitted except by direct petition to the Dean of the college in which the course is taught. |
| 6 | | |
| 7 | | |
| 8 | | |
| 9 | | |
| 10 | | |
| 11 | | |
| 12 | No withdrawals with passing grade, | |
| 13 | | |
| 14 | | |
| 15 | | |
| 16 | | |
| NOTE: Summer session deadlines are shortened to one-half the lengths of all above recommendations. | | |
| "W" as a final grade. | "W" can be given for 1) never attending 2) extraordinary cause, or 3) no basis for a failing grade. | "W" no longer permitted as a final grade. |

Support for the Senate Committee proposal was expressed by Professors Locke, Stock, Love, El-Ibiary, West, and Fishbeck.

Dr. Messer, University Registrar, reported the following grade distribution data on the Norman campus for the years, 1968 and 1981, that reflect the effects of the withdrawal policy.

| Grade | 1968 | 1981 |
|-------|--------|--------|
| A | 30,000 | 50,000 |
| B | 56,000 | 60,000 |
| C | 55,000 | 46,000 |
| D | 16,000 | 16,000 |
| E | 13,000 | 11,000 |
| GPA | 2.42 | 2.67 |

He also commented on the Academic Regulations Committee's suggestion that the neutral grade of WF be used. In their opinion, WF is more descriptive of what actually happens. He urged the Senate to take action that would be applicable uniformly on campus and to avoid establishing varying policies for the various colleges.

Professor Love expressed his reaction to Mr. Sevenoaks' philosophy expressed earlier--that is, to wait until the last possible date to decide whether to drop a course. In his words, "That is exactly what we are trying to avoid. With that philosophy, we will have no one with anything but A's on the transcript!"

Dean Weber commented that the reason for initiating a review of this policy had been largely to provide "a basis for making decisions in a manner that removes an enormous burden on the faculty member." In his view, a petition should be treated as a legitimate exception and not just another way of getting around the regulations.

Professor West mentioned the heavy enrollments and the long waiting lists for courses in civil engineering. A quiz during the first three weeks should give students some indication of progress and should counteract grade shopping.

Professor Whitmore, on the other hand, suggested that students who withdraw from a particular course not be allowed to re-enroll in that course for a year. Professor Graves supported that suggestion but felt that such students should be put in a "conditional enrollment" status in a subsequent semester until the end of the enrollment period.

Professor Gross opposed the amendment proposed by the Engineering faculty. The College of Arts and Sciences has a different problem--i.e., reduced enrollments. In his view, "shopping around is not necessarily bad. The students have a right for a few weeks to try to see whether a particular course is the one that they really want." He was concerned that allowing instructors to give an F after the third week could mean too much potential that could be used "capriciously." He favored the Senate Executive Committee proposal that he considered to be a compromise.

Senate action: In presenting the Senate Executive Committee proposal, Professor Thompson, Senate Chair, noted that one of the objectives of the change in the policy is the general upgrading of academic standards. He added, "This speaks to the problem of grade inflation and addresses the question of students being able to produce at the end of their college careers transcripts with a high grade-point average but with a large number of W's. Very often in large classes, most of those who would eventually fail the course drop out and grade inflation results."

Professor Thompson then moved Senate approval of the Senate Executive Committee proposal that he termed "extremely liberal compared to the policies at other universities throughout the country."

Dean Weber of the University College considered the proposal a "reasonable one that moves in the desirable direction." He did, however, propose that the dean to be petitioned after the 6th week should be the dean of the college in which the student is enrolled rather than the college in which the course is taught. In his opinion, the dean of the student's college has records and other pertinent information that would be of primary concern in taking action on petitions. Another possibility would be to route the petition to both deans; such additional channeling would make the process "unnecessarily cumbersome."

Dean Weber also noted that his proposal would allow 8 rather than 6 weeks for withdrawing with a "W." However, he posed no objection to the reduced time limit of 6 weeks.

Dean Hoving of the Graduate College also offered the suggestion that the dean involved in deciding exceptional cases be the dean of the student's college.

Professor Rinear expressed himself in favor of the original stipulation that the dean of the college of instruction and not of the college of enrollment be involved in the petitioning process. He mentioned the large number of Arts and Sciences students who take courses in the College of Fine Arts and wait until the midsemester and later to withdraw.

Professor Love presented the proposal offered by the Engineering Senators that no withdrawals be permitted after the 6th week. He cited the large enrollments in that College and the practice of some students "shopping around" while others are denied access to the classes that they need.

Mr. Sevenoaks, the newly appointed UOSA representative, commented that the Student Congress "is not very receptive" to the proposal. He noted that there is no uniformity in test scheduling on this campus, particularly the mid-term examination. At one point, he stated, "Twelve weeks may be a little long but six weeks is a little short."

Mr. Sevenoaks also favored the use of the instructor in consenting to withdrawals after a stipulated deadline. He expressed a reluctance to channel the workload through the dean's office whose heavy workload would preclude giving adequate attention to each petition.

He urged the faculty members either to defeat or to table the proposal. "We are not trying to fight you but we are willing to work with you. We should have some sort of compromise."

Professor Schliefer also indicated his opposition to the amendment and asked, "Who will protect the students when there are insufficient instructors?"

Professor Rinear saw "different needs among the various colleges." In his opinion, "The issue is how to protect the student during the period, from 3 to 6 weeks, when the instructor can assign either W or F." He felt that W must be given to protect the student from any kind of hostility on the part of the instructor.

Subsequently, the faculty approved the amendment (W or F between the 3rd and the 6th week) in a tally of 23 in favor and 19 against.

Professor Moriarity next moved that the proposal be amended to stipulate that the dean of the college in which the student is enrolled must be involved in the petitioning process rather than the dean of the college in which the course is offered.

Professor Levy favored the amendment as being "more efficient administratively."

Professor Hebert felt that 70-90 percent of the students would be petitioning the dean. He expressed a concern about graduate and University College students.

The faculty then approved the amendment in a voice vote without dissent.

At this point, Mr. Sevenoaks reiterated his plea that students be allowed to withdraw after the sixth week and urged the Senate to reject the proposal.

In a voice vote without dissent, the Senate approved the proposal as amended twice at this meeting.

Professor Baker next moved that the Faculty Senate recommend to the administration that the new policy be implemented not later than the fall, 1982, semester if possible.

In a voice vote with a few dissenting votes, the Senate approved the motion.

As submitted in final form to the University administration, the Senate proposal reads as follows:

(Section 4.5.1, Faculty Handbook, November, 1981)

W (meaning withdrawal) is a neutral grade given a student who withdraws from a course with a passing grade.

A student who withdraws from a course during the first two weeks of classes (first week of a summer session) receives no grade.

From the third week (the second week of a summer session) through the sixth week (the third week of a summer session), the student receives, upon withdrawal, a grade of either W or F from the instructor of the course.

After the sixth week (the third week of a summer session) through the remainder of the term, withdrawals are not permitted except by direct petition to the dean of the college in which the student is enrolled. The student who withdraws with permission of the dean of the college in which he or she is enrolled receives either W or F as the final grade at the discretion of the instructor.

After the twelfth week (sixth week of a summer session), a grade of W or F will be given as the final grade to a student who is dropped for nonpayment of fees.

ACTIONS TAKEN BY PRESIDENT WILLIAM S. BANOWSKY

- ✓(1) Faculty Position Paper - Traffic/Parking, Norman campus: On April 27, 1982, President Banowsky acknowledged receipt of the 1982 Position Paper on Traffic and Parking (Norman campus) with the following message addressed to the Senate Secretary:

"It was encouraging to note that the conclusions of the Faculty Senate ad hoc Committee studying traffic/parking problems on the Norman campus were generally consistent with goals I have enunciated at various times while addressing our problems. I believe that the final report of the consulting firm of Harland Bartholomew and Associates, Inc., will assist us in these efforts."

(Please see pages 22-27 of the Senate Journal for April 12, 1982.)

- (2) Faculty Position Paper - International Dimensions of the University of Oklahoma: On May 14, President Banowsky addressed the following message to the Senate Secretary:

"Thank you for forwarding to me the report of the Faculty Senate ad hoc Committee on the international dimensions of the University. This report is particularly timely and, as you know, I am very sympathetic toward the goals enunciated in the paper.

"I can assure you that the recommendations contained in the paper will be given very serious consideration."

(Please see page 3 and pages 7-12 of the Senate Journal for the special session on May 3, 1982.)

- ✓(3) Senate Committee Report on General Education

(a) On June 1, President William S. Banowsky forwarded copies of the Senate Committee report on general education to all deans on the Norman campus. His memorandum included the following comments:

"In the next meeting of the Deans' Council, Provost Morris will discuss with you the procedures for evaluating the Committee's proposals within each of your Colleges.

"The University of Oklahoma has an opportunity and a responsibility to influence the quality of secondary education in our state. As a part of our discussions concerning general education requirements within each college, I would hope that the colleges consider recommendations that would increase the admis-

sions requirements of students coming to the University from Oklahoma high schools. In coordination with Oklahoma State University, this effort could dramatically assist Oklahoma high schools encouraging greater efforts from their university-bound students."

(b) Also on June 1, President Banowsky addressed the following pertinent message to the Senate Secretary:

"Please express my appreciation to the Senate ad hoc Committee that engaged in an in-depth study of general education requirements at the University during the 1981-82 academic year. This group provided a valuable service to the institution that will result in improvements, I believe, in the educational program of the University of Oklahoma.

"The Committee recommendation will provide a basis for discussions within each college and within the central administration of possible revisions in our general education requirements."

(Please see pages 4-6 of the Senate Journal for the special session on May 3, 1982, and also page 8 of this Journal.)

✓(4) Proposed redesignation of the Physical Resources/Campus Planning Council (Norman): On May 13, President Banowsky acknowledged, without comment, the Senate proposal to redesignate the Physical Resources and Campus Planning Council (Norman) as the Campus Planning Council (Norman).

ACTION TAKEN BY STATE LEGISLATURE: Admission standards and general education requirements, OSU and OU.

Professor Foster, Senate Chair, reported the fact that State Representative Cleta Deatherage had recently furnished the Senate office a copy of the concurrent resolution of the Senate and the House, 38th Legislature (1981-82), stating legislative intent concerning the utilization of certain funds appropriated to the Oklahoma State Regents for Higher Education.

Expressing appreciation for Ms. Deatherage's continuing interest and support, Professor Foster called attention to the following section of that concurrent resolution of the State Legislature:

"SECTION 15. It is the intent of the Legislature that the two comprehensive universities undertake a review of their admission standards and general education requirements for possible upgrading and strengthening where necessary to contribute to improved educational quality and excellence."

REPORT OF SENATE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

Professor Teree Foster, Senate Chair, reported on the following items:

Scheduling of athletic events during finals: Last spring, the Athletics Council disapproved the scheduling of two basketball games during the 1982 finals week--viz., Tuesday, December 14, and Saturday, December 18.

Coach Billy Tubbs appealed to the Council Chair for an exception to allow the December 18 (last day of finals) game with Georgia Tech in Oklahoma City. The December 14 game will be either canceled or rescheduled.

After checking with the Senate Executive Committee, Professor Hengst Council Chair, wrote to the Athletic Director approving the December 18 game as a one-time "compromise" exception and recommending that Coach Tubbs send a confirming memorandum to the Council indicating his agreement with the exceptional nature of his request. Professor Hengst indicated that Coach Tubbs earlier had informally stated that he would abide by the decisions of the Council.

Senate Committee report on general education: On June 1, President William S. Banowsky forwarded copies of the report on general education to all deans on the Norman campus. (Please see page 6 of this Journal.)

Provost Morris discussed this matter at a recent meeting of the Deans' Council. All programs are to be reviewed according to the desires and the needs of each college.

Professor Foster added that the Executive Committee is considering ways of implementing the report so that the document "is not merely preserved in the archives." She solicited faculty ideas, suggestions, and comments.

Proposed study of admission requirements: At the Poteau conference last April, OSU and OU representatives agreed to study the possibility and the feasibility of having both comprehensive universities upgrade their admission requirements. (Please see page 3 of the Senate Journal for April 12, 1982.)

Energy Conservation Committee: Executive Vice President Gerald Turner informed the Senate Chair recently that the Energy Conservation Committee had requested council status.

The Senate Executive Committee felt that council status would be inappropriate now but recommended that the Committee membership be increased from five to seven.

On June 24, 1982, President William S. Banowsky approved the recommendation to increase the membership of that Committee to seven, including an additional faculty representative.

Proposed Senate/UOSA Committee on make-up policy: At a recent meeting with the Senate Executive Committee, a group of UOSA representatives requested a joint Senate/UOSA study of the University policy concerning the making up of class absences and tests by students away from the campus on legitimate, extra-curricular activities. The Senate Executive Committee agreed to undertake such a joint study early next fall.

EEC/Senate review of Affirmative Action Policy: Professor Foster, Senate Chair, reported that during the past year she had received many "mild" complaints about the Affirmative Action Policy. Subsequent discussions with the leadership of the Employee Executive Council have led to the decision to form two separate, independent groups to study how the policy operations in terms of hiring/promotion. The groups will not look at goals and how they are set but rather look at the existing document itself.

The faculty group includes the following individuals:

Keith Bystrom (Law), Chair
 Ramon Alonso (Management)
 Sherril Christian (Chemistry)
 Jean McDonald (Political Science)
 Gail Weftstein (Affirmative Action Liaison)

The two groups will issue a joint report, hopefully in November, for subsequent consideration by the Faculty Senate and the Employee Executive Council.

✓ REPORT OF SENATE COMMITTEE ON FACULTY WELFARE

Professor Stephen Whitmore, Committee Chair, reported on the following items:

- (1) Retirement plan: University Regents recently approved the new University retirement plan that includes the phased-retirement option.
- (2) Use of University recreational facilities by retirees: University recreational facilities (Huffman Fitness Center and the swimming complex) are now available for use without charge by retired faculty and staff.
- (3) OTRS contributions: Professor Whitmore urged interested faculty to check with the Personnel Services office by July 15 to sign the appropriate form for tax sheltering the OTRS contributions.

Professor Christian suggested that an appropriate reminder be sent to Norman campus faculty members.

(The Senate Secretary accordingly sent an appropriate notice to Norman campus faculty on June 29.)

Professor Whitmore reported that the OTRS base has been raised from \$17,000 to \$25,000. He also stated that the TIAA-CREF contribution is determined before the OTRS deduction is made.

- (4) New OTRS free life insurance: The State Legislature recently approved the issuance, without charge, of an \$18,000 life-insurance "death benefit" to all OTRS participants while in service.

PROPOSED REVISION: University policy, administrative search committees.

Background information: During the 1980-81 academic year, the Faculty Senate took the initiative in reviewing the University policy on administrative search committees. An ad hoc Committee's proposal for revising the policy was approved by the Senate on March 30, 1981. (Please see pages 4-6 of the Senate Journal for the special session on March 30, 1981.)

In due course, President Banowsky referred the Senate proposal to the University Regents for their consideration and action.

In May, 1981, Regent Dan Little, as a Regents' Committee of One, contacted the Senate Chair about an appropriate, in-depth, joint study of this question. Another Senate ad hoc Committee (consisting of the Senate officers--Professors Gary Thompson, Teree Foster, and Anthony S. Lis--as well as Professors Alex Kondonassis, Tom Love, Kenneth Merrill, Patricia Self, and Jay Smith and Mr. Chester Cowen, representing the Employee Executive Council) met with Regent Little several times throughout the summer, fall, and winter, 1981-82. (Please see page 4 of the Senate Journal for the special session on June 29, 1981.)

The final report of that group, with the approval of Regent Little, was distributed to Senate members on June 21, 1982.

Senate action: In formally presenting the Committee proposal for Senate approval, Professor Foster, Senate Chair, reviewed the history of the document and called attention to the following two points therein:

- (1) A faculty majority is guaranteed on all search committees, except for vice presidents and non-academic vice provosts (Section C (3)).
- (2) The preamble (Section C) states explicitly what has always been done implicitly. The University Regents are the "final governing authority." They were concerned that the statement be made explicit; Committee members were equally concerned that the role of the faculty also be made explicit. Therefore, both statements are included.

Professor Foster next called on Professor Gary Thompson, Senate Chair, 1981-82. He also noted that the University of Oklahoma is governed by a Board of Regents with strong constitutional powers--in his view, "stronger than most boards of regents of public institutions in this country." He expressed the opinion that the Regents do not wish to exercise their authority "capriciously" and do want the system to work internally. "They are very sincere in this."

In Professor Thompson's opinion, the proposal "represents a real compromise" and is acceptable to the Regents in its present form. He urged the Senate to adopt the proposal after appropriate discussion.

Professor Hebert raised some questions concerning faculty representation on search committees for deans.

Professors Howard and Ford also commented on the need to have University faculty "at large" representation.

Subsequently, Professor Hebert moved that the last section (Section 4, Deans) be amended to specify that the President of the University shall designate the number of positions to be filled from both the general faculty of the college or unit involved and the University faculty at large. The former would constitute the majority of the committee; the latter would be selected from nominations submitted by the Faculty Senate. His motion also authorized the Senate Executive Committee to work out the final language of his change.

Professor Ford asked whether the Regents would accept further modifications in the proposed revision. Professor Thompson replied, "I think that this modification would be received favorably, although some parts of the document could not be changed easily."

Associate Provost Ray cautioned about starting a "snowballing effect" in increasing the size of the search committee to maintain the desired faculty majority.

Subsequently, the Senate members approved without dissent both Professor Hebert's motion to amend the Committee proposal and the Committee proposal as amended.

In final form, the proposed policy revision reads as follows:

FINAL REVISION: University policy on administrative search committees

C. Administrative search committees.

It is expected that administrative search committees will make nominations and recommendations concerning candidates and that the President of the University and the Board of Regents will be guided by them in most instances, but it is understood that the President and the Board of Regents shall not be bound by nor limited to nominations and recommendations of administrative search committees. The Faculty Senate shall be informed of all faculty nominations before the committee is finally constituted.

The spirit and the letter of all applicable Affirmative Action regulations shall be followed.

1. President of the University.

The selection of the President and the process leading to that selection are the prerogatives of the particular Board serving at the time that the selection process is established. However, it is recommended that the presidential search committee have representation by the faculty from the Norman campus, the Health Sciences Center, students(s), and staff. The Board of Regents would appoint these members from nominees selected by the following organizations: faculty members, by the appropriate Faculty Senate; student member(s), by the University of Oklahoma Student Association or the Health Sciences Center Student Association; and staff member(s), by the Employee Executive Council or the Employee Liaison Council. Faculty members shall constitute a majority. There shall be twice as many nominees as there are positions. The Board of Regents shall designate other members as deemed appropriate.

2. Provost and academic Vice Provosts.

The committee shall have faculty, student, and staff representation. The President of the University shall appoint these members from nominees selected by the following organizations: faculty members, by the appropriate Faculty Senate; student member(s), by the University of Oklahoma Student Association or Health Sciences Center Student Association; and staff member(s), by the Employee Executive Council or the Employee Liaison Council. Faculty members shall constitute a majority. There shall be twice as many nominees as there are positions. The President of the University may designate other members as deemed appropriate.

3. Vice Presidents and non-academic Vice Provosts.

The committee shall have faculty, student, and staff representation. The same procedure for selecting committee members as outlined in Section C.2 will be followed. Because the degree of faculty and

staff participation should vary in accordance with the duties of the administrative official being sought, faculty need not constitute the majority of a committee composed to search for an administrative official whose duties are primarily non-academic.

4. Deans

The Committee shall have faculty, student, and staff representation. The procedure for selecting student and staff representation shall be as outlined in Section C.2. Upon requesting nominations of faculty members, the President of the University shall designate the number of positions to be filled from (a) the general faculty of the particular college or unit involved and (b) the university faculty at large. The former shall constitute a majority of committee positions and shall be nominated by the general faculty of the college or unit involved. There shall be at least one position filled from the University faculty at large from nominations made by the Faculty Senate. In all cases, there shall be twice as many nominees as there are positions. The President of the University shall make all appointments.

FINAL REPORT: Committee on Teaching Environment.

Background information: Last fall, several Senate ad hoc Committees were appointed to study specific faculty concerns and submit reports to be included in the 1982 Faculty Position Paper. One such group was assigned the topic of the teaching environment on the Norman campus. (Please see page 4 of the Senate Journal for October 19, 1981.)

The final report of that Committee was distributed to Senate members in advance of the special session on May 10, 1982. Consideration of this question, however, was postponed until this special session of the Senate.

Senate action: After moving acceptance of the Committee report, Professor William Graves, Committee Chair, reported briefly on his Committee's activities and deliberations. He noted an "interesting phenomenon"--- instructors using classrooms that are 2, 3, and even 4 steps removed from the decisions that should be made concerning the rooms. In some cases, departments do not own the classrooms of their faculty; in other cases, even the colleges themselves do not own them. The problem is further complicated when the faculty member is teaching outside his or her own designated area.

In Professor Graves' words, the classroom is a teaching tool. Most people who work with tools of any kind do not let other individuals buy or manage tools for them. On the Norman campus, the lack of an effective communication channel is a major problem. As a result, there is a tendency on the part of the faculty not to report any complaints.

Professors Baker, Christian, Grant, and Hibdon expressed their reactions and concerns particularly with regard to the lack of an appropriate communication channel.

Associate Provost Ray commented that Dr. Ronald Stafford, Assistant Provost (Norman campus), should be contacted by departments and faculty members. There was consensus at this meeting that the report of the Committee should include a reference to Assistant Provost Stafford in the "Conclusions" section.

Professor McDonald called attention to the fact that the Committee report does not address the problem of maintenance. In responding, Professor Graves stated that maintenance is a janitorial service and that problems should be handled through the department and the dean. He noted that the deans do not hire the janitorial staff.

The Senate subsequently accepted the Committee report in a voice vote without dissent.

The text of the Committee report follows--except for the 13-page list submitted by the Office of Classroom Scheduling giving location, capacity, designation, configuration, seating type, and special features of every classroom on the Norman campus. (Interested faculty members may obtain copies of that list from the Faculty Senate office, OMU 242, 5-6789.)

The General Faculty of the University of Oklahoma (Norman campus) is formally charged with responsibilities in four areas: teaching, research, continuing education and public service (Faculty Handbook, paragraph 3.1). The teaching function is traditionally linked to the professoriat. This report was undertaken to investigate the state of the environment in which teaching occurs on this campus.

Rather than enumerate the number or percentage of non-functional seats, erratic sound systems or dim lighting conditions in classrooms, all of which do occur, this report will focus on delineating the organizational structure behind one of our basic tools, the classroom environment. It was felt that the faculty can and should identify specific areas of need and concern within their own disciplines. Given this "grass roots" value, an understanding of the process for change would be beneficial.

On the Norman campus, all teaching facilities are the responsibility of the Provost's office. Many departments support specialized space for which they are responsible for routine work (e.g., laboratories). Classroom assignment is generally handled centrally by the Office of Classroom Scheduling (OCS). Some departments have "in-house" space into which they may assign classes. For example, the College of Education schedules all of the classroom space in Collings Hall. For the bulk of classroom assignments throughout campus, departments make requests for space and the OCS makes the assignment based on the request, previous class enrollment history, and distance from the professor's home department. A report from the OCS specifying the location, capacity, designation, configuration, seating type, and special features is provided at the end of this report. The total capacity of "special purpose" rooms sometimes used for classes is also indicated. A representative from the OCS indicated that classroom space is becoming increasingly scarce due to classroom conversion to other uses, increasing enrollment and lack of construction.

Repairs and substantial maintenance of classrooms are usually performed by Physical Plant. Such services are often requested by the Provost's office but are also requested by a department or college representative. Fiscal responsibility is generally assumed by the Provost. Two recent changes have been undertaken which deviate from this "crisis management" orientation. Major refurbishing is presently underway on a "greatest need" basis. A building is identified in which renewal of classrom is undertaken. After that building is refurbished, another is started as funds permit. This approach is also in the works for the sound systems in the larger lecture halls which will be routinely checked and maintained by the University's Instructional Services Center.

Faculty involvement in the preceding events is relatively minimal (notification of a deficiency, indication of a preference for class location). In many cases, this is probably appropriate as these are processes for which it is easy to establish a paradigm. However, faculty input would be desirable in the decisions on how to refurbish a classroom and perhaps in scheduling work within a building.

There are presently two major construction projects underway involving classroom space, one in planning and one at the construction stage. Burton Hall is being extensively remodeled for Human Development. The director detailed the process of planning and implementation of this project, and faculty involvement was reported as being extensive from the outset. Four plans were provided by the project engineers and all were modified and evaluated by the faculty before approving a final plan. The central administration recognized the need and provided the budget; the faculty provided detailed input as to what was needed for instructional and other uses.

The Energy Center is in the planning stage. The faculty involvement and autonomy that was indicated in the remodeling of Burton Hall was reinforced in the planning of the Energy Center space. Virtually all considerations about the building, such as allocation of space to offices, laboratories and classrooms had extensive faculty input.

In the organizational structure of the Norman campus, there is an office of the Vice Provost for Instructional Services. This office supports several services relative to the teaching environment. One of those is the Instructional Services Center. The Instructional Services Center provides assistance and consultation on instructional design and media service and the previously mentioned plan for routine maintenance of sound and media systems. There is also an instructional consultant who can supply alternative class evaluation procedures, who conducts seminars for teaching assistants on topics of importance to instruction and who coordinates campus-wide faculty interaction on the processes of teaching.

To the extent that there may be concerns with the physical or support environment for teaching, there does not seem to be anything to impede the faculty at whatever level--individual to university wide--from organizing an idea for change and forwarding it to the appropriate level. One faculty member apparently indicated that phone hookups in some classrooms would enable a professor to arrange to have a specialist on some topic available for an interactive session in class at considerably less expense than transporting that person to Norman. The same potential would allow access to local or national computer systems and data bases for class purposes. Initially, funding for this was not provided but eventually it was found and the system will soon be installed in about six classrooms across campus.

It seems, however, that departments and colleges could have a committee in place which could take such ideas, perhaps expand them, coordinate with other concerned faculty members or areas, develop a "desirability index" for projects to enhance the teaching environment and thus forward them with the increased weight of consensus.

Conclusions

1. Through normal wear and occasional acts of vandalism the physical environment in classrooms and laboratories has deteriorated.
2. A mechanism has been in place for considerable time through the Provost's office to the Physical Plant whereby replacement and repairs could be made on a case-by-case basis. The faculty should become familiar with this mechanism and should, through their departments, report these needs and establish follow-up procedures to insure that the replacements and repairs are made.
3. The recent commitment to refurbish classroom buildings on a continuing cyclic basis is to be commended.
4. The faculty is encouraged to make greater use of already available assistance provided by the Instructional Services Center in evaluating and improving instruction.
5. The faculty is urged through their departments and in cooperation with other departments to develop new ideas for better use of instructional space.
6. In planning new facilities, the planning committees must continue to seek input from the faculties which will use the facilities, and the faculties must seriously involve themselves in the development of these plans.
7. For advice and assistance, department chairs and individual faculty members should contact Dr. Robert Stafford, Assistant Provost, Evans Hall.

Respectfully submitted,

Harley Brown, Zoology
William Graves, Education, Chair

Alice Lanning, Music
Donald Patten, Mathematics

✓ FINAL REPORT: EEC/Senate Committee on problems of professional staff with advanced degrees.

Background information: At the initiative of the Employee Executive Council, a joint EEC and Faculty Senate ad hoc committee was appointed last January to study the problems of professional staff members with advanced degrees. (Please see page 4 of the Senate Journal for January 18, 1982.)

Copies of the final report of that Committee were distributed to Senate members in advance of the special Senate meeting on May 10. Discussion of this question, however, was postponed until this special meeting of the Senate.

Senate action: Professor Foster, Senate Chair, reported that Dr. Paul F. Sharp, President Emeritus, Regents Professor of Higher Education, and a member of the ad hoc Committee, had sent his regrets at being unable to attend this Senate meeting because of a prior, out-of-town commitment.

She next called on Dr. William Riggan, Associate Editor of World Literature Today and Chair of the ad hoc Committee, who formally presented the Committee proposal for Senate consideration.

Mr. Riggan prefaced his remarks with his presentation of the following list of categories of University personnel on this campus:

- (1) faculty)
- (2) administrative officers : identical benefits
- (3) executive officers)
- (4) administrative staff)
- (5) managerial staff)
- (6) professional staff : benefits lower than those of the
- (7) supervisory staff) top 3
- (8) service/operations staff)

He reported that the objective of the Committee was to determine whether there were any problems in the changing nature of the non-teaching staff personnel with increasing educational and research backgrounds who are joining the University in increasing numbers.

Although in its survey the Committee found a lower than expected percentage of individuals with either a doctorate or the ABD status, there was a great deal of interest expressed among individuals in the professional, administrative, and managerial levels who possess extensive educational backgrounds.

He mentioned conversations with Provost Morris, Vice Provost Hoving, and Dean Eek and reported that all three administrators were "enthusiastically supportive of our interest in trying to expand the opportunities of the professional staff." He also stated that the EEC had forwarded its approval of the recommendations to President William S. Banowsky. He called attention to the fact that the Committee report contains no specific program for implementing the various recommendations.

Professor McClure, a member of the ad hoc Committee, urged the Senate members to take advantage of the unique skills of the broad range of individuals on campus with advanced degrees and professional skills. He mentioned the difficulties encountered by the school of Library

Science in obtaining joint appointments for individuals with professional expertise in computers. At another point in the discussion, he expressed the opinion that only a relatively small number of individuals would be interested in research and teaching activities.

Professor Graves mentioned the informal arrangements that the College of Education has with the Counseling Center. Some members of the Counseling staff teach on their own; Education faculty members, in turn, assist with counseling activities.

Professor Love repeatedly raised questions concerning the proposed Senate representation and the non-faculty research. In his opinion, qualified individuals should, instead, seek faculty status.

Professor Fishbeck supported Professor Love's views and voiced his apprehension about the possible increased competition for the limited research resources. Noting his own "adjunct" status at the Health Sciences Center, he felt that other alternatives were already available.

Professor Seaberg also agreed with Professor Love that faculty status was an available alternative and expressed his concern about increased competition for research resources. He also suggested that the Norman campus faculty be polled for their views in this matter.

Professor Dunn mentioned the use of the "adjunct" status in the Anthropology Department. Associate Provost Ray saw this practice as one way of taking care of the problem at the departmental level.

Professor Grant favored the sharing of available resources with professional staff members who want to stay in the academic environment and noted the University benefits of having high-quality staff on campus, particularly in the music field.

Professor Love subsequently moved that the question be tabled. With two dissenting votes, the Senate approved the tabling motion.

The full text of the Committee report follows.

As outlined by the University of Oklahoma Regents and by President William S. Banowsky, one principal mission of the University in its drive toward overall excellence and toward membership in the American Association of Universities is the furthering of scientific and scholarly research and of superior academic performance in all areas of endeavor encompassed by the school's many programs and departments. While the focus of such efforts has rightly been on the University Faculty, and particularly on the full-time teaching Faculty at the Assistant, Associate, and Full Professor levels, the Committee proposed that the University broaden its reach to encompass certain segments of the nonacademic staff as well.

It is the finding of the Committee that there exist a substantial number of highly qualified administrative and professional employees of the University who currently hold no Faculty status, although their training, experience and interests place them in most other respects on a par with those holding academic appointments. Such employees, like all nonacademic staff at OU, enjoy many of the same benefits as the Faculty; but as currently practiced at the University, their added talents and expertise are not always being

used to the fullest advantage. Nonacademic employees possessing extensive academic and scientific training are not being expressly offered access to research funding, are not being urged or in some cases not being permitted to seek research leave, are seldom granted either time off or substantial financial support to attend professional meetings or take advanced training programs outside the University or the State, and are not being encouraged to pursue special scientific/scholarly/creative projects outside regular office hours, whether directly related to the individual employee's principal duties or not.

A committee survey (see attached copy) has revealed considerable interest on the part of these academically and professionally trained nonacademic employees in administrative and professional positions for a broadening of opportunities in the areas of research, travel, leave, and professional development. It is our general recommendation to the Employee Executive Council and the Faculty Senate that such interest be strongly encouraged and promoted through the opening of such opportunities to the academically and professionally qualified members of the nonacademic staff. The expansion of opportunities would, the Committee feels, coincide fully with the Regents' designated mission of the University by facilitating those qualified nonacademic employees in the full accomplishment of their professional/administrative duties, in their effective participation in the professional activities of their special fields, and in their individual professional development. The result, we believe, would be an enhancement for such employees in the three traditional academic functions of service, research and teaching--or, in this case, the dissemination of knowledge by means other than direct classroom instruction. Departments, programs, and the University as a whole should realize benefits as well through the improvement of such individuals' job performance and professional accomplishment--and, not least, through the greater likelihood of retention of such qualified staff members over a longer period of time.

Specifically, the Committee recommends the following:

- 1) that all nonacademic employees possessing advanced degrees or other requisite training in the various academic or scientific fields, as determined at the departmental level, be allowed to compete for University research funds and that they be actively encouraged to do so by whatever means and through whatever channels the Provost and the Vice Provost for Research Administration deem most appropriate;
- 2) that such employees be made eligible for research leave of up to six months for work on approved projects of a scholarly, creative, or developmental nature;
- 3) that such employees be given consideration for extended Library privileges appropriate to their scholarly or scientific work, namely study space and semester-long book loans, subject to approval by the Library administration;
- 4) that such employees be encouraged to attend regional, national, or even occasional international meetings in their specific fields, and that they be permitted to take brief periods of leave (up to two weeks) and to seek departmental or University funding for such purposes;
- 5) that such employees be granted access to University computer facilities and to financial support for the use of these facilities;

- 6) that University departments encourage the participation of such employees in regular teaching and in other Faculty functions at the departmental level;
- 7) that such employees be given a stronger voice in University governance by the granting of voting representation in the Faculty Senate.
- 8) The Committee also suggests for the consideration of the EEC and the Senate the idea of establishing a separate classification for academically trained staff performing essentially academic functions in a professional or administrative position rather than in the classroom. The designation "Academic Staff" as used, for example, by the University of Minnesota might serve as a model for such a classification; employees so designated are deemed the peers of regular Faculty appointees and are accorded all benefits accruing to the latter, including the matters addressed above in recommendations 1-7.
- 9) The Committee further suggests the following matrix as a tool for identifying those nonacademic employees who would be eligible for such extended benefits and services:

| | want benefits | don't want benefits |
|---|---------------|---------------------|
| prof. training req'd by position | A | B |
| prof. training not req'd by position | C | D |

"Academic Staff" as envisioned by recommendation 8 would include groups A and B. Recommendations 1-7, using OU's current employee classification system, would be directed toward group C, as well as A and B.

Just as now, not all Faculty members avail themselves of research funds, sabbaticals, leaves, professional meetings, and Library services, so too would we expect only a portion of the academically qualified staff to take advantage of the expanded opportunities proposed in those areas. Even if the number of individual employees benefited were small, however, the University would nonetheless gain in proportionate measure. It is the Committee's view that this gain would be well worth the implementation of those opportunities.

ADDENDUM: In its investigations, the Committee also found several instances of problems involving University employees who do possess Faculty status in some form but whose primary functions are professional or administrative in nature. Many such employees expressed considerable confusion as to the precise nature of their status and of the rights and benefits accruing to them, and many felt greatly underutilized by the departments and programs in which they hold their nominal Faculty appointments, sometimes to the point of apparent discrimination. The Committee, as a joint entity of the EEC and the Senate, did not deem it appropriate to pursue an investigation into this area; we would, however, recommend that the Faculty Senate study the problem and explore the availability of specific Faculty-status benefits to those entitled to such benefits.

Respectfully submitted,

William Riggan (Chair), World Literature Today
 Aleta Barth, Career Planning & Placement Services
 Charles McClure, Assoc. Prof. of Library Science
 Paul Sharp, Pres. Emeritus and Regents Prof. of
 History and Education
 Connie G. Smith, Oklahoma Geological Survey

Appendix A1

EEC/Senate Committee Survey

135 questionnaires mailed to members of the OU nonacademic staff believed to hold advanced degrees, to possess research training and skills, or to hold positions involving work of a scholarly or scientific nature; 55 questionnaires returned (41 percent).

| | |
|---|--|
| 1. Respondents holding Ph.D., A.B.D., Ed.D. or DBA - 18 | 3. Respondents with MA or MS - 26 |
| Administrative Staff - 5 | Administrative Staff - 3 |
| Professional Staff - 10 | Professional Staff - 20 |
| Managerial Staff - 3 | Managerial Staff - 3 |
| Have taught or currently teach - 15 | Have taught or currently teach - 10 |
| Had/have Faculty status - 11 | Had/have Faculty status - 6 |
| FTE paid as Faculty - 1 (.25 FTE) | FTE paid as Faculty - 2 (percentage not given) |
| Engage in academic activity - 14 | Engage in academic activity - 11 |
| Would benefit from: | Would benefit from: |
| Extended Library privileges - 9 | Extended Library privileges - 16 |
| Research grants and leave - 14 | Research grants and leave - 21 |
| Research awards - 10 | Research awards - 12 |
| 2. Respondents with MD or JD - 4 | 4. Respondents with BA or BS - 7 |
| Professional Staff - 4 | |
| Engage in academic activity - 1 | |
| Would benefit from: | |
| Extended Library privileges - 1 | |
| Research grants and leave - 2 | |

EEC/Senate ad hoc COMMITTEE PROPOSAL: All-campus "official" publication.

Background information: Last February, the Employee Executive Committee invited the Senate to select two faculty representatives to serve on a joint Committee on Communications to study the possibility of establishing an all-campus "official" publication. In response, the Senate Executive Committee chose the Chair-elect and the Secretary of the Faculty Senate. (Please see page 5 of the Senate Journal for March 15, 1982.)

The Committee proposal for an all-campus "official" publication was distributed to Senate members on June 21.

Senate action: Professor Foster, Senate Chair and member of the joint ad hoc Committee, summarized the Committee proposal and reported that the EEC had already forwarded its approval to President Banowsky.

Professor Hebert moved Senate approval of the project. Without further discussion and in a voice vote without dissent, the Senate approved the motion. The full text of the Committee report follows.

The ad hoc Committee on Communications recommends that an all-campus publication be created for faculty and staff. The Committee agrees that such a publication is needed to provide timely, reliable information on a regular basis. If approved, this publication should replace AB distributions for official policy announcements, changes in policy, explanation of policies, and other general communication to the campus. It should be the official publication for all staff and faculty and serve as an official reference document in department offices, in the library, and in the offices of the EEC and the Faculty Senate.

The proposed publication would be the responsibility of an editorial board consisting of a chair and seven other members. The Committee suggests that the Chair be a staff member of News Services. The remaining members would consist of one EEC representative, one Faculty Senate representative, and one representative each from the Provost and the Vice Presidents' offices.

The Editorial Board will coordinate submission of information to be published. Their responsibility will be to screen all items submitted for publication. The proposed editorial board will include campus-wide representation to ensure complete coverage of all areas of interest to faculty and staff.

Format of the publication should be kept simple. The Committee suggests a double, 8½" x 11" sheet with center fold. This would be published monthly on a pre-determined schedule. Items to be included would be all University information on policy changes affecting employees, complete coverage of University benefit changes, announcements or important notices, and information from the EEC and the Faculty Senate. The following items are to be excluded: features about people, personnel changes, photographs, and such other items as determined by the Editorial Board. All material to be published will be approved by the Editorial Board. Proposed distribution will be to each employee through campus mail by labeled "x" distribution.

Estimated cost of this publication is \$5,520.00 per year, including staff support from News Services and all publication charges. This annual cost allows for 5,000 copies to be printed once per month for twelve months. The only additional cost would be for labels at \$18.00 per mailing. The total cost involved would be \$5,736.00.

The ad hoc Committee representation closely paralleled the suggested editorial board. The need for a channel to disseminate important information to all faculty and staff was apparent to all. The key to the success of this publication will be its status as the official publication and its strong Editorial Board. The ad hoc Committee suggests that this recommendation, following approval by the Faculty Senate and EEC, be forwarded to the President in a joint proposal.

Respectfully submitted,

Ron Wilson, Chair
Aleta Barth
Teresa Foster

Judi Freyer
Len Harper
Anthony Lis

Ruth McKinnis
Donna Murphy
Pat Zidek

PROPOSED REVISIONS: Charge/membership, Research Council

Background information: Several months ago, Professor Dick Van der Helm, Chair of the Research Council (Norman), proposed several revisions in that Council's charge and membership.

Copies of the proposal were distributed to Senate members in advance of the Senate meeting on March 15. Consideration of this matter, however, was repeatedly postponed until this special session.

Senate action: In the absence of the Council Chair, Professor Roger Mellgren, Council member, formally presented the proposed revisions and moved Senate approval.

Professor Mellgren indicated that, on the basis of the Council's study of the files for the last three years, the Council's proposal makes its membership proportionate to the number of research proposals actually received. He noted, however, that the proposed six categories have nothing to do with the categories involved in reviewing the research proposals themselves.

Without further discussion and without dissent, the Senate approved the recommendations of the Research Council.

Professor Ford, Chair-elect, solicited faculty nominations for the additional faculty members on that Council for Senate consideration next fall.

The full text of the approved proposal is reproduced on pages 23 and 24 of this Journal.

ADJOURNMENT

The Faculty Senate adjourned at 5:08 p.m. The next regular session of the Senate is scheduled for Monday, September 13, 1982, at 3:30 p.m., in Dale Hall 218.

Respectfully submitted,



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

COUNCIL: Research Council (Norman)

CHARGE: The Research Council is charged with the promotion and development of research and creative activity throughout the University community.

(added) The primary function of the Council is to evaluate internal proposals requesting University funds for the support of research and creative activities and to make recommendations concerning the awarding of research professorships.

1. The Council will serve as advisor to the President, Provost, Vice Provost for Research Administration and Dean of the Graduate College, as well as the Faculty Senate in matters regarding research.
2. ~~The Council will review and coordinate the various organized research units.~~
3. ~~The Council will work closely with the Office of Research Administration and the University of Oklahoma Foundation in the development of outside funding for research and creative activities.~~
4. ~~The Council will take the initiative in the encouragement of research by seeking to develop seminars and workshops, and other means of stimulation of creative activity, particularly that which involves cooperation between colleges and departments.~~
5. ~~The Research Council shall each year present a detailed request to the Budget Council asking that the University include specific requests for research support in its budget proposal to the Regents.~~
6. ~~The Research Council shall consider ways of better informing the people of Oklahoma of the research needs and accomplishments of the University through the Office of University Relations and Development.~~
7. The Research Council should undertake other activities it considers appropriate to foster and promote the research and creative functions of the faculty and students of the University of Oklahoma.

| MEMBERSHIP | HOW NOMINATED | TERM |
|---|--|--------------------------------------|
| 2. 12/9 Faculty Members | To be elected by Faculty Senate | 3 years (1/3 to retire each year) |
| 2 Graduate Students | To be selected by President from nominations submitted by UOSA | 1 year |
| Vice Provost for Research Administration and Dean of the Graduate College | Ex officio (non-voting) | |
| Associate Dean for Research, Graduate College | Ex officio (non-voting) | |
| STAFF SERVICES: Vice Provost for Research Administration and Dean of the Graduate College | | |

Recommendations of Research Council:

To reflect the volume of proposals from various areas of the University and to ensure broader expertise of members of the Research Council, the Faculty Senate recommends the following:

- 1) The number of faculty members on the Council should be expanded from nine to twelve.
- 2) Future appointments should provide a balanced representation across the University by including two members in each of the following six areas:
 - a. Engineering.
 - b. Physical Sciences: Chemistry, Geology and Geophysics, Mathematics, Physics and Astronomy, and Meteorology.
 - c. Social Sciences and Education: Anthropology, Communication, Geography, HPER, Human Relations, Political Science, Psychology, Regional and City Planning, Social Work, Sociology, and Education.
 - d. Biological Sciences: Biological Station, Biological Survey, Botany-Microbiology, and Zoology.
 - e. Humanities and Arts: Classics, English, Fine Arts, History, History of Science, Modern Languages, and Philosophy.
 - f. Other: Business Administration, Economics, Home Economics, Journalism, Library Science, Architecture, Environmental Design, and University Libraries.
- 3) Individuals recommended for Council membership should be currently active in either research, scholarship, or creative activities. The above representation will be reviewed by the Council every 3 years.
- 4) Current Membership (Parentheses indicate 1st, 2nd, or 3rd year on the Council):
 - a. Charles Bert (1)
 - b. Dick van der Helm (3)
Patrick Sutherland (2)
 - c. N. Jack Kanak (1)
Roger Mellgren (2)
 - d. None
 - e. John Biro (3)
Christine Smith (2)
Henry Tobias (1)
 - f. Alex Holmes (3)

For 1982-83, the Council will require appointments from the following areas:

- a. one person (3-year term)
- b. one person (3-year term)
- c. none
- d. one person (3-year term)
one person (2-year term)
- e. none
- f. one person (3-year term)
one person (1-year term)

For 1983-84, the Council would require appointments from areas (b), (c), (e), and (f); in 1984-85 from (a), (c), (d), and (e); in 1985-86, from (a), (b), (d), (f), all for normal 3-year terms. The sequence would repeat itself every 3 years.