

JOURNAL OF THE FACULTY SENATE (Norman campus)

The University of Oklahoma

Regular session - November 8, 1982 - 3:30 p.m. - Conoco Auditorium,
Doris W. Neustadt Wing, Bizzell Memorial Library

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

Present:

Black	Gollahalli	Howard	Lis	Scharnberg
Bredeson	Goodman	Inman	Locke	Schleifer
Christian	Grant	Karriker	Love	Schmitz
Cohen	Gross	Kiacz	McDonald	Seaberg
Conner	Harper	Kutner	Mills	Smith
Dumont	Hauser	Lanning	Moriarity	Sonleitner
Dunn	Hayes	Lehr, Robert	Nicewander	Stock
Ford	Hebert	Lehr, Roland	Patten	West
Foster	Hibdon	Levy	Ragan	Whitmore

Provost's Office representative: Ray

PSA representatives: Boehme Guyer

Liaison, Women's Caucus: Cleaver

UOSA representative: Sevenoaks

Absent:

Baker	Fishbeck	Kleine	Reynolds	Slaughter
Catlin	Graves			
PSA representatives:	Corcos	Morrison	Powers	
	Cowen			
UOSA representatives:	Allen	Stanhope	Rodriguez	

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Action taken by Interim President J. R. Morris:	
Legal advisers, Faculty Appeals Board.	2
Report of Senate Executive Committee:	
Meeting with Provost J. R. Morris.	2
Meeting of Inter-Senate Liaison Committee.	2
Fall meeting, OSU/OU Executive Committees.	2
Fall meeting, OCFO	3
Report of Senate Committee on Faculty Compensation.	3
Selection of faculty replacements, University groups	4
✓ Proposal for reimbursing faculty for legal expenses	4
✓ Proposal to reschedule Texas game holiday	8
✓ Proposal to amend Senate Journal: Final report,	
Senate Committee on Student Evaluation of Faculty.	9
Spring semester reports: Councils/Publications Board	13
✓ Resolution of appreciation: Interim President J. R. Morris	22

ACTION TAKEN BY INTERIM PRESIDENT J. R. MORRIS: Legal advisors,
Faculty Appeals Board.

On October 22, 1982, Interim President J. R. Morris selected the following law faculty members from the nominations submitted by the Senate to serve on a panel of legal advisers for the use of hearing committees of the Faculty Appeals Board:

Michael Cox	Ted Roberts	David Swank
Elmer Million	Robert E. Richardson	R. Dale Vliet

(Please see page 6 of the Senate Journal for October 18, 1982.)

REPORT OF SENATE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

Professor Foster, Chair of the Senate Executive Committee, reported on the following items:

(1) Meeting with Provost J. R. Morris: At the regular monthly meeting recently with the Senate Executive Committee, Provost Morris commented on the following items:

(a) KGOU: Expectations are that KGOU will be officially affiliated with NPR by January 1, 1983.

(b) General education proposals: The Deans on the Norman campus were requested by the Provost to report to him before the end of this semester on any actions taken in their respective colleges regarding the Senate proposals concerning general education.

Provost Morris is planning to appoint a University-wide committee to help coordinate the efforts of the various colleges on campus.

(2) Meeting of Inter-Senate Liaison Committee: The Inter-Senate Liaison Committee (consisting of the officers of the Faculty Senates on the Norman campus and at the HSC) held its fall semester meeting on Nov. 4 at the Health Sciences Center. In Professor Foster's words, "We discussed a number of common issues and renewed our commitment to work jointly to improve communication between both groups, as well as the administration."

(3) Fall meeting, OSU/OU Executive Committees: The Norman campus Senate Executive Committee hosted the fall (1982) joint meeting of the Executive Committees of the Faculty Council, Oklahoma State University, and the Norman Faculty Senate, on Wednesday, October 20.

Participants included the following faculty members:

<u>Norman:</u>	<u>Stillwater:</u>
Teree Foster (Law), Senate Chair	Donald Brown (Anthropology), Council Chair
Robert Ford (Finance), Senate Chair-elect	Marvin S. Keener (Mathematics), Council Vice Chair
Anthony S. Lis (Bus. Admn.), Senate Secretary	Robert Radford (Philosophy), Council Secretary
Harold Conner (Architecture)	Edward G. Lawry (Philosophy)
John Dunn (Anthropology)	Kent W. Olson (Economics)
William Eick (HPER)	O. Bruce Southard (English)
Jeanne Howard (University Libraries)	

Special guests at the social hour and dinner were State Representatives Cleta Deatherage and Cal Hobson. Both legislators were supportive of

"our efforts in general education and in formulating admission requirements." They also indicated that, from the legislative point of view, the better strategy would be to have the two comprehensive universities issue a joint statement. Such joint effort would be indicative of a real need. Ms. Deatherage and Mr. Hobson also indicated that there would be legislative support.

(4) Fall meeting, OCFO: The fall, 1982, meeting of the Oklahoma Conference of Faculty Organizations was held on the Norman campus on Friday, October 29, 1982. (For program details, please see page 2 of the Senate Journal for October 18, 1982.)

A total of 55 faculty members from 18 institutions participated in the all-day program. In Professor Foster's opinion, "The program generally was very well received by the representatives from the other institutions."

During the morning panel, a student observer asked State Regents Vice Chancellor Dan Hobbs about possible funding implications if the University of Oklahoma were to adopt some admission requirements that would result in decreased enrollment. In response, he detailed the current funding methods and concluded with the statement that, "If the University were serious in its efforts to establish entrance requirements, something could be worked out so that the University would not be disadvantaged in the process."

Dr. Loy Prickett (Education), 1982-83 President, FOCUS (Faculties of the Oklahoma College and University Systems), gave a brief report of the current activities of that group.

In conclusion, Professor Foster expressed special thanks to the following Norman campus faculty members: Professors Jean McDonald, John Dunn, Jeanne Howard, and Anthony S. Lis.

REPORT OF SENATE COMMITTEE ON FACULTY COMPENSATION

Professor William Eick, Committee Chair, indicated that the Committee will be meeting in a few days to discuss the University health insurance program.

This year, the claims are outstripping the premiums to such an extent that a deficit is anticipated to approach \$750,000. Consequently, either the premiums paid by the University for employees and by the employees for their spouses and dependents will have to be increased or some other adjustments in the University policy will have to be made in advance of the policy renewal on January 1, 1983.

The Committee will consider various alternatives and will report to the Senate later on the recommendations submitted to the President.

Professor Eick suggested that faculty desiring to provide appropriate input should contact Professor Stephen Whitmore, a member of both the University Employment Benefits Committee and the Senate Committee on Faculty Welfare.

During the ensuing discussion, faculty members raised questions concerning the Prucare program option and the new dental care plan.

In response to a question, Professor Whitmore stated that the University Employment Benefits Committee includes faculty, staff, and administration. To his knowledge, no administrative "signals" were ever received by the Committee and, in his opinion, none are expected concerning possible changes in the health insurance plan.

SELECTION OF FACULTY REPLACEMENTS: University groups

Voting by written ballot, the Senate selected the following faculty replacements for vacancies on the University groups designated below:

Elections:

- (1) Academic Program Council: James Horrell (Finance)
replacing Hillel Kumin (1981-84)
- (2) Investigative Council
on Sexual Harassment: Maggie Hayes (Human Development)
replacing Hillel Kumin (1981-83)
- (3) Faculty Appeals Board: Fred Batt (University Libraries) and
Ray Dacey (Management)
replacing Arn Henderson (1980-84)
Hillel Kumin (1980-84)

Nominations:

- (1) Campus Tenure Committee: Alexander Holmes (Economics) and
William McGrew (Accounting)
replacing the late Ralph Cooley
(1982-85)
- (2) Energy Conservation Committee: Edward Blick (Pet/Geol Engr) and
(additional member) (1982-84) Ann Million (University Libs)
- (3) Goddard Center Review Board: Vicki Cleaver (HPER) and
Al Smouse (Education)
replacing Thomas Miller
(new term, 1982-84)
- (4) University Libraries Committee: Mike Cox (Law) and
Richard Pailles (Anthropology)
replacing John Biro (1980-83)
- (5) ROTC Advisory Committee: Henry Eisenhart (HPER) and
Marc Faw (University Libraries)
replacing John Pulliam (1981-84)

PROPOSAL FOR REIMBURSING FACULTY FOR LEGAL EXPENSES

Background information: At the October 18, 1982, Senate meeting, Professor David Levy, a member of the Senate Committee on Faculty Welfare, distributed copies of a 3-page Committee proposal for reimbursing faculty members for legal expenses. (Please see pages 6-7 of the Senate Journal for October 18, 1982.) Copies were later forwarded to Senate members absent that day. Notice was given that this matter would be considered at this session.

Senate action: Professor Levy moved adoption of the proposed Senate resolution directing its Executive Committee to investigate with the University administration the possibility of such reimbursement.

Professor Levy noted that the proposal was the product of that Committee's deliberations during the past year, including a session with the Assistant Chief Legal Counsel of the University. He added, "We want to make it clear that this is not the result of any particular injustice of present or past faculty members but is simply an attempt to foreclose the possibility of abuse in our system in the future."

In Professor Levy's opinion, a faculty member could be placed in jeopardy by accusations in many situations--e.g., Presidential sanctions, dismissal, tenure abrogation, violations of academic responsibility, charges of sexual harassment, and the like.

In responding to Professor Moriarity's question, Professor Levy stated that any results of subsequent negotiations with the University administration would be brought back to the Senate.

Noting his objections to some aspects of the proposal, Professor Moriarity suggested that the first paragraph of the section, Resolution, be amended as follows:

from: "The Faculty Senate directs that its Executive Committee investigate with the University administration the possibility of having the University reimburse the legal expenses of a member of the faculty under the following conditions:"

to: " . . . under conditions such as the following:"

There was no objection from the Senate to that "friendly amendment" to provide some leeway in the negotiations.

Professor Kutner objected to the implication of "frivolity" in item 4 (\$500 deductible) of the Resolution and moved that this item be deleted. In a tally of 15 affirmative and 19 negative votes, the motion was defeated.

Associate Provost Ray noted that one of the important considerations will be whether the faculty member is exonerated or not. In his view, "It is perfectly appropriate that these kinds of cases be negotiated with the administration."

In a voice vote without dissent, the Senate approved the Committee proposal.

The full text of the proposal follows:

A RESOLUTION FROM THE FACULTY WELFARE COMMITTEE, FACULTY SENATE:

Introductory Remarks

October 18, 1982

The University Legal Counsel has two functions in our community. On the one hand, it is the job of the Legal Counsel to advance or to protect the legal interests of the University of Oklahoma as those interests occasionally have to be represented against the outside world. In discharging that function, the Legal Counsel assumes the role of being the attorney for the entire community. On the other hand, the Legal Counsel also assumes important responsibilities on occasions when the internal constituencies of the University are in contention. When disputes arise between students, faculty members, and administrators, the Legal Counsel may also take a part--sometimes defending a faculty member against a charge brought by students, sometimes espousing the complaint of the students or representing the administration in a case brought against a faculty member. This second, internal function of the University Counsel, in our view, raises at least three troubling problems.

First, of course, members of the faculty are left in considerable doubt about where the University Legal Counsel will stand with respect to any internal dispute. In general, it is assumed that the Counsel will defend faculty members against charges made by students and that the Counsel will represent faculty members in cases (such as those involving alleged academic dishonesty on the part of students) brought by faculty members against students; but the Counsel will probably be found arrayed against faculty members in cases where the administration brings the charges or where the students' charges against faculty members are thought, by the Counsel or by the administration, to have merit. It goes without saying, therefore, that faculty members can feel little assurance about the extent to which they may count on the advice, support, and expertise of the Legal Counsel.

A second troubling question raised by the Counsel's internal function is the one regarding precisely how it is determined whether to represent the faculty member or to represent the faculty member's accusers. Obviously, the Legal Counsel, on the basis of a private investigation, makes some determination of the validity of the charges being brought against the faculty member, a determination, in other words, of the faculty member's innocence or guilt respecting the charges. But it will be remembered that under our system the determination of innocence or guilt is to be the result of a carefully contrived set of procedures which attempt to guarantee the rights of all parties and which insist that the final judgment be reached only after scrupulously impartial hearings. When the Legal Counsel renders a personal preliminary judgment--in trying to decide whether to defend or to prosecute the faculty member--inevitable violence to the procedures occurs. And in those instances where the Legal Counsel decides that the faculty member is guilty, a train of unfortunate consequences follows. One consequence is that an unavoidable prejudice is created against the faculty member as the formal process.

Another consequence, when the Counsel decides to proceed against the faculty member--and this is the final bothersome matter raised by the Legal Counsel's internal function--is that the accused faculty member has literally no alternative but to hire an attorney of his or her own if the charges are thought to be unwarranted. Whether innocent

of the allegations or guilty, members of the faculty will need professional help in negotiating the perilous legal and procedural territory ahead--and this is particularly true when the faculty member discovers, arrayed against him or her, the immense resources and expertise of the Office of the Legal Counsel of the University of Oklahoma. But, as everyone knows, the legal expenses involved in even a moderately complicated case can be not merely awesome, but also they can be positively devastating to the lifesavings of any member of the faculty.

The Faculty Welfare Committee has discussed these matters in considerable detail and at considerable length during the past year. We have no solution for all of the difficulties we have noted, but we believe that the following resolution would, if implemented, go a long way toward relieving much of the uncertainty and some of the potential injustice in our present practice.

Resolution

The Faculty Senate directs that its Executive Committee investigate with the University administration the possibility of having the University reimburse the legal expenses of a member of the faculty under conditions such as the following:

1. When the expenses are incurred in a case brought against a member of the faculty; not in any case where the faculty member initiates the action;
2. When the expenses are incurred in connection with the internal negotiations and hearings provided for by the University's procedures; not in connection with any legal action outside the University's internal procedures;
3. When the case against the faculty member is being conducted or aided by the Office of the University Legal Counsel or by some representative of that Office; and
4. After the initial sum of \$500.00 has been expended by the faculty member for legal advice and aid touching this particular case.

Concluding Remarks

The University already makes certain contributions to the defense in cases where allegations are made against a faculty member. Our rules stipulate, for example, that a transcript be provided to the accused faculty member at University expense. Our rules also stipulate that any expense incurred in bringing witnesses to the campus to testify on behalf of the faculty member be borne by the University. If implemented, therefore, this resolution would have the effect of adding a new expense as a responsibility of the University, but it would not, it seems to us, be breaking entirely new ground.

After much deliberation, we concluded that the arrangement proposed in this resolution--wherein the faculty member hires his or her own attorney and is then reimbursed by the University--is the least likely to raise questions of legal ethics or conflict of interest and most likely to insure the sanctity and the privacy of the attorney-client relation.

We have suggested the \$500.00 "deductible" provision in an attempt to discourage the pursuit of frivolous cases or cases where faculty members, in view of the weight of evidence against them, can harbor no serious hope of being vindicated but decide to proceed anyway because it will not cost them anything. By this provision, we insist that faculty members have to believe in their own innocence enough to commit a considerable sum of private savings to their defense.

We want to emphasize our opinion that this mechanism would be used only very rarely. Attorney's fees incurred in disputes over the denial of tenure, the denial of a promotion, or over salary would, of course, not be reimbursed under this resolution because such cases are initiated by the faculty member under our grievance procedures. Nevertheless, given the present uncertainty over the role of the Legal Counsel in an internal dispute and given the potentially catastrophic expenses involved for individual faculty members called upon to defend themselves against accusations, we feel that this resolution embodies an important principle and one which the community, in the interest of fairness, ought to be willing to protect.

PROPOSAL TO RESCHEDULE THE TEXAS GAME HOLIDAY

Professor David Levy moved acceptance of the following self-explanatory resolution to be forwarded to the Student Congress for its consideration:

"The Faculty Senate, on behalf of the faculty on the Norman campus of the University of Oklahoma, expresses the view that the academic functioning of the University would be considerably benefited by moving the free day of the fall semester from the Monday following the Dallas game to the Friday preceding the game.

"The Faculty Senate, therefore, formally requests that the Congress of the University of Oklahoma Student Association consider changing the free day to the Friday preceding the Dallas game."

After his motion had been seconded, Professor Levy noted that the tradition, years ago, was to have the holiday only in the event of a victory. He added, "In reality, students leave the Norman campus for Dallas on either Thursday or Friday. This custom places a tremendous strain on the faculty members who have to decide how to play the game. Some simply wink at it; others try to be very strict." In his view, the practice places a strain on students who are otherwise conscientious but who want to leave for Dallas on Friday. With the Labor Day holiday also on a Monday, two days are lost every fall semester. Professor Levy concluded, "There is some rationality for a holiday on the day before the game rather than two days after the game. There is no logical reason for having a holiday on Monday!"

Without further discussion and without dissent, the Senate approved the resolution.

PROPOSAL TO AMEND SENATE JOURNAL: Final report, Senate Committee on Student Evaluation of Faculty.

Background information: At its May 10, 1982, session the Faculty Senate "accepted" the majority report of its ad hoc Committee on Student Evaluation of Faculty. (Please see pages 8-11 of the Senate Journal for May 10, 1982.)

Early in the fall semester, Professor George Murphy, Chair of that Committee, requested Senate consideration of his request that the Journal be amended to show that the majority report was "approved" rather than "accepted."

At the October 18, 1982, Senate meeting, Professor Foster, Senate Chair, indicated that this matter would be placed on the agenda for the November 8 meeting. (Please see page 7 of the Senate Journal for October 18, 1982.)

During October, 1982, Professor Murphy conducted a Norman campus faculty survey concerning the recommendations contained in the above-mentioned majority report of the ad hoc Committee. The questionnaire was prepared by Professor Murphy but was reproduced and distributed at Senate expense without any endorsement whatsoever.

The referendum produced the following results that were distributed to Senate members at the November 8 meeting for their information only:

FINAL RESULTS: Prof. Murphy's questionnaire survey of faculty regarding student evaluation of faculty, on the Norman campus.

Questionnaire item:	Number Responding
(1) I favor the present system of teacher evaluations for administrative decisions, in which use of results of anonymous student questionnaires is mandatory for majority of faculty.	71
(2) I favor the suggested teacher-evaluation proposal which allows depts. the choice of evaluation methods, subject to certain guidelines.	127
(3) I favor a third option as follows:	24
(a) combination of (2) and (3)	22
(b) combination of (1) and (3)	7
	251 (30.4% return)

Senate action: Professor Foster, Senate Chair, gave a brief history of this question. At the special session on May 10, 1982, the Senate voted (19 to 14) in favor of the majority report of its ad hoc Committee on Student Evaluation of Faculty. The report was routinely incorporated into the 1982 Faculty Position Paper, which was subsequently distributed to the President, the Board of Regents, other administrative officers, and all faculty members on the Norman campus.

Early in the fall, Professor Murphy, Committee Chair, asked the Senate Chair why the Committee report had not been forwarded to the Interim President as an official Senate action. Professor Foster responded that, in her opinion, the Senate had "accepted" the report on May 10 as a "position paper." Subsequently, the Senate Executive Committee unanimously agreed with Professor Foster's statement. At the several "small group" sessions of Senate members last September, the consensus was that this matter should be brought to the attention of the Senate for resolution.

Professor Foster then commented as follows on the possible courses of Senate action:

(1) If the Senate should decide not to amend the May 10 Journal, the Committee report would retain its status of a position paper.

As with all position papers, the Faculty Senate's desires, wishes, and so forth have been made known. Provost Morris reported to the Senate Executive Committee the previous week that the recommendations in that report (included in the 1982 Position Paper) had been discussed by the Deans' Council recently. His idea is to delegate to Dean Weber the responsibility of working with a group of faculty, administrators, and students in exploring various alternatives to improve the quality of instruction on this campus. Such action has remained in abatement pending the Senate's resolving the question of the action taken last May.

(2) If the Senate decides to change the word "accept" to "approve" in the May 10 Journal, the report would attain the status of official Senate action and, as such, would be forwarded to the President for his consideration and action.

She then indicated that she would entertain an appropriate motion. Professor Christian moved that the word "accepted" be changed to "approved" in line 1, paragraph 3, page 11 of the Senate Journal for May 10, 1982.

At this point, with permission of the Senate officers, Professor Murphy addressed the Senate. He first called attention to the results of his campus faculty survey, which he considered to be "overwhelmingly in favor of the recommendations that came out of this Committee and that," in his opinion, "were approved by the Senate last May."

He then read the following prepared statement:

The question now before the Senate is a purely technical one: "Did the Senate vote to approve the Committee report and the recommendations contained therein?" The answer is an unqualified yes; hence, the Senate should vote now to correct the May 10 Senate Journal, which states incorrectly that the Senate "accepted" the report.

If the Senate proceedings had been tape recorded (and I urge the Senate to waste no time instituting this as a regular backup to the Secretary's written notes), here is what one would hear on playback:

(Murphy) "I move approval of this report (the position paper)" with "approval" orally emphasized. Since the proceedings were not recorded, in the absence of credible evidence to the contrary, the Senate is obligated to believe the word of the motion mover. The only credible evidence is the Senate record itself, which states, "Professor Murphy next moved approval of the Faculty Position Paper submitted by the Committee on Student Faculty Evaluation." There was no subsequent Senate amendment to change "approve" to "accept." Use of the term "accepted" following the vote by the Secretary is purely an error, in my opinion.

The possibility that some Senators voted with a misunderstanding of the motion has no bearing on the matter now before the Senate. If a Senator later changed his mind regarding his vote, this also has no bearing. Mechanisms are available to have questions concerning motions cleared up before the vote.

After correcting the May 10 record, the present Senate has the right to formally reopen the question if it so desires. But it should not plan to do so unless there is a clear agenda item to this effect and there is ample time for debate.

Professor Dunn next read the following prepared statement:

1. Paragraph 3, page 9, of the Senate Journal for May 10, 1982, includes the statement that the Chair indicated that "Senate acceptance would not indicate either approval or rejection of the report itself." I took this statement to apply to the whole report: both the resource report (43 pages) and the shorter position paper.

In my best recollection, Professor Murphy moved approval of the Faculty Position Paper (of page 9, paragraph 5 of minutes). Then, Gary Thompson, the Chair, corrected him and said, the proper motion for a Position Paper was for acceptance. Murphy then indicated acceptance of this correction to the motion (but the minutes don't show this).

I felt that we were voting for/against acceptance of a Position Paper and that acceptance did not imply approval or disapproval but merely acknowledged that the Committee had completed its charge.

2. If we amend it to "approval," the report must then be sent to the President for action. The action will doubtless be rejection of the report. The Regents will not agree to delete SFE's from the teaching-evaluation process. They will not allow it because such a move would be anti-populist. The report will then die; the Committee's work will be for nothing. The Faculty Senate will have "egg on its face" because (1) the report is based on data collected in a very superficial manner from Deans and department chairs, (note: no data at all from Colleges of Business Administration and Law), (2) the report is in factual error of page 45 (Journal) and l.b., "anonymous inputs subject the University to substantial legal risk" should read...might subject the University to some legal risk--no precedent for this opinion--, and (3) the report misses the mark on several points:

a) The present Z-score statistical interpretation is suspect and allows for all kinds of abuse. This problem needs to be studied carefully with the aid of expert technical advice. The very structure of the current SFE form must be impugned. Otherwise, when departments come to determine their own evaluation means, some will be using the same old forms, perpetuating the same old problems and abuses.

b) It seeks to devalue student opinion about teaching--a very dangerous and undesirable undertaking. At present, the objective reporting of student opinion is the only check the evaluation system has against the tendency of Committees A to use teacher evaluation in an abusive manner.

c) It seeks to impugn the motives of Deans. This is ridiculous. Deans are not vicious ogres, who prowl about the campus seeking out individual faculty members for destruction. I have been on Committee A or Chair of my Department since I came to OU. I have gone through 5 departmental evaluations under 2 Deans in A&S. In each of these cases, Committee A presented its evaluation. The Dean was asked for the basis for the evaluation, insisting on more than just SFE's. In not one instance did the Dean change any evaluation. In not one instance did the Dean ask me privately as Chair whether I agreed with Committee A's evaluation. If there is abuse and if SFE's are used as instruments of abuse, it is not students, not the Dean, but it is Committees A and Chairs who are the abusers. If this report were put into effect, it would deliver the whole matter into the hands of the very people who most use it for abuse. It would remove any effective checks against the continuation of their abuse.

d) Removing control of teaching evaluation to the departmental level without also removing the whole evaluation process to the departmental level implies that teaching is not as important as research!

At present, the best way to keep the issue alive is to let the position paper stand as is--i.e., as an open issue that can be pursued by the Faculty Senate with some dignity.

The Executive Committee has already begun discussing the membership of a committee to pursue the recommendation of the Murphy Position Paper (I) to do further needed research as, e.g. in the case of the Z-score component in the present SFE, (2) to develop effective strategies for redressing the abuses of the current teaching evaluation system, and (3) to develop (in accordance with recommendations of the report) more productive ways to evaluate teaching.

I believe the best course of action is to let the position paper stand as accepted, so that we can have breathing room to keep working on the problem. I ask the Senate not to force the hand of the President and Regents at this time, not with this premature set of recommendations. It will only result in the closing of the issue and the embarrassment of the Senate.

Professor Murphy commented that Professor Dunn's statement was out of order and urged the Senate to keep this matter as a strictly technical item. He also expressed the opinion that the extensive debate on May 10 was evidence of the Senate members' perception of their considering the approval of a report rather than the acceptance of a position paper.

Professor Cohen raised questions about the nature of the motions made at the May 10 session. Professor Stock commented that the motion before the Senate would amend an already approved Journal and felt that any other discussion was a moot point. Professor Christian commented that, if a mistake had been made, "we can undo that by launching another study." Professor Schleifer expressed his support of Professor Dunn's statement "for the sake of keeping the issue open." Professor Smith questioned whether the present Senate can correct the action of a previous body. He added, "There are avenues open to us and we can re-examine the whole issue in substance. I don't see how I can set the record straight for a previous body on the basis of latest information inasmuch as I was not a member of that body last May." Professor Christian stated that he was so confused that he could not vote on the issue before the Senate.

At this point, the Senate Chair called attention to the issue at hand-- the substitution of the word "approved" for the word "accepted."

Professor West moved that the question be tabled so that the "Senate Parliamentarian can determine whether this Senate can legally approve the minutes that had been approved by another group." The Senate rejected the tabling motion in a tally of 19 affirmative and 20 negative votes.

Professor Hebert expressed his desire "to keep the issue alive." He felt "inclined at this point to vote in favor of the motion with the understanding, however, that the President will not summarily eliminate the SFE system and that there will be further consideration of this matter."

Professor Murphy stressed the importance of "getting the issue forced through the administration" and urged favorable Senate action.

Voting by show of hands (7 to 34), the Senate rejected the proposal to amend the May 10 Journal.

In responding to Professor Smith's query about follow-up actions, Professor Foster reported that Provost Morris had indicated to the Senate Executive Committee that there is serious concern with abuses of the SFE system. Her next step will be to contact Dean Weber to begin discussion of existing problems and abuses. She solicited faculty ideas and suggestions.

SPRING (1982) SEMESTER REPORTS: University Councils and Publications Board

In approving Professor Locke's motion, the Faculty Senate accepted the following reports for the spring semester, 1982, submitted by the Chairs of the designated Councils and the Student Publications Board:

Report of the Athletics Council for spring semester, 1982, submitted by Professor Herbert R. Hengst, Chair, on August 23, 1982:

1. Significant Recommendations to the President

(1) Developed, approved, and recommended to the President a balanced budget for 1982-83 fiscal year. In addition to the dollar amount, the Council recommended (a) that one sport be considered in the first phase of a move toward club sport status, (b) that continued departmental and presidential attention be directed toward minimizing the use of complimentary tickets, (c) that departmental staff needs be monitored closely, (d) that continued attention be directed at satisfying Title IX requirements, and (e) that the search for new revenue sources be continuously enlarged. Receipt of the budgetary recommendations was acknowledged by the President's office.

(2) Recommended that the women's program change affiliation from AIAW to NCAA. The recommendation has been implemented.

(3) Recommended that, when a voting member of the Council must be replaced, an alternate member be appointed to the voting position and the new (or replacement) appointee be assigned to the alternate position.

(4) Recommended all athletic contest schedules and schedule adjustments for the 1982-83 academic year. All recommendations were approved by the President's office.

(5) Recommended appropriate awards for all eligible participants in winter and spring sports programs. All award recommendations were approved by the President's office.

2. Subjects addressed by the Council

(1) The organization and operation of the Council was the focus of attention. The subcommittee structure seemed to work well, permitting issues-oriented discussions during Council meetings. The Personnel Subcommittee was not called upon for any service during the year.

(2) The problems involved in the scheduling of athletic contests were the most frequent subject of discussion. Issues included safeguarding the examination period and Sunday competition. Both were resolved equitably with no loss of principle. A trial Sunday competition was authorized for one year (1982-83) and the examination period issue was resolved through a one-time compromise involving only the Saturday night of examination week (fall semester).

(3) Special Awards were determined according to regular Council policy and procedures. They were presented to the recipients during the half-time of the Alumni-Varsity game.

(4) The recruiting of athletes was addressed again by the Council through a detailed (oral) report by the coach in charge of the football recruiting program. He answered all questions posed by the members to the satisfaction of the Council.

(5) The preparation of the Athletic Department budget and the development of a recommendation to the President was one of the most important and time-consuming activities addressed by the Council. The work of the departmental staff in the preparation of analyses requested by the Budget Subcommittee was, once again, most commendable. The

work of the staff and the Subcommittee made possible a detailed discussion by the Council before the decision to recommend a budget package was taken.

(6) The involvement of the University in the suit regarding television rights in conjunction with the University of Georgia was a subject of much interest. The Council was briefed regularly and thoroughly by the Athletic Director and the Faculty Representative regarding this matter.

3. Time spent on Council Activities, Spring Semester, 1982

(1) Five regular meetings of the Council were held, February through June. It is difficult to estimate the time involved, but each meeting lasted between one and one-half and two and one-half hours.

(2) The preparation of the budget proposal by the Budget Subcommittee was perhaps the most time-consuming activity. It met at least four times, each meeting lasting more than two hours. In addition many hours of staff time were involved between each meeting. The work of the other Subcommittee was not oppressive in terms of time. Much of the Scheduling Subcommittee work was able to be accomplished via telephone conferences, and the Awards Subcommittee met prior to Council meetings.

(3) It is appropriate to re-emphasize the time invested by the staff of the Department. The secretary to the Council and the business staff made the contribution of time that made possible a smoothly operating Council that could be productive.

4. Important Decisions Made by the Council

(See sections 1 and 2 above)

In conclusion, it should be added that all decisions leading to recommendations have been taken in open, public meetings with representatives of the press present. It was necessary to go into executive session only for the consideration of the details of the budget proposal developed by the Subcommittee.

Respectfully submitted,

Laura Gasaway
Herbert Hengst, Chair
Jim Artman

Jack Kasulis
Laura Folsom
Sharon Sanderson, HSC

Report of the Academic Program Council for the spring semester, 1982, submitted by Prof. Penny M. Hopkins, Chair, on October 18, 1982:

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. No student representatives were appointed to the Council during the fall or spring semesters despite repeated requests to the Student Government. In the opinion of this Council, student input is extremely useful and very necessary. The Council would once again urge the President of the University of Oklahoma Student Association to appoint student representatives to this and other Councils and Committees.

During the spring and summer of 1982, the Council met ten times. Major curriculum changes that received special attention and discussion from the Council resulted in changes in the PhD program in English, the MS/PhD programs in Geology and Geophysics, the Master of Accountancy program, and the undergraduate curriculum in Petroleum Engineering, as well as the elimination of the EdD degree in Counseling Psychology with a division of the M. Ed degree program in Guidance and Counseling Psychology. Major curriculum and degree changes were approved in the School of Human Development and in the School of Environmental Design (including a change in the March degree program and the new Construction Sciences program). New programs that were approved include the MS in Fisheries Biology in Zoology, the new School of Professional Accountancy, the new PhD in Meteorology, and a new curriculum in Piano Pedagogy in Music.

More than 300 courses were evaluated by the Council for approval of changes, additions, or deletions. The breakdown of those figures follows:

Changes in content	192
Additions to curriculum . .	135
Deletions from curriculum . .	33

Another matter discussed at some length by the Council was the proposal for an Honors College. The Council informed the Provost that the members of the Council do embrace the concept of programs for honors students but had some basic questions about the proposal. These questions included such items as the definition of a core curriculum, the possibility of excluding some excellent students, and a concern about funding. These questions were forwarded in detail to the Provost, and the issue was set aside until the fall semester.

Respectfully submitted,

Thomas Carey	Hillel Kumin	Richard Nostrand
Gwenn Davis	Joakim Laguros	Jay Smith
Penny Hopkins, Chair	Stanley Neely	Benjamin Taylor

Report of the Budget Council for spring semester, 1982, submitted by Professor V. Stanley Vardys on October 15, 1982:

During much of the 1981-82 school year, the Budget Council operated under full authorized membership strength. This was due to a long cumbersome process of appointing replacements of both faculty and student members. Three institutions are involved in the process: the Faculty Senate, the student government, and the President's office.

During the school year, the Budget Council held 14 meetings. Its work, in addition to committee in full, was aided by the following three task forces, consisting of Council members and appointed by the Chair: Task Force for Long-Range Planning; Task Force on Research, Library, and Computers; and Joint Budget Council/Faculty Senate Task Force on Continuing Education and Public Service.

The Committee heard testimony from the following University officials: Provost J. R. Morris, Vice Provost William Maehl (twice), Dean of Libraries Sul Lee, Director of Computer Services Bob Shephard, Personnel Director Len Harper, and Vice Provost and Dean Kenneth Hoving. Assistant Provost Ron Stafford and Budget Director Craig Conly worked very closely with the Council and its Chair.

In August-September, 1981, the Chair, at the Provost's invitation, sat in on the Provost's budget meetings with Norman campus deans. In a follow-up on the Council's recommendations concerning salary increases, the Chair conducted a survey of deans and departmental chairs on the question of increased allocation, including percentage of salary raises. In cooperation with Budget Director Conly, the data were made available to the Council on May 4, 1982.

During its term, the Council forwarded six recommendations to the President concerning FY 82/83 budget. These were the following:

- 1) The Budget Council recommends that salary and wage increases should constitute the top budgetary priority in 1982-83. The Council supports President Banowsky's goal of 13% increase in salaries and wages for the purpose of approximating the AAU average within the next two years. If state funding level in 1982 will not permit the achievement of the proposed increase, the Council recommends that faculty salaries be increased by a percentage sufficient to reach the average faculty salary of \$30,200 mandated for 1982-83 by the State Regents for Higher Education (February 9, 1982).
- 2) The Council further recommends that forty percent of salary and wage increases 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 (February 9, 1982).
- 3) As the second budgetary priority for FY 1982-83, the Budget Council recommends the purchase of a main-frame computer and the development of the holdings of Bizzell Memorial Library, including materials and services needed to support and maintain each of these agencies (February 16, 1982).
- 4) As the third budgetary priority for FY 1982-83, the Budget Council recommends the funding of new positions especially faculty, supplies with adequate maintenance and operations expenses, as well as with sufficient instructional and research equipment (February 16, 1982).
- 5) The Budget Council recommends that final FY 1982-83 budget reflect increased emphasis on the needs of academic departments and similarly organized budget units, allocating them relatively larger new position and M&O category increases than the University as a whole and discouraging duplication between all University and departmental functions (February 23, 1982).
- 6) The Budget Council supports the view of the State Regents for Higher Education that Continuing Education and Public Service constitute an important function of the University of Oklahoma and recommends adequate state funding to supplement the self-generated income of the Oklahoma Center for Continuing Education (March 16, 1982).

President Banowsky found these recommendations "timely." At the May 4, 1982, meeting, I suggested to the Council that the "Council's budgetary priorities are substantially reflected in the University's 1982-83 budget." The minutes recorded no disagreement with this judgment.

Respectfully submitted,

James Kenderdine
V. Stanley Vardys, Chair
George Bogart

Brooke Hill
Stan Neely
Ronald Evans

Travis Goggans
Beverly Joyce
Jeff Kimpel

Faculty Awards and Honors Council:

In his report for the fall semester (1981) Professor Joe Rarick, Council Chair, stated that the Council had completed its work for the academic year 1982-83. Therefore, no report for the spring semester (1982) was submitted. (Please see pages 6 and 7 of the Senate Journal for February 8, 1982.)

Don Counihan
Jack Metcoff
Joseph Rarick, Chair
Karl Bergey
Jo Frazer
Tom Hill
L. Doyle Bishop
Seymour Feiler
Robert Patnode
Martha Primeaux

Report of the Physical Resources and Campus Planning Council for spring semester, 1982, submitted by Professor R. D. Larson, Chair, on August 27, 1982:

During the spring semester, 1982, the Physical Resources & Campus Planning Council met in five regular sessions, four special sessions, and in meetings appropriate to its subcommittees.

During the semester, the Council was concerned with the following:

Sandblasting of Buildings:

Considerations of the fall semester resulted in a recommendation sent to President Banowsky... "that the sandblasting of masonry on the campus be suspended until the safety of such procedures can be established by laboratory tests or other non-harmful means."

Facilities Named for Donors:

On May 6, 1982, the Council acknowledged information related to rooms and other facilities in the Sam Viersen Gymnastics Center and the Doris W. Neustadt Wing of Bizzell Memorial Library named for various donors to these structures.

Bizzell Library Landscaping:

On February 4, 1982, the Council approved the final plans for the landscaping of Bizzell Library Plaza as presented by David Stapleton, A&E Services.

O.U. Foundation Site:

Mr. Ron Burton met with the Council and after discussion of various possibilities, the southwest corner of Timberdell and Wadsack, east

of the Law Center, was recommended as the site for the O.U. Foundation Building. On June 8, the Council met and accepted the above proposal with specific recommendation related to the building and the site.

Energy Center:

The Council continued its overview of the progress of the Energy Center and on May 25, 1982, accepted the schematic plans for the Energy Center Building.

Parrington Oval:

On May 24, 1982, President Banowsky met the with Council to discuss the concept of the inner-core pedestrian campus. The Council approved "the action of closure of the Parrington Oval to vehicular traffic" and recommended "the conversion of the area to a pedestrian mall..."

Parking & Traffic:

During the semester, the problems of Parking & Traffic continued to be studied. On March 25, 1982, Mr. Joe Guyton, Traffic Consultant with Harland-Bartholomew & Associates, Inc., as a progress report, distributed copies of "Description of Alternative Transportation Plan Concepts" to the Council. The Council studied the report, and their individual recommendations were submitted to the traffic consultants prior to the final report being sent to President Banowsky.

University Boulevard Parking:

On May 24, 1982, the Council "received the plans of the University Boulevard Parking Area and recommended that construction proceed."

Day Care Center:

Dr. Arthur Elbert informed the Council of his interest in a Day Care facility on the Norman campus. The Council approved the project for presentation to the Regents.

Music Building:

The Music Building continued to be an important item on the agenda of the Council throughout the semester. On June 3, Mr. Bill Kaighn, Kaighn Associates, and Mr. David Nordyke, representing A&E Services, presented the schematic plans of the Music Building to the Council. In a meeting on June 8, the Council approved a letter to Pres. Banowsky accepting the schematic plans for the Music Building with strong recommendations for immediate attention to related problems of parking and traffic, exterior design, and the function of Gothic Hall.

Name Change:

During the course of the semester, the Faculty Senate changed the name of the Physical Resources and Campus Planning Council to Campus Planning Council - Norman.

Election of Chair for 1982-83:

Professor James Goodman was elected Chair of the Campus Planning Council (Norman) for the academic year, 1982-83.

Council membership included the following faculty members:

Ray Larson, Chair (Drama)	Deirdre Hardy (Architecture)
Wayland Bowser (Architecture)	Jeanne Howard (University Libraries)
Larry Canter (CEES)	John Lancaster (Botany/Microbiology)
Charles Goins (Reg/City Planning)	Arnold Parr (Finance)
James Goodman (Geography)	

Report of the Research Council for spring semester, 1982, submitted by Professor Dick van der Helm, Chair, on August 2, 1982:

During Fiscal Year 1982, the Council participated in the award (changes with respect to F.Y. 1981 in parentheses) of \$757,587 (+57%) to support research and creative activity at the University. Overall, the Council reviewed 331 (+50%) proposals involving 408 faculty members requesting \$2,982,552 (+103%). Of these, 130 (+27%) involving 158 faculty members were fully or partially funded, for a success rate on the basis of dollars of 25.4%, to be compared with a success rate of 28.8% for F.Y. '81. These numbers are somewhat biased because during F.Y. '82 both F.Y. '82 and F.Y. '83 O.U. Associates Research/Creative Activity Funds proposals were reviewed. When the F.Y. '83 O.U. Associates proposals are substracted, the numbers change as follows: Number of Proposals reviewed 275 (+25%) involving 321 faculty members requesting \$2,002,163 (+36%); of these 115 (+13%) involving 130 faculty members were funded at a total of \$511,621 (+6%), for a success rate, based on dollars, of 25.5% (last year 28.8%).

A success rate of 25% is really quite low, and a more reasonable number would be 35 -40%. The numbers clearly indicate (a) a growth in the number of requests (b) a decreasing success rate and (c) a need for more internal funds for research and creative activities (a success rate of 35% would require an additional \$200,000; 40%, an additional \$300,000).

At its monthly meetings, the Council evaluated 121 (+29%) proposals, requesting \$279,335 (+37%) funding 68 (+11%) in the amount of \$119,514 (+18%) for a success rate (in dollars) of 43%, which was 50% last year. The OURI Trust Fund Allocation provided \$52,500 for Junior Faculty Summer Research Fellowships. Fifteen of these were awarded at \$3500 each, from 52 applications. Also the National Institutes of Health provided \$46,394 for the Biomedical Research Support Grant Program. In this program, 23 applications were received for \$117,647, and the Council supported 11 proposals.

Several changes were made during the past year:

- 1) For all monthly requests, a written critique was prepared and the proposals were given numerical scores by the individual Council members. The scores ranged between 1 and 4.
- 2) It was decided to consider the Junior Faculty Summer Research Fellowships during the fall rather than during the spring. This allows better planning of the summer for the faculty involved. Also, the guidelines for these Fellowships were changed.
- 3) The charge of the Council was streamlined. The new charge was approved by both the Faculty Senate and President Banowsky.
- 4) The membership of the Council will be enlarged from 9 to 12 elected faculty members, two each from 6 different areas of academic interest. This change was approved by both the Faculty Senate and President Banowsky.
- 5) O.U. Associates Research/Creative Activity Funds proposals will be reviewed during the spring for the next Fiscal Year rather than during the fall of the same Fiscal Year.

All changes will be in effect during F.Y. 1983.

As usual, the Council reviewed nominations for George Lynn Cross Research Professorships and made recommendations to the Provost.

At the May meeting of the Council, Dr. Patrick Sutherland was elected Chair for 1982-83. He will provide able leadership for the Council.

The Council is indebted to Vice Provost for Research Administration Kenneth Hoving for his financial support, encouragement, and wise counsel. Dean Hoving's regular attendance at Council meetings provided an informal but effective method of communicating to him our concerns about research at the University. We also appreciate the valuable contributions of Associate Dean Eddie C. Smith.

The 1981-82 membership of the Council was as follows:

Dick van der Helm, Chair (Chemistry)
 John Biro (Philosophy)
 Alexander Holmes (Economics)
 Patrick Sutherland (Geology and Geophysics)
 Christine Smith (Music)
 Roger Mellgren (Psychology)
 Charles Bert (AMNE)
 Jack Kanak (Psychology)
 Henry Tobias (History)

Report of the Board of Student Publications (Norman campus) for spring semester, 1982, submitted by Professor Ed Carter, Chair on August 20, 1982:

OU Student Publications ended fiscal year, 1981-82, in July with a net operating margin of \$46,879.28 in all of its accounts. This compares with a profit of approximately \$15,000 for the 1980-81 fiscal year.

Although advertising sales for the Oklahoma Daily were down about 4 percent, the Daily's advertising revenue showed an 8.6 percent compared with last fiscal year's figure. The Daily wound up the fiscal year with a profit of \$20,228.34.

For the third year in a row, the Sooner Yearbook has shown remarkable improvement. Book sales totaled approximately 3,000, an increase of about 300 compared with last year's sales. The yearbook showed a profit this past fiscal year of \$2,475.82.

The Journalism Press showed an operating margin of \$35,788.22, compared with a loss of \$2,475.82 for the previous fiscal year.

The Publications Board showed a loss of \$2,795.43 for the past fiscal year because of increased but unplanned expenses in the new accounting system.

On other matters, bids have been asked for a new computerized editing system. Hopefully, the new system will be installed at the end of the fall semester.

The Board of Publications reviewed and revised the Charter of Student Publications. The revised charter is to be sent to the OU Regents for consideration and action.

Council membership included faculty members Ed Carter and John

RESOLUTION OF APPRECIATION: Dr. J. R. Morris, Interim President,
September/October, 1982.

Dr. John Dunn, a member of the Faculty Senate Executive Committee, moved approval of the following resolution of Senate appreciation to Dr. J. R. Morris for his service as Interim President of the University during September and October, 1982:

- WHEREAS Dr. J. R. Morris served as the Interim President of the University of Oklahoma during the period, September 1 through October 31, 1982,
- WHEREAS Dr. Morris demonstrated his managerial expertise in administering a very smooth and almost imperceptible transition from one administration to another,
- WHEREAS he took every opportunity on public occasions to express his continuing commitment to high-quality education and academic excellence at this University,
- WHEREAS his keen insight, extensive institutional background, and selfless dedication brought his own unique and personal dimension to the task of assuming the Presidency of this institution on relatively short notice,
- WHEREAS his exceptional sensitivity, refreshing sense of humor, unaffected collegiality, and proved sincerity coalesced into an inspiring and inspired leadership,
- WHEREAS his wholehearted support of the Energy Center project provided an essential element of stability to this very important ongoing program on this campus,
- WHEREAS he established the program of "President's Partners" to provide an additional source of vital, private funding for this University,
- WHEREAS he demonstrated effectively his stature as an educational leader in this state and region, and
- WHEREAS he has further enhanced the respect and the admiration of the faculty, the students, and the staff on this campus during the past few months,
- BE IT THEREFORE RESOLVED THAT the Faculty Senate on the Norman campus take this opportunity to express publicly its sincere and genuine gratitude to Dr. J. R. Morris for the noteworthy manner and the outstanding quality of his leadership during his two-month tenure as the Interim President of this University.

The resolution was approved by acclamation.

ADJOURNMENT

The Faculty Senate adjourned at 5:09 p.m. The next regular meeting of the Senate is scheduled for 3:30 p.m., on Monday, December 13, 1982, in the Conoco Auditorium, Lower Level 2, Doris W. Neustadt Wing, Bizzell Memorial Library.

Respectfully submitted,

Anthony S. Lis

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