

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

The Journal for the regular session on December 13, 1982, was approved.

ANNOUNCEMENTS

Spring semester meeting, General Faculty: The General Faculty on the Norman campus will hold its spring semester meeting at 3:30 p.m., on Thursday, April 14, 1983, in the Ballroom, Oklahoma Memorial Union.

Senate replacement - College of Arts and Sciences: Dr. Robert Con Davis (English) has been selected to replace Dr. Ronald Schleifer (English), who is on sabbatical leave this semester, as a College of Arts and Sciences representative for the unexpired portion of Professor Schleifer's term, 1981-84.

ACTIONS TAKEN BY PRESIDENT BANOWSKY

(1) EEC/Senate proposals, professional staff with advanced degrees.

On January 3, 1983, President William S. Banowsky addressed the following self-explanatory, follow-up message to the Senate Secretary regarding the report of the joint EEC/Faculty Senate Committee on problems of professional staff with advanced degrees:

On November 5, I responded to your memo concerning the report of the EEC/Faculty Senate Committee on Problems of Professional Staff with Advanced Degrees. A review of the eight proposals contained in this committee report has been undertaken.

Recommendations one through six detail opportunities that would be very appropriate to be made available to administrative and professional staff members with advanced degrees. Arrangements will need to be worked out for implementing the details of these recommendations. I am asking Provost J. R. Morris to work with the appropriate areas of the University to implement these recommendations.

Recommendations seven and eight have implications that need further consideration. I will respond to these two items as soon as possible after the first of the year.

(Copies of the above memorandum were distributed by the President's office to Provost J. R. Morris, Vice Presidents David Burr and Art Elbert, and Associate Provost Joseph Ray.)

(Please see page 2 of the Senate Journal for December 13, 1982.)

(2) Energy conservation measures.

On January 3, 1983, President William S. Banowsky addressed the following self-explanatory memorandum to the Provost and the Vice Presidents, with copies to the Chairs of the Faculty Senate and the Energy Conservation Committee:

The University's educational and general budget for energy this fiscal year approximates \$5 million. In an attempt to reduce this budget proportionately with other University reductions, it was noted that significant contribution could be made in energy saving during this heating season by adhering more closely to some practices recommended by the Energy Conservation Committee. In summary, these are:

1. Portable electric heaters should not be used.
2. Temperatures should be kept at 68°F.
3. All exterior doors should be kept shut at all times.
4. Decorative lighting should be eliminated.
5. All electrical equipment, including office machines, should be turned off when not in use.
6. Departments should consolidate the use of coffee pots, etc.
7. Copy machines should be turned off at night.
8. All lights should be turned off when leaving the area.
9. Idle classrooms should not be used indiscriminately as study areas.
10. Any malfunctioning of heating or cooling equipment should be reported to the Physical Plant at 325-3060.

I am asking that each dean, director, department chair, and all supervisors assure themselves that personnel in their respective areas observe the energy conservation practices outlined above. I would encourage you to assign a departmental energy coordinator to help monitor compliance.

The discontinuance of the use of portable electric heaters is of particular importance since they consume a large amount of energy. Personal heaters of this type should be taken home and University-owned heaters should be turned in to the Physical Plant. The University Environmental Safety unit will monitor use of electric heaters in the future. Any requested deviation from this policy should be directed to Mr. Ben Kinder, Director of the Physical Plant.

This action is essential if we are to reduce our utilities cost this year. Continued active support on your part will allow future savings to be used for other essential purposes in subsequent years. Please see that this memo is distributed to each of your directors and/or deans and department chairs.

ACTION TAKEN BY PROVOST J. R. MORRIS: General Education Coordinating Committee.

On January 3, 1983, Provost J. R. Morris announced the appointment of the following General Education Campus-wide Coordinating Committee to serve as a liaison among the various colleges, as well as to assist him and the colleges in facilitating their general education desires:

Vice Provost Jerome Weber, Chair
 Associate Dean John Francis, College of Engineering
 Associate Dean Morris Marx, College of Arts and Sciences
 Assistant Dean James Faulconer, College of Fine Arts
 Interim Dean Ronald Hess, College of Environmental Design
 Professor James Constantin (Marketing)
 Professor Charles Harper (Geology/Geophysics)
 Professor Richard Wells (Political Science)
 Professor Lloyd Williams (Education)

Provost Morris' formal notice to the individuals listed above included the following relevant background of this matter:

"As I believe you know, the Norman Faculty Senate approved on May 3, 1982, the report of the Senate's ad hoc Committee on General Education.

"In June, President Banowsky forwarded copies of that report to the deans on the Norman campus, and we discussed the report at the Deans' Council meeting on June 16. At that meeting, I asked that each dean formally review and submit to me by the end of the 1982 fall semester a report evaluating the merit of the recommendation contained in the Faculty Senate report and the potential implications for each college. I also indicated that, while it is understood that there is no common approach to general education requirements, there are common concerns and elements shared by all disciplines. Consequently, I also asked the deans to address in their reports both general education in their colleges and any recommendations for change.

"The Faculty Senate's report recognized that there might be different general education requirements from one college to another. At the same time, the Senate also recognized that there would need to be some mechanism on a university-wide basis for coordinating college-level general education."

(Please see page 6 of the Senate Journal for September 13, 1982, and page 25 of the Senate Journal for May 3, 1982.)

ACTION TAKEN BY UNIVERSITY COMMITTEE ON ALL-CAMPUS PUBLICATION

At a recent meeting, the University Committee (whose membership includes Professor Anthony S. Lis, Senate Secretary) on the all-campus publication agreed to hold the new project in abeyance in view of the current budgetary crisis. The FY 1982-83 allocation of approximately \$8,000 for the publication will revert to the University administration.

The Committee intends to review the situation next fall and to reactivate the project if the University budgetary situation improves. (Please see page 2 of the Senate Journal for September 13, 1982.)

ACTION TAKEN BY SENATE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE: Budgetary allocations, FY 1982-83.

On December 17, 1982, the following recommendations of the Executive Committee, Faculty Senate (Norman campus), concerning FY 1982-83 budgetary allocations were forwarded to President William S. Banowsky:

On December 6, 1982, President William S. Banowsky asked the Executive Committee of the Faculty Senate to contribute in the process of planning for diminished operating funds for the 1982-83 fiscal year and to develop recommendations as to the forms which this contribution should take.

In response to this request, the Executive Committee recommends that it be afforded a dual role in this process. First, the Executive Committee should function during this period of budgetary decisions as the intermediary between faculty and administration. In this capacity, the Executive Committee can assure that communication regarding budgetary concerns between faculty and administration remains unimpeded. Second, because it is a representative body, the Executive Committee recommends that it be granted a participatory role in the budgetary reallocation process.

In pursuit of this dual role, the Executive Committee offers the following principles and recommendations:

(1) The Executive Committee expresses its unqualified support for the interim measures taken to date regarding hiring, purchases, and nonessential travel and recommends that the administration encourage departments and nonacademic units to continue these restrictions.

(2) The Executive Committee lauds and supports, without reservation, President Banowsky's stated goal of preserving newly won academic gains and institutional momentum. Thus, to the extent feasible, the Executive Committee recommends that reductions be made so as to minimize hindrance of or disruption to progress in academic programs.

Specifically,

(a) All aspects of the campus should be examined to determine which sorts of services and programs might be reduced or eliminated before academic units are affected. For example, environmental improvement projects and outreach programs might be curtailed in times of budgetary strain. Also, areas of nonacademic services should be examined for purposes of short-term operational reductions.

(b) The possibility of diverting funds available for specially designated purposes, such as the Associates Fund, on a short-term basis to the general operating budget should be explored.

(3) The Executive Committee is firmly committed to the concept that budgetary reductions cannot be visited equally on all academic departments. Rather, decreases should be apportioned so as to preserve real gains made by some departments and to avoid disastrous consequences to other departments.

Although this differential allocation of reductions involves very difficult decisions, the Executive Committee views the alternative, across-the-board decreases, as potentially destructive to the academic component of this institution and thus recommends that the more difficult course be followed.

(4) Once specific percentages for decreases are determined, it is the view of the Executive Committee that each individual budget unit must be allowed discretion, subject to Provost's review, as to how its mandated percentage reduction might be accomplished.

For example, some departments might choose to encourage voluntary early retirement of senior faculty, who are generally higher salaried. Others may choose to leave vacant positions unfilled for a year and to teach with existing personnel courses allocated to those positions. Others may choose to trim summer school offerings either by raising the minimum number of student enrollments necessary for a course to make or by cancelling courses duplicated during the regular semesters. Still others may choose to undergo voluntary salary reductions.

Inasmuch as the units are most aware of their individual strengths and needs, it is of crucial significance that these determinations be made by each budgetary unit.

(5) Capital improvement funds should be expended with utmost caution. Use of these funds for nonessential projects is inappropriate for two reasons. First, if the severity of the fiscal outlook for the state and for the University is to be credible, no unnecessary projects should be undertaken. Second, if University employees are asked to endure shortages and to make sacrifices while nonessential projects are funded, faculty and staff morale will plummet irretrievably.

(6) The Executive Committee recommends that it participate in the actual administrative process of determining budgetary reductions. Representatives from the Executive Committee could meet with administrators and actually participate in the decision-making process. Or, this participatory role could be fulfilled by allowing the Executive Committee to review the reports regarding budgetary reductions which have been solicited from Deans.

Regardless of which participatory mechanism is chosen, the Executive Committee can accomplish its function as liaison between faculty and administration and as facilitator of communication only if it is fully apprised as to reasons, policies, and priorities that underlie the reallocation decisions. Moreover, the faculty perspective may prove useful to administrators as they struggle with very difficult determinations.

(7) The process by which reductions are authorized is of crucial significance at all levels. The Executive Committee recommends that the administration encourage deans, chairs, and program directors to review thoroughly all recommendations for decreases with all affected personnel.

(8) In order to assure that all University personnel are fully informed, the Executive Committee recommends that final decisions regarding all reductions and percentage allocations of decreases be announced publicly.

(9) In order to fulfill this dual role effectively, the Executive Committee asks to be informed of further developments on a continuing basis. Whether the fiscal outlook improves or declines, the Executive Committee should be provided any new information and should be allowed to participate in any resulting revisions of policies and principles governing allocations.

The Executive Committee of the Faculty Senate extends its thanks for this opportunity to participate in what will prove to be, at best, a bleak process. We remain firm in our resolve to aid the administration in this process through the aforementioned recommendations or through any other way in which we can provide constructive assistance.

REPORT OF SENATE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

Professor Teree Foster, Chair of the Senate Executive Committee, presented the following report on behalf of the Senate Executive Committee:

(1) Update - budget crisis, 1982-83:

In addition to the budgetary proposals submitted to President Banowsky by the Senate Executive Committee (see pages 4-6 of this Journal), the Budget Council forwarded its own recommendations to President Banowsky.

President Banowsky has written to Governor Nigh expressing his feeling "that the University cannot bend too much without regressing." In recent conversations with Provost Morris and Vice President Turner, Professor Foster indicated faculty support of his views.

At a recent meeting with the Senate Executive Committee, Provost Morris commented that no one knows exactly what the final figure will be. Provost Morris reported on a recent meeting with Senator Randall and Representative Deatherage, as well as a meeting in the Capitol with agency heads. Budget cuts of 3 to 7 percent were mentioned.

Provost Morris also reported on Governor Nigh's recent meeting with college representatives. Although the Governor did not back off from his previously announced figure of 3 percent, toward the end of the meeting he commented, "We should be keeping our eyes on 6 percent."

Most people feel that higher education will come out with a cut of about 6 percent. The general feeling also is that there will be a differentiation and that some agencies will have greater cuts than others.

Provost Morris mentioned TIAA-CREF adjustments as a way of achieving budget cuts. The Senate Executive Committee told the Provost that, in their opinion, the faculty would prefer a small reduction in salary to any adjustments in TIAA-CREF with the logic that, if conditions improve, the salary adjustment would be a much easier matter. Professor Foster solicited faculty reactions and suggestions.

Provost Morris reported that departmental budgets were cut 4 percent. He hopes that there will be no need to go back to the academic deans and further indicated that, at present, no necessity is anticipated for declaring a financial emergency, laying off any personnel, or discontinuing any programs.

Meeting with the Senate Executive Committee last December, President Banowsky expressed the feeling that budget reductions should be achieved through the democratic process and that a two-way communication system is important at the departmental level. Professor Foster mentioned that the Law College held a general faculty meeting on this matter. She urged faculty members in departments lacking this two-way communication to go to their respective chairs to learn how decisions were being made and where the money is coming from.

In responding to a question from the floor, Professor Foster stated that, once the final figure for 1982-83 is made known, planning for FY 1983-84 can begin in a better atmosphere. To date, the cut is definitely 4 percent, across the board.

(2) Salary audit, 1982-83:

Professor Foster announced that the 1982-83 salary audit is now being conducted in the Provost's office by the following ad hoc group:

Associate Provost Joseph Ray
 Mr. Walter Mason, Affirmative Action Officer
 Professor Teree Foster, Senate Chair
 Ms. Ann Glenn, Provost's office

FACULTY NOMINATIONS, STUDENT DISCIPLINARY COUNCILS

Professor Robert A. Ford, Chair of the Senate Committee on Committees, requested Senate authorization for the Senate Executive Committee to submit to the President, as soon as possible, a number of faculty nominations for the newly established Student Disciplinary Councils. A pending case necessitates quick action in activating the Councils, without delaying Senate action until the February 14 Senate meeting.

Professor Baker moved that the Senate Executive Committee be so empowered. The motion was approved without dissent.

REPORT OF SENATE COMMITTEE ON FACULTY COMPENSATION

Dr. William Eick, Chair of the Senate standing Committee on Faculty Compensation, reported on the following items:

- (1) The Committee is studying the proposal for continuing TIAA-CREF contributions for faculty members over 65.
- (2) Mr. Leonard Harper, Chair of the University Employment Benefits Committee, has accepted the invitation to address the Senate on February 14. He will discuss both the dental plan and the new health insurance contract.

REMARKS BY FACULTY REPRESENTATIVE, BIG 8 CONFERENCE: Recent NCAA changes in academic requirements, student athletes.

At the invitation of the Senate Executive Committee, Professor Dan Gibbens (Law), Oklahoma University faculty representative to the Big Eight Conference, addressed the Senate regarding the changes recently approved by the National Collegiate Athletic Association in academic requirements for student athletes on scholarship.

Professor Gibbens distributed to Senate members copies of the following:

- (1) Statement to the press, dated January 13, 1983, by Dr. Gerald Turner, Executive Vice President, University of Oklahoma.
- (2) Excerpts from 1983 NCAA Convention program giving complete text of NCAA Council proposals Nos. 48, 49 A and B, 50, 51, and 52.
- (3) Professor Gibbens' observations on the new NCAA academic standards legislation.

Items (1) and (3) are reproduced below:

Statement, dated January 13, 1983, to the press by Dr. Gerald Turner, Executive Vice President, University of Oklahoma

The National Collegiate Athletic Association at its annual convention January 10-12, 1983, in San Diego, acted upon a number of dramatic changes related to increased academic requirements for prospective student-athletes. Although almost all member universities were committed to increasing the readiness of student-athletes to successfully complete college level work, five different approaches to increasing academic requirements were offered. However, most attention centered around two proposals: (a) No. 48 which required all prospective student-athletes to have completed a basic core curriculum in high school with a "C" average and to make a composite score of 15 on the ACT or a combined score of 700 on the SAT and (b) No. 51 which required the successful completion of the same core listed in No. 48 but did not require the standardized test component.

Proposal No. 48 was controversial because various minorities have lower average scores on these standardized tests than do majority white students. The University of Oklahoma supported proposal No. 51 because ACT and SAT tests underpredict the grade-point averages of black students at this University. In other words, a "C" average can be predicted for a black student who scores less than a 15 composite on the ACT. Therefore, the University felt that adding the standardized test requirement was inappropriate.

As has been reported by the national wire services, proposal No. 48 passed the convention. Therefore, proposal No. 51 was declared moot and no vote was taken on it. The University of Oklahoma then supported an amendment to proposal No. 48 which allowed students who did not meet the standardized test requirement to be granted a scholarship but such students would not be able to participate in intercollegiate athletics until they had made a "C" average during their freshman year on campus.

The University of Oklahoma is interested in increasing the preparation for collegiate work of their entering students. Requiring a more substantial core of academic work at the high school level for prospective student-athletes is an important step in the right direction. Whether the standardized test requirement will be retained until the 1986 effective date is an open question, given the opposition now building among many educators throughout the country.

Professor Gibbens' observations
on new NCAA academic standards legislation:

- (1) OU favors higher academic standards for student-athletes, as indicated by our support of proposals No. 51 (which became moot with the passage of No. 48), No. 49B, and No. 56 (these latter two we voted for, and they also passed).
- (2) OU opposes the use of specified standardized test scores (SAT, ACT) as a requirement for freshman eligibility and, therefore, voted against No. 48.
- (3) The 2.0 requirement for the 11 specified high school courses - the "core curriculum requirement" of No. 48 -- is viewed as an important tightening of academic requirements. This requirement, without the standardized test requirement, is No. 51.
- (4) It is well known that the standardized tests are viewed by some as racially discriminatory.
- (5) The subjects of academic standards and academic performance have been regular focuses of discussion at all levels of the University administration for many years. These specific proposals received particular attention at both the December and the January Big Eight meetings (the latter was held on January 2, 1983, chaired by Dr. Banowsky). Dr. Gerald Turner and I discussed these matters both before and after Christmas and daily while I was in San Diego. I did not discuss these specific proposals with the Athletics Council -- until December. It was not clear that this year's proposals were to be given heightened attention; and, in substance, these proposals were not viewed as different in kind from others previously discussed.

In elaborating on his written statement, Professor Gibbens noted, "Several proposals were passed. We supported some and did not support others. Because we did not support some, we got what we feel is bad press. I hope it's clear by now that the position that I went to the convention and consistently stayed with was one in favor of higher academic standards."

He viewed as "significant and very meaningful" the new requirement for a 2.0 plus eleven specific (college-preparatory) courses in high school. He noted that the 5 percent exception is quite standard throughout the country in an attempt to create better opportunities for minorities to attend college and become role models. "It is no secret that the 5 percent provision has been used heavily but not exclusively for student athletes." In his opinion, the underlying basis for the upgrading is to send a message to the high schools that academics are important and that, in order to cope with the academic aspect in college, students must be prepared. The core curriculum requirements, therefore, make "a lot of sense." In the past, a student could flunk a course and then take another course to maintain a 2.0 average on all high school work.

The additional test-score requirement is another matter. "In our view, there are arguments for both sides. It is perceived by many as having a racial bias; it is not easily proved or disproved. We felt that imposing this additional requirement is inappropriate at this time. It may be in time, however."

"Those of us who voted 'no' (and we were in the minority) felt that this was a little unrealistic throughout the country, as well as in Oklahoma.

We are not saying that standardized tests are bad for high schools. However, I think that it is foolish to suppose that you will be able to gear up the high schools between now and 1986 so that the youngsters who want to and who can will be geared up."

In commenting on his role in the Athletics Council, Professor Gibbens reported that he had discussed similar proposals with the Council in previous years. He added, "However, I would have felt better if I had discussed these items with the Council last fall." He noted that he and Athletic Director Wade had been in regular communication with the administration concerning this matter.

Reacting to unfavorable recent criticism in the Daily Oklahoman, as well as reports in the Oklahoma Daily, Professor Gibbens stated, "As far as the University is concerned, we don't want to be known as being opposed to higher academic standards for athletes." In closing his remarks, Professor Gibbens added that Vice President Gerald Turner is very sensitive to the testing issue because of his background at Pepperdine University, where he was in charge of all testing.

Professor Gibbens next answered questions from the floor.

Professor Locke expressed appreciation to Professor Gibbens for his explanation of the recent press accounts and expressed his concern that, while the faculty is currently discussing increasing academic standards for all students at this University, Professor Gibbens, as Big 8 faculty representative, was narrowing the issue to student athletes. "I don't think that is the way that we want to move." Professor Gibbens agreed with Professor Locke's statement. He added, "Imposing standardized test requirements now--during the recession--however, might be the worst of times to restrict opportunities for minorities, including athletes. I don't mean to suggest that this issue is the main thing. I think that we need to be honest about opportunities for athletes--other than academic."

Professor Cohen asked about the decision-making process at this University regarding admission standards for student athletes. Labelling the matter as "a classical case of faculty responsibility," he asked why the matter had not been processed through the Athletics Council. In response, Professor Gibbens stated that, as far as he knew, the Regents had nothing to do with this matter. "The University policy in this instance was developed by me, Athletic Director Wade, and the administration--primarily President Banowsky and Vice President Turner. Provost Morris was also involved to some extent. This is the kind of thing that should go through the Athletics Council and, as a matter of routine, has in the past. A major reason for not getting the Athletics Council involved this time was the matter of timing." Another reason was the fact that he was on sabbatical leave during the fall semester. He added, "I did not attend the Council meetings but they knew that I was available. In retrospect, I would feel a lot more comfortable if I had taken the initiative even though it might have been difficult in the matter of timing."

Professor Gibbens indicated that this question had been discussed at a meeting in Ohio last June and at the Big 8 meeting last January. chaired by President Banowsky. Vice President Turner tried unsuccessfully to get in touch with Professor Jack Kasulis, Chair of the Athletics Council. The President's office has recently learned that Professor Kasulis had been on a teaching assignment in Saudi Arabia during that time.

Professor Ragan raised questions concerning the minimum SAT score of 700, which, to him, means that 93 percent of those taking the test had attained that score. When Professor Gibbens indicated his lack of details about the minimum score requirement, Professor Ragan commented that "our position looks tacky." Professor Whitmore expressed the opinion that the

lack of knowledge "makes our Big 8 faculty representative look even worse." Professor Cohen saw this shortcoming as another argument for the need for consultation with a larger group in the decision process.

Mr. Williams (Student Services) expressed his dissatisfaction with the nature and the quality of academic support made available to student athletes. He questioned the validity of the ACT in predicting academic success but felt that the test could have some value in counseling. He also asked whether the Athletics Council was planning to do anything about academic support services for the Athletic Department. Professor Gibbens felt that the Athletic Department will be responsible in this matter. He, too, questioned the validity of ACT scores.

Mr. Mason (Affirmative Action Officer) asked whether (1) there were any representatives from testing firms at the NCAA meeting in California and (2) there was any prior consultation with such firms. Professor Gibbens replied that there were no representatives from testing organizations at the meeting. "That, however, does not mean that there was no such consultation during the process." Proposal 48 came out of a special committee of 26 university presidents. Some resource people were used by that group. Professor Gibbens did not know, however, whether any test experts had been consulted by them.

Mr. Mason commented that the test companies themselves do not make any claims about the use of such tests as admission tools. "They are placement tools; any other use is a misuse of these instruments." Professor Gibbens noted that the issue is one of eligibility for athletics and athletic scholarships, not admission requirements.

Mr. Mason asked whether NCAA had received any reactions to its recent actions. Professor Gibbens replied that he did not know.

Professor Gross saw the issue as one of "faculty governance over academic standards." Hearing on the radio and reading the newspapers about a University position on academic standards, the faculty raise questions about the method of determining such a position. In his view, "Questions of academic standards (whether admission or retention) should be discussed by the faculty and not the administration. Even though the number is small, there is the matter of principle--the academic process itself."

Professor Cohen called the Athletic Department and the President's office about the questionable process of generating the University position in this matter. He also complained about the "shabby treatment of the Athletics Council by the Athletic Department." Professor Gibbens, generalizing on the basis of his experience of 6-plus years, indicated that faculty members on the Athletic Council "had suspicions that they were treated shabbily by the Athletic Department. As far as I know, very few felt that they got very good treatment. That is my impression, and I report it for whatever it is worth."

Professor Foster thanked Professor Gibbens for his appearance and comments. In her opinion, "two significant and paramount premises underlie this issue: (1) The management of academic affairs and standards must remain in the hands of the faculty and (2) the management of questions about academic standards and these issues are questions of faculty government that must be resolved through the faculty-governance mechanism."

Professor Locke supported Mr. Williams' concern about providing adequate academic support to student athletes. "Those who are here are our responsibility. We, as faculty members, should have some input."

Professor Graves asked about the percentage of student athletes who graduate on athletic scholarships. That figure, in his opinion, "is much lower than can be accounted for by attrition. This is something that I would like to see presented to us as important information." Professor Foster added, "This is a very important issue!"

FINAL REPORT: EEC/Senate Committee - Affirmative Action Plan.

Background information: Last summer, the Faculty Senate and the Employee Executive Council appointed separate ad hoc committees to review the current affirmative action plan on this campus. In accordance with plans, both Committees subsequently joined in a common effort to prepare a final report for consideration by both sponsoring groups.

The final, joint report of that Committee was distributed to Senate members on December 9, 1982. At the December 13 Senate meeting, the Senate Chair announced that this question would be formally considered at this (January 17, 1983) session. (Please see page 7 of the Senate Journal for December 13, 1982.)

Senate action: In formally presenting the report to the Senate, Professor Keith Bystrom, Committee Chair, made some introductory remarks. "The problem is not unique to this campus--many universities and colleges throughout the country are now reviewing their affirmative action policies. At Stanford University, for example, a faculty committee has recently recommended that affirmative action procedures be continued for at least ten more years."

He indicated that Mr. Walter Mason, Affirmative Action Officer, had submitted a detailed analysis of the Committee report. "Mr. Mason is generally supportive of our recommendations but not all of them. He feels that a full commitment to affirmative action guidelines is needed at the higher level of the University administration. He felt that some of our recommendations were minor and would not make a big change." He also did raise some questions about the procedural aspect.

Professor Bystrom and some staff members were invited to meet with the Black Faculty and Staff Caucus on campus. The Caucus members had their own recommendations, many of which paralleled the items in the final report of the Committee. That group was, however, much more specific regarding retention and promotion policies.

He called specific attention to Section III (Recommendations) and Appendix B (Summary of Recommendations) of the Committee report.

Professor Tom Smith then moved approval of the Committee report.

Professors Baker and Cohen commended the Committee for its efforts and fine report. During the discussion period, they and Professors Christian, Graves, Kleine, Kutner, Locke, Schmitz, and Smith either raised questions or commented on various aspects of the issue.

According to Professor Baker, "It is very difficult for faculty conceptually to give 'reasonable,' quantitative weight for minority status." He suggested that either this Committee or some other group pursue the varieties of approaches to giving such weight; otherwise, no progress will be made. Professor Bystrom replied that the Committee did not propose anything definite to be used uniformly throughout the campus. The group tried to emphasize that this factor is a circumstance in the hiring decision that can be looked into in pursuing the University goal of increased progress in affirmative action.

In Prof. Kleine's view, "The very initial beginning of the pipeline is the most important element. Most programs of this type come of age rather than try to stop discrimination. The conceptual confusion has to be clarified downstream--either to try to stop discrimination or to help solve the problem."

Professor Cohen felt that some recommendations may work for staff and administration but may not work very well for faculty.

While answering various questions, Professor Bystrom called retention a major problem. He reported on the Committee's interview with an individual who had left the University because of an alleged lack of concern in the department for his professional development. "Once hired, these individuals must be accepted as much as others who come aboard. Recruiting must be more than advertising."

In response to a question, Professor Foster stated that the report, if approved, would be held up until the EEC takes action at its meeting later in the week so that a joint report can be forwarded to President Banowsky.

Professor Henderson noted that giving weight to minority applicants would be analogous to the accepted practice of giving preference points to veterans. In his opinion, Senate approval of the report would be a form of affirmative action.

Mr. Mason answered questions and offered his comments throughout the discussion period. He noted, "We are not doing very well in initial appointments and even more poorly in retaining those hired. The problem will not get better unless we are more serious all along the road." He feels that one reason for the low retention rate is the "bad treatment when the individuals are interviewed and later when they are hired as tokens. Last year, 5 out of 14 black faculty members left because of the treatment they had received."

Mr. Mason reported that the black faculty and staff group recently proposed to President Banowsky that he should intervene--even in tenure decisions. "The President, however, turned that proposal down. If the president won't do it, then you must do it!" In his opinion, the problem is not one of identifying applicants in the search process. "You are seeing them, but you are not hiring them." He does not see the need for adding someone to his staff and would prefer to attach such a position to the Provost's office. In his view, the term "minority liaison" would be better than "minority recruiter." Subsequently, the Senate approved the Committee report with one dissenting vote.

Prof. Foster complimented the Committee on its efforts in producing a report that is "a signal of commitment. It could not purport to resolve all questions."

Reproduced below is the 2-page summary of the Committee recommendations.

Copies of the complete, 31-page report were distributed to Senate members on December 9, 1982. Faculty members interested in reading the entire report should contact either their respective Senate representatives or the Faculty Senate office, OMU 406 (5-6789).

Summary of Recommendations

- A. Increase University administration commitment to affirmative action and equal employment opportunity by improving public relations and monetary support.

- B. Revitalize the Equal Opportunity Committee as the Equal Opportunity Council.
1. Restructure the Council by reducing the size of its membership and creating specific terms of service to ensure continuity.
 2. Require regular monthly Council meetings.
 3. Require that the Chair of the Council rotate between a staff member and a faculty member.
 4. Require that the quarterly written reports to be presented to the President also be sent to the Faculty Senate and the Employee Executive Council.
- C. Institute corrective actions for current hiring procedure deficiencies.
1. Modify Procedure A for staff hiring.
 - a. Improve clarity of Personnel Services notification to departments when underutilized positions are open.
 - b. Establish increased review and approval by Personnel Services for affirmative action taken for monthly positions.
 - c. Increase review by Personnel Services of non-hiring reasons to ensure conformance with procedures on a timely basis.
 2. Modify Procedure B for faculty, executive officer, and administrative officer hiring.
 - a. Establish a requirement that each search committee have a minimum of three members.
 - b. Establish a requirement that each search be open for a minimum period of 30 days and allow the Affirmative Action Officer the discretion to require that a position be open for a longer period of time if the nature of the position warrants.
 - c. Encourage that at least one minority, woman, or other interested person be on the search committee in underutilized departments for the purpose of working with the Affirmative Action Office to ensure adequate attention is given to minorities and women in the search process.
 - d. Emphasize the importance of the Affirmative Action Officer requiring departments to fully explain hiring decisions and document why a minority or woman is not hired in an underutilized area.
 - e. Require underutilized departments to follow Procedure B for appointment of the chair of the department.
 3. Establish new procedures for both faculty (Procedure B) and staff (Procedure A) hiring.
 - a. Establish a grievance procedure for applicants for positions with respect to affirmative action and equal employment opportunity problems.
 - b. Report all vacancies, whether or not they are contemplated to be filled, to Personnel Services or the Affirmative Action Office and require documented reasons why a vacancy is not to be filled and what duties are reassigned from the vacant position.
 - c. Require that all records of the hiring process be kept five years rather than the current two years.

- D. Provide incentives, information, and increased assistance for hiring officials in meeting affirmative action goals.
1. Increase hiring official and unit incentives.
 - a. Incorporate into Performance Evaluations clear affirmative action goals and objectives as implied in the current Affirmative Action Plan.
 - b. Establish monetary "unit commendation" for meeting, exceeding, and making acceptable progress toward affirmative action and equal employment goals.
 - c. Establish monetary incentives for underutilized departments to hire senior-level minorities and women.
 2. Provide increased information and assistance to hiring officials, search committees, and departments.
 - a. Create a position of full-time recruiter in the Affirmative Action Office to recruit minorities and women for both faculty and monthly staff positions with emphasis on a definite outreach program.
 - b. Obtain and use any available lists, including computer printouts, of minorities and women who might be potential applicants for current or future open positions.
 - c. Computerize applicant pool retrieval systems for notification internally and externally of positions that are vacant.
 - d. Encourage minorities and women on campus to increase networking among themselves for identification of potential applicants.
 - e. Establish management training programs to ensure hiring officials are knowledgeable, aware, and capable of implementing affirmative action procedures properly.
- E. Establish a University task force to address the special problems of the retention and promotion of minority and women faculty and staff.
- F. Develop a "human resources" plan by designating a set of actions that will stimulate and assure the appropriate and effective use of personnel at the University of Oklahoma.

ADJOURNMENT

The Faculty Senate adjourned at 5:31 p.m. The next regular session of the Senate will be held at 3:30 p.m., on Monday, February 14, 1983, in the CONOCO Auditorium, Doris W. Neustadt Wing, Bizzell Memorial Library.

Respectfully submitted,

Anthony S. Lis

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