

JOURNAL OF THE FACULTY SENATE (Norman campus)

The University of Oklahoma

Regular session -- April 11, 1983 -- 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:

Baker	Fishbeck	Hayes	Levy	Reynolds
Black	Ford	Howard	Lis	Scharnberg
Bredeson	Foster	Inman	Love	Schmitz
Cohen	Gollahalli	Karriker	McDonald	Slaughter
Conner	Goodman	Kutner	Mills	Smith
Davis	Grant	Lanning	Nicewander	Sonleitner
Dumont	Graves	Lehr, Robert	Patten	Stock
Dunn	Hauser	Lehr, Roland	Ragan	Whitmore

Provost's office representative: Ray

PSA representatives: Boehme Guyer Morrison
Corcos

UOSA representative: Stanhope

GSA representative: Walsh

Absent:

Catlin	Harper	Kiacz	Locke	Seaberg
Christian	Hebert	Kleine	Moriarity	West
Gross	Hibdon			

PSA representatives: Cowen Powers

Liaison, Women's Caucus: Cleaver Liaison, AAUP: Turkington

Liaison, Association of Black Personnel: Butler

UOSA representatives: Albert Rodriguez

GSA representative: Strickland

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Announcements:

Spring meeting, General Faculty - April 14	2
CCFO meeting - April 22.	2
Action taken by President Banowsky: Exam makeup policy.	2
Action taken by Provost J. R. Morris: Student withdrawal policy	2
Proposed Early Warning Assistance Program for Minority Students	3
Report of Senate Executive Committee:	
Committee meeting with Chairs of University Councils and Selected University Committees - April 26.	4
Committee meeting with Association of Black Personnel - April 20	4
Committee meeting with Provost J. R. Morris - April 7.	4
Spring meeting with Executive Committee, OSU, and Chair, HSC	4
Budgetary problems - Libraries Committee statement	4
Senate request for study of alleged overadministration	5
Proposed revision of nominating procedures - George Lynn Cross Research Professorship.	5
Final report: CE&PS/Senate <u>ad hoc</u> Committee on Continuing Education and Public Service.	6
Report of <u>ad hoc</u> Committee: Faculty Governance (1983 Faculty Position Paper)	7
Final report: <u>Ad hoc</u> Committee on Admission Requirements.	9

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

The Senate Journal for the special session on March 28, 1983, was approved.

ANNOUNCEMENTS

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

Immediately following, President William S. Banowsky will host a reception in the Ballroom to honor the new distinguished professors and the recipients of faculty awards.

(2) Spring meeting - OCFO - April 22: The spring meeting of the Oklahoma Conference of Faculty Organizations (representing private and public institutions of higher education throughout Oklahoma) will be held all day, Friday, April 22, at the El Reno Junior College.

For further details, interested Senators and other faculty members are urged to contact the office of the Faculty Senate (OMU 406 - 5-6789).

ACTION TAKEN BY PRESIDENT BANOWSKY: Exam makeup policy.

On March 24, 1983, President William S. Banowsky approved the exam make-up policy recommended by the joint Faculty Senate/University of Oklahoma Student Association ad hoc Committee. (Please see the Senate Journal for March 7, 1983.)

ACTION TAKEN BY PROVOST J. R. MORRIS: Student withdrawal policy.

At the April 7, 1983, meeting with the Senate Executive Committee, Provost J. R. Morris discussed an apparent misinterpretation of the policy on student withdrawals approved by President William S. Banowsky on July 30, 1982, as recommended by the Senate last summer. (Please see pages 2-6 of the Senate Journal for the special session on June 28, 1982.)

As a result, Provost Morris on April 13, 1983, issued the following revised directive to Norman campus deans, chairs, directors, and faculty members:

A question has arisen in connection with the revised withdrawal policy recommended by the Faculty Senate and approved by President Banowsky on July 30, 1982. It is whether the policy stated in Section 4.5.1 of the Faculty Handbook that authorizes a faculty member to give a grade of "W" as a final grade for certain stated purposes at the end of the semester continues or was repealed by the new policy. The discussions with the Faculty Senate Executive Committee clearly show that the intent was to repeal that section insofar as it authorized the faculty member to give a grade of "W" after the sixth week of a regular semester or a third week of a summer session. In those instances, "W's" would be permitted after those dates only by direct petition to the dean of the college in which the student is enrolled. So that the currently operating policy is clear to all, I am repeating it below. It replaces entirely Section 4.5.1 of the November 1981 issue of the Norman Campus Faculty Handbook. The revised section is:

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

A student who withdraws from a course during the first two weeks of classes (first week of a summer session) receives no grade; however, a student who withdraws from all courses of enrollment in the first two weeks of classes (first week of a summer session) receives the grade of "W" in each course of enrollment.

From the third week (the second week of a summer session) through the sixth week (third week of a summer session) any student who withdraws from a course will receive a grade of either "W" or "F" from the instructor of the course.

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

Students withdrawn for nonpayment of fees may receive only a grade of "W" or "F" in each course of enrollment.

(Faculty Senate, 4-12-82; President, 7-30-82, with clarifying modifications approved by the Provost, 9-7-82)

Each hour of A, B, C, and D carries a grade-point value as follows: A-4, B-3, C-2, and D-1. Grades of I, NP, F, and U, as well as grades of P, S, and X, carry no grade-point value and are not figured in the computation of a student's cumulative grade-point average, but credit hours to which the grade of F are assigned are included.

(Admissions and Records 3-29-83)

PROPOSED EARLY WARNING ASSISTANCE PROGRAM FOR MINORITY STUDENTS

At the invitation of the Senate Executive Committee, Mr. Norris Williams, Office of Minority Student Affairs, appeared before the Senate to explain the "early warning assistance program" to be put into effect next fall.

The faculty referral sheet reproduced below will (a) alert the Office of Minority Student Affairs that a student is doing poorly in class and (b) neither be placed in any permanent file nor result in any discipline of the student concerned. The OMSA will contact the student, attempt to ascertain the problem, and refer the student to the appropriate resources.

To: Office of Minority Student Affairs, Hester Hall - Room 220

Name of Student _____ I.D. _____
 Class involved (i.e. Math 1113) _____ meets _____
 This student has () excessive absences; how many? _____
 () poor academic performance on () tests () papers () class participation
 () other _____
 My guess as to the possible nature of the problem is:
 () inadequate background () health () confusion about educational goals
 () poor study skills () money () motivation
 () emotional () other _____
 May we tell the student that you referred him/her? () yes () no
 Would you like a follow-up call on disposition of this referral? () yes () no
 Your name _____ Dept. _____
 Date _____ Phone _____

Please add any comments on the back that might help us with this student.

Mr. Williams indicated that the forms would be distributed to college deans and department heads.

The Senate Chair urged members of the Senate to share this knowledge with their colleagues on campus.

REPORT OF SENATE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

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

- (1) The Senate Executive Committee will meet with Chairs of University Councils and selected Committees on April 26 to follow up on a previous such session last fall.
- (2) On April 20, the Senate Executive Committee will be meeting with representatives of the Association of Black Personnel on the Norman campus. The first such meeting last February was, in Professor Foster's view, "a very productive one in that a number of concerns were aired."
- (3) Senate Executive Committee meeting with Provost J. R. Morris on April 7:
The main topics discussed were (a) the new policy on student withdrawals and (b) the Senate proposal for reimbursing faculty for legal expenses.

Because of the apparent misinterpretation of that policy brought out in the discussions with the Senate Executive Committee at this meeting, the Provost's office has issued a revised (clarifying) version. (Please see pages 2-3 of this Journal and page 2 of the Senate Journal for the special session on September 2, 1982.)

The legal-fee reimbursement proposal apparently will continue to be discussed as the Executive Committee attempts to "negotiate" a solution with the Provost. There are many issues to this proposal.

- (4) Spring joint meeting with Executive Committee, OSU Faculty Council - April 9:
The all-day (9:00 a.m. - 9:30 p.m.) session in Stillwater included the following participants:

Norman campus: Teree Foster (Law)	OSU: Donald Brown (Anthro)
Robert Ford (Finance)	Marvin Keener(Math)
Anthony Lis (Bus Ad)	Robert Radford (Philos)
Harold Conner(Env Des)	William Drew (Entomology)
John Dunn (Anthro)	James Key (Ag Ed)
Jeanne Howard (Libs)	Sharon Muir (Educ)
Tom Love (AMNE)	Kent Olson (Econ)
	Alex Ospovat (History)
HSC: Andrea Bircher (Nursing)	Bruce Southard (English)

Among the many topics discussed were the following:

- (1) Enhanced admission requirements
- (2) Budgetary problems
- (3) Affirmative Action policies
- (4) Early/phased retirement plans
- (5) Employee Assistance policy
- (6) Student exchange programs

Professor Foster was most laudatory about the high-quality accommodations and hospitality of the OSU hosts, as well as the great value of such joint sessions.

- (5) Budgetary problems: Professor Foster reported that she had received a copy of a recent statement by the University Libraries Committee strongly urging that, during the current period of budgetary constraints, the University not reduce but, in fact, increase the funds for acquisitions even if state funds must be supplemented by discretionary funds.

She then reported on a list of suggestions recently submitted to the Budget Council by the Senate Executive Committee. In her words, "We recommended measures that were not too different from those of last December on an interim basis." She did, however, call attention to several new items. All departments should be afforded the latitude to let bids and to contract with lowest bidders for service projects and work estimated at more than \$500.00. Each individual unit should be allowed to accomplish its budgetary reductions. Capital funds should be expended with

utmost care. Process of re-examination and analysis of institutional priorities and goals must precede any programmatic reductions. The administration should try to persuade the State Regents to examine programmatic distribution throughout state institutions of higher education.

The Budget Council is to prepare its final recommendations after two weeks of small-group, in-depth study of various proposals.

Professor Cohen stressed the need to fund periodical acquisitions in the Library. Professor Whitmore urged that research funds be given high priority. Professor Cohen later suggested that State Regents be approached about authorizing emergency borrowings from capital funds for purposes normally funded by E&G funds.

(6) Professor Gross' suggestion for Senate Executive Committee study of alleged overadministration on the Norman campus: Professor Foster referred to Professor Gross' resolution of last month that the Executive Committee study alleged overadministration on campus. Professor Foster sought the advice of Professor Herbert Hengst. She and the student secretary in the Senate office have spent hours trying to classify data in the annual budgets with little success. Attempting to classify individuals, particularly on partial assignments to various departments and activities, became a hopeless task. Cost analyses likewise would become very difficult. She concluded, "I am amenable to any suggestions as to what can be done and how we can try to get the desired information. I will be glad to take any suggestions from you now or later." One suggestion from the floor was the use of sampling procedures.

PROPOSED REVISION: Nomination procedure,
George Lynn Cross Research Professorship.

Professor Foster, Senate Chair, reported the receipt recently of a request from Dr. Gerald Turner, Executive Vice President, for Senate reaction to the following proposed revision of the nominating procedure for the George Lynn Cross Research Professorship:

The Research Council (Norman) has recommended that the nomination procedures for the George Lynn Cross Research Professorship be revised in two ways. The changes are designed to remove the need for (a) the Research Council to consider every year departmental nominations of faculty who do not meet the criteria and (b) departments to continue to nominate faculty members who meet those criteria but, for some reason or another, cannot be selected in a particular year.

1. Add the following statement to the end of paragraph 3.16.2(2)(b) of the Faculty Handbook: "Unsuccessful nominees may not be renominated for a period of three years."
2. Insert in paragraph 3.16.2(3)(b) the following statement: "In making the recommendations, the Provost may review the faculty that the Research Council has nominated for the current year, as well as any unselected faculty nominated by the Council during the preceding two years."

Associate Provost Ray, in answering a question from the floor, commented that the proposal had originated in the Research Council. Professor Foster requested Senate members to study the proposal in advance of the next Senate meeting on May 2.

FINAL REPORT: CE&PS/Senate ad hoc Committee
on Continuing Education and Public Service.

Background information: During the 1981-82 academic year, the Senate appointed a joint Budget Council and Faculty Senate ad hoc Committee on Continuing Education and Public Service. The final report of that Committee was tabled (see the Senate Journal for March 15, 1982). However, on May 10, 1982, the Senate did approve a Committee recommendation that a liaison CE&PS/Faculty Senate ad hoc Committee (five faculty and four non-voting members of the staff of OCCE) be appointed during 1982-83 academic year to study the nature of CE&PS activities at this University, assess the budgetary impacts of such existing programs, and submit recommendations regarding future funding of the University continuing education and public service function. (Please see pages 7-8 of the Senate Journal for May 10, 1982.)

Last fall, the following individuals were appointed to serve on the Committee: (Please see page 2 of the Senate Journal for December 13, 1982.)

Homer Brown (Accounting)
 Ray Daniels (CEMS)
 David Huettner (Economics), Chair
 Donald Maletz (Political Science)
 Don Perkins (Zoology)

Robert Martin, Associate Vice Provost, CE&PS
 Jerry Hargis, Assistant Vice Provost, CE&PS
 Charles Christian, Director, Urban/Community Programs, CE&PS
 John Steffens, Exec. Director, Public Responsibility and
 Community Affairs, CE&PS

Joakim Laguros (CEES) (ex officio, representing the University
 Academic Program Council)

The final report of that Committee was submitted to the Senate office on April 7 and distributed to Senate members in advance of this meeting.

Senate action: Professor David Huettner, Committee Chair, presented the Committee report formally for Senate consideration.

He expressed thanks to Vice Provost Maehl and his staff. He noted that Drs. Robert Martin (OCCE) and Ray Daniels (a member of the Committee) were at this meeting prepared to answer any questions. He also expressed his appreciation to Associate Provost Ronald Stafford and Budget Director Craig Conly for their considerable help.

He next discussed the Committee report in detail. He called attention to the State Regents' recommendation that some emphasis be given to CE&PS programs at this University. Calling attention to Table 2 of the report, Professor Huettner commented, "We have found that essentially the emphasis that the State Regents recommend is being accomplished."

He added that the Committee did identify issues that a permanent committee should look into. In his view, "Such a group is definitely needed to build faculty consensus on this campus. This group should report either to the Provost or to the President."

Professor DuMont asked whether the Committee had examined any redundancies in the administration and the administrative support, as well as any duplication of services; e.g., the admissions office. Professor Huettner replied that such matters were not considered by the group.

Professor Cohen asked whether there was any integration of accounting and revenue receipts from various courses in line with Dr. Maehl's efforts toward a closer integration of the campus planning and the budget processes. He mentioned the recent embezzlement case. Dr. Martin replied that CE&PS accounting and admission procedures are part of the University system. Referring to the embezzlement case, he stated that they had worked for about two years with the internal auditor and that, as a result, a great many changes have taken place.

Professor Grant noted that OCCE was "very receptive" to the Music School's farming out the summer program through them and took on the assignment as a "risk venture." Professor Huettner mentioned the fact that Appendix C describes many such activities.

Professor Foster expressed the Senate's appreciation to Professor Huettner and the members of his Committee for their efforts. She also reminded the Senate members that the recommendation for a permanent group would be considered by the Senate at its next meeting on May 2, 1983.

The full text of the Committee report follows on pages 10-23 of this Journal.

REPORT OF ad hoc COMMITTEE: Faculty Governance (1983 Faculty Position Paper).

Background information: Last fall, the Senate Executive Committee decided to limit the number and to change the subject matter of the 1983 Faculty Position Papers. The two topics chosen were faculty governance and short- and long-range University goals.

The final report of the Senate ad hoc Committee on Faculty Governance was distributed to Senate members in advance of this meeting.

Senate action: Professor DuMont, Committee Chair, formally introduced her Committee's report for Senate consideration.

She reported that the Committee had met last fall with the Senate Executive Committee to determine which councils and committees were, for one reason or another, to be investigated. A great deal of the report is factual. Most of the recommendations came from the members of the various groups; others were made by the members of her Committee after conversations with various individuals.

A number of complaints dealt with poor attendance by the committee members. The Committee, therefore, recommends that meeting schedules be established in advance and that faculty members volunteering for service on councils and committees be urged to take such assignments seriously.

She called attention to the Committee recommendation concerning the establishment of a student affairs committee to advise the Vice President for Student Affairs. At present, there is no direct faculty connection with the Student Affairs Office. The Committee feels that the Financial Aids Committee (which meets rarely and whose decisions are made on the basis of existing regulations) be abolished and that its business be given to the new committee that should include students and faculty.

In the Committee's opinion, other areas that exclude faculty input at present are the auxiliary services, the physical plant, and campus safety.

Professor Baker called attention to the recommendation regarding hazardous waste. He mentioned the fact that, before going to California last summer, President Banowsky had written to a campus group about having the administration do a better job of environmental safety and planning. In that area, faculty input is neither sought nor considered. He suggested that the recommendations be expanded accordingly.

Professor DuMont commented that, in her opinion, the council/committee structure is basically a communication link, with very little decision making involved. "A great deal can be done to make these groups viable!"

Professor Howard expressed the feeling that the report should also include more of the conceptual aspect of the committee structure. "I would like to see this expanded in that way so that we can begin to make changes."

Professor Lanning reported that the Athletics Council and the Athletic Director had made recommendations to save money that had been ignored.

Professor Cohen indicated that there was a "serious problem" in funding minor sports for men and women. Professor Lanning expressed the desire that not only minor academic disciplines but also minor sports be given support.

Professor Cohen expressed "amazement" that joint recommendations of the Athletic Director and the Athletics Council were ignored. To him, the basic question is, "Who controls?"

Professor Foster mentioned her Budget Council experiences this year. She sees two basic steps in putting together and structuring a budget: the asking (wishing) budget and the final disbursement of the funds.

Professor Foster also noted the persistent problem of attendance at meetings of councils and committees. She has asked council and committee chairs to submit next year's meeting schedules that she can forward to Senate Committee on Committees now preparing the slate of faculty replacements for 1983-84.

In responding to several comments regarding availability of data, Associate Provost Ray stated that there has been a strong emphasis on making data available even to the point of inviting Budget Council representatives to budget hearings by the Deans' Council.

Professor Lanning complained that some departments still give no credit for council/committee service in connection with salary increases and promotion.

Professor Howard suggested that the Committee report include some mention of the value to faculty governance of the news media at open meetings. Professor DuMont mentioned receiving some criticisms of the student press.

Senate consensus was that the Committee report should be revised to include more of the conceptual and philosophical aspect and that the report should be returned to the Senate for final consideration at the next (May 2) meeting.

FINAL REPORT: Ad hoc Committee on Admission Requirements.

Background information: At its last meeting, the Senate tabled final action on the final report of its ad hoc Committee on Admission Requirements. (Please see pages 3-10 of the Senate Journal for the special session on March 28, 1983.)

Senate action: Professor Ford moved that the question be removed from the table. The motion carried.

He next reported that not a single faculty member had appeared at the Committee's open hearings on March 30 and 31. "We took this as an indication of faculty acquiescence or abstinence."

He then moved acceptance of the following revision of recommendation (3) submitted Professor Smith:

"Any student who transfers to Oklahoma University without having completed at least two semesters of matriculation with passing grades as a full-time student (normally 30 credit hours or equivalent) at an accredited college or university will be required to meet the high school standards set for entering freshmen."

Professor Smith gave the following reasons for the proposed change: (a) many colleges and universities do not use the OU credit-hour system when computing matriculation requirements and (b) satisfying freshman requirements is not always a matter of simply reducing the numbers and the types of courses taken to some precise number like 30. Professor Ford reported that the Committee had felt that the 5 percent exception rule would take care of this problem but had no objection to this proposed revision.

Professor Hauser questioned the alleged flexibility of the proposal. Many schools do not use the OU credit-hour system. "It seems to me that satisfying freshman requirements is a substantive matter that you cannot tell by simply reducing the number of experiences to a precise number like 30." She noted that some schools are on a quarter system. Professor Smith replied that even schools on a semester/quarter system use something other than the OU semester approach. Rather than saying 2 semesters or 3 quarters completed, the requirement for 2 semesters as a full-time student (normally 30 credit hours or equivalent) would suffice.

Professor Whitmore asked about the "full-time student" stipulation. Professor Smith replied that with part-time students the question would be "how long has this gone on." He also noted the accreditation problem.

The Senate subsequently accepted the amendment in a tally of 15 to 4. Professor Ford mentioned the discussion of this question at the April 9 joint meeting in Stillwater of the Executive Committees of the OSU Faculty Council and the OU Faculty Senate. He noted the apparent opposition from the Colleges of Agriculture, Home Economics, and Education.

Professor Baker urged that the Provost be authorized to negotiate any appropriate changes in the Committee recommendations with his OSU counterpart. Professor Ford assured him and the Senate that the two versions of the basic proposal "are not that different."

Without dissent, the Senate then approved the original motion to accept the Committee report.

ADJOURNMENT

The Faculty Senate adjourned at 5:11 p.m. The next regular session of the Senate will be held at 3:30 p.m., on Monday, May 2, 1983, in the Conoco Auditorium, Doris W. Neustadt Wing, Bizzell Memorial Library.

Respectfully submitted,



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

April 4, 1983

Report of the Joint Senate/CE&PS Sub-Committee *
University of Oklahoma (Norman campus)

I. Introduction

This Committee held its first meeting in early November 1982 and met continuously through March 1983. The Committee benefited from the work of the joint Budget Council/Senate Committee on this subject in 1981, from the full and generous cooperation of Dr. William Maehl and his staff; and from the help of Mr. Craig Conly and Mr. Ron Stafford of the OU Budget Office and Provost Office, respectively.

The charge to this Committee was to:

- (1) Examine and report to the Faculty Senate the nature and extent of Continuing Education and Public Service activities at the University of Oklahoma and comparable universities in this region.
- (2) Assess and report to the Senate the budgetary impacts of present programs of continuing education and public service at the University of Oklahoma.
- (3) Submit to the Senate its recommendations concerning future funding of the continuing education and public service function.
- (4) Consider the creation of a permanent council or committee to assure appropriate participation of faculty, students, and staff in matters concerning continuing education and public service and recommend to the Senate a structure and a charge for any such group.

Fortunately, much of the spadework on 1, 2, and 3 above had already been done by CE and PS and these documents have been appended to this report. This report addresses points 1 to 4 above separately in sections 2 to 5 that follow. Section 6 presents a Summary of our major conclusions and recommendations.

2. Nature and Extent of CE&PS Activities at OU and Comparable Universities

Extension and public service is one of three missions assigned to OU, along with teaching and research, by the Oklahoma State Regents for Higher Education. Over the years, under the direction of Dr. Thurman J. White and Dr. William H. Maehl, Jr., CE&PS has evolved programs that can currently be grouped into four broad divisions:

1. Continuing Education Services
2. Professional Development
3. Public Service & Community Affairs
4. University Services

The present activities of CE&PS at OU have been summarized in great detail in Sections II and III of a July 1981 report prepared by CE&PS (see Appendix A).

*This report reflects faculty opinion more than that of CE & PS since faculty were granted a majority of votes when this joint committee was organized.

The College of Liberal Studies, while not formally a part of the CE&PS organization, is closely affiliated with CE&PS in terms of shared facilities and administrative personnel and through its history of development. The College of Liberal Studies is budgeted separately from CE&PS (\$426,491 in 1981-1982 and \$480,735 in 1982-1983) and its income and expense are not treated as part of the overall CE&PS funding. The relationship of the College of Liberal Studies to CE&PS is described in Section IV.C. of Appendix A.

The State Regents' definition of extension and public service has evolved through time (see the documents included in Appendix B), and the scope of these activities is quite broad. In recent years, the State Regents have expressed increased interest in CE&PS activities at OU, but the University retains great latitude in defining its role, and, with few exceptions, the University determines the budgetary emphasis to be given.

While CE&PS has the major responsibility for the continuing education and public service mission at OU, all areas of the University share this mission. In the 1970s under Thurman White, CE&PS grew in an entrepreneurial style with little University or State funding and with little formal faculty input. We believe that William Maehl is now in the process of defining a role for CE&PS with more formal integration into the OU planning and budgeting process.

It should be noted that the State Regents Council on Extension and Public Service has been urging the Regents to require that all CE&PS functions at each university be centralized and administered by a designated university office. The adoption of a centralized or decentralized approach to the CE&PS mission at OU is an important choice that merits faculty attention. At present, OU has designated CE&PS the lead role in this area.

State funding for continuing education existed from the inception of extension work at the University in 1913 and represented a significant amount by the 1960s. Under Thurman White although self-supporting and grant and contract activities grew substantially, state funding represented about 15% of the E&G income by 1966-67. This funding was subsequently cut from about \$260,000 to \$135,000 and remained at the latter figure during most of the 1970s. Over the past three years, state funding has grown to the level of \$719,000 in the 1982-83 budget.

The CE&PS mission, defined by Dr. Maehl for the future, appears to place more emphasis on new programs that are less likely to be self-supporting. CE&PS is receiving significant budgetary support for the first time since the late 1960s and has requested increased levels of support in future years. While future growth in self-supporting programs is planned and additional funding could make these programs more widely available, a higher growth rate for public service programs is clearly being planned. Over time, the CE&PS plan for the future would alter the mix of self-supporting versus public service programs and necessitate increased OU or State funding.

The highly autonomous nature of the CE&PS evolution in prior years has created little faculty (and perhaps even central administration) consensus and few formal or written policies as to the role of CE&PS and its budget allocation vis-a-vis the education and research missions and other budget entities at OU. Given this background, one can understand some of the difficulties this Committee has encountered in comparing OU to other universities in the region and evaluating future CE&PS program and funding requests.

Turning to comparisons of OU with other universities, pages 56 and 57 of Appendix A to this report indicate that CE&PS at OU is fairly typical in state support among the 140 institutions that responded to the question. OU is among the sixty-four institutions (46%) reporting that they received less than 10% of their funds from state allocations. When compared to universities of its FTE size, to universities in NUCEA Region V, and to Big Eight schools, OU falls into the group with the smallest percentage budget subsidy from state allocation in each case. OSU's budget subsidy of 45% exceeds OU's 9% by a wide margin.

While it is clear that CE&PS at OU is not heavily subsidized by state funds, the Committee found that this could be considered a negative or positive factor depending on one's point of view. Since the mission of the other universities with which OU was compared was not defined and the degree to which the mission was accomplished was unknown, we had no output measure to use. In addition, lack of state subsidy for CE&PS does not mean that OU is not fulfilling its continuing education and public service mission. Furthermore, OU's role as the primary graduate and research institution in Oklahoma requires budgetary commitments to these missions and, consequently, it is difficult for OU to give CE&PS the same budgetary emphasis that is provided by OSU.*

This Committee also examined the CE&PS contribution to the OU community of faculty, staff, students, alumni, etc. As shown in Appendix C, this contribution is substantial and goes well beyond measurement in terms of dollars and cents.

Overall, the Committee found it difficult to assess the appropriate level of State subsidy for CE&PS at OU because of a lack of faculty and administration consensus of where we ought to be relative to where we are in balancing the teaching, research, and continuing education and public service missions of OU. By way of comparison, however, the committee felt that OSU has done a very good job of building a constituency of grassroots support via its Agricultural Extension activities (which is mostly state funded and separate from OSU's University Extension activities) and that these efforts do generate substantial good will and state support for OSU in the State budget process. Indeed, it is possible that OSU's success in this area had been great enough that its continuing education and public service mission may enhance rather than compete with its teaching and research missions in the state funding process. Our major recommendation is that some consensus needs to be reached on whether there are CE & PS programs that have the likelihood of succeeding to the point where they will enhance rather than compete with OU's teaching and research missions in the State funding process.

*According to the State Regents, the missions of OU and OSU as the two comprehensive universities in the state are exactly the same in terms of graduate education, research and continuing education. This may come as a surprise to many OU faculty and perhaps some effort should be devoted to changing this perception given OU's much higher percentage of graduate credit hours.

3. Budgetary Impacts of Present CE&PS Programs at OU

As noted in Section 2, the CE&PS programs at OU provide benefits extending well beyond those measurable only in dollars and cents (See Appendix C). This Section will, however, focus on those measurable in financial terms. Pages 59-84 of Appendix A and Appendix D present the raw budget data used by this Committee and it reflects the wide range of CE&PS activities. A summary of these data indicate that: payments to faculty and grad students were \$701,793 in 1981-82 but some would question the evenness of distribution by college^{*}; that the hard money allocation to CE&PS reached \$719,343 in 1982-83 or 1.08% of Norman Campus E&G budget; that CE&PS paid \$125,142 of faculty fringe benefits in FY 81-82; that the total CE&PS budget for FY 81-82 was \$7,884,826; that 9,248 student credit hours (of which 7,584 are intersession) produced by CE&PS in FY 81-82 went into university headcount of 529,765 credit hours for the Norman Campus; that CE&PS credit programs, non-credit programs, and contract activities are self-supporting; and that \$50,000 are required to meet activities mandated by the State Regents.

One hypothetical situation the Committee elected to examine to highlight the financial benefits of CE&PS to OU was to assume that CE&PS ceased to exist. The five major financial benefits that would be lost to OU are summarized in Table 1 and total \$811,000 for FY 1981-82. A large and controversial portion of this total is the \$236,000 that we have computed by multiplying the FY 1981-82 Norman Campus E&G budget of \$75 million by the proportion of total Norman Campus credit hours produced by CE&PS that would be permanently lost. While we recognize that the State Regents do not use an exact formula, it is well known that the structured approach used by the Regents does give heavy weight to credit hours. We have assumed that a loss of 1,664 on-campus advanced program credit hours would eventually reduce the OU share of the funds available to all state universities for E&G.

Table 1 includes \$420,000 of OU administration costs paid by CE&PS grants and contracts. The last Table of Appendix D shows that this figure is currently very high due to the FAA contract and that, in a more typical year, this figure would be about \$135,000. We have used the \$420,000 figure since it reflects the current facts but note that this figure could decline once the FAA contract is completed.

The calculations of Table 1 have ignored the fact the CE&PS activities resulted in extra payments of \$701,793 in FY 1981-82 to OU faculty. In order to keep its faculty salaries competitive, OU might have to increase faculty salaries by some proportion of this amount to retain existing faculty or to attract new faculty. While this argument is plausible, we did not include it in our calculations.

The \$811,000 for FY 1981-82 calculated in Table 1 represents 1.08% of the FY 1981-82 Norman Campus E&G budget and is 1.13 times the 1982-83 hard money of \$719,343 allocated to CE&PS. While Table 1 may represent a crude way to value the financial benefits of CE&PS to OU, the basic logic is that if CE&PS ceased to exist, OU would lose roughly \$811,000. This would seem to suggest that CE&PS is worth at least this much to OU. Note that maintenance

*To a large degree faculty participation is determined by client demand for courses and programs hence CE&PS does not have total control over this distribution.

TABLE 1

Major Financial Benefits to OU Due to CE&PS
(FY 1981-82)
(Calculated by Estimating the Norman Campus Budget Impacts
of a Discontinuance of CE&PS)

1. Faculty fringe benefits paid by CE&PS ¹	\$ 75,000
2. Graduate Student supported by CE&PS ²	30,000
3. Funding for CE&PS programs mandated by State Regents ³	50,000
4. Potential Norman Campus funding reduction due to loss of 1,664 student credit hours from CE&PS ⁴	236,000
5. OU Administration costs paid by Indirect Costs from Grants & Contracts of CE&PS and transferred to Norman Campus Revolving Fund ⁵	<u>420,000</u>
Total	\$ 811,000
1981-82 Norman Campus E&G Budget	\$75,000,000
Total as a percent of E&G Budget	1.08%
FY 1981-82 hard money allocation to CE&PS	\$ 606,000
FY 1982-83 hard money allocation to CE&PS	\$ 719,343

¹In FY 1981-1982, CE&PS paid \$124,142 in Norman campus faculty and staff fringe benefits, of which \$49,000 was for personnel at OU Press and Books Abroad and \$75,000 was for faculty in Advanced Programs. While CE&PS is fully reimbursed for this \$124,000 as part of its \$719,343 in hard money, the net effects of a cessation of CE&PS would be \$75,000. This assumes that the Norman Campus would retain the OU Press and Books Abroad and, therefore, the \$49,000 in fringe benefits. Advanced Programs was assumed to disappear (to the chagrin of many faculty and students). Since the \$75,000 in faculty fringes are all items with caps on them (FICA, Health, Dental, etc.) and do not include TIAA/CREF, the Norman Campus budget would have to pay them (instead of reimbursing CE&PS) but the \$75,000 paid by CE&PS would no longer exist.

²From FY 1984 New Money Request of Appendix E.

³Mandated by the State Regents for support of the S.W. Center for Human Relations.

⁴Computed as the 1,664 CE&PS on-campus, advanced program credit hours (off-campus advanced program credit hours are not in the head count) divided by 529,765 Norman Campus annual credit hours and multiplied by the \$75 million FY 1981-1982 Norman Campus E&G budget. This calculation assumes that, if CE&PS ceased to exist, advanced programs would be discontinued but intersession would be continued by the Norman campus.

⁵In a more typical year without the FAA training program (such as FY 1979 to 1981), this would average about \$135,000.

and utility expenses for the OU physical plant used by CE&PS have not been considered in Table 1 since these expenses would continue even if CE&PS ceased to exist. A similar assumption was made with regard to CE&PS's pro rata share of OU general administrative and library expenses.

Our major conclusion is that, currently, the net financial benefit of CE&PS to OU is roughly \$811,000 in FY 1981-82. Since several of the major components of this total have been shrinking in recent years, this total could be smaller in future years. This prognostication is offset somewhat by the fact that this total is probably a lower bound on the true financial value of CE&PS to OU. The current hard-money allocation to CE&PS of \$719,343 represents 9.1% of the CE&PS budget and is roughly comparable to the direct financial benefits of CE&PS to OU estimated above.

While this analysis is rough, we believe it is important that OU administration and faculty know that CE&PS is currently contributing financially to OU in rough balance with OU's hard money allocation to CE&PS.

One other aspect of CE&PS funding that deserves emphasis is the State Regent funding for CE&PS. Each university develops a CE&PS budget request for the State Regents who in turn, develop one for presentation to the State Legislature as part of the overall request for higher education. Once the Legislature has determined total funding for higher education, the State Regents will recommend a funding level for CE&PS at OU but will deduct an estimate of Revolving Fund Income for CE&PS activities as shown in Table 2.

For 1981-82, the actual CE&PS allocation for OU was \$2,222,786, as shown in Table 2, after deducting Revolving Fund Income. From this, must be subtracted CE&PS's share of OU general administrative and physical plant expenses (from Appendix F -- note library expenses are not considered) and OU's hard-money funding for CE&PS.

The remainder in Table 2, \$593,764, is CE&PS's share of the State Appropriation to be derived from retention of Non Credit Course Revenues or underestimated Revolving Fund Income. The Revolving Fund Income of \$2,266,384 subtracted in Part I of Table 2 is an estimate and the CE&PS actual Revolving Fund Income for 1981-82 was \$2,065,330 as shown in Table 3. Actual Revolving Fund Income fell short of the estimate in 1981-82 but in many years it will exceed the estimate. The actual Non Credit Course Revenue of \$3,460,584 from Table 3 was retained by CE&PS.

CE&PS is the only group at OU that is allowed to retain moneys on a regular basis in this way. CE&PS retains 100% of any revenue in excess of costs on non-credit courses and 2/3 of indirect cost recovery on grants and contracts. This is done to give CE&PS an incentive to perform above the estimated level of Revolving Fund activity. There is a significant difference in treatment of CE&PS grant and contract activities when compared to all other OU programs, and this difference must be kept in mind when making such comparisons.

Overall, CE&PS activities at OU are receiving the budgetary emphasis recommended by the State Regents as can be seen in a comparison of Table 2 and Appendix D.

CE & PS State Appropriation
1981-82

I. CE & PS Contribution to University		
State Appropriated Funds:		
Regents formula	\$4,538,010*	
Less Rev. Fd Income	<u>2,266,384**</u>	
Appropriation Request		<u>\$2,271,626</u>
Actual Appropriations (97.85%)		2,222,786
II. Less CE & PS share of OU general administrative and physical plant expenses (see Appendix F for details)		1,023,022
Less OU hard money funding for CE & PS		<u>606,000</u>
III. CE & PS Share of State Appropriation to be derived from retention of Non Credit Course Revenue or underestimate of actual Revolving Fund Income		\$ 593,764

Sources * State Regents Budget Request to Legislature
** OU Budget

TABLE 3

1981 CE & PS Revolving Fund Income
and Non Credit Course Revenue

<u>I. Revolving Fund Income</u>	<u>Estimated</u>	<u>Actual</u>
Extension Study Fees	\$1,350,770	\$1,030,561
Off Campus Programs	173,000	108,269
Correspondence Fees	296,000	256,356
Intersession	215,738	148,824
Advanced Programs - On Campus	79,876	38,431
On Campus Credit Programs	39,000	21,122
Indirect Cost from Grants and Contracts	<u>112,000</u>	<u>461,767</u>
	\$2,266,384	\$2,065,330
II. <u>Non Revolving Fund Income</u>		
Non Credit Course Revenue	\$3,902,002	\$3,460,584

4. Recommendations Regarding Future CE&PS Functions

This committee has seen three statements by CE&PS concerning its future funding needs. The first is found in the Report of the Vice Provost for CE&PS, issued July, 1981 (see Appendix A). The second is in the Budget Needs Request, FY 1983, which contains a "new funding analysis" giving specific program titles and amounts requested. The most recent statement is a FY 1984 New Money Request, which, likewise, gives specific figures for new programs. These latter two statements are collected in Appendix E.

The diversity of anticipated uses for new funding is striking as is the shift of emphasis from self-supporting programs to public service programs which are not likely to be self-supporting. Additional funding requests also place heavy emphasis on increased support for administrative costs and on renovation and equipment. In the earliest of the three statements, full funding is requested for CE&PS administrative costs, as a sign by which the University can "demonstrate its commitment to the centrality of the Continuing Education and Public Service Mission." Envisioned also in general terms are such undertakings as a National Center for Energy Continuing Education, an educational radio function, an expansion of College of Liberal Studies programs, a major investment to up-grade OCCE facilities (office space, housing, large conference rooms), extension of University computer service to OCCE, and other programs or improvements.

In the last of the three statements of need, specific figures are given; they include the following:

Administrative Costs:	\$ 540,000
Graduate Assistants and Interns:	30,000
New Program Development:	267,250
Public Service Programs:	502,350
Fringe Benefits:	460,000
Equipment and Renovation:	387,680
Total:	<u>\$2,187,280</u>

The category of public service refers, in the CE&PS terminology, to programs which are not required to pay their own way but are performed as a service to the community. Included in proposed new programs in Appendix E are:

- Urban and Community Development
- Volunteer and Advisory Board Training
- American Indian Institute
- Center for Personal and Career Development
- Institute for Family Relations
- Institute for Consumer Education
- Technical Assistance Center
- Forum Scheduling
- Small Business Technical Services

CE&PS has argued that the environment for program development has changed. There is now more competition for the offering of credit and non-credit programs and less government funding for grants and contracts. Hence, it is less likely that there can be a major expansion of self-supporting or

income-producing programs. It has also suggested that there is currently more need for public service programming and more support at the level of the State Regents for it. Further CE&PS representatives have asked for a higher level of support for administrative costs, in order to become more competitive with OSU and other universities in the pricing the credit and non-credit offerings and to provide public service programs at low cost to those who have high needs but few resources. Finally, CE&PS representatives have indicated that the requested increased funding for public service activities does not represent a shift in emphasis so much as it does an addition to what is already being done. In addition, some of the programs listed above would be income producing, and some funds for space (large conference rooms) would enable them to expand significantly self-supporting activities.

To the best of our knowledge, no list of priorities has been established for the use of new funding, if it should become available. (An exception to this proposition is the statement in the Vice Provost's report of 1981 that coverage of administrative costs is the most important goal.) The proposed new programs vary widely, suggesting that there may be a danger of a diffused effort rather than a concentrated and focused attention to programs with a high probability of success. A question might be raised whether all of the proposed public service programs necessarily belong to the province of the University. While we have not yet received detailed descriptions of the content of the programs, their titles indicate that they might duplicate efforts made by the federal or state governments or by public or private social welfare organizations. The case for further funding seems to be strongest when new programs involve the central educational and research mission of the University, involve teaching and the transmission of knowledge, or are the kind of program that only a University is likely to be able to carry out well. A future committee should examine whether new programs will be training people to provide services, not providing the services themselves. In the present budgetary crisis, or in the foreseeable future, it is not feasible to issue a blanket endorsement of complete or partial funding of the new money requests.

There does not appear to be a definite policy from the State Regents concerning the desirability or the rate of expansion of public service programs. A sustained and detailed study of the direction of future growth in CE&PS should be undertaken to develop such a policy at least for the University of Oklahoma. We would advocate serious consideration of requests for new state funding, under the following conditions: 1) that funding be given for support of specific programs or improvements for specific time periods; 2) that funding for new programs be particularly targeted toward those which seem likely to pay their own way after a year or two of development or seem likely to attract outside support (from the state legislature, foundations, or other sources); 3) that encouragement be given to developing programs that help to draw attention and interest to the areas where the University of Oklahoma has a special role in state higher education, including in particular advanced work in the arts and sciences; and 4) that public service programs selected for funding should have visibility and appeal that will enhance rather than compete with OU teaching and research missions in the State funding process. Additional support for CE&PS administrative costs would be one way of supporting a coordinated development program, either on a temporary or a permanent basis, but a future committee needs to determine whether this is the best way for support to be given.

5. Creation of Permanent Senate/CE&PS Committee

As we have noted at several points above, the autonomous operation of CE&PS for many years has resulted in the absence of guidelines, policies, and faculty consensus for a CE&PS mission at OU and budget allocations for it. A permanent Committee is needed to resolve these issues and to determine what the proper mix of self-funding and public service programs should be. Additional topics to be considering by this Committee include faculty rewards for CE&PS participation, whether CE&PS activities at OU should be centralized or decentralized, what input, if any, CE&PS should have in faculty hiring, salary, tenure and promotion decisions, and whether CE&PS should be training people to provide services as opposed to providing the services themselves.

We recommend that the permanent committee or council on CE&PS be similar to the Academic, Budget, and Research council in terms of membership and purpose. The committee or council should have broad representation within the university and should be advisory to the president and/or provost.

We note also that the Academic Program Council of OU is specifically charged to evaluate annually the program offerings in continuing education from this campus. This report has not attempted to evaluate continuing education program offerings and has merely examined the extent to which they are or are not self funding. We recommend, however, that a member of the Academic Program Council be appointed to the permanent CE&PS Committee and that this permanent Committee provide the Academic Program Council assistance in its annual evaluation of continuing education program offerings.

6. Summary of Recommendations

We believe that Dr. Maehl is in the process of defining a role for CE&PS with more formal integration into the OU planning and budgeting process. Overall, this Committee has found it difficult to assess the appropriate level of State subsidy for CE&PS at OU because of a lack of faculty and administration consensus on the correct balance of the teaching, research and CE&PS missions of OU. Our first recommendation is that a permanent CE&PS Committee be appointed to develop and maintain a consensus on the CE&PS mission at OU.

As for the issue of hard money funding for the CE&PS mission, we note that CE&PS is currently generating about \$811,000 of financial benefits for OU which is roughly comparable to the \$719,343 hard money allocation from OU. We are concerned, however, that this \$811,000 figure could decline by about \$285,000 per year once the FAA contract is completed and that the CE&PS future funding requests contain a striking shift of emphasis from self-supporting programs to public service programs not likely to be self-supporting. The net effect of these two trends would move CE&PS from its current position of being roughly self-supporting* (i.e. financial benefits to OU of \$811,000 roughly

*Note that CE&PS's share of OU library, general administration, and physical plant expenses have been excluded from this definition of self-supporting since these expenses are virtually unaffected by the level of CE&PS activity.

equal to its \$719,343 hard money allocation) to a position where OU would contribute heavily to the CE&PS mission. The impact of this type of change on OU's already underfunded teaching and research missions is not well understood but has generated faculty concern.

With specific regard to the CE&PS future funding requests, we find that:

- (1) there is no established policy or consensus which commits OU to covering all of the administrative costs of CE&PS or to funding and indefinite expansion of public service programs.
- (2) in the present budgetary crisis, it is inadvisable to advocate any funding of CE&PS new money requests.

The CE&PS mission is an important, mandated part of OU's overall mission. Once the State funding process returns to normal, we recommend serious consideration of CE&PS new state funding requests under the following conditions:

- 1) that funding be given for support of specific programs or improvements for specific time periods;
- 2) that funding for new programs be particularly targeted toward those likely to pay their own way after a year or two of development or seem likely to attract outside support (from the state legislature, foundations or other sources);
- 3) that encouragement be given to developing programs that draw attention and interest to the areas where the University of Oklahoma has a special role in state higher education, including in particular advanced work in the arts and sciences.
- 4) that the public service programs selected for funding should have visibility and appeal that will enhance rather than compete with OU teaching and research missions in the State funding process.

We believe that CE&PS funding requests for programs satisfying the above conditions could develop a consensus for support among faculty and administration. We recommend that CE&PS revise its funding requests with these conditions as guidelines and with the help of the permanent CE&PS Committee.

Listing of Contents of Each Appendix

Appendix A

CE&PS, A Report to the Office of the Vice Provost for Continuing Education and Public Service, July 1981.

Appendix B

1. Dan S. Hobbs, The Role and Scope of Oklahoma Higher Education: Guidelines for Planning in the Decade of the 1970's, February 1970.
2. Dan S. Hobbs, Oklahoma Higher Education: A State Plan for the 1970's Revision and Supplement, April 1976.
3. Oklahoma State Regents, Standards of Education and Procedures Relating to the Operation of Extension and Public Service Programs at State System Institutions, September 25, 1981.
4. Oklahoma State Regents, Minutes of the Eighth Meeting, Council on Extension and Public Service, January 28, 1982.
5. M.B. Goldstein et. al., Summary of Public Policy Priorities and Strategies for Consideration by the Commission on Higher Education and the Adult Learner, February 16, 1983.
6. American Council on Education, Minutes of Second Meeting, April 19-20, 1982.

Appendix C

Memo from Bob Martin to Dave Huettnner summarizing CE&PS Contributions to the University Community, March 23, 1983.

Appendix D

1. CE&PS, Report of Faculty Participation, 1981-82.
2. CE&PS, Financial Status Report Summary, June 30, 1982.
3. CE&PS, Expenditures and Income by Source, Division Break-out, FY 81-82.
4. CE&PS, Expenditure and Income Sources, Activity Break-out, FY 81-82.
5. Three tables of data, copies attached.

Appendix E

CE&PS, FY 84 New Money Request.

CE&PS, Budget Needs Request FY 83.

Appendix F

Calculation of CE&PS share of OU general administrative and physical plant expenses.

March 23, 1983

APPENDIX C

TO: Dave Huettner
 FROM: Bob Martin
 SUBJECT: CE & PS Contributions to the University Community

Listed below, in no particular order of importance, are some of the things that I see as contributions to the general university community:

1. Public Relations

Continuing Education and Public Service reaches approximately 60,000 individuals a year, about 50% of whom attend activities on campus. The exposure to campus and to university faculty and facilities certainly benefits the university. We have many comments and letters complimenting the University from those who participate in activities here.

Seven hundred credit and credit-free programs were held in Oklahoma communities outside Norman in FY 81-82. These contacts through instructional and public service activities help publicize the University and establish a positive relationship with the communities.

Many of our programs in which university faculty participate publicize both Continuing Education and the College involved on brochures and flyers. This is particularly the case with programs involving the College of Business Administration.

Over 4,000 young people attended cheerleaders', football, and twirlers' camps and academic programs in FY 81-82. Not only does this provide an exposure to the campus for these pre-college youth, but also results in enrollments in the University.

2. Faculty

In FY 81-82, 307 faculty members were paid a total of \$701,793, an average of \$2,286 per faculty member. Although perhaps not so often the case today, the possibility of this supplemental pay has in past years been a major factor in retaining faculty members and is still a significant one for some who do not have other summer employment.

Many faculty have indicated that their on-campus teaching has been significantly helped by their exposure to continuing education programs. Exposure to adult audiences, working in interdisciplinary teaching situations, and developing new techniques have all been beneficial.

Faculty are exposed to practitioners in the field and to business and industrial client groups. This has helped them to bridge the gap between theory and practice and, in some instances, to make contacts that result in consulting activities.

Travel opportunities related to teaching assignments both in the United States and abroad have been provided, particularly through Advanced Programs. In many instances, these trips have provided faculty members with the opportunity for research that either would not have been available otherwise or would have been made at the faculty member's expense.

3. Academic Departments

In one specific instance, the cooperative arrangement between an academic unit and CE & PS has resulted in a most beneficial situation for both groups. Arrangements between Public Administration and Advanced Programs have enabled

the academic units to create a diversity in faculty that would not have been possible otherwise. Without this diversity, it is possible that the graduate programs as they exist in Public Administration would not be possible.

There has been some direct impact on curriculum as a result of Continuing Education activities. Two specific examples come to mind. A grant a few years back led to the inclusion of international dimensions in courses in the MBA; and one course in the Public Administration program, Functions of Public Management, was first designed for inclusion in the program through Advanced Programs.

Intersession has also provided a format for experimentation and the development of new courses and techniques that we hope have been beneficial to academic units

4. Financial Support

In FY 1981-82, 9,535 student credit hours produced through Advanced Programs, Intersession, and other courses went into the University headcount. Although it is impossible to allocate a precise dollar figure to university funding by the State Regents resulting from this SCH production, it certainly has some effect, particularly since most of the courses were at the graduate level.

Various units in continuing education have employed graduate assistants from academic departments for a number of years, thus benefiting the University and graduate programs.

Advanced Programs provides financial support for a number of academic units in return for administrative and student advisement services in the departments. Although services are provided, this has eased somewhat the financial burdens of the departments.

The fringe benefits of faculty members teaching or consulting on grants and contracts in Continuing Education are paid by the grant or contract, reducing the amount paid by the University. Indirect costs generated by grants and contracts in CE & PS help cover costs of the University central administrative offices.

5. Services

The Independent Study Department administers advanced standing, CLEP, and PEP tests for academic units. Over 1,200 such tests were taken in FY 1981-82.

Continuing Education maintains an office in Washington that is utilized by many units of the University. We also rent an apartment that is available when not in use by CE & PS at a rate much lower than Washington hotels.

CE & PS provides logistical and financial services for several faculty members who are involved in consulting with other state agencies.