

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

Regular session -- March 5, 1984, -- 3:30 p.m., Conoco Auditorium,
Doris W. Neustadt Wing, Bizzell Memorial Library

The Faculty Senate was called to order by Dr. Robert A. Ford, Chair.

Present:

Atherton	Gollahalli	Karriker	Magrath	Seaberg
Benham	Grant	Knapp	Murphy	Smith
Biro	Hauser	Kramer	Nicewander	Sonleitner
Bredeson	Hawley	Kutner	Nuttall	Stevens
Christian	Hayes	Lehr	Pflaum	Tharp
Davis	Hengst	Levy	Reynolds	Uno
DuMont	Higginbotham	Lis	Schmitz	Wedel
Ford	Howard	Love		

Provost's office Representative: Ray
 PSA Representatives: Corcos Guyer Powers
 GSA Representative: Baldwin Liaison, AAUP: Turkington
 Guests: Professors Ray Daniels and Beverly Joyce (Budget Council)

Absent:

Beesley	Canter	Goodman	Harrington	Whitely
Black	Conner	Green	Larson	Whitmore
Cameron	Cozad	Gross		
PSA Representatives:	Boehme	Skierkowski	McCarley	
Liaison, Women's Caucus:	Williams			
UOSA Representatives:	Albert	Stanhope	Rodriguez	
GSA Representative:	Larson	Liaison, ABP:	Butler	

TABLE OF CONTENTS

<u>Announcements:</u>	
Spring meeting, OSU/OU Executive Committees, April 7.	1
Spring meeting - General Faculty, April 19.	1
Special Assembly - University community, April 19	1
Reception, April 19	1
<u>Action taken by President Banowsky:</u>	
Senate recommendations, final report of Senate/UOSA Committee on Improvement of Instr/Teacher Evaluation.	1
<u>Reports of Senate standing Committees:</u>	
Executive Committee	2
Committee on Committees	2
Committee in Faculty Compensation	2
Proposed Senate <u>ad hoc</u> Committee: Funding priorities	2
Senate resolution: Scheduling of athletic events during final examination periods	8
Message of Condolence: late Professor Emeritus Paul R. David	9

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

The Senate Journal for the special session on January 30, 1984, was approved with the following addition recommended by Professor Biro:

Page 7 (Recommendations of Senate Executive Committee concerning the budget crisis, Norman campus):

Second paragraph, lines one and two: add the following underscored words to the parenthetical comment:

". . . (urging the administration to continue to apply the financial burden equitably). . ."

ANNOUNCEMENTS

(1) Spring meeting - Executive Committees, OSU Faculty Council and OU Faculty Senate, Stillwater campus, Saturday, April 7.

(2) Spring meeting - General Faculty (Norman campus) - 3:00 p.m., Thursday, April 19, Dining Rooms 5 and 6 - Oklahoma Memorial Union.

(3) Special Assembly - University community - "Focus on Quality in Higher Education Day" - 4:00 p.m., Thursday, April 19, Ballroom, OMU.

Featured speaker will be Dr. Robert Rosenzweig, President, Association of American Universities.

(4) Reception - 5:00 p.m., Dining Rooms 5 and 6, Oklahoma Memorial Union. The Norman Chamber of Commerce will sponsor the reception honoring Dr. R. Rosenzweig, AAU President, and the recipients of distinguished professorships and faculty awards announced at the General Faculty meeting at 3:00 p.m., as well as those announced last October.

(A number of state dignitaries will be invited to attend the various functions of the day.)

ACTION TAKEN BY PRESIDENT WILLIAM S. BANOWSKY:

Senate recommendations, final report of Senate/UOSA Committee on Improvement of Instruction and Teacher Evaluation: On February 22, President Banowsky acknowledged receipt of the Senate recommendations concerning the final report of the Senate/UOSA Committee on Improvement of Teaching and Teacher Evaluation. In his memorandum to the Senate Chair, he included the following comments:

"As part of the review of this report, Provost Morris will gather additional observations concerning it and transmit it to each academic unit for its consideration.

"I appreciate the work of the Committee on this important topic at the University of Oklahoma."

(Please see pages 14-16 of the Senate Journal for February 13, 1984.)

REPORTS OF SENATE STANDING COMMITTEES

(1) Executive Committee: Professor Ford, Committee Chair, reported on the following items:

(a) Committee meeting with Provost Morris - February 29: Noting President Banowsky's comment (please see preceding item: Action taken by President Banowsky) concerning the final report of the Senate/UOSA Committee on Instructional Improvement and Teacher Evaluation, Professor Ford reported that the Senate Secretary last November had distributed copies of that document to all Norman campus deans and department chairs. (Please see page 19 of the Senate Journal for November 14, 1983.)

Provost Morris will recirculate copies of that report shortly with his request for their reactions, comments, and suggestions. Subsequently, he will urge each academic unit to come up with specific proposals. Professor Ford then concluded with the comment, "I think that there is enthusiasm on the part of both the Provost's office and the Senate Executive Committee. We will continue to monitor this matter."

(b) Faculty/student visit to State Capitol: Professor Ford noted that Professor Whitmore was not present at this Senate meeting because of illness. Therefore, there was nothing to report concerning the planned lobbying trip to the State Capitol by a group of faculty members and students.

(2) Committee on Committees: Professor Love, Committee Chair, reported that the Senate office had recently distributed to Senate members, as well as to Norman campus deans and department chairs, copies of the Committee's formal request for nominations for end-of-year faculty vacancies on various University and Senate groups. He urged Senate members to submit their nominations to him as soon as convenient. The Committee hopes to have the complete slate of nominations ready for presentation at the Senate meeting on April 9.

(3) Committee on Faculty Compensation: Professor Baker, Committee Chair, reported "some unhappiness by faculty members with payroll deductions designated for either the Credit Union or various tax-shelter accounts." Apparently, there is an increasing delay between the time that the faculty are paid and the time that checks are being sent to the agencies concerned. Furthermore, faculty members making inquiries at the payroll office are not getting satisfactory answers.

Professor Baker urged faculty members who have experience such problems to send him complete details as soon as possible. He plans to take this matter up with the appropriate administrative personnel.

PROPOSED SENATE ad hoc COMMITTEE: Funding priorities.

Background information: At its February 13 meeting, the Senate approved the proposal that the nine faculty members currently serving on the Budget Council be asked to serve as a Senate ad hoc Committee to develop funding priorities that would reflect the faculty's fundamental commitment to teaching and research, to formulate appropriate strategies, and to submit appropriate recommendations to the Senate. (Please see pages 17-19 of the Senate Journal for February 13, 1984.)

Senate action: Professor Ford, Senate Chair, announced the receipt of a memorandum from Professor Ray Daniels, Council Chair, in which he indicated that the Council, at its February 15 meeting, had discussed the Senate request and had approved the following motion:

"The Budget Council expresses its concern about the request of the Faculty Senate. To isolate any group within an active function might do damage to the function of the whole. We wish to go on record in opposition to the request."

Professor Daniels also indicated in the memorandum that other Council faculty members would be writing to the Senate Chair individually regarding this matter.

Professors Ford (Senate Chair) and Love (Senate Chair-elect) personally contacted the faculty members on that Council and extended an invitation to them to attend this Senate meeting.

One Council member did write that he saw no conflict of interests and would be willing to serve on such a Committee. Others indicated orally that, in their opinion, such action would be divisive and would prefer not to do so. Professor Teree Foster "responded at great length and respectfully declined the request." In her view, the Senate was asking the Budget Council faculty members to do what was already being done by that Council.

The Senate Chair invited the Council Chair to attend this Senate meeting to elaborate on the Council's consideration of the Senate's request. Professors Daniels (Council Chair) and Beverly Joyce (Council member) were present at this session of the Faculty Senate.

Professor Ford commented that, at its recent meeting, the Senate Executive Committee "came to realize that much of the problem is the fact that we do not have the close liaison with the Budget Council that we should have. We should have had a report from that Council every month."

Professor Daniels, Council Chair, reported that the majority of that Council felt that the Senate request "duplicated the current charge to the Budget Council." The overriding consideration was the view that "in any recommendations of the Budget Council, the faculty members would advocate the faculty viewpoint. There is a potential conflict of interests if the Senate is asking for independent recommendations--i.e., independent of those of the Budget Council." Speaking only for himself, he added, "I would decline to serve on such an ad hoc Committee."

According to Professor Daniels, during most of the fall semester, the Council was concerned with the immediate problem of the current fiscal year. "We were locked into a situation and were faced with making recommendations to solve the immediate problem. Not until Christmas time were those matters resolved and the Council then began to look at long-term problems."

He reported the appointment of the following subcommittee to make a budget analysis and present its recommendations at the next Council meeting: Professors Jeff Kimpel, Teree Foster, Larry Hill, and Ray Daniels and Associate Provost Robert Martin (CE/PS).

In Professor Daniels' view, "For the next several years, we will be dealing with virtually flat budgets. The University may be faced with a budget that is about 5 percent less than the starting budget last fall. With the 7+ percent reductions this year, it might mean a 1984-85 budget about 2½ percent better than the current one. The best picture at this time is that the reduced budget will mean the elimination of furloughs.

He also called attention to uncontrollable increases in such expenditures as utilities, fringe benefits, FICA payments, and the like. Pending tuition increases will help the situation but to a lesser extent than anticipated because of the decreased enrollments experienced this spring and expected next year.

Professor Love asked whether the Budget Council would cooperate with a separate Senate ad hoc Committee to avoid the presence of two groups "going their ways." Professor Daniels indicated that, although he could not speak for all Council members, he could see no reason why the Council would not want to cooperate with any Senate committee. Furthermore, "We are not privy to anything that is not public information."

In responding to Professor Karriker's question, Professor Daniels indicated that fund transfers within the E&G budget are not difficult; transfers from one service to another, however, are easy in some areas and impossible in others.

Professor Baker asked about the status and the effect of the proposed tuition increase. In Professor Daniels' opinion, "Everyone is presuming that the increase will be approved." The original figure of additional \$1.2 million will probably become \$600,000+, in view of the anticipated decreases in undergraduate enrollment.

Professor DuMont asked about the Council's involvement in long-range planning. Professor Daniels reiterated his comments about "reactive planning" last semester and added, "It is essential that we begin long-range planning. The Budget Council is aware of it and is interested in doing it."

Professor Hengst asked Professor Daniels whether, in his opinion, a Senate committee would be helpful. Professor Daniels could not see the necessity for such a group but added, "We would certainly cooperate with such a committee and share any information with them. I see no reason why all members of the Budget Council would not agree."

Professor Biro next moved that the Senate return to the original proposal; i.e., that a 7-member Senate ad hoc committee be elected with the same three-point charge with the further stipulation that this committee work closely with the Budget Council (Please see pages 17-19 of the Senate Journal for February 13, 1984.) Professor Smith seconded the motion.

Professor Biro reiterated his last month's opposition to the compromise solution. "I am not surprised at the Budget Council's reactions; I agree with them. We must abandon the compromise solution and go back to the original proposal." He urged that the matter be considered with a historical perspective in mind.

Professor Ford, Senate Chair, next read the original three-point charge.

He solicited comments concerning the "conflict of interest" aspect. None were offered.

Professor Christian asked for comments from Senate members serving on the Budget Council. Professor Grant, a member of the Council, commented on the "exhaustive effort required in any budget analysis" and also discussed at length "the difficult aspect of understanding the budget and working with figures." He felt that some kind of liaison function would be needed between the Budget Council and the Senate subcommittee to avoid having the Senate group "scratch around and do it all over again." He concluded, "I am a little hesitant about any further analysis."

Professor Hengst saw the real interest as "an operational one." He felt that the burden of the discussion seems to be the question -- "Who is making these decisions that result in what some folks feel is not a wise allocation?" He noted Professor Grant's suggestion that the Senate should have a priorities committee that will be "a watch dog committee."

In Professor Biro's view, the proposed committee should neither merely repeat the work of the Budget Council nor become an investigative group. "The emphasis should be on the question of priorities, without ignoring history altogether. The committee should consider the information received from various sources, try to formulate priorities for future action, and then bring them to the Senate for endorsement. We would then have a faculty voice that would say that we think that, in general, we have been going in one direction and should be going in another."

Professor Hengst felt there was a need for "a reasoned voice that would respect not just the tradition but also some form of open decision making. This body needs to do something not in a perjorative sense but as a responsible action."

Professor Ford felt that the Senate group could, without any difficulty, act as a liaison with the Budget Council, take a position, and report to the Senate.

Professor Benham questioned the need for the second charge; he saw the Senate committee as "simply a faculty priorities committee." Professor Biro saw a danger in talking only about priorities.

Professor Nicewander favored the motion. "Of greater importance is the attitude of some decision makers that is contemptuous of faculty views. A counterattitude needs to be expressed."

Professor Grant stated that he had "an easier time accepting the proposal. Often the Council could have used a Senate voice for coordination between the Senate and the Council. There isn't a very clear linkage." "However, you have to be very careful with the investigative aspects that the Budget Council spends a lot of time on."

Associate Provost Ray commented on budget-making activities with Provost J. R. Morris. "There are times when some structure to the decision-making process does indeed take place. There are many times, furthermore, when priority issues are those that have been discussed with the Council. During the past 2-3 years, there have been attempts to bring such issues to the Budget Council. There also have been many attempts to keep the channels open for supplying information. Somewhere along the line, there is a need for a decision that is part of the responsibility and the judgments that the Provost has to make. We try to be

as open as possible and to make all kinds of information available as soon as we get it."

Professor Love reminded the Senate that last month he had suggested amending the original proposal for the Senate ad hoc Committee. "My main concern was the conflict between the Budget Council and the Senate committee. Apparently, that has now been resolved." "Our chief problem is not with the allocations from the Provost's office down as much as with the initial divisions between the academic units and the rest of the University budget." He recalled serving some years ago on the Budget Council and mentioned the frustrations of not having the power over the initial divisions of money. "We were given allocations and were involved strictly with allocating the funds among the academic departments. I presume that the Senate committee will be concerned with overall allocations rather than with allocations to departments. With that understanding, I speak strongly in favor of the ad hoc Committee."

In responding to Professor Smith's query about the tenure of the new committee, Professor Biro stated that the ad hoc Committee "could be active for along time."

In a voice vote without dissent, the Senate approved the motion.

Professor Levy next moved that the task of preparing the slate of nominees for the ad hoc committee be delegated to the Senate Committee on Committees. Senate members will be requested to submit their nominations to the Committee on Committees, and that group will prepare the written ballot for Senate vote at its next regular session on April 9. The motion, seconded by Professor Biro, was approved without dissent.

During the discussions throughout this Senate meeting, the following faculty analyses of the Norman campus budget were mentioned:

- (1) Stephen Whitmore
- (2) Sherril Christian, Arthur Johnson, and Alan Nicewander
- (3) David Golden

There was consensus that all three budget analyses should be made available to the ad hoc Committee, as well as to Senate members.

Subsequently, Professor Biro moved approval of the following Senate request for the administration's response to the above budget analyses:

The Faculty Senate has appointed an ad hoc committee to look into funding priorities at the University of Oklahoma. After this committee reports, the Senate intends to develop a set of priorities for the distribution of funds.

There have been a number of reports circulated lately about the relative support given in recent years to the academic and the non-academic areas of the University. It would be helpful in the discussions of that ad hoc committee to have the views of the central administration about these reports (viz., the Whitmore, the Golden, and the Christian, Johnson, Nicewander reports). For this reason, we request that the administration provide a written response to that committee by April 9, 1984.

Professor Christian seconded the motion. Professors Levy, Hengst, Wedel, Biro, and Grant spoke in support of the motion. Professor Grant noted that the administration has already responded to analyses (1) and (2). Professor Biro felt that the response should be addressed to the Committee rather than to the Senate.

With two dissenting votes, the Senate approved the motion.

At this point, the Senate Secretary announced that he had copies of analyses (1) and (2) and that he would contact Professor Golden for a copy of his analysis (3). Copies of these analyses will then be made available to interested Senate members and non-voting representatives.

SENATE RESOLUTION: Scheduling of athletic events during final examination periods.

Background information: While serving as Chair of the Athletics Council, 1981-82, Professor Hengst reported to the Senate Executive Committee that the question of scheduling basketball games during final examination period had arisen. Professor Hengst also reported, that as a "one-time compromise," one game had been approved and that Coach Tubbs had promised to abide by the University policy. (Please see pages 7 and 8 of the Senate Journal for June 28, 1982.)

Senate action: Professor Benham reported that President Banowsky on October 6, 1983, had approved the following recommendation of the Athletics Council:

"In men's and women's basketball scheduling, home competition ('home' defined as a Norman or an Oklahoma City game site) will be allowed during the final exam time periods (Dead Day through the last regularly scheduled final exam) in which there are no final examinations scheduled and no final examinations scheduled on the following day.

"(The purpose of this policy change is to allow the basketball teams to schedule games for the Saturday evenings of a finals period so long as no final examinations are taking place during those periods of time.)"

He noted that a basketball game had been played on December 17, 1983-- during finals week.

Professor Hengst mentioned the background information as reported above. Professor Ford, Senate Chair, commented, "Apparently this exception became policy."

Professor Tharp added that, in his opinion, the baseball team "is one of the worst examples in this regard playing about 60 games from March through the middle of May. I have had baseball players whom I have not seen in class after the middle of the spring semester." He felt that the entire scheduling issue should be re-examined rather than merely the final examination period.

Professor Hengst noted that the University of Oklahoma is the only institution in the Big Eight Conference with such a game-scheduling policy.

Professor Benham then moved the following Senate resolution:

"The Faculty Senate has noted an increasing number of athletic events scheduled during the final examination periods. The Senate re-affirms its intent that athletic events not be scheduled during final examination periods."

Professor Tharp seconded the motion. The Senate, without further discussion and without dissent, approved the motion.

MESSAGE OF CONDOLENCE: Family of the late Professor Paul R. David

Professor Christian moved approval of the following message of condolence prepared by Professor Levy and addressed to the family of the late Professor Emeritus Paul R. David:

The Faculty Senate on the Norman campus of the University of Oklahoma notes with great sadness, the passing, on January 17 of this year, of Dr. Paul R. David, David Ross Boyd Professor Emeritus of Zoology.

In addition to his work as a researcher in human and medical genetics and in addition to his distinguished career as a classroom teacher, he was a ceaseless advocate of faculty rights and of academic freedom. For a third of a century, this faculty has received the benefits of his vigilance and dedication. Those sections of the Faculty Handbook that he did not write himself he scrutinized with the suspicious eyes of one who thought that liberty within the University was worth the most serious thought and the most meticulous effort. For a third of a century, no threat to the freedom of those who teach and do research here--whether to the community of scholars as a whole or to some isolated and lonely member of it--failed either to arouse his indignation or to enlist his energetic and effective opposition.

It is not extravagant to assert that, to whatever extent this University is a free place, some of the credit belongs to his alertness; and it is proper to acknowledge that those of us who follow after him here are deeply in his debt.

The Faculty Senate, which he served as a member on three separate occasions, sends its sincerest sympathies to the members of his family, together with its gratitude for his wise counsel and outstanding service to this University.

Without dissent, the Senate approved the message of sympathy to be sent to Mrs. Paul R. David and family.

ADJOURNMENT

The Faculty Senate adjourned at 5:10 p.m. The next regular meeting of the Senate will held at 3:30 p.m., on Monday, April 9, 1984, 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