

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

Regular session - September 10, 1984 - 3:30 p.m., Conoco Auditorium,  
Doris W. Neustadt Wing, Bizzell Memorial Library

The Faculty Senate was called to order by Professor Tom J. Love, Chair.

Present:

Atherton	Canter	Green	Larson	Parker
Baker	Cozad	Hayes	Lehr	Pflaum
Beesley	DuMont	Hengst	Levy	Poland
Benham	Eliason	Hopkins	Love	Reynolds
Biro	Emanuel	Horrell	Magrath	Smith
Black	Fitch Hauser	Huseman	Morgan	Tepker
Bredeson	Friend	Karriker	Murphy	Tharp
Caldwell	Goodman	Kudrna	Nicewander	Thompson
Cameron	Grant	Kuriger	Nuttall	Tobias
			Palmer	Uno

Provost's office representative: Ray

PSA representatives: McCarley, Skierkowski

Liaison, AAUP: Turkington

Liaison, ABP: Butler

Absent:

Hawley	Schmitz
Knapp	Whitely

PSA representative: Nicely

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Announcements by Professor Tom Love, Senate Chair:	
Schedule of regular Senate meetings, 1984-85 . . . . .	2
Attendance requirement . . . . .	2
Council on Continuing Education and Public	
Service approved . . . . .	2
Faculty selected for Provost Search Committee . . . . .	2
Informal coffee sessions . . . . .	2
Report of the Senate Executive Committee:	
Administrative Coordinator selected . . . . .	2
Commission on Reform of State Government report . . . . .	2
Provost position . . . . .	2
Oklahoma Outlaws . . . . .	3
Committee on Budget Priorities . . . . .	3
Transfer credit policy . . . . .	3
Academic Appeals Board . . . . .	4
Sabbatical leave deadlines . . . . .	4
Sabbatical leave eligibility . . . . .	5
Election of replacements, Faculty Welfare Committee and	
Faculty Compensation Committee . . . . .	5
Selection of faculty replacements, University groups . . . . .	6
Senate Journal distribution . . . . .	6
Ad hoc Committee on external affairs . . . . .	6
Academic appeals process . . . . .	7
Budget Council concerns . . . . .	7

## ANNOUNCEMENTS

The new members of the Senate not present at the August 29 meeting were introduced.

Approval of the Senate Journals for the regular session of May 7 and special session of August 29 will be delayed until October 8.

The regular meetings of the Senate for 1984-85 will be held at 3:30 p.m. in the Conoco Auditorium, Doris W. Neustadt Wing, Bizzell Memorial Library on the following Mondays:

September 10	December 10	March 4
October 8	January 14	April 8
November 12	February 11	May 6

Senators who have accumulated four absences will be dropped from membership. Attendance at special meetings can be used to offset absences from regular meetings.

Faculty membership of the Council on Continuing Education and Public Service (elected May 7, 1984) was approved by the President. The members are:

For 1-year terms, 1984-85: Teree Foster (Law)  
Kenneth Merrill (Philosophy)  
Ann Hoover Smith (Architecture)

For 2-year terms, 1984-86: Gary Green (Education)  
C. Kenneth Meyer (Political Science)  
A. Ravindran (Industrial Engineering)

For 3-year terms, 1984-87: Leroy Blank (Chemistry)  
Alex J. Kondonassis (Economics)  
E. L. Lancaster (Music)

The faculty selected by the President to serve on the Provost Search Committee are Russell Buhite (History), who will be the Chair, Charles Butler (Education), Penny Hopkins (Zoology), Alex Kondonassis (Economics), Gregory Kunesh (Drama), Jane Lancaster (Anthropology), and Carl Locke (CEMS).

Senators were asked to attend one of the seven informal coffee sessions to discuss problems the Senate should address during the year.

## REPORT OF THE SENATE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

An Administrative Coordinator, Sonya Fallgatter, was employed (3/4 time) to assume many of the administrative duties of Professor Tony Lis. The Senate office hours will be 8-12 Monday-Friday. Word processing equipment has been rented for the office.

The Study Committee on Education of the Commission on Reform of State Government invited the Senate to express opinions concerning the future of higher education in Oklahoma. The Senate Executive Committee wrote a letter to the Committee stressing the importance of informing the people of the State of the need for funding directed at quality in the major institutions of higher learning. The Committee's preliminary report includes many of the Senate's recommendations.

The Executive Committee met with President Banowsky to discuss the pending appointment of J. R. Morris as Senior Vice President and the question of whether the Interim Provost should be a candidate for the Provost position.

The Executive Committee wrote to the University Regents and Governor Nigh to express concerns about the Oklahoma Outlaws team holding games in the stadium during class nights.

The report of the Committee on Budget Priorities was given by John Biro, Chair of the Committee. He and the other Committee members, Professors Bredeson, Christian, DuMont, Grant, Hengst, and Razook, asked to hear suggestions from Senate members. Their plans include looking at statements of the mission and goals of the institution and preparing a list of questions to ask the faculty. This survey will be conducted through the departments unless there are suggestions of other methods to use. The Committee will be looking at reallocations of resources which may be necessary and structural changes needed to reallocate resources. The Committee seeks opinions that are as widely based as possible.

#### TRANSFER CREDIT POLICY

At the December 1983 Senate meeting, a proposal to accept courses taken at other institutions to make up for courses failed at OU was passed. Provost J. R. Morris asked the Senate to reconsider the proposal, saying that he considers the current policy against accepting courses taken elsewhere to make up for courses failed at OU to be long-standing and in the interest of academic standards of the University. According to the general catalog, credit from other institutions is transferrable, but subject to validation. Provost Morris believes the current regulation is a fair one and that the issue needs further discussion. Professor Eliason explained that the Mathematics Department allows students to count transferred courses if they take the next higher course at OU and pass it. If the transferred course is a terminal course, then they must pass an exam. The Mathematics Department feels that this process is a fair way of measuring quality, and a student who fails a math course has shown himself not to be prepared in that course. Therefore, the Mathematics Department does not want to see the current policy rescinded. Professor Benham explained that the motivation for proposing the change was to remove the burden of validating courses from the departments. He pointed out that under the current policy, students can take a course (not previously taken at OU) at another institution, fail it several times, finally pass it, then transfer it down to OU. A compromise might be "if you fail it at OU, you make it up at OU."

In answer to Professor Nuttall's question on whether all courses transferred in for specific courses have to be validated, Provost Morris said there is no validation procedure on a regular transfer if a course has not previously been taken at OU. For questions on the equivalency of courses, Admissions & Records refers to the individual departments. Professor Eliason said the validation practice varies depending on whether it comes from within the state or from out-of-state. Within the state most elementary courses in math have the same course description throughout the state. For out-of-state courses, the Math Department estimates in which course the student should enroll. If that course is passed, credit will be given. In answer to Professor Biro's question as to why this kind of process is required only of those students who have previously failed a course, Professor Love explained that departments such as those in Engineering were experiencing problems with students failing their courses, making them up at other institutions, then failing the next courses at OU. Professor Levy inquired whether we were on sound legal ground in using two different standards for transfer credit. Provost Morris explained that the validation process makes the policy acceptable, since it does allow for transfer credit for courses failed at OU.

Professor Love reminded the Senate that he would like to defer the vote on this issue until a future meeting in order to allow time for discussion with colleagues.

#### ACADEMIC APPEALS BOARD

Provost Morris explained that the State Regents had directed the University to provide a mechanism for dealing with complaints about an instructor's inability to speak the English language. Rather than try to establish an elaborate mechanism, the Administration felt appeals should be handled by the established structure already in place and by the faculty of the College involved, since it involves evaluation of the instructional staff. Because every College has an Academic Appeals Board, this appeals responsibility was added to the Board's jurisdiction. Associate Provost Ray pointed out that because of some confusion regarding its meaning, a slight editorial revision was made in the 1984-85 Student Code to change the wording from "...alleged inability to communicate course content" to "...alleged inability to speak the English language to the extent necessary to adequately instruct students."

Professor Tepker expressed his concern that the Academic Appeals Board is examining questions of teaching competence, when half of its members are students. It ought to be confined to the narrower jurisdiction of academic misconduct in the grading or evaluation process (i.e. "prejudiced or capricious evaluation"). He recommended that the Senate study constructive alternatives, such as a separate tribunal, for dealing with this issue. Associate Provost Ray explained that there is a separate Academic Misconduct Board to judge students' actions, whereas the Academic Appeals Board judges the issues of prejudiced or capricious evaluations on the part of the faculty.

Professor Grant explained that this situation should require treatment as a class, not as an individual matter, so that, if a teacher is incompetent, none of the grades in the class hold. Professor Emanuel noted that since so few cases arise, a separate tribunal would not seem warranted. Professor Benham reminded them that, currently, graduate assistants for whom English is a foreign language must pass the English language exam. Professor Love explained that the appeals process was set up in response to a Regents' directive.

The motion was made by Professor Biro and seconded by Professor Tepker that "the Senate establish a committee to consider what, if any, machinery might be needed for investigating student complaints about instructors' abilities to speak English adequately." The motion carried.

#### SABBATICAL LEAVE DEADLINES

The proposal to advance the deadlines for submitting sabbatical applications to the dean from March 1 to December 1 (for fall sabbaticals) and from August 15 to July 15 (for spring sabbaticals) was in response to departmental requests. In order to prepare the class schedule on time, departments need to know who will be on sabbatical and unavailable to teach. The Provost's office is neutral on the question of deadlines, since applications that come in late still would be considered.

Professor Grant protested advancing the deadlines because "those who do the class scheduling need as much flexibility as possible." He made the motion, which was seconded by Professor Levy, that the Senate oppose advancing the dates. The motion carried.

### SABBATICAL LEAVE ELIGIBILITY

The Provost proposed substituting the word "regular" for "continuous" wherever it appears in Section 3.18.1(3) of the Faculty Handbook in order to clarify what kinds of teaching count toward sabbatical eligibility. This proposal would permit any years in a tenured or tenure track appointment to be counted toward sabbatical eligibility. The term "continuous" means tenured, whereas "regular" means tenured or tenure-track. The second change in section 3.18.1(3), as explained by Associate Provost Ray, would involve adding the following two sentences to (a) Regular Sabbatical: "The term "six years of service" also includes other full-time service at The University of Oklahoma that has been included in the probationary period for tenure. Such service at other institutions of higher learning shall not be included."

Professor Emanuel moved that the Senate accept the changes. It was seconded by Professor Nuttall. The motion carried.

### ELECTION OF FACULTY WELFARE AND FACULTY COMPENSATION COMMITTEE MEMBERS

Professor Love suggested asking the Faculty Welfare Committee to provide workshops for Committee A members in order to guarantee that peer review and peer participation is present in the evaluation process and in recommendations concerning raises, tenure, and promotion. In the Faculty Senate By-Laws the charge to the Committee states, "This Committee is responsible to the faculty for policy review and recommendations on questions of tenure, faculty evaluations, professional conduct, promotion, and working conditions." Professor Love asked that the Committee form sub-committees, adding additional members if necessary, to study the problem of faculty participation in the departmental governance procedure, to prepare a document to the faculty dealing with the responsibilities of Committee A, and to provide workshops. He suggested that the Faculty Compensation Committee become more active in calling attention to the disparity in salaries between OU and comparable institutions in the nation.

Paul Tharp was elected to the Faculty Welfare Committee. Bart Turkington was elected to the Faculty Compensation Committee.

### SELECTION OF FACULTY REPLACEMENTS, UNIVERSITY GROUPS

Professor Levy noted that the Committee on Committees plans to give advance notice of who will be nominated for offices. He explained that the Faculty Senate has been instructed by the Provost to submit two names of faculty outside the College of Arts and Sciences, from which one will be chosen, to serve on the Search Committee for the Arts and Sciences Dean. He asked them to make nominations to the Senate office in writing, having first secured the agreement of the nominee to serve, and include a curriculum vita for that nominee. The Senate will then make the curriculum vitae available in the Senate office and circulate a ballot.

Professor Benham suggested that the Committee on Committees present more than one nomination for each opening on University groups. He further suggested that the Senators vote for a blank space if they objected to the names presented. Professor Levy explained that perhaps a discussion should be held in the future on the current practice of presenting only one nominee for each office. Voting by written ballot the following faculty were elected to fill vacancies on the University groups listed below:

Committee on Discrimination: Luis Frage (Political Science)  
 replacing William Bittle (1983-86)  
 Academic Program Council: Vivien Ng (History)  
 replacing Alexis Walker (1983-86)  
 Parking Violations Appeals Committee: George Tauxe (CEES)  
 replacing Richard Resco (1983-85)  
 Faculty Advisory Committee to the President: Bert Scanlan (Management)  
 replacing Raymond Dacey (1983-85)  
 KGOU Community Advisory Board: Donald Maletz (Political Science)  
 Gary Cohen (History)  
 replacing Sidney Brown (1982-85)

#### SENATE JOURNAL DISTRIBUTION

The Executive Committee recommended distributing the complete journal only to the Senators and a condensed version to the general faculty in order to economize on expenses and generate more interest in the proceedings. Each digest would indicate that a complete version would be available upon request. Professor Baker suggested sending one complete version to each departmental Chair for circulation to the rest of the faculty. Professor Eliason suggested that faculty members be given the option of receiving a complete version if they so indicated at the beginning of the year. Professor Murphy recommended sending more than one copy to the Chairs of large departments. Professor Love suggested that the Senators discuss the proposal with their colleagues and make a decision at the October 8 meeting.

#### AD HOC COMMITTEE ON EXTERNAL AFFAIRS

Professor Love explained that last year an ad hoc committee was formed to meet with legislators and other external groups and discuss problems facing OU. Vice President Burr would like to continue the idea and plans to form a committee of approximately six faculty members, including the Chair and Chair-elect of the Senate, to work with the legislature and other groups external to the University. The Executive Committee will be asking Senators to participate on this committee. In the future this committee might be removed from an ad hoc basis and be established as a formal council or committee.

## ACADEMIC APPEALS PROCESS


Professor Baker suggested the Faculty Senate discuss the case of Professor Harden (AMNE) v. OU. As the only information was from the newspaper accounts, in which neither the University nor the College of Engineering was being presented in a favorable light, Baker suggested that "this case involves the principle of academic freedom, yet we are relying on the courts for interpretation and protection. A possible action of the Senate might be to undertake an independent inquiry, not into the absolute rights and wrongs, but rather into what went wrong in the appeals process. Does our academic appeals process remain sound or does it call for some revisions? Is there a long-term threat to academic freedom?" Professor Love suggested that it may be out of order for the Senate to take this up because it is before the Academic Appeals Board. Professors Eliason and Murphy suggested that the Senate look into the matter only if the appeals process is not working. "If the Senate does get involved," Professor Huseman recommended, "the Senate should wait until after the judge makes a decision." Professor Love suggested that John Lancaster, Chair of the Academic Appeals Board, be asked to discuss the general process of appeal. There was some discussion about whether the Senate should study the Appeals Board system and the timeliness of such a project. Professor Love explained his feeling that it would be inappropriate for the Senate to single out an individual case which is already following the appeals process. He pointed out that an Academic Appeals Panel is composed of seven persons chosen from the Academic Appeals Board pool, and that they are sworn to secrecy. Professor Thompson noted that traditionally the Faculty Senate has avoided getting involved with any individual cases, but rather has confined itself to principles. Professor Love said he would ask Professor Lancaster to address the Senate regarding the appeals process in general and to comment on what may cause cases to be delayed.


## BUDGET COUNCIL CONCERNS

Professor Grant, Chair of the Budget Council, noted that the Budget Council would be discussing the matter of selective raises at their meeting Tuesday, September 11. The meeting would include discussion on Athletic Department raises compared to faculty raises and Committee A participation in salary increase decisions. He asked that faculty express any concerns to him.

## ADJOURNMENT

The Faculty Senate adjourned at 5:40 p.m. The next regular session of the Senate will be held at 3:30 p.m. on Monday, October 8. Professor Love said he looked forward to meeting with the Senators at the informal coffee sessions and any time during the semester.

  
 Sonya Fallgatter  
 Administrative Coordinator  
 Faculty Senate

  
 Gary L. Thompson  
 Secretary  
 Faculty Senate