

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

Regular session - February 11, 1985 - 3:30 p.m., Conoco Auditorium,
Doris W. Neustadt Wing, Bizzell Memorial Library

The Faculty Senate was called to order by Professor David Levy, Chair-elect.

PRESENT: Atherton, Baker, Biro, Black, Bredeson, Canter, Cozad, DuMont,
Eliason, Emanuel, Fitch Hauser, Friend, Goodman, Grant, Graves,
Hawley, Hengst, Hopkins, Huseman, Karriker, Knapp, Kudrna,
Kuriger, Larson, Levy, Magrath, Marek, Morgan, Murphy,
Nicewander, Nuttall, O'Rear, Palmer, Parker, Poland, Reynolds,
Schmitz, Smith, Tepker, Tharp, Thompson, Tobias, Uno, Wedel,
Whitely

PSA representatives: McCarley, Nicely, Skierkowski
Liaison, Women's Caucus: Killian
Liaison, ABP: Butler

ABSENT: Beesley, Caldwell, Cameron, Horrell, Lehr, Love, Pflaum, Taylor

Provost's office representative: Ray
UOSA representatives: Rasnic, Wiseman, Zuberi
GSA representative: Lawrence
Liaison, AAUP: Turkington

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Introduction of new Senate representatives 2
Ethics in research proposal 2
Fall 1984 semester reports of University Councils
and Publications Board 2
Senate Executive Committee Report 3
Faculty Welfare Committee Report on Committee A survey 3
Faculty Compensation Committee Report 4
Selection of faculty replacements for University groups 4
Election of faculty replacement for Committee on Committees . . . 5
Academic Program Council Report on proposed
Council on Instruction 5
"Dead week" proposal 6
Committee A discussion 7
Resolution on criteria for OU Presidency 8

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

The minutes of the regular session of January 14, 1985, were approved.

ANNOUNCEMENTS

Professor Levy announced the election of two new representatives to the Senate:

Professor Benjamin Taylor (Economics) completing the 1983-86 term of
Professor Harry Benham (Economics), College of Business Administration
Professor Ed Marek (Science Education) completing the 1983-86 term of
Professor Gary Green (Education), College of Education

ETHICS IN RESEARCH PROPOSAL

Professor Levy reminded the members that the "Policy and Procedures on Ethics in Research" was developed last year by a committee at the Health Sciences Center. It was approved unanimously by the HSC faculty in May 1984 and subsequently approved by the Legal Counsel and Norman campus Research Council. The Senate voted at its December 12, 1984 meeting to approve the document with two modifications. The first change of wording named the Research Council as the body nominating the committee to conduct an investigation. The second modification substituted "tenured" for "of senior rank" to make more specific the composition of the investigating committee (see 12/84 Journal, page 6).

Speaking for Dean Kenneth Hoving, who was out of town, Dean Eddie Smith reported that Dean Hoving was not concerned with the change from "of senior rank" to "tenured", but was concerned with the change making the Research Council the nominating body. Because of his concern for the accused person and for maintaining confidentiality during the investigation, Dean Hoving feels as few people as possible should be involved in the investigation, in order to avoid having rumors about the accusation spread around the campus, and possibly damage the scholarly reputation of a falsely accused person.

Answering Professor Tepker's question about what the alternatives were, Dean Smith said Dean Hoving's recommendation was to delete the Research Council as the nominating body. Professor Levy suggested debating the question and reaching a final resolution at the March meeting.

FALL 1984 SEMESTER REPORTS OF UNIVERSITY COUNCILS AND PUBLICATIONS BOARD
(see Appendix I)

EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE REPORT

The External Affairs Committee, organized by Vice President Burr, met with House Speaker Barker, who explained that the House leadership was well aware of the plight of higher education in Oklahoma and seemed in favor of finding some relief. He suggested that the faculty continue to contact local representatives, especially those who have reservations about providing such funding, and also should explain the difficulties to the alumni. For this purpose Professor Love has arranged to send a list of OU graduates by major to the faculty in each department so they may correspond with the alumni (without using state funds). In addition, the External Affairs Committee attended the annual reception held by the Chamber of Commerce for members of the legislature, and talked with members of the legislature at the reception held prior to the OU-Nebraska basketball game.

The chairs of the OU Faculty Senate and OSU Faculty Council sent a joint letter to the faculty organizations in the state, to provide data on funding for higher education in Oklahoma and encourage them to contact their local legislators.

Professors Love and Levy discussed with Interim President Jischke the problems the faculty are facing. It is significant that on his first day in office Interim President Jischke began a series of regular meetings with the Faculty Advisory Committee to the President, a committee which had been inactive in recent years.

In an effort to convey a better understanding of the functions of the university to people outside Norman, the Executive Committee is establishing a Speakers' Bureau, which will provide lecturers for civic clubs in Oklahoma. Faculty speakers will speak briefly to the impacts of financial underfunding and deliver an address outlining a special interest topic related to the welfare of the state. While there will be no honorarium associated with the talks, the OU Foundation has agreed to reimburse travel expenses.

At the February 1 meeting with Provost J. R. Morris and Associate Provost Joe Ray, the Executive Committee raised the following topics: i) conducting faculty evaluation of all administrators this spring. A question evaluating the subordinate administrators, and a statement encouraging the faculty to type their responses to ensure their anonymity will be included; ii) reinstating the OU-OSU library shuttle; iii) following up on the funding promised to the library. Although the library had not received the additional funding, the Dean of the Library felt there were enough funds to maintain the current level of acquisitions; iv) strengthening the Committee A system; v) increasing the FTE of the Faculty Senate administrative coordinator position to full-time; and vi) reducing the number of 2 for 1 nominations the Senate must make for vacancies. Professors Levy and Provost Morris will meet on that issue at a later date.

FACULTY WELFARE COMMITTEE REPORT ON COMMITTEE A SURVEY

Professor Black, Chair of the Faculty Welfare Committee, reported that to determine the problems with the Committee A system, a survey was sent to all of the Committee A members in December. The first part of the survey, which was factual, showed that there is no consistency across campus about the role or function of Committee A. The second part, which was anonymous, asked for opinions. According to the comments, Committees A currently function

according to tradition rather than according to the brief statement in the Faculty Handbook. For example, in many departments the chair is a member of Committee A, whereas nowhere in the Faculty Handbook does it state that the academic unit head should be a member. The next step will be to address the suggestions and problems and make recommendations to the Senate. Professor Black pointed out that the responses may be slightly biased because part of the responses were from administrators, who may believe the system is working fine. Professor Levy explained that the discussion of the Committee A system would be held under new business.

FACULTY COMPENSATION COMMITTEE REPORT

Professor Holmes, Chair of the Faculty Compensation Committee, discussed the four tasks addressed by the Committee: i) slow payments to the Credit Union and annuity accounts. The committee found there was no foundation for the allegation that moving the funds from a person's paycheck into those accounts was being delayed. ii) internal salary distribution and equity relief -- how revenues that come to the university are distributed internally within the University, and how they are divided among the faculty and between faculty budgets and operating budgets. The committee is studying a plan proposed by Professor Murphy which is indexed to a cost-of-living escalator, such that the distribution of revenues for salaries would first be earmarked on the basis of cost-of-living and pegged to the date of first employment with the University. iii) comparison of current OU salaries with other institutions. iv) non-pecuniary compensation -- compensation not in the form of salary but in benefits, such as parking stickers and tickets to athletic events, funded by non-salary budgets. The committee's report has been referred to the Senate Executive Committee and will be presented to the Senate in the near future.

SELECTION OF FACULTY REPLACEMENTS, UNIVERSITY GROUPS

As there were no further nominations from the floor, the nominations recommended by the Committee on Committees were elected.

Computing Advisory Committee: Andy Magid (Mathematics) to complete the 1983-86 term of Adele Hughes (Marketing) and Gregory Parker (Physics & Astronomy) to complete the 1982-85 term of Kenneth Meier (Political Science)

Faculty Advisory Committee to the President: Patricia Schwagmeyer (Psychology) to complete the 1983-85 term of Ted Hebert (Political Science)

Faculty Appeals Board: Robert Petry (Physics & Astronomy) to complete the 1982-86 term of Richard Wells (Political Science); Frank Peirce (Social Work) to complete the 1982-86 term of Julia Norlin (Social Work); and George Emanuel (AMNE) to complete the 1984-88 term of Joakim Laguros (CEES)

University Copyright Committee (2 for 1 nomination): Patricia Weaver-Myers (University Libraries) and William Savage (History) to complete the 1983-86 term of Donis Casey (University Libraries)

ELECTION OF FACULTY REPLACEMENT, COMMITTEE ON COMMITTEES

Professor Stewart Ryan (Physics & Astronomy) was elected to complete the 1984-86 term of Professor Roger Atherton (Management) on the Committee on Committees.

ACADEMIC PROGRAM COUNCIL REPORT ON PROPOSED COUNCIL ON INSTRUCTION

Professor Cozad explained that the Academic Program Council had been asked by the Senate Executive Committee to study the proposal suggested by Myrna Carney, Dee Fink, Jay Smith, and Jerome Weber to form a new Council on Instruction. He noted that many of the items which would be considered by a Council on Instruction would fall within the charge of the Academic Program Council. The Council voted not to establish a new council at this time, but rather form a sub-committee of the Council to handle these matters. Specifically, their report states:

"At its meeting on Monday, January 21, 1985, the Council voted to recommend to the Faculty Senate that a Council on Instruction not be formed at this time.

The Council voted to approve the motion that the Chair of the Academic Program Council appoint a subcommittee of the Council, consisting of three Council members (two faculty members and one student member), with Vice Provost Weber or his designated representative as an ex officio member, to investigate instruction-related concerns and report back to the Council."

Vice-Provost Weber explained that he would be glad to answer questions about the recommended Council on Instruction if the Senate were likely not to approve the Academic Program Council's recommendation. He remarked that, for an institution with a small resource base, any emphasis in one direction, such as on research, takes away from other areas, such as instructional activities. The reason for raising the proposal with the Faculty Senate was to give the proper legitimacy to the issue. He pointed out that while these activities could be considered by a sub-committee of the Academic Program Council or by ad hoc committees, a Council on Instruction could give instruction-related matters the attention they deserve. Professor Nuttall remarked that in the 1960's there was a Senate committee on teaching and research, which kept very busy with instructional matters. When the Research Council was established, this committee disappeared, which perhaps left a void in the teaching area. Professor Murphy noted that 25 years ago there used to be a Council on Instruction. Professor Levy explained that in the interest of symmetry it might be useful to have a Council on Instruction to balance the Research Council.

Answering Professor Huseman's question about what matters a Council on Instruction would treat, Professor Cozad said a Council or subcommittee would consider any academic subject matter brought to its attention. Dean Weber said that he hoped such a council would be proactive instead of reactive, would be taken seriously and would focus on instructional matters. He commented that he envisioned the Council considering broad-based topics such as funding to support instructional activity, televised instruction, which is particularly important now because the dorms are being wired for cable t.v., and improved advising.

Professor Cozad reminded the Senate that the charge of the Academic Program Council includes setting up subcommittees to consider matters such as this, but that perhaps the charge of the Academic Program Council is too broad. Professor Baker, noting he was sympathetic to both causes, pointed out that because a 40% drop in enrollment among freshmen and sophomores from Fall 1981 to 1985 is expected, OU should look at questions of philosophy and programs. Historically the Academic Program Council has been more concerned with packages of courses rather than with the basic philosophy of what the end product should be. Professor Hengst said he felt the work that Dee Fink and Jerry Weber have been doing provides a good example of the initiatives that could be expanded and points out the need for recognizing instructional responsibilities. Professor Eliason commented that a lot could be done internally within the departments by reaffirming the importance of quality in both teaching and research.

Professor Fink suggested additional topics which could be considered by a new Council: physical condition of classrooms, coordination of computer-assisted instruction, and national reports on higher education in relation to OU. He said he felt a Council on Instruction would be preferable to a subcommittee because, by being linked to the Vice-Provost's office, it would have more clout. Professor Biro remarked that if a subcommittee of the Academic Program Council could not address these kinds of issues with some sense of urgency, then the Faculty Senate should consider forming a Council on Instruction.

Professor Levy suggested that a yes vote would indicate approval of the Academic Program Council recommendation to handle these matter through a subcommittee; a no vote would refer the question to the Senate Executive Committee for further recommendations. The motion failed 25 to 17.

"DEAD WEEK" PROPOSAL

Professor Friend, chair of the committee to study the Student Congress resolution that a "dead week" be adopted, explained that that the crux of the proposal was that during the last week of classes no examination could be given that accounted for more than 5% of the student's grade, with a couple of exceptions (see Student Congress Bill No. 321201, Appendix II). The Class Schedule Committee considered the proposal and did not reach a decision; it was referred to the Senate. Since the faculty had already been polled, the ad hoc committee decided not to repeat that process. Although the students had asked to meet with the committee, no such meeting had been scheduled. The students asked that the Senate consider tabling the committee's resolution (see Appendix III) for a month to give them another opportunity to meet with the committee. The motion was made by Professor Tobias and seconded by Professor Morgan to table the resolution. The motion carried.

DISCUSSION OF COMMITTEE A SYSTEM

The open discussion of the Committee A system as it is and as it should be was led by Professor Black. He suggested that the Senate representatives take a poll of their colleagues and bring the concerns to his committee. He reiterated that Committee A is functioning according to tradition instead of according to any written document. On campus there are 40 Committees A, each with three or four members. Approximately one-fourth of the respondents could have been administrators. In response to a question about whether Committee A could function without having an administrator on the committee, Professor Black said the dissatisfaction arose not because an administrator was on the committee, but when Committee A felt the administrator manipulated Committee A. Professor Black listed the nine categories of criticism or praise which summarize the responses:

- 1) The chair manipulates, dictates, or more or less ignores Committee A
- 2) More power is needed for Committee A; chairs should only be advisory members
- 3) Committee A functions are not clearly defined; they need rules
- 4) Committee A needs a better relationship with the faculty and the faculty need a better understanding of what Committee A does
- 5) Committee A needs some orientation or preparation for their assignment so that there is some uniformity
- 6) Committee A has little power unless it has a direct role in the budget process
- 7) Committee A should consist of only tenured faculty
- 8) Some Committee A members get preference when faculty are ranked
- 9) Committee A does a good job.

Although there were no clear cut conclusions, there were problems to address. The majority of the departments have no internal document to define the duties or term of Committee A. Professor Nuttall noted that the structure of Committee A was redefined in the 1970's, resulting in a diminishing of Committee A. Professor Black explained that the erosion of Committee A occurred in part due to the attempt by some Regents in the past to eliminate Committee A. There was a brief discussion on whether it would be beneficial to include a member on Committee A from outside the academic unit. Professor Black encouraged the Senate representatives to find out the concerns of their colleagues and forward their suggestions to the Faculty Welfare Committee.

Professor Baker asked if there are any administrative guidelines concerning how the annual departmental budget should be reported to the faculty. There was some feeling that suggestions from the general faculty should be solicited. Professor Black noted that there might not be enough time to do that. Professor Nicewander suggested that the Faculty Welfare Committee consider initiating a faculty evaluation of the Committee A members. Answering a question about whether Committee A was participating in promotion and tenure decisions for new faculty, Professor Black said Committee A seemed to be functioning alright in that situation and that was not one of the problem areas.

Professor Levy answered Professor Biro's question about the time frame, by pointing out that the committee plans to formulate a short paragraph, which would outline with more specificity the duties of Committee A. The document would be presented to the Senate for approval, and, if approved, included in the Faculty Handbook.

RESOLUTION ON CRITERIA FOR OU PRESIDENCY

Professor Nicewander made the motion, seconded by Professor Baker, that the Senate approved the following proposal:

"The advertisement recently published in the Chronicle of Higher Education announcing the search for a new OU President is unbecoming to the faculty and staff of a research-oriented university.

The fact that the job qualifications for the OU Presidency do not include such criteria as "earned doctorate," "commitment to research and teaching," "experience in higher education administration" and "national reputation as a scholar" is an insult to the integrity of the OU faculty and students. The impression created by the published criteria is that academic credibility is secondary to other qualities.


We believe that the cardinal criterion for the job of President of the University of Oklahoma should be academic credibility and respectability — this criterion implies an earned doctorate and the other criteria mentioned earlier.


We encourage the faculty, staff and student members of the Presidential Search Committee to apply criteria that are more in consonance with academic excellence than those published in the Chronicle."

The resolution passed.

ADJOURNMENT

The meeting adjourned at 5:05 p.m. The next regular session of the Senate will be held at 3:30 p.m., on Monday, March 4, 1985, in the Conoco Auditorium, Doris W. Neustadt Wing, Bizzell Memorial Library.


Sonya Fallgatter
Administrative Coordinator
Faculty Senate


Gary L. Thompson
Secretary
Faculty Senate

ATHLETIC COUNCIL REPORT

Fall Semester 1984
Submitted by Ted Roberts, Chair

The Athletic Council is composed of nine faculty (six voting), three students (two voting), three alumni (two voting), two EEC (one voting), and three ex officio members. Attached to and made part of this report, marked Exhibit "1", is a roster of the Council members. Marked Exhibit "2" and attached to this report is the composition of the various standing committees of the Council.

The work of the Council begins in the standing committees, which then report their recommendations to the full Council. The Council will then proceed to act on the Committee reports.

The Council meets once per month having met four times this past semester. The meetings last from two to three hours. Between monthly meetings, the standing committees meet and discuss various items of business and prepare reports to submit to the full Council at the monthly meeting. The time spent by the various committees is governed by the amount of business before them which they must conduct.

The following is a summary of the action which the Athletic Council took during the semester:

I. AWARDS

The Athletic Council has approved awards for the following sports:

1. 1983-84 Spring Baseball
2. 1984-85 Men's Cross Country
3. 1984-85 Women's Cross Country
4. 1983-84 Men's Golf
5. 1983-84 Softball
6. 1983-84 Men's Tennis
7. 1983-84 Men's Outdoor Track
8. 1983-84 Women's Outdoor Track
9. 1984-85 Volleyball

II. SCHEDULING

Schedules approved during the fall semester were as follows:

1. 1984-85 Fall Baseball
2. 1984-85 Spring Baseball
3. 1984-85 Women's Basketball
4. 1984-85 Men's Cross-Country Track
5. 1984-85 Men's Fall Golf
6. 1984-85 Women's Fall Golf
7. 1984-85 Men's Gymnastics
8. 1984-85 Women's Gymnastics
9. 1984-85 Fall Softball

10. 1984-85 Spring Softball
11. 1984-85 Men's Swimming
12. 1984-85 Women's Swimming
13. 1985 Men's Spring Tennis
14. 1984-85 Women's Fall Tennis
15. 1985 Women's Spring Tennis
16. 1984-85 Men's Indoor Track
17. 1984-85 Women's Indoor Track
18. 1984-85 Men's Outdoor Track
19. 1984-85 Women's Outdoor Track
20. 1985 Spring Volleyball
21. 1984-85 Wrestling
22. 1984-85 Men's Spring Golf - was approved on the condition that Coach Yates provide the Council with an individual class cut and grade report on each student-athlete at the end of the semester.
23. 1984-85 Men's Basketball - was approved with the following comment. With reference to the Suntory Bowl in Japan on December 20 & 21, since the event occurs during finals week, in accordance with University Policy, it was not added to the approved schedule (see Exhibit "3" - Letter).

The Scheduling Committee was asked to prepare a recommendation as to whether or not the Athletic Director, or his designee, could automatically approve schedule changes where an exception had been granted in approving the original schedule and, additionally, to prepare a recommendation as to Sunday scheduling. At the present, the Scheduling Committee is working on this assignment.

III. PERSONNEL

There were no changes in head coaching positions in the major sports during the fall semester; therefore, the Personnel Committee did not conduct any formal meetings. The Committee and Council were advised and kept up-to-date by the Athletic Director on all resignations and appointments to the coaching staffs of the various sports.

IV. ACADEMIC COUNSELING

The Committee has been involved in assisting the Athletic Department in implementing an academic counseling program for all athletes. The Committee is making inquiry to various administrative and academic departments at the university to determine what programs are available outside of the Athletic Department, which the Student-athletes can utilize. The Committee is structuring procedures which will enable the Athletic Department and other University groups to coordinate the various programs which are available to all university students.

Jin Brown, who is presently serving as counselor for football and women's sports, reported to the Council. He briefly described the type of program being implemented, which includes mandatory study hall and arrangements for tutors, as needed. He is looking at

mini-computers and will soon add one to his equipment in order to track the students degree progress. Additionally, the counselors talk with recruits, parents, and faculty members as well as other interested members of the university community, with the objective of improving communications, relaying expectations, and trying to work out or avoid problems encountered by or with student-athletes.

Serving with Mr. Brown, is Rick Pryor who handles counseling for the balance of men's sports and department is in the process of adding two graduate assistants.

The Committee will continue to work with the Athletic Department and University staff to see that the athletes have the opportunity to avail themselves of all programs in the University which will assist them in succeeding academically.

V. BUDGET

The majority of the Committee's work is done in the spring semester when they are involved in developing the budget for the following fiscal year.

This fall, the Committee has been studying the feasibility of reducing the number of funded athletic programs in order to relieve some of the budgetary problems which the Athletic Department is encountering. The Committee is making an economic study in order to determine whether it is sound for the Athletic Department to continue funding the number of athletic programs that they now have. A report will be made when the Committee presents the budget recommendation in the spring.

The Basketball Donors Program was discussed by the Council. Wade Walker explained the purpose of the Donor Program was two-fold, to provide capital improvement monies for Lloyd Noble Center and to perpetuate Sooner Basketball through a scholarship endowment program. It was the consensus of the Council that anticipated future donor programs should be reviewed by the Athletic Council prior to institution, so that members will be aware of them and be prepared to answer questions concerning them, as well as promoting them. The Budget Committee was given the responsibility of looking into the creation of any new donor programs involving athletics.

VI. SPIRIT SQUAD

The Committee is evaluating the Athletic Council's involvement with the Spirit Squads to determine if the Council should continue to oversee the activities of the various squads. Assisting in this evaluation are Wade Walker, Anona Adair, Chris Purcell, and Jan Warner. A full report with recommendations will be made in the spring.

EXHIBIT "1"

12/6/84

ATHLETICS COUNCIL MEMBERS
9/1/84 - 8/31/85

<u>Name</u>		<u>Status & Term</u>
<u>ALUMNUS</u>		
W. M. "Buster" Cloud		Voting - 1983-85
Paul Nieto		Voting - 1984-86
Wilson Baptist		Alternate - 1984-86
<u>E.E.C.</u>		
Rick W. Melton	(O.U. - Internal Auditing)	Alternate - 1983-85
Norris Williams	(O.U. - Student Affairs)	Voting - 1983-85
<u>EX-OFFICIO</u>		
Dan G. Gibbens	(O.U. - Law Center)	Non-Voting
Robert E. Smith	(O.U. - Athletic Department)	Non-Voting
Wade H. Walker	(O.U. - Athletic Department)	Non-Voting
<u>FACULTY</u>		
Ron Coleman	(OUHSC - Environmental Health)	Voting - 1984-87
Claude E. Duchon	(O.U. - Meteorology)	Alternate - 1984-87
Steve Hamilton	(OUHSC - College of Pharmacy)	Alternate- 1984-87
George Henderson, Vice-Chair	(O.U. - Human Relations)	Voting - 1983-86
James Hibdon	(O.U. - Economics)	Voting - 1982-85
Carl E. Locke	(O.U. - CEMS)	Alternate - 1984-87
Carolyn Morgan	(O.U. - Sociology)	Voting 1983-86
Ted Roberts, Chair	(O.U. - Law)	Voting - 1982-85
Terry Robertson	(O.U. - Finance)	Voting - 1984-87
<u>STUDENT</u>		
Mike Bresson		Voting - 1983-85
Steve Dolman		Alternate - 1984-86
Susan Bugg		Voting - 1983-85
<u>SECRETARY TO THE COUNCIL</u>		
Marilyn McCarty	(O.U. - Athletic Department)	

EXHIBIT "2"
STANDING COMMITTEES OF THE ATHLETICS COUNCIL
1984-85

9/25/84

AWARDS COMMITTEE

Chair: Buster Cloud
Members: Steve Hamilton, Carl Locke, Carolyn Morgan

Responsibility: To recommend to the Council, recipients of all categories of Athletic Department Special Awards annually (see Council handbook); to review standards for Varsity Awards periodically.

BUDGET COMMITTEE

Chair: James Hibdon
Members: Buster Cloud, Ron Coleman, Carolyn Morgan

Responsibility: To review in detail Department prepared proposals for its annual budget and to recommend a specific budget to the Council each spring.

PERSONNEL COMMITTEE

Chair: Ted Roberts
Members: Ron Coleman, James Hibdon, Wilson Baptist

Responsibility: To serve with the Athletic Director as the Council's representatives in the personnel search and selection process upon the development of vacancies in the coaching and administrative staff of the Department.

SCHEDULE COMMITTEE

Chair: Rick Melton
Members: Claude Duchon, Susan Bugg, Norris Williams

Responsibility: To review all proposed athletic schedules and schedule changes (excepting football) and recommend appropriate action to the council.

SPIRIT SQUADS COMMITTEE

Chair: Norris Williams
Members: Claude Duchon, Paul Nieto, Steve Dolman

Responsibility: To review the activities of the spirit squads; to recommend to the Council the appointment of a Spirit Squads Coordinator; to recommend other appropriate action to the Council.

ACADEMIC PROGRESS COMMITTEE

Chair: Terry Robertson
Members: Mike Bresson, George Henderson, Carl Locke

Responsibility: To conduct studies as needed with regard to the NCAA eligibility rule (Rule 48) and to recommend appropriate action to the Council.



The
 University of Oklahoma

COLLEGE OF LAW
 300 Timberdell
 Norman, Oklahoma 73019
 (405) 329-8800

September 14, 1984

Coach Billy Tubbs
 Athletic Department
 180 W. Brooks
 Norman, Oklahoma 73019

RE: Approved Basketball Schedule

At your request, I am writing this letter to inform you of the action taken by the Athletic Council on the 1984-85 O.U. Men's Basketball Schedule, which was submitted on the day of the Council meeting, September 5, 1984. Normally, the Council will not consider an item unless it has been placed on the Agenda, which is distributed to Council members, one week prior to the meeting. The Council was informed that it was imperative that action be taken at this time, so that the Athletic Department could proceed to print tickets and publicize the events; therefore, by unanimous vote, the basketball schedule was added to the Agenda.

Attached to this letter is a copy of the Tentative Basketball Schedule, which you submitted to the Council and which the Council acted on. The Tentative Schedule did not include the Suntory Bowl, but you noted at the bottom of the Tentative Schedule that the Council would have to approve the team playing in that tournament in order for you to schedule it. After a lengthy discussion, the Council approved the Schedule of Games, which you set out in your Tentative Basketball Schedule. With reference to the note at the bottom of the Schedule, the Suntory Bowl in Japan on December 20 and 21 was discussed. Since this event occurs during finals week, in accordance with University Policy, it was not added to the approved schedule.

In order to provide you with an explanation of the action of the Council, I will provide you a brief history of the Council's authority and actions concerning scheduling of athletic events during finals week at the University of Oklahoma. The Council's general charge dealing with the scheduling of athletic events provides that the Council shall submit its recommendation to the President in regard to the policies relating to the scheduling of intercollegiate contests. Pursuant to this charge, various policies have been approved. There are two relevant policies dealing with the basketball schedule, which you submitted to the Council. The

first one deals with the scheduling of any athletic events during final examination week and the second is the Saturday Exception during final examination week.

In response to a letter from Dr. John R. Morris, on January 31, 1980, which was directed to the Athletic Council, and was in response to conflicts which had arisen between the Basketball Schedule and finals week, the Council formulated a Final Examination Week Policy. In part that letter reads:

"Clearly it is the established practice of the University to avoid scheduling any official activities involving students during final examination weeks; and that has always been the practice of the Athletic Department. It is unfortunate that December is a critically important month for our basketball team's development, and also a critically important time in the educational responsibilities of our players, but there is only one defensible resolution to that conflict, and that is in favor of the educational responsibility."

In response to Dr. Morris' letter, the Athletic Council approved the following policy on February 14, 1980:

1. That there should be no known conflicts between finals and scheduling.

In applying the policy of February 14, 1980, the Athletic Council decided that the Suntory Bowl, which is scheduled for December 20 and 21, 1984, should not be added to the approved schedule, since final examination week begins December 15 and concludes the night of December 21.

It was noted that at the present time you have an open date on Saturday, December 15, 1984, and the Council assumes there is a possibility of scheduling a game at that time. Since that would be during finals week, it would ordinarily be prohibited, but the approved policy will allow an exception under certain circumstances. So that you are aware of the policy and can proceed with knowledge of it, I will first direct your attention to a letter to the Council from Dr. Bill Banowsky, dated April 20, 1982, wherein he requests the Council to review two components of the Basketball Schedule during finals week. Dr. Banowsky requested that the Council consider two adjustments to its 1980 policy, in order to accommodate the basketball coaches to competitively schedule games while at the same time providing appropriate examination study periods for the student-athlete. Quoting from Dr. Banowsky's letter:

"First, a game here or in Oklahoma City, on the night of the last day of examination schedule would not seem to provide any problem. It would be rare for an exam to be given on the last night and with very little travel time, students would not miss a morning or afternoon examination on that date."

"Second, a home game on the Saturday night in the middle of exam week would also not require any missed exam periods and would precede a day when no exams would be scheduled (Sunday); therefore, this would provide flexibility for the program while maintaining the initial intent of my post correspondence with you."

In response to Dr. Banowsky's letter, and reaffirmed on September 13, 1983, the following policy was instituted:

APPROVED, in Men's and Women's Basketball Scheduling, home competition (home being defined as a Norman or Oklahoma City game site) will be allowed during the final exam 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 evening of a finals period and for evening games on the last day of finals period, so long as no final examinations are taking place during those periods of time.)

That policy approved by the Council on September 13, 1983, and approved by the President's office on October 6, 1983, will allow you to schedule a basketball game on Saturday evening, December 15, 1984.

The action taken by the Council, as stated in my letter, has been forwarded to the President's office for his approval. Our next Athletic Council meeting will be at 3:00 p.m. on October 2, in the Jack Santee Lounge. If you desire to request any further adjustments to your schedule, I would appreciate it, if possible, that you provide those to me one week before the meeting, so that I am able to distribute those requests to all Council members. Prior to the business meeting, there will be a reception for all coaches so they will have the opportunity to meet with the various Council members. I would personally like to invite you to that meeting, so you are able to meet the persons who are serving on the Athletic Council for the 1984-85 year.

As an avid basketball fan (I have missed very few home games since 1969), I am sorry that the University of Oklahoma will not be able to schedule the Suntory Bowl. It appears that the tournament will be an excellent one. I am sorry it falls during finals week, which prohibits us from competing.

If you have any questions, please do not hesitate to call me.

Cordially,



THEODORE P. ROBERTS
Chair, Athletic Council

TPR:eas

Encl.

cc: Mr. Wade Walker
Mr. Robert Smith
Dr. J. R. Morris

ACADEMIC PROGRAM COUNCIL REPORT

Fall Semester 1984

Submitted by George Cozad, Chair

The Academic Program Council met four times during the fall semester (September 17, October 22, November 19, December 17) with each meeting lasting approximately two hours. The Council regularly meets the third Monday of each month at 3:30 p.m.; the October meeting was rescheduled to the fourth Monday due to the student holiday on the third Monday.

The Council recommended to the Provost approval of the following proposals:

1. A change in the undergraduate graduation requirements for the School of Social Work.
2. Changes in the Industrial Engineering Ph.D. program, after a change was made in the residency requirement.
3. Changes in the admission requirements and course prerequisites for the undergraduate Computer Science program in the College of Engineering.
4. A Day Care Management track for the Professional Studies major in the College of Education.
5. The College of Arts and Sciences interdisciplinary course identifier; the Council asked that assurance of continued quality control and the ability to sustain the vitality of the course be given.

The Council approved 11 course additions, 2 course level changes, 44 course changes and 20 course deletions. The Council voted against approving 11 course change requests.

The following persons attended meetings at the Council's request to provide information concerning proposals under consideration: Dean Jischke, Dean Marx, Dean Weber, Associate Dean Francis, Professor Schwarzkopf, Mr. Fink and Ms. Carney. Information was requested by mail and telephone from several schools and departments concerning program and course changes.

Faculty members of the Council are: George Cozad, Botany/Microbiology; Kevin Crowley, Geology/Geophysics; Gene Levy, Mathematics; Cecil Lee, Art; Roy Knapp, Petroleum/Geological Engineering; Vivien Ng, History; Ramon Alonso, Management; Beverly Joyce, University Libraries; and Roger Mellgren, Psychology. Student members are Marla Wiseman, David Patterson, Erich Brueschke, Marilyn Grass, Granger Meador, and Lamont Cavanagh. (All from the Norman campus.)

Dr. Milford Messer, Registrar, and Mrs. Connie Boehme, Editor, Academic Bulletins, regularly attend Council meetings and provide information and staff support.

CAMPUS PLANNING COUNCIL REPORT

Fall Semester 1984

Submitted by Roland E. Lehr, Chair

The Campus Planning Council (CPC) held four regularly scheduled meetings (Sept. 13, Oct. 4, Nov. 1, Dec. 6). Topics discussed at the meetings included: areas where there are perceived deficiencies in housekeeping, landscaping and/or information sources (e.g. signs) on campus; the Norman Campus Master Plan of Capital Improvement Projects for 1984/85; CART and the parking/traffic situation on campus; adequacy of classroom space and policies and procedures regarding classroom utilization; the Energy Center and Music Building projects; the current status of the Duck Pond renovation and plans of the Friends of the Duck Pond for future work. The Council recommended approval of the Administration's request that the School of Music building be named the Stanley B. Catlett, Sr. Building.

The Council met for two hours with the Norman Planning Commission on November 29 for a study session devoted primarily to mutual concerns regarding parking and traffic. As a prelude to this session, Council members studied the City of Norman Core Area Plan and held a study session (Nov. 5) where they were briefed by a representative of the city. It was agreed that interaction between the CPC and the Norman Planning Commission should be continued, and each group will appoint members of a committee in early 1985 to continue discussions.

Two major areas have been selected for study by the Council. One relates to perceived deficiencies in the appearance of the campus and the difficulty that many guests (and faculty/staff) have in locating unfamiliar buildings on campus. A committee has been formed to study this issue. A second area relates to utilization of space. A committee has been appointed that is examining the data base available regarding building space and policies and procedures that are being used to determine the utilization of space. The committee has met with staff of Architectural and Engineering Services and of the Provost's office as initial steps in the process.

The Council has spent about eight hours in regularly scheduled meetings and four hours in special study sessions. Members of committees have spent 6-8 additional hours in meetings and about three hours were required to prepare for the meeting with the Norman Planning Commission.

Members of the Council:

Joe Rodgers	(Psychology)	Mike Newkham	(Physical Plant)
Leonard West	(CEES)	Linda Harris	(Arts and Sciences)
Roland Lehr	(Chemistry)	Rebecca McGary	(Student)
Henry Eisenhart	(HPER)	Rick Plass	(Student)
Walter Dillard	(Zoology)	Mike Keys	(Student)
James Kudrna	(Architecture)	Eb Bright	(Student)
Sally Caldwell	(Regional/City Planning)	To be selected	(Provost, Norman Campus)
Angela Million	(University Libraries)	J. R. Morris	(Senior Vice President)
Donna Young	(Architecture)	Arthur J. Elbert	(Vice President for Administrative Affairs)
Michal Gray	(Law Center)	Milford D. Messer	(Registrar)
Mike Scanlan	(Lloyd Noble Center)		

COUNCIL ON FACULTY AWARDS AND HONORS REPORT

Fall Semester 1984

Submitted by Donald Counihan, Chair

The Council held its organizational meeting on October 25, 1984, at which time a permanent Chair for the year was elected and procedures and deadlines were discussed. The principal charges of the Council are that of (a) reviewing nominations submitted to the Provost for the three Regents' awards, the AMOCO teaching award, and the David Ross Boyd Professorship and (b) making recommendations to the Provost concerning these nominations.

Forty-eight faculty members in all were nominated for the five awards. After a review of files submitted for these nominees, the Council convened on December 18, 1984, to discuss the nominations and to reach a consensus on recommendations to be forwarded. These recommendations were forwarded to the Provost on January 7, 1985.

The Council again noted the disparate number of nominations submitted by the various academic units across the two campuses. While some units are especially prolific in submitting nominations, others submit few if any nominations over the years. Because the Council can consider only those nominations that are submitted, there may well be deserving faculty members who are being overlooked.

The Council noted that a number of potentially deserving nominations were accompanied by relatively sparse supporting materials which did not provide the Council with the documentation needed for its review. Academic units are asked to remedy this deficiency when future nominations are submitted.

The Council also developed recommendations for limits on the length of nomination dossiers, procedures for further objectifying the review process, and encouraging academic units to put forward the names of deserving colleagues.

Professor Joakim Laguros (CEES) was elected temporary Chair for the next academic year and will be responsible for convening the organizational meeting of the Council in the fall of 1985.

The two Council sessions involved a total of five hours. In addition, Council members spend an average of sixteen hours studying the corroborating data submitted for the nominees.

In addition to the faculty members listed below, Lynn Grigsby (UOSA) served as a Council member.

This report completes the work of the Council for the academic year 1984-85.

Respectfully submitted,

Digby Bell (Music)
Don Counihan (HSC), Chair
Kurt Dubowski (HSC)
Joseph Ferretti (HSC)
Arrell Gibson (History)
Joakim Laguros (CEES)
Herbert Nishikawa (HSC)
John Sokatch (HSC)
Daniel Wren (Management)

RESEARCH COUNCIL REPORT

Fall Semester 1984

Submitted by Jon G. Bredeson, Chair

During the first six months of the fiscal year 1985, the Research Council received 50 non-routine applications for research funds totaling \$125,814. These grant requests were for amounts ranging up to \$5,000 each. The Council recommended funding awards totaling 32. As of January 1, \$15,936 remained available for non-routine faculty research awards.

The Research council also reviewed 34 requests totaling \$668,239 for OU Associates funds. These were for grants exceeding \$5,000. A total of 11 grant requests were recommended for funding in the amount of \$149,788.

The Research Council will be examining the Junior Faculty Summer Research Fellowship requests and George Lynn Cross Research Professorship nominations in January of 1985.

Respectfully submitted,

Jon Bredeson (EECS), Chair
Victor Hutchison (Zoology)
Ryan Doezema (Physics/Astronomy)
Don Kash (Political Science)
Leonard Beevers (Botany/Microbiology)
David Rowe (Human Development)
John Chisholm (Grad Student PGE)

Roger Frech (Chemistry)
James Hibdon (Economics)
Richard Gipson (Music)
Tom Murray (CEES)
Nancy Mergler (Psychology)
Robert Nye (History)

PUBLICATIONS BOARD REPORT

Fall Semester 1984

Submitted by Professor Ed Carter, Chair

Business is improving for the Oklahoma Daily this year. Advertising lineage is up again this year by 1.57 percent. In a major page change, the Oklahoma Daily in September switched from an eight-column format to a six-column format. This format has been adopted by more than 1,500 daily newspapers in the country. It makes placement of advertising easier for national advertisers. Overall the change has resulted in a more visually attractive, easier-to-read editorial and advertising package.

The 1983 Sooner yearbook has won a Gold Crown Award from the Columbia Scholastic Press Association. It was one of five awards given in the competition in which 2,700 books were entered.

The Publications Board on November 16, 1984, unanimously approved an agreement with the University of Oklahoma Police Department giving the Oklahoma Daily greater access to police incident reports. Oklahoma Daily editor Ruth Baxter had requested in October that complete OU Police Department incident reports to opened to the public under Oklahoma's Open Records Act. The OUPD had been allowing Daily reporters to see only the first page of the incident reports. After several meetings of board members with police officials, an agreement was reached in which Daily reporters would be allowed to see complete police incident reports in which only the names of sex crime victims, juvenile suspects and suspects not in custody would be withheld.

Members of the Board:

L. Edward Carter	(Journalism Faculty)
Chipman Stuart	(Education)
Joe Ray	(Provost's Office)
Jack Copeland	(News Services)
To be selected	(Alumni-Working Press)
Kim Berthiaume	(<u>Oklahoma Daily</u> Rep.)
Shan Cody Neely	(<u>Sooner Yearbook</u> Rep.)
To be selected	(Publications-at-large)
Shila Fletcher	(Student)
Valerie Corzine	(Student)
Elizabeth Yamashita	(Director, School of Journalism and Mass Comm.)
Fred Weddle	(Director, Student Publ.)
Charles House	(Editorial Supervisor- <u>Oklahoma Daily</u>)
Twila Smith	(Editorial Supervisor- <u>Sooner Yearbook</u>)
Ruth Baxter	(Editor, <u>Oklahoma Daily</u>)
Johnny Rard	(Editor, <u>Sooner Yearbook</u>)

BUDGET COUNCIL REPORT

Fall Semester 1984
Submitted by Kerry Grant, Chair

The increases in compensation granted on a selective basis to some members of the University community was the subject of the first several of the four regular meetings of the Council and one special session held during the Fall semester. There was considerable and intense debate about the wisdom, the propriety and the equity of the policy. Special concern was voiced about the effect of the selective changes in salary on future salary computations. The Council received a report from the Vice President for Administrative Affairs, Dr. Art Elbert and voiced few concerns about the procedure used in the non-academic sector. A similar presentation about the origin of the policy and the dissemination of the guidelines for its implementation to academic units made by Provost J. R. Morris occasioned considerably more discussion and dissension among the members. The differences in judgement and opinion of the members of the Council was reflected in the difficulty we experienced in approving an advisory report on the matter. A first draft from the subcommittee appointed to formulate the position paper was rejected by the Council and a new version was later approved. The report was forwarded to the President with an expression of regret from the Chairman that the Council had been unable to make clear and specific recommendations on the most serious issues raised by the procedures used in setting salary levels for the academic year 1984-1985.

At the final meeting of the semester the Council considered a request from the student members of the Council to support a resolution from the Student Congress which urged that tuition increases not be sought this year. The disparity in the portion of instructional costs paid by students at O.U. and O.S.U. and that paid by students at other state colleges was the subject of special concern. The Council agreed to study the matter and to formulate a position on it in time for possible presentation at the meetings being held at the state capitol in January.

Among the routine items of business of the Council were presentations on the proposed budget for fiscal year 85-86 and discussions of long range planning. The administration was requested to furnish the Council with three budget projections reflecting expenditures on budgets ranging from poor requiring minor retrenchment to good allowing for a 6 to 10 percent increase in expenditures. These reports will be presented early in the Spring semester.

STUDENT CONGRESS
UNIVERSITY OF OKLAHOMA STUDENT ASSOCIATION
CONGRESSIONAL SESSION XXXII OCTOBER 9, 1984

CONGRESSIONAL BILL NO. 321201

Title: A RESOLUTION CALLING FOR THE CLASS SCHEDULING COMMITTEE TO ADOPT THE PROPOSAL OF A "DEAD WEEK."

WHEREAS: Finals week is a very stressful time during which students must have tremendous preparation; and

WHEREAS: Many professors give major exams during the last week of regularly scheduled classes; and

WHEREAS: Exams given during the last week of class distracts from students preparation of finals and gives students unwarranted stress; and

WHEREAS: Oklahoma State University has instituted a dead week policy which is highly appreciated by the student body; and

WHEREAS: The OSU dead week policy prevents any instructor from giving an exam during the last week of regularly scheduled classes worth more than 5% of the students total grade.

LET IT THEREFORE BE RESOLVED THAT:

Section 1: The Class Scheduling Committee should adopt a dead week policy.

Section 2: Make-up exams and early final exams agreed upon by the student and faculty may be taken at this time.

Section 3: No instructor should give an exam during the last week of regularly scheduled classes worth more than 5% of the students total grade unless the student and faculty have agreed on a make-up exam.

Author of the bill: Bill Stanhope

Submitted on a motion by: Naveed Zuberi

Action taken by Congress: Passed 31-2-2 this ninth day of October, 1984.

Verified by Chair of Congress: Elyette Barrett Date 10/10/84

Resolution on Proposed "Dead Week" Policy

WHEREAS a single policy on examinations during the final week of the semester cannot accommodate the unique characteristics of the various academic units on campus; and

WHEREAS the giving of examinations during the final week of classes may in some instances be sound instructional policy; and

WHEREAS the determination of instructional procedures including the scheduling of examinations is the responsibility of the course instructor; and

WHEREAS a clearly stated policy concerning final examinations already exists (Faculty Handbook, p. 65); and

WHEREAS the Chairperson of the Class Scheduling Committee has already polled campus academic units and generally found mixed reaction to a campuswide "dead week" policy;

Be it resolved that

1. The Faculty Senate does not support the Student Congress "dead week" proposal (Bill No. 321201); nonetheless
2. The Faculty Senate encourages faculty members to be sensitive to student study loads during the latter part of the semester and to avoid (if possible) giving examinations during the final week of classes; and .
3. The Faculty Senate applauds student concern about quality in academic standards and welcomes student input into such matters.