

JOURNAL OF THE FACULTY SENATE (Norman campus)
 The University of Oklahoma
 Regular session - April 8, 1985 - 3:30 p.m.
 Conoco Auditorium, Doris W. Neustadt Wing, Bizzell Memorial Library

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

PRESENT: Atherton, Baker, Beesley, Biro, Black, Bredeson, Caldwell, Cameron, Canter, Cozad, DuMont, Eliason, Emanuel, Fitch Hauser, Friend, Goodman, Graves, Hengst, Hopkins, Huseman, Karriker, Knapp, Knehans, Kuriger, Larson, Levy, Love, Magrath, Marek, Morgan, Murphy, Nicewander, Nuttall, O'Rear, Palmer, Parker, Pflaum, Poland, Reynolds, Schmitz, Smith, Taylor, Tepker, Tharp, Thompson, Wedel, Whitely

Provost's office representative: Ray
 Liaison, ABP: Butler
 PSA representative: McCarley
 GSA representative: Lawrence

ABSENT: Grant, Hawley, Horrell, Kudrna, Tobias, Uno

Liaison, AAUP: Turkington
 Liaison, Women's Caucus: Killian
 PSA representatives: Nicely, Skierkowski
 UOSA representatives: Brueschke, Rasnic, Wiseman

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Announcements by Professor Tom Love, Chair:	
Spring General Faculty Meeting	2
Replacement on Presidential Search Committee	2
Action taken by Interim President Martin Jischke:	
Selection of faculty replacement, University group	2
Senate Executive Committee report	
OCFO meeting	2
Meeting with OSU Faculty Council	2
Committee on Committees report	2
Faculty Welfare Committee report on Committee A	3
Faculty Compensation Committee report	4
Funding Priorities Committee report	4
"Dead week" resolution	4
Survey on interlibrary loan turn-around, OU-OSU library shuttle	5
Recommendation of ad hoc committee on staff chairing councils	5
Recommendation of ad hoc committee on student appeals respecting English proficiency of instructors	5
Recommendation of Academic Regulations Committee on expanded grading scale	6

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

The minutes of the regular session of March 4, 1985 were approved.

ANNOUNCEMENTS

The time of the Spring General Faculty meeting was announced as Thursday, April 11, 1985, at 3:30 p.m., in the OMU Ballroom, with a reception, hosted by Interim President, Dr. Martin Jischke, following the meeting.

Professor Teree Foster (Law) was selected by the Regents from the nominations submitted by the Senate to replace the late Professor Carol Brice Carey (Music) on the Presidential Search Committee.

ACTION TAKEN BY INTERIM PRESIDENT MARTIN JISCHKE

Professor Paul Gilje (History) was selected from nominations submitted by the Senate to complete the 1984-86 term of Professor Judy Katz (Human Relations) on the Campus Disciplinary Council I (see 3/85 Journal, page 2).

SENATE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE REPORT

Tom Love and Sonya Fallgatter attended the Oklahoma Conference of Faculty Organizations (OCFO) April 5 at East Central Oklahoma State University in Ada. Seventeen of the twenty-seven state institutions and one private institution were present. The main topic of the meeting was the financing for higher education by the state. Participants in the panel discussion included Rep. Enoch Kelly Haney, Vice Chairman of the House Appropriations Committee; Sen. Billie Floyd, Member of the Appropriations and Higher Education Committees; Rep. Lonnie Abbott, speaker Pro Tempore; Carlos Johnson, President of HEACO; and Gary Tompkins, President of the Oklahoma Conference of the AAUP. The panelists stressed the need to pass all three of the state questions on the April 30 ballot, especially State Question 587, which changes the method for determining the amount of funds available for the legislature to appropriate. They pointed out that if this question is not passed, appropriations would be cut by 10%, and it is unlikely that the legislature will be willing to propose any tax increases. If state question 587 passes, an additional \$143 million would be available for the legislature to appropriate. Professor Love encouraged the faculty to actively work to get this question passed.

The joint meeting of the OSU Faculty Council and OU Faculty Senate Executive Committees was held April 6 in Stillwater. The funding problem was the main focus. Other topics concerned changes in the admission requirements, retention of students, and sharing library facilities through a shuttle service.

COMMITTEE ON COMMITTEES REPORT

Professor Levy distributed a preliminary list of nominees for end-of-the-year vacancies on University Councils and Committees. The final list will be distributed prior to the May meeting. He explained that on an experimental basis, Interim President Jischke and Provost Morris have agreed to allow the Senate to submit one name instead of two for vacancies on council and committees requiring nominations, except for the Athletics Council, Faculty Awards and Honors Council, Publications Board, Campus Tenure Committee, and Commencement Committee. The Senate will vote on the nominations at the May meeting.

FACULTY WELFARE COMMITTEE REPORT ON COMMITTEE A

Professor Black explained that the report on revisions to the Committee A system (see Appendix I) contains the findings of the two surveys conducted, which revealed information on procedural problems -- how elections are held, how people are nominated, what the terms of office are -- and abuses of the system. The committee decided to clarify the current historical tradition and recommend making the unit head the chair of Committee A, because they felt that having the unit head separate from Committee A would create an adversarial relationship. Another recommendation is that Committee A be allowed to have a minority report. Under formal recommendations, the committee proposes that each academic unit develop a formal document which outlines how elections should be held. The guidelines for determining the number of Committee A members are simply suggestions, because the committee feels that should be determined by the academic unit. In addition, the report calls for the Faculty Senate to establish regularly scheduled orientation seminars for new Committee A members. In the future the orientation could be expanded to include all Committee A members. Another recommendation proposes that Committee A provide guidance to untenured tenure-track faculty to assist them in their efforts to obtain tenure. The most substantive changes made by the committee involve rewording the description of Committee A in the Faculty Handbook to firm up the duties of Committee A, based on the results of the survey. They also modified the section in the Faculty Handbook describing the responsibilities of the Chair of Committee A to clarify what his/her role is.

Professor Graves commented that some colleges (e.g. Architecture, Business, Education) also are departments with a college/department-wide Committee A which reports to the Dean. He reported that the College of Education feels that making the Dean the Chair of Committee A gives too little representation to the faculty and too much to the Dean; they elect three faculty members on Committee A, who report to the Dean. He suggested that Deans or other people who have a subsequent decision-making responsibility be excluded from serving on Committee A, and particularly from serving as Chair of Committee A. Additionally, he recommended that the section on elections be amended to allow departments to conduct elections by mail ballot instead of during a faculty meeting. He asked why the Faculty Senate should conduct the orientation sessions. Professors Black and Love responded that they didn't know of another body to conduct such training sessions.

Professor Eliason suggested that the departments be given the option of restricting the membership on Committee A to tenured faculty. He noted that in the smaller departments it might not be possible to restrict the membership to tenured faculty only. Professor Love pointed out that it can be useful to have non-tenured tenure-track faculty on Committee A, and there is a divergence of opinion as to whether only tenured faculty should serve. Professor Love said that if there is enough support, the document should be amended to indicate that it is the choice of the department whether to restrict the membership to tenured faculty. He suggested that written recommendations for modification be forwarded to the Senate office by April 22, and they will be distributed to the Faculty Senate before the next meeting. According to Associate Provost Ray, it still would be possible to include the changes regarding Committee A in the new edition of the Faculty Handbook.

Professor Murphy asked if there is any established procedure for faculty review of revisions made in the Faculty Handbook. Associate Provost Ray said the Faculty Handbook is reviewed by each party who has responsibility for that segment. Revisions are circulated to all of the enacting bodies to verify that they reflect the current wording. Professor Murphy said he thought whenever the Faculty Handbook went into revision, the Faculty Senate should have the opportunity to review the new version. Associate Provost Ray said that all of the sections indicating Faculty Senate actions are sent to the Faculty Senate for review.

FACULTY COMPENSATION COMMITTEE REPORT

Speaking for Professor Holmes, Chair of the Faculty Compensation Committee, Professor Love explained that the Committee had planned to submit a "purchasing power parity" proposal, but had withdrawn it for further committee work. In addition, Professor Holmes had planned to discuss the April 30 ballot. In his place, Professor Love explained that the text of State Question 587, as stated on the ballot, will be distributed to the faculty. He briefly explained the additional two state questions and urged the representatives to vote for all three state questions and encourage others to vote yes.

FUNDING PRIORITIES COMMITTEE REPORT

Professor Biro, in presenting the committee's report (see Appendix II), explained that the debate and vote on the recommendations would take place at the May meeting. The entire committee will be available at that meeting to answer questions. He encouraged the representatives to discuss the report with their constituents. The recommendations contained in section three are addressed to the faculty, because they are intended to be the policies and priorities of the faculty, as expressed through the Senate, and it would help the Senate represent the faculty in future years. Professor Biro suggested that the representatives not let differences in interpretation of the middle section of the report affect their endorsement of the recommendations, which are forward-looking and would help to lessen the need to react on an ad hoc basis in the face of future changes in funding levels. He feels the timing of this report is propitious; if the faculty are to agree on a clearly articulated, explicit policy, this is the time to do it. He pointed out that it can be very enlightening and educational for the faculty to be involved in a process like this. He thanked the members of the committee for their hard work. Professor Eliason noted that this report not only speaks to the faculty, but also to the administrators, and that it should be beneficial to the university as a whole.

"DEAD WEEK" PROPOSAL

Professor Friend explained that the committee studying the Student Congress "dead week" proposal (see Appendix III) had met with the students, forwarded some alternatives to them, but the students had not yet responded to the suggestions. With the understanding that the committee is willing to continue to work with the students as they generate alternatives, Professor Friend moved that the committee's resolution (see Appendix IV), tabled at the two previous meetings, be approved. The resolution carried.

SURVEY ON INTERLIBRARY LOAN TURN-AROUND, OU-OSU LIBRARY SHUTTLE

The University Libraries Committee furnished the results of the survey on interlibrary loan turn-around, as requested by the Senate at the March meeting (see Appendix V). The report substantiates their position that most faculty are satisfied with the long delays, and indicates that a shuttle service is not necessary. Professor Love commented that the Senate Executive Committee will continue to try to work out a solution with OSU to better utilize the two libraries. One possibility is to arrange a meeting of shuttles from both schools at the HSC.

STAFF CHAIRING COUNCILS

Professor Cozad explained that it was apparent to the ad hoc committee, in reviewing the charge and membership of the councils, why faculty were designated as chairs of councils in all cases except one. In the case of the Investigative Council on Sexual Harassment the interests of both faculty and staff seem to be the same. For this reason, the committee recommends that the "current stipulation that the chair of the Investigative Council on Sexual Harassment must be a member of the faculty be amended to allow for the leadership of this council by a representative from the staff."

Further, the committee recommends that the provisions in the faculty and staff handbooks which require that the chairs of all councils be ex-officio members of the Faculty Senate Executive Committee be revised to stipulate that "only the chairs from those councils whose regular participation is deemed to be of importance to the activities of the Executive Committee will be members of that body. This group is to be determined by action of the Senate upon the recommendation of the Executive Committee." (See Appendix VI.) Professor Emanuel moved that the recommendation be approved. The motion carried.

STUDENT APPEALS RESPECTING ENGLISH PROFICIENCY OF INSTRUCTORS

Professor Love explained that a change in the wording of the Faculty Handbook brought to the attention of the Senate the concern about the way in which cases involving the alleged inability of instructors to speak the English language were handled. There was some feeling that these kinds of cases should not be handled by the Academic Appeals Board. The vote on whether to accept the recommendations of the ad hoc committee (see Appendix VII) will be postponed until the May meeting.

Professor Tepker, Chair of the committee assigned to study this matter, pointed out that 1982 legislation mandates that there be some grievance procedure for students if they have complaints about instructors who are not proficient in the English language, and the University must report those procedures to the legislature. The Provost office vested this authority in the Academic Appeals Boards. It is the view of the committee that the authority should be vested with Committee A, and that Committee A should be provided with a number of possible options for handling a complaint.

Professor Emanuel asked if, in the event these recommendations are adopted, there would be a procedure whereby the Dean and Provost would be notified of the action Committee A had taken. Professor Tepker responded that it was his understanding that Committee A's decision would be in the form of a recommendation, and Committee A would be accountable to their supervising authority. Professor Love explained that the faculty could appeal a decision to the Faculty Appeals Board, and he feels the students also should have an appeals route. Professor Tepker commented that the committee's recommendations do not provide an appeals procedure beyond Committee A, but currently there is no appeals procedure from the Academic Appeals Board except to the faculty unit. Professor Love suggested adding a provision to the document to provide for following up on the complaint and spelling out the procedure the student should follow for grievances.

Professor Tepker explained that there was some concern that it was inappropriate to rely upon a grade remedy if there has been a decision that the instruction has been inadequate. The committee believes that if instruction has been inadequate, perhaps personnel should be changed or the course should be changed to pass/fail grading, but that grades should not be raised.

Professor Eliason pointed out that these kind of problems could be handled through positive approaches, such as enrolling instructors in conversation courses. Professor Tepker explained that the committee is not recommending that those procedures be changed. Professor Love suggested that recommendations for changes in the document be forwarded in writing to the Senate office, and they will be distributed to the representatives prior to the next meeting.

EXPANDED GRADING SCALE

The recommendation of the Graduate Council and Graduate Faculty that an expanded grading scale for 5000 and 6000 level courses be adopted was referred to the Academic Regulations Committee. That committee voted to recommend to the Senate that the expanded scale be adopted.

Proposed scale:	A = 4.0	B- = 2.67	D+ = 1.33
	A- = 3.67	C+ = 2.33	D = 1.0
	B+ = 3.33	C = 2.0	D- = .67
	B = 3.0	C- = 1.67	F = 0

The president of the Graduate Student Association, Mr. David Lawrence, reported that last year the graduate student association voted overwhelmingly against the proposal for the following reasons: The grading scale is restricted to 5000 and 6000 level courses, so graduate students taking 3000 and 4000 level courses, undergraduate students enrolled in 5000 level courses, and students taking courses at the HSC will be graded on different scales. Mr. Lawrence said Dean Hoving of the Graduate College was not in favor of the new scale and thought the record-keeping costs would increase if this system were used.


Professor Atherton said that the last statement was in error, because Dean Hoving had reported to the Graduate Council that there would be no additional cost. Also, whether Dean Hoving was for or against the proposal was irrelevant, because the Graduate Council voted overwhelmingly in favor of the proposal.


Continuing, Mr. Lawrence explained that many graduate courses were not suitable to this kind of grading because it would be difficult to make such fine distinctions on a consistent basis, and might lower a student's gpa. He said he felt this grading scale would place undue emphasis on grades.

Explaining the rationale behind the proposed system, Professor Atherton said the proposal initially was raised in the College of Business to provide more flexibility in grading. Originally a 12-point system was proposed, but it later was modified by the Graduate Council to a 4-point system with provision for + or -, although there is no provision for an A+ or F+. He commented that there would not be inconsistencies, as it is basically a 4.0 system. The system was applied only to 5000 and 6000 level courses because the Graduate Council only has authority over these courses. The College of Business may try to establish such a system for undergraduates as well. Professor Atherton said that the Admissions and Records office saw no problem with handling the system, since they already process 12-point grades for the Law School. It would enhance quality, because there would be more motivation to try to get better grades. There was some discussion about assigning +'s and -'s to "D" grades if a "D" is considered unacceptable work. Professor Hengst said he thought this kind of precision would place too much emphasis on grades, and that refined grading scales do not improve standards. The motion was made by Professor Hengst to table the recommendation. The motion carried. Professor Emanuel asked if any other universities were using this system for graduate level courses only. Professor Atherton agreed to furnish the Senate with a list of the schools.

ADJOURNMENT

The Faculty Senate adjourned at 5:15 p.m. The next regular session of the Senate will be held at 3:30 p.m. on Monday, May 6, 1985, in the Conoco Auditorium, Doris W. Neustadt Wing, Bizzell Memorial Library.


 Sonya Fallgatter
 Administrative Coordinator
 Faculty Senate


 Gary L. Thompson
 Secretary
 Faculty Senate

REPORT TO THE FACULTY SENATE ON THE
PROPOSED REVISIONS TO THE COMMITTEE A SYSTEM

APPENDIX I
4/85

FACULTY SENATE WELFARE COMMITTEE
PROF. BRAD BLACK, CHAIR

MARCH 25, 1985

I. CHARGE

The Welfare Committee of the Faculty Senate was given the charge of examining the Committee A system campus-wide and making recommendations for improvements and modifications. This charge included revision of the description of Committee A and its function as included in the Faculty Handbook.

II. RESULTS OF SURVEY

The Welfare Committee prepared and distributed a two part survey to 122 faculty members who form Committee A's across campus. Forty separate Committee A's were identified. Of the 122 surveys distributed, 78 were returned. Responses were received from at least one member of each Committee A. Part One of the survey was aimed at gathering factual information about the policies and procedures associated with the operation of the various Committee A's. Part Two of the survey provided an opportunity for anonymous suggestions and comments about Committee A. The results of these surveys were then tabulated and analyzed. The results were used as the basis for many of the recommendations included in this report.

From the results of the survey it was apparent that there are several problems which are associated with the selection of Committee A members as well as how Committee A's function across campus. These problems may be seen as both procedural and substantive as follows:

III. CURRENT PROCEDURES AND COMPLAINTS

1. Nominations- one half of the respondents indicated that nominations for election of Committee A members are made from the "floor" at a faculty meeting. But as to the remaining half, there was a great variety of nominating processes, some unclear.
2. Elections- the overwhelming majority indicated that secret ballots are used in the election process, with over two thirds of these vote taking place at faculty meetings. There was however, no apparent standard provision for absentee ballots.
3. Elected Members- over 75% of the responses indicated two elected members is the norm. Likewise, it appears that a staggered two year term is also the norm. Variations do occur however.
4. Chair of Committee A- Almost unanimously the Chair of Committee A is the head of the budget unit involved. This appears to be in direct conflict with the structure of Committee A as stated in the Faculty Handbook. It is however, the structure which seems to survive through historical precedents.

5. The most substantial complaint was that Committee A is not regarded seriously by many heads of units. Heads of units were accused of ignoring or manipulating the actions of Committee A.
6. There were frequent complaints that Committee A's were not consulted on important matters of budget, tenure, promotion, etc.
7. There appeared to be a feeling among the respondents that there needed to be some guidelines for Committee A's to follow along with a clearer definition of the role of Committee A in faculty governance.
8. Campus-wide orientation sessions for newly elected Committee A members was suggested by a number of respondents as a method to improve effectiveness and eliminate questions as to the role and function of Committee A.
9. There appeared to be a feeling among the respondents that the decisions of Committee A should not be regarded as merely advisory, but binding upon the higher university official.

IV. FORMAL RECOMMENDATIONS

Based upon the facts and opinions gained from the survey, several procedural as well as substantive recommendations have been developed. In addition, the proposed revised wording for inclusion in the Faculty Handbook is also presented.

Procedural Recommendations

1. Documentation The faculty of each academic unit containing a Committee A should develop and approve a formal document which outlines the procedures and qualities specific to the functioning of their Committee A. Such a document should include, but not be limited to the following recommendations:

a) Nominations Nominations for election to Committee A should be determined by a faculty vote at a regularly scheduled faculty meeting. This process should be formally established and documented by the faculty in each academic unit.

b) Elections Elections should be held by secret ballot at open faculty meetings in a process formally established by the faculty in each academic unit. The process in each unit should provide for absentee ballots.

c) Elected Members There appears no uniform way to establish what required number of members should compose Committee A or what terms may be appropriate. This decision should be formally established by the faculty in each academic unit after consideration of the unique requirements of the unit. The following are guidelines for determining the number of Committee A member on a particular committee:

Less than 20 faculty
in the unit

More than 20 faculty
in the unit

Two elected faculty plus the
head of the unit.

Three elected faculty plus the
head of the unit.

d) Length of Term The length of the term each Committee A member serves should be formally established by the faculty of each academic unit. It is strongly suggested however, that terms be two years in duration with terms of the various committee members staggered.

e) Chair of Committee A To clarify the current historical tradition, the head of the academic unit should serve as Chair of Committee A. This is a formal recognition of current practices.

f) Orientation The Faculty Senate should establish regularly scheduled orientation seminars to aid new Committee A members in understanding the Committee A system, its role, various functions and responsibilities.

g) Guidance Committee A should provide continual guidance to untenured tenure-track faculty to assist them in their efforts to obtain tenure. Committee A should provide periodic evaluations and assessment of the progress such faculty are making toward receiving tenure.

Substantive Recommendations

The current description in the Faculty Handbook of Committee A and its function is inadequate and has led to many of the current problems and apparent abuses. To correct this situation, rewording of several areas of the Faculty Handbook are required. The following represents the suggested revisions as proposed by this committee:

1. Page 13, Section 2.8.2, third paragraph, reword as follows:

"On the Norman Campus, the departmental form of organization shall include an elected body of tenured and tenure-track faculty known as Committee A of that budget unit. Members shall be elected by secret ballots (with provisions for absentee ballots) at duly called faculty meetings in accordance with the procedure formally established by the faculty of each budget unit. Modes of nomination, the number of elected members, and terms of office shall also be established by the faculty of each budget unit. The head of the budget unit shall serve as Chair of Committee A. Committee A shall prepare and transmit to higher university officials formal recommendations as to (1) annual faculty evaluations, (2) budget requests/allocations, (3) increases in salaries of faculty and staff, (4) faculty awards, (5) hiring of new faculty and staff, (6) tenure and promotion matters and (7) other matters as transmitted to Committee A (travel requests, equipment priorities, etc). (8) Committee A shall provide periodic evaluation, assistance and guidance to all tenure-track faculty to aid in their efforts to obtain tenure. Minority opinions may be noted in any formal recommendation forwarded by Committee A."

2. Page 13, Section 2.8.2, fifth paragraph, item (4) reword as follows:

"(4) with Committee A make recommendations for annual faculty evaluations, budget requests/allocations, increases in salaries for faculty and staff, faculty awards, hiring of new faculty and staff, tenure, promotion, teaching methods, other as matters transmitted to Committee A and periodic reviews of the progress of tenure-track faculty in their efforts to successfully obtain tenure."

V. CONCLUSIONS

The committee recognizes that the structure and function of Committee A is an important part of university governance. The recommendations presented here attempt to recognize this importance and improve upon the existing. The recommendations attempt to strengthen the role of Committee A without creating an adversary relationship between the faculty and administration. The committee believes that the recommendations presented here, if accepted and implimented, will effectively eliminate the perceived abuses and ineffectiveness of the past.

We do not suggest that these recommendations will be a remedy for all of the problems associated with Committee A and its function. The potential for abuse will still be present if the members of Committee A and the faculty allow it to occur.

Respectfully submitted:

Prof. Brad Black, Architecture
Prof. Carol Beesley, Art
Prof. Gerald Braver, Zoology
Prof. Jane Magrath, Music
Prof. Paul Tharp, Political Science

FACULTY SENATE AD HOC COMMITTEE ON FUNDING PRIORITIES

Report and recommendations

I. Introduction

1. **Purpose**

The purpose for which the committee was set up may be summed up as that of taking a look, from a faculty perspective, at what principles and processes appear to have guided the allocation of funds in the University in recent years and at whether any changes in those principles and processes are desirable. After a year's study, we have come to some clear conclusions about both of these questions.

After presenting a brief historical background to the establishment of the committee, we explain our view of the status of our work and conclusions and describe the method we have used. In Section II. we give a discursive account of the main issues we have considered and of the conclusions we have come to concerning them. Section III. contains our recommendations.

We believe that this is an especially propitious time to consider the matters dealt with in this report. With virtually all of the higher administration of the University in transition, a clear and forceful faculty policy on funding priorities is both needed and has a better-than-usual chance of making an impact. If the faculty of a university cannot come to agree on and articulate the basic principles that should guide the allocation of resources, it must not complain if that allocation is made based on points of view that are — or at least appear to be — less closely tied to the teaching and research that are the faculty's daily activities and primary concerns. The principle that underlies the whole of this report is that these activities are the central — indeed, the defining — activities of a university and that all financial decisions must be made by direct reference to them. What this implies more specifically for the University of Oklahoma we attempt to spell out in the body of our report.

2. **History**

The committee submitting this report was established by the Faculty Senate in the late spring of 1984 in response to widespread concern about the allocation of the diminishing resources available to OU in recent years. This concern found expression in the publication during 1983/4 of a number of analyses by individuals and groups, seeking to show that in one way or another the university administration's budgetary decisions in recent months and years had failed in substance or procedure or both to reflect the priorities that the majority of the faculty would find it natural to endorse. On the other hand, there had not been any systematic attempt made to spell out what those priorities may be. Thus the Senate, and especially its leadership, was in no position to rely on a set of clear and widely supported priorities in discussions with the administration of issues of the day

(such as the furloughs of 1983/4). The faculty representatives on the Budget Council — the body through which the faculty's views on financial matters are supposed to be voiced -- had no settled long-term policy to which they could refer to guide them in their attempts to influence the kind of advice that body is charged with providing to the administration.

It must be remembered that the Council is made up of representatives of all the main constituencies on campus — while it is (properly) regarded as part of the faculty governance system, it is not, strictly speaking, a faculty organ. This was one reason why a need was felt for a separate faculty committee on funding priorities. The other was that the Budget Council has not been able in the past to conduct the kind of examination of long-term priorities that it was felt was needed. But the central consideration was that even if, in spite of the press of its work in the annual budget cycle, the Council were to undertake such a task, it could not, because of its composition, do so with a view to developing a distinctively faculty view of the long-term questions that will continue to confront it and the University generally.

These questions we see as falling into three rough categories. First, there is the question of what the faculty can itself do and what it can encourage others within and without the university to do to enhance the funds available to the institution. Second, there is the question of what priorities should be used in allocating whatever funds are available from time to time. Third, there are questions about the process of allocation; in particular, what are the structural arrangements that would best enable the faculty's voice to be heard by those who must make the important financial decisions.

We will have something to say on each of these categories of question, though we took our charge to be to concentrate on the second and the third. However, our relative neglect of the first should not be taken as a measure of its importance. In any case, other groups, not least among them the Executive Committee of the Senate, have in the past year devoted considerable attention to some aspects of the first question.

3. Nature and status of present study and recommendations

Our charge from the Faculty Senate was as follows:

- a. To develop funding priorities for the Norman campus that, within estimated budget constraints for fiscal year 1985 will reflect the faculty's fundamental commitment to teaching and research.
- b. To formulate appropriate funding strategies to realize these priorities.
- c. In accomplishing this charge, to consult with concerned faculty, administrators, and staff and to report to the Senate as soon as possible.

We have interpreted this charge as requiring us to develop, in the

light of whatever information and opinion we could gather, concrete recommendations about both the substance and process of budgetary allocation. We did not take it to be our task to seek out detailed and comprehensive data on the budget or on actual expenditures. Doing so in any serious way would have been both beyond our resources and, we think, unnecessary for our purposes. Our aim was to get a reading on opinions among members of the faculty about the relative importance of the many — in themselves perhaps all worthwhile — things on which the University might spend the limited funds likely to be available to it.

Impressions about past decisions and present practices have obviously played a role in influencing these opinions, and it is possible that some of these impressions are unsupported by evidence. Some members of the central administration we have talked with have urged that this has sometimes been so. While our aim was to get away from this kind of controversy, it soon became evident during our discussions with faculty members that there is a widely — and firmly held opinion on campus that the policies and decisions of the university administration in recent years have not always been in line with the priorities the faculty would have been willing to endorse, had it been properly consulted.

Whatever the justice of this view, we believe we can be of more service by offering suggestions for future action than by re-hashing the details of old disputes. Thus, while in Section II. we comment on the reasons, as we see them, for the prevalence of this picture, our recommendations in Section III. are forward-looking and can, we believe, be endorsed in their own right, regardless of what one's interpretation of the past may be.

We believe that the recommendations contained in this report can form the basis of faculty policy on the matters in question. Naturally, changing circumstances will require adjustments, and the policy will have to evolve in a continuous way. We have made recommendations for machinery to allow such evolution to occur. If after broad consultation between senators and their constituents, our report and recommendations are endorsed by the Senate, the Senate leadership of the day, the faculty representatives on the Budget Council and other individuals and groups acting on behalf of the faculty will have a point of reference in carrying out their responsibilities. While such individuals and groups may find it necessary to depart from these policies in response to the needs of the hour, the faculty would expect such departures to be justified through explanations to the Senate.

4. Method of Study

In line with our interest in gathering opinion as broadly as possible, we held a series of meetings during the fall of 1984 and the early spring of 1985. We invited the heads of all academic budget units (some 45 in all) to meet with us and 26 agreed to do so. Subsets of the committee met with the deans of all colleges, and the entire committee met with a number of central administrators, including Interim President Jischke, Provost Morris and Vice President Elbert.

We feel that we were thus able to tap a broad range of views, cutting across disciplines and functions, enabling us to form a realistic picture of the funding situation at OU and of the range of informed opinion that exists about that picture. We have not, however, attempted to reflect all these shades of opinion (let alone some substantial divergences of opinion) in our recommendations. We have tried to use our own judgment and have in most cases come down in favor of one among a variety of several different views. We believe, however, that, taken as a whole, our recommendations are such that most faculty, even if they disagreed with individual ones, could endorse them.

We also believe that the discussions we have had with our colleagues (usually across departmental and disciplinary gaps that are not often crossed) have been of benefit to all participants. We have learned a lot about our university in the process, and we very much hope that the kind of self-examination that enabled us to do so will continue.

5. **Summary of conclusions**

- a. The faculty has the primary responsibility for striving to improve the academic quality of the university, on the perception of which the willingness of the public to provide improved resources ultimately depends (Section II.1.). In addition, the faculty must redouble its efforts to attract funds from a variety of sources other than legislative appropriations (Section II.1.).
- b. Neither the substantive decisions concerning the allocation of funds in recent years, nor the mechanisms and processes involved in reaching these decisions, have been as well considered or as appropriate to the academic mission of the university as they might have been (Section II.2. and II.3.).
- c. It must be the explicit and consistent policy of the university to address needs directly related to teaching and research first, both in good times and in bad (Section II.1. and Recommendations 1, 2 and 3).
- d. Systematic evaluation and planning must be the basis of decisions about the distribution of funds among academic units (Section II.3. and Recommendations 4, 6 and 7).
- e. Structural and procedural changes must be made in the current method of allocating funds (Section II.1. and II.2 and Recommendations 8, 9 and 10).

II. Academic priorities and budgeting

1. **Resources available to the University**

The University must rely on an uncertain combination of state, federal, and private funding to meet its obligations to teach and do research. Faculty and administrators agree that our present level of support is inadequate, and that the amount of money the University can

expect from the state's higher education budget will not increase dramatically during the next decade. The faculty recognizes that most citizens of Oklahoma do not assign a high priority to the goal of building excellent universities. Many faculty would agree with Frosty Troy of the Oklahoma Observer that Oklahoma is once more "groping for the bottom" in education. Although the situation is discouraging, we are not convinced that the University's position has become hopeless. We believe that the University must accept the challenge of showing that it is in the interest of the state, as well as of the University, to promote the development of excellence in higher education.

In certain fields, faculty have become adept at finding external support for research and creative activity, attracting funds from government agencies, industry, and individual donors. During the past decade, while state funding for higher education increased by **245%**, the support for research projects funded from sources other than the normal higher education budget increased by more than **460%**. This advance reflects a greater effort, by an improved faculty, to obtain money for worthwhile projects that could not be supported by state funds.

Undoubtedly many more faculty in many more areas could become actively involved in generating such funds for worthwhile educational programs. The University administration can help by providing incentives and rewards for those who develop their academic entrepreneurial skills, being careful not to neglect or penalize faculty in fundamental scholarly areas where significant outside support is not available. Our report will not be concerned with developing strategies for obtaining increased outside funding; however, we believe the central administration should provide more active assistance to faculty in developing sound research and educational programs that will generate external support. Services provided by the Office of Research Administration are already quite good, but this type of support does not go far enough. The central administration needs to coordinate the efforts of faculty to develop proposals for interdisciplinary programs, particularly in areas such as energy-related research. In many academic fields, the only way to rise above mediocrity is to compete successfully for outside funding.

Ultimately, our ability to obtain funding from all sectors, including the state legislature, will depend directly on our success in setting and maintaining high academic standards. Recognizing that a university is only as good as its faculty, we may note that the important criterion for excellence -- in fact the only one -- is the recruitment and retention of truly excellent faculty members. There is no other way the University of Oklahoma can aspire to greatness. Excellence in higher education is solely determined by the quality of faculty, and this fact must be accepted by our administrators and used as the basis for formulating funding priorities.

2. The initial academic/non-academic split

There is a view held by some administrators (particularly those who do not have direct responsibility for teaching and research) that all activities at the University are equally important, whether they may

be the relocation of trees, grass, and concrete on the North Oval, or a study of the scattering of electrons by collision with molecules. Everyone in the university community is involved in the same educational process, so the argument goes, and all are equally dedicated, so everyone should be supported equally well when times are good and be prepared to suffer equally when times are bad.

Since we cannot realistically expect times to be very good any time soon, we will focus here on the problems created by such a view in times of austerity. Implementing a policy of equal suffering is not easy, as we have surely learned during our most recent period of adversity; it is not even possible to obtain a consensus about what constitutes equal suffering in different areas within the University. Faculty tend to regard the concept of mandatory equal suffering as a fraud. They point out that the temporary inconvenience caused by curtailing the operations of Physical Plant cannot in any way be compared with the long-term damage done to the Department of English by a budget slash. If we allow the School of Civil Engineering and the Department of Modern Languages to founder, it will take us a generation to build these units up again. Without wishing to demean the importance of ground-keepers, we suggest that one could in bad times reduce the number of employees who mow the grass and relocate trees without in the slightest degree harming the academic quality of the University. In contrast, academic excellence must be nurtured and maintained consistently over long periods if it is to exist at all. This is the compelling reason for assigning first priority to academic needs in budget-making and in the allocation of funds at all levels.

The argument that every activity or unit of the University is -- by definition -- academic is, in this context, a red herring. Of course there is a sense in which it is trivially true. But it must be clear on a moment's reflection that some activities are more directly related to the University's central functions of teaching and research than are others, however worthy and, in ideal circumstances, desirable the latter may be. We will, without further apology, use the terminology of academic versus non-academic activities and units to mark this hard-to-make-precise but obviously real distinction.

An anecdote may be used to illustrate this understanding of academic vs. non-academic priorities as seen from a faculty perspective. During the Spring semester of 1984, the University reduced budgets severely in most areas and all faculty, staff and administrators received pay cuts (the euphemism used was "furlough"). During most of the semester, a large crew of workers was busy sand-blasting the outside of the Education Building, undoubtedly at considerable expense to the University. The occupants of the building (who would have been inconvenienced by the sand-blasting under any circumstances) were understandably bitter at the realization that the central administration had decided to let this kind of cosmetic operation continue in the face of a budget crisis threatening the very fabric of the University. In a catastrophic budget year, it was felt, the administration should have had the good judgment to cancel or defer operations like sand-blasting the Education Building, applying the savings to the academic budget.

If we are to maintain, let alone improve, academic quality during such periods, we must try to answer two key questions. How has the University, during the recent past, made the decisions to distribute its meager resources between academic and non-academic activities? How should we advise the University leadership to approach this vitally important allocation problem in the future, in good budget years as well as bad? These are the questions we want to consider in the remainder of this section of our report.

The division of funds between the Provost's budget and all of the other budgets is vitally important to everyone at the University. We take it as given that the President, the Provost, the vice presidents, the academic deans, and the faculty all want this initial division of resources to be made as judiciously as possible. Therefore, we may begin by assuming that the academic/non-academic division of funds should be made by those most qualified to recognize and promote academic excellence.

So far, so good. The President and Provost can only serve effectively if the Regents and the faculty believe that they can lead the University in achieving its academic goals. Many agencies, councils, and experienced individuals can provide our top administrators with information about the needs of academic units and their performance in meeting educational objectives. If the President and Provost use these sources of information wisely, the faculty should have little to fear regarding the process by which University funds are allotted to those who teach and do research.

What is the process, then, that the University has used in allocating funds to the academic and non-academic units? The organization has undoubtedly varied considerably in the past, depending on the personalities and styles of those holding high administrative office. During President Banowsky's tenure, the central administrative group seems to have consisted of the Provost (the senior executive officer on the Norman Campus), the President's representative (for most of his term, Dr. Gerald Turner), the vice-presidents, and administrative staff called upon to provide information. The ranking member of this important group, the Provost, was the only person representing, ex officio, the teaching and research functions of the University. The executive group seems to have met on a regular basis to make the key decisions about allocating money for academic and non-academic purposes.

We have been assured by several top administrators that all the members of this governing group had impeccable academic viewpoints. Even so, the fact remains that the Provost alone had, or should have had, the responsibility for ensuring that the lion's share of the University budget was spent on the direct academic functions of the University. The group we have described was, we are told, able in almost all cases to administer by consensus. Thus, except for the rare occasions when a direct order (or even a suggestion) came down from the President, they are collectively responsible for the important decisions affecting the flow of money to the various divisions of the University.

We see no need to develop a detailed criticism of the procedure whereby funds were distributed to academic and non-academic units during the Banowsky years. But in the light of the principles enunciated earlier in this section, it should be clear that the faculty should advise the new President and Provost to implement a greatly improved process, to ensure that academic priorities are promoted at the highest level when strategic budgetary decisions are being debated and made. One person — the Provost — cannot reasonably be expected to counterbalance the opinions of an entire group of professional administrators whose direct responsibilities do not include the teaching and research functions of the University. One may by analogy say that if the University under President Banowsky had been the Navy, it would have been a navy in which the important strategic decisions were made by support personnel, rather than line officers. In a sensibly-run navy or university, those who have been on the bridge, and those who have command of functioning units, should guide the organization in meeting its primary goals.

3. **Dividing resources among academic units**

Our main purpose so far has been to focus attention on the process that has been responsible for dividing the University budget into academic and non-academic parts, and we have suggested that this process needs to be reformed. But we cannot ignore the substantive question, "What share of a very meager academic budget do different individual academic units deserve?" This question is not easy to answer, but we can try to provide some guidelines for considering it. Two words summarize our basic need — and our previous failures — in making the right decisions. These words are evaluation and planning.

The previous central University administration did not appear to know how to evaluate academic activities, to find out what the faculty are doing in teaching and research, and how well they are doing it. Specific criteria for judging the performance of individual academic units were lacking, and the administration seemed unable to make hard budgetary decisions based on consistent evaluation and planning. What evaluation and planning there were seem primarily to have evolved at the college and department level. This may be the most serious criticism that has been leveled at the previous administration, and our main purpose in emphasizing it is the hope that the next administration can be persuaded to make adequate evaluation and planning essential components of the process in charting the course of the University during the difficult budget years that lie ahead.

We recognize a danger in urging that evaluation and planning be made essential factors in allocating funds within the University. Many administrators and faculty may construe this as a recommendation for establishing an extensive bureaucracy for the purpose. But we do not believe that intelligent planning and evaluation will require spending large amounts of money for additional staff or administrative support, although some reallocation of time will be required from administrators and faculty. Skilled, academically-oriented administrators should be able to develop efficient procedures for learning what is going on and making optimum use of such information in their efforts to meet our primary educational goals.

The picture faculty members have is that the state funds they receive have been allocated by means of an elaborate process involving the college dean and the chairperson or director of their academic unit. But they know relatively little about the details of this administrative process. As a first step in understanding this process, we may comment briefly on the role of administrators and faculty in budgeting and dividing the funds among academic units.

The central budget-making group (see previous section) initiates the process of preparing a budget for the coming year. During the preliminary stages of budget preparation, other administrators, including deans and sometimes chairs and directors, are consulted in an attempt to establish priorities. Usually a detailed presentation of the proposed budget is made to the Budget Council, which examines the document and suggests revisions. Some of the suggested changes may be made, and then the President forwards the tentative budget to the University Regents and the State Regents.

The amount requested in the original budget is always much larger than what the University will ultimately receive from the State Regents; it is presumably good strategy to let the Regents and the legislature know what our real needs are, and what we would do with the money if the State of Oklahoma were to come through with adequate funding. However, the planning involved in making the proposed budget, although often elaborate, does not usually reflect systematic, analytical evaluation of the relative needs of academic and non-academic units and the relation of the proposed budget to clearly stated academic goals. At this point in the budget-making process, it seems to be hard for the administration to deny any unit the right to present a "wish list" comprising all of the expenditures that unit might want to make, given a satisfactory level of funding.

As the year progresses, and the funding situation becomes clearer (usually more dismal), some planning does go on at the departmental and college levels, but with little knowledge about what funds may be available during the coming academic year. Finally the decision is made by the legislature and the State Regents to provide a given sum of money to the University. Often the final University budget becomes known quite late in the academic year, or even during the summer; therefore, the real decisions about the division of the funds among the various units are made (typically rather hurriedly) by the central budget-making group without further discussion with faculty and deans. So once again, the composition of the group of decision-makers and its ability to solicit and recognize good advice from faculty and academic administrators becomes crucial.

During the good budget years of the first Banowsky administration, deans and other middle-level administrators were asked to present detailed information about their needs and plans for the coming academic year. The advice and pleas of some of these administrators apparently had an effect; decisions were made to recommend substantial funding increases for several colleges. Key decisions were also made to improve the library and the computer facilities of the campus.

However, we have not seen evidence that, even during the good budget years, decisions to favor certain colleges and programs were justified on the basis of academic performance, needs, and clearly stated University objectives. Rather, the persuasiveness of particular deans in presenting their cases directly to the President, and secondarily to the Provost and the inner administrative circle, seems to have been the major factor leading to preferential funding for particular colleges and divisions of the University. One gets the impression that the Deans' Council, the Vice Provost for Research, key chairpersons, and knowledgeable faculty were hardly consulted in the process.

Finally, and perhaps most importantly, there was no clearly and openly articulated picture of what goals the University could realistically pursue in the financial environment in which it actually found itself, relative to some long-term vision of the kind of institution it could realistically aspire to become. Loose talk about becoming an AAU institution at a time when many departments are finding it all-but-impossible to maintain a barely acceptable minimum level of academic services, having to cancel courses and programs and watching some of their best faculty leave, is not merely not an adequate substitute for systematic planning but is downright irresponsible.

The process, such as it was, which in the good budget years resulted in some additional funding for certain academic areas was not continued in the subsequent years, because significant amounts of new money were not expected, and it was thought to be non-productive to ask academic units and other divisions to plan for the future under these circumstances. Thus, academic evaluation and planning, not developed systematically even during the good times, were considered to be unnecessary as we entered the bad budget years. A top administrator has stated that "the gulf between the central administration and the academic deans was infinite" during the last years of the Banowsky administration. Global planning, to the degree that it had ever existed, gave way to the doctrine that faculty and others at the University would simply have to grit their teeth and learn to survive with all budgets more or less equally reduced in the hope of an eventual turning of the tide which would again lift all boats. The imposition of a (virtually) uniform system of furloughs for faculty, staff, and administrators underlined the belief that all departments should be required to adjust to inadequate funding in the same way. Units which could have made up budget deficiencies with soft money were in general not allowed to do so.

There are of course valid reasons for preventing academic units from meeting financial crises individually and autonomously. A department like Chemistry, which supports a large fraction of its activities with "soft" money, enjoys a degree of flexibility not attainable by the Departments of Philosophy or History of Science. No responsible academic administrator can ignore the fact that faculty goals and opportunities in science or engineering are quite different from those in the arts and humanities. Yet many chairs and directors have argued that previous inadequacies in state funding could have been partly met by intelligent use of direct and indirect support from outside agencies and donors. This factor at least needs to be considered in our planning for the future.

III. Recommendations for budgeting and establishing funding priorities

Within academia, there is a natural, and usually healthy, spirit of competition among colleges and departments for resources. Faculty and administrators at the department and college level are quite willing to make their case for funding based on perceptions of academic needs and plans to improve the performance of their units. Faculty look to their chairpersons and academic deans to represent them in the political process of budget-making.

Most faculty members want to believe that the central administration is wise enough to weigh all of the legitimate academic needs of the University and mandate a fair and judicious allocation of funds. But for this to be so, the budget-making process will have to be drastically changed with regard to both the substantive criteria which form the basis for sound budgeting decisions and the administrative procedures that need to be established to encourage such decisions. The following recommendations are divided into substantive and organizational ones. We present them in the hope that they will be accepted as the legitimate bases for University budgeting and as criteria for evaluating the performance of those who make future budgets.

We recommend the following as SUBSTANTIVE requirements for establishing budget priorities:

1. The development of University budgets and the disbursement of funds should always be defended in relation to the broad goal of enhancing the academic quality of the University.
2. In years when academic needs are adequately provided for by state funding, additional support may be provided for facilities and activities not directly related to the University's primary teaching and research functions.
3. In periods of inadequate state funding, allocations for activities that are not directly related to teaching and research should be decreased first, so that the academic units will still be able to meet their primary responsibilities. The central administration must recognize that many non-academic functions can be decreased in bad times and expanded — cautiously — in good times without affecting the academic quality of the University. (In making this recommendation, we fully realize that some staff members in the administrative areas are performing essential academic functions that must be preserved in bad times and strengthened in good budget years.)
4. Decisions to provide preferential increases in funding for specific units or divisions should always be justified by reference to both past academic performance and the expected academic improvements that the University may realize as a result of the proposed increases in funding. It is essential that the central administration seek advice from faculty and administrators who recognize academic quality and who understand how to establish academic priorities.
5. The administration must be committed to strengthening the fundamental academic areas that are the indispensable bases for all other academic fields. Unless we achieve excellence in these central disciplines,

the University of Oklahoma cannot become a first-rate university, let alone achieve the status of the best institutions in the American Association of Universities.

In order to facilitate the making of academic budgets based on substantive criteria, we recommend the following PROCEDURAL and ORGANIZATIONAL changes:

6. The individual academic units and colleges should be required, on a regular basis, to articulate their long-term goals and to justify their immediate plans and needs in the light of these. Their summaries of past performance and plans for the future should be a major part of the information used by the central administration in budget-making.
7. The central University administration should develop a budget-making process that requires evaluation of the performance of individual units as measured against well-defined educational goals and national standards of academic excellence. This requires much greater participation by faculty than has been the case hitherto -- through departmental and college administrators -- in all stages of the budget-making process and in subsequent decisions on the distribution of funds.
8. The administrative group responsible for evaluating and funding the academic units should be re-structured to include strong representation from those who are directly responsible for the teaching and research functions of the University. The budget-making group should not, as in the past, include a majority of administrators who are responsible for functions and activities other than teaching and research. The Provost, as the senior academic and executive officer of the Norman Campus, should head the budget-making group, and the group should report directly to the President.
9. The initial division of resources between academic and non-academic functions should be considered by the same group (see recommendation 8, above) responsible for allotting state funds to the academic units. The budget-making group should formulate uniform policies for the wise dispensation of all funds coming to the University. Those in the budget-making group should demonstrate commitment to the pre-eminence of academic goals by their observance of the principles underlying recommendations 1-5 above.
10. To help in the process of establishing priorities and allocating resources, the President and Provost should develop the mechanism for evaluating all academic units and divisions. Divisions that are not directly involved in teaching and research should be scrutinized for academic value and accomplishment in the same way as the more traditional academic departments.

Jon Bredeson
Sherril Christian
Rosemary DuMont
Herbert Hengst
Nim Razook
John Biro, Chair

April 8, 1985

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: Elizabeth 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.



The
University of Oklahoma

APPENDIX V
4/85

SCHOOL OF GEOLOGY AND GEOPHYSICS
830 Van Vleet Oval
Norman, Oklahoma 73019
(405) 325-3253

April 1, 1985

TO: Dr. Tom J. Love, Chair
Faculty Senate

FROM: Dr. John D. Pigott, Chair ^{JDP}
University Libraries Committee

SUBJECT: Survey of Interlibrary Loan Users

A preliminary interlibrary loan survey was conducted by Bizzell staff during the Fall of 1984. The sampled population consisted of 40 "heavy users" of the interlibrary loan service - faculty and graduate students. The survey questionnaire is attached. Statistical highlights and our interpretation of the survey are:

Question #

4. within 1-2 weeks = 32.4%
1-3 weeks = 62.2%
1-4 weeks = 81.1%

Interpretation: Most users receive materials within 4 weeks.

6. willing to pay \$4 or more (typical cost of interlibrary loan) to get faster service
faculty = 22%
graduates = 28%

Interpretation: Few are willing to pay to get faster service.

7. 0-1 month = 13.5%
0-2 months = 18.9%
0-3 months = 27.1%
0-4 months = 33.5%
6 or more = 66.5%

Interpretation: Most projects using interlibrary loan do not require faster service than we now provide (average turn-around is 2-4 weeks).

A more detailed survey is in the process of being conducted by the Libraries. Nonetheless, the information from this survey is not the main reason for recommending against the reactivation of the OU-OSU shuttle. As detailed in the preceding memorandum, the two principal reasons are 1) cost and 2) adequate service using electronic mail for transmission of requests and the U.S. mail or UPS for document delivery. For patrons requiring one week or less service on photocopies, the Libraries have access to commercial services which can send materials in 24-48 hours for a fee. However, as the preliminary survey indicated, most would not be willing to pay for this special service.

JDP:ms

Attachment

INTERLIBRARY LOAN SURVEY

The following information will assist Bizzell Library's Interlibrary Loan department plan future programs and policies. Thank you for your assistance.

1. Circle your university status.

Faculty Staff Graduate Undergraduate

Other (please specify) _____.

2. What is your major/department ? _____.

3. What is your sex ? (circle one) Male Female

4. On average, how long does it take Interlibrary Loan to fill your requests ? (circle one)

weeks:

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 12+

5. Since not all items can be received for free, how much are you willing to pay for:

borrowing a book: (circle one)

\$ 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16

purchasing a photocopy: (circle one)

\$ 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16

6. Would you be willing to pay for photocopies if by so doing the delivery time was cut in half ? (circle one)

NO

YES: (how much ?)

\$ 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16

7. On average, how long do your research projects typically last ? (circle one)

months:

less-than-1 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 12+

Comments/suggestions regarding Interlibrary Loan services are welcome on the back of this form.

**Recommendations from the
Senate ad hoc Committee on the Chairmanship
of University Councils**

I. The Faculty Senate Recommends that the current stipulation that the chair of the **Investigative Council on Sexual Harassment** must be a member of the faculty be amended to allow for the leadership of this council by a representative from the staff.

II. The Faculty Senate recommends that the provisions in the faculty and staff handbooks which require that the chairs of all councils be *ex-officio* members of the Faculty Senate Executive Committee be revised to stipulate that only the chairs from those councils whose regular participation is deemed to be of importance to the activities of the Executive Committee will be members of that body. This group to be determined by action of the Senate upon the recommendation of the Executive Committee.

**Report of the
Senate ad hoc Committee on the Chairmanship
of University Councils**

The Councils of the University of Oklahoma are created in two ways: by direct action of the Board of Regents and by recommendation of the Faculty Senate with the approval of the President. Among those created by the former method which have both faculty and staff representation are the **University Athletics Council**, and the **University Publications Board**. In establishing these councils, the Regents also stipulated the composition of the membership and the policies governing the appointment or election of the chair. Among those created by the latter method are the **Budget Council**, the **Campus Planning Council** and the **Investigative Council on Sexual Harassment**. The membership and criteria for selection of the leadership for these councils is stipulated in the handbooks of the faculty and staff (section 2.8). At this time the chair of all bodies described in this section is required to come from among the faculty members. Pursuant to the request of the Employees Executive Council the Faculty Senate established an ad hoc committee to study the feasibility and desirability of recommending that staff members be permitted to chair university councils.

In its deliberations the committee was guided by the charges of each of the councils and by the rationale given for the creation of the councils and their composition as given in the handbooks of the faculty and staff. Most pertinent to the question is the statement in the handbooks that "To achieve full effectiveness, councils and committees must be representative of the groups appropriate to their particular functions." It follows then that the chair of each council should be drawn from those representatives who have the greatest concern for the functions over which

the council will deliberate. That group of representatives can readily be identified by the composition of the committee.

When doubt arose as to the relative importance of the views of the faculty or staff on a particular council the generally accepted statement of the mission of the university was deemed of overriding importance to the question: that is teaching, research and service. Although the essential nature of staff services to the support of these activities is readily apparent, these services are supportive rather than decisive to the mission of the institution. The matter does not hinge on the innate competency, quality, or worth of the individuals employed in the two sectors, rather it is the function of the employee within the university community that is the determinant.

In reviewing the composition and leadership of the councils it was apparent in every case except one why the chairmanship of a faculty member was mandated. On most of the councils the interests of the faculty and the staff can be seen as being different in kind. In the instance of the **Investigative Council on Sexual Harassment** however, the interest of both faculty and staff seem to be the same. This is evident not only in the charge of the committee, but also in the composition of its membership which is evenly divided between faculty and staff. For these reasons the committee recommends that the stipulation for the chairmanship of this council be amended to permit the leadership of this body by a representative from the staff.

The faculty and staff handbooks presently state that "On the Norman Campus the chair [of a council] will be an *ex-officio* member of the Faculty Senate Executive Committee." This provision should be altered to mandate that only a select and appropriate group of council chairs will hold *ex-officio* membership. An alternative to amending the handbooks would be to designate the Investigative Council on Sexual Harassment as either a committee or a board. The ad hoc committee recommends the first course of action.

Senate ad hoc Committee on the Chairmanship of
University Councils

George Cozad, Chair
Jon Bredeson
Marcia Goodman
Kerry Grant
Carolyn Morgan

April 4, 1985

M E M O R A N D U M

To: The Faculty Senate

From: Ad Hoc Committee of the Faculty Senate on Student Appeals
Respecting English Proficiency of Instructors

FINAL REPORT

The Faculty Senate appointed this ad hoc committee to consider constructive alternatives to current procedures for handling student complaints about professors and instructors who allegedly cannot speak or write English adequately. After reviewing pertinent materials supplied by the the Provost's office and after circulating our tentative recommendations to all Deans and to the Provost's office, the Committee submits this report to the Senate for its consideration.

I. Background

A. Actions of Oklahoma Legislature

The impetus for university procedures respecting student grievances against professors unable to speak English derives from a 1982 statute passed by the Oklahoma legislature. 70 Okla. Stat. §3224 (1984 Supp.) [attached to this Report as Appendix A]. Basically, the statute declared the legislature's intent that professors be proficient in English and established general procedural requirements to ensure this proficiency. The legislature required that each college and university in the state system report to the President Pro Tempore of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of the Oklahoma Legislature. These reports were to identify the procedures adopted by the university or college to enforce the English proficiency requirement and to notify students of "grievance procedures regarding instructors who are not able to speak the English language." As the statute reflects, the university retains discretion as to what enforcement procedures are appropriate.

After the statute was effective, the Oklahoma State Regents for Higher Education directed the university to develop procedures to comply with the statute. The Regents collect the data to provide the report to the Senate and House through a form questionnaire.

B. The Jurisdiction of the Academic Appeals Boards

The jurisdiction of the Academic Appeals Boards has been defined and redefined over the years. Prior to November 9, 1982, the jurisdiction of the Boards was defined as follows:

"Each academic appeals board will hear cases in which the issue to be resolved is that of prejudiced or capricious evaluation."

This version of the jurisdictional charge is the one that appears in the Faculty Handbook, pp. 69-70, §4.13 (November 1981).

In November 1982, the Provost announced a change in the jurisdiction of the Board to reflect the duty to provide some means to consider student complaints against teachers who allegedly cannot speak English. The Provost's additional language is underscored:

"Each academic appeals board will hear cases in which the issue to be resolved is that of prejudiced or capricious evaluation or alleged inability to communicate course content."

In August 1984, the jurisdiction of the Boards was narrowed by a more precise formulation of additional duty of the Board to consider student complaints respecting the English-speaking ability of professors.

"Each academic appeals board will hear cases in which the issue to be resolved is that of prejudiced or capricious evaluation or alleged inability to speak the English language to the extent necessary to adequately instruct students."

II. Recommendations

A. Language of Provost's Delegation to Academic Appeals Boards.

As just noted, at the present time, the Academic Appeals Boards are responsible for considering student grievances which allege "inability to speak the English language to the extent necessary to adequately instruct students." The Committee believes this language is a substantial improvement over the language existing between November 1982 and August 1984.

However, the Committee believes that the language should be narrowed further to confine the focus of any reviewing committees to matters of proficiency in written and spoken English. Our concern is that professors who are proficient but who merely have accents not be burdened or disadvantaged. Perhaps the easiest solution is to adopt the language of the state legislature. For example, even if the jurisdiction remained with the boards, it could be formulated so that the Boards would consider "grievances that an instructor is not proficient in written and spoken English."

Recommendation: The focus for student grievances *against professors should be narrowed strictly to*

questions of proficiency in written and spoken English.

B. Jurisdiction of Academic Appeals Boards

Although there have not been large numbers of student appeals considered by the Boards, the Committee believes that the decision to delegate this jurisdiction to these Committees was unwise. The original jurisdiction of these committees was "prejudiced or capricious academic evaluations." This responsibility is far different from that of evaluating a matter of instructional competence. We believe that the expansion of the Boards' jurisdiction sends the wrong signal: that the Boards are authorized to consider general matters of competence.

Recommendation: Responsibility for student grievances should not be assigned to the Academic Appeals Boards. The jurisdiction of the boards should be confined to allegations of "prejudiced or capricious academic evaluations"

C. Student Grievances and Grade Appeals

The state legislation requires only that universities and colleges (i) maintain procedures to "guarantee... proficiency" and (ii) inform students of those procedures. It does not require-- and does not explicitly contemplate-- grade appeals.

The Committee believes that a student appeal from a low grade is not an appropriate occasion to evaluate a claim of a professor's proficiency in the English language.

First, it is too late. We believe the faculty should adhere to the principle that the injury suffered by students is loss of knowledge, not a low grade. Raising a grade is not a remedy for the loss of good instruction.

Second, the issue should not be tested because one disaffected student makes the claim. If there is a real problem, many students should be complaining-- and complaining at the outset of the class, not after it is all over.

Recommendation: A student should not be able to maintain an appeal from a grade based on allegations that a professor is not proficient in the English language.

D. Recommended Procedures

It is clear the university must maintain "grievance procedures" for handling student complaints to comply with the Oklahoma statute. We believe the following procedure is the preferable method of complying with state law.

Recommendation:

(A) If a college or department has received a substantial pattern of complaints from students alleging that an instructor is not proficient in the English language, these complaints should be referred to the appropriate Committee A for investigation.

(B) The appropriate Committee A shall undertake any appropriate investigative efforts, including interviewing of students, of the instructor involved and visiting the class. If appropriate, Committee A might appoint an ad hoc investigation committee to evaluate the student complaints.

(C) The appropriate Committee A should have the primary responsibility for resolving the student grievances by recommending appropriate action to the University. Such appropriate action may include, but is not limited to: (i) reassignment of courses; (ii) reevaluation of the instructor for purposes of making hiring, tenure, promotion, salary or other personnel decisions; (iii) converting a course from a "graded" course to a "pass-fail" course; or (iv) implementing or recommending other appropriate remedial measures.

(D) Each college or department should be responsible for notifying students of the proper procedures for grievances against instructors.

Heidi Karriker
William Kuriger
Harry F. Tepker, Jr., Chair

APPENDIX A

§ 3224. Instructors to be proficient in speaking English language—Intent of Legislature—Reports

It is the intent of the Oklahoma Legislature that all instructors now employed or being considered for employment at institutions within The Oklahoma State System of Higher Education shall be proficient in speaking the English language so that they may adequately instruct students.

Each college and university of the State System shall provide an annual report to the President Pro Tempore of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of the Oklahoma Legislature by January 1 of each year setting forth the following information:

1. Procedures established to guarantee faculty members have proficiency in both written and spoken English; and
2. Procedures established to inform students of grievance procedures regarding instructors who are not able to speak the English language.

Added by Laws 1982, c. 47, § 1, eff. June 1, 1982.

Approved March 26, 1982. Emergency.

Section 3 of Laws 1982, c. 47 directs codification and section 4 provides that this act shall become effective June 1, 1982.