JOURNAL OF THE FACULTY SENATE (Norman campus)
The University of Oklahoma
Regular session - December 8, 1986 - 3:30 p.m.
Conoco Auditorium, Neustadt Wing, Bizzell Memorial Library

The Faculty Senate was called to order by Professor Penny Hopkins, Chair.

PRESENT: Bell, Bert, Brown, Childress, Cohen, Devine, Dietrich, Economou, Eisenhart, Eliason, Emanuel, Faibisoff, Foster, Frech, Harper, Harris, Hill, Hopkins, Horrell, Johnson, Knehans, Kuriger, Kutner, Lee, Lewis, Livesey, Madland, Magid, Magrath, Mennig, Morgan, Mulholland, Palmer, Parker, Poland, Rogers, Shambaugh, Spaeth, B. Taylor, K. Taylor, Tobias, Tompkins, Wallace

PSA representative: Laquer
UOSA representatives: Johannes, Wesner
Liaison, ABP: Butler

ABSENT: Aly, Caldwell, Canter, Crowley, Curtis, Herstand, Kudrna, Tepker, Wiggins

Liaison, Women's Caucus: Norton
PSA representative: Weddle
UOSA representative: Poynor

TABLE OF CONTENTS

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

The minutes of the regular session of November 10, 1986, were approved.

ANNOUNCEMENTS

The faculty nominated for the two positions on the Affirmative Action Officer search committee are (see 11/86 Journal, page 2): Teree Foster (Law), Anant Kukreti (CEES), Vivien Ng (History), and Walter Dillard (Zoology).

The faculty nominated for the seven positions on the Vice Provost for Continuing Education and Public Service search committee are (see 11/86 Journal, page 2): Carol Beesley (Art), Wayne Chess (Social Work), Barbara Davis (English), Joel Dietrich (Architecture), Eugene Enrico (Music), Paul Gilje (History), Jimmy Harp (CEES), Thomas James (Political Science), Roger Mellgren (Psychology), A. Ravindran (Industrial Engineering), Robert Richardson (Law), Roger Rideout (Music), Paul Sharp (Education), and Gordon Uno (Botany & Microbiology).

In view of Provost Wadlow's initiatives, a separate ad hoc committee will not be set up to look into changing the process for promotion to full professor (see 11/86 Journal, page 6 and Senate Executive Committee Report below).

ACTIONS TAKEN BY THE ADMINISTRATION ON SENATE RECOMMENDATIONS

The resolution passed by the Senate regarding the Energy Center (see 10/86 Journal, pages 6-7) (1) urged the President and the Search Committee to seek the best-qualified research scholar/administrator to direct the Energy Center, and (2) set up a study group to provide advice on the direction of growth of the Energy Center and recommend priorities relating to its funding. President Horton responded to the two recommendations in a letter dated November 7, in which he says: "You may be assured that I am anxious to find an excellent person to direct the Energy Center's interdisciplinary research efforts. We need a person who has conducted research and understands the many facets of facilitating successful multidisciplinary research efforts. I have very strong notions about the research mission of the Energy Center, but also will look forward to suggestions that the faculty may provide with regard to this important research activity at OU."

In regard to the resolution on classroom facilities (see 11/86 Journal, page 7), Provost Wadlow, in a letter dated November 14, states that she asked Vice Provost Jerome Weber to "prepare a comprehensive request for Section 13 funds to improve instructional facilities."

SENATE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE REPORT

The Provost selected the following nine programs to undergo Academic Program Review this year: Aviation, Chemical Engineering, Classics, Economics, Human Development, Interior Design, Journalism, Mathematics, and Modern Languages. The Faculty Senate was asked by the Provost to nominate five faculty members for the review panel (see Academic Program Review below).

Regarding the process for promotion to full professor, Provost Wadlow plans to require a vote of at least the full professors in the unit and dossiers justifying the promotion, so that this process will be in parallel with the tenure process. For this year the Campus Tenure Committee will be asked to review the promotion dossiers as the Provost deems necessary. Professor Cohen pointed out that these procedures would be in effect for this year on a provisional basis and are within the prerogatives granted to the provost; this does not involve changing any permanent specifications in the Faculty Handbook.

Last year the Senate passed a resolution asking for clarification of the relationship between the university and the Summer Institute of Linguistics (SIL) and for standardization of hiring practices along the same lines as those in place for the rest of the faculty of the university (see 5/86 Journal, pages 3-5). Currently, negotiations are taking place with the SIL to make sure they are meeting affirmative action hiring requirements.

At a December 3 meeting President Horton discussed the Centennial fund-raising drive to raise $100 million by 1990, the 100th anniversary of the University. $64.5 million will go toward endowed chairs, scholarships, library, OU Press, Museum of Art, Honors College, and instructional and research programs. The remaining $35.5 million will go toward construction and renovation projects. President Horton said the items to be funded were identified at the departmental level and forwarded through the chairs to the deans and then to the President.

At its December 1985 meeting the Senate approved a resolution that requested the OU Board of Regents to totally divest of stocks of companies doing business in South Africa. At that time the Board had voted for divestment only from companies not following the Sullivan Principles. It was understood that the Senate might want to raise this matter again in a year (see 12/85 Journal, pages 5-6 and 3/86 Journal, page 2). On November 20, 1986, President Horton, on his own initiative, recommended complete total divestiture of stocks of companies doing business in South Africa to the OU Board of Regents, which they approved.

The Senate received strong support from faculty, staff, alumni and the general public for the resolution concerning Regent Kemp (see 11/86 Journal, pages 8-9), with the exception of an editorial in the Daily Oklahoman.

The Executive Committee is addressing other issues, such as budgetary cut priorities, insurance for privately-owned equipment, the skyboxes' effect on the stadium and the architecture college, the phone system, priority allocations of Section 13 monies, and possible conflict of interest in some of the administrative offices.

FOCUS ON EXCELLENCE

Professor Teree Foster focused on four faculty members in the College of Arts and Sciences who were elected to national offices in their respective professional organizations:

Gustav Friedrich, Professor and Chair of Communication - for the Speech and Communication Association, elected for the second vice-presidency in 1987, first vice-presidency in 1988, culminating in the presidency in 1989, which, coincidentally, will be the 75th anniversary of that organization.

Victor Hutchison, George Lynn Cross Professor of Zoology - elected president-elect for 1987 and president for 1988 of the American Society of Ichthyologists and Herpetologists (fish, reptiles, and amphibians).

Mary Jo Nye, Professor of History of Science - will assume immediately the vice-presidency of the History of Science Society for two years and will then be the president for two years in 1989 and 1990.

Logan Wright, Visiting Professor of Psychology - was president-elect of the American Psychological Association in 1985, has served as president during this year, 1986, and next year will serve as president.

PROVOST'S EVALUATION FORM

Professor Hopkins noted that a copy of the proposed new form to replace the current Provost's evaluation form had been sent to all the department chairs to solicit their comments and suggestions. She reminded the members that this form would not replace the evaluation forms currently used by departments, but rather the summary form which is submitted to the Provost.

As a result of the discussion at the November meeting, "weight during year ___%" was removed from section D, "weight during year ___%" was changed to "relative weight during year ___%" in sections A, B, and C, and "scholarship and creative activity" was added to "research" in section B (refer to pages 4-5 and Appendix II of 11/86 Journal). The suggestion to change "rationale" to "justification" was not approved, because the committee believed "justification" had some connotation of defense and because they did not see a problem with the word "rationale."

Professor Economou reported on the recent comments he had received about the proposed form. There was a suggestion that the five tiers of evaluation were inflated and should be reduced to four; the committee didn't see that as a serious problem. There were some questions about the meaning of the tiers; however, the committee believed the wording allowed sufficient flexibility. Concerning a recommendation that section C should be divided into separate categories of professional and university service, Professor Economou and other members of the Senate agreed that service could be explained further under "rationale." Regarding a suggestion to change "relative weight during year" to "allocated percentage or rating," Professor Economou said that he thought this could be ironed out by the department, that the committee believed "relative weight during year" was a more accurate terminology, and that this was the terminology used in the Faculty Handbook. Lastly, Professor Economou noted that no one had objected to the back side of the form.

Professor Wallace said members of her department were pleased about including "relative weight during year ___%," since her department uses a very quantitative form, but she suggested changing "needs improvement" to "inadequate" in sections A, B, and C (as it is in D), because, as she said, "We all need improvement." Professor Economou accepted Professor Cohen's friendly amendment to make that change. Professor Kutner said he thought the form should allow for an explanation of relative weight instead of requiring a percentage, especially when it is not the policy of some departments to express relative weight in percentage terms. Professor Economou made a friendly amendment to add "or emphasis _____" to "relative weight during year ___%" in sections A, B, and C. There was a brief discussion as to whether examples should be included to clarify the meaning of emphasis and whether "if applicable" should be added. Professor Hopkins said that she thought those kinds of additions would be unnecessary.

Professor Magid asked whether a rating of "meets acceptable standards" on this form would then imply that an individual would be considered acceptable for tenure. Professor Economou answered that he believed the department's evaluation letters, not this form, would be the basis for that decision. Professor Kutner noted that an "excellent" individual could receive an "average" rating if the department itself was excellent. Professor Hopkins suggested that this kind of situation could be explained under the rationale for the ranking.

The Senate approved the amended document (see Appendix I). The proposal to replace the footnote in the 1981 Faculty Handbook with a new paragraph (preferably in the body of the text) describing the function of the form will be considered at the January meeting.

POLICY CONCERNING CHANGES IN CRITERIA

The proposed revisions in the policy concerning changes in criteria for evaluation, promotion, and tenure (discussed at the November meeting; refer to page 5 of 11/86 Journal) were approved by the Senate (see Appendix II).

ACADEMIC PROGRAM COUNCIL CHARGE

The proposed changes in the charge of the Academic Program Council (discussed at the November meeting; refer to page 5 of 11/86 Journal) were approved by the Senate (see Appendix III).

ACADEMIC PROGRAM REVIEW

In response to a State Regents for Higher Education mandate that each academic unit should be reviewed once every five years, Provost Wadlow asked the Faculty Senate to convene a committee to draft a new procedure for academic review of programs. This process was drafted by the following committee of 7 faculty and 3 deans.

Maryellen Cameron (Geology and Geophysics)
Roger Frech (Chemistry)
Deirdre Hardy (Architecture)
George Letchworth (Education)
Helga Madland (Modern Languages)
Larry Michaelsen (Management)
William McNichols (Law)
Dean Nat Eek (College of Fine Arts)
Interim Dean Tom Love (College of Engineering)
Dean Kenneth Hoving, Chair (Graduate College)

The Faculty Senate was asked to consider the new procedural document, which was mailed to Faculty Senate members November 19. Dean Hoving explained that this process is modeled after a document used to review graduate programs, but also incorporates mechanisms which exist around the country. It is designed not to take enormous amounts of faculty time. Professor Emanuel asked if the documents, such as the self study, would be made available to the public. Dean Hoving answered that he assumed they would be.

Professor Emanuel asked how units such as OCCE and University College would be evaluated. Dean Hoving said this procedure did not lend itself easily to reviews of units of that type which spread across other units, but that they could be reviewed by another mechanism. Professor Frech mentioned that the Faculty Senate Executive Committee had urged President Horton to conduct administrative program reviews also. To Professor Emanuel's question about whether there would be any funds available to support the staff necessary to gather this information, Dean Hoving answered that it was unlikely.

Professor Magid commented that it wasn't clear how to discover all of the external units that would be impacted by the department being reviewed. Dean Hoving said not all of the procedures designed to establish external relationships had been developed. Professor Magid said, in addition to relying on the department, there ought to be something built into the procedure, for instance a survey, to discover impacts which the department may not be aware of. Dean Hoving said one option might be to announce which departments were being reviewed and ask those who would be impacted to indicate how and in what manner they would be impacted.

Professor Frech reported Professor Crowley's suggestion for more emphasis on external reviews. Professor Shambaugh said the faculty in his unit believed external reviews should be mandatory and not optional. Dean Hoving said he couldn't predict whether the internal/external review committees would be routinely requested. Professor Cohen asked whether the internal review committee, which is composed of faculty within the University but outside the department under review, could solicit advice from other experts in the discipline outside the university, without impaneling a formal external review committee. Dean Hoving said what they could and could not do was not proscribed in any detail. Dean Love said it would be desirable to bring in an external panel for every review, but it would be very costly.

Professor Emanuel made several friendly amendments, which Dean Hoving thought would be acceptable:

Page 1: eliminate the last line, which is duplicated on page 2.
Page 10, J: Add the sentence, "More frequent reviews may be held if deemed necessary by the Provost."
Page 14, 3.a.: Reword to read, "Evaluate the stated undergraduate and graduate entrance requirements and procedures and the criteria for exceptions."
Page 14, 4.c.: Reword to read, "Is the balance between teaching commitments and opportunities for research and creative activity and service appropriate for the programs offered?"
Page 13: At the end of the first paragraph reword the last sentence to read, "Please do not duplicate material provided in other components of the report; however, departments should feel free to present any data that is relevant to the review."

Professor Emanuel said the chair of his department thought there were some items on the Departmental Profile that should be completed by Institutional Research or the Graduate College rather than the department. Professor Professor Bert, noting that in certain areas staff also contribute toward reaching goals, suggested changing the wording to "faculty and staff" on page 14, 4.a.

Professor Magid commented that if the process left it to the departments to determine their own external relationships, then on page 7 under part D.2., an additional category g., called "Academic Impact Statement," should be added with the same statement as on page 4, A.3. Professors Eliason and Lee agreed that the department being reviewed might not always be aware of the services that could be provided to other disciplines. Professor Hopkins suggested that the strategic task force could address this kind of question. Professor Cohen argued that the task force was only a two-year project, in contrast to the permanent ongoing reviews. Dean Hoving offered to take the problem back to the committee to see if they could address this issue. Professor Magid suggested that a way to get honest language and still be able to vote on the document would be to add "and university-wide" before questionnaires on page 10, VI.A.2 and let the committee work out what university-wide questionnaires should be. Dean Hoving thought that would be acceptable.

Professor Bell said a section should be added to clarify what the CDRP does. Professor Madland suggested adding "CDRP" on page 7, E. after "DSSC" to make the CDRP locatable. Professor Hopkins said the CDRP would simply review what the other committee had done. Dean Hoving explained that the charge of the CDRP was not spelled out, because it was the hope that the CDRP would exercise some judgment in looking at the review and make a determination. Professor Cohen recommended inserting "CDRP" on page 8 before "report" on the second line of 3. to specify which report.

Professor Emanuel suggested inserting "approximately" between "will be reviewed" and "every five years" on page 5, V.A. Dean Hoving said the language reflected the Regents mandate that the reviews be done every five years, and that he thought there would be some flexibility even with such definite language. Professor Faibisoff asked whether schools would be expected to do program reviews in addition to accreditation reviews. Dean Hoving answered that the program reviews would be coordinated with accreditation reviews. Professor Kutner pointed out that if reviews and accreditation were going to be coordinated, then it would be better to use the flexible language suggested by Professor Emanuel ("will be reviewed approximately every five years"), because, otherwise, a department could be doing a review every two or three years.

Several of the process committee members reminded the Senate that the process could be refined and amended once experience is gained by completing some reviews. The Senate approved the proposed document as amended.

(A copy of the original document is available in the Faculty Senate office. The final revised version will be circulated at a later date.)

ADJOURNMENT

The meeting adjourned at 5:07 p.m. The next regular session of the Senate will be held at 3:30 p.m., on Monday, January 12, 1987, in the Conoco Auditorium, Neustadt Wing, Bizzell Library.

Sonya Wallgatter
Sonya Wallgatter
Administrative Coordinator

Teree E. Foster
Teree E. Foster
Secretary

SUMMARY REPORT
Of
ANNUAL FACULTY EVALUATION

12/86 (APPENDIX I)

NAME _____ EVALUATING UNIT _____

CALENDAR YEAR Ending December 31, _____ RANK _____ UNIT FTE _____

A. TEACHING — Relative weight during year ____% or Emphasis _____

		Rationale
Exceptional, clearly superior	_____	
Excellent, well above average	_____	
Good, desirable contributions	_____	
Meets acceptable standards	_____	
Inadequate	_____	

B. RESEARCH, SCHOLARSHIP, & CREATIVE ACTIVITY — Relative weight during year ____% or Emphasis _____

		Rationale
Exceptional, clearly superior	_____	
Excellent, well above average	_____	
Good, desirable contributions	_____	
Meets acceptable standards	_____	
Inadequate	_____	

C. PROFESSIONAL/UNIVERSITY/ ADMINISTRATIVE SERVICE — Relative weight during year ____% or Emphasis _____

		Rationale
Exceptional, clearly superior	_____	
Excellent, well above average	_____	
Good, desirable contributions	_____	
Meets acceptable standards	_____	
Inadequate	_____	

D. EVALUATION OF COMPOSITE CONTRIBUTIONS AND ACHIEVEMENTS OF FACULTY MEMBER DURING YEAR

		Rationale
Exceptional	_____	
Excellent	_____	
Good	_____	
Adequate	_____	
Inadequate	_____	

SIGNATURES Of COMMITTEE A — Date _____

_____ _____ _____

FACULTY RESPONSE

( ) I have read and do not wish to respond to the evaluation summary of my performance.

( ) I have read and wish to respond to the evaluation summary of my performance.

Response

FACULTY MEMBER'S SIGNATURE Date _____

_____

Possible Revisions in Policy Concerning Changes in Criteria for Evaluation, Promotion, and Tenure

EVALUATION - Reword paragraph (b) of Section 3.11.1 as follows (additions are shown by underlining and deletions by strikeovers):

(b) Each academic unit, with the participation and approval of the dean and the Provost, shall establish and publish specific criteria for evaluating faculty performance in that unit, consistent with over-all University evaluation procedures, so that any ensuing disagreements on salary recommendations will arise only through differences of opinion concerning evaluation and application of the criteria rather than over the criteria themselves. These criteria may be changed by the faculty of the unit from time to time with the approval of the dean and the Provost. The Provost's approval of the revised criteria shall indicate a date on which they become effective. The revised criteria for salary evaluation shall apply to all faculty beginning with the academic year following the effective date.

PROMOTION - Reword the third paragraph of Section 3.12.1 as follows (additions are shown by underlining and deletions by strikeovers):

Each academic unit, in concert with the dean and the Provost, shall establish and publish specific criteria for promotion in that unit. These criteria may be changed by the faculty of the unit from time to time with the approval of the dean and the Provost. The Provost's approval of the revised criteria shall indicate a date on which they become effective. The revised criteria for promotion shall apply to all faculty in the unit beginning with the academic year following the effective date. These statements of criteria determine the emphasis placed on the various areas of faculty activity, subject to the following conditions:

TENURE - Reword the fourth paragraph of Section 3.7.4 as follows (additions are shown by underlining and deletions by strikeovers):

Each academic unit, with the participation and approval of the dean and the Provost, shall establish and publish specific criteria for evaluating faculty performance in that unit, so long as those criteria are in accord with this policy. These criteria may be changed by the faculty of the unit from time to time with the approval of the dean and the Provost. The Provost's approval of the revised criteria shall indicate a date on which they become effective. The revised criteria shall apply to all faculty in the unit appointed to the tenure-track after the effective date. Untenured faculty in the tenure-track on the effective date shall be subject to the revised criteria in instances where the changes affect only the process by which the unit ascertains the quality of individual faculty performance. When the revisions involve changes in the quality of faculty performance required for granting tenure, faculty already in the tenure-track shall remain subject to the previous criteria unless these faculty consent to the new criteria by written statement.

The University of Oklahoma

12-86 (APPENDIX III)

OFFICE OF ADMISSIONS AND RECORDS
1000 Asp Avenue, Room 127
Norman, Oklahoma 73019

TO: Dr. Frank E. Horton, President
University of Oklahoma

FROM: Professor Helga Madland, Chair
Academic Program Council, Norman Campus

DATE: September 23, 1986

SUBJECT: Proposed Changes in the Charge of the Academic Program Council

At the September 16, 1985, meeting of the Academic Program Council, changes in the charge of the Council were proposed and recommended for approval. These changes were later discussed during a meeting of the Faculty Senate, but no action was taken. Professor Penny Hopkins, Chair, Norman Campus Faculty Senate, has informed me that the proposed changes should be forwarded to you for your recommendation, which would then be sent to the Faculty Senate.

The proposed changes in the charge are as follows:

1. Change in the name from Academic Program Council to Academic Programs Council.

2. State that the Council will "Serve as advisor to the President, Provost, and Faculty Senate...." to conform with actual practice.

3. Delete the provision for an annual review of programs in Continuing Education, since another body of the Faculty Senate is now performing this function.

4. Add the Vice Provost for Instructional Services and the Editor of Academic Bulletins as ex officio members of the Council.

5. Change of "Administrative and Physical Resources Council" to "Campus Planning Council" to conform to the current name of the council.

6. Change of non-members being "co-opted" for subcommittees to being "appointed" for such subcommittees.

7. Change of student terms from 1 year to 2 years with 1/2 retiring each year.

The Council is currently operating under a subcommittee concept, with three subcommittees, (1) curricula, (2) courses, and (3) instruction. If further information is needed, we will be happy to provide it.