

JOURNAL OF THE FACULTY SENATE (Norman campus)
 The University of Oklahoma
 Regular session - February 9, 1987 - 3:30 p.m.
 Conoco Auditorium, Neustadt Wing, Bizzell Memorial Library

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

PRESENT: Aly, Bell, Brown, Caldwell, Canter, Childress, Cohen, Crowley, Curtis, Devine, Dietrich, Economou, Eisenhart, Eliason, Emanuel, Fagan, Faibisoff, Foster, Frech, Harper, Harris, Herstand, Hill, Hopkins, Horrell, Johnson, Knehans, Kudrna, Kuriger, Kutner, Lee, Lewis, Livesey, Madland, Magid, Magrath, Mennig, Morgan, Parker, Poland, Rogers, Shambaugh, Spaeth, B. Taylor, K. Taylor, Tepker, Wallace

PSA representatives: Laquer, Weddle

UOSA representatives: Goodspeed, Sharpe, Solomon

Liaison, Women's Caucus: Norton

ABSENT: Bert, Palmer, Tobias, Tompkins, Wiggins

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Announcements:	
New Senator, Michael Devine.....	2
Program Review Panel.....	2
Actions taken by the Administration on Senate recommendations:	
Change in membership of Patent Advisory Committee.....	2
✓ Revisions to policy concerning changes in criteria.....	2
Revision to paragraph describing Provost's evaluation form.....	2
Senate Executive Committee Report:	
✓ Senate Bill 26.....	2
Honors Program.....	2
Evaluation of administrators.....	2
Oklahoma Higher Education Task Force Report.....	2
Legislative Liaison.....	2
Focus on Excellence.....	3
Committee on Committees Report.....	3
Maternity Leave Policy.....	3
Expanded grading scale.....	3
✓ Energy Center Study Group Report.....	4
✓ Tobacco Policy.....	5
✓ Indirect Costs Committee Report.....	5
Auxiliary Enterprises Committee Report.....	5
Statement by OUHSC Faculty Senate Chair re. College of Dentistry.....	6
Telephone System Report.....	6
Congratulatory Resolution.....	7
Resolution on electronic I.D. system.....	7

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

The minutes of the regular session of January 12, 1987, were approved.

ANNOUNCEMENTS

Professor John Fagan (Electrical Engineering) was elected to complete the 1986-89 term of Professor Robert Mulholland (EECS) on the Faculty Senate, representing the College of Engineering.

The newly elected Student Congress representatives to the Faculty Senate are Lisa Goodspeed, Lori Ann Sharpe, and Shellie Solomon.

The additional faculty members nominated for the program review panel (see 12/86 Journal, page 2 and 1/87 Journal, pages 2 and 6) are Professors Jeff Kimpel (Meteorology) and Robert Petry (Physics and Astronomy).

ACTIONS TAKEN BY THE ADMINISTRATION ON SENATE RECOMMENDATIONS

Change in membership of Patent Advisory Committee (see 9/86 Journal, page 6): Approved. Professor Michael McInerney (Botany and Microbiology) was selected to fill the added faculty position.

Revisions to policy concerning departmental changes in criteria for evaluation, tenure, and promotion (see 12/86 Journal, page 5): Approved.

Revisions to paragraph in Faculty Handbook describing the Provost's evaluation form (see 1/87 Journal, page 5): Approved.

SENATE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE REPORT

The Executive Committee made inquiries about Oklahoma Senate Bill 26, which seemed to contain some provisions affecting TIAA-CREF. Currently, modifications are being proposed by the OU Administration to clarify the wording so that there is no ambiguity in the meaning and that TIAA-CREF will not be jeopardized.

The Executive Committee met with Provost Wadlow on February 2. She expressed her appreciation to the Honors Task Force, chaired by Professor David Levy, for its report (a copy is available in the Senate office). Revisions in the honors program are now being implemented by the Provost's office.

The Provost will delay the evaluation of administrators until fall.

During the past month the Senate Executive Committee met with President Horton, OU Regent Imel and the OU Board of Regents. These meetings centered on the Oklahoma Higher Education Task Force report.

The Legislative Liaison program, sponsored by the Faculty Senate, is underway for this year, under the guidance of Professors Tom James (Science and Public Policy) and Paul Tharp (Political Science). Legislators are invited to visit the campus in order to become acquainted with the research and teaching missions of the university.

FOCUS ON EXCELLENCE

Professor Canter focused on the accomplishments of three young faculty in the School of Chemical Engineering and Materials Science:

John Scamehorn: Since coming to OU in 1981, he has received the College of Engineering's award for faculty excellence in research in 1986, been the editor of two books (one with Harwell), published 28 articles, and received funding of \$835,000 in sponsored research.

Jeffrey Harwell: Since coming to OU in 1982, he has won an award for an outstanding dissertation, served as editor for one book (with Scamehorn), published 17 articles, and been awarded \$885,000 in sponsored research. He also has a Master of Divinity degree in pastoral theology.

Edgar O'Rear (who was a Faculty Senate member 1984-86): Since coming to OU in 1981, he has received the college's award for outstanding achievement in teaching in 1984, published 18 articles, and been awarded \$613,000 in sponsored research funding (some individually and some as joint endeavors).

SENATE'S COMMITTEE ON COMMITTEES REPORT

Professor Canter, Chair of the Senate's Committee on Committees, announced that a memo had been sent to members of the Faculty Senate and Chairs/Directors soliciting nominations for the end-of-the-year vacancies on Councils/Committees/Boards. This year a one-page abbreviated version was also sent to all faculty to encourage them to submit nominations to their Chair/Director. Nominations are due in the Senate office by March 6.

MATERNITY LEAVE POLICY

Professor Carol Beesley, Chair of the Senate's Faculty Welfare Committee, explained that President Horton had requested the Faculty Senate to consider substituting a condensed version of the maternity leave policy for the policy approved by the Senate at its April 1986 meeting (see 4/86 Journal, page 3). The President's proposal was referred to the members of the Faculty Welfare Committee, the group that had drafted the Senate's version, and it was their unanimous opinion to recommend adopting the President's version, as they found no substantive difference in the two versions. The motion of the Faculty Welfare Committee to approve the condensed version was approved by the Senate. (The policy is attached as Appendix I.) According to the President's cover memo, he will also be receiving input on this issue from the HSC Faculty Senate, the Employee Executive Council and the Employee Liaison Council.

EXPANDED GRADING SCALE

Professor Hopkins explained that since the last Senate meeting (see 1/87 Journal, page 4), it was learned that, while Provost Wadlow would welcome Senate opinion on expanding the grading scale, she also would like to have the broader opinion of the faculty. Professor Hopkins proposed that the Senate have a vote as to whether to support the document in principle, but there should also be a discussion at the April 16 General Faculty meeting and then a written poll of the general faculty.

Several senators reported the results of polling their colleagues. Professor Kuriger asked who favored changing the grading system, since the faculty in his unit had responded negatively. Professor Kasulis answered that the College of Business had initiated the issue about two years ago based on the grading system the best business schools use (a large percentage of the AAU institutions use an expanded grading scale), what the employers were looking for, and what the faculty were looking for in an evaluation.

Professor Kudrna said the Architecture faculty believed the change could increase accuracy and equity by making more of a distinction between grades, for instance, between a C+ and a C-. Professor Eliason said his experience with an expanded scale was a "headache." He said the faculty already have the option of assigning a plus or minus on the grade sheet (to which the faculty member can refer when writing a recommendation letter for a student); it just doesn't appear on the student's transcript. Senate opinion differed as to whether an expanded scale would lead to grade inflation and whether it was a compelling reason that the majority of the AAU schools use some form of plus or minus.

Professor Economou suggested simplifying the proposed scale, so that the only change to the present five-step system would be to add a B+ (3.5 points) and a C+ (2.5 points). Professor Kasulis reminded the group that the recommendation asked the Senate to "approve in principle an expanded grading scale employing + and - modifiers to letter grades for all courses on the Norman Campus"; therefore, it would be possible to have a different scale than the one proposed in the report. Professor Lewis pointed out that the faculty would have the option of not assigning pluses and minuses if they didn't want to make that finer distinction. The Senate voted to approve the report in principle, 29 to 15. (The report is attached as Appendix II.)

ENERGY CENTER STUDY GROUP REPORT

Professor Cohen moved to "adopt the report of the Energy Center Study Group as a statement of the mission for the Energy Center and to recommend it to the President of the University for incorporation in the documents describing the program of the Center and the responsibilities of its director." (See 1/87 Journal, page 5.) Professor Devine submitted a friendly amendment to attach an addendum to the report. Professor Kenneth Starling, chair of the study group, said the committee accepted in principle the suggested addendum, but proposed shortening the addendum to read as follows:

While the primary goal of the Energy Center is to enhance research, it also has a significant role to play in education and public service. In university instruction, although the Energy Center would not offer courses itself, the Energy Center Director would encourage and assist faculty in developing interdisciplinary courses encompassing energy technology, economics, and policy. Public service missions of the university in the area of energy should also be encouraged by the Energy Center Director.

Professors Devine and Cohen accepted the wording of the revised addendum. The motion to adopt the report, including the addendum, was approved by the Senate. (The report is attached as Appendix III.)

TOBACCO POLICY

Professor Hopkins said the Employee Executive Council was working on rewriting the proposed tobacco policy (see 1/87 Journal, page 6). A member of the Senate's Faculty Welfare Committee will participate in that process. The vote will be deferred on the issue until the new document is available.

INDIRECT COSTS COMMITTEE REPORT

Professor Leonard Beevers, chair of the joint Budget Council/Faculty Senate/Research Council committee, explained that an ad hoc committee had been created to study the basis for determining the extent of indirect costs, the allocation of those dollars retrieved for indirect costs, and the allocation of funds generated through indirect cost over-realization. The report (distributed at the meeting) mentions that the indirect cost formula (presently 43%) is negotiated with the government, university and NIH and is similar to the rate in the Dallas region to which OU belongs. Currently, \$2.1 million is expected to be generated by indirect costs. That money goes into the revolving fund but is not reallocated back for research efforts. However, last year President Horton allocated \$390,000 in overrealized funds back to the units, a step which the committee supports. The committee recommends that all of the indirect cost money be placed in an identifiable fund to be allocated to faculty research. The funding lost in E&G could be recovered from auxiliary enterprises. Professor Cohen asked if the recommendation took into account that some funds would have to be allocated to the central administration to meet costs. Professor Beevers said it was the intent that all of the funds should be allocated back to research, but that they realized that some funds would have to go to Grants and Contracts and Research Administration. The Senate will vote on this next month. (A copy of the report is available in the Senate office.)

AUXILIARY ENTERPRISES COMMITTEE REPORT

Professor Canter explained that the Senate had voted to undertake a study to explore whether the revenues from auxiliary services and university properties could in some instances be used for educational programs (see 3/86 Journal, page 7). The joint Budget Council/Faculty Senate ad hoc committee examined the policies by which indirect charges are levied against auxiliary accounts, the practice of exempting certain accounts from any kind of indirect charge, and what happens to that money in terms of any kind of internal reallocation within the university system.

The report (distributed at the meeting) is organized into a series of 10 findings and a series of 3 recommendations. Professor Canter called attention to the definition of an auxiliary enterprise operation on page 2, which states that, "while it apparently is not prohibited by law, the auxiliary enterprises should not be called upon to provide support for the educational and general activities of the institution" and on page 3, "Auxiliary enterprises should be charged for a share of general administrative expenses as well as their direct operating expenses, including debt service and provisions for renewal and replacement." He explained that the auxiliary accounts could be divided into 3 types of accounts (page 3). 319 of the 523 accounts are subject to a 2% indirect cost (overhead) charge, which has been in effect since 1972, and over half of the \$969,623 in indirect charges comes from 11 service units. The main reason cited for exempting an account from a charge is a bond issue.

The recommendations are to (1) initiate an immediate study to determine an appropriate indirect cost rate; (2) develop a policy that delineates the rationale for indirect cost rates and incorporates a periodic review; and (3) develop a policy on exemptions. Professor Canter said the committee believes it would be appropriate to use a highly structured system similar to the one used by Grants & Contracts for sponsored research indirect costs in order to establish a rate (which the committee suspects would be higher than the current rate) consistent with what the true indirect cost rates are of auxiliary accounts. Compared with the 43% indirect cost rate for sponsored research, the rate for auxiliaries is very low, although, presumably, the auxiliaries pay for their own utilities, etc. There could be a tiered approach, with the rate varying depending on the type of account.

In answer to Professor Cohen's questions, Professor Canter said the Lloyd Noble Center is an auxiliary, but exempt from an overhead charge because of bonds, and the Athletic Department general revenues are auxiliary accounts and are charged 2%. Recently the administration started reviewing many of the accounts to see if they should be exempt. The Senate will vote on the report next month. (A copy of the report is available in the Senate office.)

STATEMENT BY CHAIR, FACULTY SENATE (OUHSC) CONCERNING GOVERNOR BELLMON'S PROPOSAL TO PHASE OUT THE COLLEGE OF DENTISTRY

Professor Thomas Coury, Chair of the OU Health Sciences Center Faculty Senate and member of the College of Dentistry faculty, explained that one of Governor Bellmon's proposals was to phase out the College of Dentistry at the HSC. He said the HSC takes the stand that Dentistry cannot be phased out without having an adverse effect on the recruitment and retention of students and faculty in the other HSC colleges and on the interaction between the College of Dentistry and the other colleges. Professor Coury said he didn't think there was a true Health Sciences Center anywhere in the nation without all of the disciplines represented. He requested the Norman campus Faculty Senate to support the HSC Faculty Senate's position that the college should not be closed without following the recognized process for program discontinuance. A resolution will be presented at the next Senate meeting.

TELEPHONE SYSTEM REPORT

Professor Alan Nicewander, Chair of the Senate's Faculty Compensation Committee, presented a report (distributed at the meeting) regarding the phones at OU. Approximately 200 faculty phones have been removed by departments this year to save money. In actuality, no money is saved, because the university has to make an annual payment toward the purchase of the system regardless of the number of phones and because it costs the departments (according to the Telecommunications office) about \$50 to disconnect a phone. Professor Nicewander said he believed it was a reasonable expectation that a professional should have a phone. The recommendation of the committee is to transfer the fixed equipment cost (not the long distance cost) of faculty phones from the academic units to University overhead. The report also lists four possible ways to help defray the cost.

Dean Hemenway, College of Arts and Sciences, pointed out that there are about 828 faculty, so the number of faculty phones would constitute less than 16% (not the 15% cited in the report) of the total number of phones in the OU system. Professor Madland asked whether Professor Nicewander knew which college had removed the most phones? Professor Nicewander responded that he assumed it would be Arts & Sciences. The Senate will vote on this next month. (A copy of the report is available in the Senate office.)

CONGRATULATORY RESOLUTION

Professor Kudrna moved for adoption of the following resolution commending President Horton and the OU Regents for voting to divest from companies doing business in South Africa:

CONGRATULATORY RESOLUTION ON DIVESTITURE FROM SOUTH AFRICA

WHEREAS, the complete divestiture of OU funds from all companies doing business in South Africa was recommended by the OU Faculty Senate; and

WHEREAS, on November 20, 1986, OU President Frank E. Horton recommended to the OU Board of Regents that the securities of all companies with operations in South Africa be divested from the Regents' endowment by January 1, 1987 and that stocks of companies doing business in South Africa not be purchased in the future; and

WHEREAS, on the same date, President Horton further recommended the Investment Policy be revised to direct the Investment Advisor not to recommend stock of companies doing business in South Africa; and

WHEREAS, on the same date, the OU Board of Regents unanimously approved these recommendations of President Horton;

BE IT THEREFORE RESOLVED that the University of Oklahoma Faculty Senate heartily commends OU President Frank E. Horton and the entire OU Board of Regents for their actions taken regarding the divestiture of funds from South Africa.

The motion carried, with one dissenting vote.

RESOLUTION ON ELECTRONIC I.D. SYSTEM

Professor Hopkins explained that the Senate had passed a resolution in October 1984 asking for measures to be taken to remedy the counterfeit I.D. problem. She introduced a resolution on behalf of the Senate Executive Committee supporting in principle a new electronic I.D. system being proposed by the Bursar's office for faculty, staff, and students.

WHEREAS: In October 1984, the University of Oklahoma Faculty Senate (Norman campus) passed a resolution requesting that the University administration make changes in the student I.D. system that would increase security and eliminate counterfeit I.D.'s and

WHEREAS: The faculty at O.U. are required to carry from 3 to 4 various I.D. cards;

BE IT THEREFORE RESOLVED that the OU Faculty Senate (Norman campus) supports in principle the establishment of a unified, electronic I.D. system, on the stipulation that it be financed entirely with auxiliary service-generated funds and that it entails no additional personal expenses for present or future faculty, students, or staff.

Mr. David Shirley, Bursar, explained that the proposed I.D. card, initiated to prevent counterfeit I.D.'s, would be non-tamperable, and would have a magnetic strip on the back, which would be read by computer. A portable unit could be taken into exam rooms to check I.D.'s. No E&G funds would be used to pay for the system, because this would replace existing systems and would be financed with auxiliary funds on hand. Fees to users would include a \$10 charge to new students and a charge to replace a lost card, but no other cost to faculty, staff, or students. The students' card could be used as a debit system at Goddard, the University Book Exchange, the Student Union, etc. For faculty and staff, who now have as many as 15 different I.D. cards, the card would replace the parking gate card and eventually the library card and University Club card. With the new system a person would not be able to use a lost gate card to get into the parking lots, since the card could be invalidated when it is reported lost.

Professor Johnson asked how much of a load this would be on the computer. Mr. Shirley said the only time on the main computer would be about 30 minutes in the middle of the night, because the electronic I.D. would operate on a mini system. Some of the senators expressed concern about having one card for everything, with one central record, which would make it possible to keep track of people (e.g. which books were checked out over a period of time, what kinds of purchases were made, when a person was in a particular place, such as the parking lot). Mr. Shirley responded that this would be strictly an accounting record, not a change in any policy; nothing would be added that isn't already on the mainframe computer. Professor Hill asked whether it was necessary to have a resolution, if the administration was already initiating such a plan. Professor Hopkins replied that this was not a fait accompli at this point. There was some confusion about the wording of the resolution, which stated there would be "no additional personal expenses for present or future faculty, students, or staff," whereas Mr. Shirley had said new students would have to pay a \$10 fee. Mr. Shirley explained that new students already pay \$5 for the present I.D., and that cost is expected to go up. Professor Hopkins pointed out that the wording of the resolution came from the Executive Committee and that the Senate could propose some amendment regarding the cost of the card. Professor Economou suggested that a card with multiple uses would pose an even greater challenge to counterfeiters. Professor Aly said he would be willing to support this kind of a system for students only. The resolution failed 21 to 12.

ADJOURNMENT

The meeting adjourned at 5:00 p.m. The next regular session of the Senate will be held at 3:30 p.m., on Monday, March 16, 1987, in the Conoco Auditorium, Doris W. Neustadt Wing, Bizzell Memorial Library.

Sonya Fallgatter
 Sonya Fallgatter
 Administrative Coordinator

Teree E. Foster
 Teree E. Foster
 Secretary

MATERNITY LEAVE

CURRENT WORDING OF SECTION 3.18.2(6) [SICK LEAVE]
OF THE 1981 FACULTY HANDBOOK

Pregnancy in itself is not a disabling condition for any fixed period of time. The granting of sick leave benefits in pregnancy situations is subject only to the same conditions as all other forms of illness and disabilities.

POLICY PROPOSED BY FACULTY WELFARE COMMITTEE
AND APPROVED BY FACULTY SENATE AT ITS APRIL 1986 MEETING

To replace section 3.18.2(6) of the 1981 Faculty Handbook:

Provisions governing pregnancy disability do not differ from policies governing other temporary disabilities. A teaching or non-teaching staff member may opt to continue her normal duties through pregnancy or use accumulated sick leave as needed for prenatal, delivery and post-delivery care while physically unable to perform regular duties.

It is against university policy and federal law for any supervisor to coerce an employee to return to work who is disabled on account of pregnancy. For example, it is not unusual for an individual to be disabled for six (6) weeks, although nothing in this policy should be construed as establishing a minimum or maximum time of pregnancy disability. Pregnancy disability is to be determined in the same manner as all other temporary disabilities as stated in the sick leave policy.

It is the university's policy and federal law that no one shall suffer any penalty, retaliation or other discrimination because she took advantage of the university's disability benefit policy during pregnancy. An employee returning to work after pregnancy disability leave must be treated like any other employee returning from disability leave. For example, consistent with the leave policy described above and in section 3.7.3(g), if a tenure track faculty member takes pregnancy leave, the probationary period prior to a tenure decision may be extended for one year at the written request of the faculty member with the approval of the academic unit, dean and Provost.

An employee who plans to take advantage of the pregnancy disability benefit policy should notify the university as soon as possible, so that appropriate plans can be made.

PRESIDENT HORTON'S PROPOSED CONDENSED VERSION (DECEMBER 1986)

To replace section 3.18.2(6) of the 1981 Faculty Handbook:

Pregnancy disability is to be treated as any other temporary disability. An employee may continue her normal duties through pregnancy or use sick leave as medically required while unable to perform regular duties. Duration of the disability is to be medically determined. No supervisor should coerce an employee to return to work without a medical release. Employees who utilize sick leave for pregnancy disability should suffer no penalty, retaliation or other discrimination.

In accordance with section 3.7.3(g), if a tenure track faculty member takes pregnancy leave, the probationary period prior to a tenure decision may be extended for one year at the written request of the faculty member with approval of the academic unit, dean and Provost.

Report to the Faculty Senate on
Adopting an Expanded Grading Scale

It is recommended (1) that the Senate approve in principle the use of an expanded grading scale employing plus and minus modifiers to letter grades for all courses on the Norman Campus; (2) that the grading scale change be implemented when possible using existing staff; (3) that the numerical level for satisfactory Graduate level work be maintained at 3.0; (4) that when the changeover is made it be applicable overall immediately, "no grandfather clauses." The proposed grading scale with its associated quality points is listed below.

Background. In its May 6, 1985 meeting, the Faculty Senate approved by a vote of 23 to 19 a motion "that an expanded grading scale employing plus and minus be used for 5000 and 6000 level courses (only) on the Norman Campus." This proposal was forwarded to the Interim President Jischke and on July 31, 1985 he reported to the Senate that the administration did not recommend approval of the motion. In a subsequent memorandum of Sept. 9, 1985 Dr. Jischke outlined the administration's reasons for their lack of support for the proposed change. The overall reaction was "more one of not being persuaded that there were sufficient reasons to depart from the existing grading scale for 5000 and 6000 level courses than a litany of reasons why it should not be done." Some specific areas of concern were (a) that undesirable inconsistencies would result from limiting the grading scale to only 5000 and 6000 level courses, e.g., having two different scales on transcripts for persons who took both graduate and undergraduate courses, and (b) having different grading scales for students doing the same work in a class. They also questioned whether it was really possible in many courses to fine tune the grading enough to distinguish between, for example, a B and a B⁻, etc., and whether grading scale change would change what has been an acceptable level of work at the graduate level. Finally, it was noted that there would be practical problems in implementing such a grading scale change within our established computerized grading system.

In January of 1986, Dr. Levy, Chair of the Faculty Senate appointed the present ad hoc Committee "to consider the advantage and disadvantages of such a change (expanding the University's grading scale to include ± modifiers to our present five-step system) and to make a recommendation to the Faculty Senate."

Over the past months we have met a number of times and have (a) gathered information from published reports on grading, (b) obtained current information on grading scale policies at public and private AAU schools, and (c) sought opinions on the proposed changes from the Provost, various Deans, Registrar, and the Student Congress. The pros and cons which emerged during our discussions can be summarized as follows.

Reasons in favor of adopting an expanded grading scale.

1. There is less error in assigning performance level.
2. It is easier for faculty in many areas to give more accurate performance assessments.
3. The expanded scale may encourage students to study harder to try to achieve the next higher half-step, whereas they might not see any hope of achieving a complete step higher.
4. A majority of the more prestigious institutions (i.e., those in AAU) use an expanded grading scale.
5. An expanded grading scale is common in major Business Schools in the country.
6. Employers of Business School Graduates prefer more distinction (discrimination) in grading scales for use in their employee selection.
7. The expanded scale would be helpful in advising students -- one would have a better idea of the overall ability and progress of a student.
8. With the current system it is difficult to make distinctions among individuals in a large group -- to reward strong students and to give clear indications of the performance of weaker students.

Reasons for maintaining the current system.

1. The current system has worked well for many years and since it does not seem to have any major flaws, why change it. ("If it isn't broken, why fix it?").
2. In many courses it is difficult to make the fine distinctions of, for example, B⁺, B, B⁻, etc.
3. Some students may be prompted not to try as hard to do best, since they would only likely fall a small step in grade level by taking it easy.
4. There will be more "borderline" decisions to make with the expanded scale system.

Communications with the current Provost and Deans revealed that none of these administrators had strong feelings for or against the proposal for an expanded grading scale. All felt that if a change in grading scale were to be made, that there would need to be compelling reasons for doing so. The Provost stated that there would have to be evidence that the majority of the faculty supported the change before she would consider approval of the plan and that any change should apply to all parts of the University. Dean Hemenway indicated a personal preference for the current system, "but would abide by the collective wishes of the faculty if they chose an expanded scale."

The Student Congress (April 29, 1986) during Special Orders concluded that they generally "felt that the change was unnecessary because it would not make any significant difference in students' GPA."

Some statistical data was gathered regarding the use of simple letter grades vs. some form of letter grade with ± modifiers. The information is summarized below. The survey published in 1982 by the American Association of Collegiate Registrars and Admission Officers includes data from all types of schools -- 2-year and 4-year colleges, as well as Universities. (A small number of schools using number or number plus letter grades are omitted from the summary below). About 1/3 of all schools in this survey (-1500) use some form of the expanded grading scale. Among public Universities, 68% reported using letter grades only. Twenty-six percent of all responding schools reported making substantial grading scale changes during the 1971-1982 period, the most common change being addition of ± symbols. In a 1971 survey by AARCO, 80% of respondents reported grading changes during the 1965-71 period.

In a survey of AAU schools, carried out by Dr. Kasulis of our Business School, 36 of 54 schools surveyed used the ± scheme and 11 of the 36 had made the change in recent years.

Statistical Information on Use of Expanded vs. Simple Letter Grade Scales

A. Survey of all types of schools in 1982 by Amer. Assoc. of Collegiate Registrars & Admissions Officers.

	<u>Use Simple Letter Grade Only</u>	<u>Use Some Form of ± with Letter Grade</u>
	906	468
B. AAU Public*		
26 Total	13	13
Private**		
28 Total	<u>5</u>	<u>23</u>
Total 54	18	36

*3 changed to ± recently

**8 changes to ± recently

In addition to pedagogical arguments and statistical data, the cost of implementing a change in grading system must be considered and Dr. Milford Messer was asked to make such an assessment for our campus. His report, which is attached, indicates that 8000 person hours would be required to make the programming changes to modify all of the relevant parts of our computerized student information system. This represents a cost of \$168,000. Using existing staff, hence no added cost, it is projected that a grading change could be integrated into our current computerized system in a 2 year period under the following conditions: (a) maintenance to the existing system

would need to be slowed considerably, (b) implementation of the new Advising/Degree Audit system would need to be slowed (could extend by 3 years the 5-year project that is now in its 2nd year of implementation), and (c) enhancements to other areas of the Student Information system would need to be curtailed.

After consideration of all the above, the motion presented at the beginning of this report passed by a vote of 3 to 1, with 2 members absent.

The committee's view is that the implementation of the new Advising/Degree Audit system should not be slowed down now and hence implementation of a grading scale change should be delayed for a few years. We recommend that in a couple of years a mechanism be set up to assess faculty opinion on a broad scale to meet the Provost's expressed requirements for evidence of broad faculty support for the change.

~~Attachments~~

- ~~(1) Correspondence leading to the establishment of this committee~~
- ~~(2) 1982 AARCO report on Grades and Grading~~
- ~~(3) Dr. Messer's report on cost estimates on implementing a grading change.~~

Respectively Submitted, Jan. 12, 1987.

Ad hoc Committee to Consider an Expanded Grading Scale

Committee Members: Dr. Francis Schmitz, Chairman
Dr. Jon Bredeson
Ms. Terry Carr
Dr. Gwenn Davis
Ms. Amy Hickey
Dr. Jack Kasulis

Proposed Grading Scale with associated quality points:

A	=	4.0	C+	=	2.30	F	=	0
A-	=	3.70	C	=	2.0			
B+	=	3.30	C-	=	1.70			
B	=	3.0	D+	=	1.30			
B-	=	2.70	D	=	1.0			
			D-	=	0.70			

Study Group Report on
The Growth and Priorities of the Energy Center

SUMMARY REPORT

The Energy Center study group was established by the Faculty Senate to provide advice on the direction of growth of the Energy Center and recommend priorities relating to its funding. The group considered a) the faculty's understanding of the mission and scope of the Energy Center; b) specific faculty concerns about university funding and support for high-quality energy research; and c) the faculty's interest in the administration of the Energy Center, particularly in relation to the search for and selection of a Director for the Center. A number of specific recommendations and opinions are presented to the Faculty Senate with the unanimous support of the study group; these are underlined in this section of the report.* The study group did not debate arguments for or against building and furnishing the Energy Center. Recognizing that the structure is already partially completed, we disposed of this topic simply by urging the university administration, faculty and staff to cooperate intelligently to complete and equip the Energy Center building for academic use.

In the remainder of this paper, the phrase 'Energy Center' will denote the general concept of an energy research institute for the University of Oklahoma and the State. In our opinion, the primary purpose of the Energy Center should be to promote and support faculty research that has the goal of meeting future energy needs of the state and the nation. Statements by the President and other top administrators supporting this viewpoint will help overcome the prevailing feeling of ignorance among faculty as regards the mission and future direction of the Energy Center. In our opinion, we should not be overly concerned now about defining the fields, basic or applied, that should be included as energy research areas on the Norman campus. Although it would be naive not to recognize the importance of fossil fuel research on our campus and in the State of Oklahoma, it would be even greater folly to define energy research so narrowly as to exclude research in other fields where novel solutions to our energy needs may originate. This position should make it clear that Energy Center research is not restricted to that performed within the physical confines of the Energy Center building. In fact, we believe that an emphasis on interdisciplinary, interdepartmental research is likely to be very productive.

A major need of our faculty is consistent and continuing university assistance in preparing major research proposals. A competent Energy Center Director, a person sharing the faculty's goals in relation to energy research, should work diligently to obtain and allocate money to develop viable cooperative research programs. At

*Supplementary information is presented in three appendices. Appendix A presents some notes on the early history of energy research at OU. Appendix B presents discussion of some facets of the Energy Center scope. Appendix C presents an example of a potential area for interdisciplinary energy research.

the same time, the Energy Center and the university must assist faculty members in developing their own individual research programs, either with or without the collaboration of faculty in other disciplines.

To accomplish the goal of fostering worthwhile energy research we recommend that the Energy Center acquire and allocate funds to: a) support the energy research of individual faculty and groups of faculty so as to enhance their ability to attract outside research funding; b) identify and explore scientific areas in which new energy research might be undertaken, given our collective talents and resources; c) aid faculty and support personnel in preparing large-scale proposals for energy research.

A key first step toward achieving the goals enumerated in the previous paragraph will be the selection of an outstanding research scholar to serve as Director of the Energy Center. We urge that the search committee, the administration, and the University of Oklahoma Regents act swiftly and skillfully to find a director who has had a successful personal research career in at least one of the basic areas of science and engineering related to energy. In addition, the Director must a) appreciate the energy needs of the State of Oklahoma and the nation and understand the key role academic research can play in meeting these needs; b) know and understand the activities of funding agencies, foundations, corporations, and other institutions that may provide support for and need the results of our energy-related research; c) understand the capabilities, needs, and biases of faculty in relation to their ability to perform important fundamental research. To insure that these goals are achieved we recommend that an advisory group composed principally of research faculty and functioning analogously to the Research Council be established to advise the Energy Center director.

Most importantly, the Director must comprehend that energy research at the University of Oklahoma is and should be preeminently faculty research; that the value of this research will reflect primarily the intelligence and intensity of faculty effort; and that the major role of the Energy Center will be to emphasize and augment the importance of energy research, while not opposing in any way faculty research efforts in other fields. Given the sincere acceptance of these views and goals by the university administration, the faculty should enthusiastically support the broad concept of the Energy Center functioning as a major energy research institution.

Submitted to the Faculty Senate

by

Kenneth E. Starling, Chairman
Sherril D. Christian
Ryan E. Doezema
Michael H. Engel
Jeffrey H. Harwell
Roy M. Knapp

Appendix A

SOME NOTES ON OU'S HISTORY IN ENERGY

The story of the invention and development of reflection seismography illustrates many of the necessary ingredients for a successful research center: top notch researchers, generous financial support, modern curricula and degree programs, broad-based interdisciplinary cooperation, close ties with industry, and cultivation of a network of alumni relations.

Reflection seismography was born just after World War I. Its birth and development are related by J. Clarence Karcher in a short book entitled "The Reflection Seismograph -- its Invention and Use in the Discovery of Oil and Gas Fields." Karcher, a 1916 (BS) graduate of OU, developed the concept of the reflection seismograph while a graduate student in physics on the East Coast. At OU, Karcher had majored in physics but also took all the courses necessary for a EE major. Both he and former OU Physics Department chair, William P. Haseman, were involved in artillery ranging work using acoustic and seismic methods during the war and, because of their Oklahoma backgrounds, had a mutual interest in oil prospecting. Their collaboration continued after the war and grew to include other OU faculty and graduates: D.W. Ohern, chair of the Geology Department, and his associates, Irving Perrine and William C. Kite. By June 1921, the concept of reflection seismology had matured to the testing stage. The first field observations were made on June 4 by a party consisting of Karcher, Haseman, Perrine, and Kite in a stream bed just west of Belle Isle in Oklahoma City. Although these and subsequent tests were successful and a new company, the Geological Engineering Company, was formed, the program was abandoned for lack of funds in January of 1922, as the oil price was falling to a low of 15 cents per barrel. It was not until 1925, when oil was back to over \$3.00 per barrel, that the Amerada Petroleum Corporation agreed to finance the research program to the tune of at least \$100,000 per year for three years. The financing was arranged by Everette De Golyer, a 1911 (BA) alumnus and Vice President of Amerada, who was contacted through Harold Bozell, director of the School of Electrical Engineering when Karcher was at OU. The funding guaranteed the success of reflection seismography: Karcher and De Golyer formed the Geophysical Research Corporation which became the largest operator of refraction seismograph equipment in the U.S. A brief history of the method by former OU physics professor William Schriever (Geophysics 17, 936 (1952)) concludes that perhaps reflection seismography should be called "the Oklahoma Method of seismograph prospecting because it was developed in Oklahoma by Oklahomans nearly all of whom were alumni or former faculty members of the University of Oklahoma."

The Karcher endowment is a tangible benefit of reflection seismography at OU. The spirit and inspiration engendered by such

successes are surely of equal importance, however, and reflection seismography is exemplary in this regard. The importance of interdisciplinary cooperation, so graphically illustrated by the story of reflection seismography, led Homer Dodge, Physics Professor and Graduate Dean, to establish with the cooperation of the Engineering Dean, James Felgar, the world's first school of Engineering Physics in 1924. Histories and descriptions of Engineering Physics at OU have been given by Dodge and St. John (Homer L. Dodge, American Physics Teacher, 4, 167 (1936); Robert M. St. John, The Physics Teacher, 14, 486 (1976)). Today it is known as the Engineering Physics Program of the College of Engineering. Nuclear Engineering, Geophysics, and Meteorology all began within Engineering Physics.

The year 1924 was a banner year for energy research on campus. In September 1924 the School of Petroleum Engineering was established with Harry C. George as head. In March of the same year, the Oklahoma Geological Survey, having been abolished the previous year, was re-established with Charles N. Gould as director. Also established in 1924 was the Southwest Gas Measurement Short Course, now the International School of Hydrocarbon Measurement, the oldest and largest school of its type in the world. (It is also interesting to note that, as detailed in Gittinger's book, "The University of Oklahoma--History of Fifty Years 1892-1942," also in 1924 the School of Business was completing its first year and the School of Fine Arts became the College of Fine Arts).

In 1941 it was again Homer Dodge who initiated a key step in making OU a research university. Following an idea credited to Josef Brandt, who later became OU President, Graduate-Dean Dodge created the Research Institute to aggressively seek and manage research funding. The history of the Institute is recounted by George Lynn Cross in his recently published book, "The University of Oklahoma Research Institute 1941-1973." As pointed out by Cross, many of the University's most eminent researchers, including J.R. Nielsen and C.M. Slipevich, had their research funding administered by the Research Institute and contributed greatly to its success. Many prominent Oklahomans, Karcher and De Golyer among them, served on the Board of Directors of the Institute.

These fascinating and inspirational historical notes serve as background against which we view the research function of the Energy Center. Surely we must not be less bold in our vision than those who built the research function of the University in its first 100 years!

Appendix B

SOME FACETS OF THE ENERGY CENTER SCOPE

It is natural to question what can be done through Energy Center programs that cannot be done through existing OU programs. Although in principle, virtually anything that might be done through the Energy Center programs could be done by other means within OU, historically there are certain activities which (1) are not clearly the responsibility of any one university area, and/or (2) lack focus, (3) lack an incentive/reward system, (4) lack support.

An historical example illustrates the situations mentioned above. In the spring and summer of 1979, a proposal was prepared for submission in the Department of Energy University Coal Research Laboratory Program. According to the DOE proposal guidelines, the proposal was to detail a focused, long term, interdisciplinary program in coal research that would be a multimillion dollar project. The area of responsibility for guiding the preparation of the proposal was unclear: should the responsibility for preparation lie with an individual, a department, an organized research unit, a college, the Office of Research Administration, the Provost Office or elsewhere? Ultimately, the establishment of a volunteer proposal preparation group by the Vice Provost for Research Administration, with Professor C.M. Slipevich heading the group, was the means for not allowing this opportunity to reply to the DOE "Request for Proposal" to "fall in a crack." Unfortunately, major proposal opportunities have been lost for lack of proposal preparation, in some cases because a responsible area for preparation of the specific proposal was not identified. We believe the Energy Center can play the role of responsible area for major university proposals in energy areas. This role would be principally to bring together the best individuals in the area of focus of the proposal, through an appropriate incentive/reward system, and with appropriate support for the effort involved.

In the proposal under discussion, it was found that although coal related research was in progress in many areas across the campus, the University of Oklahoma did not have a focused program in coal research. Also, to submit a proposal with a coherent program involving well focused objectives, a number of program projects had to be proposed for which there were no faculty members currently working in the project areas. It was obvious that if there had been greater interaction between faculty from diverse parts of the campus prior to the proposal preparation step, OU would have been positioned better to propose a focused program. We believe that if an appropriate incentive/reward mechanism is used, the Energy Center can play the important role of increasing interactions between faculty in important energy areas.

As the effort progressed on the proposal under discussion, some of the individuals involved lost interest. A major incentive for faculty to work on a major interdisciplinary proposal is the inclusion in the proposal of projects in that faculty member's research area. If the chances of this inclusion are diminished, then the individual's interest diminishes proportionately. This is especially true when the individual is not given proper credit for the effort expended in preparing the proposal. Worse still is the instance in which significant effort occurs in the summer when the faculty member's salary is not paid by the University. Since most major proposals to federal agencies are due in the fall, faculty are perennially faced with preparing such proposals in the summer without salary from the University. We believe the Energy Center can solve these problems by implementing an appropriate incentive/reward system for activities such as preparation of major university proposals in energy areas.

The preparation group considered a plan to continue meetings beyond the proposal submission date for a period of a year or more, with the goal of developing improved proposals for subsequent submissions until OU was successful in obtaining support as a DOE University Coal Research Laboratory. It was felt that some exploratory research could be started which would "fill holes" in the first proposal, create camaraderie, and improve the focus of the next proposal. But such an approach would have required directed support which historically has not been provided within OU. We believe the Energy Center can provide directed support for such special energy related activities.

In summary, the activities related to preparation of the DOE University Coal Research Laboratory proposal, in the spring and summer of 1979, led to a proposal which, by virtue of the "tailing off" of interest on the part of the proposal preparation group, was prepared almost single handedly by one person, Professor C.M. Sliepcevich, who himself was not paid by the University during his peak period of effort in the summer months. And, although the proposal was well written, the lack of an appropriate incentive/reward system had caused the University to fall short of its potential for a coherent focused coal research program which would have been truly worthy of support.

Although only one example has been presented above, and although the scope of the Energy Center will evolve as the Energy Center progresses, we believe the Energy Center can meet important needs at OU if the following facets are included in its scope. The Energy Center should (1) be the responsible area for major energy related activities, (2) provide the forum in which a proper focus in individual energy areas can be attained, (3) provide an appropriate incentive/reward system to insure interest and follow-through in energy related activities, and (4) provide an appropriate framework and methodology for support for promising energy related activities.

Appendix C

AN EXAMPLE OF A POTENTIAL AREA FOR INTERDISCIPLINARY RESEARCH

University of Oklahoma faculty who are involved in energy-related research represent a broad spectrum of scientific interests. It is possible, however, that there may be some common grounds upon which we may develop informal (or, with time, formal) associations that could benefit our personal research endeavors and provide an organized, cohesive infrastructure with respect to establishing the Center's initial goals and objectives for the scientific community. To avoid the many problems and resistance that commonly result from attempting to 'fit square pegs into round holes,' it will be to our advantage to identify common threads that, to some extent, represent portions of the current research interests of as many individuals as possible.

One such energy-related area that is currently of great interest (academic, industrial and government) is the phenomenon of fluid flow, i.e. migration, in the earth's subsurface. With this in mind, Mike Engel prepared and distributed a questionnaire in the spring of 1986 to begin to assess the interests of O.U. faculty in migration research, as well as to solicit other areas of energy-related research that might be of broad interest on campus. There were responses from 28 individual faculty members, representing 10 departmental or research units and five colleges or similar administrative areas. The areas of interest of these 28 responses are diverse, including not only geophysics, geology, reservoir rock and fluid characterization, fluid migration, simulation, production and enhanced recovery, but also mathematical theory. From this survey it is evident that a broad base of interdisciplinary interest and ongoing research in the area of migration already exists on the O.U. campus. Interdepartmental interactions of faculty working in this area are, however, at the present time, extremely limited.

Given the current interest and funding opportunities for migration research, it would be unfortunate if an attempt is not made to bring people together who are currently working (or interested) in this area to exchange ideas and set the groundwork for the development of an integrated program that could eventually be presented to private and federal funding agencies. While many of us have obtained limited to moderate funding for our specific areas of migration research, we are not taking advantage of our combined experience. This is also the case with other areas of energy research on campus and there are a number of broad, interdisciplinary areas, such as materials science and surface science, which impact significant groups of OU faculty.

Having identified a research area of significant interdisciplinary interest, the next step would be to bring together faculty working in this area to discuss the development of a program and the preparation of proposals for appropriate agencies. Under the

present circumstances, it is not entirely clear how to go about this. The organization of a major, interdisciplinary research effort requires a significant amount of time, money and mutual commitment by the faculty and the administration. No single faculty member with an active research program can, at present, afford to neglect his or her 'own house' for the betterment of the community. It is possible, however, that an Energy Center Director with a strong background in interdisciplinary research may be able to develop a workable strategy to exploit the strengths of our faculty and turn interdisciplinary dreams into realities.

ADDENDUM TO ENERGY CENTER REPORT

While the primary goal of the Energy Center is to enhance research, it also has a significant role to play in education and public service. In university instruction, although the Energy Center would not offer courses itself, the Energy Center Director would encourage and assist faculty in developing interdisciplinary courses encompassing energy technology, economics, and policy. Public service missions of the university in the area of energy should also be encouraged by the Energy Center Director.

SEMESTER REPORTS

FALL 1986

ACADEMIC PROGRAM COUNCIL (Norman)

ATHLETICS COUNCIL (University)

BUDGET COUNCIL (Norman)

CAMPUS PLANNING COUNCIL (Norman)

COUNCIL ON CONTINUING EDUCATION AND PUBLIC SERVICE (Norman)

COUNCIL ON FACULTY AWARDS AND HONORS (University)

PUBLICATIONS BOARD (University)

RESEARCH COUNCIL (Norman)

Distributed by the Faculty Senate Office
University of Oklahoma (Norman campus)
February 1987

ACADEMIC PROGRAM COUNCIL REPORT

Fall 1986

Submitted by Helga Madland, Chair

The Academic Program Council met four times during this period (September 15, October 20, November 17, and December 15) with the meetings lasting approximately two hours. The Council regularly meets the third Monday of each month at 3:30 p.m.

The Council decided that a quorum would be a simple majority of the entire Council--eight voting members, including the chair. It was also determined that at the May meeting each year the Council would see if, in the absence of most members, it was necessary to select a subcommittee to conduct business during the summer.

The Council approved the following policy on attendance--if a member misses four meetings (Council and/or subcommittee), he or she will no longer be a member of the Council, and the Faculty Senate or the Student Association will be notified that a new member must be selected.

The Council was divided into three subcommittees--Instruction (Professor Mellgren, chair); Curriculum (Professor Petry, chair); and Courses (Professor Ayres, chair).

The curriculum subcommittee studied the following proposals with the assistance of departmental representatives, and made recommendations to the Council. The Council made the following recommendations to the Provost:

1. That the proposed changes in the requirements for an additional bachelor's degree in the College of Arts and Sciences be approved.
2. That the proposed second track for the Master of Arts degree in journalism and mass communication be approved.
3. That the proposed change in the transfer credit regulations for the College of Business Administration be approved.

Several substantive recommendations by the Council await administrative action.

The subcommittee on courses studied all course requests and reported to the Council. The Council approved 11 course additions, 4 course deletions and 21 course changes.

The Council revised the two forms (Course Request and Statement of Content of a New Course) used for course changes and/or course additions.

Provost Wadlow spoke to the Council at the October meeting on activities taking place on the campus.

Professor Flanigan, Department of English, attended the December meeting to discuss the writing across the curriculum project. It was decided that the subcommittee on instruction should review the material on the writing project and prepare a report for the Faculty Senate.

Faculty members of the Council were: Frances Ayres, Accounting; Thomas Gallaher, Education; Beverly Joyce, University Libraries; Joakim Laguros, Civil Engineering and Environmental Science; Helga Madland, Modern Languages, Literatures and Linguistics; Roger Mellgren, Psychology; Robert Petry, Physics and Astronomy; Albert Smouse, Education; and Gordon Uno, Botany and Microbiology. Student members were: Ben Akande, Bob Goodspeed, Marilyn Gottshall and Rustom Irani. Two students were dropped from Council membership because of absences. All members are from the Norman campus.

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

Helga Madland
Chair, Academic Program Council

REPORT OF THE ATHLETICS COUNCIL
FOR FALL SEMESTER 1986
Submitted by Ronald L. Coleman, Chair

The Athletic Council's activities and concerns begin with actions at the standing committee level and then are brought to the council as a whole (see attached for committee assignments). Items for consideration by the standing committees come from the Athletic Department, student government, faculty and the concerned community. The Council as a whole then acts on the Committee reports and recommendations.

The Council met four times during the Fall 1986 Semester and the following represents a summary of the actions taken by the Council.

I. Awards

The Athletic Council approved awards in the following sports: 1985-86 Men's Basketball; 1986 Women's Softball; 1986 Men's Outdoor Track; 1986 Women's Outdoor Track; 1986 Spring Baseball; 1985-86 addition to Wrestling; and corrections to 1983 and 1984 Baseball.

II. Scheduling

During the semester the following coaches appeared before the Council requesting special consideration: Coach Grost, Men's Golf and Coach Ludvigson, Women's Golf. These coaches were requesting schedule considerations to exceed the 10-day team class cut council policy. Exceptions to the class cut limitation were allowed based on the teams past GPA record and with the stipulation that grades for the semester for those teams exceeding the 10 class cut days be reported to the Council.

The Council amended its class cut policy to define "schedule" as the actual athletic event plus travel time to and from the event, and, further, no schedule infringing on Stop Day will be approved.

The Council recommended against an ESPN request to move the OU-Florida State men's basketball game to a time conflicting with the Fall final exam schedule.

Schedules approved for 1986-87 included: Fall Baseball; Women's Basketball; Fall Men's Golf; Fall Women's Golf; Men's Gymnastics; Women's Gymnastics; Fall Softball; Fall Men's Tennis; Fall Women's Tennis; Men's Cross-Country Track; Women's Cross-Country Track; Fall Volleyball; Wrestling; Men's Indoor Track; Women's Indoor Track; Men's Basketball; and Men's Spring Tennis.

III. Personnel

During the summer and fall semester 1986, personnel hired were Robert Clark (Assistant Women's Basketball Coach) and Donnie Duncan (Director of Athletics).

IV. Academic Advisory

The Council has continued monitoring academic performance and graduation rates by sport for student athletes. Those teams whose GPA's exceed the average for the University receive a letter commending academic performance; those teams whose GPA's are below the University average receive a letter expressing concern. Conferences have been held with coaches to share information concerning performance predictors which maybe useful during the recruiting and retention process. An extension data set has been developed and maintained to assist this predicting and retention process. A primary emphasis of this council has been to stimulate and emphasize the academic performance of the student-athlete. Overall, team GPA's are improving one a year-to-year basis.

The Council's class cut policy and scheduling policy is unique among the Big 8 conference and one of few among the NCAA. The Council has continued to request that the Big 8 not schedule conference events e.g., Big 8 Conference Championships, during our final exam week. This continues to be a problem due to a 3 week overlap of final exam among the 8 members. The Council maintains its position that student-athletes whose final exams are unable to be otherwise arranged must meet their academic responsibilities first.

V. Spirit Squad

The position of Spirit Squad Coordinator has been filled by Meredith Wilber.

VI. Budget

This committee is not yet ready to submit its formal report to the Council. Items of discussion during the fall semester have included Skyboxes, Radio and Television Contracts and Organe Bowl finances.

VII. Other Business

A wide variety of other matters have received council attention, these have included, potential violations of NCAA and Big 8 rules, effects of OU-Georgia vs NCAA 1984 lawsuit concerning TV arrangements, long-range space and facility planning, football stadium renovations, skyboxes, student priority for football tickets, legislative football tickets, and an Athletic Heritage Center.

ATHLETICS COUNCIL (UNIVERSITY)
1986-87

<u>Name</u>		<u>Nominated By</u>	<u>Term**</u>
Ron Coleman, Chair	(Public Health)	Faculty Senate	1984-87
Terry Robertson	(Finance)	Faculty Senate	1984-87
Claude Duchon	(Meteorology)	Faculty Senate	1984-87
Michael Flanigan	(English)	Faculty Senate	1984-87
Steve Hamilton	(Dentistry (Alternate))	Faculty Senate	1984-87
Maryellen Cameron	(Geology/Geophysics)	Faculty Senate	1985-88
Gregory Kunesh	(Drama)	Faculty Senate	1985-88
Steve Ballard	(Political Science (Alternate))	Faculty Senate	1986-89
Joanna Rapf	(English (Alternate))	Faculty Senate	1986-89
William Gaddis	(Alumnus)	Alumni Association	1986-87
Lanny Ross	(Alumnus)	Alumni Association	1986-88
Donald Stehr	(Alumnus (Alternate))	Alumni Association	1986-88
Myrna Carney	(Ctr. for Instructional Research)	EEC	1985-87
Kelly Curry	(Physical Plant (Alternate))	EEC	1985-87
Paula Rubenstein	(Student) (non voting)	UOSA	1985-87
Karl Means	(Student)	UOSA	1986-88
John Lambeth	(Student)	UOSA	1986-88
Donnie Duncan	(Athletic Director)	Ex Officio, non voting	
Robert E. Smith	(Asst. Athletic Director)	Ex Officio, non voting	
Daniel Gibbens	(Faculty Representative to the Big 8)	Ex Officio, non voting	

STANDING COMMITTEES OF THE ATHLETICS COUNCIL
1986-87

AWARDS COMMITTEE

Chair: William Gaddis

Members: JoAnna Rapt, Paula Rubenstein, Lanny Ross

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

BUDGET COMMITTEE

Chair: Claude Duchon

Members: Gregory Kunesh, Steve Ballard, Kelley Curry, William Gaddis

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

PERSONNEL COMMITTEE

Chair: Ronald Coleman

Members: Michael Flanigan, Gregory Kunesh, Donald Stehr

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

SCHEDULE COMMITTEE

Chair: Terry Robertson

Members: Carl Means, Myrna Carney, Steve Ballard

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

SPIRIT SQUADS COMMITTEE

Chair: Carl Means

Members: Claude Duchon, Kelley Curry, Lanny Ross

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

ACADEMIC PROGRESS COMMITTEE

Chair: Myrna Carney

Members: Mary Ellen Cameron, John Lambeth, Terry Robertson

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

February 9, 1987

REPORT OF THE BUDGET COUNCIL
FOR FALL SEMESTER 1986
Submitted by Stephen Whitmore, Chair

The Budget Council met eight times during the semester, at four regular monthly meetings, two special meetings, and two study sessions. In addition, members served on various subcommittees of the Council, and on joint committees with other Councils, as described below.

At a special meeting on November 6, President Horton met with the Council to present the Budget Preparation Guidelines for 1987-88. The Guidelines are detailed and explicit. From the budget units to the Presidential level, they require contingency planning for the next fiscal year, and long-range planning for the two ensuing years. The Council is gratified to have the new policy in place, and anticipates taking its full part in review and recommendation during the Spring semester.

In response to a request from Provost Wadlow, the Council spent considerable time trying to determine how to fund a general salary and wage increase next year, in the event that there is no increase in our state appropriation. Our consensus was that the reallocation that would be necessary would not be advisable at this time. The Provost expressed agreement with our conclusion. We also held a special meeting with the Provost to discuss the questionnaire from Governor-elect Bellmon regarding the University budget.

Members of the Council served on two joint committees, one with the Faculty Senate to study Auxiliary Enterprises and Service Units, the other with the Senate and Research Council to study indirect costs charged to externally funded grants and contracts. These committees will report to the Council and Senate this Spring.

Much of our effort this Fall has been spent trying to make the Council a better informed, more effective source of advice to the President. Budget Director Jackson conducted a study session on "Budget Basics," especially for new members, early in October. A subcommittee of the Council on "Information," chaired by Michal Gray, has been charged with selecting and assembling current and historical information on University finances which will be useful to the Council. We have formed five "topical subcommittees," to keep the Council informed of the overall flow of University funds for research, extension, capital expenses, auxiliary enterprises and service units, and from private funding. In addition, we have formed a permanent "action team" of senior members of the Council to serve as an avenue of rapid communication with the Administration.

The Council appreciates the work of the Budget Office and Budget Director Jan Jackson in supporting the activities of the Council.

COUNCIL MEMBERS:

Faculty Senate: Stephen Whitmore, Chair (Physics & Astronomy), Glenn Dryhurst (Chemistry), Malcolm Morris (Marketing), Larry Canter (Civil Engr. & Envir. Sci.), Lynda Kaid (Communication), E.L. Lancaster (Music), Jon Bredeson (Elec. Engr. & Comp. Sci.), Lenore Clark (University Libraries), Andy Magid (Mathematics)

EEC: Ruth McKinnis (Personnel Services), Michal Gray (Law Center Admin.), Sara Nixon (Student Development), Don Huntington (Physical Plant)

UOSA: Amy Hickey, John Conwell, Bob Besse, Melinda Bennett

Ex-officio, non voting: Joan Wadlow (Provost), Arthur Elbert (VP Admin. Affairs)

Report of the Campus Planning Council

Fall 1986

Submitted by: Adel A. Aly, Chair

The Council met on the first Thursday of every month (September, October, November and December). In addition, one working session was held.

The major topic addressed by the Council during the Fall semester is the classroom maintenance problem and setting policy, procedure and strategy of implementing a preventative maintenance system for classrooms on campus.

On the September 11, 1986 meeting, several issues were discussed to plan for the 1986-1987 activities. At the October 2, 1986 meeting the Council established a committee for naming new buildings as set forth by the Regent's "Guidelines for Naming Buildings". Both V.P.'s Burr and Elbert addressed the Council about guidelines used in the past. The naming committee will be responsible for studying any new proposals and make recommendations to the Council.

The priority rules established by the Council last year for allocating Section 13 monies were tested with 85-86 allocations. V.P. Elbert made a presentation to discuss each item on the request for funds from Section 13.

In the meeting of November 6, 1986, the new construction addition to Owen's Stadium was discussed to figure out any financial commitment from OU (Section 13 or Capital improvements). Mr. Tuttle, A&E, presented the proposal submitted by SportSuites, Inc. to build luxury football seating accommodations on the east side of the stadium. The only money requested from OU was about \$3,800,000 (\$3,000,000 for constructional, mechanical and electrical improvements and \$800,000 for financial and legal expenses needed for the bond issue). The Walker Tower Lounge was named after the late "Craig A. Hall" for his effort in renovating the lounge.

On the November 20, 1986 meeting, the issue of the classroom maintenance was discussed by all concerned parties (Art Tuttle, A&E; Ben Kinder, Physical Plant; Jeff Stark, Classroom Scheduling; Mike Mooman, A&E and Lisa Portwood, Instructional Services). Each one presented their role in class maintenance and an overall policy was outlined.

On the December 4, 1986 meeting, the Council discussed the problem of open (outdoor) classrooms. The issue was presented by Trent Gabert, chair of HPER and several recommendations were forwarded to the administration.

The Council looked into the campus "Comprehensive Transportation Plan". Mr. Ralph McFarland presented OU viewpoints and the current status of the plan. Also, Mr. David Clark, Norman Interim city manager discussed traffic and parking issues between OU and the City of Norman.

The members of the Council for 1986-1987 are listed below:

CAMPUS PLANNING COUNCIL (NORMAN)

1986-87

September 1, 1986

<u>Name</u>		<u>Nominated by</u>	<u>Term</u>
Susan Vehik	(Anthropology)	Faculty Senate	1984-87
Angela Million	(University Libraries)	Faculty Senate	1984-87
Bill Bauman	(Architecture)	Faculty Senate	1984-87
Adel A. Aly, CHAIR	(Industrial Engineering)	Faculty Senate	1985-88
Anne H. Henderson	(Architecture)	Faculty Senate	1985-88
James Wainner	(Music)	Faculty Senate	1985-88
Tom Maze	(CEES)	Faculty Senate	1986-89
Stan Neely	(Chemistry)	Faculty Senate	1986-89
Gary Schnell	(Zoology)	Faculty Senate	1986-89
Linda Harris	(Arts and Sciences)	EEC	1984-87
William Varley	((Research Administration)	EEC	1985-88
Gwen Williamson	(Okla. Geological Survey)	EEC	1985-88
Bob Gallagher	(Education)	EEC	1986-89
Myrna Robinson	(Student)	UOSA	1986-87
Jeff Powell	(Student)	UOSA	1986-87
David Merritt	(Student)	UOSA	1986-87
Lori Ann Sharpe	(Student)	UOSA	1986-87
	(Exec. Assistant to the President)	Ex-Officio, non voting	
Joan Wadlow	(Provost)	Ex-Officio, non voting	
Arthur J. Elbert	(Vice President for Administrative Affairs)	Ex-Officio, non voting	
Milford Messer	(Registrar)	Ex-Officio, non voting	

REPORT OF THE COUNCIL ON CONTINUING EDUCATION AND PUBLIC SERVICE
FOR FALL SEMESTER 1986

Submitted by Alex J. Kondonassis, chair

In the fall of 1987 the Council on Continuing Education & Public Service continued to discuss and gather data on the following three issues: 1) subsidies to continuing education; 2) incentives for increased faculty participation in CE&PS; 3) continuing education innovations and/or changes.

One of the meetings was largely devoted to hearing from Dr. Larry Hays, former Vice-Chancellor for Educational Outreach, Oklahoma State Regents for Higher Education. He provided information and explained the State Regents for Higher Education Policy proposal for educational outreach. The members of the Council expressed concern about the proposed policy's goal to fragment the state into specific jurisdictions for purposes of continuing education; but also the council indicated satisfaction on that the document proposed simplified procedures on approval of programs.

The Council has plans to integrate the reports of the three sub-committees into its annual report for 1986-87. It is intended that the report will offer constructive suggestions to improve faculty participation in CE&PS but also provide insights into enhancing the effectiveness of CE&PS.

The members of the Council for 1986-87 are: Professors: L. Blank, J. Burwell, A. Covich, S. Faibisoff, J. Harp, T. James, A. Kondonassis, chair, R. Mellgren, W. Rowe; Public Members: E. Apple, J. Lovell, C. Smith; CE&PS Staff: H. Harris, L. Morris; Ex officio Members: R. Martin, J. Wadlow.

AJK/trk

REPORT OF THE COUNCIL ON FACULTY AWARDS AND HONORS
FOR FALL SEMESTER 1986
Submitted by Daniel Wren, Chair


The activities of the Council consisted of the following:

1. At the September 26, 1986 meeting, Professor Daniel A. Wren was elected to Chair the Council for the 1986-87 year; new members of the Council were introduced; and the Council's work for the coming year was previewed and discussed.
2. On November 21, 1986, the Norman campus members and the student representative met in Vice Provost Jerry Weber's office to discuss the nominees for the Oklahoma Gold Medal for Excellence in Teaching. From five nominees, we recommended one person to be the University of Oklahoma's candidate for this award.
3. At the December 12, 1986 meeting, the Council reviewed 56 candidates for David Ross Boyd Professorships (8 candidates), Regents Awards for Teaching, Research, and Service (33 candidates), and the AMOCU Foundation Good Teaching Award (15 candidates), and made recommendations for these awards to the Provost, Norman campus.

Members of the Council are:

<u>Name</u>	<u>Affiliation</u>
Betty Atkinson	Physics
Daniel Wren	Management
Herbert Nishikawa	Nursing
Joe Ferratti	Medicine
Yoshi Sasaki	Meteorology
Herbert Shillingburg	HSC
Lerner Hinshaw	HSC
Donald Counihan	Allied Health
Susan Caldwell	Art
George Letchworth	Education
Karen V. Waddell	Alumnus
Becky Dahms	UOSA

Respectfully submitted,


Daniel A. Wren,
Professor

REPORT OF THE PUBLICATIONS BOARD
FOR FALL SEMESTER 1986
Submitted by Professor Ed Carter, Chair

The Board of Publications has scheduled a public access session at the beginning of each monthly meeting of the board. The purpose of the access session is to hear any member of the public who wants to talk about the performance of the Oklahoma Daily.

The board also has established a Committee on Credibility to recommend specific actions that can be taken by the board to demonstrate the Oklahoma Daily's openness and sensitivity to the needs and interests of the OU community.

A committee appointed by the board is developing a graphics and design manual for the Oklahoma Daily. The project is expected to improve the day-to-day look of the newspaper as well as improve its readability.

A bronze plaque naming the Oklahoma Daily's production facility as the "W.C. Vanderwerth Backshop" has been placed at the entrance area to the Daily's backshop. The plaque honors Vanderwerth, who served as the Daily's mechanical superintendent from 1945 to 1971. The OU Board of Regents approved the honor for Vanderwerth.

Advertising lineage of the Oklahoma Daily is up 15 percent for the first six months of the fiscal year. Fred Weddle, director of Student Publications, termed the increase especially gratifying when the results are compared with the Oklahoma economy.

The 1985-86 Sooner yearbook won a Pacemaker Award from the College Media Association and a Silver Crown Award from the Columbia Scholastic Press Association. This means the Sooner was judged to be one of the top four and five books in the nation. Sales of the 1986-87 Sooner yearbook now total more than 1,700. This is approximately 100 more than last year's total.

<u>Members of the Board:</u>	<u>Norman campus membership</u>
L. Edward Carter	Journalism faculty
Elaine Kumin	Administrative staff
Carol Burr	Employees' Executive Council
Ted Phillips	Alumni-Working Press
Elizabeth Lowry	Oklahoma Daily representative
Stacie Sarff	Sooner yearbook representative
Michelle Freed	Publications-at-large representative
Micheline Johnson	UOSA appointed
Wes Ballard	Student body elected
Elizabeth Yamashita	Director, School of Journalism and Mass Communication
Fred Weddle	Director, Student Publications
Charles House	Editorial Supervisor, Oklahoma Daily
Twila Smith	Supervisor, Sooner yearbook
Doug Ferguson	Editor, Oklahoma Daily
Terri Metzger	Editor, Sooner yearbook

REPORT OF THE RESEARCH COUNCIL (Norman Campus)
FOR FALL SEMESTER 1986
Submitted by Roger Frech, Chair

During the first six months of fiscal year 1987, the Research Council received and evaluated 42 proposals totaling \$96,361 for support from the Faculty Research Fund. The Council recommended funding 32 proposals totaling \$65,293, leaving \$43,315 available for additional proposals under this program as of January 1, 1987.

The Research Council also reviewed 45 requests totaling \$678,539 for OU Associates Research/Creative Activity Funds. Eleven of these requests were recommended for funds in the amount of \$200,000.

At the beginning of the Fall Semester, the Council modified its guidelines for applications to the Faculty Research Fund, reflecting an increase in research money made available by President Horton. The normal maximum funds which may be requested in a proposal have been increased from \$5,000 to \$6,000, although the Council will consider exceptional requests up to \$7,500. The Council also continued to discuss the general research needs of the University. The Council will present specific recommendations to President Horton regarding the distribution of indirect cost over-realization, the level and allocation of SRI funding, and the support of the Faculty Research Fund Program and various restricted programs for research support.

Roger Frech, Chair

Leonard Beevers

Marilyn Flowers

Kirby Gilliland

Judith Lewis

Jane Magrath

Douglas W. Mock

Michael A. Morrison

Robert J. Mulholland

Jim Richstad

John F. Scamehorn

Courtney Vaughn-Roberson

John Chisholm

Patricia Halbeck

Kenneth L. Hoving

Eddie C. Smith

William L. Varley