

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

The Faculty Senate was called to order by Professor Larry Canter, Chair.

PRESENT: Baker, Bell, Bergey, Bert, Brown, Canter, Carr, Childress, Cohen, Cook, Curtis, Dietrich, Economou, Eisenhart, Faibisoff, Farmer, Harris, Herstand, Johnson, Kenderdine, Knox, Kondonassis, Kutner, Lewis, Livesey, Magid, McManus, Mennig, Nicewander, Ray, Rideout, Rogers, Ryan, Shambaugh, Snell, Spaeth, Taylor, Vestal, Weaver-Meyers, Wiggins, Williams, Zelby, Zonana

PSA representative: Maria Protti

UOSA representative: Tina Crow

ABSENT: Barker, Brock, Fagan, Hill, Knehans, Smith, Tepker, Turk, Wallace

PSA representative: Bette Scott

GSS representative: Mistele Bloom

UOSA representatives: Kim Clinton, Julie Reding

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Announcements:

- Faculty Senate/UOSA ad hoc committee.....2
- Ad hoc committee on classroom maintenance.....2

Actions taken by the Administration on Senate recommendations:

- Changes in academic program review process.....2
- Appointments to councils/committees/boards.....2
- Ad hoc committee on program discontinuance.....2

Remarks by Dr. Lawrence McKibbin, Director of International Programs..3

Senate Executive Committee Report:

- Expanded grading scale.....3
- Campus Tenure Committee - substance.....3
- SIL.....3
- Special General Faculty Meeting.....4
- Focus on Excellence.....4
- Issue for Discussion - Interdisciplinary teaching and research.....4
- Election, councils/committees/boards.....5
- Resolution - academic misconduct.....6

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

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

ANNOUNCEMENTS

Prof. Daniel Snell (History) was elected to complete the 1986-89 term of Prof. Michael Devine (Industrial Engineering) on the Faculty Senate, representing the Graduate College.

A joint Faculty Senate/UOSA ad hoc committee, composed of four faculty and four students, has been established to study issues such as increasing the number of stop days before final exams and eliminating significant tests during the final week of classes. The faculty serving on the committee are: Marvin Baker (Geography), Paul Bowen (CEES), Larry Hill (Political Science), and Christine Williams (Sociology).

The faculty serving on the ad hoc committee to address classroom maintenance issues are: Robert Knox (CEES), Steven Livesey (History of Science), and Stewart Ryan (Physics and Astronomy), all members of the Faculty Senate. The Provost has asked this committee to (1) conduct a survey of classroom users to determine the requirements of adequate class space; (2) establish standards for maintenance or renovation of classrooms; (3) complete an inventory of class space; (4) provide appropriate checklists to maintenance personnel to insure that these classrooms are properly maintained during the semester; and (5) establish a single point of contact within the campus to which users can report any class space problems.

ACTIONS TAKEN BY THE ADMINISTRATION ON SENATE RECOMMENDATIONS

The proposed procedural changes in the Academic Program Review process (see 9/87 Journal, page 7) were approved.

The following faculty were appointed to Councils, Committees, and Boards from the election held at the October 12 Senate meeting (see 10/87 Journal, page 6):

- Centennial Promo. & Spec. Proj. Comm.: James Kenderdine (Mkt.)
to complete the 1987-90 term of Cecil Lee (Art)
- Faculty Appeals Board: John Wood (Political Science)
to complete the 1986-90 term of Anne Henderson (Arch.)
- Research Council: Darryl McCullough (Math.)
to complete the 1985-88 term of Roger Frech (Chem.)
- Campus Disciplinary Council I: William Graves (Ed. Psych.)
to complete the 1986-88 term of Anne Henderson (Arch.)
- Patent Advisory Committee: Benjamin Wallace (CEES)
to complete the 1986-89 term of Sherril Christian (Chem.)

The following faculty were selected to serve on the ad hoc committee to study the possible discontinuance of the aviation program (see 10/87 Journal, page 7): James Burwell (Physics and Astronomy), Charles Gettys (Psychology), William Kuriger (EECS), and Gregory Reinhart (Chemistry) [chair]. The College of Education faculty appointed by the Provost are William Graves and Thomas Wiggins.

REMARKS BY DR. LAWRENCE MCKIBBIN, DIRECTOR OF INTERNATIONAL PROGRAMS

Prof. McKibbin spoke on the activities of the International Programs Office, which has been in operation since October 1, 1986, and whose charge is to internationalize the university and coordinate its international activities. The program is involved with attracting international students to OU and providing opportunities abroad to faculty and students. Other activities include linking OU with MASUA (Mid American State Universities Association), managing the Colima, Mexico branch campus, and coordinating visitors to campus.

Prof. Cohen complimented the program on the advising service it provides to applicants for international fellowships and scholarships, such as the Fulbright Fellowship. He asked if there were plans to internationalize OU's curriculum. Prof. McKibbin answered that he considered that a priority and that his office has been developing an inventory of and analyzing the courses that are presumed to have international content. He has submitted a proposal to the State Regents for reciprocal exchange agreements, so that exchange students can be granted in-state tuition in those instances where OU students receive the same treatment abroad. Prof. Weaver-Meyers said it would be beneficial to arrange reciprocal library lending agreements with international institutions.

SENATE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE REPORT, PROF. LARRY CANTER

Prof. Canter reported that Provost Wadlow had decided not to recommend implementation of an expanded grading scale at this time, but to reserve the option of reconsidering the decision in a couple of years when the student information system is scheduled to be reviewed. (See Appendix I for full recommendation.)

Prof. Canter referred to a November 2 memo from the Provost and Campus Tenure Committee chair clarifying the nature of the Campus Tenure Committee's vote on "substance" (see Appendix II). Regarding substance, the Campus Tenure Committee will look at the information on the candidate presented by the academic unit to see if that information supports the unit's stated criteria for tenure.

In May 1986 the Senate approved some recommendations regarding the Summer Institute of Linguistics (SIL), requiring courses offered through the SIL to be approved by the appropriate OU departments and the faculty teaching the courses to be recruited through the normal processes used on campus. The current situation is that the departments of Anthropology and Modern Languages/Literatures/Linguistics have disapproved the courses which SIL proposed offering through the University and for University credit. The University has indicated to SIL that next summer it will not be possible to offer those courses for academic credit. SIL has not responded yet.

The first visit by legislators is scheduled for November 10.

At the last meeting with President Horton on November 4 the Executive Committee asked about the status of the current search committees. The search committee for the Vice President for University Affairs, chaired by Prof. Paul Sharp, will begin work November 19. The search committee for the University Legal Counsel should begin interviewing candidates in January.

The State Regents are in the process of establishing peer group institutions for OU. The preliminary list includes the Big 10, Big 8, the University of Texas at Austin, and Texas A&M. President Horton was elected for a one-year term as Chair of the Council of Presidents of the National Association of State Universities and Land-Grant Colleges--an honor for him and OU because this is a national group of universities.

Prof. Canter reminded the Senators that they should have received the listing of University and Campus Councils, Committees and Boards, which was distributed October 29. He commented that this is a fluid document because it is always in a state of change.

Prof. Canter noted that the recent ad in the Oklahoma Daily incorrectly reported that the Senate had approved the "Operation O.U. \$." It was in fact endorsed by the Senate Executive Committee. (Faculty, staff, and students were asked to place OU stickers on checks and credit cards to show the impact OU dollars have on the Norman economy.)

The statement approved at the October 22 special general faculty meeting regarding the October 15 Regents' decision to reduce Joe Brett Reynolds' suspension from 2 years to 1 year was signed by 71% of the regular faculty and will be given to the Regents November 10. Prof. Canter characterized this as a "grassroots" movement, not involving any member of the administration. He said that according to the newspaper, the Regents did not have this issue on the agenda for their next meeting.

At the December Senate meeting Prof. Canter will report on the disposition of the issues identified in the small group discussions. Some of the plans include looking into the question of legal protection and advice for faculty and appointing a Senate committee to look at updating the program discontinuance policy.

FOCUS ON EXCELLENCE, PROF. GARY COHEN

Prof. Cohen focused on four faculty in the School of Music who make up the Quartet Oklahoma, a string ensemble: Michael Ma (Assistant Professor of Violin), Alison Neufeld (Special Instructor of Violin), Wayne Crouse (Associate Professor of Viola), and Marjory Cornelius (Professor of Cello). The quartet was formed three years ago and already has made an important impact through concert tours in Oklahoma, England, and Wales and through national radio broadcasts. In April they gave the world premiere of the Second String Quartet, subtitled "Celebration," of the American composer Stephen Paulus, a work commissioned for the Quartet Oklahoma by the Mark Allen Everett Foundation of Oklahoma City for the sixtieth anniversary of World Literature Today.

ISSUE FOR DISCUSSION - INTERDISCIPLINARY TEACHING AND RESEARCH

During the discussion several senators said interdisciplinary teaching and research is a good concept but in reality is just a "buzz-word" because of several impediments. Prof. Ryan pointed out that many interdisciplinary programs, such as Engineering Physics, have no budget. Prof. Bell said, compared to other universities with which he has been associated, interdisciplinary programs at OU are not as well developed, partly because the faculty at OU has decreased in size to the point that they are busy with intradisciplinary responsibilities, and there's not much time for

interdisciplinary activities. According to Prof. Bell, another problem is the lack of funding, since many departments do not have the funds to support an interdisciplinary program, which doesn't belong to any one unit. Prof. Canter said that, along those same lines, there's the question of who will get the credit for the semester credit hours taught. Prof. Kondonassis said a related problem is how to account for interdisciplinary activities in performance evaluations, especially for younger faculty who will be coming up for tenure and promotions.

Prof. Economou suggested that one way interdisciplinary teaching could be stimulated is through the revitalized Honors program. He cautioned, though, that interdisciplinary programs shouldn't be put together arbitrarily or artificially.

Prof. Cohen said he resented some of the preaching from the administration that the faculty should do more interdisciplinary work, because, in his opinion, the faculty is prepared and interested in pursuing interdisciplinary teaching and research; the problem has been institutional barriers and a lack of support. Some of the impediments are the lack of release time from teaching the regular departmental courses, the heavy teaching and advising loads, the needs of students for regular courses, and the fact that students aren't advised as to the availability of interdisciplinary courses.

Prof. Lewis agreed that institutional obstacles often prevent true interdisciplinary teaching and research from occurring. She cited the Women's Studies program as an example of a large program which is not properly supported, and consequently the courses are not really interdisciplinary.

Prof. Canter summarized by saying, there is support for the concept, but there are several issues to address: academic credit for teaching, credit in terms of the dollars counted for a funded research project, and performance evaluations for those who participate in this. He commented that participation in interdisciplinary teaching and research should be both encouraged and rewarded. He said these key issues will be communicated to the Provost and the President.

ELECTION, COUNCILS/COMMITTEES/BOARDS

The Senate approved the following Committee on Committees nominations to fill vacancies on University and Campus Councils, Committees and Boards.

<u>Faculty Nominated</u>	<u>Faculty Replaced, Term</u>
<u>ONE NOMINATION FOR EACH VACANCY</u>	
<u>Campus Planning Council:</u>	
Lloyd Korhonen (Educ. Leadership)	Anne Henderson (Arch.), 1986-88
<u>ROTC Advisory Committee:</u>	
Carl Rath (Music)	John TeSelle (Law), 1987-90
<u>Instructional Facilities Subcomm. of Space and Facilities Planning:</u>	
Faruk Civan (PGE)	Jay Smith (Educ.), 1986-88
<u>TWO NOMINATIONS FOR EACH VACANCY (President selects one)</u>	
<u>Campus Tenure Committee:</u>	
Michael Flanigan (English)	Drew Kersten (Law), 1985-88
Larry Hill (Political Science)	

Vacancies as of January 1988

ONE NOMINATION FOR EACH VACANCYCampus Planning Council:

Pat Weaver-Meyers (Univ. Lib.) Tom Maze (CEES), 1986-89

TWO NOMINATIONS FOR EACH VACANCY (President selects one)University Copyright Committee:

Anne Million (Univ. Libraries) Terry Patterson (Arch.), 1986-90
T. H. Milby (Univ. Libraries)

RESOLUTION - ACADEMIC MISCONDUCT

Prof. Lewis moved adoption of the following resolution:

WHEREAS, the protection of academic integrity is, and ought to be, of considerable importance to students and faculty alike; and

WHEREAS, there is, in place, and in constant use on this campus, an Academic Misconduct Code; and

WHEREAS, this Code would more effectively serve as a deterrent were its application more widely known;

NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, that the Faculty Senate requests that the Provost's Office publish in the student paper and elsewhere as deemed advisable, no less frequently than once a year, the number of students convicted of academic misconduct within each college, the nature of the offenses, and the disposition of those cases.

Prof. Lewis commented that serving on the Arts & Sciences Academic Misconduct Panel has shown her that the number of cases has increased and yet students are not aware that people are being prosecuted for academic misconduct. She said she believed that students have the perception that nothing happens if they cheat, and that if they knew there were penalties for cheating, that might serve as a deterrent. Also, the innocent students need to have the integrity of their degrees defended. Faculty are often cynical about prosecuting because they think nothing will come of it.

Prof. Economou exhorted the faculty to inform their students as to what cheating is and the consequences of academic misconduct. He said the English department is preparing a document on plagiarism to be distributed to all freshman English classes, with instructions to the teaching staff to spend time in class going over it.

There were some questions about whether it is legal to publish the names of the persons convicted of academic misconduct, whether publishing the numbers of convictions by college would reveal the identity of the individual, whether there should be a mechanism to insure there is a central point to which this information is reported, and whether the information should be published once a semester instead of once a year. Prof. Cohen noted that ultimately all sanctions for academic misconduct must be approved by the Provost, so the central information would be available from the Provost's office.

Prof. Livesey pointed out that students should be reminded when they are about to take an exam, that there is an Academic Misconduct Code and that they are expected to abide by it. Prof. Weaver-Meyers, agreeing that prosecuting can be a deterrent to misconduct, reported that the Library is filing more charges against students for book thefts. Prof. Kenderdine suggested that the recent case that went before the Regents pointed to the need for the faculty to reassert their position on academic misconduct and not sit back and make Provost Wadlow and President Horton carry the whole ball.

Prof. Cohen suggested that the last paragraph was a little vague and implied that the specific penalty of the specific case should be published. He offered a friendly amendment, which Prof. Lewis accepted, to replace "the disposition of" with "a statistical summary of the penalties for" so that the last paragraph would read:

NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, that the Faculty Senate requests that the Provost's Office publish in the student paper and elsewhere as deemed advisable, no less frequently than once a year, the number of students convicted of academic misconduct within each college, the nature of the offenses, and a statistical summary of the penalties for those cases.

Prof. Canter reminded the group that the vote on the resolution could be delayed until the next month, especially in view of the questions raised earlier. Prof. Ryan suggested that the points mentioned could be forwarded along with the resolution. The resolution as amended was approved by the Senate unanimously.

Prof. Ryan commented that it is difficult for faculty members to know what their legal rights are when they receive an anonymous tip on cheating. He suggested that the administration should issue some guidelines as to what is permissible, so that faculty can avoid being charged with entrapment.

ADJOURNMENT

The Faculty Senate adjourned at 5:08 p.m. The next regular session of the Senate will be held at 3:30 p.m. on Monday, December 14, 1987 in the Conoco Auditorium, Neustadt Wing, Bizzell Library.

Sonya Fallgatter
Sonya Fallgatter
Administrative Coordinator

A. J. Kondonassis
Alex Kondonassis
Secretary



The
University of Oklahoma

OFFICE OF THE PROVOST
680 Parrington Oval, Room 104
Norman, Oklahoma 73019
(405) 325-3221

November 6, 1987

Professor Larry Canter
Chair, Faculty Senate
OMU 406
CENTRAL MAIL SERVICE

Dear Larry:

I am responding to your October 21, 1987 memo about the expanded grading scale. I have now sought input from the deans, students, and appropriate staff as you anticipated. I have reviewed reports, minutes, and correspondence made available on this issue since it was introduced in 1985. I have also studied the results of the expanded grading scale ballot which you forwarded on October 21.

It seems to me that the critical question is whether adoption of an expanded grading scale at this time would constitute a significant step toward better academic quality at the University of Oklahoma. I am not convinced that it does. Here is my thinking.

The report of the Ad Hoc Faculty Senate Committee of 1/25/87 summarized the pros and cons of the expanded grading system which emerged during their discussions. As I examine them, it seems to me that in general the pros and cons balance each other. While it is true that the majority of the membership in AAU uses an expanded grading scale, of the public AAU members, the majority is a margin of one. This suggests to me that an expanded grading scale is not a critical factor in quality; in other words, good schools use different systems.

When I met with the Ad Hoc Committee during its discussions, I said that there should be compelling reasons to instigate a change in a system which had appeared to be working well and a change which would naturally disrupt activities temporarily. I also said that there should be substantial support for the change. I cannot find a compelling reason at the present time, and the results of the recent balloting and the vote of the Ad Hoc Committee, while indicating support for a change, are not overwhelming in support of a change nor is there agreement on the system to be adopted.

It is clear that an expanded grading system allows for more precision in grading. This is desired by some faculty and by a few faculty very strongly. One argument that has been advanced is that it will make our students more competitive in applying for jobs or professional schools. Among the materials I studied was the report of the experience at Washington State University. Admissions personnel at 11 professional schools throughout the country which were thought likely to receive applications from WSU graduates were asked whether the WSU graduate would be disadvantaged by the absence of an expanded grading scale. Of the 11 people interviewed, 7 said there would be no disadvantage; 1 said there might be a very slight disadvantage but not enough to cause difficulty; 1 said there would be a slight disadvantage if very large numbers of applications were received; and 2 did not respond. I am simply not yet convinced that the "competitiveness" of a degree from OU depends in a critical way on the existence or non-existence of an expanded grading scale.

But let us assume that there is indeed merit in more precise grading. Using this as a point of departure, I examined the impact on resources and the change in the grading system to other current and anticipated activities. If we were to adopt the expanded grading system and implement it immediately, and if we assume that there would be no additional personnel for implementation (I must assume this), then it would be necessary to slow down the implementation of the new Advising/Degree Audit System. In my judgment, the availability of the type of transcript being produced by this system is of great value to the Advising System and should be completed as quickly as possible. I have also taken into account an additional responsibility which will be very time consuming but will be incurred by Admissions and Records beginning this semester as we receive applications for Fall of 1988. The new state mandated admission requirements effective Fall, 1988 requires each institution to examine the transcript of each applicant to determine whether the specific courses that are mandated for admission have successfully been completed. Moreover, an assessment of the deficiencies for each student must be made and communicated. This will require additional resources and Dr. Mel Messer has already carefully reallocated to try to cover this new responsibility without new resources. In addition, there will be costs associated with grade changes and there will be many more of them. The fact is that at Washington State, for example, the number of grade changes in the six-year period after adoption of an expanded grading scale doubled. This also will require additional staff time.

So at this time, I am not prepared to approve the implementation of an expanded grading system. I believe that this is consistent with most of the input. The student leadership with whom I met did not support adoption of the expanded grading scale system; in the vote of the Deans' Council, there was no vote in favor of it.

Having said all of this, I think that we should keep an open mind to the idea of more precision in grading, and maintain our options. Actually there would be an appropriate time to consider implementation of an expanded grading system as well as assure that technically we preserve the option. This would be at the time the current Student Information System, now eight years old, is changed. Ten years is the expected life span of computer information systems, and it is reasonable to expect that in the years immediately ahead, significant changes will be required. At this time, we could reconsider adoption of the expanded grading system and, as a minimum, insure that the system we adopt would easily lend itself to implementation of a more precise system.

I hope you will convey this to the Faculty Senate. I want to express my appreciation for your willingness to consider this matter so very carefully and to offer the faculty an opportunity to express their views by means of the survey. Please call if there are questions.

Sincerely,


Joan Wadlow
Provost

JW/cva

cc: President Frank E. Horton
Faculty Senate Executive Committee
Norman Campus Deans' Council
Strategy for Excellence Task Force
Ma. Terry Carr



The
University of Oklahoma

11/87 (Appendix II)

OFFICE OF THE PROVOST
660 Parrington Oval, Room 104
Norman, Oklahoma 73019
(405) 325-3221

To: Deans/Chairs/Directors
Committees A

From: Joan Waddow, Provost
Gail Tompkins, Chair, Campus Tenure Committee

Date: November 2, 1987

Subject: Nature of Campus Tenure Committee's Vote on Substance
in Tenure Cases

In response to questions that some department chairs and faculty have raised regarding the nature of the Campus Tenure Committee's vote on substance in tenure cases, the Provost and the 1987-88 Chair of the Campus Tenure Committee met to try to clarify. The following is designed to provide this clarification.

The Faculty Handbook states that "The main purpose of the Campus Tenure Committee is to provide faculty advice on whether or not the academic unit's recommendation with regard to both substance and process is sustained by the accompanying documentation and is consistent with the approved tenure criteria of the academic unit and the University" (Section 3.7.5k). We interpret this statement to mean that regarding substance, the members of the Campus Tenure Committee vote on whether to sustain or not to sustain the vote of the tenured faculty in the academic unit to grant or deny tenure to the candidate. The vote of the Committee members represents their determination of whether the candidate's record as documented in the completed dossier supports the recommendation of the tenured faculty in the unit as measured against the established tenure criteria for that academic unit and the University of Oklahoma criteria as stated in Section 3.7.4 of the Faculty Handbook.

JW:GT/cvs