JOURNAL OF THE FACULTY SENATE The University of Oklahoma (Norman campus) Regular session - March 14, 1988 - 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, Barker, Bergey, Bert, Brock, Brown, Canter, Cohen, Cook, Curtis, Dietrich, Economou, Eisenhart, Faibisoff, Harris, Herstand, Kenderdine, Knehans, Knox, Kondonassis, Kutner, Lewis, Livesey, Magid, McManus, Mennig, Nicewander, Ray, Rideout, Robertson, Rogers, Ryan, Snell, Spaeth, Taylor, Turk, Vestal, Weaver-Meyers, Wiggins, Williams, Zonana |
| | Provost's office representative: Roger Frech and Ravi Ravindran PSA representatives: Maria Protti and Bette Scott |
| ABSENT: | Bell, Carr, Fagan, Farmer, Hill, Johnson, Shambaugh, Smith, Tepker, Wallace, Zelby |
| | TABLE OF CONTENTS |
| Facul Searc Facul Remarks Faculty | ral Faculty Meeting |
| Announce Gener Facul Searc Facul Remarks Faculty Defir | Bell, Carr, Fagan, Farmer, Hill, Johnson, Shambaugh, Smith Tepker, Wallace, Zelby TABLE OF CONTENTS ements: ral Faculty Meeting |

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

The minutes of the regular session of February 8, 1988, were approved.

ANNOUNCEMENTS

The Spring General Faculty meeting will be held Thursday, April 21, 1988, at 3:30 p.m. in Adams Hall 150. Faculty awards will be presented at a luncheon on Thursday, April 7, 1988.

Prof. Gary Cohen (History) will serve on the search committee for the general manager of KGOU.

The colleges will be conducting elections to the Faculty Senate during the next couple of months. Prof. Canter encouraged the faculty to make nominations for these positions.

REMARKS BY DR. RODNEY EVANS, DIRECTOR OF OFFICE OF BUSINESS AND INDUSTRIAL COOPERATION (OBIC)

Dr. Evans reported that OBIC was formed in Spring 1986 to help bring the University into the state economic development process. One aspect of OBIC involves providing the technical expertise of the University to Oklahoma businesses in order to build existing companies and to develop small businesses around new ideas. Through a program called Community Venture Teams, creative people are brought together to try to identify the problems in economically depressed areas and formulate generalized solutions. Questions from the floor centered on OBIC's connection with other economic development committees and the SCORE program and training offered by OBIC.

FACULTY SENATE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE REPORT

Prof. Canter reported on the status of previous Senate activities and the progress of several search committees. Interviews for the Chief Legal Counsel position have taken place, and the position should be filled soon. Candidates for the Vice President for University Affairs position will be interviewed later this spring; the schedule calls for the permanent Vice President to be in place by summer. The OU Regents plan to discuss the candidates for the financial and budget analyst position at their March meeting. The legislative visits program is being handled by Professors Tom James and Dave Morgan. They have arranged for several state legislators to visit the campus later this spring. The administration has responded to the report of the auxiliary accounts committee. The committee sent a reply to that response and should hear back from the administration the first part of April.

Prof. Canter mentioned that the Continuing Education and Public Service Council had developed a revised definition of "service." The Provost suggested that the definitions of the teaching and research categories should also be examined. Before any action is taken, the Senate will have an opportunity to review the revisions.

Discussion is taking place with regard to the location and operation of the OU book store; suggestions should be directed to Prof. Djebbar Tiab, Chair of the University Book Exchange Oversight Committee.

Prof. Canter called attention to a table on average faculty salaries, which Regent Imel mentioned at the February Regents' meeting. (This table was distributed at the Senate meeting and is available from the Senate office.) A weighted average calculation shows that the 1987-88 9-month salaries for

OU professors are 84% of the faculty salaries at comparison institutions (excluding OSU), associate professors are 88%, and assistant professors are 87%. Prof. Canter said that President Horton planned to discuss salaries again at future Regents meetings. Several senators commented that the figures were actually understated, because many of the other universities have more summer research support. In addition, OU's figures probably include the Law School, whereas the comparison institutions might not include law schools.

ELECTION, COUNCILS/COMMITTEES/BOARDS

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

Class Schedule Committee:
[to complete the 1987-88 term of Walter Wei (Mathematics)]
Alan Nicewander (Psychology)
Edward Sankowski (Philosophy)

Energy Conservation Committee:
[to complete the 1986-88 term of Mary Whitmore (Zoology)]

James Forgotson (Geology & Geophysics)

Murlin Hodgell (Architecture)

Student Discrimination Grievance Committee:
[to complete the 1986-88 term of Raynetta Kinne (Military Science)]
Michael Angelotti (Education-Instructional Leadership)
Jon Forman (Law)

Prof. Cohen, Chair of the Committee on Committees, announced that the committee had begun work on the end-of-the-year vacancies.

REVISIONS IN PROGRAM DISCONTINUANCE POLICY

Prof. Canter explained that when the issue of discontinuing the aviation program came up last fall, it became clear that the 1977 program discontinuance policy needed to incorporate the current program review process. An ad hoc committee, consisting of Professors Steven Curtis (Music), Roger Frech (Chemistry), and Benjamin Taylor (Economics), was formed to recommend revisions. Prof. Frech reported that the substantive changes involve bringing the affected department and college and the open hearings into the program discontinuance proceedings as early as possible and also enumerating the possible kinds of "evidence" that the program discontinuance ad hoc committee could consider. In the current policy the ad hoc committee evaluates the evidence (which is nowhere defined) and reports to the Provost, then an open hearing is held. In the proposed policy the committee reviews the evidence and holds the open hearing before making a recommendation to the Provost. Other changes are minor and concern removing ambiguities or redundancies.

There was some discussion about the selection and composition of the \underline{ad} hoc committee. Under the current policy the Provost chooses four of the \underline{eight} faculty nominated by the Faculty Senate and also selects two additional faculty members directly. Various other options were raised, but no conclusion was reached. Prof. Turk suggested that policy provide the opportunity to include additional people on the \underline{ad} hoc committee, such as outside experts.

Prof. Faibisoff commented that, according to the document, there are two methods for initiating program discontinuance--the regular academic program review and the discretion of the Provost. Prof. Frech said that was correct. Prof. Canter asked what conditions other than the normal program review would lead to program discontinuance. Prof. Frech said that would be some sort of fiscal exigency or Regents' decision. Prof. Canter noted that the new policy allowed only one week after the public hearing for the unit to respond. Prof. Taylor explained that the unit would have been involved all through the process so shouldn't need much time to respond. There was some discussion about what would happen if the Regents did not accept the recommendation of the Provost and what effect a declaration of financial exigency would have on the program discontinuance policy. Prof. Weaver-Meyers suggested that there should be a process for informing the rest of the university community when a program has been discontinued. She said, for example, that the library needs to know as soon as possible when a program is discontinued so that unit's library funds can be allocated to other areas. Prof. Frech commented that the policy does not address the process for public notification, but in practice, articles are run in the usual sorts of publications that are read by the university community.

Prof. Magid proposed that a sentence in the "Initial Steps" paragraph be changed to read "... the Provost will make a determination regarding the suggested discontinuance consideration" instead of "appropriateness and feasibility of the suggested discontinuance."

Prof. Cohen said he believed that part A of "Personnel Alternatives" was ambiguous and that additional language should be inserted to spell out what the University's obligation is. He said his understanding of the wording was that the University's commitment to the faculty and staff of a discontinued program was discretionary. Prof. Frech said that according to the fiscal exigency policy, the University has a moral obligation to try to place these individuals within the university, but that one can't insist that it be done. Prof. Kutner contended that to be consistent with AAUP standards and the understanding of many people in the University, there is an obligation to place that individual if there is an opening and if the individual is suitable. Prof. Frech agreed to consider alternative wording for that section.

Prof. Kenderdine asked why points C. and D. were omitted from the proposed "Personnel Alternatives" section. Prof. Kenderdine said he thought the intent of item D. was that if a program is reinstated, then the people who were terminated because of that ought to have a preferential shot at a job. He explained that item C. was included when the policy was originally adopted because of the concern that program discontinuance could be used as an excuse to eliminate minorities, women, or undesirable faculty. Prof. Frech said he believed that would be hard to do now under affirmative action programs. He said the committee believed points C. and D. were ambiguous, but that if the Senate thought it was necessary to retain the items, the committee could work on more specific language.

Other suggestions for changes should be forwarded to the Senate office. The Senate will vote on the proposed policy at its April 11 Senate meeting. (The current and proposed policies are available from the Senate office.)

REPORT BY PROFESSOR KARL BERGEY - FACULTY SALARIES

Prof. Bergey presented a report on teaching salaries in relation to the total budget for OU from 1981/82 to present. OU's total budget has increased from \$157 million in 1981/82 to \$212 million in 1987/88, yet teaching salaries have remained fairly constant. In 1981/82 the percentage of the total budget spent on teaching salaries was 17%; by 1987/88 that percentage had dropped to 15.5%. According to Prof. Bergey, if the 17% had been retained during those years, then each individual faculty member would now have \$4500 more per year, or that money could have been used to hire 100 new faculty members—which is about the number of positions lost since 1981/82. He questioned where this money had been spent, in view of his impression that there had been a growth in administrative staff and administrative salaries during that time. He said he believes it is important for the Faculty Senate, as elected representatives of the faculty, to protect the rights of the faculty, and therefore has an obligation to look at whether this money is really being spent on education.

Some of the senators had questions as to what items were included in the figures. Prof. Bergey said his total budget figures include University activities, such as dormitories, but not items such as the Post Office, FAA, and HSC. Prof. Curtis asked whether he had similar data on the number and average salaries of administrators during that period. Prof. Bergey said he has been gathering data for some of the administrative functions. Prof. Magid asked whether Prof. Bergey had data on salaries in relation to just the E&G budget--with auxiliaries excluded. Prof. Ravi Ravindran, Associate Provost, remarked that the total budget should consist of only the E&G budget, which comes from the state, and should not include the auxiliaries, which generate their own income. Prof. Bergey argued that auxiliaries should be included unless the university is going into business. Prof. Ryan pointed out that it is difficult to get a true picture of the auxiliary budget because of the transfers of funds that occur between accounts. Prof. Nicewander commented that the budgets of the auxiliary enterprises had experienced a tremendous jump 4 or 5 years ago, which could account for part of the situation. He suggested that the 100 fewer faculty could also have had an impact. Prof. Turk commented that another issue is that the student population remained fairly constant during those years, so the faculty are teaching much higher loads than before.

Prof. Canter noted that the Senate's Committee on Faculty Compensation has been examining some of these concerns and will present an interim report on their findings to the Senate. At that time the Senate can decide whether there should be a special committee to address this matter.

REMARKS BY STATE SENATOR GARY GARDENHIRE (R-DISTRICT 16) AND DISCUSSION OF LEGISLATIVE INITIATIVES

Senator Gardenhire said he found Prof. Bergey's statistics very instructive. He commented that OU ranks last or next to last in higher education appropriations. He suggested that ad valorem tax reforms could make more funds available for higher education. He also proposed that the state consolidate the colleges and universities into two or three university systems in order to eliminate duplications. He said, "We need to reduce the "flotilla" of higher education that we thought we could fund." He said he planned to ask the State Regents' office to initiate an executive study to determine how such a plan could be implemented.

Senator Gardenhire mentioned other reforms that he believed would provide more money for the state: reduce the state's share of common education funding to 50%, make sure income earned in Oklahoma is reported in Oklahoma, improve sales tax collections, ensure that state lands are leased at current prices, and improve accountability in the state. He said he was the first one to propose using the one-time insurance protest money to fund permanent chairs, and he will fight hard for the funding of academic positions. He pointed out that consitutionally the legislature can only give the state's total higher education appropriation to the State Regents; it is up to the Regents to make the allocations among the institutions. When questioned about the status of the \$20 million for endowed chairs, Senator Gardenhire said the bill had passed both Houses and is in conference committee.

Prof. Cohen asked what the State Senate could do to improve the selection and accountability of the Regents of the various higher education governing boards, so that situations like those at Rose State, Durant (Southeastern), and Alva (Northwestern), could be avoided. Senator Gardenhire said it is not the role of the legislature to tell the Regents how to run the university; however, it might be possible to draw up some criteria for the selection of Regents. Prof. Herstand asked about the legislature's proposal to adjust state income taxes because of the federal tax changes. He said state taxes are already low, and he thought it would be a mistake to lower them even further and thereby miss out on the slight windfall. Senator Gardenhire answered that he didn't believe that measure would make it out of conference committee. Senator Gardenhire said he would like to help take higher education's message and needs to the legislature.

ADJOURNMENT

The Faculty Senate adjourned at 5:23 p.m. The next regular session of the Senate will be held at 3:30 p.m. on Monday, April 11, 1988 in the Conoco Auditorium.

Honeya 'talla attur Sonya Fallgatter

Administrative Coordinator

Alex J. Kondonassis

Secretary