

JOURNAL OF THE FACULTY SENATE
 The University of Oklahoma (Norman campus)
 Regular session - September 19, 1988 - 3:30 p.m.
 Conoco Auditorium, Neustadt Wing, Bizzell Memorial Library

The Faculty Senate was called to order by Professor Gary B. Cohen, Chair.

PRESENT: Ahern, Baker, Barker, Bergey, Bert, Blick, Brock, Cohen, Cook, Cozad, Dietrich, Fagan, Farmer, Fife, Gabert, Goodey, Gudmundson, Hill, Jackson, Johnson, Kenderdine, Kiacz, Knox, Kutner, Lewis, Magid, McManus, Minnis, Moore, Mouser, Nicewander, Ray, Razook, Reardon, Rideout, Robertson, Ryan, Salisbury, Sankowski, Smith, Snell, Stoltenberg, Swisher, Tompkins, Vestal, Weaver-Meyers, Wedel, Zelby, Zonana

Provost's office representative: Provost Wadlow

ABSENT: Herstand

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Announcements:

Roster of Senate members for 1988-89.....	2
Schedule of regular Senate meetings for 1988-89.....	2
Fall General Faculty meeting.....	2
Actions taken by the Administration on Senate recommendations:	
Presidential Search Committee.....	2
Resolution of commendation to Dr. Frank Horton.....	2
Senate Chair's Report:	
Searches for President and Vice President for Univ. Affairs.....	2
DeBarr Hall.....	3
Academic misconduct statistics.....	3
Assessment of undergraduates.....	3
Whistle-blower policy.....	3
Campus master plan.....	3
Remarks by Mr. David Swank, Interim President.....	4
Focus on Excellence - Gwen Davis and Beverly Joyce.....	4
Election, councils/committees/boards.....	5
1988-89 Program Review Panel.....	5
Election, Senate Executive Committee.....	5
Triennial reapportionment of Senate seats for 1989-92.....	5
Distribution of seats on the Research Council.....	5
Regents' policy on ethics.....	6
Undergraduate admissions requirements.....	7
Higher Education Faculty Association.....	8

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

The minutes of the regular session of May 2, 1988, and special session of June 27, 1988, were approved.

ANNOUNCEMENTS

The new members of Faculty Senate were introduced. The roster of Senators for 1988-89 is attached (Appendix I).

The regular meetings of the Faculty Senate for 1988-89 will be held at 3:30 p.m. in the Conoco Auditorium on the following Mondays:

September 19	December 12	March 13
October 17	January 16	April 10
November 14	February 13	May 1

The Faculty Senate planning/discussion sessions will be held September 22, 23, 27 and 28. The purpose of these sessions is to identify those issues of concern to the faculty which could become agenda items for the Senate.

The Fall General Faculty meeting will be Thursday, October 20 at 3:30 p.m. in Dining Rooms 5 and 6 of the Oklahoma Memorial Union. Dr. Hans Brisch, the new Chancellor for the Oklahoma State Regents for Higher Education, will be the principal speaker. There will also be addresses by Interim President Swank and Senate Chair Cohen. A reception will follow.

The Spring semester Council reports and the comprehensive list of actions taken by the administration on Senate recommendations will be ready in October.

ACTIONS TAKEN BY THE ADMINISTRATION ON SENATE RECOMMENDATIONS

The following faculty from the Norman Campus were appointed by the OU Regents to the Presidential Search Committee (see 6/88 Journal, page 2):

Jerry Purswell (Industrial Engineering)
 Kevin Saunders (Law)
 Bart Ward (Accounting)
 Wanda Ward (Psychology)

Other members of the search committee are:

HSC faculty: Thomas Coury, Joseph Ferretti, Francene Weatherby
 At-large: G. T. Blankenship, Tom Hughes, Barry Galt,
 Martha Griffin, Jere McKenney [chair]
 Staff: Elaine Kumin (Norman); Bruce Love (HSC)
 Students: Shellie Solomon (Norman); David Donnell (HSC)

Dr. Frank Horton expressed his appreciation to the Senate for the resolution of commendation (see 6/88 Journal, pages 1-2). His letter is on file in the Senate office.

SENATE CHAIR'S REPORT, PROF. GARY COHEN

Prof. Cohen discussed the activities of the Senate Executive Committee with regard to the searches for President and Vice President for University Affairs. He explained that the Senate Executive Committee spoke with various Regents about the search for a new President to share the faculty's concerns about the constitution of the search committee, the shape the search might take, the Regents' intentions, and the job description. Copies of the ad from the Chronicle of Higher Education and the criteria adopted by

the OU Regents at their July meeting were available at the Senate meeting (see Appendix II). Prof. Cohen noted that the criteria state that an earned doctorate or its equivalent is expected, and that he is confident that the search committee will take the criteria seriously. Regarding the search for a Vice President for University Affairs, the Executive Committee met with three candidates. The search is continuing.

Concerning previous Senate actions, Prof. Cohen reported that the Regents acted to remove the name of DeBarr from the chemistry building (see 5/88 Journal, pages 6-7). In accordance with a request made at the May 1988 Senate meeting, historical information on Edwin DeBarr and the naming of DeBarr Hall is included in this journal (Appendix III). In response to a resolution approved by the Senate last November (see 11/87 Journal, pages 6-7), the Provost's office published statistics on academic misconduct in the September 12 and 19 Campus Bulletin Board inserts of the student newspaper.

Prof. Cohen reported that the State Regents will be requiring each institution to develop a mechanism for assessing educational outcomes among undergraduate students. Saying it is important for OU to develop an effective mechanism before some outside authority imposes one, he announced that a task force of faculty, staff and students would be formed. Prof. Joe Rodgers (Psychology) will chair the committee. Faculty who are interested in serving should contact the Senate office.

Prof. Cohen commented on the opinion of the state attorney general that the whistle-blower provision applies to institutions of higher education. The opinion was that the protection applies to the faculty and staff, and that has required changing some long-standing policies in the OU Regents Handbook. A copy of this provision was distributed at the meeting (see Appendix IV).

Prof. Cohen asked for a member of the Senate who would be interested in serving as parliamentarian for the Faculty Senate and General Faculty to inform the Senate office; one will be appointed at the next meeting.

The Senate Executive Committee will continue its work on overhead charges for auxiliary accounts and fringe benefits charged to grants. Last year the ad hoc committee on auxiliary accounts prepared a report which questioned the overhead rate, which currently is 2%, the accounts exempted from the charge, and how the overhead revenue is budgeted. A second response from the administration to the committee's report is expected soon. Another follow-up item concerns the policy whereby the total premium for fringe benefits for faculty are fully deducted from their nine-month E&G salaries so that those faculty on summer grants are paying additional premiums from their grant account. Also, in subsequent years, the premiums may inflate beyond the amount budgeted in the original grant. The administration has agreed to charge the grant account at the rate negotiated in the original grant, but refused to drop the premiums deducted from a grant in the summer.

Prof. Cohen urged that the Senate monitor the updated campus master plan, in particular the proposal for a new science center.

REMARKS BY MR. DAVID SWANK, INTERIM PRESIDENT

Pres. Swank told the Senate that 1988-89 will not be a stand-still year. He reported on the ongoing internal projects, the Centennial activities, the joint meeting of the OU and State Regents on September 18, and the capital improvement plan. Efforts on campus that will help OU to meet the standards of AAU include the Strategy for Excellence, improving the core curriculum in general education, implementing an assessment program, and exploring higher admission standards. He announced that later that day he would be accepting a \$1 million donation to OU as part of the centennial campaign, which should provide several professorships and scholarships. If the expected funding from the state and federal governments is received, the construction of the Energy Center should stay on schedule and be completed by September 1990.

Pres. Swank explained that the State Regents had requested a plan for assessing outcomes of undergraduate education; OU will try to have its plan ready by the end of the year. Another request of the Regents was for OU's capital plan by September 1. Since OU was not fully prepared to submit its report that early, the plan turned in is not considered final. He noted that the State Regents' recognition that OU and OSU should be differentiated from the 4-year regional universities and should be funded like their peer institutions resulted in OU receiving about \$12 million more from state appropriations and increased tuition this fiscal year. As future tuition increases are likely, OU has encouraged the State Regents to look at a 4-year plan so that students can plan for the future. The OU Regents now expect higher admission standards at OU. The question is how high they should be and when to implement them. A proposal of the State Regents is to require entering students to rank in the top 1/3 of their class or in the top 1/3 of ACT score (compared with OU's task force proposal of top 1/2). Continuing discussions will take place between OU and the State Regents over the next few weeks.

Pres. Swank said he is optimistic about higher education in Oklahoma. The average ACT score of entering students has jumped a half a point to 21.5, and students are taking more math, science, English, and foreign languages. The number of national merit scholars has increased; there are 45 new national merit scholars and 5 national achievement scholars, which should place OU in the top 30 of all institutions in the country. OU is a finalist for a multi-million dollar funding program from the National Science Foundation for the NSF science and technology center. Pres. Swank said he believes excellence at OU is an achievable goal and he looks forward with confidence to working with the faculty while he serves as interim President.

"FOCUS ON EXCELLENCE"

Prof. Andy Magid, Senate Chair-elect, focused on the Women's Bibliography Project being conducted by Gwen Davis, Associate Professor of English, and Beverly Joyce, Associate Professor of Bibliography in the University Libraries. Professors Davis and Joyce are assembling an annotated bibliography of all literary works by British and American women authors published prior to 1900. They have identified references to about 100,000 books which must each be examined for annotation, so this project may take two decades to complete. This year the first volume (of 6) will be published. Professors Davis and Joyce recently received a \$110,000 grant from the National Endowment for the Humanities to, among other things, computerize their data base.

ELECTION, COUNCILS/COMMITTEES/BOARDS

The Senate approved the Committee on Committees nominations to fill vacancies on University and Campus Councils, Committees and Boards (see Appendix V). Prof. Magid, Chair of the Committee, pointed out that the nominations for the Research Council follow the existing distribution, as opposed to the proposed distribution (see below).

1988-89 PROGRAM REVIEW PANEL

The Senate approved the following nominations of the Senate Executive Committee for the faculty positions on the 1988-89 Academic Program Review Panel:

Davis Egle (Aerospace & Mechanical Engineering)
 Walter Kelley (Mathematics)
 James Kudrna (Architecture)
 Daniel Snell (History)
 Calvin Stoltenberg (Educational Psychology)
 Daniel Wren (Management)

Prof. Cohen pointed out that James Kudrna is a carryover from last year's committee in order to provide some continuity.

ELECTION, SENATE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

Prof. Patricia Weaver-Meyers (University Libraries) was elected, without dissent, to replace Prof. Judy Turk on the Senate Executive Committee (1988-89 term).

TRIENNIAL REAPPORTIONMENT OF SENATE SEATS FOR 1989-92

Prof. Cohen announced that an ad hoc committee composed of Professors Gary Copeland (Carl Albert Center) and Al Schwarzkopf (Management) has been appointed to recommend the apportionment of Senate seats for 1989-92. As soon as the statistics on the number of regular faculty are available, the committee will make a report to the Senate.

DISTRIBUTION OF THE RESEARCH COUNCIL

According to the charge of the Research Council, the composition of the Council is to be reviewed every three years. The last such review was done in 1982, when two seats were allocated to each of six areas based on the number of proposals received from each area. A subcommittee of the Research Council reviewed data from 1982-88 and found that the following changes should be made to make the distribution proportionate to the proposals submitted to the Faculty Research Fund.

	Current	Proposed
Engineering	2	2
Social Sciences & Educ. - Anthr, Commun, Geog, HPER, Hum Rel, Poli Sci, Psych, Soc Work, Soc, Educ	2	2
Biological Sciences - Biol Station, Biol Survey, Bot/Micro, Zoo	2	1
Other - Arch, Bus Ad, Hum Dev, Jour, Lib/Info Sci, Univ. Lib	2	1

Humanities and Arts - Classics, Engl, Fine	2	3
Arts, Hist, Hist of Sci, MLL&L, Phil		
Physical Sciences - Chem/Biochem,	2	3
Geol/Geophys, Math, Phys/Astr, Metr		
	<u>12</u>	<u>12</u>

The Research Council further recommends that a review be done again in three years. Prof. Cohen mentioned that Regional and City Planning was moved from "social sciences and education" to "other" because they are part of architecture now and because their research proposals do not affect the distribution. There was no objection to the change.

Prof. Darryl McCullough, a member of the Council's subcommittee, explained that reviewing proposals is one of the main duties of the council. The recommendation would even out the work load of the Council members but not affect the output from the Council. Prof. Cohen reminded the Senate that the vote on matters of substance is generally deferred a month to allow sufficient consideration.

Prof. Kenderdine commented that the other duties of the Council might require equal numbers of faculty from each area and that the problem of having sufficient numbers of faculty to review proposals could be solved by drawing upon other faculty to help on an ad hoc basis. Prof. Cozad suggested that the distribution should be based on the number of faculty in each area, as opposed to the number of proposals submitted. He pointed out that a low number of proposals could reflect the success of those units in securing outside funding, and that there may be a time when the units will need more access to internal funds. Furthermore, the figures for the number of proposals submitted do not take into account any interdisciplinary activities. Prof. Lewis said, as a former member of the Research Council, she believes the Council's proposal is designed to distribute more fairly the work load among the people who serve on the Council, and that it is not meant to slight those areas that would lose seats. Other discussion centered on how often the apportionment should be done and how the work of the Research Council is conducted. Prof. Cohen reiterated that the vote will be taken at the next meeting.

REGENTS' POLICY ON ETHICS

Prof. Cohen noted that if the Senate is to offer any advice to the administration on the Ethics [Conflict of Interest] Policy (see Appendix VI) before the next Regents' meeting, then some action would have to be taken now. The document is modeled after the policy adopted by the State Regents, although the section on consulting is more precise. The Executive Committee recommended general endorsement of the policy. Prof. Kutner said he thought the policy was quite good except for the third paragraph of II.A.1 on page 2, concerning accepting gifts. He said, as the paragraph is written, the provision would also apply to gifts between people within the university. He also suggested eliminating the examples. Other Senators asked what kinds of gifts would be proscribed--e.g. whether faculty would be prohibited from receiving complimentary textbooks from publishers--and how possible violations by OU Regents might be handled. Prof. Cohen speculated that the code of ethics adopted by the State Regents would apply to governing boards. Prof. Magid moved for general endorsement of the policy excepting section II.A.1. The Faculty Senate approved the motion. Prof. Cohen said he would communicate the concerns to the President and Legal Counsel.

UNDERGRADUATE ADMISSIONS REQUIREMENTS

Prof. Rideout moved that the Faculty Senate endorse the Eliason Task Force proposal on undergraduate admissions requirements (see Appendix VII). Note: The Provost's draft study paper which summarizes the subject was also distributed at the meeting and is available from the Senate office.

Prof. Kenderdine asked who is admitted under the 5% exception category. Dr. Myrna Carney (University College) answered that OU has never filled its quota, and that athletes usually are not the majority. Prof. Rideout commented that a lot of fine arts majors are admitted under that category. Prof. Cozad asked if there was any exposure to litigation in having the 5% exception. Provost Wadlow said neither OU nor OSU had ever been challenged.

Prof. Cohen noted that some of the issues are the speed of implementation and steepness. He pointed out that the State Regents had suggested the top 1/3 to be in effect by 1990 and that OSU is considering a sliding scale program. Prof. Eliason, Chair of the OU task force, explained that the reason for recommending an ACT of 20 or 3.0 g.p.a. and the upper 1/2 was to take into consideration the effect on minorities and females. He commented that ACT scores of females typically are lower than those of males and are not good predictors of how well females will do in school. That also holds true to some extent for minority groups. Offering alternative admission criteria is one solution to that problem.

Provost Wadlow explained that the State Regents recently had mandated a 19 ACT for Fall 1989, so OU's baseline will no longer be 18; consequently, OU's recommendation of 20 might not be as steep as the State Regents would like. She cited other options the Senate could consider, for example a 20 ACT and the top 1/3. She said she believes OSU's sliding scale proposal links ACT too closely with the alternative method. Answering Prof. Nicewander's question, Dr. Carney reported that an 18 ACT and upper 1/2 and 3.0 g.p.a. was the median in Oklahoma in 1988. Prof. Ryan said he was worried that the proposal would lead to grade inflation in high school. Prof. Cohen said that is why the 3.0 g.p.a. is linked with rank in class.

Prof. Fagan asked whether the ACT and SAT could be imposed on transfer students. Prof. Cohen said the current State Regents' policy would not allow that, but that discussions are taking place with regard to the graduation requirements of transfer students. When asked whether the state high schools would be able to meet the foreign language requirements, Provost Wadlow replied that by 1994 they could. Of the freshman students entering OU this fall, 77% have had 2 years of the same foreign languages, and the percentage has risen each semester the last three semesters. Prof. Smith pointed out that small towns can offer foreign languages through the telecommunications system.

Prof. Rideout moved to endorse the proposal. The Senate unanimously approved the recommendations. Prof. Bergey moved that "if there are any significant changes proposed by the administration in the admission standards approved today, that the Faculty Senate be consulted." The motion was approved. Prof. Cohen said he would ask the administration to conduct a study on the transfer requirements. Prof. Cohen said "We're sending a message to our administration and to the OU Regents that we believe this is a sound report, it has a reasonable base and this is a good position for OU to take with the State Regents."

HIGHER EDUCATION FACULTY ASSOCIATION

Prof. Cohen reported that there is a state-wide effort to establish a Higher Education Faculty Association (HEFA). The Senate was requested to consider ratifying the HEFA constitution and bylaws and to affiliate formally as an organization. Prof. Magid said he believes there is no particular point to the OU Faculty Senate affiliating with this organization, as long as each institution would have equal representation. Prof. Cohen noted that there is an equivalent organization of state college presidents which often has votes of 25 to 2. Prof. Smith moved to table the question of affiliating with HEFA. The Senate approved the motion.

ADJOURNMENT

The Faculty Senate adjourned at 5:45 p.m. The next regular session of the Senate will be held at 3:30 p.m. on Monday, October 17, 1988 in the Conoco Auditorium.

Sonya Fallgatter
Sonya Fallgatter
Administrative Coordinator

Gail Tompkins
Gail Tompkins
Secretary

THE UNIVERSITY OF OKLAHOMA
FACULTY SENATE (Norman Campus)
1988-89

9/88 (Appendix I)

Gary Cohen (History), Chair
Gail Tompkins (Instr. Leadership.), Secretary

	<u>Term</u>
<u>College of Architecture</u>	
Joel Dietrich	1986-89
William McManus	1987-90
<u>College of Arts & Sciences</u>	
Monte Cook (Philosophy)	1987-89
George Cozad (Botany & Microbiology)	1988-89 *
Art Johnson (Chemistry)	1986-89
Judith Lewis (History)	1986-89
Andy Magid (Mathematics), <u>Chair-elect</u>	1986-89
William Ray (Mathematics)	1988-89 **
Richard Reardon (Psychology)	1988-89 *
Robert Swisher (Library & Info. Studies)	1988-89 *
John Farmer (Zoology)	1987-90
Paul Minnis (Anthropology)	1988-90 *
Alan Nicewander (Psychology)	1987-90
Stewart Ryan (Physics & Astronomy)	1987-90
Bedford Vestal (Zoology)	1987-90
Joyce Zonana (English)	1987-90
to be elected	1988-90 *
James Fife (MLL&L)	1988-91 *
Trent Gabert (HPER)	1988-91 *
Paul Goodey (Mathematics)	1988-91 *
Lowell Gudmundson (History)	1988-91 *
Sally Jackson (Communication)	1988-91 *
Edward Sankowski (Philosophy)	1988-91 *
Kenneth Wedel (Social Work)	1988-91 *
<u>College of Business Administration</u>	
Terry Robertson (Finance)	1987-89
James Kenderdine (Marketing)	1987-90
James Mouser (EAP)	1988-91 *
Nim Razook (EAP)	1988-91 *
<u>College of Education</u>	
Jay Smith (Ed. Psych.)	1987-90
Cal Stoltenberg (Ed. Psych.)	1988-91 *
<u>College of Engineering</u>	
Charles Bert (AMNE)	1986-89
John Fagan (EECS)	1987-89
Robert Knox (CEES)	1987-89
Karl Bergey (AMNE)	1987-90
Leon Zelby (EECS)	1987-90
Edward Blick (PGE)	1988-91 *
<u>College of Fine Arts</u>	
Bob Barker (Art)	1987-89
Ter ^r Herstand (Drama)	1986-89
Roger Rideout (Music)	1987-90
Daniel Kiacz (Art)	1988-91 *
Joy Nelson (Music)	1988-91 *
<u>College of Geosciences</u>	
Fred Brock (Meteorology)	1987-89
Judson Ahern (Geology & Geophysics)	1988-91 *
Neil Salisbury (Geography)	1988-91 *
<u>College of Law</u>	
Peter Rütner	1986-89
Anita Hill	1988-91 *
<u>Provost Direct</u>	
Patricia Weaver-Meyers (Univ. Libraries)	1987-90
Allen Moore (Naval Science)	1988-91 *
<u>Graduate College</u>	
Daniel Snell (History)	1987-89
<u>College of Liberal Studies</u>	
Marvin Baker (Geography)	1987-90

* New member

** Re-elected member

CRITERIA FOR THE SELECTION OF A PRESIDENT

The University of Oklahoma is seeking a dynamic, articulate, and experienced leader as its next President. The President serves as the Chief Executive Officer of the institution and should possess the exceptional drive and stamina needed to lead a major university.

The following additional characteristics are sought in candidates for the Presidency. A desirable combination of these is expected and candidates will be judged on the basis of overall qualifications.

A distinguished record of executive level accomplishments, preferably in higher education, and an understanding of and a strong commitment to excellence in teaching, scholarship, and research.

Demonstrated scholarly accomplishments, including an earned doctorate or its equivalent.

Knowledge and understanding of the role and function of a comprehensive public research university.

A solid commitment to the principles of accountability and the policies and directives of The University of Oklahoma Board of Regents.

A strong commitment to the affirmative action goals and objectives of the University.

Demonstrated skill in developing financial support from both public and private sources.

Commitment to free expression and the basic principles of academic freedom.

Ability to articulate and express effectively the goals and aspirations of the institution internally and externally.

Demonstrated ability and willingness to make difficult decisions and to assume responsibility for those decisions.

Evidence of physical and intellectual strength, energy, and enthusiasm.

Strong interpersonal and leadership skills.

Personal integrity, dignity, and compassion.

The Chronicle of Higher Education • July 20, 1988

PRESIDENT

The University of Oklahoma

The University of Oklahoma Board of Regents is seeking a dynamic, articulate, and experienced leader with drive and stamina as its next President. Candidates should be dedicated to the pursuit of excellence in education and fully committed to the affirmative action goals and objectives of the University. The President is the chief executive officer of the institution and reports directly to the Board of Regents.

Nearing its 100th anniversary, The University of Oklahoma is a comprehensive research university offering a wide variety of undergraduate and graduate programs in the arts and sciences, architecture, business, education, engineering, fine arts, law, medicine, nursing, pharmacy, and allied and public health, and an extensive continuing education and public service program. Its 2,000-acre Norman Campus houses 11 colleges, including the Law Center and the Oklahoma Geological Survey, and 6 medical and health-related colleges are located on the Health Sciences Center Campus in Oklahoma City and at the OU Tulsa Medical College.

The student enrollment is approximately 25,000 with a faculty of approximately 1,450. The annual budget is in excess of \$350 million.

The review of résumés and other supporting materials will begin on August 1, 1988. The early submission of nominations and applications is encouraged.

Nominations with a current address, and applications with a complete résumé, should be submitted to:

Presidential Search Committee
c/o Mrs. Barbara Tuttle
Executive Secretary, OU Board of Regents
660 Parrington Oval, Room 119
Norman, Oklahoma 73019

An Equal Opportunity, Affirmative Action Employer

Appendix to the Journal of the Faculty Senate,
September 1988

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION ON DR. EDWIN DEBARR AND THE CHEMISTRY BUILDING

At the Senate meeting on May 2, 1988, it was suggested during the discussion of the resolution on renaming DeBarr Hall that additional information be gathered regarding the original naming of the building and Dr. DeBarr's involvement in the Ku Klux Klan. The Chair of the Senate requested such additional information from Dr. Don DeWitt, curator of the Western History Collections at the University; Professors Jidolph Kamoche and William Savage in the Department of History; Mr. Speck Reynolds, Visiting Instructor in Journalism; and Prof. William Campbell, Department of History, Central State University. A summary and excerpts follow from the materials they submitted.

Summary

A) Original Naming of the Building

Dr. DeBarr was apparently the guiding spirit in the planning and designing of the chemistry building. The State Bureau of Public Affairs in November 1915 even authorized him to act as superintendent and architect, to assist the principal architectural firm, in the course of construction. The building was his "baby" from the outset, and the State Superintendent of Public Instruction, R. H. Wilson, authorized the naming of the building after DeBarr with the agreement of the President of the University, Stratton Brooks, when the building was opened in January 1917.

B) Dr. DeBarr's Involvement in the KKK

The materials regarding the Klan indicate that DeBarr was the first "Grand Dragon," head of the state organization, appointed by the Imperial organization in Atlanta, in early 1922. In the spring of 1923, shortly before the OU Regents dismissed Dr. DeBarr, he ceased to be Grand Dragon of the Klan for Oklahoma, but became instead a member of the Klan's national executive committee, the Imperial Klonselium. After DeBarr's dismissal from OU he remained prominent in national Klan affairs at least through 1924 when he served as the Klan's national chaplain, Imperial Kludd. This period saw the height of the illegal activities connected with the Ku Klux Klan across the nation, including mob attacks, kidnappings, beatings, lynchings, vigilanteism, and the systematic terrorization of blacks, Catholics, and Jews.

Excerpts from the Additional Materials Submitted

A) Excerpt from Memo by Dr. Don DeWitt

After reviewing the DeBarr Collection, the Dale Collection, the papers of Stratton Brooks and J. Buchanan, the Edwin DeBarr file in the Provost's office and the minutes of the Board of Regents, I am unable to answer conclusively the questions posed in [the Faculty Senate's query] of May 26, 1988.

One new item relating to the first question about the original naming of DeBarr Hall did turn up, however. My interview with Mrs. Tuttle and the review of the Regents' file on the DeBarr issue disclosed that it was not the Regents who authorized the designation of the Chemistry building as DeBarr Hall. Rather it was the Superintendent of Public Instruction, R. H. Wilson. A letter of Wilson to Brooks 12/19/16 indicates that naming the new science building after DeBarr had been discussed by Wilson and Brooks. While the program for the dedication ceremonies makes no reference to DeBarr Hall, a newspaper account of 1/27/17 reports that it was, indeed, so named.

B) Excerpts from Materials prepared by Mr. Speck Reynolds

THE CONSTRUCTION OF DEBARR HALL

From Carolyn Sorrells, Eight Early Buildings on the Norman campus of the University of Oklahoma, p. 85:

July 20, 1915--Proposals for building examined by committee to agree on architect. All agreed on Hawk & Parr design of Oklahoma City, with the exception of Dr. DeBarr who cast the lone dissenting vote.

November 10, 1915--State Bureau of Public Affairs sent the following letter to DeBarr:

"You are authorized by the Board of Affairs to act as superintendent and architect of the new science building to be erected in Norman by the Holmbe Co., at all times when our state engineer is not present, and to assist him when present. It is understood that no changes are to be made without the consent of the Board."

The author said this was in recognition of DeBarr's contribution. Plans were drawn by DeBarr after an inspection trip covering the leading universities and scientific labs in the U.S. and Europe.

"Again a strong faculty member was given credit for the architects' work (Hawk & Parr). They are not mentioned as architects in documents in the President's Papers but they are named as architects on the carved stone on the north wall of the entrance porch."

EDWIN DEBARR'S KLAN ACTIVITY

From Howard A. Tucker, History of Governor Walton's War on the Ku Klux Klan, 2nd ed., (Oklahoma City: Southwest Publishing Co., 1923):

Page 9--Gov. Jack Walton's first political battle wherein the KKK question was openly discussed was the removal of Professor Edwin DeBarr.

Atlanta, GA, July 12, 1922: Memo of interview between Edward Young Clarke, Imperial Wizard pro tem, Invisible Empire, Knights of KKK, and Robert A. Rogers, Suite 522, First National Bank building, Oklahoma City--"...Then later on Grant Landon, the last eligible candidate, comes to me and he says Dr. DeBarr wants to take in Elmer Fulton and naturalize him...I am naturally prejudiced to that extent on the influences in Dr. DeBarr's offices and on the floor of the Klan...Dr. DeBarr and his friends are backing Thomas H. Owen, not a Klansman...Dr. DeBarr said I was not qualified. I am a graduate of Virginia Law School and sat next to Woodrow Wilson. ...When Dr. DeBarr gets back he said you (Clarke) would be banished. Mr. Clarke--"You have to go through the constitution..."

From Charles C. Alexander, The KKK in the Southwest (Lexington: University of Kentucky Press, 1965):

Page 108--"During January 1922, Imperial headquarters formally established the four Realm, or state, organizations for the Southwest. At the head of each Realm was a Grand Dragon appointed by Imperial Wizard William J. Simmons. The first Grand Dragon in Oklahoma was Dr. DeBarr of Norman, whose background made him unique among Klan officials. The chemistry professor may have been about the last person one would expect to find in the Klan, but nonetheless he was a zealous Klansman devoted to the cause of the Order and anxious for the secret organization to become a force in state and national politics."

Pages 133-134--"Grand Dragon DeBarr had to reckon with an angry Board of Regents at the University of Oklahoma. The previous spring, the Regents had instructed faculty members at the University not to take part in the KKK vs. anti-KKK controversy...On August 5, the OU Board president, pointing out that DeBarr had made speeches on Wilson's (for governor) behalf and had mailed model Klan tickets to local Klan groups over the state, charged the professor with conduct in direct violation of the policy of the University."

Grand Dragon DeBarr retorted to the charges:
"If 30 years of living and doing in Norman and in Oklahoma is not sufficient defense, then I have none other to make."

The OU Norman Alumni Association acted quickly in DeBarr's defense:
"If Dr. DeBarr is a Klansman, then the Klan is to be congratulated on the high type of its membership."

The board voted to reprimand DeBarr officially. DeBarr thought about going to court, but he took the reprimand and stayed on. In the spring of 1923 he resigned the Grand Dragon office and was succeeded by Oklahoma City businessman N. Clay Jewett.

Note: DeBarr then became national chaplain for the KKK.

C) Document provided by Prof. William Campbell

Article from the Oklmulgee Daily Democrat
June 2, 1922

Edwin A. DeBarr's commencement speech to the graduating class of Okmulgee High School, June 1, 1922, at the Orpheum Theatre in Okmulgee

DeBarr devoted a portion of the speech to insinuation and innuendo against the Catholic church and Catholic schools. "The Catholic priest says, 'Give me the child until he is seven years of age, and you can have him the rest of his life.' I say, 'Give me the child until he is seven years of age, and I will make a patriot of him.'"

Girls, he said, who have been kept in seclusion until nineteen years old are more apt to "fall" than those who are not.

The speaker said all children should attend the public schools. He added that even if he lived in the worst slums of New York, he would compel his children to attend public schools.

"When the Catholics want to take hold of our schools or when they want to take hold of our politics, then we must say no."

COMMUNICATIONS WITH STATE OFFICIALS AND THE OKLAHOMA "WHISTLE-BLOWER" LAW

A recent State of Oklahoma Attorney General's opinion concludes that an institution in the Oklahoma State Higher Education System is subject to the "whistle blower" provisions of the State Personnel Act, 74 O.S. Supp. 1987, Section 841.7. In addition, the opinion indicates that a University department head is a supervisor as defined in the statutes and is subject to forfeiture of position for violating provisions of this act.

In essence, the "whistle blower" provision requires that no supervisor or appointing authority of a State agency may prohibit employees of that agency from discussing the operations of the agency either specifically or generally with others. This includes discussions with State legislators. The law provides also that disciplinary action shall not be taken against any employee for providing or offering to provide information regarding actions within the State agency.

Pursuant to the Attorney General's opinion the OU Regents approved the following policy at their September 1988 meeting:

The President and the Board of Regents are the only proper channel through which recommendations concerning the administration of the University, as a whole or in any of its parts, should reach the legislature or other State officials and authorities.

Without the knowledge and approval of the President, no employee of the University should initiate, or promote with individual members of the Legislature or other State authorities, any recommendation ~~concerning general University policies or~~ concerning his/her personal advancement, the advancement of his/her department, or the advancement of any other individual or department. ~~This applies also to encouragement of activity among students or groups of students.~~

(strikeouts
indicate
deleted
language)

The above principles and policies are designed to promote the effective, orderly and efficient communications and operations of the University of Oklahoma and to restrain University of Oklahoma employees from interceding with members of the Legislature and other State authorities for personal or departmental gain or for gain to other individuals or departments which may necessarily be at the expense of the operations of the University as a whole. These principles and policies shall not be construed to abridge an employee's rights to discuss and comment on matters of public concern regarding the operations of the University.

(new
language
added)

Faculty Senate (Norman campus)
 Nominees for Councils/Committees/Boards
 September 1988

Nominees	Replaced
<u>Academic Programs Council: 1:1</u> John Farmer (Zoology) Richard Resco (Mathematics)	Judy Turk, 1987-90 Gordon Uno, 1986-89
<u>Bass Memorial Scholarship Committee: 1:1</u> David Wilsford (Political Science)	Euel Elliott, 1988-90
<u>Budget Council: 1:1</u> Arn Henderson (Architecture) Alex Kondonassis (Economics)	Jon Bredeson, 1986-89 N. Jack Kanak, 1987-90
<u>Campus Disciplinary Council I: 2:1</u> Eldon Matlick (Music) Jerry Parkinson (Law)	John Albert, 1987-89
<u>Campus Tenure Committee: 2:1</u> David Rinear (Drama) Bedford Vestal (Zoology)	Frank Durso, 1987-90
<u>Employment Benefits Committee: 2:1</u> Gary Thompson (Geography) Elizabeth Yamashita (Jour. & Mass Comm.)	Steven Livesey, 1985-89
<u>Equal Opportunity Committee: 2:1</u> Curtis McKnight (Mathematics) Donna Nelson (Chemistry)	Sandra Flesher, 1986-89
<u>Faculty Advisory Committee to the President: 1:1</u> Wayland Bowser (Architecture)	Mack Caldwell, 1988-90
<u>Faculty Appeals Board: 1:1</u> Kaan Akin (Mathematics) Ted Roberts (Law) Alfred Striz (AMNE)	Timothy Yoshino, 1985-89 Dragan Milivojevic, 1986-90 Carol Beesley, 1987-91
<u>Legal Panel: 2:1</u> Forrest Frueh (EAP) Ted Roberts (Law)	Mike Cox, 1987-90
<u>Parking Violation Appeals Committee: 1:1</u> Douglas Montgomery (Naval Science)	Slawomir Kwasik, 1987-89
<u>Patent Advisory Committee: 2:1</u> Jack Cohn (Physics & Astronomy) Kyung-Bai Lee (Mathematics)	Michael McInerney, 1986-89
<u>Research Council: 1:1</u> William Shelton (Zoology) John Scamehorn (CEMS) Yoshi Sasaki (Meteorology) Jim Richstad (Jour. & Mass Comm.) Robert Bursik (Sociology)	Paul Bell, 1987-90 Jeff Harwell, 1987-90 Michael Morrison, 1986-89 Patricia Self, 1987-90 C. Vaughn-Roberson, 1986-89
<u>Rita Lottinville Prize for Freshmen Committee: 1:1</u> James Paschal (Jour. & Mass Comm.) Brad Koplowitz (Univ. Libraries)	Timothy Yoshino, 1987-90 Christine Smith, 1988-91
<u>ROTC Advisory Committee: 1:1</u> Don DeWitt (Univ. Libraries)	L. Brooks Hill, 1986-89
<u>Speakers Bureau: 1:1</u> T. H. Milby (Univ. Libraries)	Scott Russell, 1988-90
<u>Student Activity Fee Committee: 1:1</u> Frank Seto (Zoology)	Jon Bredeson, 1986-89

1:1 = The Faculty Senate submits 1 nomination for each vacant position.

2:1 = The Faculty Senate submits 2 nominations for each vacant position;
 selection is made by the President.

CONFLICT OF INTERESTS POLICYI. STATEMENT OF PURPOSE

A public servant occupies a position of trust and confidence, and the public expects its servants to be above reproach in fulfilling the duties and responsibilities of office. However, in a community as diverse and complex as that of a modern public university, the pursuit of individual interests may result in conflicts with University interests. It shall be the policy of the University that its Regents, officers, faculty and employees, hereinafter for the sake of brevity referred to as "individual," avoid these conflicts or even the appearance of such conflicts. The University of Oklahoma should serve as the model for ethical conduct in the State. If a University can not exemplify the highest principles of honesty and integrity, then its very reason for being is called into question.

This policy is not limited to outright dishonesty. It is clearly wrong and is a criminal offense to take state property, sell protected information and privileges for one's personal gain, or accept money, gifts or favors from suppliers. Most conflicts of interest are more subtle, and often only a matter of degree separates an acceptable course of action from an unacceptable one. What follows is intended to provide guidance to individuals, so that they can anticipate and avoid situations where personal interests cause a person to act in a way inconsistent with University interests.

The conflicting interests referred to throughout this policy may be direct or indirect. The interest might be that of the individual or that of another, such as a close relative or friend. It may even be that of a business in which the individual or other person has an interest, financial or otherwise, which is likely to or would tend to interfere with the individual's objective performance of public duties.

In determining whether a conflict exists, there is no substitute for common sense and good judgment. The cardinal question is whether

one's judgment in official matters may be affected by circumstances of personal interest. In a particular situation, identification of a disqualifying interest must include all the facts, including, the individual's position, the government action, the impact of that action, the kind and amount of the individual's personal interest, and in some instances the kind and amount of the individual's other interest. In case of doubt, an individual should seek clarification from the President, or his or her designee, before acting. Consultation with Legal Counsel also may be desired.

II. STATEMENT OF RULES

A. Conflict of Interests. There are five general areas of concern, which are set forth below.

1. Seeking or Accepting Gifts. No individual shall seek or accept anything of value from others given for the purpose of influencing him or her in the discharge of official duties or if one has reason to believe that the gift would not have been offered had the individual not been associated with the University.

To come within this prohibition the interest must be one incurred by reason of the individual's public position. Normally this requirement would exclude gifts for purely social reasons; however, if a gift would have a tendency to reflect adversely upon one in the public eye, a conflict of interest will probably arise. Again one should seek to avoid the appearance of corruption, since the public expects a high ethical standard from its public servants.

This rule does not prohibit occasional acceptance of items of nominal value such as plaques, desk calendars, pens or pencils and the like (generally less than \$50.00) which are not intended to influence the judgment of the employee in the performance of his public duties. However, while favors or gifts may be small, they have the tendency to become reciprocal. If there is ever any doubt as to the offerer's intent, it is always advisable to decline the favor or gift. Benefits of significant value should be declined or

returned with a letter explaining this policy; a copy of the letter should be filed. Likewise this rule does not prohibit gifts to an individual retiring or leaving the University.

2. Improper Use of Office or Position. No individual shall knowingly use his official position with the University to obtain some special privilege or advantage for himself or herself or another except as specifically provided by law.

Improper use of position can take many forms. For example, one might use influence or coercive power with others to give a friend special consideration; or it might also induce the use of position to obtain preferential treatment with a private business having some connection with an individual.

One of the more frequent problems in this area concerns use of public property for personal purposes unrelated to the individual's public duties. Charging personal long distance telephone calls to the University, using a University vehicle for personal purposes, or using one's University office to operate a personal business are all examples of improper use.

3. Disclosure of Confidential Information. No individual shall offer to or in fact give, release or discuss confidential information obtained by the use of his or her official position to anyone not entitled to that information. Furthermore, no individual may use any confidential information obtained by the use of his or her official position for his or her own personal gain.

This prohibition is intended to protect not only information directly received by the individual but also information which one, by the use of some power associated with his or her official position or by virtue of that position, has obtained and offers to or in fact gives to another not entitled to that information. Some of the areas to which this policy pertain include student records, personnel records, proprietary research information, procurement, etc.

4. Commercial Transactions with the University and other State agencies. In general, no individual may sell, offer to sell, or cause to be sold, either as an individual or through any business enterprise in which he or she holds a substantial financial interest, any goods or services to the University or any other agency of the State or to any business licensed by or regulated by the State, unless the contract is preceded by public notice of the University's intent to procure such goods or services and they are procured by competitive bidding, with the individual being the lowest and best bidder.

Whether or not an individual has a "substantial financial interest" in a particular business organization is always a matter that must be determined on a case by case basis. One of the most important factors to be considered in interpreting "substantial financial interest" is whether the individual's judgment in official matters may be affected by circumstances of personal interest. Normally, individuals should avoid financial relationships with the University. For example, it would be improper for an individual to approve the awarding of a contract to a firm of which he is a part owner or which employs the spouse or other close relation of the one connected to the University.

One definition of "substantial financial interest" identifies it as an interest arising from a gift, salary or other compensation from any individual or business or an interest which could result in a substantial financial gain or loss arising from such interest in a business.

5. Outside Employment or Compensation. No individual may receive or solicit outside employment or compensation that would impair the independence of judgment of the individual in rendering service as a state employee unless specifically provided by law.

A person who accepts full time employment in the University owes his first duty and loyalty to the University. Any other

employment or enterprise must be understood to be secondary to his University work. Notwithstanding this, a faculty or staff member is permitted, as set forth in the Faculty Handbook and Staff Handbook, to have some outside employment.

The University expects members of its faculty to pursue continual scholarly development and renewal and to share their professional capabilities for the common interest. The University recognizes that consulting activities may provide good opportunities toward these ends. Members of the faculty and staff therefore are encouraged to devote, within the limits of the current policies of the University on outside employment, a reasonable amount of effort to personal professional activity beyond the professional responsibilities of employment by the University, provided such activity does not interfere with the faculty member's teaching, research and service to the University.

It is recognized that Regents are not full time employees of the University and that they have their separate careers. In the pursuit of their separate careers they should avoid placing themselves in situations and positions that might impair, or give the appearances of impairing, their independent judgment as Regents.

Of concern in this area, is the relationship of the University with foundations organized to benefit the University. Public servants must not permit their judgment to be clouded by concern over the effect of their actions on foundation goals and priorities. Individuals should not serve as officers for university-related foundations, nor should they receive compensation from such foundations for activities related to the improvement of education in the State. Any activities for which the employee or officer is able to receive extra compensation should be preceded by a contract between the foundation and the University, which calls for that compensation to be paid to the University, with the University then paying the employee.

6. Participation In Hearing Panels.

No member of a University hearing or appeals panel or of another committee, council, or the Board of Regents when engaged in judicial proceedings shall participate in such an action when the panel member has a close professional or personal relationship with any of the principal parties in the matter or with their counsel/representatives. For instance, faculty and staff shall not participate as panel members when appellant or respondent is a member of their own department or unit or has been a close collaborator except in the case of appeals panels internal to some units where their rules specifically permit such participation.

B. Political Activities. All citizens of this country have guaranteed rights as individuals to participate in civic affairs. The key phrase is "as individuals." No Regent, officer, faculty or employee may engage in political activities with the use of state funds, personnel or property. The provisions of the Regents' policies concerning political activities of faculty and employees shall continue in force and effect.

III. POLICY ADMINISTRATION

It shall be the policy of the University that if an individual fails to comply with any provisions of this University policy, it may be grounds for appropriate disciplinary action. Complaints relating to violations should be reported to the appropriate academic dean or executive officer.

IV. CONCLUSION

No policy can hope to answer all questions that might arise. Whenever you are in doubt as to the propriety of any given situation, always err on the side of propriety. One might disclose the potential or perceived conflict, seek advice or guidance from the appropriate officer before entering into the activity, and make a record of the matter for future reference and use.

PROPOSAL FOR NEW UNDERGRADUATE ADMISSION REQUIREMENTS FROM THE ELIASON TASK FORCE

CURRENT OU ADMISSION STANDARDS COMPARED WITH
ADMISSION STANDARDS PROPOSED BY 1987 TASK FORCE

<u>Freshmen</u>	<u>Fall '88</u>	<u>Task Force Proposal for Fall '91</u>
<u>Academic Performance Requirements</u>	18 ACT (or 790 SAT) or 3.00 GPA in high school or upper 1/2 of high school class or 5% Exception Category	20 ACT (or 840 SAT) or 3.00 GPA in high school and upper 1/2 of high school class or 5% Exception Category*
<u>Curricular Requirements</u>		
English	Four years	Four years
Math	Three years	Three years
Social Science	Two years	Two years
Science	Two years	Two years
Foreign Language	None	Two years beginning in FY '94
	*Up to five percent of the first-time entering Fall freshmen class may be admitted provided that the students demonstrate unusual talent or ability in an academic area; or else that the students are educationally or economically disadvantaged and also show promise of being able to succeed in an academic program at OU.	
<u>Transfer</u>	At present, a sliding scale with the required GPA depending upon the number of hours being transferred.	2.00 for <u>all</u> transfers