

JOURNAL OF THE FACULTY SENATE
 The University of Oklahoma (Norman campus)
 Regular session - October 17, 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, Barker, Bert, Blick, Brock, Cohen, Cook, Cozad, Dietrich, Farmer, Fife, Gabert, Gudmundson, Herstand, Jackson, Johnson, Kiacz, Knox, Kutner, Magid, McManus, Minnis, Moore, Mouser, Nelson, Nicewander, Ray, Reardon, Rideout, Robertson, Ryan, Salisbury, Sankowski, Snell, Stoltenberg, Swisher, Tompkins, Weaver-Meyers, Zelby, Zonana

Provost's office representative: Ravi Ravindran

PSA representatives: Bloomgarden, Scott, Spigner-Littles, Turner

UOSA representatives: McDaniel, Walsh

ABSENT: Baker, Bergey, Fagan, Goodey, Hill, Kenderdine, Lewis, Razook, Smith, Vestal, Wedel

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Announcements:

Whistle-blower policy.....	2
Alcohol awareness task force.....	2
Task force on assessment of undergraduate education.....	2
Spring 1988 semester reports of councils.....	2
1988-89 booklet of faculty membership of councils/committees/boards..	2
Summary of actions taken on Senate recommendations for 1987-88.....	2
Actions taken by the Administration on Senate recommendations:	
Program review panel for 1988-89.....	2
Policy on ethics (conflict of interest).....	2
Admissions standards.....	3
Senate Chair's Report:	
Meeting with HSC Faculty Senate Executive Committee.....	3
Auxiliary accounts.....	3
Meeting with Regent Sarratt.....	3
Focus on Excellence - Shane Moriarity.....	4
Election, Budget Council.....	4
Issue for discussion - academic facilities.....	4
Distribution of seats on the Research Council.....	7
Current status of admissions requirements.....	7
Election of Parliamentarian.....	7
Other new business.....	7

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Prof. Cohen noted that the policy on communications with state officials and the "whistle-blower" law, which was attached to the September Senate journal as Appendix IV, was deferred from the September meeting of the OU Regents and then amended at their October meeting. The final policy approved by the Regents is included in this journal as Appendix I. [Prof. Cohen pointed out in his Chair's report that communications with state officials must also be approved by the Board of Regents now.]

The minutes of the regular session of September 19, 1988, were approved, with the understanding that the 9/88 Appendix IV would be corrected in this month's journal.

ANNOUNCEMENTS

The Chair introduced the new members of Faculty Senate, the representatives from Student Congress, and the representatives from the Professional Staff Association.

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, Chancellor for the Oklahoma State Regents for Higher Education, will be the principal speaker. A reception will follow.

Professor Paula Englander-Golden (Human Relations) was asked by the Senate Chair to serve on the alcohol awareness task force and consented. Alcohol Awareness Week will be held the week of October 17.

The following faculty agreed to serve on the university-wide task force on assessment of undergraduate education: Mike Abraham (Chemistry and Biochemistry), Mary Margaret Holt (Drama/Dance), Paul Kleine (Educational Psychology), and Curtis McKnight (Mathematics). Professor Joe Rodgers (Psychology) will chair the committee.

The compilation of the Spring 1988 semester reports of University Councils was mailed October 13 to the Faculty Senate members and to chairs/directors/deans to be made available to the general faculty. Copies are also available from the Senate office.

The 1988-89 booklet listing faculty membership on University and Campus Councils, Committees and Boards and the Faculty Senate was mailed to the general faculty October 19.

The record of actions taken by the administration on Faculty Senate recommendations from last year (September 1987 - August 1988) was distributed at the meeting and is attached as Appendix II.

ACTIONS TAKEN BY THE ADMINISTRATION ON 1988-89 SENATE RECOMMENDATIONS

President Swank approved the nominations for the 1988-89 Academic Program Review Panel (see 9/88 Journal, page 5).

In response to the suggestions of the Faculty Senate and various individuals, the University Legal Counsel revised the Ethics [Conflicts of Interest] Policy (see 9/88 Journal, page 6), and it was approved by the OU Regents at their October meeting. The revised document is attached as Appendix III.

The examples of acceptable gifts were retained so that examination copies and desk copies of textbooks could be included. The section on policy administration now contains a provision requiring each individual to sign a compliance statement. The Board of Regents is also included in the definition of "individual" in the policy. Discussion is still taking place some implementation questions. Prof. Zelby asked about the legality and usefulness of requiring individuals to sign such a statement. Prof. Cohen said he would convey that concern to the President.

President Swank acknowledged the Senate's endorsement of the proposed admissions standards along with the Senate's request for further study of the transfer requirements and the request for consultation should the administration make any significant changes in the proposed standards (see 9/88 Journal, page 7).

SENATE CHAIR'S REPORT

The Executive Committees from the Norman and Health Sciences Center Faculty Senates met in Norman on August 31, 1988. Several items were discussed, including policies on extra compensation, the proposed "Conflict of Interest" policy, assessment of undergraduate education, the Presidential search, and priorities for new money.

A summary sheet of the concerns raised in the Senate's small group planning sessions, along with the assignments for action, will be mailed to the Senators in late October. In general, the proposals fall into three major categories: 1) issues regarding current or proposed actions by the State Regents, 2) faculty professional and economic issues, and 3) efforts to improve the academic environment.

The latest report from the administration on the overhead rates for auxiliary and service accounts proposes an increase in the rate from 2% to 2.55%, phased in gradually over three years. Additional work needs to be done in reviewing which accounts should be exempted from the overhead charge.

Prof. Cohen attended a workshop at the University of Cincinnati October 9-11 on creating an environment and finding incentives to increase the representation of minorities in doctoral programs and college faculties. Prof. Cohen said he hoped to make this a discussion topic at a future Senate meeting.

Prof. Cohen reported on some of the actions taken at the October OU Regents meeting. The current status of various endowed chairs was discussed. A proposed cooperative agreement between OU and Chengdu College of Geology in the Peoples Republic of China was approved following a prolonged discussion. The Regents are looking into the possibility of linking the computing system on the Norman campus with the new administrative system being installed at the HSC; a special committee has been appointed to examine this matter. Several Regents attended the Presidential Search Committee meeting on October 12. Prof. Cohen was asked to present his views on the profile of the next President.

The Executive Committee met with Regent Sarratt on October 13. Regent Sarratt seems particularly concerned about faculty work loads.

OSU also has abstained from affiliating with the proposed Higher Education Faculty Association. However, both OU and OSU will send representatives to the meeting November 18.

Prof. Cohen received a letter from the director of the higher education division of the Association of American Publishers asking OU to consider an ethics document preventing the resale of complimentary copies of textbooks. Prof. Cohen asked the Senators to let him know if they are interested in having the Senate consider such a policy.

"FOCUS ON EXCELLENCE"

Prof. Magid said he became interested in the number of faculty who are directly involved with doctoral education at OU after hearing Dr. Brisch characterize OU and OSU as doctoral research universities. Information from the Graduate College indicates that 408 faculty at OU chair doctoral committees -- a remarkable achievement considering there are less than 700 faculty, and many serve in areas without doctoral programs.

Prof. Magid's focus for this month was on Prof. Shane Moriarity, of the School of Accounting, whose specialty is managerial accounting. Prof. Moriarity is the director of the Ph.D. programs for the College of Business Administration, is the co-author of one of the top textbooks in cost accounting, has been on the editorial boards of the two top accounting journals, and is serving as the chairman of the managerial accounting section of the American Accounting Association.

Prof. Cohen congratulated Prof. William Ray (Mathematics) on his appointment as Assistant Dean of the Graduate College. Prof. Ray will remain in the Senate, since his administrative appointment is only half-time.

ELECTION, BUDGET COUNCIL

Prof. John Cowan (Physics and Astronomy) was elected to replace Alex Kondonassis (1988-90 term) on the Budget Council.

ISSUE FOR DISCUSSION: ACADEMIC FACILITIES

Prof. Cohen introduced the discussion by saying that the problem in developing and planning academic facilities on campus seems to be that of assuring adequate input from the affected academic units. He acknowledged that the current planning process was interrupted by the early deadline for submitting a plan to the State Regents. Several items in the plan have drawn the attention of the faculty, in particular the proposal for a science complex. [Under the proposal the Science Complex would house Chemistry, Physics, Zoology, and Botany/Microbiology; a combined Science Library; a Research Support Center, which would include an animal care facility; and the University Computer Center.] Prof. Cohen noted that the faculty were not opposed to planning new facilities but rather concerned that the facilities not overlook the needs of the faculty. Present at the meeting to aid in the discussion were Gary Schnell (Chair of the Campus Planning Council), Jeffrey Stark (Classroom Scheduler), Arthur Tuttle (Director of Architectural and Engineering Services), and Michael Moorman (Campus Planner, A&E Services).

Prof. Schnell commented that the Campus Planning Council had been given the plans of the Space and Facilities subcommittees in August and September and asked to respond by the first of October. In such a short time it was only possible for the Council to make general recommendations. For instance, the Council questioned locating the computer center in the proposed science complex and pointed out that general classroom space had not received enough attention. Answering Prof. Cohen's question, Prof. Schnell said it was his impression that the concept of the science complex was initiated at the college level, not by the Space and Facilities steering committee, and then was further developed in the Provost's office.

Prof. Ryan commented that the departments concerned should have a chance to discuss the concept of a science complex, since there are potential problems with housing physical and life sciences together and designing classrooms that are suitable for the respective disciplines. The Physics Department has estimated that an annex to Nielsen Hall would fulfill their anticipated needs for the foreseeable future and would cost approximately one-third of the amount projected for the Physics phase of the new complex. Prof. Ryan also pointed out that an argument for such a center is that it would foster interdisciplinary research. In his opinion, people, not buildings, do research, and turf battles might hinder interdisciplinary research. He also commented on the plan to centralize the research support facilities, the future role of the computer center, and the effects of housing diverse experimental groups in one location.

Prof. Nicewander said he objected to the secrecy surrounding the planning of the complex and the reference to the "premier" departments in Physical and Life Sciences, since Psychology uses lab animals, yet would be the only laboratory science on campus without a research facility. Prof. Johnson said was surprised that his fellow Senators had so much information about the complex, because the Chemistry Department has not seen any documents. He said his department had some critical space needs, but that the science complex would solve the problems only if sufficient funds were available to build it to the necessary level and proper specifications. He cited the Physical Science Center as an example of a building that is still unfinished and whose design was changed once it left the departmental level, so that now the space assigned to Chemistry laboratories is inadequate. For instance, his lab is a firetrap, because there are no windows and only one door.

Prof. Rideout commented that during the planning of the Catlett Music Center the architects worked directly with the music faculty, and the result has been a building that meets their needs. Prof. Ahern pointed out that the plans on the Energy Center have been changed in the course of developing the Center, and that it is his impression that it is difficult to combine different disciplines. Prof. Cozad said the Botany-Microbiology building suited the needs of the faculty because they worked very closely with the architects. He pointed out that his animal research laboratory was located in Nielsen Hall years ago, and that particular cooperation didn't work well because the physicists objected to the odor.

Prof. Cohen asked Mr. Tuttle whether it would be possible to have the kind of input from other units that occurred for the Music building, given the many units that would be involved in the science complex. Mr. Tuttle discussed the steps of the planning process over the past two years in order to explain how the space needs in the proposal were derived. In answer to Prof. Cohen's question, he said that the process involving faculty is the one that they use as the standard in planning all buildings. On the other hand, a space such

as the science complex must be looked at also as a whole, where several units will benefit by having some shared facilities in one place. Prof. Ryan reiterated that adequate planning must occur before the science complex proceeds any further. He pointed out that there is the science complex the building and then there is the science complex the concept, neither of which may be desirable. Prof. Johnson noted that Chemistry had not even been officially notified, let alone asked to draw up any specifications. Prof. Cohen summarized by saying there is no doubt of the critical needs for space, but that additional consultation with the units is necessary before the process of funding this kind of capital venture begins.

The discussion then turned to space concerns regarding architecture, the fine arts studios, and classrooms. Prof. Cohen reported that the renovation of Gould Hall for the College of Architecture is listed as #5 in the highest priority projects in the campus master plan for capital improvements. He asked whether Architecture had any problem in knowing where it would be located. Prof. McManus said that Gould Hall had been promised to Architecture for a number of years. Architecture faculty would prefer to have a new building, but they could make do in Gould Hall. It would at least be an improvement over the current space in the Stadium. He questioned the large amount of money that has been estimated for moving Architecture into Gould Hall and noted the need for a large lecture room. He said he was concerned that Architecture would have to wait to move into Gould Hall until after the science complex was completed. Prof. Schnell said it was his understanding that Architecture could move in once Gould Hall is vacated. Prof. Dietrich commented that the College of Architecture is composed of small units that can work together fairly well.

Prof. Cohen brought up the question of the studio space for fine arts on the north campus. Prof. Barker said the main concern was to find adequate space. The current facility, which is an old military building, has severe problems with leakage and is a firetrap.

Prof. Cohen asked Mr. Stark to comment on the needs for classroom space. Mr. Stark said he provided qualitative and quantitative information on general classrooms in the initial stage of the space and facilities planning process, but that has been the extent of his participation. Prof. Schnell said the Campus Planning Council had suggested that the needs of general classroom space were not adequately addressed in the recent master plan. Mr. Stark mentioned that generally assignable classrooms are still being lost to other functions, such as research, while any new construction has been specialized. Prof. Cohen speculated that the problem might be that the individual academic units were not asked to address this question. Mr. Stark explained that at some point in the process the administration realized that classroom space had been omitted, and so to address this problem, Provost Wadlow asked him to chair a committee on classroom maintenance. Mr. Stark reminded the Senate that his committee had recently distributed a questionnaire asking the faculty to describe what kind of instructional space they need. He urged the faculty to complete the questionnaire, because Section 13 funds will be available to correct the problems. Prof. Cohen asked Mr. Moorman whether projections had been made of classroom space needs. Mr. Moorman responded that he had developed a model to measure utilization of classrooms with an ideal utilization being 100%. For the past Fall the classrooms controlled by Mr. Stark were at 109-115%. Classrooms assigned to departments are at about 39% efficiency, but those include specialized rooms, such as music studios with pianos. Any growth in weekly student contact hours will have a serious

impact on classroom space. Furthermore, these figures are purely quantitative and do not take qualitative factors into account.

Prof. Cohen explained that a report of the issues raised would be sent to the appropriate administrators, including the President.

DISTRIBUTION OF THE SEATS ON THE RESEARCH COUNCIL

Prof. Cohen conveyed the concerns raised in the Senate meeting to the chair of the Research Council, who suggested that the Council be given some time to reconsider their proposal. The Executive Committee recommended deferring the vote until the November meeting to allow for additional input from the Research Council. Prof. Cozad asked that the duties of the Research Council be reviewed to determine whether they should be expanded.

CURRENT STATUS OF PROPOSAL TO CHANGE UNDERGRADUATE ADMISSIONS REQUIREMENTS

Prof. Cohen reported that several OU Regents raised two points on admissions requirements at the October OU Regents' meeting: 1) if more students will have to enter under the exemption category, then what mechanism would be used, and 2) given the historical data, how did the administration and the task force arrive at the particular conclusions? President Swank recommended deferring action for a month to work out those problems.

ELECTION OF PARLIAMENTARIAN

Prof. Peter Kutner was elected by acclamation as parliamentarian for the Faculty Senate and the General Faculty.

OTHER NEW BUSINESS

Prof. Cohen reported that the Executive Committee is discussing with Student Affairs administrators the possibility of a university council on student life, whose membership would include faculty, students, and staff. The Senate will be kept informed of the deliberations.

Prof. Herstand said he intended to present a motion at the next meeting to abolish the OU-Texas holiday, and he asked the Executive Committee to place this item on next month's agenda. Prof. Cohen asked the Senators to discuss this with their colleagues.

ADJOURNMENT

The meeting adjourned at 5:18 p.m. The next regular session of the Senate will be held at 3:30 p.m. on Monday, November 14, 1988 in the Conoco Auditorium, Neustadt Wing, Bizzell Library.

Sonya Fallgatter
Sonya Fallgatter
Administrative Coordinator

Gail Tompkins
Gail Tompkins
Secretary

NEW POLICY FOR COMMUNICATIONS WITH STATE OFFICIALS
AND THE OKLAHOMA "WHISTLE-BLOWER" LAW
AS ADOPTED BY THE OU REGENTS AT THEIR OCTOBER 1988 MEETING

[The draft policy included in the September Senate journal (Appendix IV) was deferred by the OU Regents from their September meeting to the October meeting and adopted in the following amended form.]

The President and the Board of Regents are the 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 AND THE BOARD OF REGENTS 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.

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 AS PROVIDED IN 74 O.S. SUPP. 1987, SECTION 841.7.

(Additions by the OU Regents to the September 1988 proposal are capitalized; deletions are lined through.)

RECORD OF ACTIONS TAKEN BY ADMINISTRATION ON FACULTY SENATE RECOMMENDATIONS
(September, 1987 - August, 1988)

Number	Date of Senate mtg.	Item*	Origin	Disposition, Date
1	9-14-87	Resolution regarding David Burr	Senate	Acknowledged, 9-24-87
2	9-14-87	Changes in Academic Program Review process	Provost's office	Approved, 10-14-87
3	9-14-87	Faculty replacements, councils/committees	Senate	Appointed, 9-24-87
4	10-12-87	Faculty nominations, search committees, Liberal Studies Dean and Vice President for Administrative Affairs	Pres./Prov. offices	Appointed, 11-20-87
5	10-12-87	Faculty replacements, councils/committees	Senate	Appointed, 10-23-87
6	10-12-87	Faculty nominations, program discontinuance committee	Provost's office	Appointed, 10-30-87
7	10-12-87	Smoking (Tobacco) policy	EEC	Rewritten by adm. to comply w/state law, 12-4-87
8	10-12-87	Expanded grading scale	Senate	Disapproved, 11-6-87
9	11-9-87	Faculty replacements, councils/committees	Senate	Appointed, 12-11-87
10	11-9-87	Resolution on publishing academic misconduct statistics	Senate	Approved, 3-24-88
11	12-14-87	Faculty replacements, councils/committees	Senate	Appointed, 12-22-87
12	3-14-88	Faculty replacements, councils/committees	Senate	Appointed, 3-25-88
13	4-11-88	Revisions in program discontinuance policy	Senate	Under review
14	5-2-88	End-of-year faculty replacements, councils/committees	Senate	Appointed, 8-25-88
15	5-2-88	Resolution on changing the name of DeBarr Hall	Senate	Approved, 7-21-88
16	6-27-88	Faculty nominations, Presidential Search Committee	OU Regents	Appointed, 7-21-88
17	6-27-88	Resolution regarding President Frank Horton	Senate	Acknowledged with thanks by Pres. Horton, 7-12-88

*Full text of recommendation can be found in Senate Journal for date indicated at left

10/88 (Appendix III)

CONFLICTS OF INTERESTS POLICY

I. 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 six 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.

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, examination copies and desk copies of textbooks, (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 retained. This rule does not prohibit gifts from within University community to individuals retiring or leaving the University or who have achieved some special distinction while at 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. Individuals 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.

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 individual 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 provision 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. Within sixty days of the implementation of this policy or within sixty days of employment, each individual shall sign a statement that he or she has read the policy and is familiar with its contents and every two years thereafter in the month of December a compliance statement shall be signed by each individual.

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.

SEMESTER REPORTS

SPRING 1988

ACADEMIC PROGRAMS COUNCIL (Norman)

ATHLETICS COUNCIL (University)

BUDGET COUNCIL (Norman)

CAMPUS PLANNING COUNCIL (Norman)

COUNCIL ON CONTINUING EDUCATION AND PUBLIC SERVICE (Norman)

RESEARCH COUNCIL (Norman)

Distributed by the Faculty Senate Office
University of Oklahoma (Norman campus)
October 1988

ACADEMIC PROGRAMS COUNCIL REPORT
SPRING 1988

Submitted by Robert Petry, Chair

The Academic Programs Council met five times during the Spring 1988 semester (January 18, February 15, March 21, April 4, and April 18) and once during the Summer (June 20). Members of the Council, including subcommittee assignments are:

Courses Subcommittee:

Frances Ayres (Accounting), Chair
Eren Erdener (Architecture)
Brian Hunt (Student)
Joakim Laguros (CEES)
Chris Moon (Student)
Judy Turk (Journalism)

Curriculum Subcommittee:

Lauren Key (Student)
M'Lou Kimpel (Student)
Helga Madland (MLL&L)
Gordon Uno (Botany/Microbiology), Chair

Instruction Subcommittee:

James Faulconer (Music)
Thomas Gallaher (Education), Chair
John Manning (Student)
A. Rehman (Student)

Also meeting regularly with the Council to provide advice, information, and staff support were Dr. Jerome Weber, Dean of University College; Dr. Milford Messer, Registrar; and Connie Boehme, Editor of Academic Bulletins. Robert Petry (Physics) served as Chair of the Council.

Activities of the Council are listed on the attached sheet along with the actions taken and the Provost's action. Not listed are the multitude of course changes considered by the Courses Subcommittee and acted upon by the Council. Course and curriculum decisions were based on information submitted by departments as well as personal contact between the subcommittees and department representatives, deans, and other persons with pertinent information.

In addition to the more routine matters that came before the Council, several issues of a more general nature were considered and recommendations made. Among these were the new Arts and Sciences General Education Requirements, endorsed by the Council. Several proposals for the management of admissions and retention in colleges or specific degree programs were considered, the major ones being the proposals of the College of Business Administration and the College of Fine Arts.

At the request of the Provost, the Council also considered the need for new policies concerning credit earned with study abroad. The problem was discussed and a policy based on suggestions from

Dr. Messer and Karen Elmore from the International Programs Office was agreed upon and recommended to the Provost.

The Council, also at the request of the Provost, considered the report of the Task Force on OU Admission Standards. After some consideration the members of the Council expressed approval of the the report with a suggestion for a minor change in the administration of the foreign language requirement.

The Council considered problems in the administration of the University-wide freshman English writing requirement. After discussions with Dean Robert Hemmenway, the Council approved a policy recommended by the Dean's Council that would require continuous enrollment in freshman English courses until satisfaction of a six-hour writing requirement (English 1113-1213; 1113-1413). The Council further recommended that a limitation on the withdrawal policy for these courses be established, and that the score presently being accepted on the CLEP exam in lieu of these courses be raised significantly.

At the final meeting of the Spring semester, Thomas Gallaher was elected Chair of the Council for 1988-89.

**REPORT OF ACTIVITIES OF ACADEMIC PROGRAMS COUNCIL
1987-88**

Proposal	Council Action	Provost's Action
1. Proposed changes in A&S Gen. Educ. Requirements	1. Recommended approval	1. Approved; instructed Dean Hemenway to implement effective Fall 1988
2. Proposal for Bus. Ad. Admission Management	2. Recommended approval	2. Approved; instructed Dean Lusch to implement effective Fall 1989
3. Combining the three majors of Elementary, Secondary and General Administration into a single major – Educational Administration, Curriculum and Supervision and changing the designation of various courses from EDEL, EDAD and EDSE to EACS	3. Recommended approval	3. Approved; instructed Dean Hoving to implement
4. Study Abroad Credit Mechanism	4. Recommended approval	4. Approved; instructed Dr. McKibbin to implement
5. Report of Task Force on O.U. Admission Standards	5. Recommended approval with change	
6. Suspension of Professional Psychology Emphasis for M.H.R. degree	6. Recommended approval	6. Approved; instructed Dean Hoving to implement
7. Revisions to College of Fine Arts Admission/Retention/Graduation Standards	7. Recommended approval of revised proposal	7. Approved; instructed Dean Eek to implement
8. Revision to A&S policy concerning major credit taken in residence	8. Recommended approval	8. Approved; instructed Dean Hemenway to implement
9. Change in graduation requirements for the B.A. in Journalism	9. Recommended approval	9. Approved; instructed Dean Hemenway to implement
10. Change in requirements for transfer students entering the J.M.C. School	10. Recommended approval	10. Approved; instructed Dean Hemenway to implement
11. Changes in grades and grade point averages for admission/retention/graduation for B.A. in Journalism	11. Recommended approval	11. Approved; instructed Dean Hemenway to implement
12. Curriculum change for the B.A. with a major in history	12. Recommended approval	12. Approved; instructed Dean Hemenway to implement
13. Curriculum changes for the B.A. with a major in Spanish	13. Recommended approval	13. Approved; instructed Dean Hemenway to implement
14. Curriculum changes for the B.A. with a major in French	14. Recommended approval	14. Approved; instructed Dean Hemenway to implement
15. Changes in requirements for B.A. with a major in Linguistics	15. Recommended approval	15. Approved; instructed Dean Hemenway to implement
16. Curriculum changes for the B.A. with a major in Public Affairs and Administration	16. Recommended approval	16. Approved; instructed Dean Hemenway to implement

**REPORT OF ACTIVITIES OF ACADEMIC PROGRAMS COUNCIL
1987-88**

Proposal	Council Action	Provost's Action
17. Termination of School Psychometry and School Psychology certificate programs	17. Recommended approval	
18. Curricular changes for the B.S. in Meteorology	18. Recommended approval	18. Approved; instructed Dean Kimpel to implement
19. Changes in major requirements for the B.A. degree with a major in European Studies	19. Recommended approval	19. Approved; instructed Dean Hemenway to implement
20. Changes in requirements for the Congressional Studies area of concentration in the major in Political Science	20. Recommended approval	20. Approved; instructed Dean Hemenway to implement
21. Changes in requirements for the B.S. in Microbiology	21. Recommended approval	21. Approved; instructed Dean Hemenway to implement
22. Changes in requirements for the B.S. degree with a major in Microbiology	22. Recommended approval	22. Approved; instructed Dean Hemenway to implement
23. Curricular changes for the B.A. with a major in Economics	23. Recommended approval	23. Approved; instructed Dean Hemenway to implement
24. Curriculum changes for the B.A. with a major in Psychology	24. Recommended approval	24. Approved; instructed Dean Hemenway to implement
25. Changes in requirements for the B.S. in Psychology	25. Recommended approval	25. Approved; instructed Dean Hemenway to implement
26. Changes in curriculum for B. Arch. degree	26. Recommended approval	26. Approved; instructed Dean Yeh to implement
27. Strategy for Excellence Priority Statements		
28. All-University Requirement for Freshman English		

Athletics Council Report
Spring 1988

Submitted by: Gregory Kunesh, Chair

The OU Athletic Council met five times during Spring Semester with no meeting during the Summer months.

January 19
February 9
March 24

April 14
May 3

Council discussed and made recommendations on several issues including, but not limited to/

I. Awards:

A. The Council approved awards in the following sports: 1987 Men's Cross Country Track; 1987 Women's Cross Country Track; 1987 Football; 1987-88 Women's Basketball; 1987 Women's Outdoor Track; 1987-88 Wrestling; 1987-88 Women's Golf; 1987-88 Men's Gymnastics; 1987-88 Women's Gymnastics; 1988 Women's Tennis; 1987-88 Men's Indoor Track; 1987-88 Women's Indoor Track.

B. Special Awards:

Sooner Schooner Award - David Alan Vickers
Men's Conference Medal - Dave Bruce Sieger
Women's Conference Medal - Margaret E. Page
Men's Jay Myers Award - Chris J. Melson
Women's Jay Myers Award - Emily Parr

Athletics Council Merit Award - Gerald F. Keen
David A. Burr
(Both presented posthumously)

II. Scheduling:

A. Schedules approved as follows:

Men's Spring Golf; Spring Volleyball; and Men and Women's Spring Outdoor Track

B. Special Schedules:

Special Events Days for the 1988 Football Season

III. Administrative Reports:

Dan Gibbens continued to fully advise the Council on NCAA and Big 8 activities and to seek advice from the OU Athletic Council on matters concerning OU Athletic Department and Big 8 interests. Both Dan Gibbens and Athletic Director Donnie Duncan kept the Council advised on all Department matters.

IV. Budget:

Council recommended approval of:

1. Ticket Prices

The 1988-89 ticket prices were approved following lengthy discussion and minor adjustments in the original proposal.

2. 1988-89 Athletic Department Operating Budget

V. Academic Advisory:

The Council continued to stress the monitoring of academic performance and graduation rates of the entire Athletic Department and each individual sport.

VI. Other Items Discussed (action not taken or not completed)

1. Big 8 Policies on post season gate and television receipts.
2. Composition of all Spirit Squads, tryout procedures, academic progress, funding of programs, and need for scholarships were all discussed.
3. Basic composition of the Athletic Council particularly addressing student concerns over representation between the Norman and Oklahoma City campuses.
4. Council informed that a "Letter of official inquiry" had been received from the NCAA and both Donnie Duncan and Dan Gibbens reported on procedures the Department and University will follow regarding formal response.
5. Post Season Bowl and Tournament revenues and expenses.

VII. Election of Officers for 1988-89:

Chair - Steve Ballard

Vice Chair - George Henderson

Council Members

<u>Name</u>		<u>Nominated By</u>	<u>Term**</u>
Gregory Kunesh, Chr.	(Drama)	Faculty Senate	1985-88
William Ray	(Mathematics)	Faculty Senate	1985-88
Steve Ballard	(Political Science)	Faculty Senate	1986-89
Joanna Rapf	(English)	Faculty Senate	1986-89
George Henderson	(Human Relations)	Faculty Senate	1987-90
John Skvarla	(Botany/Micro Alternate)	Faculty Senate	1987-90
Jerry Purswell	(Indus. Engin. (Alternate)	Faculty Senate	1987-90
Joseph Ferretti	(Medicine)	Faculty Senate	1987-90
Richard Clover	(Medicine (Alternate)	Faculty Senate	1987-90
Lanny Ross	(Alumnus)	Alumni Association	1986-88
Donald Stehr	(Alumnus)	Alumni Association	1986-88
James Morrison	(Alumnus (Alternate)	Alumni Association	1987-89
Pat Corley	(Physical Plant)	EEC	1987-89
Helen Dethrow	(Telecommunications (Alternate)	EEC	1987-89
Karl Means	(Student)	UOSA	1986-88
John Lambeth	(Student (Alternate)	OUSAHSC	1986-88
Jeff Powell	(Student)	UOSA	1987-89
Donnie Duncan	(Athletic Director)	Ex Officio, non voting	
Robert E. Smith	(Asst. Athletic Director)	Ex Officio, non voting	
Daniel Gibbens	(Faculty Representative to the Big 8)	Ex Officio, non voting	

REPORT OF THE BUDGET COUNCIL
FOR SPRING SEMESTER 1988
Submitted by E. L. Lancaster, Chair

The Budget Council met four times during the semester for regular monthly meetings. A special budget study session was held in April to review budget priorities for each Vice-Presidential area. In addition, members served on various subcommittees of the Council that had other meeting times.

The January meeting completed our study of budget issues and priorities begun in the fall semester by inviting OU administrators to speak on this topic. The speakers for this meeting were Don Murry, Department Chair of Economics and Allan Ross, Department Chair of Music. Representatives from Vice-Presidential areas discussed significant budgetary issues in their area of responsibility at the February and March meetings. A list of the speakers at these monthly meetings follows: February - Donna Murphy, Anona Adair; March - A. Ravindran (for Joan Wadlow), Arthur Elbert.

Several recommendations were passed by the Council and forwarded to President Horton. These recommendations are listed below by their date of passage by the Council.

February 17

1. Concerning faculty and staff raises for 1988-89, the Budget Council recommends that "In the case of otherwise satisfactory service, basic salary adjustments should be considered along with merit and compression issues."
2. Concerning the allocating of one-time funds, the Budget Council recommends that the attached criteria be used for such considerations. In addition, a list of "Examples of Special Projects for One-Time Monies" has been attached.

March 27

1. The Budget Council recommends that a minimum stipend of \$6000 be established for Graduate Assistants during the 1988-89 academic year without a reduction in the number of graduate assistants. Furthermore, it is recommended that a minimum GA salary target be set to achieve, over the next three years, the average GA salary of our target institutions as established by the State Regents. This needs to take into consideration any raises by these institutions too.

April 20

The Budget Council requests that you consider the following in making plans for 1988-89:

1. That those graduate teaching assistants who were funded in 1987-88 by one-time monies, grant release or through OCCE be annualized with new monies (if available) within the budget of their respective departments so that there are no cuts in numbers of graduate teaching assistantships.

2. That the issue of raising salaries to market value be considered only as a part of the Phase II budget process and not a part of the 6% increase in Phase I.
3. That start-up costs for new faculty be given from one-time monies rather than being annualized as a part of the Phase I budget.
4. That the funds for the establishment of the Congressional Relations Office not be funded from the 6% increase in the Vice Provost for Research Administration area, but from some other source. The Vice Provost for Research Administration would then have the entire 6% increase for restoring previous cuts to other areas within that office's jurisdiction.
5. That careful consideration be given to the need for the establishment of new faculty lines in highly impacted areas. In many cases, these faculty positions may be identified as a result of program review or externally driven from such issues as accreditation.
6. That the following statement be added to the Phase II budget guidelines on page 1, paragraph 6, after the first complete sentence: "Compression and inversion situations created by market adjustments should be redressed in a timely fashion."

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

COUNCIL MEMBERS

Faculty Senate: E. L. Lancaster, Chair (Music); Larry Canter (CEES); Jay Smith (Education); Jon Bredeson (EECS); Lenore Clark (Library); Andy Magid (Mathematics); Victor Hutchison (Zoology); N. Jack Kanak (Psychology); James Kudrna (Architecture)

EEC: Michal Gray (Law Center); Don Kunz (University Press); Don Huntington (Accounting, Physical Plant); Linda Berardo (Financial Services, OCCE)

UOSA: Terry Carr, John Conwell, Andrea Kucirek, David Roy

Ex-Officio, Non-Voting: Joan Wadlow (Provost); Arthur Elbert (VP, Administrative Affairs)

CRITERIA FOR ALLOCATING "ONE-TIME" FUNDS THAT ARE NOT PART OF THE REGULAR APPROPRIATIONS AND BUDGET PROCESS

Projects or programs to be supported with these special funds MUST REQUIRE ONE-TIME ONLY FUNDING (i.e. SHOULD NOT REQUIRE ONGOING SUPPORT FROM THESE FUNDS).

NOTE: This type of expenditure might include "seed" money to initiate a special faculty advisor training program but could not include funding to support such a program over three years. Neither should these funds support expenditures such as the cost of accreditation visits. These costs can be anticipated and should be absorbed within normal administrative budgets.

Requests for these special "one-time" funds should be included within the normal budget request process. Even though there is no guarantee any special funds will become available during any given budget year, there would seem to be merit and greater equity in pursuing a standardized method of receiving and tracking requests for such funds.

Once this initial criteria (need for "one-time" funding only) has been met, ALL proposed projects should be screened against ALL of the following criteria. Normally, under most circumstances, those projects satisfying the greatest number of these criteria should be the highest priority projects for the receipt of special funds.

Priority should be given to proposals that:

1. Are directed toward goals or activities which could not normally be supported but which directly benefit the academic mission of the university.
2. Are consistent with overall university goals of focusing resources in "Areas of Excellence".
3. Have the opportunity to generate matching or additional funding from sources outside the university.
4. Are directed toward long term savings and benefit rather than short term impact.
5. Are critical with respect to timing or for which special "one-time only" opportunity has arisen.

EXAMPLES OF SPECIAL PROJECTS FOR ONE-TIME MONIES

Most of the items listed below cover regularly recurring needs. In the event that they are not funded in the normal budget process, they should be funded from one-time funds.

1. Increase money to M & O accounts as a one time supplement to regular M & O budgets to meet special needs.
2. Library Needs
 - a. Monographs and serial backfiles to support new academic programs or new areas of emphasis within established programs.
 - b. Monographs and serial backfiles to support rapidly growing or impacted programs, such as Computer Science, or changing or emerging fields, such as Biotechnology.
 - c. Expensive cumulations of major abstracts and indexes, such as Chemical Abstracts.
 - d. Major microfilm collections, for example, the papers of U. S. presidents.
 - e. World newspaper backfiles, especially important in certain social science and humanities fields.
 - f. Other special one time library material needs.
3. Visiting Distinguished Professors
 - a. Academician in residence.
 - b. Guest artists to give public performances and provide master classes.
4. Research Equipment
 - a. Special needs to enhance procurement of extramural research contracts and creative activity grants.
 - b. Personal computers with software support.
5. Subvention to help faculty publish scholarly limited edition research books.
6. Additional junior and senior faculty summer research fellowships.
7. Special equipment for classroom and laboratory teaching needs to enhance quality of instruction (audio visual aids, VCRs, data bases, software, computers, films).

8. Personal computer systems for departments for faculty and secretarial use (software and hardware including laser printers).
9. Additional salary supplements to enable faculty to make better use of sabbaticals.
10. One time supplement for graduate teaching and research assistantships including post docs.



The University of Oklahoma

CAMPUS PLANNING COUNCIL—NORMAN

REPORT OF CAMPUS PLANNING COUNCIL: Spring 1988

Submitted by: Gary D. Schnell, Chair

The Council met four times during the spring and early summer (13 January, 30 March, 20 April, 22 June). A variety of topics were covered.

Meeting of 13 January. The meeting was devoted largely to a report by Sarah Blough from Parking and Transportation on campus parking and traffic. She discussed in detail the parking situation with respect to Graduate Assistants involved in teaching and research. A motion was passed to recommend that the distribution of graduate student parking permits be at the discretion of the academic department. An appropriate method for determining the number of permits to issue to each department would be developed by Parking and Transportation.

Parking policies implemented for the fall semester have resulted in it being easier to find a parking space for many of the faculty and staff. Not unexpectedly, smaller lots seldom have available spaces, but others had vacancies throughout most of the day. Relatively few parking permits were stolen, which was a concern of some patrons when we initiated the new system. Snow removal (and the lack thereof) was also discussed.

Meeting of 30 March. Ben Kinder, Randy Lacewell, and Arthur Tuttle discussed an offer by the family of Elaine Bizzell Thompson to create and provide by endowment for the perpetual maintenance of a garden near the Bizzell statue at the north end of the South Oval. A motion was passed to support this project.

David Nordyke from Architectural and Engineering Services presented plans for the Oklahoma Fishery Research Laboratory, which is to be constructed on South Campus. This project, previously approved by the Council, was progressing well and minor modifications in plans have been made. These were approved by the Council. A short update was presented concerning the ongoing Space and Facility Planning Process. Various subcommittees are completing their work, and the Council will soon be involved in reviewing documents from a number of committees and offices. A brief presentation was given by Sarah Blough that indicated an increase was needed in the parking fee to provide funds for parking-lot repair.

Meeting of 20 April. Discussion was continued concerning the possibility of a parking fee increase. After lengthy discussion, the Council voted to recommend an increase of \$10 in the annual parking fee. Ed Hilliard gave a briefing on work of the Campus Environment Subcommittee, which is meeting as part of the ongoing Space and Facilities Planning Process. Gary Schnell was re-elected Chair of the Campus Planning Council for the coming year.

Meeting of 22 June. This meeting was devoted to discussion of the possible name change for DeBarr Hall. The Council was given detailed information concerning the accomplishments and activities of Dr. Edwin DeBarr prior to and after his dismissal from the University of Oklahoma. After careful deliberation, members of the Campus Planning Council recommended that the name "DeBarr Hall" be removed from the building that houses the Chemistry Department. This recommendation was consistent with those prepared by the Department of Chemistry, the Faculty Senate, and the Student Association.

Members of the Council were: *Faculty and Staff*, D. Annis, K. Bystrom, F. Carr, W. Chess, B. Gallagher, E. Hilliard, L. Korhonen, S. Neely, G. Schnell (Chair), W. Varley, P. Weaver-Meyers, G. Williamson. *Students*, L. Sharpe, R. McDaniel, L. Torcom, K. Fuselier. *Ex-Officio*, F. Horton, A. Elbert, M. Messer, and J. Wadlow; *Architectural & Engineering Services*, A. Tuttle, M. Moorman, and Y. Evans (Secretary).

Report of the Continuing Education and Public Service Council

Spring Semester, 1988

Submitted by Roger L. Mellgren, Chair

The council has been attempting to define and explain CE and PS in ways that relate to regular faculty and are consistent with the goals of CE & PS, with its broad scope and importance to the University and State. Therefore, the council has been both an advocate and initiator of courses of action that will bring CE & PS into closer contact with regular faculty and to promote better understanding between regular faculty and the staff of CE & PS. One of the most important ramifications of these goals was a proposed revision of the faculty handbook. The current faculty handbook definition of "Service" was reviewed and found to be inconsistent in some respects, and vague in other respects. Therefore the Council drafted proposed revisions to the handbook that made clear the position of CE & PS within the service category. This proposed change was forwarded to the Provost and Faculty Senate Chair. Action was deferred by the Provost in favor of considering the proposed change in the definition of "Service" as part of more extensive changes in the faculty handbook.

The council felt that the deferral of action on the proposed clarification and changes in defining Service to be appropriate, but concern was also expressed that the deferral not be permanent and be lost in the ongoing problems the University must face.

The shift of Summer school programming to CE & PS was discussed by Council and various potential problems were mentioned. Among the problems were concerns for nonprofitable, but institutionally important, programs such as the biological survey, graduate education, etc. Innovations in the Summer program were also discussed and a general consensus was reached that the CE & PS would be sensitive to both the enrollment-driven considerations of Summer programs and the long-term institutional needs of programs not immediately responsive to enrollment constraints.

Other topics discussed included educational technology and the "talk-back TV" system, the Regent's policy on outreach and who will teach courses at noncampus sites, the Tulsa programs and funding of such programs, and faculty rewards for activities in CE & PS. Dr. Barbara Buzin, Acting Vice Chancellor for Educational Outreach of the State Board of Regents was an invited guest and discussed the Television Information System of the state. Jerry Jerman of CE & PS was also a guest and discussed plans for the CE & PS Newsletter with the Council.

Continuing Education and Public Service Council
Spring 1988

James Burwell	Physics & Astronomy	1985-88
Sylvia Faibisoff	Library & Info. Studies	1985-88
Roger Mellgren, Chair	Psychology	1985-88
Alan Covich	Zoology	1986-89
James Harp	CEES	1986-89
Wayne Rowe	Education	1986-89
William Carmack	Communication	1987-90
Bruce Hinson	Journalism & Mass Comm.	1987-90
Roger Rideout	Music	1987-90
Huey Long	Education	1987-90
Hugh Harris	CE&PS	1985-88
Leon Crowley	CE&PS	1986-89
Ed Apple	Public Member	1985-88
Carolyn Smith	Public Member	1986-89
Joan Wadlow	Provost (Norman campus); ex officio, non voting	
James Pappas	Vice Provost CE&PS; ex officio, non voting	

Report of The Research Council (Norman Campus)

Spring Semester 1988

Submitted by Michael A. Morrison, Chair

Proposal Review

During its monthly meetings, the Research Council regularly reviewed proposals for internal support of research (including several resubmissions) from the Physical Sciences, Engineering, the Life Sciences, and Arts, Humanities, and other Departments. In addition, aided in some cases by other faculty who agreed to serve on subcommittees, one or more members of the Council reviewed proposals for the following programs:

- [1] George Lynn Cross (GLC) Research Professorships (the second of two discussions of nominees).
- [2] Junior Faculty Summer Research Fellowships;
- [3] Senior Faculty Summer Research Fellowships;
- [3] Interdisciplinary Research Support Program (review of full proposals for eligible applicants as determined during preliminary review in Fall 1987);
- [4] NIH Small Instrumentation Grant Program.

Policy Issues

The Council discussed the following issues and communicated its concerns to President Horton and/or Provost Wadlow:

- [1] Desirability of establishing a full-time congressional liaison in Washington DC.
- [2] Methods for funding small- and high-dollar requests for internal research support.
- [3] Policy issues related to the research environment (*e.g.*, teaching loads, the library, need for personal computers).
- [4] The criteria for selection of GLC Professors and the nature of the award.

Other Activities

- [1] A subcommittee of the Council wrote a report summarizing the results of a questionnaire that was distributed to all faculty late in the Fall semester. This report, which addressed faculty perceptions of the research climate on campus, was distributed throughout the campus and was discussed in a meeting with President Horton and Provost Wadlow, who directed the Council to develop policy and programmatic suggestions to address the problems that surfaced in this study.
- [2] Responding to the aforementioned request, the Council prepared a three-part report to the President and the Provost entitled "A Proposal for Improving the Research Environment at the University of Oklahoma." This report, which was unanimously endorsed by the Council and then submitted to President Horton, included recommendations for a Scholarship Support Grant Program, several policy recommendations, and a discussed of proposals to address "high-dollar" needs of on-campus scholars.
- [3] At the direction of the Faculty Senate, the Council carried out a review of the composition of the Council. The subcommittee reviewed data on proposals submitted to the Faculty Research Fund during the past five years. Our charge was to ascertain whether the current distribution

of faculty members (two from each of six groups defined in the original recommendation of the Faculty Senate on July 2, 1982) is, in fact, proportionate to the number of proposals received from each area. We found that it is not. Based on this review, the Research Council unanimously passed the following recommendation to the Faculty Senate:

Representation on the Research Council

"... that the distribution of faculty members to the Research Council be changed to the following: 2 members from Engineering, 2 from Social Sciences and Education, 1 from the Biological Sciences, 1 from Other, 3 from Humanities and the Arts, and 3 from the Physical Sciences. This change will make the distribution proportionate to the proposals the Council reviews at its regular monthly meetings. The Council further urges that this review be done again three years hence."

Membership Roster for Spring 1988

Faculty:

Michael A. Morrison (Physics & Astronomy), Chair
Paul Bell (Zoology)
George England (Center for Economic & Management Research)
Kirby Gilliland (Psychology)
Jeffrey H. Harwell (Chemical Engineering & Materials Science)
Jane Magrath (Music)
Darryl J. McCullough (Mathematics)
Michael J. McInerney (Botany & Microbiology)
Robert Mulholland (Electrical Engineering & Computer Science)
Ronald Schleifer (English)
Patricia A. Self (Human Development)
Courtney Vaughn-Robertson (Education)

Graduate Student:

Nancy Hanks (Economics)

Ex-Officio Members:

Kenneth L. Hoving (VPRA & Dean, Graduate College)
Eddie C. Smith (Associate Dean, Graduate College)
William L. Varley (Director, ORA)

The secretary to the Council is Connie White.

At its May meeting, the Research Council unanimously elected as its chair for 1988-89 Professor Ronald Schleifer (English).