

JOURNAL OF THE FACULTY SENATE
 The University of Oklahoma (Norman campus)
 Regular session - January 16, 1989 - 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, Herstand, Hill, Hinson, Jackson, Kenderdine, Kiacz, Knox, Kutner, Magid, Minnis, Moore, Mouser, Nicewander, Ray, Rideout, Ryan, Salisbury, Sankowski, Smith, Stoltenberg, Swisher, Vestal, Wedel, Zelby, Zonana

PSA representatives: Barth, Bloomgarden
 UOSA representatives: Bell, Newton, Walsh
 Liaison, ABP: Morris

ABSENT: Gudmundson, Johnson, McManus, Nelson, Razook, Reardon, Robertson, Snell, Tompkins, Weaver-Meyers

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Actions taken by the Administration on Senate recommendations:

- Appointment to Patent Advisory Committee.....2
- Resolution on facilities planning.....2
- Proposed Council on Campus Life.....2
- OU Update.....2

Senate Chair's Report:

- Associates' contributions.....2
- Faculty committee to assure compliance with athletic regulations...2

Report of the Senate Committee on Committees:

- Election, Campus Planning Council.....3
- End-of-year vacancies on councils, committees and boards.....3
- Focus on Excellence.....3
- Discussion of NCAA probation and compliance with athletic regulations.3
- Issue for discussion: academic computer services.....4
- Triennial reapportionment of Senate seats.....5
- Resolution on State Regents' initiatives.....5
- Proposed revisions in the Student Code.....6

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

The minutes of the regular session of December 12, 1988, were approved.

ACTIONS TAKEN BY THE ADMINISTRATION ON SENATE RECOMMENDATIONS

Prof. Bruce Roe (Chemistry/Biochemistry) was selected to complete the 1988-89 term of Prof. Jack Cohn on the Patent Advisory Committee (see 11/88 Journal, page 3).

Concerning the Senate's resolution regarding the planning of academic facilities (see 11/88 Journal, page 7), Interim President Swank agreed that any planning process must have input from all levels of the University. However, he said he expected "to use the normal channels of communication through the Provost, Deans and Chairs when decisions about significant changes in facilities planning need to be made." He "would not expect to convene a departmental meeting of all faculty and staff in that unit prior to each decision." Prof. Cohen said the Executive Committee might need to discuss this further with Interim President Swank to make sure he understands what can happen when plans are changed without sufficient communication with the unit.

Interim President Swank decided to defer any action on the proposed University Council on Campus Life (see 12/88 Journal, page 7). He plans to have discussions of this during the Spring semester and then make some decision on whether and how it might be implemented. Prof. Cohen noted that discussions are taking place with Vice President Adair and student leaders, as well as with the Employee Executive Council. It is expected that the UOSA and GSS will consider this issue at future meetings.

Interim President Swank asked the faculty and staff governance organizations on the Norman and Health Sciences Center campuses to discuss the University-wide publication OU Update (see 11/88 Senate Journal, page 6). As a result of those discussions, Interim President Swank has asked Interim Vice President Donna Murphy (University Affairs) to examine whether there is any way to modify Update to meet the needs for providing information and, at the same time, reduce the costs.

SENATE CHAIR'S REPORT

At the December OU Regents' meeting Interim President Swank proposed that faculty and staff who join the University Associates be allowed to designate 100% of their contributions to particular programs. Interim President Swank has since decided to drop that proposal in order to preserve the original purpose of the Associates' Program, which is to maintain a source of unrestricted funds for academic support programs.

On behalf of the Executive Committee, Prof. Cohen sent a letter to Interim President Swank urging him to consider drawing faculty from the Athletics Council for the special faculty committee authorized by the OU Regents to assure compliance with the NCAA and Big 8 regulations.

With regard to the General Motors display of cars on the south oval, which was brought up at the November Senate meeting, President Swank has asked the Student Affairs office for the policies on commercial promotions on campus, and in particular whether all the other corporate donors have the privilege of displaying their products on the campus.

Prof. Cohen noted the article written by Prof. Zelby in the January 10 Oklahoma Observer on the newly-approved admissions standards. Prof. Zelby wrote that the new standards would not mean very much unless there is a broader-based effort to raise the educational standards and the level of performance expected from the students and faculty. Prof. Cohen also commented on an editorial in the Sunday Oklahoman of January 8 which criticized some researchers and research methods in an OU department.

Prof. Cohen noted with sadness the recent death of Prof. Joseph Rarick, Murrah Professor of Law. Prof. Rarick was a member of the faculty for 35 years and was a noted authority on water law.

REPORT OF THE SENATE COMMITTEE ON COMMITTEES

The Senate approved the nomination of the Committee on Committees of Prof. Sue Anne Harrington (University Libraries) to replace Prof. Patricia Weaver-Meyers on the Campus Planning Council (term ending 8/31/89).

Prof. Magid noted that the solicitation for nominations for the end-of-the-year vacancies on Councils, Committees and Boards would be sent out at the end of this month and would be due back to the Senate office on March 1. He urged the faculty to make nominations.

FOCUS ON EXCELLENCE - GREGORY REINHART

Prof. Magid focused on Prof. Gregory Reinhart of the Department of Chemistry and Biochemistry. Prof. Reinhart is a biochemist who studies the regulation of enzyme activity. His recent work has focused on liver enzymes and the regulation of blood sugar. The National Institutes of Health have supported Prof. Reinhart's research since he arrived at OU in 1983, and this past summer the American Heart Association honored him with a five-year salary award for released time.

DISCUSSION OF NCAA PROBATION AND OU'S COMPLIANCE WITH ATHLETIC REGULATIONS

While waiting for some guests who were invited to participate in the following discussion on computing, Prof. Cohen called for old business. Prof. Nicewander said OU faculty receive some ridicule at professional meetings for being at a university that is academically less than first-rate but with first-rate athletics. He said it is irritating to find out that part of the advantage that athletics have over academics is due to cheating. [Note: This discussion refers to the recent NCAA sanctions against the football program and a shooting incident involving two OU football players.]

Prof. Bert said he believed certain past actions by the OU Regents, such as the decision to reduce a cheating penalty for a student athlete, have given a signal that cheating is not wrong. Prof. Blick commented on a lack of discipline in the athletic dormitories and suggested that athletes be housed in dorms with the rest of the students, instead of in the athletic dorms. Prof. Cohen pointed out that a reverse price might be paid if there are disciplinary problems among certain individuals and the rest of the student population is subjected to them.

Prof. Baker said activities that cannot be controlled by the administration and the Regents ought to be divorced from the University. Prof. Cohen said student athletes should have an adequate opportunity to get an education, yet certain athletic programs have very low g.p.a.s and low graduation rates. He said he also was concerned about proposals to offer special academic programs for athletes once the higher admissions standards are in place. Prof. Kenderdine mentioned that a large number of student athletes are good students and that the problems with low graduation rates and low g.p.a.s seem to be concentrated in a limited number of areas.

Prof. Wedel said he considers the problem to be a national issue and that it is up to the faculty to come up with some recommendations or suggestions. Prof. Fife suggested that it might be appropriate to investigate the degree of discipline in the athletic program, and if that shows that discipline is lacking and that it comes from the top down, then some motion of censure from the Faculty Senate might be appropriate. Prof. Herstand noted that reviews of academic programs are taking place at the University, and as a result of the reviews, some programs may be discontinued. He said, "We don't really review with the same seriousness the athletic programs." He added that the problem might be on a national level, but someone has to start dealing with it on a local level.

Prof. Nicewander said he believed the athletic problems had tarnished the academic side of the University and agreed that the faculty should do something. Prof. Zelby said he thought it was the function of the Athletics Council to present a course of action to the Senate. Prof. Cohen said the Senate Executive Committee would consider the suggestions.

ISSUE FOR DISCUSSION: current state and future planning of academic computer services

The following individuals were invited to the meeting to provide information on academic computing: Kelvin Droegemeier, Chair of the Computing Advisory Committee (CAC), Bob Shepard, Director of University Computing Services, Jim White, Head of Academic User's Services, Carl Bush, Assistant Director of University Computing Services, John Hawley, Manager of the College of Engineering Computer Network, and some faculty who are heavy users of the computer services.

Prof. Cohen asked Prof. Droegemeier to present an overview of academic computing on campus and the issues the CAC is examining. Prof. Droegemeier said the CAC surveyed 15 universities, as well as 20 groups on campus, in order to develop a long-range computing plan. Key issues are support for distributive systems, the capacity of the IBM mainframe computer, the location of the computing center, personal computers, the relation of administrative to academic computing, networking of administrative computing, and support of computing services by research grants. Prof. Droegemeier gave some examples of concerns that were raised in the survey: salaries for computer support personnel, the need to prioritize computing initiatives, and policies and support for personal computers to deal with matters such as acquisition, set-up, software, training, trade-ins, up-grades, hard disk capability, and networking. Now the CAC is establishing specific prioritized goals and a plan for implementation. One goal, for example, is to maintain a powerful centralized computing facility. The committee plans to have the final document completed by May.

Prof. Cohen asked when the mainframe would be saturated. Mr. Shepard said the mainframe could be saturated within the next year for large users, but that it probably would not be replaced for 3-4 years. Prof. Fagan asked about getting a supercomputer. Prof. Droegemeier answered that the Governor is trying to get one in the state, but that supercomputers should be used only for certain applications. He mentioned the trend toward the operating system UNIX. There was some discussion about mainframe versus network computing, support for the networks, and whether administrative computing should be decoupled from academic computing. Mr. Shepard explained that BITNET did not become operational as soon as he would have liked, but by spring BITNET should be available to the networks. Prof. Fagan pointed out that as saturation is reached on the mainframe, the academic user will be shortchanged. Prof. Ray commented that there is no one to speak on behalf of academic computing. Prof. Magid remarked that the priority that faculty place on computing depends on how involved they are with computing. He urged every faculty member to have an account on the IBM mainframe or VAX so that they will have access to electronic mail and thereby have access to colleagues all over the world. Prof. Cohen summarized by saying that academic administrators will have to take more responsibility for academic computing.

TRIENNIAL REAPPORTIONMENT OF SENATE SEATS FOR 1989-92

Background: Prof. Cohen appointed an ad hoc committee consisting of Professors Gary Copeland (Carl Albert Center/Political Science) and Al Schwarzkopf (Management) to recommend the apportionment of Senate seats for 1989-92. Prof. Copeland explained that the apportionment figures were derived by providing one seat each to the Graduate College and to Liberal Studies, as required by the Faculty Senate Charter, and proportionally allocating the remaining 48 seats. The percent of faculty in each division was calculated and then multiplied by 48. Based on this methodology, there is no change from the current apportionment. Prof. Copeland commented that this is striking considering the decline in the number of faculty in the period, but the decline has been relatively proportional across-the-board. The Senate will vote on this recommendation at next month's meeting. (See Appendix I.)

RESOLUTION ON STATE REGENTS' INITIATIVES

Prof. Bergey presented the following motion of the Executive Committee commending the State Regents:

WHEREAS, the Oklahoma State Regents for Higher Education have reviewed and raised admission standards for the comprehensive research universities in the State of Oklahoma

AND WHEREAS, they have revised the allocation formula to recognize the unique mission of the two comprehensive research universities,

BE IT THEREFORE RESOLVED: that the Faculty Senate of the University of Oklahoma heartily commends the State Regents for their progressive and courageous support of the cause of excellence in higher education for the State of Oklahoma.

The Senate approved the resolution without dissent. Prof. Cohen said the resolution would be communicated to the State Regents as well as to the University administration.

PROPOSED REVISIONS IN THE STUDENT CODE

Prof. Cohen announced that Student Congress had recently approved some revisions in the Student Code. The one which follows would add "sexual orientation" to the categories protected from discrimination. (Underlining indicates additions to existing language; strike-throughs indicate deletions)

The student has the right not to be denied any right, privilege, position or status by reason of discrimination on the basis of race, color, creed, sex, national origin, ~~or~~ political belief or sexual orientation.

Prof. Cohen said a member of Student Congress was concerned that the administration would oppose broadening the protections. Prof. Cohen said the Executive Committee recognized that the Faculty Senate is not part of the code revision process but thought the Faculty Senate might want an opportunity to express its views regarding discrimination in the educational process and in employment practices on campus. Accordingly, the Executive Committee recommended forming an ad hoc committee to consider whether to propose a resolution to the Senate. Mr. Richard Walsh, a member of Student Congress explained that Student Congress had voted on this twice and approved it both times. It also passed in the Graduate Student Senate. President Swank has asked both bodies to reconfirm their vote because their previous meetings were in violation of the Open Meetings Act. Prof. Cohen said certain administrators are opposed to the revision on the grounds that it goes beyond the scope of federal and state laws; that if this is accepted, the university might then have to deal with other classes or groups who demand protection; that the university already has procedures in place to protect students; and that none of the 10 other schools surveyed had such protections. Prof. Herstand pointed out that the administrative response does not address the rightness or wrongness of the proposal and he encouraged the formation of an ad hoc committee to look into the situation. The Senate approved the recommendation on a voice vote. [Note: Professors James Kenderdine (Marketing), Kenneth Wedel (Social Work), Shirley Wiegand (Law), and Gail Tompkins (Instructional Leadership) will serve on the ad hoc committee. Prof. Kenderdine will be the chair.] Prof. Cohen asked the members of the Senate to confer with their colleagues on this subject, so that the proposal of the ad hoc committee could be put to a vote at the February meeting.

ADJOURNMENT

The meeting adjourned at 5:25 p.m. The next regular session of the Senate will be held at 3:30 p.m. on Monday, February 13, 1989 in the Conoco Auditorium, Neustadt Wing, Bizzell Memorial Library.

Sonya Fallgatter
Sonya Fallgatter
Administrative Coordinator

Gail Tompkins
Gail Tompkins
Secretary

TO: Gary Cohen, Chair
Faculty Senate

1/89 (Appendix I)

FROM: Gary Copeland, Chair
Al Schwarzkopf, Member
Ad Hoc Committee on Faculty Senate Reapportionment

SUBJECT: Faculty Senate Reapportionment

DATE: January 16, 1989

Pursuant to the guidelines provided in the Faculty Handbook we propose the following reapportionment for the Faculty Senate for the next triennium, 1989-1992. Figures for current faculty were provided by Theresa Smith, Director of the Office of Institutional Research. The numbers reflect tenured and tenure-track faculty on the payroll on October 24, 1988. Figures for 1986 come from the report filed by the previous ad hoc committee on reapportionment.

The recommended apportionment figures were derived by providing one seat each to the Graduate College and to Liberal Studies and proportionally allocating the remaining 48 seats. We decided on the methodology prior to receiving the final numbers of faculty. As you can see, this method produces no changes from the current apportionment.

Table 1

Division	Total Faculty 1986	Faculty Fall, 1989	Percentage of Faculty 1986	Percentage of Faculty 1989	Current Seats 1986-1989	Potential Allocation (of 48)	New Seats 1989-1992	Percentage of Seats (of 50)	Percentage of Seats (of 48)
Architecture	24	20	3.29	3.20	2	1.54	2	4.0	4.17
Arts & Sciences	346	292	47.46	46.72	22	22.43	22	44.0	45.83
Business Admin.	66	54	9.05	8.64	4	4.15	4	8.0	8.33
Education	34	32	4.66	5.12	2	2.46	2	4.0	4.17
Engineering	92	81	12.62	12.96	6	6.22	6	12.0	12.50
Fine Arts	70	61	9.60	9.76	5	4.69	5	10.0	10.42
Geosciences	41	33	5.62	5.28	3	2.53	3	6.0	6.25
Law	24	24	3.29	3.84	2	1.84	2	4.0	4.17
University Library	15	15	2.06	2.40	1	1.15	1	2.0	2.08
ROTC	17	13	2.33	2.08	1	1.00	1	2.0	2.08
Graduate College	---	---	----	----	1	----	1	2.0	2.08
Liberal Studies	---	---	----	----	1	----	1	2.0	2.08
Totals	729	625	100.00	100.0	50		50	100.0	