The Faculty Senate was called to order by Professor Edgar O’Rear, Chair.

PRESENT: Apanasov, Atiquzzaman, Ayres, Bemben, Bergey, Burcham, Burns, Clark, Cracknell, Cravey Stanley, Duncan, Elisens, Hahn, Halterman, Hewes, Irvin, Irvine, Johnson, Keresztesi, Kim, Kong, Kornelson, Kutner, Laubach, Loon, Mackey, Merchan-Merchan, Miller, Nelson, O’Rear, Palmer, Pigott, Raman, Refai, Schwarzkopf, Sharma, Shelton, Snell, Stoltenberg, Strout, Terry, Warren

Provost’s representative: Mergler
ISA representatives: Hough

ABSENT: Grady, Klein, Lamb, Marcus-Mendoza, Mortimer, Riggs, Schmeltzer, Smith
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APPROVAL OF JOURNAL

The Faculty Senate Journal for the regular session of October 14, 2013 was approved.
ANNOUNCEMENTS

The following faculty member was recently elected to the Faculty Senate:

Mohammed Atiquzzaman (Computer Science), completing the 2013-14 term of Krishnaiyan Thulasiraman (Computer Science) and representing the College of Engineering.

The Faculty Senate Executive Committee nominated three faculty members for the Arts & Sciences dean search committee. From the nominations, the administration selected one nominee (Ingo Schlupp from Biology) to serve. The search committee will be chaired by Dean Greg Garn from the College of Education.

The Faculty Senate Executive Committee nominated three faculty members for the Business dean search committee. From the nominations, the administration selected two nominees (Frances Ayres from Accounting and Laku Chidambaram from Management Information Systems) to serve. The search committee will be chaired by Dean Joseph Harroz from the College of Law.

The Faculty Senate is sad to report the deaths of retired faculty members N. Jack Kanak (Psychology) on October 16, 2013 and Jid Gitau Kamoche (History) on October 31, 2013.

The exhibit “On Assignment: the Photojournalism of Horace Bristol” opens at the Fred Jones Jr. Museum of Art on Friday, November 15, 2013. For more information, see the museum website at http://www.ou.edu/fjjma/

Dr. Emily Neff, curator at the Houston Museum of Fine Arts, has been appointed the new Director of the Fred Jones Jr. Museum of Art.

Faculty members are asked to complete the “Needs Survey for Faculty” from the Center for Teaching Excellence available at http://oucas.qualtrics.com/SE/?SID=SV_eJOZH8e3LsrvXI9. The survey will help Dr. Felix Wao, Director, Academic Assessment for Student Learning to identify topics/areas faculty consider important relative to assessment of student learning and continuous enhancement of teaching.

REMARKS CONCERNING THE CURRENT POLICIES AND PROCEDURES ON THE DISSERTATION REPOSITORY AND OPTIONS FOR EMBARGO WITH BY DEANS RICK LUCE AND LEE WILLIAMS

Prof. O’Rear introduced Deans Luce and Williams and read the following prepared statement:

“Profound changes are taking place in the publishing industry. Through its funding agencies, the federal government now presses for greater use of open access. A recent article in *Science* indicates over half of the publications in technical disciplines are appearing through such outlets. Many universities now have open access thesis mandates. We find long established practices in disciplines under review and being challenged and debated.

*The Chronicle for Higher Education* has been a format for embargos, open access, and dissertations. In one article, a historian from Princeton advocates new professors in the humanities spending one year cleaning up their dissertations before publication online then summarizing and sharpening key points in journal articles and afterwards moving to a new topic, all before tenure evaluation. I do not know whether that will be the outcome, but to be relevant we must be aware of these issues and trends. We must be living with the times as judgment dictates. It is clear that libraries and faculties must adapt to new models of dissemination.

“Needless to say, the establishment of Share Oklahoma and the announcement of the corresponding embargo policy created a lot of anxiety on campus. Some of that anxiety is due to legitimate concerns associated with change and some due to misinformation. Steps have been
taken in response to faculty concerns. Deans Rick Luce and Lee Williams, as well as the Vice Provost for Research Kelvin Droegemeier have been meeting with Faculty Senate leadership. Lee Williams has conducted meetings with faculty and graduate students, while Dean Luce is working with Dan Emery and the University Libraries Committee. The Faculty Executive Committee has invited Dean Lee Williams and Dean Rick Luce to make a presentation to the Senate today with the principle aim of addressing this information. We will be then asking you, the Senators, to reach out to the units so that we have a systematic approach to identify and considering all concerns.”

Dean Luce thanked the Senate for inviting him to speak and reflected on his dialog about open access (OA) with the Faculty Senate in October of 2012. He then presented background information about OA policies at other universities in the U.S.

The schools included in his assessment of Open Access Benchmarks: Campus wide OA Policy are:

- Arizona State
- Kansas State University
- Indiana University
- Rutgers
- Texas A&M
- University of Kansas
- University of Colorado
- Oregon State
- University of California
- University of Florida
- University of Hawaii
- University of Kentucky
- University of Missouri -Columbia
- University of New Mexico
- University of Tennessee
- University of Virginia
- Virginia Tech
- Utah State University
- West Virginia University
- Brandeis
- Caltech
- Duke
- Emory
- Rice
- Harvard
- Princeton
- MIT
- Oberlin College
- Wellesley College

The schools included in the assessment of OA Benchmark: Institutional Repository are:

Big 12:
- Baylor
- Iowa State
- KU
- KSU
- Missouri
- Nebraska
- OSU
- OU
- Texas
- Texas A&M
- Texas Tech

Aspirational Peers:
- Illinois Urbana-Champaign
- Indiana
- Iowa
- Michigan
- Minnesota
- Ohio State
- Penn State
- Purdue
- Virginia
- Wisconsin

Dean Luce then recapped the implementation timeline at OU for the new policy. In October of 2012, he presented the Faculty Senate on OA, including background information about OA policy at other universities in the US. This was the beginning of a campus-wide discussion on OA. On February 28, 2013, OU hosted an OA conference and a series of informational meetings with faculty and students followed. In August 2013, the ShareOK repository for OA content opened; ShareOK is a joint repository for both OU and OSU.

Dean Luce then addressed the issue of embargoes on dissertations. He noted that about 75 US Institutions are registered with the National Digital Library of Theses and Dissertations as holding electronic dissertations in their institutional repository. The best practice on embargo policy is an overall policy that is broadly shaped, but addresses embargo implementation on departmental level or case-by-
case basis with appropriate approvals. He mentioned that Harvard University recommends a default for embargoes of 1-2 years.

Dean Luce said that over 800 colleges and universities participate in electronic dissemination of dissertations worldwide. 1.8 million OA electronic theses & dissertations are currently indexed (OATD.org), and 3.1 million records are in the National Digital Library of theses and dissertations.


"...the ready availability of ETDs on the Internet does not deter the vast majority of publishers from publishing articles derived from graduate research already available on the Internet."

He then shared a chart that showed the policies at several other institutions:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>PhD in IR?</th>
<th>Permit Embargo</th>
<th>Requires Approval?</th>
<th>Embargo Length</th>
<th>OA Required?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>American Univ.</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BYU</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
<td>1 yr, if patent</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caltech</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
<td>1 yr, can extend</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Columbia</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
<td>1 yr, 2 years</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Duke</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
<td>6 mo, 1 yr, 2 yrs</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GWU</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y if 2+ yrs</td>
<td>6 mo, 1 yr, 2 yrs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Georgia Tech</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y, Grad Dean</td>
<td>1 yr, renew 1X</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NCSU</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y, Grad Dean</td>
<td>1 yr</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rice</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
<td>1 yr</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rutgers</td>
<td>Y (except MFA)</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y if 2+ yrs</td>
<td>6 mo, 1 yr, 2 yrs</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Dean Williams took the floor to discuss electronic thesis and dissertation archives and embargoes at OU. He stated that an underlying academic principle is that a thesis or dissertation are an integral part of a graduate degree, and demonstrate the student’s original and independent contribution to the body of knowledge. As such, these works are subject to scholarly scrutiny, first through presentation of a written document and an oral defense of the work before a committee of faculty scholars, then through presentation of this work for public review by the broader scholarly and general community. The method for this presentation has evolved over the past century, but at the core is the idea that it is ‘broadcast’ as widely and promptly as possible. Along with this has been a concern to protect the students’ ability to use the results of their scholarship to advance their careers through scholarly publication and this has been addressed through judicious use of embargos.

Dean Williams outlined the history of OU’s Dissertation Archive. In 1929, OU granted its first doctorate for a dissertation by Mary Jane Brown in Zoology. At that point, the policy was to place a printed copy in Library, with on-campus checkout and referenced in the Library card catalog. By the 1960’s, inter-library loan of thesis and dissertations was available. The 1980’s brought electronic cataloging and the 1990’s brought off-campus access to the electronic catalog.

Dean Williams noted that since the 1930’s, there have been commercial dissertation archives, starting with microfilm abstracts, which were the precursor to dissertation abstracts. By the early 2000’s, ProQuest made electronic full text copies available and most dissertations after 1997 from participating universities are available on ProQuest. In addition, all available OU dissertations prior to 1997 were
submitted by OU Libraries to ProQuest for digitization, so all OU dissertations are available online. ProQuest dissertations are full-text, findable, and searchable.

The new trend is institutional (university) archives, which are now findable, accessible, searchable, and free. In 2013, OU and OSU collaborated to create ShareOK, which is Open Access. It is starting in 2013 with dissertations, but will be expanded to include theses.

Dean Williams then addressed OU’s embargo policy and practice, which has been in place for more than 20 years. An embargo holds the thesis or dissertation by request out of circulation for a finite period of time and is intended to protect students’ rights re use of the thesis/dissertation. At OU, it is handled on an individual case-by-case basis and most requests since 2000 have been related to Intellectual Property (patents and licensing) and business confidential/proprietary information. Thus, embargo policy timelines reflect these situations. In addition, a few individual embargoes have been requested and approved for book publication.

Dean Williams is aware of the concerns expressed by faculty when the new dissertation repository, ShareOK, was announced, concerns about protection of publication interests for books, and multi-authored journal articles. While ProQuest has always provided searchable full-text copies, the ‘Google-ability’ of the new ShareOK (and other institutional archives) has heightened awareness and concern. Therefore, it is clear that the current embargo policy and practice needs to be revised to address potentially increased volume of requests.

Prof. Johnson stated she is in the Humanities and that Humanities faculty have been surprised by many of the changes at the Library and worry that they are not being included in decision-making, including not having representation on the University Libraries Committee. She mentioned several issues related to microfilm access and discarding older issues of several journals. She thinks there is a communication problem between Library decision-makers and faculty in the Humanities. The graduate faculty in her discipline will be submitting a letter expressing their concerns. Dean Luce stated that he does not appoint members to the ULC. In addition, last year, he had eleven well-attended town hall meetings. He added that the removal of journals and other materials from the library was a human mistake and that the process has been corrected.

Prof. Irvin asked about the source of the research data regarding open access and publishing opportunities. She is also concerned that dissertation publishing and faculty open access seem to be two different issues that have been grouped together. Dean Luce offered to send Prof. Irvin more details on the studies he cited.

Prof. Ayres was concerned about the statement on the ShareOK website that the university has the right to sell the material published on ShareOK. Dean Williams said that the student owns the copyright to the dissertation, however it is part of the terms of the graduate degree. Prof. Ayres asked if the library can amend the metadata, does that mean that they could change the abstract. Dean Williams said that even for embargoed dissertations, we need to be able to publish the metadata.

Prof. Refai noted that he once had a situation where he submitted a white paper to the Army and then was unable to retract it. The Army said that once it was submitted, it was available to anyone within the military. In addition, he attended a meeting at NSF, and he heard a speaker from Cornell. When he searched for information about his work, all of it was available on a Cornell open access site.

Prof. O’Rear thanked Deans Luce and Williams. He stated that we want to know the full range of concerns and asked the senators to go back to their units and get information about those concerns and submit them to the Faculty Senate by email by November 25. Dean Williams added that for the benefit of the students, he wants to quickly develop an embargo policy.
FACULTY HANDBOOK CHANGES RECOMMENDED BY THE ATHLETICS COUNCIL

In their 2012-13 annual report, the Athletics Council recommended changes to the Faculty Handbook, which deal with accommodations for athletes for exams, makeup exams, and final exams. At the October 2013 meeting of the Senate, Prof. Charles Kimball, 2012-13 Chair of the Athletics Council and Jason Leonard who is Head of Compliance for OU discussed the reasons for the recommended changes. After discussion, it was decided that the Senate would vote on the recommendation at the November meeting.

Prof. O’Rear opened the floor back up for discussion. Prof. Burns reiterated his concern from the October meeting that for large classes of several hundred students it is a logistical problem to try to give makeup exams to numerous students. He is especially concerned about pop quizzes. Prof. O’Rear stated that one option is to reapportion the grades to drop the pop quiz. Prof. Burns replied that faculty members are already doing that, so the changes to the policy sound like this increases constraints on a policy that is already working.

Prof. Apanasov said that it raises concerns about academic integrity when athletic activities take precedence over exams, even final exams. He agrees that military service or jury duty is a valid justification, but that athletics should not take priority over academics.

Prof. Bergey asked if the recommended changes mean that if the student lets a faculty member know just two weeks before the final exam, then the faculty member would have to change the date of that student’s exam. She was told that it does.

Prof. O’Rear called for a vote on the recommendations. The Faculty Senate approved the resolution (attached) that recommends changes to the Faculty Handbook made by the Athletics Council.

REAPPORPTIONMENT OF THE RESEARCH COUNCIL WITH 2012-13 RESEARCH COUNCIL CHAIR, PAUL SPICER

Prof. O’Rear introduced Paul Spicer, 2012-13 Chair of the Research Council. Prof. Spicer briefed the Senate on some recent changes that have resulted in a need to change the apportionment of the Research Council. Possible funding for proposals went up to $15,000 and there is less restriction on funding use. In addition, each proposal must have at least two primary reviewers and the new conflict of interest policy prevents Council members from reviewing proposals from their departmental colleagues. Thus, the Research Council has had a problem securing adequate reviewers in the social sciences, humanities, and fine arts. This has forced them to bring in reviewers from outside the Research Council. In order to remedy this issue, the Council would like to increase the number of members to serve as reviewers from the social sciences, humanities, and fine arts.

Prof. Apanasov asked if the new allocation is based on the number of applications to the Research Council for funding. He reasoned that if there have not been many proposals from that area in the past, now that area will be at a disadvantage. He stated that when he was chair of the Research Council, they did have more applications from areas where there was little opportunity for external funding. Prof. Spicer said that the reality of who actually applies is that we do not get many applications from engineering and physical sciences, so we do not need many reviewers from those areas.

There were no additional questions and the Senate will vote on the recommendation at its next meeting in December 2013.

SENATE CHAIR'S REPORT, by Prof. Edgar A. O’Rear, III

“On Thursday, October 17, Ed O’Rear met with Felix Wao who has joined the Center for Teaching Excellence. Dr. Wao offers expertise in outcomes based course assessment. This includes
knowledge of software templates to help faculty with this task. In the spring of 2014, he will be visiting departments to meet with faculty and to describe assessment services that will be available. Dr. Wao indicated a survey will be distributed to faculty this fall to explore needs and interests of faculty in the area of assessment.

“At the October Dean’s Council meeting, the following items were covered: Digital Measures software for faculty mini-vitae, a new general education web site, the IRR SharePoint website, and the Digitization Laboratory at Bizzell. Engineering Dean Tom Landers gave an update on testing of the Digital Measures system in the College of Engineering and also the College of Education. There was 80% compliance last year in Engineering with training ongoing. Faculty input has been compiled and reviewed. New features include BibTeX for auto-entry of publications and generation of biographical sketches in NSF and NIH formats. The package has been rebranded now as the College Academic Profile or CAP. The Provost wants the entire campus migrating to the system. Associate Provost for Academic Affairs Joyce Allman, who has been working with Senior Vice Provost Kyle Harper, introduced the new Gen Ed web site. Students can use the site for assistance with the course selection necessary in meeting Gen Ed requirements, while faculty can get assistance with creating Gen Ed courses. The URL for the web site is http://www.ou.edu/gened. Susannah Livingood, Associate Provost & Director of Institutional Research & Reporting, described the IRR SharePoint website and showed data on graduation trends. In 2012-13, OU granted more degrees than ever. Graduate College Dean Lee Williams pointed out that 1/3 were advanced degrees.

“An article from the Chronicle of Higher Education titled “Explosion of Wireless Devices Strains Campus Network” highlighted the problems of bandwidth limitations and the number of devices being used. The network at OU is being upgraded with continual attention to the problem expected to be needed for the future. The meeting adjourned to move to Bizzell Library for a tour of the new Digitization Laboratory.

“Each year the leadership of the Student Government Association, Staff Senate, and Faculty Senate meet to discuss issues of common concern. The meeting this year was hosted by Ed O’Rear, Randy Hewes, and Stacey Bedgood of the Faculty Senate. Attendees from the Staff Senate included Chair Amanda Pai, Chair-Elect John Bishop, Previous Past Chair Chris Cook, and Staff Senate Coordinator Melissa Lane. Representing the SGA were President Ernest Ezeugo, Graduate Student Senate Chair Jerry Overton, and Chair of the Undergraduate Student Congress John Montgomery. This group discussed the Faculty Senate resolution on a recommended student response system, Janux, the new GenEd web page, and an ongoing study by the Faculty Welfare Committee on incivility on campus. The Staff Senate announced that it has been working on a policy, which would allow brief absences from work for volunteerism, such as leaving work to donate blood. Time away would be limited to eight hours per year and would require permission of the immediate supervisor. Lastly, the student representatives expressed a desire for a change to the pre-finals “dead week” policy so that there would not be so many papers, presentations, and projects due. However, the University is barred from considering modifications to the policy until 2014. Student leaders were advised that, in order to effect a change, they would probably need hard data on the magnitude of the problem and with insights as to whether concerns related to the policy or its implementation.

“On Saturday, November 2, Faculty Senate Chair Ed O’Rear attended the Faculty Advisory Council meeting at the Oklahoma State Regents for Higher Education followed immediately by the annual Faculty Assembly. The Faculty Advisory Council consists of representatives from the research universities, regional colleges, community colleges, and independent institutions like the University of Tulsa. Members of the Advisory Council reviewed the 2013 Annual Report in preparation for the subsequent Faculty Assembly. The report gave a brief history of the Council and its makeup along with the work plan and activities carried out over the past year. These activities included participation in Higher Education Day at the State Capitol, comments at the Annual Tuition Hearing on April 18, 2013, and an opinion survey of faculty leaders. With regard to this survey, the top issues from all Oklahoma institutions of higher education were preparedness of students for college and faculty salaries and Oklahoma salary compression and comparison to regional averages. The
highlight of the Faculty Assembly was a presentation titled “State of Oklahoma Higher Education” by Chancellor Glen Johnson. The Chancellor mentioned the quick emergence of online education. The State Regents have formed a task force to look at online instruction. At the same time, Chancellor Johnson commented about the “professor in the classroom, still the most important ingredient.” Rigor in online courses as well as standards and credentials of instructors should all be the same. A task force has also been formed to look at campus safety and security. There is continuing discussion about the value of a college degree. According to the U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics, 90% of the fastest growing jobs will require a college degree. The Chancellor noted a strong correlation exists between percentage of population in a state with a college degree and per capita income. Oklahoma has 23% compared to a national average of 28.5%. A goal has been set to increase the number of degrees awarded by 67% over 2011 levels in another 10 years.

“Members of the Faculty Senate Executive Committee (FSEC) met on Monday, November 4. Their compiled responses to the Faculty Advisory Council survey on issues indicated that graduate student support was of greatest concern at OU, followed by faculty recruitment including diversity, higher education having a greater faculty voice at the capital, and salary compression and inversion. The FSEC examined the various initiatives underway at Bizzell. This included the Collaboratorium, Digitization Laboratory, and the dissertation repository. The Digitization Laboratory currently focuses on archiving OU’s scholarly research and special collections such as the History of Science Collection, the Western History Collection, and the John and Mary Nichols Rare Books and Special Collections in high quality electronic media. A Master Renovation Planning Group for the library is being formed. There will be faculty representatives with the opportunity to provide input on issues of faculty concern including library carrels. Discussion followed on the dissertation repository and options for embargo with Dean of the Graduate College Lee Williams and Director of Collection Management and Scholarly Communication Karen Rupp-Serrano. Prof. Rupp-Serrano substituted for Dean Rick Luce, who was on travel. Dean Lee Williams noted that there has been public access of dissertations through University Microfilm and ProQuest as well hard copies in libraries. Because ShareOK will be ‘Googelable’, dissertations may be a lot more visible, causing anxiety among some faculty members. An embargo policy has been in place, but mostly utilized for intellectual property in the past. Thirteen departments have contacted the Graduate College about the embargo policy; Associate Dean Janis Paul will be meeting with them. Some disciplines have concerns related to journals and others to books. Dean Williams said each unit would have an opportunity to express its opinion. While there will be an option to apply for an embargo, there will not be a blanket open-ended policy. Dean Williams said that the Graduate College would regularly review with departments their embargo norms, perhaps every three years. Karen Rupp-Serrano said she is available to review publication agreements for faculty. In the next item on the agenda, Vice President for Research Kelvin Droegemeier and 2012-13 Research Council Chair Paul Spicer presented data in support of a reapportionment of the Research Council. Reapportionment would bring representation in line with the number of proposals submitted. The data provided indicated a declining number of proposals over the last three fiscal years from 69 to 62 to 33. It was asked whether the data for FY13 was complete and, if so, whether it was a good idea to make a decision based on such large transients. The data for last year was checked and the data you have today includes data from all of FY13. The Faculty Senate Executive Committee then met with Senior Vice President and Provost Nancy Mergler. The group discussed some items from the State Regents survey. One thing Oklahoma does well is course equivalency with a matrix for transferring courses. Advanced Placement tests are also used. It can be a challenge to evaluate extra-institutional credit with a variety of methods available. The CAEL website gives details for best practices (www.cael.org/home). The need for graduate student support raised the question of fellowships as a possible component of the 125th anniversary fund-raising efforts. Asking alumni who primarily hold undergraduate degrees for graduate fellowships is a tough sell. Presentations to alumni donors in the form of videos by students might be effective; a similar approach called “three minute thesis” has been used at the University of Queensland. Lastly, the Provost informed the Faculty Senate Executive Committee that Scott Mason will be working with Vice President for Governmental Relations Danny Hilliard at the legislature. Scott Mason has experience working for the Governor’s Office.”
ADJOURNMENT

The meeting adjourned at 4:45 p.m. The next regular session of the Faculty Senate will be held at 3:30 p.m. on Monday, December 9 2013, in Jacobson Faculty Hall, Room102.

Stacey L. Bedgood, Administrative Coordinator

Jill A. Irvine, Faculty Senate Secretary
Changes to the Faculty Handbook Proposed by the Athletics Council
(Approved by the Faculty Senate on November 11, 2013)

These modifications would require a change in Faculty Handbook, section 4.9, 4.7, and 4.19 (deletions crossed through; additions underlined):

4.7 FINAL EXAMINATION REGULATIONS

....

If a final examination is given, no faculty member is authorized to depart from the published examination schedule for either a class or an individual without approval, as follows: An examination for the entire class may be rescheduled only with the approval of the Academic Regulations Committee. A request for such rescheduling should be addressed to the Chair of that committee and should carry the endorsement of the department and the dean concerned. Final examinations for a class outside the period set aside under University regulations for final examinations are prohibited. An examination may be rescheduled for an individual student only when required by law, as in the case of jury duty, or in emergencies such as illness of the student, a serious illness or death in the immediate family, or an unavoidable academic conflict of compelling importance, including a conflict due to Regents’ approved exceptions for Conference and NCAA post-season intercollegiate athletics competition (as per section 6.3.7.1 of Regents’ policy). For such a conflict to be considered as grounds for rescheduling a final examination, the activity must be directly related to the student’s academic work in the University or a Provost-approved University-sponsored event. Such rescheduling must have the approval of the instructor or instructors concerned, the department chair or chairs concerned, and the dean of the college in which the student is enrolled and should be timed in such a way to avoid compromising the integrity of the examination (Note 1). Final Examination has been defined as follows: an examination that is comprehensive in nature or that accounts for a greater proportion of the final grade than an exam given during the semester.

....

4.9 MAKE-UP EXAMINATIONS (OTHER THAN FINAL) DUE TO UNIVERSITY-SPONSORED ACTIVITIES OR LEGALLY REQUIRED ACTIVITIES

The following guidelines have been approved by the Faculty Senate and the UOSA to aid the faculty in determining a policy for make-up exams (other than final examinations) in cases of absences due to participation in University-sponsored or legally required activities. (For the policy on final examinations, see Section 4.7.)

Only Provost-approved university-sponsored activities such as scholarly competitions, fine arts performances, intercollegiate athletics competitions, and academic field trips, and legally required activities, such as emergency military service and jury duty, are covered by these guidelines.

Faculty, if given notice two class periods or one week (whichever is less) before an exam (including final exams with two weeks notice) or quiz (excluding pop quizzes), should make every effort to find a reasonable accommodation by (a) giving a makeup exam, an early exam, or
quiz; (b) changing the exam schedule; or (c) dropping the exam or quiz and increasing the weight of another exam or quiz or other agreed upon approaches acceptable to the instructor and the student; or (d) by identifying a certified testing center. Students missing an exam on account of jury duty must be allowed an accommodation.

Corresponding Changes to the Athletics Class Attendance Policy Proposed by the Athletics Council

Section 4.19 CLASS ATTENDANCE of the Faculty Handbook states:

STUDENTS

Students are responsible for the content of courses in which they are enrolled. Specific policy concerning attendance requirements and announced and unannounced examinations is the responsibility of the individual instructor. Students have a responsibility to inform faculty prior to absences whenever possible. Faculty should make every effort to find a reasonable accommodation for students who miss class as a result of participation in Provost-approved University-sponsored activities or legally required activities such as emergency military service. Students missing class on account of jury duty must receive such an accommodation.

Revised Athletics Class Attendance Policy (2012)

The Athletics Class Attendance Policy approaches the issue differently, focusing primarily on the repercussions for the student-athlete who is not meeting their scholastic responsibilities. Thus, few changes are necessary to reconcile the Athletics Class Attendance Policy with the others discussed. Only if the other policies are amended, would the Athletics Policy be required to change, as it references both the Regents Policy and the Norman Faculty Handbook. Among the most significant differences are:

a) The two day notice requirement for student-athletes regarding missed class and missed exams should be changed to two class periods or one week (whichever is less) with the exception of a final examination which requires a minimum of two weeks notice (no exceptions).

b) Copying the Provost on all missed class notification as a result of Provost-approved University-sponsored activity.

c) Athletics policy should require a minimum of two weeks notice for any missed final examination which occurs as a result of NCAA post-season or conference competition.

d) Policy should include a statement that informs student-athletes that if notification regarding exams or missed class does not meet this policy, that faculty members and instructors are not obligated to provide an excuse as stipulated in the Faculty Handbook.