The Faculty Senate was called to order by Dr. Donald C. Cox, Senate Chairperson, in Room 165, Oklahoma Memorial Union.

Present:

Artman Christian Foote Joyce Lis Saxon
Atherton Coulter Gillespie Kitts McDonald Scheffer
Bishop Cox Goff Kunesh Merrill Seaberg
Braver Crim Hackler Kutner Murray Shahan
Brown Crites Hookman Lancaster Rasmussen Snell
Caldwell Davis Hood Larson Reynolds Thompson, Gary
Carmack Dewey Huettner Lee Rowe Yeh

Absent:

Bell Calvert Hill Rice Walker
Blick Herrick Lewis Thompson, Steve

(Secretary's note: In accordance with precedent, attendance at this special meeting will be used to offset an absence during the current academic year. Conversely, members of the Senate will not be charged with absence on this date.)
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ANNOUNCEMENT OF SENATE REPLACEMENTS

Dr. Cox, Senate Chair, next introduced the following new members of the Senate:

Professor Bess Hood (University Libraries): replacing Professor James Alsip (1976-79) as a representative of the Provost Direct faculty category.

Professor Osborne Reynolds (Law): commencing his 1978-80 term as a representative of the Law Center. Professor Charles Todd served the first semester (fall, 1977) of Prof. Reynolds's 3-year term.

Professor Wayne E. Rowe (Education): replacing Professor Glenn Snider (1975-78) as a representative of the College of Education.

DECLARATION OF "EXECUTIVE SESSION" STATUS FOR THIS MEETING

Dr. McDonald moved that, as authorized by Senate By-Laws, this special meeting be declared an "executive session," in view of the personnel matter to be discussed; i.e., faculty nominations for the Search Committee for the President. Without discussion and dissent, the Senate approved the motion.
SEARCH COMMITTEE FOR THE PRESIDENT

Background Information: Dr. Cox, Senate Chair, summarized events following
President Paul F. Sharp's announcement of his retirement as President of the
University effective upon the selection of his replacement. All Senate officers
were present at the Regents' meeting on Thursday, January 19, 1978, when President
Paul F. Sharp had made his formal announcement. Immediately following, the
Regents went into executive session. Reopening the public meeting, Mr. Tom Brett,
President of the Board of Regents, announced the following composition of the
Search Committee for the President:

Faculty (Norman campus 3; HSC 1) 4
Students 2
Staff 1
Alumni 2
At large 1
Regents 2

The Regents' Secretary will also be a non-voting, ex officio Secretary of the Committee.

At their January 19 meeting, the Regents solicited additional nominations for the
faculty positions from deans, department heads, or any other faculty source. All
nominations were to be submitted to the Regents by February 2. The Regents will
make the ultimate selection and will announce the membership of the Committee at
their Tulsa meeting on February 15.

Displeased with the turn of events, the Senate officers at once researched pertinent
University procedures and policies and ascertained that current University policy
stipulates that (1) faculty should have majority membership on Search Committees for
administrative officers, including the President, and (2) faculty nominations are to
be submitted only by the Faculty Senate Committee on Committees. Further investi-
gation disclosed that the Hollomon Committee consisted of 10 faculty and 2 alumni
members and the Sharp Committee included 8 faculty, 4 students, 1 staff, and 2 alumni
members.

The Senate Chair, accordingly, contacted Regent Brett by telephone and did his best
to make a strong case for increased faculty representation on the Search Committee.
Mr. Brett "was not necessarily impressed" with either precedent, policy, or the
faculty concern that, under the announced guidelines, individuals on campus inter-
ested in the Presidency could conceivably nominate advocates of their own candidacies.
He did, however, react to the faculty concern that, under the circumstances, the
search process, the committee itself, and the individual finally selected would be
suspect in the eyes of the faculty. Regent Brett requested Dr. Cox to present these
issues in a letter as soon as possible.

Accordingly, Dr. Cox on January 23 sent to Mr. Brett the following self-explanatory
letter that he also read to the Senate at this meeting:

As I mentioned in our telephone conversation this morning, I feel compelled to
transmit to you my feelings and those of the Norman campus Faculty Senate Executive
Committee concerning the inadequate representation of the Norman campus and the
Health Sciences Center faculty on the Search Committee for the President of this
University.
(1) University policy published on December 1, 1976, states that the majority of the membership of search committees for University administrative officers, including the President, should be composed of faculty. That policy further stipulates that faculty nominations are to be transmitted by the Committee on Committees of the Faculty Senate.

(2) Many faculty members view the composition of the two previous presidential search committees as precedent setting. On both committees, the faculty constituted the majority, even when two faculty positions on the Sharp Search Committee were given to students.

(3) If policy and precedent are not followed in the formation of the present Search Committee, we are certain that the faculty will regard such action as an intentional reduction of their participation and an expression of the lack of the Regents' confidence in the ability of the faculty to participate in such an important University process.

(4) This brings me to what I and many faculty members feel is the most important aspect of this problem. If the composition of the Search Committee is regarded as not being sufficiently representative of the Norman campus and the RSC faculty, then that Committee, the search process, and the individual finally selected as the next president would be considered in a very controversial light. Complete faculty support and commitment are absolutely essential if a University president is to function effectively.

(5) Furthermore, potential candidates may be reluctant either to be interviewed or to accept the position if an atmosphere of controversy surrounds that person's selection.

(6) Moreover, because of the many difficulties that the University is now experiencing, we fervently hope that the incoming president would begin his/her tenure in a University atmosphere of confidence and cooperation.

(7) In our opinion, certain members of the University community may wish to be considered active candidates for the Presidency. Opening the nominations for faculty representatives on the Search Committee would provide potential candidates the opportunity of nominating advocates of their candidacies. While not entirely undesirable, such a possibility could conceivably place such candidacies and possible final selection under a cloud of suspicion and doubt and, thus, further exacerbate the situation.

We appreciate this opportunity to present our valid faculty concerns in this very important matter and request favorable consideration of the above views by the Board of Regents.

In an attempt to follow up on his January 23 letter, the Senate Chair telephoned Regent Brett in Tulsa on Monday morning, January 30. Mr. Brett reported that the January 23 letter had been circulated to all the Regents but that there has been no response to date. He expressed his personal doubts as to whether the composition of the Committee would be changed. In rebuttal, he cited the following views of the Board in this matter:

(1) The University policy in question was approved only by the President and was never approved by the Regents.
The College/Departmental Organization Section of the University
Faculty Personnel Policy currently awaiting Senate approval contains the
proposal that Presidential Search Committees be excluded from the University
policy concerning search committees.

In a public institution, a 12-member Presidential Search Committee that
includes 8 faculty and 2 student members would be "questionable."

Senate Action: Expressing pessimism about a favorable outcome, Dr. Cox, nevertheless,
suggested that the Senate at this meeting nominate one group of six "top-notch"
faculty members for the positions and, in anticipation of favorable Regential action
to enlarge the faculty representation on the Search Committee, nominate an additional
group of six equally competent faculty members. He urged the Senate to select indi­
viduals with established reputations, both inside and outside the University community,
for performance in all aspects of the University. The importance of best-available
nominations was underscored by the fact that the Search Committee apparently will not
have a faculty majority.

During the ensuing discussion with pro and con arguments for subsequent faculty
strategy, Dr. Cox reported that the Health Sciences Center Faculty Senate last week
had selected six nominees for the single HSC faculty position. In addition, the
HSC Senate voted to express its own displeasure with the Regents' actions, as well
as to urge the Board to increase the HSC representation and select Committee
members only from nominations submitted by that Senate.

At this point, Dr. Bishop moved that the Senate endorse the views presented in Dr. Cox's
letter of January 23 to Regent Brett and so notify the Regents. Without dissent, the
Senate immediately approved the motion.

Dr. Cox then asked for Senate reaction and guidance concerning the suggestion that
the Senate resort to press releases in this matter. Most of the discussion, on both
sides of the argument, was focused on speculations as to what effect such releases
would have on the credibility of the faculty members on the Search Committee. The
consensus of the Senate appeared to be that the Senate should limit itself to
publishing the official Journal of this meeting and a subsequent issue of the Senate
newsletter, the Faculty Senate Forum.

Dr. McDonald, Chair of the Senate Committee on Committees, then presented the slate
of six nominees prepared jointly by the Senate Executive Committee and the Committee
on Committees after careful consideration of qualified and available faculty members,
including minorities and women.

Professor Davis then presented four nominees approved by the Norman campus Women's
Caucus. Two more nominations were made from the floor.

Dr. Christian next moved that the consent of any additional nominees be required.
The motion carried without dissent.

During the discussion of the mechanics of the voting procedure, Professor Crim moved
that Senate members select six nominees from the ballot of twelve individuals. The
motion carried without dissent.

Dr. Christian then moved that the Senate vote in two separate ballots for the two
groups of nominees and that the second ballot follow the announcement of the results
of the first ballot. The motion carried.
Voting by separate written ballots, the Senate selected the following two groups of nominees:

**List of nominations for the 3 Norman campus faculty positions**
already included on the Search Committee:

- Roger Prech (Chemistry)
- Martin Jischke (AMNE)
- Don Kash (Science and Public Policy)
- Alexander Kondonassis (Economics)
- Eugene Kuntz (Law)
- David Levy (History)

**Alternate list of nominations for any additional faculty positions:**

- Karl Bergey (AMNE)
- James Bohland (Geography)
- Jim Estes (Botany/Microbiology)
- Kenneth Merrill (Philosophy)
- Dwight Morgan (Law)
- Tom Smith (History of Science)

Both lists of nominees are the same as those presented by the Senate Committee on Committees.

**ADJOURNMENT**

The Senate adjourned at 5:29 p.m. The next regular session of the Faculty Senate will be held at 3:30 p.m., on Monday, February 13, 1978, in Dale Hall 218.

Respectfully submitted,

[Signature]

Anthony S. Lis
Professor of Business Communication
Secretary, Faculty Senate