

**JOURNAL OF THE FACULTY SENATE**  
The University of Oklahoma (Norman campus)  
Regular session - November 14, 1994 - 3:30 p.m.  
Jacobson Faculty Hall 102

The Faculty Senate was called to order by Professor Tom W. Boyd, Chair.

**PRESENT:** Badiru, Baker, Boyd, Bremer, Burnett, R.C. Davis, Dillon, Erdener, Fiedler, Friedrich, Fung, Genova, Greene, Gutierrez, Havener, L. Hill, Holmes, Hutchison, Koger, Kukreti, Laird, Landes, F. Lee, Loving, R. Miller, D. Morgan, Mouser, Nelson, Ogilvie, Patterson, Pauketat, Ragep, Reeder, Rhodes, Roegiers, Sankowski, Stock, Sutton, Tepker, Tiab, Van Gundy, Wallach, Watson, Weaver-Meyers, Weinel, Wenk, Williams

PSA representatives: Bark, Barth, Spencer

**ABSENT:** Anderson, Horrell, Kincade, Mock, Sullivan, Wiegand

---

**TABLE OF CONTENTS**

**Announcements:**

Fall General Faculty meeting.....	1
Non-discrimination based on sexual orientation.....	2
Committee, presidential search committee policy.....	2
Search committee, Vice President for Institutional Advancement.....	2
Remarks by UOSA President.....	2
<b>Senate Chair's Report:</b>	
President Boren's address to general faculty.....	2
Parking garage.....	3
Letter describing OTRS effect on take-home pay as of 7/1/95.....	3
Retirement philosophical statement.....	3
Sabbatical and Leave of Absence without Pay policy.....	4
Academic achievement of student athletes.....	7
Academic reprieves.....	7
Employee financial obligations to the University.....	7
Routing of tenure dossiers.....	7
Publication of grade distributions.....	7
Campus Crimestoppers Board.....	7
Faculty class attendance.....	7

---

**APPROVAL OF JOURNAL**

The Senate Journal for the regular session of October 10, 1994, was approved.

**ANNOUNCEMENTS**

The Fall General Faculty meeting will be held Thursday, November 17, 1994, at 3:30 p.m. in Adams Hall 150. President David Boren will be the guest speaker.

On May 4, 1992, the Faculty Senate approved the inclusion of sexual orientation in the non-discrimination statement in the Faculty Handbook (see 5/92 Senate Journal, page 8). President Van Horn responded that the Presidential statement of March 27, 1990, the student code, and other University personnel policies already covered that issue. Interim President Morris was asked to re-consider the action. He decided to include the following sentence as presidential policy in the Faculty Handbook: "It is also the policy of the University not to discriminate on the basis of sexual orientation."

A committee is being formed, comprised of representatives from the Faculty Senate, Staff Senate, and UOSA, to establish guidelines for representation on future presidential search committees. Professors Michael Scaperlanda (Law), William Sutton (Aerospace and Mechanical Engineering), and Eleanor Weinel (Architecture) are the Faculty Senate representatives.

Prof. Penny Hopkins (Zoology) was selected from nominations submitted by the Faculty Senate Executive Committee for the search committee for the Vice President for University Affairs (renamed Institutional Advancement). Vice President for Administrative Affairs Jerry Farley will chair the committee.

#### **REMARKS BY MR. SCOTT MARTIN, UOSA PRESIDENT**

Mr. Martin said the Student Association is the representative body of the students and serves as a forum for students to express their needs. UOSA is expected to resolve problems and improve the atmosphere for students. Accomplishments in the last six to seven months include access to bookstore and vending money, which is being used to fund concerts. UOSA has developed scholarships for the child care center and is working on funding the all-campus card. Student activity fee money funds such things as peer education programs and crime awareness week. UOSA was instrumental in bringing Chick-fil-A to Ellison Hall and is trying to get Sooner Sense as an option in the Union food court. Other accomplishments are the Martin Luther King holiday, publication of faculty evaluations, and inclusion of sexual orientation in the non-discrimination statement.

see  
addendum

Mr. Martin said UOSA has been successful working with the Faculty Senate, Graduate Student Senate, and Student Congress. He is looking forward to working on issues such as grade distribution, a mandatory multicultural class, an extra day in the fall for a fall break, and additional funding for higher education. Students helped to lobby the legislature last spring on the teachers' retirement problem. They are interested in finding ways to increase funding for the library. He said we can make a positive difference on campus by working together.

Prof. Weaver-Meyers commented that this body owes a debt of gratitude to the students for helping to talk with legislators about the retirement problem.

#### **SENATE CHAIR'S REPORT, by Prof. Tom Boyd**

Prof. Boyd talked about a discussion at a conference which centered on whether the term "university" was now obsolete because of the dynamic change universities are undergoing. He said something new means opportunity and reminded the Senate that our new President would be discussing his expectations and concerns at the General Faculty meeting on Thursday.

President Boren is interested in how the faculty feel and will talk about the things of interest to faculty. He has been given the list of faculty concerns identified by the Senate.

The parking garage was approved by the OU Regents last week. Several individuals, representing a diversity of opinion, made presentations to the Regents. Part of the discussion was about the kind of traffic problems that could be caused by a garage that large. Prof. Boyd tried to represent the voice of faculty in objecting to the increased fees.

The administration has been promising to send out a letter to faculty and staff describing the effect of the changes in the Oklahoma Teachers' Retirement System (OTRS) on take-home pay as of July 1, 1995. The Senate Executive Committee mandated Prof. Boyd to send out a letter if the administration did not. The administration now says a letter will be sent Friday that will provide some general information and a personal illustration.

#### **RETIREMENT PHILOSOPHICAL STATEMENT**

A proposed retirement philosophical statement, recommended by the Faculty Welfare Committee, was distributed at the meeting (Appendix I). Prof. Gabert reported that the document states that salaries have been low but fringe benefits have been quite good. We would not want to wind up with low salaries and low retirement benefits. Issues such as fairness, security, freedom of choice, portability, and vesting should be addressed in a good retirement package. The employee should be highly involved and visible. The University ought to have a statement that describes what a good level of benefit should be. The Faculty Welfare Committee recommended an 80% wage replacement, exclusive of social security, as a target retirement goal. The Foster Higgins plan calls for something like a 35% plan provided by the University and 50% to 60% provided by the individual. This is in contrast to our current plan, which has the individual paying for approximately 40% wage replacement and the University paying for 50% to 60% wage replacement. In the addendum, the committee addresses the matter of current employees being held accountable for the problems with OTRS.

Prof. Boyd proposed that the Faculty Senate approve this statement as a guide in discussion. Prof. Gabert noted that the Staff Senate will meet November 16 to discuss this proposal. He said he also hopes that the HSC and Tulsa campuses will consider such a statement.

Prof. Friedrich suggested that the Faculty Senate wait to vote until the senators had a chance to discuss the statement with their colleagues. Prof. Stock said he applauded the Faculty Welfare Committee's position that the OTRS problems are not our fault. He said his calculations of what he has paid and what he will receive bear that out. Prof. Loving said his colleagues were not looking for a philosophical statement but rather pitchforks and torches. Since the legislature controls the money, we need to take action now before the legislature goes into session. Prof. Sutton pointed out that legislators are not members of OTRS, and their retirement system is well funded. Prof. Holmes said legislators belong to the Oklahoma Public Employees' Retirement System.

Prof. Stock said he would like President Boren to come to a Faculty Senate meeting to discuss his strategy about this issue. Prof. Boyd responded that the Faculty Senate Executive Committee had already requested a discussion with President Boren, who said he wanted to address that issue very early. Prof. Van Gundy said he thought this was a fine document but would like to change the title to a position statement.

Prof. Weinel commented that this document is not directed only at the legislature. The University has to establish its position, and that position will be significant to the legislature. Prof. Weaver-Meyers said it is important to take a clear, concise stand and establish a minimum acceptable level of benefit that is reasonable.

Prof. Holmes said he presumed the statement would allow flexibility, yet point five would exclude OTRS. Prof. Gabert answered that immediate vesting is desirable in the long run. Prof. Stock asked whether the letter that is going out on Friday would address the likelihood that TIAA-CREF will be reduced. Many people have come to OU because of the TIAA-CREF benefit. Prof. Gabert said no decision has been made on what will happen with TIAA-CREF. Prof. Stock contended that it is clear there will be reductions.

Prof. Friedrich moved to postpone the vote on the statement to give colleagues a chance to look at it. Prof. Dillon asked whether such an action would hamper any discussions with other groups. Prof. Davis added that Faculty Senate approval at this meeting would get discussions going on campus. Prof. Friedrich said if there was a pressing reason to vote at this meeting, he was comfortable with the statement. The motion to postpone failed on a voice vote. The motion to adopt the document as a position statement for negotiation and further action on the part of the Faculty Senate was approved on a voice vote.

#### **PROPOSED REVISIONS IN THE SABBATICAL AND LEAVE OF ABSENCE WITHOUT PAY POLICY**

The Faculty Senate approved Prof. Boyd's request to consider this item earlier than under new business. The proposed, revised Sabbatical and Leave of Absence without Pay policy was mailed to senators October 31 and is attached as Appendix II. The Provost requested that the Senate act on the proposal at this meeting so that the Regents could consider the final form at their December 7-8 meeting. Prof. Boyd noted that this document has led to considerable discussion among the Senate Executive Committee. Professors Tepker and Hill distributed some proposed amendments.

Prof. Reeder said the Mathematics Department had two points of view. One was that we should never be asked to consider on such short notice something that will have a lasting effect, and the way to handle this is to ask for more time. The other point of view was this is our chance to preserve sabbaticals if there are unseen forces trying to remove sabbaticals soon. It would be impossible to take a sabbatical in any industrialized country under the conditions outlined in the sabbatical pay section. His department had serious objections to the rewritten philosophical statement, in that the proposed version is not written to the faculty but rather to these unseen forces. He suggested that the original first two sentences be retained and that the second sentence end with "through study, research, and training." He also suggested that the new paragraph beginning with "Periods of study" be deleted and that the paragraph that began with "Accordingly" now begin with "However." Prof. Holmes moved to adopt that amendment. Prof. Tepker commented that the paragraph that once began with "Accordingly" on page one is the most punitive. The amendment does not address that. Prof. Reeder said the two main objections in his department were to the language "staying abreast of rapidly developing fields" and "Such faculty study results in improved classroom productivity and teaching effectiveness" because that is an inaccurate portrayal of the purpose of a sabbatical. Prof. Boyd announced that the following members of the committee were present to answer questions: Dan Snell (History and Faculty Administrative Fellow in the

Provost's office), David Branch (Physics and Astronomy), and Bob Foote (Industrial Engineering). Prof. Snell explained that the Regents were especially concerned about the leaves of absence without pay policy, which was very old and brief. The purpose is not to curtail sabbaticals but to assure that they are used for scholarly purposes. Prof. Weaver-Meyers asked for the committee's reasons for the revisions and for information on other policies. Prof. Snell said the committee reviewed policies of Big 8 and Big 10 schools, and those varied. The committee wanted to remove language that gave a false appearance of how faculty spend sabbaticals. Following a brief discussion about the meaning of "training," the amendment was approved.

Prof. Tepker moved to amend the document to retain the provisions of (d) (3) on page 6, arguing that the calculation of sabbatical eligibility once allowed faculty to count, between sabbaticals, any year in which a sabbatical was delayed. A faculty member should not have to wait the full period before the next eligibility because of some institutional delay. He also moved to replace the paragraph beginning with "Sabbatical pay" under (b) on page 3 with "Sabbatical pay and University-paid benefits plus pay and benefits from other sources, less expenses of sabbatical activities personally borne by the person on sabbatical leave, shall not exceed 100 percent of the person's salary and benefits at the University of Oklahoma." He explained that the 100 percent rule would correctly keep faculty from profiting from a sabbatical at taxpayers' expense. However, the policy should take into account extra expenses incurred because of approved sabbatical work. Prof. Bremer pointed out that a 100 percent rule was not a part of the original policy. Lower paid faculty could easily double their salary while on sabbatical through one good commission. Prof. Snell said the committee had re-considered that issue and proposed that the percentage be deleted. Professor Tepker withdrew his amendment. Prof. Hill moved to amend the document by deleting that sentence, arguing that such a revision should come from the Faculty Senate. Prof. Tepker said if the committee was willing to take that position, the Senate should applaud the committee for doing so. Prof. Hutchison urged the Senate not to forget the political climate in which the revisions were being proposed. We should show that faculty are not gaining through sabbaticals. It will hurt us if we do not have a statement that keeps people from making two to three times their salary. Prof. Weinel contended that she could not go anywhere on sabbatical without compensation for expenses. It is best not to address the issue in the document. Even if faculty are under attack, they do not have to run. Prof. Loving noted that the regents and provost feel the pressure of the political climate. Faculty should stand up and not be bullied by the legislature. Faculty should be able to go out on a sabbatical and be paid what they are worth. Prof. Sutton said it was absurd not to let the free market value prevail. Prof. Weaver-Meyers asked how other universities addressed this issue. Prof. Boyd also asked about the committee's willingness to delete that statement now. Prof. Snell said the committee had wanted to curb abuses, but subsequently realized that many areas have a higher cost of living. Some of the other universities have a limit. Prof. Tepker said it is clear that something should be done to curb any abuses, but the 100 percent rule is inflexible. The Senate should encourage the committee to come up with substitute language. Prof. Hutchison agreed that the Senate should find a way of showing some responsibility or limit but still allow for travel and per diem. Prof. Van Gundy claimed that how faculty use their time is more important than how much money they make. Prof. Hill said most faculty will not be making more than 100 percent, and the Provost has to approve the applications. Prof. Bremer commented that instead of making all faculty suffer equally, it should be left to the President as to whether a sabbatical is in the best interest of the

University. Prof. Havener contended that parts (c) and (d) specify the benefits and the pay from the University, so controls are already built in. Prof. Tepker said there should be some guarantees that what is being done by the person is what they are supposed to be doing on sabbatical. Prof. Havener said misuse has to do with the guidelines, not the finances. Prof. Weinel added that likely abuses are for not using a sabbatical as it was intended rather than for being overpaid. The motion to delete the paragraph beginning with "Sabbatical pay" on page 3 and to retain the original (d) (3) on page 6 was approved on a voice vote.

Prof. Hill proposed that the following sentence be substituted for the first sentence of the last paragraph on page 3: "Persons on sabbatical leave at full pay may not receive additional compensation from within the University for teaching more than one course in Advanced Programs, Liberal Studies, Intersession, or other University programs without the approval of the President." He cited the reasons for his proposal: (1) Including UCT, over one-third of the faculty are involved in teaching in these programs. Prohibiting faculty from participating would have a substantial adverse impact on these programs. (2) Some faculty use Advanced Programs classes to enhance their research. (3) Large numbers of faculty would be asked to take a substantial pay cut. Prof. Sutton pointed out that faculty could still teach in these programs, just not while they are on sabbatical. Prof. Havener said it would be unwise politically for the Faculty Senate to go on record as saying faculty can get more than 100 percent from the University (as opposed to from other sources). Prof. Tepker claimed it would be difficult to explain why faculty need release time from regular teaching obligations but not from these others. Prof. Greene mentioned that the compensation for teaching in Liberal Studies is minimal but could make a great difference to faculty at the lower end of the pay scale. Prof. Weinel explained that this teaching could occur when faculty are beginning or ending a sabbatical and therefore not interfere with the sabbatical. Prof. Dillon pointed out that teaching in Advanced Programs is a research opportunity for her discipline. Prof. Hutchison suggested that the entire sentence be deleted. Prof. Davis said he would support that because, otherwise, attention is called to that issue. Prof. Hill accepted that as a friendly amendment. Prof. Snell said that section speaks to the fear of abuse and applies only to people on full pay who should not be distracted by other assignments. Prof. Hill asked whether the committee added this language because of a perceived problem or because of instructions to do so. Prof. Snell said it was because of a perceived problem. Prof. Bremer suggested substituting "if" for the word "since," so the process of applying for a sabbatical would take care of the situation. Prof. Sutton said the pay should not matter if it does not come out of the state budget. Prof. Havener recommended the removal of "for teaching in Advanced Programs, Liberal Studies, Intersession, or other University programs." Prof. Kukreti asked whether this paragraph applied to faculty on a one-year sabbatical leave. Prof. Snell clarified that faculty on a one-year sabbatical would receive half pay, and this would not apply to them. Prof. Hill said the proposed revisions would still give the administration the power to deny a sabbatical for engaging in such activities. He commented that "substantially" could be added before "diminish." Prof. Weinel said some statement could be included in the sabbatical request declaring that the activity would not interfere. Prof. Havener proposed that the last part of that sentence read, "if such activities would interfere with the purpose of the sabbatical." Prof. Hill said he did not trust the administration. Prof. Hutchison remarked, "If you don't want the question raised, delete the whole thing." Prof. Erdener asked, "What if such activities are an integral

part of the sabbatical research?" The motion to delete the first sentence of the last paragraph on page 3 was approved, 18 to 10.

Prof. Holmes moved to amend the last paragraph of page 7 by deleting the language, "if their services are not immediately essential to the University, with the understanding that they may be recalled during the year if their services are required, upon 60 days' notice by the President of the University." Prof. Sutton noted that the original policy was dated 1943, so the reason this phrase was initially included is obvious. The amendment was approved on a voice vote.

Prof. Landes said he thought time spent on leave should count toward tenure (top of page 9). Prof. Havener pointed out that a faculty member could take leave without pay for some personal reason. Faculty can always come up for tenure early. Prof. Weinel agreed that leaves without pay could be taken for reasons that are non-academic. Prof. Foote said he views this provision as protecting faculty because they will not be penalized for taking two years off to take care of an ill parent, for example.

Prof. Ogilvie read a statement from Prof. Steven Livesey (History of Science) explaining that OTRS has no provision for contributions less than a full year when faculty are on leave. Prof. Boyd suggested that she bring this to the attention of the committee.

Prof. Patterson moved to table the revised policy. The motion failed on a voice vote. The motion to approve the document as amended was approved on a voice vote.


A statement in recognition of academic achievement of student athletes (Appendix III) was distributed at the meeting for the information of the Faculty Senate.

Due to time constraints, the following items of business had to be postponed. The documents are available from the Faculty Senate office.

- Proposed procedures for granting academic reprieves
- Proposed policy on employee financial obligations to the University
- Recommended change in the routing of tenure dossiers
- Student Congress request to publish grade distributions for courses
- Proposed campus-wide Campus Crimestoppers Board
- Proposed statement concerning faculty class attendance

#### 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, December 12, 1994, in Jacobson Faculty Hall 102.

  
Sonya Fallgatter  
Administrative Coordinator

  
Connie Dillon  
Secretary

November 14, 1994

A Statement of Philosophy:

**RETIREMENT BENEFITS AT THE UNIVERSITY OF OKLAHOMA**

The Faculty Welfare Committee\* propose the following philosophical statement regarding the retirement program for the employees of the University of Oklahoma:

Retirement benefits are an important component of overall compensation. A high quality retirement program should be consistent with national norms at major institutions of higher education. Historically, base salaries of employees at the University of Oklahoma have been below national averages for comparable institutions while fringe benefits have been very competitive. The retirement program at the University of Oklahoma has served as an inducement to help attract and retain faculty and served as a partial offset for low salaries. The University of Oklahoma Retirement Plan should consider the history of total compensation at the University of Oklahoma and the benefits promised employees when they accepted employment at the University.

The retirement plan should consider the following qualifying elements: fairness, security, freedom of choice, portability, and vesting. We believe the employees should have a strong voice in the retirement plan. A quality plan should allow for individual choice among retirement investment options. The benefits should assist individuals to maintain a retirement income comparable to that received while employed.

- A fair plan offers returns commensurate with contributions made by the employee and on the employees' behalf. It also offers reasonable equity across classes of employees.
- A secure plan is soundly managed and backed by solid investment practices.
- Freedom of choice implies that employees should have some ability to choose among investment options.
- A high quality plan must be portable in recognition of the national market from which we recruit.
- A high quality plan must offer immediate vesting of contributions made by employees and on behalf of employees.

Wage replacement should be the guiding factor in establishing the fringe benefit retirement provision, with a goal of 80% wage replacement upon retirement, exclusive of Social Security. The retirement benefits should be provided by the University. In addition, retirement plan options should be available to employees who may choose to provide personal funds to enhance their individual retirement goal.

\* The Staff Senate of the University of Oklahoma is preparing a similar document.

**ADDENDUM**

"Unless a retirement system offers secure and predictable benefits, employees cannot plan for the future or look forward to retirement with any degree of confidence or optimism. It is unfair to expect the current employees of the University of Oklahoma to bail out the Oklahoma Teacher's Retirement System when those employees do not bear direct, and sole responsibility for the system's current unfunded liability. It would be equally unfair to exclude any single class of employees--faculty, staff, or administrators--from any revised retirement plan based on income. University employees should not be asked to pay additional retirement contributions unless the benefits exceed a normal, high quality program, i.e., greater than 80% wage replacement, exclusive of Social Security. If S.B. 568 is fully implemented, recruitment at all levels will suffer and retention of high quality faculty will become a severe problem. Many senior faculty will likely retire rather than pay the large increase in retirement contributions. Whatever changes are made in the retirement plan in this or any subsequent year, the university should do more to educate employees about the retirement program, through workshops and employer sponsored seminars as well as through the distribution of written material."

Provided to the Faculty Senate of The University of Oklahoma by the Faculty Senate Welfare Committee- Fran Ayres, Accounting; Trent Gabert, Health and Sport Sciences; David London, Geology and Geophysics; Don Pisani, History; and Ken Wedel, Social Work.



OFFICE OF THE SENIOR VICE PRESIDENT AND PROVOST  
The University Of Oklahoma  
Norman Campus

MEMORANDUM

To: Professor Tom Boyd, Chair, Norman Campus Faculty Senate  
From: James F. Kimpel, Senior Vice President and Provost  
Date: October 25, 1994  
Subject: Sabbatical and Leave of Absence without Pay Policy

Enclosed is a copy of the proposed, revised Sabbatical and Leave of Absence without Pay policy as suggested by the recently constituted faculty committee. The proposed and existing policies have been presented in strike-out and underline format so that you can see what has been suggested for deletion and addition as well as what would remain the same.

Because of the urgency with which the OU Regents view the updating of these policies, I ask you to proceed expeditiously in considering them. Although it goes outside your usual procedure, I request that you circulate the proposal among senators before your November 14 meeting, consider it at that meeting, and return it to me with any suggestions as soon as possible. The Regents will consider the updating of the policy at their December 7 and 8 meeting, which means that we must have a final form of the policy no later than November 21 in order to get it ready to mail to the Regents in a timely manner.

I appreciate your cooperation in this regard. I am sure the senators will appreciate the importance of this matter; the faculty committee has acted as quickly as could be expected. I hope the Senate can too.

If you have questions about the thinking behind the proposed policy or the practice of peer institutions, please contact Professor Daniel Snell, the Faculty Administrative Fellow who has followed the work of the committee.

The committee consisted of Professors David Branch of Physics and Astronomy, Dortha Killian of Architecture, Bob Foote of Industrial Engineering, and Dean David Woods of the College of Fine Arts. Professor Ralph Guild of the Health Sciences Center was informed of all the committee's business, but he did not participate.

JFK/cvs

Enclosures

cc: Interim President J.R. Morris  
Professor Daniel Snell

Summary of Substantive Changes in Sabbatical and Leave of Absence  
Without Pay Policy

1. Listing of purposes for sabbatical leave.
2. Requirement that faculty adhere to sabbatical plan.
3. Requirement that sabbatical pay and pay from elsewhere not exceed 100% of faculty member's salary.
4. Specification that faculty on full-pay sabbatical are not to receive additional compensation from within the University.
5. Deadlines for application moved up a month, to February 1 for the following fall and July 15 for the following spring semesters.
6. Formalization of application for leaves of absence without pay, including specific arrangements to cover courses normally taught by the faculty requesting leave.

Appended: (available from the Faculty Senate office)

1. Form for Application for Sabbatical Leave of Absence, currently in use.
2. New Sabbatical Leave Report Form, currently in use.

LEAVES POLICY

Paragraph 3.18.1 (New 3.21.1) of The Faculty Handbook

Leaves of Absence

Sabbatical Leave

(a) Purpose

~~Sabbatical leaves of absence are among the most important means by which an institution's academic program is strengthened, a faculty member's teaching effectiveness enhanced, and scholarly usefulness enlarged. The major purpose is to provide opportunity for continued professional growth and new or renewed intellectual achievement through study, research, writing, and travel. A leave may either involve specialized scholarly activity or be designed to provide broad, cultural experience and enlarged perspective.~~

~~Application for sabbatical leave should be encouraged, and a Faculty member who is on sabbatical leave should be considered to be enhancing personal value to the department and to the University.~~

~~Periods of study, research, and training enable University faculty members to improve their teaching, research, and service by staying abreast of rapidly developing fields. Such faculty study results in improved classroom productivity and teaching effectiveness. Sabbatical leaves have been effective tools based on historical experience.~~

~~However, a Accordingly, a faculty member does not automatically earn a sabbatical leave. Instead, it is an investment by the University in the expectation that the sabbatical leave will significantly enhance the faculty member's ability to contribute to the objectives of the University. There should be a clear indication that the improvements sought during a sabbatical will benefit the~~

work of the faculty member, department, college, and the University. Only sabbatical leave proposals that meet this criterion will be accepted and approved by the University. Sabbatical leaves are supported as an investment in the future of the faculty member and the future of the faculty member's students at the University of Oklahoma.

The purposes for which a sabbatical leave may be granted may include:

- 1) Research on significant problems and issues.
- 2) Important creative or descriptive work in any means of expression, for example writing or painting.
- 3) Postdoctoral study at another institution to update teaching skills.
- 4) Other projects satisfactory to the University.

It should be demonstrated that such work cannot occur as effectively during the regular work schedule of the faculty member.

Normally the University will not grant a sabbatical for the purpose of pursuing work on the terminal degree in the person's academic field; however, it will entertain application for a sabbatical leave to permit post-terminal degree study or professional training.

Adherence to the plan submitted by the faculty member is expected. Within two months of returning from leave, the faculty member shall submit to the Senior Vice President and Provost through the chair or director and college dean a report of activities undertaken, which will be used in evaluating future applications for sabbatical leaves.

A faculty member who is on sabbatical leave shall not be penalized on matters of salary consideration. The report on the sabbatical will be used in consideration for merit raises in subsequent years.

retain but with amendment

(b) Conditions of Award

~~A sabbatical leave of absence may be granted by the President of the University with the approval of the Regents of the University to any tenure holding faculty member on the Norman Campus or to any regular faculty member on the Health Sciences Center Campus, provided that the time shall be applied to study and travel approved by the President, and provided further that the application meets the conditions for a regular sabbatical or a mini sabbatical as set forth below.~~

~~(Regents, 9-9-82)~~

Approval of a sabbatical leave of absence with full or partial pay depends on the ability of the applicant's college to absorb the financial obligation.

~~A person applying for a sabbatical leave and receiving a stipend for the same period from another institution or agency may still receive a sabbatical provided that it appears to the President that it is in the best interest of the University and will be needed to prevent financial loss to the person obtaining the sabbatical.~~

~~Each sabbatical leave application shall be judged on the merits of the individual case.~~

~~Sabbatical pay along with pay from elsewhere shall not exceed 100 percent of the person's salary at the University of Oklahoma.~~

~~Persons on sabbatical leave at full pay may not receive additional compensation from within the University for teaching in Advanced Programs, Liberal Studies, Intersession, or other University programs, since such activities would diminish the sabbatical time for study and creative activity. Persons on sabbatical shall resign from all councils, standing committees, and administrative advisory committees of the University, except graduate students' committees, in~~

order to devote their full time to their projects. [See Faculty Handbook 2.7.7] The obligation to supervise and advance the work of graduate students shall continue during the sabbatical leave.

The sabbatical recipient shall sign a statement of commitment to return to the University for one year following receipt of the sabbatical or, if the individual accepts employment elsewhere, to remit that the salary and cost of benefits received from the University during the sabbatical leave, unless this requirement is waived by the President.

Faculty who are returning from sabbatical leave shall submit a report of activities to the Senior Vice President and Provost via their departmental chair and dean within 60 days after returning to University service.

(c) Benefits Payable ~~Continuation of Benefits and Salary~~

Employment benefits for faculty members on full salary will continue at full benefits levels. Employment benefits for faculty members on sabbatical leave at less than full salary will be as follows:

- (1) Health, Accidental Death/Dismemberment, and dental insurance will continue at full benefit level.
- (2) Social Security contributions will be based on the actual salary paid.
- (3) The normal Defined Contributions Plan will be computed by reducing the salary that is exempt (normally the first \$9,000) in the same proportion to the sabbatical FTE. For example, for a faculty member on sabbatical leave at half pay for a year, the exempt salary will be reduced to \$4,500.

(Regents, 5-11-78, 4-12-84, 7-23-87)

(d) Eligibility

The semesters that are counted toward eligibility for sabbaticals are the fall and spring semesters only and do not include the summer session term.

(1) ~~Regular Sabbatical~~: After six years of service, faculty on nine-month appointments may be granted a sabbatical leave at half pay for a period not to exceed two semesters or at full pay not to exceed one semester. After six years of service, faculty on 12-month appointments may be granted a sabbatical leave at half-pay for a period not to exceed 12 months or at full-pay for a period not to exceed six months. The term "six years of service" refers to full-time appointments in a regular faculty appointment at the University of Oklahoma, but not counting leaves of absence without pay. The term "six years of service" also includes other full-time service at the University of Oklahoma that has been included in the probationary period for tenure. Such service at other institutions of higher learning shall not be included.

(2) ~~Mini Sabbatical~~: After establishing the initial eligibility of 12 semesters of full-time regular service, faculty on nine-month appointments may apply for a one-semester leave at half pay or a two-semester leave at quarter pay and faculty on 12-month appointments may apply for a six-month sabbatical leave at half pay or a 12-month sabbatical leave at quarter pay. ~~Application for subsequent mini-sabbaticals~~ Applications for half-pay and quarter-pay sabbaticals may be made after additional every six semesters of full-time ~~regular~~ service. ~~Under~~

~~exceptional circumstances, alternate sabbatical leave arrangements may be approved, as exceptions, by the President. Any proposals for alternative arrangements should clearly specify: (1) the proposed period of the leave, (2) the full or fractional salary rate, and (3) the period of full time service that establishes eligibility for that specific sabbatical leave arrangement. Faculty members who have taken a half- or quarter-pay sabbatical and wish to take full sabbaticals must serve an additional six years before they are eligible.~~

(3) ~~A faculty member's eligibility to apply for subsequent sabbatical leaves is established by length of service following return from the previous sabbatical leave in accord with the schedule referred to above. Occasional exceptions to the rule may occur when a faculty member who is otherwise formally determined to merit a sabbatical leave is obliged to postpone it for the convenience of the University. In exceptional cases, the President may determine the period of delay be considered as part of the period of service establishing eligibility to apply for the next sabbatical leave.~~

retain

(e) Procedures

The procedure to be followed in applying for a sabbatical leave shall be as follows:

(+) The faculty member shall apply to the department. After recommending approval or disapproval, the department chair or director shall submit the application to the college dean by ~~March 1~~ February 1 for sabbaticals beginning in the following academic year or later and no later than ~~August 15~~ July 15 for sabbaticals

)

beginning the following spring semester. The dean will hold all applications for comparative review and recommend, by ranking in order of merit, to the appropriate Senior Vice President and Provost. The Senior Vice President and Provost may seek the advice of the Council on Faculty Awards and Honors. The Senior Vice President and Provost will recommend to the President, who will recommend make recommendations to the Regents for the May and October meetings respectively. ~~Only under unusual circumstances will exceptions be made.~~

~~(2) If the Regents approve the recommendation, the Office of the President shall formally notify the faculty member to that effect by June 1 for applications submitted to the dean by March 1 and by November 1 for applications submitted to the dean by August 15.~~

~~Exceptions to the above policy will be considered when such reasons are judged by the Dean and the Provost to be compelling.~~

(Regents, 5-11-78, 4-12-84, 1-17-85, 7-23-87)

#### Paragraph 3.18.6 (New 3.21.0) of The Faculty Handbook

##### Leave of Absence Without Pay

Leaves of absence without pay may be granted for a period usually not exceeding one year to members of the faculty and other employees for ~~government service, or other employment purposes deemed to be in the interests of the University if their services are not immediately essential to the University, with the understanding that they may be recalled during~~

)

~~the year if their services are required, upon 60 days' notice by the President of the University.~~  
Leaves without pay should be infrequent and should be approved only after careful consideration by department heads and college deans. Recurring requests for leaves of absence without pay should not be approved without strong justification, particularly when they are in consecutive years.

Application for a leave of absence should be submitted to the department chair or director, who will forward it with recommendation to the college dean, who will forward it to the Senior Vice President and Provost. The application will be in the form of a letter of request with specific justification for the absence from the University of Oklahoma and will include the following information:

- 1) Sabbatical or other leaves the faculty has taken in the past six years, their dates and purposes.
- 2) The purposes of the proposed leave.
- 3) The contribution of the leave to the realization of the person's goals and those of the University in research, teaching, or service.
- 4) The arrangements to be made by the department to handle the courses that normally would be taught by the faculty member who is proposing to go on leave. The application should be specific and list the affected courses or other work and the arrangements that have been made for these courses and work.

Requests for extension must contain updated information about the above items and will be subject to the same approval procedure as an initial leave.

Time spent on leave without pay will not count toward a probationary period for tenure or for eligibility for sabbatical leave.

University contributions to the Defined Contributions Plan and group life and medical insurance will not be made during a leave without pay. Persons on leave may pay for their own contributions to the plans.

~~Extensions of leaves of absence beyond one year may be granted under the above conditions.~~

(Regents, 11-12-43)

November 14, 1994

TO: Faculty Senate

FROM: Connie Dillon, Chair, Athletics Council

RE: STATEMENT IN RECOGNITION OF ACADEMIC ACHIEVEMENT OF  
STUDENT ATHLETES

As Chair of the Athletic Council, I would like to commend the Athletic Department and Athletic Director Donnie Duncan on the significant improvement demonstrated in the Athletic Department's commitment to improving the academic achievement of athletics.

Each year, OU is required to submit detailed data related to student athlete admissions and academic performance. I am pleased to report that recent NCAA Graduate Rates Reports have demonstrated dramatic rises in OU student athlete graduation rates. The 1994 graduate rates report indicated a 53% graduation rate for all student athletes and a 78% graduation rate among those who complete their eligibility. Our football student athletes, with a graduation rate of 57%, currently lead both the Big 8 Conference and universities joining us in the Big 12. Most notably, our women student athletes graduated at a rate of 78%.

Although GPA conference comparisons are not available, it is important to note that the average student athlete cumulative grade point average was a 2.72. Teams earning particular distinction were the women's volleyball team (3.14 cum), coached by Miles Pabst; women's golf team (3.07 cum) coached by Carol Ludvigson; the men's tennis team (2.97 cum), coached by Paul Lockwood; and the women's tennis team (2.96 cum), coached by Mark Johnson.

It is important to note that, while significant gains have been made, the Athletic Department is committed to continuing its efforts to improve the academic performance of athletes in a manner consistent with academic integrity and the mission of the university.

cc: President-Designate David L. Boren  
Donnie Duncan, Athletic Director



# *The University of Oklahoma*

OFFICE OF THE STUDENT PRESIDENT

To: Faculty Senate

From: Scott C. Martin, UOSA President

Date: December 13, 1994

Subject: Senate Journal

After reviewing my comments from the November 14, meeting, I have made some corrections to my remarks. I feel these corrections could be helpful in making certain that your records are totally accurate.

Please do whatever you can in correcting these errors. Thank you for your time and consideration with this matter. Please do not hesitate to contact my office if I can be of further assistance.

encl.



## REMARKS BY MR. SCOTT MARTIN, UOSA PRESIDENT

Mr. Martin said the Student Association is the representative body of the students and serves as a forum for students to express their needs. UOSA is expected to resolve problems and improve the atmosphere for students. Accomplishments in the last six to seven months include access to bookstore and vending money, which is being used to fund concerts, Speaker's Bureau, scholarships for child care center and is working on funding the all-campus card. Student activity fee money funds such things as peer education programs and crime awareness week. UOSA was instrumental in bringing Chick-fil-A to Ellison Hall and in getting Sooner Sense as an option in the Union food court. Other accomplishments are the Martin Luther King holiday, publication of faculty evaluations, and inclusion of sexual orientation in the non-discrimination statement.

Mr. Martin said UOSA has been successful working with the Faculty Senate, Graduate Student Senate, and Student Congress. He is looking forward to working on issues such as grade distribution, a mandatory multicultural class, and an extra day in the fall for a fall break, and additional funding for higher education. Students helped to lobby the legislature last spring on the teacher's retirement problem. They are interested in finding ways to increase funding for the library. He said we can make a positive difference on campus by working together.