

JOURNAL OF THE UNIVERSITY SENATE
 October 30, 1950, 4:10 p.m.
 Monnet Hall, Room 101

The Senate met in regular session. Since neither the Chairman nor the Vice-Chairman were present, Dean Laurence H. Snyder was elected to serve as moderator for this meeting.

MEMBERS PRESENT

Bender, John F.
 Blankenship, Forrest F.
 Brown, Horace B.
 Cass, Carl B.
 Copeland, Fayette
 Cosgrove, A. L.
 Crook, Kenneth E.
 Ewing, A. M. Cortez
 Farrar, C. L.
 Fite, Gilbert C.
 Herbert, H. H.
 Hoy, Harry E.
 Hughes, Frank C.

MEMBERS PRESENT

Keeley, Joe
 Marrs, Wyatt
 Matlock, J. R.
 Morris, F. C.
 Ortenburger, A. I.
 Pritchard, J. P.
 Rackley, John R.
 Reid, L. S.
 Sneed, Earl
 Snyder, Laurence
 Springer, C. E.
 Warren, Mary A.
 Wilcox, Stewart C.

MEMBERS ABSENT

Cross, G. L.
 Beach, L. B.
 Bienfang, R. D.
 Couch, Glenn C.
 Larsh, Howard W.
 Nielsen, J. Rud
 Penfound, William T.
 Pugmire, Donald R.
 Schriever, William
 Smith, Paul W.
 Stow, H. Lloyd
 Wardell, Morris L.
 Winfrey, L. E.

CORRECTION AND APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES.

With the following corrections, the Journal of the Senate for the September 25, 1950, meeting was approved.

1. The date mentioned under Approval of the Minutes (page 1) should be corrected to read May 29, 1950.
2. On page 2, Members on Leave of Absence, the reference concerning the election of a replacement for Professor Gilbert Fite should be deleted. Professor Fite's name should also be included in the personnel of the Committee on Libraries and Laboratory Facilities (page 8).

EVALUATION OF TEACHING EFFECTIVENESS.Background.

Letter from the Chairman of the University Budget Council:
 On May 2, 1949, the Chairman of the University Budget Council (Financial Vice President Roscoe Cate) addressed a letter to the University Senate. The following statements are excerpts from that letter:

The members of the University Budget Council have found during their work on faculty salary recommendations that it is very difficult to evaluate effectiveness of a particular faculty member as compared to his colleagues.

In some cases, members of the Budget Council have had first hand information, but most of the substantiating material with respect to teaching effectiveness consisted of generalizations supplied by the chairman or the dean, or both. In a great many cases, no information at all was presented to indicate whether or not a particular faculty member is a good, bad or indifferent teacher.

.....
There are three obvious sources of information about a faculty member's teaching effectiveness: (1) his colleagues; (2) his students; (3) his former students.

The Budget Council receives some information about the opinion of colleagues, but it is hoped that more comprehensive reports along this line can be furnished next year. We have found that frequently a faculty member's colleagues are reluctant to express an opinion one way or the other, for the reason that they have not heard the man teach and their opinions are colored largely by statements they have heard from students.

.....
The question of establishing a procedure to obtain student opinion as to the teaching effectiveness of faculty members immediately presents two alternatives: shall the University adopt a mandatory system in which every faculty member is rated by all of his students, or shall a questionnaire on teaching effectiveness be made available for optional use of those faculty members who desire that such a rating be made a part of their personnel records for consideration in connection with salary raises and promotions.

Before setting up the procedures to be followed in preparation of departmental budget recommendations to be submitted next fall for the 1950-51 school year, the University Budget Council would like to have an expression of opinion from the University Senate as to which of these alternatives would be preferable.

.....
Council members realize that student opinion as to a faculty member's teaching effectiveness must be considered as only one item of many items to be considered. Moreover, it is realized that the results of a questionnaire survey for one year only might be of comparatively little worth. The major benefit to be

derived from a survey of student opinion would be the cumulative significance of the ratings on a particular faculty member for a substantial number of years.

.....
It is therefore believed that one of the proposed methods of obtaining information from students should be adopted despite the recognized limitations that must be kept in mind in the use of the results obtained.
.....

Student Senate Bill Number F-35: On November 16, 1949, the Student Senate passed a bill entitled "Consideration by the Faculty Senate for Evaluation of Courses and Instruction of the University of Oklahoma". This bill stated:

WHEREAS in other institutions, students and faculty alike have praised the value of rating of instructors, and

WHEREAS evaluation assists an instructor in the improvement of his teaching techniques, and

WHEREAS rating of instructors offers an opportunity for students to present their criticisms and suggestions intelligently and honestly without the discomfort or embarrassment of disclosing their identity, and

WHEREAS evaluation offers an opportunity for the faculty to receive student opinion in confidence and determine the effectiveness of their courses and instruction.

BE IT RESOLVED that the Faculty Senate of the University of Oklahoma go on record as favoring the aforementioned plan, the first efficiency ratings to be administered prior to the final examinations, January, 1950.

The University Senate Committee on Faculty Personnel:
The proposals submitted by the Budget Council and the Student Senate were referred to the University Senate Committee on Faculty Personnel. (See Journal of the Senate, November 22, 1949.)

Action by the Committee on Faculty Personnel.

Journal of the Senate, May 29, 1950, page 3: Dr. Carl B. Cass, Chairman of the Committee on Faculty Personnel, presented the following recommendation from his committee:

The Committee on Faculty Personnel recommends to the University Senate, for consideration and adoption, the University of Washington plan for "Evaluation of Academic Effectiveness--November, 1949," with modifications hereinafter stated.

1. Student opinions surveyed at the option of the individual teacher shall be used along with faculty rating as an official part of the promotional plan at the University of Oklahoma in contrast to the University of Washington plan which admits of student opinion surveys only as an aid to teachers who are interested in improving their teaching.
2. In place of the five criteria listed on the form, "Survey of Student Opinion of Teaching," (page A in Appendices of the University of Washington plan, the following three criteria should be substituted:
 - a. Classroom Performance 1 2 3 4 5 6
(well-organized, clear, and thorough explanations - distinct and interesting manner of speaking - sticks to subject and stresses important material)
 - b. Classroom Attitude. 1 2 3 4 5 6
(enthusiastic enough to stimulate interest, thinking, questions, and class discussion)
 - c. Personal Attitude towards Students 1 2 3 4 5 6
(fair, patient, tolerant, and broadminded)
3. In order to avoid the necessity of establishing any new administrative machinery, surveys of student opinions shall be administered by the offices of the respective deans. Faculty rating shall be administered by the departmental budget committee supplemented by two to four members of related departments appointed by the dean of the college. Analyses of the student opinions and faculty evaluations shall be submitted by the deans to the University Budget Council.

It was moved and passed that this recommendation from the University Senate Committee on Faculty Personnel be received. It was further moved that the Committee hold meetings during the summer months and submit an informational report to the Senate at the September, 1950, meeting.

Meeting of the Senate, September 25, 1950: Dr. Cass reported that the Committee on Faculty Personnel had prepared an amendment for the Senate's consideration. Although this amendment was printed in the agenda for the September 25 meeting, Dr. Cass suggested that its consideration be postponed until the October 30 meeting. This suggestion was approved by the Senate.

Meeting of the Senate, October 30, 1950: The Committee on Faculty Personnel, in accordance with the request made at the May 29 meeting, proposed that: Item 3 on the first page of the May 23, 1950, report should be changed to read as follows:

The administrative machinery should approximate as closely as is practical, under local and current conditions, the centralized machinery used by the University of Washington; and analyses of student opinions and faculty evaluations shall be submitted by the central agency to the University Budget Council.

In proposing this amendment, Dr. Cass stated that the Committee on Faculty Personnel assumed that the Senate would recommend that President Cross appoint a committee to work out the matters of administration.

There was considerable discussion of the report. A portion of the discussion is mentioned here:

Professor A. L. Cosgrove: Since the University of Washington plan was initiated by the student body, should the Senate ask the University of Oklahoma Student Senate to assist in working out the plans for matters of administration?

Dr. J. P. Pritchard: Is this evaluation procedure necessary? My experience has been that the matter of evaluation can be completed capably by Committee A.

Dr. Stewart C. Wilcox: There is a danger that such an evaluation may become mandatory. None of the nine faculty members with whom I have talked consider such a plan advisable. Several of them have been very much against it.

Dr. A. I. Ortenburger: In the Zoology Department we have used a system of student evaluation for two or three years. Some members of our faculty use it, and others do not. In any event, it has not become mandatory. Personally, I am in favor of student evaluation.

Dean John R. Rackley: Is this evaluation procedure intended to serve as a basis for promotion, or is it a means of enabling the individual teacher to do better teaching?

Professor Joe Keeley: When I was a member of the University Budget Council, we found it difficult to determine adequately the individual teacher's teaching effectiveness. Committee A's report is not always reliable. In some cases the Committee A report will state something by letter, and then state something else in a telephone conversation. I might add that Committee A is on a Departmental basis while the Budget Council must make its recommendations on a University-wide basis.

Dean Laurence H. Snyder: Why was the "optional idea" placed in this proposal from the Committee on Faculty Personnel?

Dr. Carl B. Cass: Some people object to the mandatory idea. Therefore, we thought we could remove the sting by making it optional.

Professor Gilbert Fite: We are already judged, whether or not we know it. This is usually done, however, by the very poor or the very good students. I believe it would be a good idea to get a wider judgment. Furthermore, there is a feeling among some faculty members that one does not get ahead by teaching freshman and sophomore classes. A method of evaluating teaching effectiveness would erase some of the stigma that is felt by those who must continue teaching the freshman and sophomore classes.

Professor Wyatt Marrs: In addition to the student opinions, the teacher whose teaching effectiveness is to be evaluated would also be rated by a group of his colleagues. Does this mean that there must be a separate committee appointed to handle each individual's case?

Dr. Cass: According to the plan proposed, Committee A would continue to operate. Six or seven faculty members would be asked to rate the individual concerned.

Dean Rackley: If the faculty members who are to make the evaluation do not make periodic observations, then they would not be able to make an accurate evaluation of the teacher concerned.

Dean H. B. Brown: The statistical procedure recommended in the University of Washington plan is too much work for the offices of the deans.

Dr. Eugene Springer: Would it be possible to get a response from the different departments as to whether this evaluation is desired?

Dean Brown: Aren't there two ideas here: The student evaluation and the appointment of committees to evaluate the faculty member?

Dr. Cortez A. M. Ewing: I submit a substitute motion: That the report be referred to the Committee on Faculty Personnel for revision so that it would fit into the present system without creating additional administrative machinery. (The motion was seconded.)

Dr. Cass: As chairman of the Committee on Faculty Personnel, I should like to say that the original report was returned to us for the purpose of recommending some way of working out the administration of the plan without adding more duties to the present administrative set up. Therefore, it would be difficult to proceed with the recommendation made in the substitute motion.

* * * * *

The Senate voted that the report be referred to the Committee on Faculty Personnel for revision so that it would fit into the present system without creating additional administrative machinery.

APPORTIONMENT OF UNIVERSITY SENATE MEMBERSHIP.

At the September 25, 1950, meeting of the Senate, President Cross was instructed to appoint a committee to study revision of the present apportionment of membership in the Senate. The following senators were appointed to the committee:

Professor Cortez A. M. Ewing, Chairman
Professor Clyde L. Farrar
Dean Horace B. Brown

The Committee recommended that membership in the University Senate for the next three years (1951-54) be allocated in the following manner:

	<u>Recommended</u>	<u>Current Membership</u>	<u>To Be Elected</u>
College of Arts and Sciences	14	13	1
College of Engineering	4	3	1
College of Business Administration	3	2	1
College of Education	2	1	1
College of Fine Arts	2	2	0
College of Medicine	2	1	1
College of Law	1	1	0
College of Pharmacy	1	1	0
Graduate College	1	1	0
General Faculty	12	13	-1
Subtotal	42	38	4
Ex Officio member (President Cross)	1	1	0
Total	<u>43</u>	<u>39</u>	<u>4</u>

The reapportionment here recommended is based upon an official report of the President's Office upon the present faculty personnel with ranks of instructor, assistant professor, associate professor, and professor. According to the report, the teaching personnel of the various colleges was, to-wit:

College of Arts and Sciences	292
College of Engineering	74
College of Business Administration	57
College of Fine Arts	46
College of Medicine	45
College of Education	36
College of Law	11
College of Pharmacy	7
Graduate College	1
<hr/>	
Total	573

A quotient of 21 was used to determine the recommended apportionment for the various constituent colleges. Under it, the general faculty will have twelve members, which is only three short of the customary one-third of the Senate membership.

IMMIGRATION AND NATURALIZATION QUESTIONS.

A proposal was made concerning the establishment of a faculty committee to have general supervision over immigration and naturalization questions affecting all persons in the University community. The proposal, made by Dr. Howard O. Eaton and submitted by President Cross, provided that the committee should have authority to make recommendations to the President's Office with respect to all such cases.

It was referred to the Committee on Extra-Mural Functions.

PROFESSORS EMERITI.

A progress report from the Committee on Faculty Personnel was discussed by Dr. Stewart Wilcox. This report concerned professors emeriti.

ADJOURNMENT.

There was no further business, and the Senate adjourned at 5:30 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Charles E. McKinney
Secretary, University Senate
Business Administration 7-A
Telephone Station 228