

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

The Senate met in regular session with President G. L. Cross in the chair.

MEMBERS PRESENT

Cross, G. L.
Beach, L. B.
Bender, John F.
Bienfang, R. D.
Blankenship, F. F.
Brown, Horace B.
Cass, Carl B.
Copeland, Fayette
Cosgrove, A. L.
Couch, Glenn C.
Crook, Kenneth E.
Ewing, A. M. Cortez
Farrar, C. L.
Herbert, H. H.
Hoy, Harry E.
Keeley, Joe
Larsh, Howard W.

MEMBERS PRESENT

Matlock, J. R.
Morris, F. C.
Nielsen, J. Rud
Pritchard, J. A. P. E.
Pugmire, Donald R.
Rackley, John R.
Schriever, William
Smith, Paul W.
Snyder, Laurence H.
Springer, C. Eugene
Stow, H. Lloyd
Warren, Mary A.
Wilcox, Stewart C.
Reid, L. S.
Logan, Leonard
Weese, A. O.

MEMBERS ABSENT

Fite, Gilbert C.
Hughes, Frank C.
Marrs, Wyatt
Ortenburger, A. I.
Penfound, William T.
Sneed Earl
Wardell, Morris L.
Winfrey, L. E.

APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES.

The Journal of the Senate for the October 30, 1950, meeting was approved.

INTRODUCTION OF NEW SENATORS.

Professors Leonard Logan and A. O. Weese, new senators from the College of Arts and Sciences, were introduced.

EVALUATION OF TEACHING EFFECTIVENESS.

The subject "Evaluation of Teaching Effectiveness" has been discussed in four previous meetings of the University Senate--November 22, 1949; May 23, 1950; September 25, 1950; and October 30, 1950.

After the Committee on University Personnel submitted its recommendations at the October, 1950, meeting, the Senate voted that the report be referred to this committee again. Its instructions were to revise the plan recommended so that it would fit into the present system without creating additional administrative machinery.

Report from Committee

Your Committee on Faculty Personnel respectfully submits its report regarding revision of the so-called Washington Plan so that it will fit into the present system without creating additional administrative machinery.

After careful consideration the Committee has concluded that it cannot fit the Washington Plan into the present system without destroying the usefulness of the plan. The virtues of the latter are its objectivity, its being university wide, and its administration by a competent statistician, who, with assistance, would carry the burden of operation. Thus to marry the plan to the present system without having the plan administered by a Central Bureau would be to rob it of the very features which prompted the Committee to suggest it in the first place. The Committee therefore concludes that the substitute motion of Professor Cortez A. M. Ewing on October 30, 1950, confronts it with an insoluble dilemma. The resolution of this dilemma is obviously up to the Senate, which can vote either to reject the plan or to accept it.

If the plan is accepted, then the Committee is finished with its work here. If it is rejected, however, then either the present system can remain operative or the Senate can suggest a method of student evaluation other than that outlined in the plan. Yet whatever the Senate does, the Committee hopes the Senate will not ask it to attempt the illogical or impossible.

To repeat: If the essentials of the proposed Washington Plan would be lost without the proper centralized administrative machinery, how can a Committee fit the plan into the present system without the machinery?

Shall we say in conclusion: If there is a man with a plan, Let him stand forth?

Respectfully submitted,
 Horace B. Brown Carl B. Cass
 M. L. Wardell Howard W. Larsh
 Stewart C. Wilcox, Chairman

* * * * *

During subsequent discussion of the report, Dr. Wilcox emphasized that his committee was not instructed to offer an alternate plan; and for this reason, none was recommended. He also pointed out that the present status of the budget did not seem to justify suggesting the employment of additional personnel to administer a plan for teaching evaluation.

Therefore, he recommended that the plan for inaugurating the University of Washington plan for evaluation of teaching effectiveness be rejected.

The Committee's report was accepted, and Dr. Wilcox's recommendation was approved.

Dr. Carl B. Cass, a member of the committee and former chairman, mentioned that the Committee on University Personnel would be glad to submit information concerning the various plans of evaluating teaching effectiveness which have been used by others.

After a brief discussion of different evaluation methods, Dean Glenn C. Couch moved that the Committee on University Personnel be asked to continue its study and make reports to the Senate.

This motion was approved.

ABOLITION OF PAPER SCHOOLS.

Background: A report from the University Council on Instruction, received at the March, 1950, meeting of the Senate, made these recommendations:

1. We recommend the abolition of all "paper schools." (A "paper school" is defined as one which does not have both a teaching staff and a separate budget.) In making this recommendation, the Council does not propose the abolishing of any existing curricula, but simply that whenever such curricula do not have both staff and budget, they should not be called schools.
2. We recommend a comprehensive survey of the University's formal organization below the college level, with the view of achieving a general consistency in administrative organization and nomenclature.

* * * * *

This report and a report from the faculty of the College of Engineering, which included the following recommendation, were referred to the Committee on Organizations of Departments, Schools and Divisions for further consideration:

We, the faculty of the College of Engineering, believe that the proposal as submitted by the Council on Instruction would not be in the best interest of the graduates, students, and this college, or the University of Oklahoma. Therefore, it is our recommendation that no changes be made in the Schools of the College of Engineering.

* * * * *

Action by the Committee on Organizations of Departments, Schools and Divisions: The Committee's report was submitted in two parts--the majority's report was presented by Professor J. Ray Matlock, Chairman; and the dissenting opinion, by Dr. Cortez Ewing.

The Majority's Report

In view of the fact that the schools of Engineering Physics, General Engineering, Geological Engineering, and Natural Gas Engineering have been in existence for from 17 to 42 years and have acquired prestige in their respective fields, and in view of the fact that there is an obvious need for their continuing development to the point of professional accreditation, we, the Committee on Organization of Departments, Schools and Divisions, recommend that the decision of the Council on Instruction be not enforced for a period of two years.

Respectfully submitted,
John F. Bender
A. L. Cosgrove
H. H. Herbert
J. Ray Matlock, Chairman

The Dissent

Though believing the present issue inflated far beyond its actual importance by misunderstanding and by the refusal openly to face facts, I must dissent from the committee decision for the following reasons.

1. The abolition of the four paper schools in the College of Engineering brings that college within general University practice. All other paper schools have been already abolished. They were abolished through the implementation of a University policy. And I see no reason why the College of Engineering should not be included within the scope of general University policy.

2. The action of the Council on Instruction does not alter even in the slightest degree the program in engineering instruction. These four alleged schools are not schools in fact. They are curricula of instruction and nothing more. They have no budget and no faculty.

3. The action of the Council on Instruction does not interfere with the right of the College of Engineering to continue giving qualified degrees in the four fields. It only means that these curricula will, like that in the industrial management engineering, become curricula in theory as well as in fact.

4. A continuance of the present policy is a continuance of a policy which approaches intellectual dishonesty. No one of the four schools is accredited. Nor is there prospect under the present arrangement of any one of them achieving accreditation. To clothe an unaccredited curriculum with the aura of accepted terminology is a policy which, in itself, has significant ethical shortcomings. If a university cannot be straightforward and honest, it is a sad commentary upon our whole system of higher education.

5. To shove up these schools to the point at which they could satisfy the requirements of accreditation would necessitate the addition of from eight to ten additional faculty members at the upper professional ranks. Many new courses, providing technical training in applied science in the last two years of the separate curricula, would have to be organized. It is, therefore, entirely too sanguine to expect this development within the next two years. Moreover, the action of the Council on Instruction does not place any impediment in the path of the College of Engineering or the university for developing any one, or all, of these four curricula in fact to the point at which it or they would be a school, or schools, in fact as well as theory. I am of the further opinion that an honest admission of fact would be the best technique for achieving the goal of accreditation. Personally, I hope, for the good of the University, that each of these four curricula will be developed to the status of schools as soon as University financial resources will permit such expansion. But we must remember that one of these schools has remained in this inferior status for forty-two years. The youngest is seventeen years old. It is difficult to imagine that a two-year probationary period would substantially alter the situation.

6. And finally, representatives of the College of Engineering insist that the prestige deriving from the use of "school" rather than "curriculum" as nomenclature gives the college an advantage in the competition with other colleges of engineering; and that the directors of the four "so-called schools" would feel as though they had been cruelly demoted after having sincerely and effectively performed their academic tasks.

Concerning the latter argument, I cannot see that their positions are any different nor their feelings any tenderer than those of the directors of other paper schools which have already been abolished by university action.

As to the first argument, my own conviction is that employing agencies will still come to the University of Oklahoma College of Engineering so long as that college continues to train students who can efficiently take their places in the industrial world. No mere nomenclature can ever be a proper substitute for effective education. And the reputation which the college has in engineering physics and geological engineering is the result of instruction rather than of any nomenclature utilized. The "school of natural gas engineering" has had but thirty graduates in seventeen years, which means that it has had little opportunity to establish a reputation in its field.

For these reasons, I dissent from the committee's majority.

Cortez A. M. Ewing, Member

* * * * *

Action by the Senate: The dissenting opinion promoted considerable discussion. The main points have been summarized for the Journal:

Dr. J. Rud Nielsen: The dissenting opinion seems to be concerned primarily with definitions of terminology which are, after all, a matter of opinion. Furthermore, the dissent presents an inaccurate description of the present plan.

Dr. Ewing: Wouldn't it be necessary to offer courses at a higher level--thus, necessitating the hiring of additional personnel--before the School of Engineering Physics can be accredited?

Professor C. L. Farrar: The primary reason why the School of Engineering Physics has not been accredited is that the person making the survey for accreditation was violently opposed to the accreditation of engineering physics--not because of course offerings.

Professor F. C. Morris: The School of Geological Engineering was not accredited because there were not enough courses listed in the catalog as Geological Engineering. To illustrate the difference of opinion concerning course listings, the University of Texas School of Geological Engineering which has fewer courses in geological engineering than the University of Oklahoma--was accredited. As for schools of engineering physics, only two such schools have been accredited in the United States--those of the University of Maine and the University of Kansas.

Although I approve of the plan which is now in existence at the University of Oklahoma, I should like to point out that

the University College, the Graduate College and other divisions of the University would also be subject to question if this change were approved.

Professor G. W. Reid: I believe that the abolishment of these schools would tend to be backsliding. This, to me, would mean a step backward instead of forward.

Dr. Ewing: Since the degrees conferred upon the completing of these curricula would not be changed and since the type of training received would not be changed, I do not believe that the change in name would make any difference.

Professor Matlock: As far as the degrees conferred and the type of training offered are concerned, there would be no difference. There are other matters to be considered. For instance, enrollment in these particular schools is important to the students, and a change in the name would make a difference to them. In addition a change in the name, although it be in name only, would raise a question in the minds of those who are interested in employing graduates from these schools.

In conclusion, I'd like to say that this matter of definition has given us no trouble before. In order that we may make the changes necessary to come within the definition of the term school, I request that the Senate grant the two years recommended by the Committee majority.

Dr. H. Lloyd Stow: Formerly there was a School of Letters in the College of Arts and Science. Abolishment of this school has in no way altered the type of training offered nor the degree conferred. I was not aware that the abolishment of a school was within the scope of the Senate's authority. We were notified that the School of Letters had been abolished.

Professor A. L. Cosgrove: From a public relations point of view, I think it would be advisable to grant the additional two years. Certainly the College of Engineering faculty would appreciate an opportunity to meet the requirements which have been mentioned.

* * * * *

Final Action: The majority's recommendation that the decision of the Council on Instruction be not enforced for a period of two years was approved.

IMMIGRATION AND NATURALIZATION QUESTIONS.

A report from the Committee on Extra-mural Functions was presented by Dr. Forrest Blankenship, Committee chairman. This report, which discussed a proposal for the establishment of a

faculty committee to supervise immigration and naturalizations affecting all persons in the University community, included the following recommendations:

1. Because of the adequate facilities now provided by existing agencies and the lack of clearly defined duties of, or need for, the proposed committee, the recommendation is made that the proposal be disapproved.
2. As an aid to foreign students, the recommendation is made that the Office of the Dean of Students be asked to issue a supplementary information sheet for foreign students (analogous to material now prepared for entering freshmen), to be distributed to all foreign students at the time of enrolment.

In arriving at these recommendations, the Extra-Mural Functions Committee made a spot check of several University offices concerned with the problems of aliens on the campus, including:

The Office of Admissions and Records
The Counselor of Men
The Coordinator of Student Activities
Dean of College of Arts and Sciences
Associate Dean of the Graduate College

The need for a faculty committee was not apparent to any of these offices, nor was there any evidence that existing agencies are over-loaded with problems peculiar to aliens. The Office of Admissions and Records has been regarded as a model in its relations with the U. S. Immigration Service.

The problems of both students and non-students were considered in evaluating the possible functions of the proposed committee; no specific duties could be imagined for the proposed committee other than trying to assist aliens in utilizing existing channels of information and help. Such assistance is already available from regular sources.

There remained some doubt in the minds of the Extra-Mural Functions Committee that all foreign students, particularly those newly-arrived, would know how to make use of the various sources of help on naturalization or any other kind of questions. This was deemed to be a problem not for a special faculty committee, but for the Dean of Students. An information sheet designed especially for foreign students is recommended as a partial answer.

Respectfully submitted,

Joe W. Keeley
D. Ross Pugmire

Wyatt Marrs
Forrest Blankenship,
Chairman

ATHLETIC VICTORY HOLIDAYS.

The faculty of the College of Law submitted the following resolution for the Senate's consideration:

RESOLVED, that the faculty of the College of Law depreciates the policy of granting holidays because of athletic victories. Be it further resolved that these views be presented to the appropriate authorities with the request that they consider the propriety of laying before the Board of Regents the impolicy of such holidays and the bad effect which they exert upon the reputation and the program of the University.

Note: The most recent report concerning athletic victory holidays appears on page 1 of the March 27, 1950, Journal.

Senate Action: The resolution was referred to the Committee on University Standards

PROFESSORS EMERITI and OTHER RETIRED FACULTY--
Eligibility for Election to University Senate.

The Committee on Faculty Personnel made this recommendation regarding the eligibility of professors emeriti and other retired faculty for election to the University Senate:

All retired faculty shall be eligible for election to the University Senate, and their duties shall be the same as those of senators who have not been retired.

Senate Action: The Committee's recommendation was approved.

REPORTING OF EIGHT WEEKS GRADES.

President Cross requested that the Senate consider the University's policies in regard to the reporting of eight weeks grades.

Senate Action: This request was referred to the Committee on Curriculum.

ADJOURNMENT.

There was no further business, and the Senate adjourned at 5:20 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,
Charles E. McKinney
Secretary, University Senate
B. A. 7-A, Station 228