

JOURNAL OF THE UNIVERSITY SENATE
 May 28, 1951, 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.
 Bienfang, R. D.
 Blankenship, F.F.
 Brown, H. B.
 Cass, Carl E.
 Crook, Kenneth E.
 Ewing, A. M. Cortez
 Farrar, C. L.
 Fite, Gilbert C.
 Hoy, Harry E.
 Larsh, Howard W.
 Matlock, J. R.
 Nielsen, J. Rud
 Penfound, Wm. T.
 Pugmire, D. Ross
 Sneed, Earl

MEMBERS PRESENT

Springer, C. E.
 Wardell, M. L.
 Warren, Mary A.
 Wilcox, S. C.
 Weese, A. O.

MEMBERS ABSENT

Beach L. B.
 Bender, John F.
 Copeland, Fayette
 Cosgrove, A. L.
 Couch, Glenn C.
 Herbert, H. H.
 Hughes, Frank C.
 Keeley, Joe
 Larrs, Wyatt

MEMBERS ABSENT

Morris, F. C.
 Ortenburger, A. I.
 Pritchard, J. P.
 Rackley, John R.
 Schriever, William
 Smith, Paul W.
 Snyder, L. H.
 Stow, H. Lloyd
 Winfrey, L. E.
 Reid, L. S.
 Logan, Leonard M.

APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES.

The Journal of the Senate for the April 30, 1951, meeting was approved.

EVALUATION OF TEACHING EFFECTIVENESS.

Background.

Senate action on resolutions concerning "Evaluation of Teaching Effectiveness" has been reported in the following issues of the Journal:

- November, 1949, page 2.
- May, 1950, pp. 3,4.
- October, 1950, pp. 1-7.
- November, 1950, pp. 1-3.
- January, 1951, pp. 7,8.
- March, 1951, pp. 2-4.
- April, 1951, page 9.

Discussion of the Proposed Plan.

At the April 30, 1951, meeting of the Senate, the Committee on Faculty Personnel submitted its latest plan for evaluating teaching effectiveness.

Time did not permit a discussion of the proposed plan at that meeting, and consideration of the plan was postponed until the next regular meeting.

Comments on the Committee's recommendations focused on:

1. Distribution and use of the results obtained from the student opinion questionnaire.
2. Permission for individual departments to revise and/or omit certain questions not considered pertinent to the subject matter of a particular department.
3. Rephrasing and/or omitting specific questions.

Dr. Gilbert C. Fite commented on the possibility that: in order to obtain a more favorable student-opinion rating, some teachers may feel obligated to put too much emphasis on popularity. He made a motion that the underscored portions of the following paragraphs be omitted:

Paragraph III: Each individual teacher shall tabulate data taken from the first section of the questionnaires (only six items) obtained from all his classes and turn the questionnaires and two copies of his tabulation over to his Committee A, which will forward one copy of the tabulation to the dean.

Paragraph IV: The original questionnaires of any teacher shall be held as strictly confidential.... But once questionnaires have been presented . . . may be passed to the dean. In turn, the dean may pass this summary on with his recommendations to the Budget Council.

Paragraph V: (Entire paragraph to be omitted)

Paragraph VI: It is assumed that the chief value of this evaluation plan will be that of guiding self-improvement by the individual teacher. It is also assumed that under such a plan. . . where it has been passed on by both Committee "A" and the dean. In such cases. . . opinions based upon mature observations and judgments.

Dr. Fite: I think we should confine this questionnaire to the improvement of teaching and that the questionnaire should be drawn up on that basis. For that reason, I think the results of the questionnaire should not go further than Committee "A."

Dr. Wardell: For the past two years I have been a member of the committee which has considered this question of evaluation. Our directions from the Senate were that the questionnaire which we prepared was to be one for the Budget Council.

To accomplish the purpose which Dr. Fite mentioned would mean that we make a different approach to the problem of this questionnaire. I do not think it would be possible for one report to deal with both of the problems.

Dean Brown: As a member of the Committee on Faculty Personnel, I'd like to comment on the proposal. I do not, however, wish to speak for or against it.

Several months ago the Committee asked the Senate for instructions as to what sort of plan was to be prepared. At that time the Senate voted overwhelmingly for a plan similar to the one which we have presented here.

I do not share Dr. Wardell's opinion that it would be impossible for data obtained through use of this questionnaire to serve the needs of both the instructor and the Budget Council. I believe that the questionnaire would give an instructor information which would enable him to improve his teaching and that it would also furnish his dean and the Budget Council with data which they would want.

Dr. Ewing: Is this questionnaire similar to those used by other schools?

Dr. Cass: Yes. It is somewhat similar to the Syracuse plan. Statements presented in our questionnaire were selected from various student opinion questionnaires already being used---by Syracuse and other schools.

Senate Action on Amendments Proposed by Dr. Fite.

The amendments proposed by Dr. Fite were not approved.

Statements included in the proposed questionnaire were divided into three sections:

Section I - Opinion of General Qualifications of Instructor

Section II - Additional Qualifications of Instructor and Qualities of the Course.

Section III - Specific Criticism of the Instructor

Dr. J. Rud Nielsen asked the Senate to give special consideration to: the phrasing of the scale of meanings and one of the statements; and the content of four statements.

After explaining his point of view, Dr. Nielsen moved that:

1. The words in this respect be deleted in the scale of meanings
2. The words to life situations be deleted in Section I, statement 3.
3. Statement 8 in Section II be omitted.
4. Statement 9 in Section II be omitted.
5. Item i of Statement 1 in Section III be omitted.
6. Item k of Statement 1 in Section III be omitted.

When the statement concerning the instructor's sense of humor (Statement 8 in Section II) was being discussed, Dr. Cass (a member of the Committee for past two years) explained that this quality was included on each

questionnaire studied by the Committee on Faculty Personnel.

Senate Action on Amendments Proposed by Dr. Nielsen.

Each alteration recommended by Dr. Nielsen was voted upon separately, and all were disapproved.

In response to comments about statements in Sections II and III, Dr. S. C. Wilcox, Chairman of the Committee on Faculty Personnel, called attention to Paragraph III of the Questionnaire's prefatory material: (Quoted below)

Each individual teacher shall tabulate data taken from the first section of the questionnaires (only six items) obtained from all his classes and turn the questionnaires and two copies of his tabulation over to his Committee A, which will forward one copy to the dean.

Dr. Nielsen: If this questionnaire will be used only by Committee A, couldn't each department devise its own questionnaire?

Dr. Cass: I made that suggestion last fall, but it was referred back to the Committee with directions to work out a plan which could be applied on a University-wide basis.

Dr. Crook: Frankly, I think the plan proposed by the Committee would do some good and that each group which makes use of the results would act with discretion. I do not see why data obtained by using the questionnaire should be made available to Committee A and not to the deans and the Budget Council.

Dr. Ewing and Dr. Crook suggested that departments could be permitted to make slight changes in the manner of administering Sections II and III of the questionnaire, and Dr. Nielsen made a motion to that effect.

Senate Action on Motion to Permit Slight Changes in Manner of Administering Sections II and III of the Questionnaire.

The motion made by Dr. Nielsen was approved.

Following approval of the proposal concerning the administration of Sections II and III, Dr. Wilcox moved that the Senate approve the plan (A copy of the plan is presented on the following three pages). In making his motion, Dr. Wilcox emphasized that as to Section I no changes should be permitted.

The Plan.Explanation.

All schools and departments of the University shall administer student opinion polls in order to obtain student estimates of the teaching efficiency of all teaching personnel. Polls shall be conducted by means of the following questionnaire form (which should be reproduced on a single sheet of paper) in all classes (except purely laboratory classes) taught by each member of the teaching staff. The poll shall be taken in every section of every course taught by each teacher five different semesters distributed over a five year period. In courses taught five times or less in five years, the poll shall be taken each time such courses are offered. Additional use of the questionnaire, after the initial five year's use by each teacher, shall be at the option of the department, school, or individual member of the teaching staff, except that new personnel as employed shall use the questionnaire over a similar five-year period.

Each teacher shall allow for time to be taken during one class period in each class for conducting the poll. This time must be after the midsemester and should be as near the end of the semester as is convenient. At the appointed time, the questionnaires shall be distributed to all students present. Although the teacher shall remain in the room to maintain order and to prevent discussion of the questionnaire, he should appoint one or more students to distribute and collect the questionnaires, which should be shuffled before being returned to him.

Each individual teacher shall tabulate data taken from the first section of the questionnaires (only six items) obtained from all his classes and turn the questionnaires and two copies of his tabulation over to his Committee A, which will forward one copy of the tabulation to the dean.

The original questionnaires of any teacher shall be held as strictly confidential by chairmen or directors, except when the teacher himself or his chairman or director, may wish to present them to Committee A. But once questionnaires have been presented before Committee A, any summary of data taken from the questionnaires (including material in sections two and three) in company with the recommendation of Committee A, may be passed on to the dean. In turn, the dean may pass this summary on with his recommendations to the Budget Council.

When questionnaire data is not immediately used by the chairman, director, or dean, it should be filed for future reference and comparison. Accumulated data may seem significant enough to be used at some future time.

It is assumed that the chief value of this evaluation plan will be that of guiding self-improvement by the individual teacher. It is also assumed that under such a plan, information obtained from students will reach the Budget Council only in individual cases where it has been passed on by both Committee "A" and the dean. In such cases the student opinions presumably will be used only as evidence in support of staff and administrative opinions based upon mature observations and judgments.

STUDENT OPINION OF TEACHING
University of Oklahoma

Course _____ Section _____ Date _____
Year in School _____ Approximate grade average at O. U. _____

Your instructor is interested in improving this course. You can help by giving frank, impersonal, and completely anonymous responses to all statements on this sheet. Do not sign your name. If your hand writing may be recognized, please print.

Using your best judgment, indicate a response to all lettered statements. Encircle the appropriate letter before each statement according to the following scale of meanings:

- (A) This course is one of the best (or most effective) I have had in this respect.
- (B) This course is better than the average in this respect.
- (C) This course is about the same as most courses in this respect.
- (D) This course is not as good as the average in this respect.
- (F) This course is one of the least effective I have ever had in this respect.

SECTION I - Opinion of General Qualifications of Instructor

1. A B C D F - Instructor's explanations are clear and well organized.
2. A B C D F - Instructor is friendly and interested in the progress of individual students.
3. A B C D F - Instructor seems to have abundant knowledge of the subject and its applications to life situations.
4. A B C D F - Instructor's enthusiasm (or apparent interest) stimulates constructive thought and real effort on the part of students.
5. A B C D F - Examinations and quizzes are fair and provide students with ample opportunity to demonstrate their command of course materials.
6. A B C D F - Rank the instructor in this class in comparison with all your other instructors.

SECTION 2 - Additional Qualifications of Instructor and
Qualities of the course

1. A B C D F - Instructor avoids unwarranted sarcasm and the ridiculing of students.
2. A B C D F - Instructor is available and willing to confer with students outside of class.
3. A B C D F - Instructor seems willing to answer pertinent questions in class.

4. A B C D F - The text book and other instructional materials used in this course are satisfactory.
5. A B C D F - The amount and quality of outside reading, special reports, term papers, etc., assigned in this course are satisfactory.
6. A B C D F - The instructional or illustrative materials of whatever nature, the demonstrations, etc., are well chosen and effectively used by the instructor.
7. A B C D F - Assignments are well balanced, resulting in steady rather than spotty progress of the class.
8. A B C D F - Instructor has a good sense of humor and uses it appropriately.
9. A B C D F - Instructor avoids wasting class time, because he does not dwell upon personal reminiscences, irrelevant narrations, etc.
10. A B C D F - Goals of this course are made clear and assignments are clearly related to these goals.

SECTION 3 - Specific Criticisms of the Instructor

The following items are of a rather personal nature. You may avoid indicating your responses to any or all of these items, if you choose.

1. Encircle the letter in front of all items in the following list which seem characteristic of the instructor's voice or manner of speaking.
 - a. Entirely satisfactory
 - b. Clear or vivid
 - c. Monotonous or bored
 - d. Too weak for easy audibility
 - e. Too loud
 - f. Harsh or unpleasant
 - g. Too fast
 - h. Too slow
 - i. Too many "ahs" or "uhs"
 - j. Too vague and indefinite
 - k. Too pompous or conceited in manner
2. Indicate any distracting or unpleasant mannerisms of the instructor.

3. Indicate any annoying manner or habit of the instructor that seems rude or offensive.

Final Action on the Proposed Plan
for
Evaluating Teaching Effectiveness.

The foregoing plan for evaluating teaching effectiveness was approved.

FACULTY TITLES.

In a letter dated May 18, 1951, Professor L. N. Morgan, Editor of University Publications, requested the Senate to reconsider its action of April 30, 1951, concerning faculty titles: (See Journal of the Senate, April 30, 1951, pages 5 and 6.)

" . . . that those persons employed only part-time be given the titles which they would ordinarily be given if they were employed full-time, and that the expression 'part-time' be inserted in parentheses following the title."

Professor Morgan's letter called attention to some sixty terms used to designate rank and title. It also explained the terminology currently used to indicate an employee's amount of service and academic functions.

Excerpts from Professor Morgan's Letter.

Paragraph II: "Part-time" has been used primarily to indicate amount of service, hence amount of pay. It has no necessary connection with academic rank or tenure. Some employees who have had professorial rank and tenure have served part-time.

Paragraph III: The academic qualifications and functions of an employee are shown, supposedly, by his rank and title. Any limitation on rank and title is shown by terms preceding rank and title. "Special," "Acting," and "Visiting" have been used specifically to show that an employee is holding a position only for the time-being, or that for some reason he is not a "regular" member of the faculty. If he is a temporary appointee, then he cannot be a candidate for tenure until his status is changed.

Paragraph IV:
All terms . . . (used in the catalog to designate rank and title) . . . show the academic function which an appointee has, not the amount of time he spends on the job. Since the editor of the catalog does not . . . prepare the pay roll, why clutter up the works with another term which in fact has nothing to do with academic standing, and which applies only to the amount of salary received?

Discussion of Professor Morgan's Request.

During the discussion of the request, President Cross mentioned, President Cross mentioned that he felt a recommendation concerning faculty titles for part-time employees was a matter of policy and called for Senate Action.

Dr. Ewing made a motion that all part-time faculty personnel be given the title Special Instructor; and Dr. Pugmire suggested the title Special Lecturer. Neither was approved.

Dr. Larsh made the following motion and approved as suggested by Dean Brown:

That reservations pertaining to academic titles be written into the contract of employment which is signed by the employee concerned, and that such reservations not be included in University publications.

After referring to the matter of tenure and the possibility of misunderstanding with the American Association of University Professors, Dean Brown asked that Dr. Larsh's motion be amended by adding this clause:

providing legal advice will concur.

Senate Action on Professor Morgan's Request.

The Senate approved the amended motion: That reservations pertaining to academic titles be written into the contract of employment which is signed by the employee concerned, and that such reservations not be included in University publications--providing legal advice will concur.

COMMITTEE ON FACULTY RETIREMENT
Appointment of Membership.

After being notified that President Cross had approved the recommendation of the Senate concerning the Appeals Committee on Faculty Retirement (Journal of the Senate, April 30, 1951, pp. 1-4), the Senate approved a motion that the Senate Nominating Committee submit a list of fourteen faculty members from which the President shall appoint the seven members of the original Appeals Committee on Faculty Retirement.

COUNCIL ON INSTRUCTION.
Nominations for New Members.

The term of membership on the Council on Instruction of Professors D. L. Barnes and Olin L. Browder, Jr., expires this year. The Senate nominated the following four faculty members for the term 1951-54.

D. L. Barnes	Kenneth E. Crook
Olin L. Browder, Jr.	J. Ray Matlock

From this list, the President will select two members for the term 1951-54.

UNIVERSITY COUNCIL ON PLANNING AND DEVELOPMENT.

On July 1, 1951, the University Council on Planning and Development will replace the University Planning Committee.

Membership of the Council.

Ex-officio Members:

Mr. Verne Schnee, Vice President in Charge of Development
Mr. Walter Kraft, Director of the Physical Plant
Professor Richard Kuhlman, University Architect
Dean John Fellows, Dean of Admissions

Appointive Members:

Professor R. Dale Vliet (1-year term)
Professor Francis R. Cella (2-year term)
Professor Joe W. Keeley (3-year term)
Professor L. M. Logan (4-year term)

In the absence of Mr. Schnee, the first meeting of the Council will be convened by Mr. Kraft who will continue as chairman of the Council until the return of the Vice-President in Charge of Development.

NEXT REGULAR MEETING OF THE SENATE.

The next regular meeting of the Senate will be Monday, September 24, 1951, at 4:10 p.m.

ADJOURNMENT.

There was no further business and the Senate adjourned at 5:15 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

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