

JOURNAL OF THE UNIVERSITY SENATE  
Regular Session, February 22, 1954, 4:10 P. M.  
Monnet Hall, Room 101

The University Senate, meeting in regular session, was called to order by the Chairman, Dr. Joseph C. Pray.

Present

Bernhart, Arthur  
David, Paul R.  
Duncan, J. P.  
Farrar, Clyde L.  
Fraser, George  
Hall, Rufus G.  
James, R. V.  
Lane, Willard R.  
Leck, J. H.  
Livezey, W. E.  
McFarland, Dora  
Mertes, J. E.  
Monnett, V. E.  
Poorhead, M. L.

Present

Morris, Virginia  
Olson, Ralph E.  
Peach, W. N.  
Poston, Lawrence, Jr.  
Pray, J. C.  
Ragan, W. B.  
Recse, J. E.  
Scatori, Stephen  
Sears, A. B.  
Stanley, A. J.  
Westfall, O. D.  
Wiley, J. B.  
Wilson, M. O.  
Winfrey, Lewis E.

Absent

Bavinger, E. A.  
Bell, R. E.  
Pruce, J. B.  
Comp. L. A.  
Cross, George L.  
Ewing, Cortez  
Goodman, G. J.  
Harvey, Harriet  
Kelly, Florene C.  
Kerr, Harrison  
Raines, J. E.  
Ruggiers, Paul G.  
Self, J. T.  
Tuma, Gerald  
Wardell, M. L.  
White, R. R.

## APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES

The Journal of the University Senate for the meeting held on January 25, 1954 was approved.

## SELF-STUDY SURVEY OF THE UNIVERSITY

*At the request of the Chairman*  
Dr. Rufus G. Hall, ~~Vice Chairman~~ of the Senate, presided over the discussion on the matter of a self-study survey of the University. Dr. Joseph C. Pray, as Chairman of the Special Committee of the University Senate, presented the report of that Committee. See pages 3 through 10 for the complete self-evaluation program recommended by the Committee.

Explanatory Comment

The University Senate, at its meeting on May 28, 1953, authorized the creation of a special committee to consider the feasibility of a self-study survey of the University in relation to the criteria for accreditation which have been established by the North Central Association. The Committee was appointed by Dr. Olin L. Browder, Jr., Chairman of the University Senate, on June 5, 1953.

Senate Action Relative to the Report of the Special Committee

Dr. Pray commented briefly regarding the procedures and problems involved in the preparation of the Self-Evaluation Program for the University of Oklahoma. He then moved that the plan of self-evaluation recommended by the Special Committee be approved by the Senate. The motion was seconded.

In the discussion which followed Dr. Pray's motion, a number of senators voiced the opinion that they needed more time in which to consider elements of the self-evaluation plan. Professor Wiley offered a substitute motion to defer action on the matter until the regular meeting in March. His motion was seconded and passed by the Senate.

ELECTION OF THE SECRETARY OF THE SENATE

Explanatory Comment

The Agenda for the February 22 meeting of the University Senate contained an item in which it was suggested that consideration should be given to the possibilities involved in having someone serve as Secretary who is not already encumbered with a full load of teaching, advisement, committee, and other types of duties.

Senate Action

Dean Livezey moved that the matter be referred to the appropriate committee. His motion was seconded and approved by the Senate. Dr. Pray immediately referred the matter to the Committee on University Organization, Budgets, and Publications.

ADJOURNMENT

The University Senate adjourned at 5:07 p.m. The next regular meeting will be Monday, March 29, 1954, at 4:10 p.m. Material for the Agenda should be in the Office of the Secretary by Monday, March 22.

Gerald A. Porter, Secretary

Office: Room 306, Education Building  
Telephone: Extension 308

SELF-EVALUATION PROGRAM FOR THE UNIVERSITY OF OKLAHOMA

General Considerations

Your committee, authorized by the University Senate on May 28, 1953, "to consider the feasibility of a self-study survey of the University..." and "to report its findings and recommendations to the Senate"\* begs leave to report.

We hasten to point out that the University, with its functioning democratic organization, from the constituent departments, through the college faculties, and to the University Senate and General Faculty, has less need for a self-evaluation program than do those institutions which do not utilize democratic procedures. In a very real sense, every departmental staff meeting, every college faculty meeting, every Council on Instruction, Budget Council, or Athletic Council session, and every Senate or General Faculty meeting amounts, in fact, to the self-evaluation of a segment of university functions.

Under the existing organization, every member of the General Faculty has the right, and indeed the responsibility, to submit ideas for improvement of University performance. At every level of university organization, there exist institutional legislative bodies for the consideration of such proposals on their merits. Your committee goes on record as endorsing the existing university organization for its practice of providing proper channels for the reception and consideration for such proposals from any member of the General Faculty from instructor to president.

At present, university agencies consider policy largely from the perspective of piece-meal planning, which inevitably results from the consideration of immediate problems. We would emphasize that, if the University decides to inaugurate a self-evaluation program, the chief purposes will be: (1) the synthesization of the various rules and policies which have, in the past, come from internal legislative bodies; and (2) the earnest consideration especially of over-all, long-term university goals.

Such studies have been conducted by many institutions and are a part of the regular program of the North Central Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools. The association urges that "an important characteristic of an effective educational institution is that it be continuously engaged in the study of its own problems, using the accepted techniques of educational investigation to derive new knowledge and to improve practice in reference to institutional problems." Though the NCA is not requiring the University to make such a study we feel that the general recommendation of self-study is meritorious. Every institution ought periodically to lift its collective head from the daily grind and reconsider its higher purposes and to ascertain whether its existing methods and practices are achieving substantial realization of those aims. Moreover, the entire academic staff ought to be brought into this process of self-evaluation. They ought to proceed in an unhurried manner, thereby bringing the best collective judgment to the stated task. We feel that such a program could not be brought to a successful conclusion short of two years, and that every one, from regent to instructor, should be asked for his contribution to the common evaluation.

---

\* The terms for reference of the Special Committee were "to consider the feasibility of a self-study survey of the University in relation to the criteria for accreditation which have been established by the North Central Association...and to report its findings and recommendations to the Senate." Letter from the Chairman of the Senate to the Special Committee, June 5, 1953; see also Journal of the University Senate, 5 - 53, p. 2, May 28, 1953.

Self-Evaluation Program -- continued

The NCA offers to constituent institutions an outline of procedure. (See Appendix I.) However, your committee is of the opinion that the University of Oklahoma's self-evaluation program should go far beyond mere pro forma subservice to these suggestions. Many of the quantitative data called for in the NCA "Revised Manual of Accrediting" are collected annually at this University. These data are readily available, and presentation would be relatively easy. But a profile constructed exclusively from such data would be far less valuable than one which also incorporates qualitative information. From the qualitative evaluation, the University could project itself into a new and higher concept of its great function and the quantitative aspects would improve in the natural course of events.

Over-all University Purposes

University functions accumulate from changing economic and social forces. New services are fitted into existing university programs on an experimental basis. Some of these new services develop far beyond original estimates; others remain anemic. The trial period is necessary for later evaluation of the importance of particular additions.

This feature of the self-evaluation program might well be entitled: The University of Oklahoma looks at itself in 1955. In it, the University should study its contribution to moral and intellectual leadership through the education of students, in the broadening of frontiers of knowledge, and in the scope of its services to the state community. In it as well, the University should study its responsibilities to the world intellectual community and the great university tradition of enlightenment. The University should particularly examine its curricular offerings in the light of potential social demands. Especially at the graduate level is this imperative. We must assume that unlimited financial resources will not be available for expansion. A critical evaluation of instructional offerings and other university services should, therefore, be made in the light of these objectives. We should determine the areas in which future expansion should be made and, possible, those in which some curtailment would not be duly injurious to the complete offering. Geographic, economic, and social factors may, for example, demand the expansion of training in certain areas, but permit the retention and improvement at a less rapid pace of offerings in other fields of university training. The important fact is that these priorities should be determined only after careful and systematic evaluation of the future needs, and not as the result of particular selfish pressures.

We believe that every institution of higher learning should direct its serious attention to over-all purpose and policy at least once every fifteen or twenty years. Not since the Conference on Higher Education of 1935 has the University of Oklahoma entered upon such high endeavor. Although the perspective then was not quite that envisaged by your present committee, the report of that conference, Higher Education and Society (Norman, 1936), constituted and altogether serious exploration of the newer aspects of the social and cultural responsibilities of higher education. It is true that the University of Oklahoma faculty did, from 1937 to 1942, enter collectively upon the task of deciding upon the most effective form of university organization, but even in

Self-Evaluation Program -- continued

that splendid effort the greater aims of the university organization were only incidentally involved. Though suggestions to the contrary have come to your committee, we do not recommend that legislation be enacted requiring such re-evaluation projects every fifteen or twenty years. We feel that the University can safely rely upon the collective judgment of its faculty in the future as well as in the present. The faculty of twenty years hence will undoubtedly be as competent to make such a decision as is the faculty of today.

In view of the foregoing, we recommend that the University inaugurate a program of self-evaluation through a "self-study survey."

## GENERAL PROCEDURE

1. Coordinating Committee:

We therefore recommend the creation of a central Coordinating Committee. This shall be an all university committee composed of seven members of the general faculty appointed by the President from a list of 14 nominated by the University Senate. The President shall designate one of the committee as chairman. The University Regents shall be invited to select one of its members to participate at this level.

The purposes of the Coordinating Committee shall be:

- a. To formulate, where feasible, uniform criteria and techniques for use by units engaged in self-evaluation, and to encourage the development of such additional criteria and techniques as may be needed by participating agencies;
- b. To receive reports from colleges, departments, and other constituted self-evaluation units;
- c. To set up special committees as needed to study particular problems;
- d. To encourage the study of the interrelationships between colleges, departments, and other agencies;
- e. To give advice to, and share information with other study groups;
- f. To arrange with the university administration for necessary facilities;
- g. To synthesize data from constituent units and on the basis of such data and other materials gathered by research and normal committee procedures, to produce for presentation to the University Senate, the general faculty, and participating units a comprehensive report with such recommendations as the committee thinks desirable.

2. Colleges:

Colleges should study long range programs and initiate inter-college studies, using, where feasible, their regular legislative organizations. In general, this process requires:

- a. Definition of functions and goals;
- b. Study of present programs, personnel, and facilities;

Self-Evaluation Program -- continued

- c. Analysis of discrepancy between goals and achievement;
- d. Recommendations of means by which goals can better be achieved;

Such a process would involve thorough consideration of such subjects as the adequacy of curricular programs and the effectiveness of teaching, and the nature and extent of research activities, both individual and cooperative. Colleges should not only establish self-imposed goals, but also should periodically examine themselves in the light of North Central Association and appropriate professional accreditation standards.

Results of such studies should be reported to the Coordinating Committee.

3. Departments and Schools:

What has been said concerning colleges has application to department and schools. However, at this level, wide-spread individual participation by faculty is possible and to a larger extent than elsewhere. The benefits of self-survey to the individual and the institution are nowhere more apparent.

It is at the department and school level as well that the most effective work can be accomplished on the fundamental and perennial questions of the adequacy of the curriculum and the effectiveness of teaching. Each department should proceed to a systematic evaluation of its total curricular offerings, with a view to adjustment to changing needs by: (a) Removing accumulated duplication; (b) Increasing emphasis in some areas, and decreasing in others; (c) Determining what courses ought to be added in undeveloped areas; (d) Consolidating courses in the interests of better learning; (e) Dropping obsolete courses. Every department should seriously examine its instructional practices through investigation of those of other universities. They should study the advisability of conducting experiments in methods and materials. There are many areas for investigations and experiments of this sort, such as the question of large classes versus small classes; the use of library and laboratory; class organization; and the like.

4. Other Constituted Agencies:

It is important that various other constituted university agencies actively participate in the university self-evaluation program. Self-analysis of the respective roles of the University Senate, the Budget Council, the Council on Instruction, the Athletic Council, the University Press, the Oklahoma Memorial Union, the University Book Exchange, the Physical Plant, the Employee-Management Council, and various other standing university committees and agencies should be made by these respective agencies, and the Coordinating Committee would need their cooperation in its effort to develop the all-university plan.

5. Members of the Faculty:

Greatness of a university lies not in the number of students who grace its halls and receive its degrees; not in the impressiveness of its buildings or expansiveness and beauty of its campus; not in the logic or efficiency of its organization or, directly, in the number of dollars which supports it; not in the authority of fiat or official proclamation; not even in the good will created through pageantry, promotion, or public relations. The sustaining essence of greatness in a university is the quality of greatness in those persons who constitute its faculty. Greatness in teaching, research, and in educational service

Self-Evaluation Program -- continued

is wholly human and poignantly personal. The true measure lies in the effect upon the lives of those who learn and those who inspire and enrich the learning. What, then, can be more fruitful for a university faculty than self-searching of their souls, singly and together--eagerly, sincerely and with humility--for the measure and the means of their own greatness and through this, the greatness of the university? The proposed self-evaluation project will give each member this opportunity. He will have the opportunity of seeing himself, his philosophy, his goals, his attitudes, and the efficacy of his efforts as reflected in his relations with colleagues and students, in his teaching, and in his contributions to knowledge. He may see his future potentiality in the greater university. How else can the faculty secure perspective in their possibilities and with wholesome unity mitigate the insidious menace of mediocrity?

Unanimously approved, and respectfully submitted to the University Senate by a Special Committee of the University Senate.

Carl B. Cass  
Cortez A. M. Ewing  
Frank C. Morris  
Lawrence Poston, Jr.  
D. Ross Pugmire  
J. E. Reese  
Joseph C. Pray, Chairman

Self-Evaluation Program -- continued

## NORTH CENTRAL ASSOCIATION OF COLLEGES AND SECONDARY SCHOOLS REVISED MANUAL OF ACCREDITING

## Appendix I

## X. INSTITUTIONAL STUDY

If an institution is genuinely concerned about the improvement of its work, it will study its problems in the most thorough manner possible. It will desire to guide its activities in the light of facts and will set about securing the facts it needs in a methodical manner, using whatever techniques of investigation are suitable to the purpose. An important characteristic of an effective educational institution is that it be continuously engaged in the study of its own problems, using the accepted techniques of educational investigation to derive new knowledge and to improve practice in reference to institutional problems. Inquiry will be made concerning the number of such studies that have been pursued in recent years, and copies of these studies will be requested for examination.

- A. NUMBER AND VALUE OF STUDIES.--Activities that may be classified as investigations of institutional problems vary widely in character, in scope, and in importance. Any investigation that seeks to clarify an educational issue to provide new knowledge about education, to demonstrate the validity of a procedure, to improve an old practice, or to institute a new one is included. A study need not be of great magnitude to be important, and the presence of numerous studies throughout an institution may be as significant as a single large scale experiment. In fact, it may be more important that an institution be permeated with the research spirit in reference to its crucial problems than that it engages in some single spectacular study.

The alertness of the institution in making intelligent investigations of its program and services will be judged in part by the number and value of the studies that have been made in recent years.

- B. AREAS COVERED.--It is not assumed that a fixed pattern of institutional investigation will be followed or that such a pattern is even desirable. Problems exist in every important area of institutional activity. The issues that are important for investigation in a particular institution will depend upon the local situation, the problems that arise, and the resources that are available. The conditions of faculty service, curriculum, methods of instruction, library service, admission of students, student personnel services administrative organization, finance, and physical plant are examples of the areas that may be covered by such investigations. The variety of useful activities that may be undertaken renders it undesirable to describe an inclusive list or to define a precise pattern for such studies. Freedom of local action is essential, but the reasonable expectation is that an institution shall give evidence of alertness and an urgent desire to improve its program of education through well-conceived and intelligently directed studies in a number of different areas.

The energy with which an institution is studying its own problems will be judged in part by the number of different areas covered by investigations carried on within recent years.

- C. PERSONNEL AND METHODS USED.--The creation of a separate administrative agency to promote educational research in an institution is not essential, although

Self-Evaluation Program -- continued

in some situations such an agency may be useful for the stimulation and co-ordination of activities and to assure the employment of adequate methods of investigation. Individual administrative officers or instructors may initiate and carry on significant studies as an adjunct and aid to their regular duties in the institution.

It is essential that the personnel engaged in such studies have command of the necessary techniques of educational investigation and are competent to evaluate and to interpret the results critically in terms of institutional policies and practices. Inquiry will be made concerning the personnel engaged in making studies of institutional problems and of the competence of these persons for the particular types of inquiry that are undertaken.

The methods employed in the investigation of institutional problems should be appropriate to the study undertaken. Some of the techniques useful in educational research have been developed in fields of scholarship other than education--in economics, in mathematics, in psychology, in sociology, in experimental science. Other methods have been created in the direct study of education. A free approach to the investigation of educational problems will canvass all such methods and select the one appropriate to the matter in hand. Also the needs of an investigation may enlist the interest and activity of any scholar in an institution. The thing of importance is that the method employed shall fit the problem to be studied and that the person doing the work shall be competent to do it. Above everything else it is vital that educational problems shall be studied with the methods and with the conscience of scholarship and that these methods shall be increasingly substituted for the much-used methods of fluent speech and "balance of power" in the determination of educational policy.

- D. PUBLICITY AND USE.--It is of slight value for an institution to study an educational program if the results of the investigation are given no publicity among those concerned. The results of the studies should be made available to all who may profit by them and to all who are in a position to influence the conduct of the institution. This means publication in some appropriate and effective form. Publicity may be secured through conferences or public meetings, through typewritten or mimeographed digests, and in case of a major study through printed reports.

There should be evidence that the findings of the studies are used in modifying or establishing institutional policies and practices. The investigations should not be made merely for the sake of the studies themselves, but the results should be effectively used in improving the institutional services. The institution will be expected to provide evidence of the uses made of the results of each study reported.

- E. ATTITUDES AND FINANCIAL SUPPORT.--It lies within the province of the administration to encourage studies throughout the institution, to provide financial support where needed, and to facilitate the use of results in the modification of institutional policies and practices. The initiative for the investigation of problems may arise in many places in an institution, but the disposition to initiate significant studies will be short-lived under an administration hostile to such investigations. An alert, open-minded administration, on the other hand, can stimulate study, foster it in various ways, and by so doing lend great strength to efforts at institutional improvement. One of the best evidences that an administration is hospitable to the study of institutional problems is the carrying-on of research within the area of the administrative activities.

Self-Evaluation Program -- continued

A sympathetic attitude on the part of the faculty toward the study of educational problems and a willingness to employ new knowledge in arriving at decisions in reference to the curriculum, instructional procedures, personnel services, and like issues are important. Even the efforts of an alert administration will be made of little avail by a faculty whose decisions are unduly influenced by tradition, by institutional politics, or by prejudices. But a faculty may be expected to do more than support politics, initiated by the administration. Many of the important educational problems lie nearer the door of the instructional staff than that of the president, and the faculty should find a way to study such matters. There should be evidence that educational issues falling within the province of the faculty for decision are considered in the light of knowledge and that, where information is inadequate, studies are instituted to derive the needed knowledge as a basis for future action.

Sufficient financial support should be provided to carry on the investigation in an adequate manner. This support may be in the form of clerical assistance and release instructors' time from classroom activities, as well as in the form of specific budget appropriations.

The effectiveness of the institution's study of its own problems will be judged in part by the attitude of the administration and faculty and by the degree of financial support that is provided for such activities.