

JOURNAL OF THE UNIVERSITY SENATE
The University of Oklahoma

Regular Session, October 27, 1969 --- 4:10 p. m.

The University Senate was called to order by Dr. Duane Roller, Chairman.

Present:

Alley, John N.
Babb, S. E., Jr.
Bowen, Willis H.
Bruce, John B.
Christian, Sherril
Ciereszko, Leon
Doerr, Arthur H.
Elconin, Victor A.
Enis, Thomas J.
Foote, B. L.
Hall, Rufus
Harden, Darrell
Henderson, Geo.
Heller, Ben L.
Hilbert, Richard E.
Hopla, Cluff E.

Present:

Johnson, B. Connor
Kendall, J. L.
Lancaster, John N.
Norton, Spencer
Parker, Jack
Parr, Arnold
Potter, Emma
Pray, Joseph
Roller, Duane H.
Root, Paul
Shepherd, Gene
Smouse, A. D.
Snow, James B., Jr.
Springer, C. E.
Weiss, A. Kurt
Zelby, Leon

Absent:

Abell, Creed
Deckert, Gordon C.
Fite, Gilbert C.
Hollomon, J. H.
Kitts, David B.
Lynn, Thomas Jr.
Olkinetzky, Sam
Smith, Thomas M.
Tolson, Melvin B.
White, Raymond R.
Williams, G. Rainey
Wolf, Stewart

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

The Journal of the University Senate for the regular meeting on September 29, 1969, was approved.

ACTION BY THE PRESIDENT

Faculty Advisory Committee to the President: On September 30, 1969, President Hollomon indicated that he is accepting the University Senate recommendation concerning the membership of the Faculty Advisory Committee to the President. (See pages 3 and 4, Journal of the University Senate, for September 29, 1969). The President will be in direct touch with each committee member and will call the first meeting as soon as possible.

STUDY OF UNIVERSITY EXPENDITURES ✓

Letter from Dr. Arthur H. Doerr:

On November 25, 1968, the University Senate approved a resolution, as amended, which read:

1. The President of the University is requested to prepare an annual report of the state of the University for distribution to the general faculty and other interested persons.
2. The Deans of the various colleges are requested to prepare annual, including financial, reports for their respective

college for distribution to college faculty and other interested persons.

To my knowledge, the requested reports have not been received from any of the administrators listed in the resolution quoted above. In my judgment, the University Senate should express its concern and displeasure that its resolution has been ignored. Further, I believe the University Senate should reiterate its request for the reports requested a year ago with a suggested deadline for the administrative personnel concerned to submit reports not later than January 1, 1970.

Senate Action:

In connection with the above letter, Dr. Doerr moved

"That the University Senate reaffirm its resolution of November 25, 1968, vis a vis annual reports from the President and the Deans of the several colleges; that the University Senate express its displeasure and concern to those administrators cited above who have not prepared and distributed reports as requested in the resolution; and that the Chairman of the University Senate request in writing that said administrators provide their particular constituencies with written reports as specified in the resolution prior to January 1, 1970."

During the ensuing discussion of this question, Dr. Zelby moved that the motion be tabled. Voting by a show of hands, the University Senate defeated the tabling motion by a count of 14 affirmative and 15 negative votes.

The original motion by Dr. Doerr was then approved in a show-of-hands vote with some opposition.

CHAPTER STUDY REPORT
ON THE PLAN FOR THE FUTURE OF THE UNIVERSITY

Dr. Doerr, Chairman of the Ad Hoc Committee of the University Senate, appointed to study the structure and the functions of the University, as well as to recommend Senate action on the Plan for the Future of the University, outlined the background to the Chapter reports presented in pages 4-10 of the Agenda of the University Senate for the October 27, 1969, meeting. (See pages 4-7 of the Journal of the University Senate for December 14, 1968). He emphasized the point that the Ad Hoc Committee attempted to distill the efforts of a number of other Committees who had studied in detail the various chapters of the Plan.

Dr. Doerr then moved:

"That the University Senate transmit its views on the Future of the University, as shown in the Senate Agenda for October 27, 1969, beginning on page 4 and concluding on page 10 to the President of the University with the understanding that it is the wish of the University Senate that the President pay careful attention to those views prior to implementation of the plans and programs laid out in The Future of the University."

After a lengthy discussion of the seconded motion, the University Senate approved the motion.

For the text of the report of the Ad Hoc Committee, please see Appendix A, pages 9 through 15.

After calling attention to the fact that the Ad Hoc Committee has not yet received a report concerning Chapter IV (Graduate and Graduate Professional Education), Dr. Doerr then moved that the Dean of the Graduate College and the Graduate Council be urged to supply its report on Chapter IV of The Future of the University to the University Senate no later than December 1, 1969. The motion PASSED.

CHANGES IN AUDIT ENROLLMENT PROCEDURES ✓

On July 14, 1969, Dr. Robert L. Bailey, of the Admissions Office, recommended a revision in the audit enrollment procedures. (See page 8 of the University Senate Agenda for September 29, 1969). This matter was referred to the University Senate Committee on Courses and Curricula.

Dr. Henderson, reporting for the Committee on Courses and Curricula, reported that the proposal is being rewritten by Dr. Bailey, who will subsequently submit a new recommendation.

COMMITTEES OF THE UNIVERSITY SENATE FOR 1969-70

Dr. Springer, Chairman of the Senate Committee on Committees, presented the following nominations for the membership of Senate Committees for 1969-70:

Academic Standards:

Victor Elconin, ~~Chairman~~
David Kitts *chmn*
Stanley Babb
Willis Bowen
Creed Abbell
Stewart Wolf

Student and Public Relations:

Sam Olkinetzky
John Alley *chmn*
Joseph Pray
Kurt Weiss
Thomas Enis

Courses and Curricula:

George Henderson, Chairman
Gordon Deckert
Rainey Williams
Arnold Parr
B. L. Foote

Teaching and Research:

Ben Heller
Leon Ciereszko
Arthur Doerr
Thomas Smith
A. D. Smouse

Faculty Personnel:

Spencer Norton *Chmn*
Paul Root
Thomas Lynn
Emma Potter
Gene Shepherd
(Gilbert Fite's replacement)

University Organization, Budget, and Publications:

Raymond R. White
Melvin Tolson
Jack Parker, Chairman
Sherril Christian
Leon Zelby
James Snow

Committee on Committees:

C. E. Springer, Chairman
 John Bruce
 J. L. Kendall
 Rufus Hall
 Richard Hilbert

Executive Committee:

Duane Roller, Chairman
 Cluff Hopla
 Conner Johnson
 John Lancaster
 Darrell Harden

Journal Committee:

Duane Roller
 Cluff Hopla
 Jack Parker

The University Senate approved all nominations.

**TENURE FOR MEMBERS
 OF THE FACULTY ADVISORY COMMITTEE TO THE PRESIDENT**

The University Senate approved the following recommendations presented by Dr. Springer, Chairman of the Senate Committee on Committees, concerning tenure for the Faculty Advisory Committee to the President of the University: (See pages 3 and 4 of the University Senate Journal for September 29, 1969).

- (1) After the first year of operation (1969-70), the term for members of the Advisory Committee shall be two years.
- (2) The terms for the current members of the Committee shall be as follows:

One Year: Crim, Ed *Conner*
 Hobbs, Joe
 Rice, Elroy
 Scheffer, Walter *See memo*
 Unger, Leon
 Zelby, Leon

Two Years: Carmack, William
 Fraser, George
 Heller, Ben
 Levy, David
 Renner, John
 Silberstein, Fred

UNIVERSITY TRAFFIC AND PARKING COMMITTEE

Background Information:

On June 18, 1969, Vice President Verne Kennedy requested University Senate nominations for a new standing committee to study problems and recommend vehicular traffic and parking controls. (See page 2 of the Journal of the University Senate for September 29, 1969). Inasmuch as the two faculty members previously nominated could not serve on the Committee for various reasons, the University Senate Committee on Committees was requested to nominate two individuals.

Senate Action:

Dr. Springer, Chairman of the Committee on Committees, nominated the following individuals for membership on the University Traffic and Parking Committee: Robert Bauer and Alvin Keaton

The Senate approved both nominations.

UNIVERSITY COUNCILS ✓

The following two communications were referred to the Senate Committee on University Organization, Budget, and Publications:

Memorandum from Vice President Edward L. Katzenbach to Dean Riggs:
September 28, 1969.

I recommend that the activities of the existing Extension Council be consolidated and that a new council, known as the Research and Public Service Council, be formed.

I further recommend that the Research and Public Service Council consist of nine (9) full-time tenure-holding faculty members, with no more than four (4) members from the same undergraduate degree-recommending college. Each member may serve three years. The terms of three (3) members should expire each year, with new members being appointed by the President from a list of persons nominated by the University Senate. An appointment to fill a vacancy should be only for the period of the vacancy. The Vice President for Research and Public Service should be an ex-officio non-voting member of the Council.

Duties:

The Council will advise the Vice President for Research and Public Service on all matters relating to the research, public service, and extension activities of the University.

Memorandum from Dean Riggs to Dr. Roller:

October 7, 1969

In reviewing the University policy councils and standing committees, it seems probable that each committee should be re-examined from the standpoint of need, duties, membership, charter, etc. Should these problems be reviewed by the existing committees for their recommendations or should the total problem be referred to the Senate for assignment to the appropriate Senate committees?

I will be happy to discuss this problem with you in more detail or to appear before the Senate, or both.

Senate Action:

Dr. Parker, reporting for the Senate Committee on University Organization Budget, and Publications, called attention to a pertinent report of that Committee presented on pages 3-7 of the Senate Journal for January 13, 1969. The Committee felt that any such restudy of the problem should be within the context and the framework of the total council structure rather than specific groups.

REGISTRATION SCHEDULE -- SECOND SEMESTER, 1969-70 ✓

Background Information: On December 14, 1968, the University Senate approved the University Calendar for the second semester, 1968-69, and the...

academic year, 1969-70. Inadvertently omitted from the schedule presented at that time was the request to increase the registration period for the second semester, 1969-70, from two to three days. On September 30, 1969, Dr. Price, Dean of Admissions and Registrar, requested approval of the three-day registration during January, 1970.

Senate Action:

Dr. Parker, Chairman of the Senate Committee on University Organization, Budget, and Publications, moved that the request for the three-day registration (January 28, 29, and 30, 1970) be approved.

Most of the ensuing discussion was devoted to questioning the continuing need for a three-day registration period after an extended period of advance registration. Subsequently, the Senate approved the motion.

During the discussion that continued after the approval of the request, Dr. Hopla moved that the University Senate communicate to Dean Price the feeling that the re-evaluation next spring of the entire enrollment procedure needs to be completed in time for the procedure to be functional next September. Dr. Foote offered an amendment requesting Dean Price to consider ways of eliminating the compulsory student payment of fees during pre-enrollment and to defer payment until the beginning of the following semester. Later, Dr. Kendall offered another amendment to express to Dean Price the fact that the University Senate is particularly concerned about the time that is demanded of faculty members during the various phases of the enrollment procedure. The Senate approved the entire amended motion.

UNIVERSITY PARKING POLICY

Letter from Professor Leonard R. Rubin:

September 29, 1969

I have sent a copy of the enclosed communication to Dr. Hollomon. As you can see from it, I would like the topic of parking brought before the University Senate in some form.

Personally, I believe the University should provide free parking for its faculty. On the other hand, if the faculty is to pay for parking, it should have the right to build its own parking facilities. This could be done if the University would lease land to the faculty members under some sort of non-profit corporation status, where the faculty members could voluntarily join in to buy shares. That way, at least, a person could see an end to the ordeal, and if he moved to another job, some new person might buy his shares from him to gain parking rights.

In any case, I do not like to buy a pig in a poke. So the very least the administration could do, would be to explain the fee and try to convince the faculty of its merit.

Senate Action:

Professor Rubin's letter was referred to the Senate Committee on University

Organization, Budget, and Publications. Dr. Parker, Chairman of that Committee, reported that Committee's feeling that this matter falls into the realm of the University Committee on Traffic and Parking.

ERRONEOUS PRESS REPORT OF ALLEGED UNIVERSITY SENATE ACTION

Background Information: A front-page item in the October 14, 1969, issue of The Oklahoma Daily included the following statement:

"Classes have been officially called off for the afternoon of Wednesday, October 15, by the administration of the University of Oklahoma at the request of the UOSA and with the approval of the faculty senate."

On October 15, 1969, The Oklahoma Daily published the following letter from Dr. Zelby to the Editor:

"Please note that contrary to the statement in the Oklahoma Daily of October 14, 1969, the Faculty Senate did not act on the question of Wednesday afternoon classes on October 15, 1969, simply because it has not met since the request of UOSA had been submitted."

Senate Action:

Dr. Harden moved that, whenever questions of fact published in The Oklahoma Daily are contrary to what appears in the University Senate Journal, the Secretary of the University Senate be empowered to bring the matter to the attention of the Daily Editor in writing and request that an appropriate correction be published.

The Senate approved the motion.

EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE JURISDICTION IN ROUTINE MATTERS

Dr. Harden moved that, in the interests of saving time, avoiding duplication of effort, and coordinating more effectively the activities of the various Senate Committees, the Executive Committee of the University Senate be authorized to act on routine matters in advance of Senate meetings with appropriate subsequent notations in the University Senate Agenda. Specific recent examples mentioned were the nominations submitted for the University Parking and Traffic Committee and a request from Dean Morris for nominations for a proposed faculty-student committee on equal educational opportunities. The consensus of the Senate was that such Executive Committee action would contribute to more efficient and prompt handling of Senate affairs. The Senate approved the motion.

NOMINATIONS FOR UNIVERSITY BUDGET COUNCIL, 1969-70

Background Information:

On May 26, 1969, the University Senate approved nominations for the University Budget Council for 1969-70.

Dr. Roller received a request from Dean Riggs (too late for inclusion in the Agenda for this meeting), for additional recommendations for the Budget Council to replace the four nominees who, Dean Riggs felt, were already participating heavily in major committees.

The request was forwarded to the Senate Committee on Committees. Dr. Springer, Committee Chairman, presented four additional nominations for the Budget Council.

Considerable discussion followed as to the purpose for replacing the original nominees. Dr. Doerr moved that the original nominations for the Budget Council be reaffirmed, that the Senate Committee on Committees be commended for its performance of the task, and that the substitutes proposed at this meeting be rejected. The Senate approved the motion.

Dr. Springer moved that the Committee on Committees dispense with the practice of calling the various nominees before submitting their names to the University Senate. This motion was defeated.

ADJOURNMENT

The University Senate adjourned at 5:50 p.m. The next regular session will be held on Monday, November 24, 1969, in Room 165 of the Student Union. Materials for the Agenda should be in the Office of the Secretary by Wednesday, November 12, 1969.

Anthony S. Lis, Secretary
University Senate

The Plan for the Future

CHAPTERS III AND V

1. The University of Oklahoma should work with the State Regents for Higher Education to effect policy permitting broader educational opportunity for the economically and culturally deprived.
2. Great care should be exercised in the apparatus employed to effect flexibility of existing programs, e. g. where the existing academic framework can be employed the establishment of new colleges and/or administrative apparatus should be avoided.
3. The University should undertake a careful re-evaluation of the credit hour concept as a means of evaluating the educational process.
4. Greater cooperation between departments should be evolved in developing schedules each semester. Similarly, greater cooperation between related disciplines in the development, revision, and creation of courses should be developed and maintained.
5. The University should have more autonomy in the evolution and development of new programs.
6. Colleges should permit more generalized courses of study than are now available under existing rules.
7. The Council on Instruction should spend more time on the internal structure of curricula and their bearing on the overall University mission.
8. The committee disagrees with the 'Plan' recommendation (p. 43) that, "This means that home economics should become a more accessible part of the general education of non-teachers, moving more fully into the realm of social and behavioral sciences, and that the primary direction of home economics should be toward nutrition, child development, and family living."
9. The committee disagrees with the 'Plan' recommendation (p. 43) that, "It may well be that the interests of women who are not career-oriented, might be best served by making courses in child development, nutrition, and family living a part of their required liberal education program."
10. Continued and intensified programs and research into the whole matter (of women's) education and professions should be undertaken.
11. Special care should be exercised in seeking out staff who are especially eager and suited to the instruction of courses for non-majors.
12. The committee recommends that the desirability of counselling by more than one discipline be extensively publicized in the college bulletins.
13. Departments should re-examine the areas in which they have consciously or unconsciously restricted the student's elective choice.

14. Courses for the non-major which will significantly broaden his educational perspective should be fostered.
15. A student should take some general courses in the senior year to 'brake the trend towards specialization.'
16. Students should have the opportunity to write a senior 'thesis' for credit.
17. Existing distributive requirements should be reviewed.
18. The University Bookstore should provide discounts for faculty and students.
19. Continued emphasis should be expended on the development of a strong central library in conjunction with existing plans for the development of the lower division library.
20. Increasing budgetary support for university museums should be developed and maintained.
21. A number of ad hoc courses like "Undergraduate Seminar" which can be used to provide flexibility in scheduling and course offerings should be developed.
22. Devices and means should be developed to provide recognition in time or in salary for courses like "Directed Reading" or "Research Problems."
23. Programs which will permit more intimate student-faculty contact should be developed.
24. Existing pre-requisites for courses should be thoroughly examined by departments and the Council on Instruction.
25. More rigorous admission and retention standards should be developed.
26. A program whereby able high school students will be permitted to enroll in certain college courses before completion of high school should be implemented.
27. The University School should be engaged in more experimental programs of various types.
28. Greater use of mechanical teaching aids should be encouraged.
29. The University should encourage classes of such a size as to permit maximum faculty-student interchange.
30. Consideration should be given to the development of a one to two weeks' reading period at the end of each semester.
31. Careful attention should be given to evaluation of student's performance by some new technique(s).
32. The faculty should be apprised (in seminars or by other means) of new techniques and evaluation which have been devised in recent years.

33. A foreign study program should be developed at the University of Oklahoma.
34. Closer supervision and evaluation of graduate assistants should be made and greater compensation for such assistants should be provided.
35. The faculty-student ratio should be increased.
36. Continued emphasis should be placed on the evaluation and reward of good teaching.
37. The faculty and administration should develop a valid scheme whereby student evaluation of teachers might be encouraged.
38. Students (and faculty) should be encouraged to audit classes. preferably without the payment of an audit fee.
39. The university should train administrators and guidance counselors to apprise fully students about differences in technical and liberal education.
40. Sub-baccalaureate degrees are not the business of the university except in medicine and law where para-professional training might take place without duplicating similar efforts elsewhere in Oklahoma, and development of such programs in areas save medicine and law are to be avoided.
41. New baccalaureate degrees should be developed only where there is a clearly demonstrable need and where such programs would not duplicate other programs in the state system.

CHAPTER VI

1. The College of Continuing Education and the Extension Division should be continued under one administrative officer. This administrative officer should be at the dean level.
2. The College of Continuing Education should be expanded to serve as an inter-disciplinary college to design, develop, and implement innovative inter-disciplinary programs on the undergraduate and graduate levels.
3. Programs which are not self-supporting but have shown important benefits for the university and the state should not only be maintained but increased in number even though this may require an increase in subsidy to continuing education.
4. Faculty committees should be appointed to serve as policy making bodies for all academic programs in the Oklahoma Center for Continuing Education. When possible the members of these committees should be drawn from the faculties of the programs.
5. The University of Oklahoma should play a leadership role in developing a research program in continuing education. Program directors in the Oklahoma Center for Continuing Education should work with appropriate faculty members to explore research possibilities related to their mutual interests and activities.
6. A special evaluation unit should be created within the Oklahoma Center for Continuing Education which would have the responsibility for developing and operating an evaluation system. This evaluation unit should be composed of members from appropriate academic areas.
7. Faculty members should be obtained through joint recommendations of the College of Continuing Education and the departments of the cooperating college(s). The division of time for these staff persons would be decided by the cooperating units. It is further recommended that the university explore the desirability of academic appointments to the College of Continuing Education, and in the event that these appointments are made, these persons should have full faculty status including tenure and promotion consideration. It is also recommended that the College of Continuing Education explore the use of retired faculty personnel on a part-time basis.
8. Faculty members should be requested from the academic units, appointed and paid on an inload or overload basis; teaching and consulting time have the approval of the appropriate Oklahoma Center for Continuing Education and academic administrative officers. The amount of time which a faculty member may devote to continuing education activity on an overload basis should be consistent with general university policy on overload such as textbook writing, lecturing, and consultation.

CHAPTER VII

1. An information system for faculty and O. C. C. E. personnel in the Administration Building concerning research and fellowship opportunities should be established.
2. Reorganization of the Information Services Office of O. U. R. I. should take place immediately.
3. Revenue generated by a given department should be shared with the generating departments. Allocations should be reviewed on a frequent and recurring basis.
4. Review of overhead charges, pricing of short courses, etc. should be undertaken at once.
5. Reduction of overhead costs through more effective administration-- especially in accounting and consolidation of staffs should be effected.
6. An investment fund under the control of the Vice-President for Research and Public Service should be established to:
 - a. Facilitate decision making
 - b. Provide a system of return on money spent
 - c. Measure efforts and contributions in terms of money spent on research and development
 - d. Provide money for faculty members with new and/or innovative ideas.
7. A faculty committee to work closely with the Vice-President for Research and Public Service on policy matters should be established.
8. Library and library facilities should be improved.
9. A new museum concept should be developed and construction of a new museum teaching, display, and research facility should be among early priorities.
10. A committee composed of the following people (and others), i.e. Vice-President for Research and Public Service, Vice-President for University Relations, and the Dean of the College of Fine Arts should be established to consider and evaluate the program of booking performing groups, individuals, and exhibitions for appearance in the state and region.
11. The percentage of time devoted to teaching, research, and public service by the several members of the faculty should be carefully assessed.
12. An experimental sciences building which could be used by people from a number of different disciplines and in which space would be assigned by the Vice-President for Research and Public Service should be developed.
13. An animal center convenient to the Norman and Medical Center campuses should be constructed.

CHAPTERS VIII AND X

The Sub-Committee Recommends:

1. The Provost system is not sufficiently well spelled out to permit a clear understanding of purposes. Advantages claimed for the system are not clear to all members of the committee.
2. The validity of such a system must rest upon successful implementation.
3. What will be the basis for development of a workable system for grouping various academic units?
4. In the event the Provost system is implemented a Continuing Faculty Oversight and Evaluation Committee should be established to evaluate the impact of the new structure on departmental development, a more meaningful set of undergraduate programs, and its effect on the faculty and students.
5. The committee believes that it would be a serious error to eliminate the chairman from Committee 'A', but it does believe that an arrangement should be developed where the chairman can submit a recommendation separate from that of Committee 'A'.

The Ad-Hoc Committee Recommends:

1. The Provost system as proposed in "The Plan" is inadequately spelled out. Moreover, the proposal as made carries with it the inherent danger of academic fragmentation and conflict.
2. The interposition of the Vice-Provost would create dual authority and responsibility which we believe would be antithetical to the accomplishment of the academic mission of the University.
3. Therefore, we recommend that the Provost system as recommended in "The Plan" not be implemented.

CHAPTER XI

1. The committee strongly endorses the proposal for a flat fee system.
2. Public service activities should be extended and expanded to make the citizenry more aware of importance of higher education--thus creating a political climate more favorable to the development of financial support.
3. The committee recommends that the State Regents for Higher Education adopt an allocation system for funds similar to that employed in Texas.
4. The committee endorses proposals for the acquisition of funds from private sources.
5. The committee recommends that in the search for outside funds that high priorities be extended to attracting funds for scholarships.
6. Expenditures for public information should be markedly increased.
7. The committee recommends that the University prepare estimates on total, average, and incremental costs for all classes of students for all the major areas of the University.
8. Funds should be set aside for higher pay for graduate assistants and publicity of and recruitment for graduate programs.
9. In recruitment of new faculty both the short range and long range expenses of such a faculty member should be carefully considered.
10. Careful attention should be given to the entire financial and auxiliary package in both the recruitment of new faculty and the retention of existing faculty.
11. A faculty salary schedule which will indicate several distinct pay grades for each rank should be evolved and this schedule should be made available to the faculty.
12. Special budgets or funds should be set up to finance such programs as professional travel, faculty leaves, research and clerical assistance, better communication facilities, faculty research, and others.
13. A systems analysis should be made to all university activities.
14. Where possible a cost benefit analysis should be made of all existing and proposed programs.
15. The committee endorses the proposal for the establishment of a formal process for determining priorities for new major facilities and of a plan for funding and for scheduling these projects.
16. The Budget Council recommends that it not be responsible either for originating or granting preliminary approval of proposals for specific facilities.
17. The committee urges that in the assignment of priorities for new facilities there be employed a consistent policy based on definite criteria rather than a flexible policy of response to undue pressure or persuasion from interested parties

The first part of the report deals with the general situation of the country and the progress of the work done during the year.

The second part of the report deals with the work done in the various departments and the progress of the work done during the year.

The third part of the report deals with the work done in the various departments and the progress of the work done during the year.

The fourth part of the report deals with the work done in the various departments and the progress of the work done during the year.

The fifth part of the report deals with the work done in the various departments and the progress of the work done during the year.

The sixth part of the report deals with the work done in the various departments and the progress of the work done during the year.

The seventh part of the report deals with the work done in the various departments and the progress of the work done during the year.

The eighth part of the report deals with the work done in the various departments and the progress of the work done during the year.

The ninth part of the report deals with the work done in the various departments and the progress of the work done during the year.

The tenth part of the report deals with the work done in the various departments and the progress of the work done during the year.