

JOURNAL OF THE UNIVERSITY SENATE
The University of Oklahoma
Norman

Regular Session -- February 14, 1972 -- 3:30 p.m.

The University Senate was called to order by Dr. Rufus Hall, Chairman.

<u>Present:</u>	Bogart, George	Hall, Rufus	Shahan, Robert
	Bourassa, Ronald	Hardin, Neal H.	Snow, James B., Jr.
	Brown, Homer A.	Levy, David	Sokatch, John
	Burwell, James	Love, Tom	Stone, George T.
	Costello, James	Lutz, Raymond	Stuart, Chipman
	Crim, Sarah	Maehl, William	Truex, Dorothy
	Daniels, Raymond	Marshall, Geoffrey	Upthegrove, William
	Eek, Nat S.	Milby, T. H.	Walker, Dallas
	Eliason, Stanley	McNichols, William	Weiss, A. Kurt
	Feaver, J. Clayton	Norton, Spencer	Whitney, David
	Gibson, Arrell	Olson, Ralph	Wilson, William
	Gregory, Helen	Owens, Mitchell	Zahasky, Mary
	Grunder, J. Richard	Prickett, Wilson	Zelby, Leon W.

<u>Absent.</u>	Abell, Creed	Johnson, B. Connor	Shepherd, Gene D.
	Bivens, Robert	Kuhlman, Richard	Sims, James H.
	Christian, Sherril	Lynn, Thomas N., Jr.	Taylor, K. L.
	Frueh, Forrest	Miller, Fred	Weinheimer, A. J.
	Hansen, Robert	Potter, Emma	Wilcox, Stewart C.
	Hopla, Cluff E.		

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

The Journal of the University Senate for the regular session on January 10, 1972, was approved.

ACTION TAKEN BY PRESIDENT SHARP

Enrollment as an Auditor: On January 11, 1972, Dr. Paul F. Sharp, President of The University of Oklahoma, approved the University Senate recommendation of January 10, 1972, for revising the University policy on enrollment as an auditor. (See pages 6 and 7 of the University Senate Journal for January 10, 1972.)

RESIGNATIONS OF SENATE MEMBERS

Dr. William E. Livezey: On January 10, 1972, Dr. William E. Livezey submitted his resignation as a representative of the General Faculty (1969-73) because of his leave status this semester, inasmuch as the General Faculty representation to the University Senate is being phased out, no replacement for Dr. Livezey will be elected.

Dr. Raymond D. Daniels: On January 12, 1972, Dr. Raymond D. Daniels offered his resignation as the College of Engineering representative to the University Senate because of his recent election to the post of Executive Director of the University of Oklahoma Research Institute. The College of Engineering faculty was to consider his resignation at its meeting late in February.

REVISION OF THE UNIVERSITY SENATE CHARTER: Reorganization of
University Councils and Committees.

Background Information:

At the request of the Chairman of the University Senate last fall, the University Senate Committee on Committees studied the matter of reorganizing the existing structure of University Councils and Committees. The report of that Committee was brought to the attention of the University Senate at its regular session on December 13, 1971. The full text of that report was published on pages 7-10 of the Agenda for the December 13, 1971, meeting of the Senate. In accordance with the Senate By-Laws, final action could not be taken until the January 10, 1972, meeting.

In response to a request from the Chairman of the University Senate for faculty reactions and suggestions (see page 7 of the University Senate Journal for December 13, 1971), Dr. William Maehl, Jr., submitted a substitute proposal for University Council and Committee reorganization, in his own behalf, as well as in behalf of several of his colleagues. Dr. Maehl's proposal was published on pages 10-12 of the University Senate Journal for January 10, 1972. The Senate tabled this question until the February 14 meeting. (See page 6 of the University Senate Journal for January 13, 1972.) The Senate Committee on Committees, in turn, submitted a revised proposal that was published on pages 4-6 of the Agenda for the Senate meeting on February 14, 1972.

Senate Action:

The University Senate Executive Committee invited both Dr. Paul F. Sharp, President of The University of Oklahoma, and Dr. Pete Kyle McCarter, University Provost, to offer their comments and reactions to both proposals to the University Senate in person at the February 14, 1972, meeting. Drs. Sharp and McCarter accepted the invitation.

Dr. Sharp first expressed his appreciation for the opportunity to visit with the Senate concerning University governance and University committee and council structure, as well as thanked the Senate for undertaking the current study of this question.

He emphasized several times his feeling that the internal organization of the Senate was the exclusive concern of the Senate. He asked that his comments be taken as merely an expression of his counsel and views. In his opinion, the decision-making processes are badly lagging behind the necessity for decisions, particularly in crisis situations.

He expressed his concern that the faculty role in University governance be geared up to the point that such a role can be both effective and timely. He stated that he wants strong faculty participation and at points where it can be most effective.

He called attention of the Senate to the fact that many decisions, in effect, are out of "our hands." Citing the establishment of a separate budget for the Law Center, which was opposed by both the administration and the Regents of the University, he stressed the point that the President and the faculty in any University governance must operate under constraints, mandates, and power of a "layered bureaucracy."

He urged the faculty to keep two points in mind. First, work must be kept in phases so that decision making can be accelerated. Second, the flow of information to the councils and the committees must, at all times, be full and current. The councils and the committees must, therefore, have a direct relationship to the President and the senior administrators.

He observed that often when he first hears about an issue the individuals involved are in fixed positions and he then appears in a virtual "no man's land." "It is then too late for us to carry on normal procedures, and we face each other over adversary roles." In his opinion, such adversary roles should appear much earlier when they can be channeled into the solution of problems. The review phase comes too late, except for the purpose of censure.

In the subsequent question-and-answer period, Dr. Sharp reiterated his pleas for

- (a) a more effective timing of faculty input into the decision-making process and
- (b) a more effective flow of information among the parties concerned.

In his view, effective communication includes methods other than memoranda and involves several points of view and interpretations that need to be weighed in the discussions. In his opinion, the current committee and council system can and will be improved.

At this point, Dr. Sharp left the meeting for another engagement.

Expressing his appreciation for the opportunity to share his views in this matter, Dr. Pete Kyle McCarter, Provost of the University, called this issue a key question in the operation of the University.

In his opinion, the committee and council system can give the faculty a separate and an additional way of participating in University governance over and beyond the University Senate. Furthermore, in contrast to the slow reaction time of the Senate on immediate issues, meetings of the committees and councils can be called on very short notice. He felt that any flaws in the system can be ironed out by both the Senate and the administration.

He also stated that it is important for the President to have committees and councils report to him directly. The President must take the responsibility for any decisions. If the flow of information is not from the committees and councils to the President, the decision process will bog down. This does not preclude councils and committees from also furnishing either summary or annual reports to the Senate.

He called attention to one communication problem that has never been solved: How can the communication process be started the other way? How can the President use the councils and committees to communicate with the faculty?

In his opinion, having administrative officers of the University preside as chairmen of the various committees and councils has both good and bad features. He agreed that the administration should not dominate the committees and councils through its ex officio chairmen. Although an administrative officer serving as a chairman can, in effect, paralyze the functioning of that group, on the other hand, committees and councils without participation by administrative officers face the problem of timely acquisition of needed information. He suggested experimenting with councils and committees that do not have such ex officio chairmen but that do have administrative officers either on call or regularly present at meetings as non-voting resource people or consultants.

Dr. McCarter expressed a misgiving about limiting the membership on councils to Senate members. He felt that there may be important faculty talent among individuals who are not members of the Senate. Furthermore, such a policy would also restrict the membership of the councils too much.

There were no questions from the floor. Dr. McCarter left the meeting at this point.

Dr. Marshall called attention to the revised Committee proposal and suggested that additional revisions could be made as desired.

Speaking in behalf of his own proposal, Dr. Maehl listed the following two weaknesses in the proposal of the Committee on Committees: (a) the small number of personnel eligible for Council membership and (b) the exclusion of other elements of the University community elements from Council membership. He also cited the need for better "ongoing relations" between the Councils and the University administration.

In rebuttal, Dr. Marshall stated that the alleged "adversary role" is an unfortunate misinterpretation of the proposal that was not intended to spell out the daily procedures of the Councils. The language of the proposal could be changed to charge the Councils with making themselves available to the President of the University at all times. He felt that, in essence, the Committee's proposal does provide for faculty views to be forwarded through the Councils' reviews.

In the ensuing discussion, both proposals received favorable and unfavorable comments from other members of the Senate. Some felt that there was a difference between the two plans while others did not share that view; others urged experimenting with the Committee's proposal; still others argued for supporting the present University administration in its avowed intent and desire to utilize faculty input in the decision-making process.

When subsequently put to a vote by show of hands, the Maehl substitute proposal was approved by the Senate in a tally of 21 affirmative and 10 negative votes. (For the complete text of the approved proposal, see pages 10-12 of the University Senate Journal for January 10, 1972.)

PROPOSED MULTI-PURPOSE ARENA ON THE NORMAN CAMPUS

The recent contribution of one million dollars from the Noble Foundation in Ardmore toward the construction of a proposed multi-purpose arena on the Norman campus has elicited varied reactions on the campus. At the recommendation of the Executive Committee of the University Senate, Dr. Hall, Chairman of the University Senate invited Mr. David Burr, Vice President for University Development, to appear before the Senate to brief the faculty on the various aspects of the proposed project.

Mr. Burr preferred to answer questions from the floor rather than present a formal speech.

Repeatedly, Mr. Burr emphasized that no "Educational and General" money would be used for the maintenance of the new building. First year's maintenance financing is to be provided by the arena fund now being successfully raised. A user's tax of \$1,000 per event in the arena should provide adequate financing after the first year, plus additional fees to be paid by the Athletic Department for practice sessions and the like. Mr. Burr quote an estimated \$150,000 as the annual maintenance cost. The 60 events tentatively schedule for the first year of operation should increase thereafter. He cited the experience of other universities with such arenas and expressed optimism concerning the financial future of the new building.

He expressed doubt whether the contributions now being made to the arena fund would have been made instead for salaries. Putting the Arena Fund Drive into perspective, Mr. Burr stated that his office with a budget of \$109,000 has during this academic year raised two million dollars for purposes other than the multi-purpose arena, compared to \$1.2 million raised during the entire preceding year.

The new arena with its 11,000+ seats will not be suitable for certain types of events. The proposed University auditorium, therefore, will not be affected by this project.

According to Mr. Burr, the Student Government has never dealt with the matter of priorities for new buildings on the campus. In 1968 in a campus-wide ballot, the student body expressed the following preference for construction of new buildings on the Norman campus: (1) Arena, (2) Physical Education Building, (3) Student Activities Building, and (4) Student Health Center. At that time, the students assessed themselves an additional semester fee to be used for financing construction.

Next in priority is the Physical Education Building. The first phase of the new building is the recently announced construction of an indoor swimming pool.

Mr. Burr announced the composition of the following Users' Committee to recommend priorities for the use of the Multi-Purpose Arena:

Director of Athletics
University Vice President for the University Community
Chairman of the Student Government
Student Activities Board

Mr. Burr assured the Senate that, even if the new Arena proved to be a financial loss, no education money would be used in any way to finance the operation.

In thanking the Senate members for their questions and interest, Mr. Burr added that President Sharp has agreed to all statements made by Mr. Burr at this meeting.

Mr. Burr then left the meeting.

STUDENT EVALUATION OF TEACHERS

Background Information:

For several months, the University Senate Committee on Teaching and Research has been studying various aspects of the question of student evaluation of teachers. On January 10, 1972, the Senate referred to that Committee its first report for further study and appropriate revision. (Please see pages 7 and 8 of the University Senate Journal for January 10, 1972.)

Senate Action:

Upon learning that the Student Congress is also considering the problem of teacher evaluation, Dr. Hall, Chairman of the University Senate, invited representatives from the student government to appear before the Senate to keep the faculty informed about their activities.

Messrs. Bill Hill and George Nelson reviewed the current project of the Student Government. Pertinent research included several studies, correspondence with several other institutions, a 1968 report from US Office of Education, and other publications. The main objective of this project is to gather data and evaluations concerning University faculty members for the information of new students primarily. The results are to be published in booklet form.

For professional assistance with preparation and administration of the test itself, the student committee conferred with faculty members in the areas of education, statistics, psychology, and computer science. A \$17,000 pilot project is now underway to evaluate faculty teaching lower-division undergraduate survey courses in the College of Arts and Sciences. Appropriate changes in the project will be made on the basis of the first year's experience, before proceeding with the second-year phase of the student project.

In reacting to this progress report from the student government, Dr. Raymond Daniels, Chairman of the Senate Committee on Teaching and Research, emphasized the essential difference between the student project and the proposal of his Committee. Whereas the students are primarily motivated by a desire to provide information for students, the faculty proposal is focused on the desire to improve the quality of teaching.

In his opinion, student evaluation of teachers is only one way of going about the problem. Then too, one evaluation form may not be suitable and desirable for all types of classes.

The student representatives reported that this project has been completely student oriented. The students feel that a student response below 80 per cent would be unsatisfactory because the findings would involve primarily the two extremes.

Dr. Daniels subsequently moved acceptance of his Committee's revised report as follows:

The Senate Committee on Teaching and Research recommends that the Senate adopt a resolution favoring the implementation of a University-wide program of instructional evaluation. This program should be a continuing one, should be mandatory for all instructional programs in the University, and should include evaluation by students. The Committee believes that responsibility for implementation of such a program should rest at the college level. Toward this end, the Senate should urge each college to establish a committee which will have representation from the faculty and student body of the college and which will have responsibility for developing and implementing an evaluation program most suitable to the college's instructional activities.

In reviewing reports of evaluation programs of other Universities it was noted repeatedly that, although there are few really objective criteria for teaching effectiveness, concern for effective teaching comes into prominence at all levels as departments, colleges and universities examine their criteria for good teaching, their procedures for reviewing it, and their stated expectations with regard to faculty performance. The fundamental importance of evaluation is to provide a feedback to the instructor on his work. In this way, the evaluation takes on a constructive role in improving teaching. In a secondary role, evaluation is necessary if we hope to be able to give appropriate recognition to quality of instruction.

In responding to suggestions that students should be involved in the faculty proposal, Dr. Daniels felt that, because of the difference in project objectives, the faculty proposal should be implemented independent of the student project.

The consensus of the Senate was that implementation of the proposal would be at the discretion of the various degree-granting colleges.

In a voice vote with some dissent, the Senate approved the revised proposal of its Committee on Teaching and Research.

✓ UNIVERSITY FINANCIAL SITUATION

Dr. Ronald Bourassa moved that the Senate next consider the question concerning the University financial situation tabled at the December 13, 1971, meeting. (Please see page 3 of the University Senate Journal for December 13, 1971.) The Senate rejected the motion to remove the question from the table by a vote of 10 to 16.

✓ ACADEMIC FREEDOM AND FACULTY TENURE REGULATIONS

Background Information:

At special sessions on April 12, April 19, and May 10, 1971, the University Senate considered proposed revisions in the University regulations concerning academic freedom and faculty tenure. Two items that appeared in the Agenda for the April 12, 1971, meeting were inadvertently omitted from Senate consideration at these three meetings. (Please see page 3 of the Senate Agenda for the special session on April 12, 1971.)

Senate Action:

In view of the fact that a Regents subcommittee is now studying the faculty proposal approved by the Senate last spring, Dr. David Levy, Chairman of the Senate Committee on Faculty Personnel, (with the concurrence of Dr. Paul David, Chairman of the 1970-71 Senate Committee on Faculty Personnel), moved approval of the following two overlooked changes in the regulations in question:

- (1) To add to Section II C 2, the following paragraph II C 2 g:
"h. Time spent on leave of absence shall not count as probationary period service unless the faculty member's academic unit has recommended that it shall so count and the recommendation has been approved by the President at the time the leave is granted."
- (2) To insert a new subsection between subsections II C and II D:
"II D." (ensuing subsections to be designated E, F, and G)
Termination of appointment by the faculty member
"A faculty member who elects to terminate his appointment at the end of an academic year is obligated to give notice in writing at the earliest possible opportunity, but not later than May 15 or thirty days after receiving notification of the terms of his appointment for the coming year, whichever date is the later. A faculty member may properly request a waiver of this requirement of timely notice in case of hardship or in a situation where he would otherwise be denied substantial professional advancement or other opportunity."

The Senate approved the two changes without either discussion or dissent.

✓ DELETION OF SCHOLARSHIP RESTRICTION IN COLLEGE BULLETINS

Background Information:

On February 1, 1972, Dr. Pete Kyle McCarter, University Provost, requested Senate consideration of the proposed deletion of the following paragraph appearing in the various college bulletins under the topic, "Scholarship":

"A student who has accumulated fifteen hours of non-passing grades in courses belonging primarily to the school or college in which he is enrolled, and which he has not repeated with passing grades, will not be recommended for a degree"

Dr. McCarter's suggestion included the provision that the individual colleges would have the option of reinstating the above restriction if desired.

Senate Action:

Professor W. B. Prickett moved approval of the suggested deletion in college bulletins with the stipulation that individual colleges have the option of reinstating the restriction if desired. The Senate approved the deletion without dissent.

ADJOURNMENT

The University Senate adjourned at 5:45 p.m. The next regular meeting will be held at 3:30 p.m., on Monday, March 13, 1972, in Room 165 of the Student Union on the Norman campus.

Anthony S. Lis
Secretary