JOURNAL OF THE FACULTY SENATE (Norman campus)
The University of Oklahoma

Regular Session -- December 8, 1975 -- 3:30 p.m., Dale Hall 218.

The Faculty Senate was called to order by Dr. Gail de Stwolinski, Chairperson.

Present:

Barefield, Paul A.	Graves, William H.	Pento, J. Thomas
Bell, Digby B.	Henkle, James L.	Rasmussen, Maurice L.
Braver, Gerald	Joyce, Beverly A.	Reid, William T.
Buhite, Russell D.	Kendall, Jack L.	Scheffer, Walter F.
Crim, Sarah R.	Kitts, David B.	Schmitz, Francis J.
Cronenwett, William T.	Kondonassis, Alex	Shellabarger, Fred D.
de Stwolinski, Gail	Kraynak, Matthew E.	Snider, Glenn
Donnell, Ruth J.	Larson, Raymond D.	Streebin, Leale E.
Duchon, Claude E.	Lee, Cecil E.	Tomberlin, Irma R.
Fife, James D.	Levinson, R. Saul	Unruh, Delbert L.
Fowler, Richard G.	Marchand, Alan P.	Verrastro, Ralph
Goff, Richard A.	Mouser, James W.	York, John G.

AUOPE representative: Cowen, Chester

Absent:

Blair, Laura B.	Reynolds, Osborne M.	Tolliver, Lennie-Marie
Cox, Donald C.	Rice, Elroy L.	Tolson, Melvin B.
Ford, Robert A.	Shahan, Robert W.	Wells, Richard S.
Hibdon, James E.	Starling, K. E.	Whitecotton, Joseph W.
Kidd, Gerald D.	Swank, David	

Provost representative: Pollak, Betty

AUOPE representatives:

Anderson, Ken	Spaulding, Kenneth	Thompson, Leon
Guyer, Dan	Stith, Mary	

UOSA representatives:

Bake, Betsy	Carnes, Nancy	Morgan, Ulys
Boyer, William	Moore, Michael	

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

The Journal of the Faculty Senate for the regular session on November 10, 1975, was approved.

ACTIONS TAKEN BY PRESIDENT PAUL F. SHARP

(1) Senate Copy of the University Budget. On November 17, 1975, President Paul F. Sharp approved the Senate request for a copy of the University budget for 1975-76, as well as subsequent years. Accordingly, interested faculty members may examine the Senate copy of the University budget available in the Senate Office (Evans Hall 100-A). (See page 5 of the Senate Journal for November 10, 1975.)

(2) Senate Revisions - Faculty Personnel Policy. President Paul F. Sharp addressed the following letter of thanks on December 4, 1975, to Dr. Gail de Stwolinski, Senate Chairperson:

"Thank you for sending me the proposed Faculty Personnel Policy as proposed jointly by the Norman and Health Sciences Center Faculty Senates.

"I am grateful to both of the Senates for the immense amount of work that you have given to this matter. I know that the effort has been a tremendous one both to meet the deadline and to make a unified proposal. Please express my appreciation to the entire Senate.

"I look forward to meeting with you and other members of the Faculty Senates' leadership on Tuesday to discuss the proposal and assist me in determining what my recommendations will be to the University Regents so that the Regents may consider this matter on the timetable that we have worked out together."

(See pages 1-27 of the Senate Journal for the special session on December 1 and 2, 1975.)

ACTION TAKEN BY VICE CHANCELLOR HOBBS

State Regents' Policy concerning Sponsored Research: On November 21, Dr. Dan S. Hobbs, Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs, addressed the following self-explanatory letter to Dr. Anthony S. Lis, Senate Secretary:

"I appreciate very much the courtesy extended to Regent John Patten and to me at the meeting of the University of Oklahoma Faculty Senate (Norman campus) on October 13. I trust that the meeting will have mutually beneficial effects at both the State System level and at the the University of Oklahoma.

"I have read the account of the background and discussion of the State Regents' policy on Sponsored Research and Other Sponsored Programs contained in the Journal of the Faculty Senate. The statements and summary items on pages 13-15 of the October 13 meeting are both comprehensive and accurate. I trust that both the discussion and summary will help to clarify the intent of the State Regents in adopting the policy which precipitated the meeting.

"As a result of this meeting, we will be sending out an administrative clarification of the policy statement to all institutions in the near future. Please extend my personal appreciation to members of the Faculty Senate for a positive and productive interchange."

(See pages 13-15 of the Senate Journal for October 13, 1975.)

FALL SEMESTER JOINT MEETING OF EXECUTIVE COMMITTEES, OU FACULTY SENATE AND OSU FACULTY COUNCIL

Dr. Gail de Stwolinski, Senate Chairperson, presented a brief report on the November 12, 1975, joint meeting of the Executive Committees of the Faculty Council, Oklahoma State University and the Faculty Senate, Oklahoma University.

At the three-hour evening meeting at the OSU Technical Institute in Oklahoma City, the following topics were discussed:

(1) Tenure regulations
(2) Student and peer evaluation of teachers
(3) Collective bargaining
(4) Faculty participation in formulation of any retrenchment policies.

In view of the fact that the OSU faculty is in the process of preparing tenure proposals to their own Regents, most of the discussion was concerned with the current discussions and proposals of the Task Forces and the Faculty Senates on both campuses of the University of Oklahoma.

The Norman delegation included Professors de Stwolinski, Kondonassis, Lis, Kitts, Lawson, Scheffer, and Tolliver.

ATTENDANCE AT SPECIAL SESSION, DECEMBER 1 AND 2

With the consent of the Senate on December 8, the Senate Secretary will not count absences of Senate members on December 1-2 against the allowable maximum of four absences during the academic year. However, Senate members present at any two of the three Senate sessions on December 1 and 2 will be given the privilege of cancelling out one absence during the current academic year.

FACULTY REPLACEMENTS: Academic Personnel Council and Parking Violation Appeals Committee

The Senate approved the following nominations presented by the Committee on Committees to fill faculty vacancies:

Academic Personnel Council: to complete the unexpired (1975-77) term of Richard Baker (Political Science) - Tom Smith (History of Science)

Parking Violation Appeals Committee: to complete the unexpired (1975-76) term of Jack Robinson (Economics) - Travis Goggans (Accounting)
Marion Phillips (Environmental Analysis and Policy)

METHODS OF EVALUATION OF TEACHING

Background Information: On November 10, 1975, the Senate accepted the report of the Academic Program Council concerning the evaluation of teaching and postponed further action until the December 8 meeting. (See pages 7-23 of the Senate Journal for November 10, 1975.)

On November 20, 1975, the Senate Executive Committee approved the following proposal published in the Agenda for the December 8 session:

- -

(a) The Faculty Senate expresses its appreciation to the members of the subcommittee of the Academic Program Council for the outstanding report on methods of teacher evaluation. The Senate recommends this report to all faculty members and academic units as a very useful source on a timely and important subject.

(b) The Faculty Senate recommends that, as a matter of University policy, each academic unit shall adopt a written statement on the procedures it chooses for the evaluation of teachers in that unit. Upon agreement of the budget dean and the Provost, such a statement would then become effective departmental policy, subject to subsequent change by departmental action and agreement by the dean and the Provost. This policy would enable each unit to fashion its own set of teacher-evaluation procedures, suited to its mission and program. College-level student instructional evaluation and peer evaluation would remain a mandatory part of any such set of procedures, and each department would be obliged to determine what additional evaluation methods it chooses to employ." (See par. 4 on page 20 of the Senate Journal for November 10, 1975.)

- -

Senate Action: As soon as Dr. de Stwolinski, Senate Chairperson, had presented the above proposal of the Senate Executive Committee, Dr. Fife moved that the following substitute proposal be accepted:

- -

(a) The Faculty Senate expresses its appreciation to the members of the subcommittee of the Academic Program Council for the outstanding report on methods of teacher evaluation.

(b) The Faculty Senate recommends that, as a matter of University policy, each academic unit shall adopt a written statement on the procedures it chooses for the evaluation of teachers in that unit. Upon agreement of the budget dean and the Provost, such a statement would then become effective departmental policy, subject to subsequent change by departmental action and agreement by the dean and the Provost. This policy would enable each unit to fashion its own set of teacher evaluation procedures, suited to its mission and program. The Faculty Senate urges each academic unit to consult the "Report of the Academic Program Council concerning Methods of Evaluating Teachers" as it prepares its written statement.

- -

Stressing that he favors student evaluation, Dr. Fife commented that his substitute proposal deletes the specifics mentioned in the Executive Committee recommendation and permits the departments to take their own positive actions in this matter.

Dr. Graves, a member of the ad hoc Committee, noted that the original report was addressed to only one aspect of evaluation of teaching, i.e., student evaluation.

Dr. Cronenwett cautioned against institutionalizing the student evaluation form. In his opinion, the currentproblem with evaluation is that the evaluation form is the only available quantitative measure.

Dr. Marchand cited two problems with the student-evaluation program -- (a) its being the sole criterion for evaluating faculty and (b) the fact that the faculty member concerned is the last person to see the completed form. Dr. Snider saw the current problem as one of misuse rather than use. He felt that the major purpose of student evaluation should be to aid the instructor in improving his or her teaching.

In a voice vote with two dissenting votes, the Senate approved the substitute proposal.

Dr. Barefield next questioned the new evaluation form being used in the Arts and Sciences Colleges and moved that the Arts and Sciences forms be forwarded only to the faculty member involved and that they not be used in personnel decisions by administrators. He questioned the language of some of the items appearing in the Arts and Sciences evaluation form.

Discussion ensued regarding Senate consideration and action concerning the use of specific forms within a college. The Senate consensus was that such Senate intervention was neither authorized nor desirable. Subsequently, Dr. Barefield withdrew his motion.

Dr. Fife then moved that the proposal approved earlier at this meeting specify an effective date of September, 1976, for implementing the policy. The motion carried without dissent.

ADJOURNMENT

The Faculty Senate adjourned at 4:35 p.m. The next regular meeting of the Senate will be held at 3:30 p.m., on Monday, January 12, 1976, in Room 218, Dale Hall.

Respectfully submitted,

Anthony S. Lis

Anthony S. Lis, Secretary