

JOURNAL OF THE FACULTY SENATE (Norman campus)

The University of Oklahoma
 Regular Session -- April 14, 1980 -- 3:30 p.m., Dale Hall 218

The Faculty Senate was called to order by Professor Barbara Lewis, Chairperson.

Present:

Acock	Etheridge	Huettner	Lis	Seaberg
Artman	Foster, J.	Karriker	Menzie	Self
Bishop	Foster, T.	Kunesh	Morris	Smith
Brown, S.	Hardy	Kutner	Murray	Sorey
Caldwell	Herrick	Lancaster	Neely	Thompson
Carpenter	Hill	Lehr	Peters	Welch
Covich	Hoag	Lewis	Reynolds	Whitmore
Davis	Hockman	Lindstrom	Rowe	Whitney
			Saxon	Wickham

Provost's Office representative: Ray

AUOPE representatives: Alonso Guyer

UOSA representatives: Graham Heldenbrand

Absent:

Brown, H.	Catlin	Eick	Gabert	Rinear
Carmack	Coulter	Flowers	Pfiester	Walker
				Yukihiro

AUOPE representatives: Chism Cowen Donwerth

UOSA representatives: Hill Parr

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>page</u>
- Report on Senate Executive Committee meeting with Provost J. R. Morris	2
- Report on joint meeting of OU/OSU Executive Committees.	2
- Report on spring meeting of Oklahoma Conference of Faculty Organizations	3
- Price increase of football tickets for faculty/staff.	4
- Reports of Senate <u>ad hoc</u> Committees, 1979-80.	6
- Final Report of the <u>ad hoc</u> Committee on Student Evaluation of Faculty	6
- Reports of Senate <u>ad hoc</u> Committees following up 1978 "Position Papers".	9
- Proposed changes in Senate By-Laws: Creation of Committee on Faculty Compensation and Changes in title/charge, Committee on Faculty Welfare . . .	10

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

—The Journal for the Faculty Senate for the regular session on March 17, 1980, was approved.

REPORT ON SENATE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE MEETING WITH PROVOST MORRIS

Professor Barbara B. Lewis, Senate Chair, reported on the April 7, 1980, Executive Committee meeting with Provost J. R. Morris.

Annual Faculty Professional Activities and Evaluation Record: Provost J. R. Morris assured the group that he had not intended to have the forms adopted by any department or division without prior discussion with the Faculty Senate. His rationale for starting with the Deans' Council rather than the Senate was to have "a product" to submit to the Senate for its review and consideration.

In this connection, Professor Lewis announced that the Senate ad hoc Committee to study this question had been formed, with Professor Teree Foster (Law Center) as Chair. Professor Lewis urged interested faculty to forward any comments and suggestions directly to Professor Foster. (See pages 9-11 of the Senate Journal for March 17, 1980.) The Committee will subsequently present its recommendations to the Senate.

Professor Lewis reported that Provost Morris was very open-minded and receptive. Furthermore, he offered to meet with the Senate ad hoc Committee and/or the Senate Executive Committee in an attempt to resolve the difficulties.

Professor Davis noted that the form in question had been distributed and collected in the Arts and Sciences College and presumably the results thereof will be utilized this spring. Professor Lewis indicated that this point had not been raised during the meeting with Provost Morris but would be brought up at the next such meeting.

Professor Kunesh expressed the opinion that the A&S form cannot be considered to be the "official University-wide form" and that the question raised by Professor Davis is separate from the one raised at the March 17 Senate meeting.

Associate Provost Ray added, "As far as the University is concerned, this is not the official form."

Price increase in season football tickets for faculty/staff and spouses: The Senate Chair "expressed with clarity and strength" the objections of a number of faculty members to the price increase recently announced in the season football tickets for faculty and staff, as well as their spouses. Furthermore, for the 1980 season, the price for spouses will be \$50 for the season ticket or \$17 higher than the price for faculty and staff members.

Provost Morris seemed to feel that the administration can do nothing about the increases in football tickets inasmuch as the Athletic Department is entirely self-supporting without any appropriated funds. In response to a question, he suggested that Mr. Wade Walker of the Athletic Department be contacted in this matter.

Professor Davis commented that, in his opinion, any University disclaimer regarding control of the Athletic Department violates NCAA regulations. Furthermore, in view of the fact that the Athletics Council had approved the increase, the Senate should also express its displeasure with that Council for not having acted in the best interests of the faculty in this instance. (See page 4 of this Journal.)

REPORT ON JOINT MEETING OF OU AND OSU EXECUTIVE COMMITTEES

Professor Kunesh, Senate Chair-Elect, reported on the March 27, 1980, joint meeting in Stillwater of the Executive Committees of the Oklahoma State University Faculty Council and the Oklahoma University Faculty Senate.

The Senate delegation consisted of the following:

Greg Kunesh (Drama), Senate Chair-Elect
 Anthony S. Lis (Business Communication), Senate Secretary
 Gary Thompson (Geography), Chair, Senate Faculty Welfare Committee
 Stan Neely (Mathematics)
 Sidney Brown (History) substituting for Professor Whitmore

Oklahoma State University counterparts included the following:

John M. Jobe (Mathematics), Council Chair
 Jerald Parker (Mechanical Engineering), Council Vice Chair
 Odell Walker (Agricultural Economics), Council Secretary
 Donald Brown (Sociology-Anthropology)
 Richard Frahm (Biological Sciences)
 Aix Harrison (HPER)
 Alexander Ospovat (Social Sciences)

For the first time in the history of these joint meetings, a participant (Professor Sidney Brown) claimed service on both groups. Professor Brown, now serving on the Senate, was a member of the OSU Faculty Council during the early 1960's.

The following topics were discussed:

- (1) Tax sheltering of OTRS contributions. Whereas the Senate Faculty Welfare Committee and the University Employment Benefits Committee had recommended against OU participation, the OSU Council is still pursuing this matter and expects final action on its favorable recommendation next summer.
- (2) Salary increases, 1980-81. OSU faculty are expecting increases of about 12-14 percent.
- (3) Fringe benefits "package." The OSU Faculty Council is trying to increase their fringe benefits "package," including dental care.
- (4) Proposed change in format of joint meetings. The OU Senate has proposed that the format of these joint sessions be changed from a one-evening meeting each semester, on a reciprocal basis, to an annual week-end retreat in the fall at one of the state lodges. Reaction on both sides has been favorable. Secretaries of both groups will continue to study the desirability and the feasibility of the proposal. In Professor Kunesh's words, "As the two flagship institutions in this state, we will have to work together much more in the future."
- (5) Administrative evaluation of faculty performance. The OSU Council has shared with the OU group results of an extensive study of this matter, as well as the forms resulting therefrom.
- (6) Student evaluation of faculty.

REPORT ON SPRING MEETING OF OKLAHOMA CONFERENCE OF FACULTY ORGANIZATIONS

Professors Deirdre Hardy and Mary Esther Saxon represented the Senate at the March 28, 1980, meeting at Southwestern State University, Weatherford, of the Oklahoma Conference of Faculty Organizations.

Professor Hardy felt that the essence of Mr. Frosty Troy's luncheon address was the need for university and college faculties to make themselves heard at the State Capital. He urged faculty members to support the legislators who are championing the cause of higher education in Oklahoma.

In the afternoon, Professor Hardy attended a session of the junior-college group in that organization. When she had advised them of her chairing a Senate ad hoc committee on junior college articulation, she was deluged with comments regarding the effects of the articulation policy at their level. Apparently, only 5 percent of the junior college student eventually transfer to 4-year institutions. Professor Hardy acknowledged that she had received additional background and perspective that will help her with her Committee assignment and that she will share with the Committee.

At the Conference, Professor Saxon received a copy of the Oklahoma AAUP Newsletter for March, 1980, featuring Representative Cleta Deatherage's article on the role of faculty in budgeting procedures at their institutions. (For the complete text of the article, see page 5 of this Journal.)

Professor Saxon attended a session of the four-year institutions. The group discussed faculty governance on the various campuses, as well as related problems of mutual interest. She favors Senate participation in such state-wide conferences that bring to light the current situation on other campuses and the relatively better situation on the Norman campus.

PRICE INCREASE: Football tickets for faculty/staff and spouses

In following up on the Senate Chair's report on discussions with Provost Morris concerning the recently announced price increase in season football tickets for faculty/staff and their spouses, Professor Kunesh labeled the recent action "arbitrary and insensitive." He reported considerable faculty displeasure with the price increase. (See page 2 of this Journal.)

Professor Thompson reported that the Employee Executive Council had lodged a strong protest with the administration.

Later, Professor Kunesh moved Senate approval of the following proposals:

- (1) The Faculty Senate (Norman campus) supports a similar protest registered recently by the Employee Executive Council.
- (2) The Faculty Senate recommends that the price increase be cancelled, effective next fall.
- (3) If cancellation is not possible at this date, the Senate strongly recommends that the price differential be cancelled effective in the fall of 1981.

Without dissent, the Senate approved the motion.

Professor Whitney then suggested that, in addition, the Senate Executive Committee investigate any possible legal aspects of the University employment benefits program, which stipulates that regular faculty and staff members "are entitled to purchase season tickets to athletic events at reduced rates."

Professor Kunesh also suggested that the Athletics Council "be rebuked for not having informed the Senate of the proposed price increase."

Article published on page 1 of the March, 1980, Newsletter of the Oklahoma Conference, American Association of University Professors:

"SLICING THE PIE: The Role of the Faculty in Campus Budgeting"
by State Representative Cleta Deatherage

During the time I have served in the Oklahoma House of Representatives, I have been deeply involved in the efforts to increase funding for our institutions of higher education. As part of that process, I have become increasingly interested in the system through which the various institutional budgets are developed and submitted. If we are truly attempting to learn the entire revenue picture, it simply isn't enough to study only the legislative response to the budgetary requests of the agencies.

What has become clear to me in these past three years is that there is very little involvement by faculty members in the establishment of funding priorities at the various institutions of higher education in our state. The degree of faculty input -- and the seriousness with which it is treated by administrators and regents -- varies widely from campus to campus. Clearly, however, the final decisions on spending needs and priorities are made without significant input from the college faculties.

My concern is this: As we struggle at the legislative level to increase the lump-sum dollar amounts appropriated to the State Regents for Higher Education, we do so in the name of academic quality and excellence. We argue for better funding in an attempt to attract and maintain the finest educators possible. Yet, we find that, as the dollars "trickle down" from the legislature to the State Regents to the governing boards to the local campus administrators, there seems to be a gap between the goals espoused and the goals achieved; namely, the placing of highest priority on faculty salaries, class size, library support, etc.

A review of the funding results of the last several years reveals that higher education has been funded at virtually 100% of the Regents' request, when the total dollars appropriated are added to the revolving funds paid into the institutions. Yet, faculty salaries at all but a very few institutions fall woefully behind the salaries paid at comparable institutions in this geographic region. The conclusion can only be that decisions have been made to move other campus needs ahead of the need for competitive salaries at most institutions. The absence of meaningful faculty input in the fiscal priorities of the colleges makes such statistics possible -- and that is unacceptable if we are serious about the academic excellence we argue for.

Administrators of all agencies, whether public schools, state offices, or higher educational institutions, are constantly besieging the legislature with requests to "leave them alone" -- to send the money without the strings.

My personal feeling is that local campus personnel are best equipped to make the budget decisions that affect and govern the institutions and that legislative directive is not the most desirable way to determine funding priorities. But as long as local campus governing systems provide little or no opportunities for meaningful involvement of faculty members in the development and implementation of budgetary decision-making, then those of us in the legislature who are determined to support academic excellence as the first priority for campus budgeting have no alternative but to insist on some manner of legislative dictates.

The administrators of our campuses must learn that the best way to rid themselves of legislative intervention is the establishment of local budget-making procedures which will guarantee the authentic involvement of the campus faculty in the crucial financial decisions of the institutions.

REPORTS OF SENATE ad hoc COMMITTEES, 1979-80

Background information: Last fall, in small-group, evening sessions, members of the Senate suggested five areas of special interest that warranted study during the 1979-80 academic year. Accordingly, the Senate officers appointed the following ad hoc Committees to study the specific areas and submit final reports to the Senate in the spring:

- (1) 1973 Faculty Career Development Plan
- (2) Junior college articulation
- (3) Interdisciplinary courses and programs
- (4) Student evaluation of faculty
- (5) University council and committee structure

(See page 2 of the Senate Journal for December 10, 1979.)

Reports by Committee Chairs:

(1) 1973 Faculty Career Development Plan: Professor Alan Covich, Chair, pre-a progress report on Committee activities to date and indicated that the final report would be presented at the May 5 Senate meeting.

(2) Junior college articulation: Professor Deirdre Hardy, Chair, reported on the recent mail-questionnaire survey of Norman campus faculty. Over 230 replies have been received to date. She solicited assistance from faculty members with expertise in quantitative analysis. Faculty volunteers will be added to the ad hoc Committee membership.

(3) Interdisciplinary courses and programs: Professor Tom Sorey, Chair, reported that the Committee had prepared a mail questionnaire to survey faculty opinion in this matter. He distributed copies of the proposed questionnaire at this meeting and requested input and reactions from Senate members to improve the questionnaire format and/or content. In view of the large number of questionnaires distributed to Norman campus faculty this year, the Committee feels that the mailing of the questionnaire should be deferred until next fall. He added, "The Committee does not have a particular objective in mind, unless it is to promote interdisciplinary activity on this campus."

(4) University council and committee structure: Professor Ronald Peters, Chair, stated that the final report of his Committee had been submitted to the Senate office a few days ago. That report will be distributed to Senate members in advance of the May 5 Senate meeting.

(5) Student evaluation of faculty: Professor Duaine Lindstrom, Chair, noted that the final report of that Committee had been distributed to Senate members in advance of this meeting.

The full text of that report follows.

FINAL REPORT OF THE AD HOC COMMITTEE ON STUDENT EVALUATION OF FACULTY

HISTORY

It has been required by the University Regents since 1972 that every course be evaluated by the students. At that time, the stated view of the Senate was as follows:

"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."

The Academic Program Council in 1975 was asked by the Faculty Senate "to examine alternative methods of teacher evaluation which go beyond our currently used student evaluation of faculty" and "to prepare recommendations.... on alternative methods of evaluation for use here at the University." The Academic Program Council's report stated that "this request is the result of a growing concern among faculty here at the University over the use of student evaluation as the exclusive measure of teaching effectiveness and of the use of these evaluations for decisions on promotion, raises, and tenure rather than as a tool to improve teaching. Several faculty feel there is a need for a systematic, professional evaluation of teaching to complement student evaluation."

Among the conclusions of the Academic Program Council were:

"The most important purposes served by teacher evaluation....are, first, the diagnostic-corrective opportunity it affords for instructional improvement, and, second, its use in distinguishing among faculty members in regard to the quality of their teaching for appropriate institutional reward."

"We recommend that student instructional evaluation be continued as an essential part of teacher evaluation."

"We recommend that...each unit adopt a written statement on the procedures it chooses for the evaluation of teachers in the unit."

"This would enable each unit to fashion its own set of teacher evaluation procedures, suited to its mission and program."

CURRENT CONCERNS

This committee was formed to consider statements of concern expressed by members of the Faculty Senate similar to those expressed in 1975 at the time of the report by the Academic Program Council. In particular, concern was expressed that in some units the administration may be using the student evaluation of faculty as the dominant or sole information source in evaluation of teaching for purposes of salary, tenure, and promotion. Since student evaluations, in some cases, may have the appearance of numerical precision, these may be used for determining salary increments beyond their numerical validity. Such overuse by administration may impair their usefulness in their primary purpose -- improving teaching. For instance, if a teacher's salary increment depends on his evaluation, he may seek to maximize his evaluation score, which may not be consistent with an effort to improve teaching.

ALTERNATIVES TO EVALUATION

Alternatives to student evaluations of faculty on a course-by-course basis can be used to supplement data obtained from these evaluations. Among them are:

- 1) administration evaluation by observation, interview, etc.
- 2) peer review
- 3) student exit interviews, solicitations, etc.
- 4) teachers' materials, statements, etc.

It is not intended that these should replace student evaluations of faculty. In particular, they cannot provide the same degree of information for individual teaching improvement that the evaluations can. Rather, these alternatives can supplement and check the information provided by evaluations in considerations of faculty salary, tenure, and promotion. The extent to which any of these can be used is expected to vary from unit to unit. To avoid concerns as indicated above, it is necessary that a reasonable effort be made to use as many of these alternatives as possible.

EVALUATION FORMS

Recently developed forms for student evaluation of teachers at several universities include separate sections to satisfy the needs of separate constituencies: the teacher, the administration, the students. The teacher's section contains questions that can assist the teacher in improving teaching. The administration's section contains questions by which some measure of teaching effectiveness is determined. A student's section is included if some evaluation information is to be circulated for student's use in choosing courses.

The teacher's section is intended exclusively for the use of the teacher in improving teaching and, in some cases may not be made available to the administration (or students). Since it is for the teacher's use only, it is most effective if it responds to specific questions chosen by the teacher. They may be of the teacher's own making, chosen from a list of available questions, or a combination of the two.

The administration's section is designed to provide partial information for determining teaching effectiveness. It may be the only section available to the administration. It would contain a small number of global questions, such as "How did this teacher rate in effectiveness, compared to other teachers that you have had?"

RECOMMENDATIONS

It is understandable that there should be concern over potential misuse of student evaluations of faculty when applied to considerations of salary, tenure, and promotion. It is not apparent, however, that such misuse occurs significantly at the University of Oklahoma. There is not a strong opposition to the use of student evaluations by administration. To maintain this generally healthy atmosphere and to help guard against possible misuse in the future, the committee has adopted the following recommendations:

1) Supplementary Information

In considerations of faculty salary, tenure, or promotion, information obtained from student evaluations of faculty as a measure of teaching effectiveness should be supplemented by information from other sources. It is important that the teacher be one of these sources by providing course descriptions, materials, or statements of course objectives. In this way, the context of the student evaluation can be known.

2) Limits of Validity

It is important that results obtained from student evaluations of faculty not be used to an extent beyond their validity. To help assure this, results should be averaged over several courses or semesters. These averaged results should then be used to distinguish generally high-quality or low-quality teaching and never to make fine distinctions between individual faculty members.

3) Multi-part Evaluation Forms

As an assist in avoiding administrative misuse and thereby decreasing the effectiveness of evaluations, the use of multi-part forms should be considered with separate teacher and administration sections. Results from the administration section, consisting of questions regarding general teaching effectiveness, could satisfy administrative needs. The teacher's section could deal with specific course and teaching questions, providing useful feedback for the teacher. This section may not be made available to administration.

4) Prompt Return of Results

To be effective as a diagnostic-correction aid for teachers, the results of student evaluation should be returned to teachers as promptly as possible. It is generally considered that the results should be available within a month after the evaluation is performed.

The Committee feels that administrative use of student evaluations of faculty is less important than faculty use in improving teaching. Therefore, any use by administration must be free from unnecessary concern of misuse. Without this freedom, the evaluations cannot be expected to be fully useful in improving teaching.

Respectfully submitted,

Alan Acock
William Carmack

John Foster
Heidi Karriker

Duaine Lindstrom (Chair)
Gene Walker

Professor Lindstrom called specific attention to the four recommendations of that Committee and requested faculty comments about the quality and the content of the report itself.

Professor Thompson commented that the recent discussions with the OSU Executive Committee had revealed a philosophical shift in their evaluation process. Student evaluations are only one phase of the process. Use of the data, for the most part, is at the departmental level. OSU faculty oppose the use of Z-scores, as well as the use of such data in the salary decisions.

REPORTS OF SENATE ad hoc COMMITTEES FOLLOWING UP 1978 "POSITION PAPERS"

- (1) Budgetary Priorities: No report.
- (2) Educational Priorities: Professor Jim Artman, Chair, reported that the final report of that Committee had been submitted to the Senate office a few days ago and would be distributed to Senate members in advance of the May 5 Senate meeting. He then outlined the highlights of the Committee report.

Most of the subsequent discussion was centered on the announced 12 percent salary increase for 1980-81. The Budget Council had recommended to the Provost and the President the following division of the proposed "average" 12 percent increase:

- 6 percent: across the board
- 6 percent: for merit and adjustments for inequities

The Provost approved the proposed distribution and notified the Deans accordingly. Furthermore, President Banowsky stressed this procedure in his recent letter to Deans and Department Chairs.

In Professor Artman's opinion, there is some question concerning the use of the word "average."

Professor Davis indicated that, to his knowledge, no department in the College of Arts and Sciences had received the anticipated 12 percent increase in funds and that faculty members are raising questions.

Professor Lindstrom stated that the departments in the College of Engineering had received 10 percent, with the remaining 2 percent to be handled by the Dean's office.

Professor Bishop stated that he would bring this matter to the attention of the Budget Council. He added that the 1980-81 budget does provide for a total 12 percent increase in faculty salaries.

- (3) Faculty Governance: No report.
- (4) Faculty Salaries and Fringe Benefits: Professor Stan Neely, Chair, reported that the Committee is still analyzing the results of the questionnaire sent to department chairs on the Norman campus regarding faculty retention and recruitment.

To date, 21 of the 48 departments responded to the 2-page questionnaire distributed by the Committee.

He presented some of the highlights of the report that will be distributed to Senate members in advance of the May 5 meeting.

- (5) Image of the University: No report.

PROPOSED CHANGES IN SENATE BY-LAWS: Creation of Committee on Faculty Compensation and Changes in title/charge, Committee on Faculty Welfare

Background information: On March 17, the Senate requested its Executive Committee to study a proposal for changing the title and the charge of the Senate standing Committee on Faculty Welfare. (See page 9 of the Senate Journal for March 17, 1980.)

Subsequently, the Senate Executive Committee proposed instead that a new Senate standing Committee on Faculty Compensation be created and that appropriate changes be made in the charge to the Senate standing Committee on Faculty Welfare. Copies of that new proposal were distributed to Senate members in advance of the April 14 session.


Senate action: Inasmuch as the Senate Executive Committee proposal goes beyond the intent and the scope of the original proposal of the Senate Committee on Faculty Welfare, this question was tabled until the May 5 Senate meeting in accordance with Senate By-Laws.

Professor Whitmore questioned the appropriateness of the charge to the Faculty Welfare Committee to provide liaison with all appropriate councils and committees. He moved that the liaison mission be assigned instead to the proposed Committee on Faculty Compensation. Without dissent, the Senate approved this change in the Executive Committee proposal.

ADJOURNMENT

The Senate adjourned at 4:57 p.m. The next regular session of the Faculty Senate will be held at 3:30 p.m., on Monday, May 5, 1980, in Oklahoma Memorial Union 165.

Respectfully submitted,



Anthony S. Lis
Professor of
Business Communication
Secretary