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ON STRAINING OUT GNATS AND SWALLOWING CAMELS

by
David A. Bella, Emeritus Professor
Department of Civil, Construction, and Environmental Engineering
Oregon State University

May 2009

In her keynote address at University Day 2008, Dr. Carol Geary Schneider emphasized the importance of preparing students to address “the big picture”. I agree! It appeared that everyone else agreed. But, I have serious doubts that we are capable of doing this. Stated bluntly, we’re in serious denial. The administrative structure and common practices of academic disciplines pose formidable barriers to the kind of discourse that “big pictures” demand. It is delusional to think that we are preparing students to do what we ourselves cannot or will not do. Yes, there are exceptions, but we should not use these exceptions as excuses to avoid the concerns that I raise herein. Yes, there is much outstanding work done in many disciplines and multidisciplinary teams. But, as I intend to explain below, it is a serious mistake to presume that excellent parts add up to big pictures that make sense.

Two Challenges

First, the most radical intellectual challenge in my lifetime (I was born in 1938) arose in fields such as nonlinear dynamics and complexity theory. Those who are mathematically challenged should not shy away because much from these discoveries: 1) can be translated into ordinary language, 2) challenge common practices in academia, and 3) open up new ways to see the big picture for real world problems. These discoveries warn us that our nonlinear world is very different from the illusions that have arisen from our linear presumptions. The deceptively simple but radical claim is that the character of wholes cannot be reduced to the character of their parts (or their sums, averages, sequences, etc.). This claim challenges linear presumptions embedded in our language, institutions, and practices.

University education is divided into parts, both administratively (departments) and intellectually (disciplines). While we point to the excellence of these parts and play lip service to interdisciplinary efforts (and occasionally attempt them), we don’t get the big pictures, much less teach them. Wholes must be addressed as wholes, an effort that is so radically different from our established practices that we are likely to avoid or reject such efforts as strange, weird, and not measuring up to our established standards of academic discipline.

If the world were linear, we could reason that if each part is done well, the whole is done well, a form of reasoning employed in assessments of administrators, faculty, and students (e.g., the GPA). And, if the world were linear, I could be a great musician; on our grand piano I could play grand notes. But, alas, when I add up my grand notes, I get terrible noise, not music! Clearly, the character of the whole cannot be reduced to the character of the parts! Likewise, the excellent parts that we play in the university (these are important) add up to babble that even we don’t understand when applied to real world “big pictures.” Thus, we seldom discuss emergent (self-organizing and not reducible to parts) wholes among ourselves, perhaps assuming that some other field of expertise should address such matters. We presume that if we all do our parts well, the problems will be addressed. When the problems are not addressed, we can blame “them” (somebody else) and return to doing our part. We act out linear presumptions. Yes, and if the world were linear, a good joke could be reduced to the sum of funny words.

Linear presumptions do serve most of us well within our own fields. In a similar manner, we can assume a flat earth when making a map of a small field. Plane surveying – assuming a flat earth – works well if we don’t look too far. As with flat earth assumptions, linear presumptions do not work for big pictures.

My second challenge is related. We have failed to address, much less grasp and teach, the seductiveness and limitations of modern technology as practiced on large scales. The Iraq war, conducted with impressive efficiency, and the disastrous postwar conditions that followed are largely examples of a reoccurring problem, the temptation of “the technological fix.” Problems are defined to fit technological solutions. Problems that do not fit are neglected.
While we have been catching up on our e-mail, the rapidly expanding capabilities of technology have extended the scale of real world problems far beyond the “flat earth” views of our disciplines. My parents and I both obtained home mortgages. But, in our world of technology enabled mortgage backed securities, credit default swaps and many strange forms of derivatives, home mortgages now threaten to trigger a global financial meltdown. This risk arose largely through the playing of sophisticated and high stakes computer games where the only score that really mattered was money gained. The players were extremely bright and highly educated. They included small armies of scientists, engineers, mathematicians, and computer scientists. Theoretical physicists played prominent roles. What were they doing? They were applying highly sophisticated computer models for “risk management.” And the outcome? We now face the risk that the global economy could collapse and we will be required to shell out a trillion or more dollars in an attempt to hopefully prevent this from happening. Clearly, with respect to intelligence, “smarts,” the whole was considerably less than the sum of the parts. In our high tech love affair, we seemed to have missed something.

It would appear that they (the really smart people who managed risks) and we (the people who taught them and invested our savings) failed to get the big picture. The only real assets that some financial geniuses may have left are the advanced computers that they used for risk management. Clearly, there are lessons that should be learned.

**Lessons Learned**

The U.S. military has a “lessons learned” tradition that seeks to learn from failures so that the same mistakes do not reoccur. Unfortunately, the university does not have a “lessons learned” tradition when it comes to complex problems, even when huge failures arise from graduates applying expertise gained through higher education. What nontrivial lessons did we learn from the Enron failure?

But, you might reply, the skills and knowledge taught at universities can be applied to learn what went wrong in many failures. I agree! Technical experts can identify design errors. Financial experts can identify accounting errors. Journalists and historians can provide comprehensive accounts that reveal in detail what occurred. Such learning requires precise investigations that draw upon the appropriate professional skills (accounting, as an example). As the saying goes, “the devil is in the details.”

Through such learning, we find that complex failures involve countless actions ranging from personal and petty to highly technical and sophisticated. Those who look toward the personal end of the spectrum ask, “Who should we blame?” In contrast, experts look toward the technical end and ask, “What mistakes were made?” But, regardless of how we look at this spectrum of details, the fact is: this particular collection of details will never repeat. When examining details, every complex failure is seen as unique. The particular combinations of acts and events will never again arise. If “lessons learned” strives to not repeat the “same” mistakes, the word “same” must refer to something very different than particular parts. It would appear that the “devil” may not be in the details but may instead be found in the emergent wholes that have a “devilish” way of coming back to haunt us, even after we’ve fixed the parts.

Learning about complex problems and failures does involve careful and detailed studies of the particular events that occurred. But, “lessons learned” – to not repeat the same mistakes – demands a very different kind of discipline. It is here that the radical claim of nonlinearity has something to offer: the character of the whole cannot be reduced to the parts (or their sums, sequences, etc.). The collection of particular actions will never be repeated, but the context (emergent pattern) within which they arose may reemerge. Thus, while particular actions may be very different, the same or similar context – larger pattern of self-reinforcing behaviors – might indeed arise again.

As technological advances expand the scale of such patterns, the reemergence of similar patterns can produce greater disasters. Lessons not learned from the Enron collapse helped to enable the larger economic meltdown we are now experiencing. If, however, emergent patterns are uncovered and sketched in recognizable form, then lessons could be learned. That is, given unique and unforeseen events and people (the parts) we and our students might say in the future:

“Something is wrong here! I recognize this. The same thing occurred before and the consequences were disastrous. We need to take steps to avoid the same mistakes. We cannot simply go along!”

The word “same” refers to whole patterns that are self organizing, emergent forms of order in human affairs that require neither intent nor deliberate design.

But, to teach such lessons, we ourselves must first practice disciplined forms of "lessons learned“ that radically depart from the established practices of academic disciplines and the compartmentalization of our administrative structures. We must uncover and expose the character of the emergent patterns from which failures arise on scales far beyond mere broken parts or individual wrong doings. We must discover self-reinforcing patterns as coherent wholes in themselves. We must clarify the character of such patterns so that we and our students – from many disciplines – can recognize when these patterns reemerge in similar forms, even as the details are radically different. “Lessons learned” involves recognizing similarities in wholes despite differences in parts. It is not enough to explain in detail what went wrong or who to blame. We must clarify the character of the contexts (emergent wholes, large scale self-reinforcing patterns) within which
bright, educated, and competent people failed to notice troubling matters until it was too late.

The “Show Us” Challenge

At this point in my rambling (or before), my students would say “give us an example.” This is a reasonable challenge: to present, in a way that they can grasp, a nontrivial example from the real world. It’s a challenge to “do it,” not merely “talk about doing it.” “Give us your best shot.” “Show us.” When I take up the challenge, discourse shifts. Abstract notions within my own academic babble must now be clearly applied to some real (not hypothetical) problem. Students from different disciplines often know more about the parts than I do. They test me! The demand is placed upon me to demonstrate how abstract notions (e.g., emergent wholes) can be clearly expressed in ways that help students to understand (rather than confuse) matters of importance in the real world.

I am forced to respond to their questions. “What do you mean?” “Why did you do this?” Like David facing Goliath, I am forced to take off my academic armor. I cannot protect myself (as a competent authority) by citing references (that students have not read) or employing jargon (that students don’t understand). “Show us” they insist. I am forced to use ordinary language, clear sketches, and familiar examples to clarify matters that even I find to be difficult and strange.

In my efforts to grasp and explain, I expose my own ignorance within this messy world. I struggle. I ask for help. The practice of “lessons learned” demands this. Through example, students learn that it is both honest and enlightening to say, “I don’t know, let us see if we can make some sense of this.” And through such vulnerable and challenging efforts, we may indeed gain clarity on matters of importance that experts failed to grasp.

When we professors give difficult reading assignments to students, present lectures (expecting students to take notes), test students on their grasp of what we have covered, and then grade them, we imply that we really do know something of relevance to the real world. Thus, when problems become apparent in the real world, it is not unreasonable for students to issue a “show us” challenge. If all we give them is more of the same – “read this book, study this author” – then students have good reasons to suspect that, while we may know a great deal about our own discipline (literature, jargon, theories, etc.), we really do not know how to give clear pictures of real world problems. Perhaps we’re bluffing. Students learn to play the game. In their words, they “plug and chug,” “cram and flush,” “regurgitate back on tests,” “jump through the hoops,” “get the grade,” and then say “thank God I’m through with that.” Of course, there are exceptions, even heroic exceptions! But, when considering the entire educational experience, it appears that our ability to clarify (rather than confuse or trivialize) big pictures is overrated and self-delusional.

Our ability to educate competent experts in many fields (where we ourselves excel) stands in stark contrast to our ability to clarify wholes (contexts, systems, patterns) through which expert-driven problems and catastrophes emerge. Linear presumptions allow us to set aside such troubling matters. Our students learn from us. Thus, when troubling matters are set aside and when grave dangers emerge from the actions of educated people, we educators can be seen as enablers. When real world problems become apparent and we merely blame others, then we ourselves fail the “lessons learned” challenge.

Perhaps we should take seriously an ancient challenge that some of you might recognize: “You blind guides! You strain out a gnat and swallow a camel!” It’s not that specialized expertise (“straining out gnats”) is wrong. But, it does appear that we do overlook and conform to larger wholes (“swallow a camel”). And, clearly, a camel is not the sum of a lot of gnats (the world is nonlinear).

Given the challenges that I myself have made in this forum paper, it is quite reasonable to say to me “show us,” “give us an example.” As an anticipatory – perhaps preemptive – response, I’ve made a preface and a paper available at http://sites.google.com/site/swallowedcamels. This paper:

1. examines the emergence of evil in our modern world, (hint: the people involved behave much as we do),

2. employs an ancient prayer (many of you will recognize it) as an intellectual discipline,

3. claims that competence can and often does become “demonic,”

4. supports the claim of others (cited in the paper) that the notion of “faith” understood as stubborn “belief” is a modern heresy, and

5. contains “lessons learned” that do apply to higher education.

This paper, “Emergence and Evil,” was peer reviewed and published in a secular journal, Emergence Complexity and Organization. It has also been student tested as a “show us” exercise. A student has set up a blog site; you can post comments at http://transcendinglessonslearned.blogspot.com/. I will be available to discuss – with students, faculty, and anyone else – this paper (“Emergence and Evil”), and the more general concerns raised in this Faculty Forum. Finally, I will share my own insights and seek help from others on “lessons learned” from the U.S. Iraq intelligence failures and our ongoing economic meltdown.
Opinions expressed by authors of Faculty Forum articles are not necessarily those of Oregon State University, the OSU Faculty or Faculty Senate.
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"All I Really Need to Know I Did Not Learn in Kindergarten"

Gordon Matzke, Faculty Senate President

Every once in awhile, my imagination is aroused by an author's clever choice of book title. Robert Fulghum's 1993 title "All I Really Need to Know I Learned in Kindergarten" helped me organize my thoughts for today.

It must be the title that got me started, because I've never read the book. Rather than read the book, I borrowed a technique from the 21st Century student and "surfed the web" in search of a "Cliff notes version" of the book's content. At AMAZON.COM, I found a description of the book that read:

"Most of what I really need to know about how to live and what to do and how to be, I learned in kindergarten. Wisdom was not at the top of the graduate school mountain, but there in the sand pile at Sunday School."

(As the major professor of 53 completed graduate students, I was starting to see this book as a threat to my career – but I persevered nevertheless.) The author continued:
"These are the things I learned:

Share everything. Play fair. Don't hit people.
Put things back where you found them.
Clean up your own mess. Don't take things that aren't yours.
Say you're sorry when you hurt somebody. Wash your hands before you eat.
Flush.
Warm cookies and cold milk are good for you.
Live a balanced life. Take a nap every afternoon.
When you go out into the world, watch out for traffic, hold hands, and stick together."

As a professor, I have a vested interest in suggesting that this book's author must have missed something. After all, he just buried the entire enterprise of higher education in the sandpile at Sunday School. Needing help with my critique of Fulghum's thesis, I turned to the readers' book reviews published on Amazon.com.

At first I found nothing but rave reviews filled with comments like:

"This book is a necessity for anyone's life."
"It made me laugh, cry, and think."
"This book cheers me up when I am blue... brings me back to earth when I am off in space."

Suspecting there would be a few cynics somewhere, I pursued my quest until they emerged from the digital darkness. The first critic was somewhat equivocal when he said:

"Some people need more intellectual stimulation, and if you're that type, pick up Kant, Nietzsche, or Carlyle. For those of you who want a simple, easy laugh, grab this book."

A series of critiques were notable for their nastiness:

"Sheep would be insulted by this stupidity."
"Ugh. Drivel. (It's ...) much like watching your neighbor's Nebraska vacation slide show."
"Fulghum was quite correct in stating that all he needed to know he learned in kindergarten. From his writing I would wonder if he made it past 3rd grade."

One reviewer took exception to Fulghum's basic content by writing: "During the twelve minutes it took me to read this in the thrift shop, I found several statements that are of dubious worth. Milk and cookies are not good for the large number of people who suffer from lactose intolerance and struggle with obesity. Flushing five valuable gallons of potable water each time you use a toilet is not necessary or recommended in every situation. Taking naps in the afternoon can disrupt one's sleep pattern at night and is hardly recommended for young, healthy adults."

After reading these criticisms, I was tempted to borrow a phrase from a colleague who summed up his evaluation of a particularly disappointing student thesis with the comment: "Another good title -- wasted!"

It is not my purpose to provide additional critique of a book I haven't read. Rather, I'd like to change the title with the addition of a single word and use it as a mirror against which to examine a few snippets from my personal life history. Drawing from this personal history, I hope to demonstrate the importance of higher education's unique role in the transformation of student lives. Finally, I'd like to suggest there is an important message for our collective decision making here at OSU because "All I Really Need to Know I Did Not Learn in Kindergarten."

Each of us has a personal life history encapsulating individually unique intellectual pilgrimages from birth to the present. To help you understand my message for today, I'm going to ask you to remember a few elements of my personal circumstances. They are as follows:
A. I'm the Faculty Senate President; that's why I'm up here, rather than out there. But that's not important.

B. More important is that I'm a Professor of Geography, and an Africanist.

C. I was born and raised in a small town in Minnesota that we viewed at the time as both ethnically diverse, and sometimes polarized. Germans on the west end, Poles on the east end, with Swedes and Norwegians scattered about the landscape of surrounding farmlands. People of non-European ancestry were nowhere to be seen.

D. In my direct ancestral lineage, no one had graduated from college.

1. My parents started a family as teenagers and supported their five kids with a small concrete business, so when I was in kindergarten, and in the sand pile at Sunday School my role models were White people wearing blue collars who worked in the construction trades.

2. My oldest brother was a truck driver delivering concrete blocks;

3. My second brother was a carpenter;

4. My lone sister was a telephone operator until she eloped with a tool and die maker from the wrong end of town and escaped to Texas to avoid condemnation.

5. While toying with the idea of becoming a brick mason, Matzke child number four (Gordon) was called into the kitchen one day to hear his father say: "I think a Matzke can graduate from college and I've decided that you are the one to do it."

E. From that day to the present, I joined many thousands of laboratory rats used in college psychology experiments aimed at assessing the hypothesis that behavior can change through directed learning. I'd like to suggest some learning is possible, even for postdoctoral kindergarten graduates such as me.

My learning took a huge leap forward when I checked into a university dormitory and found myself alone in an elevator staring face-to-face at a guy who clearly didn't come from the west end of my hometown, nor did he come from the east end, nor even the surrounding farmlands populated by Swedes and Norwegians. Wearing clothes unlike anything I'd ever seen before, his funny looking hat exposed tightly kinked black hair melding into black skin.

Having just returned from a trip to the cowboy West, I thought I'd make the first move by saying: "Howdy" and was surprised to get a strange reply: "Karibu". Now, all of the Swahili speakers in the audience (wherever they are) will immediately recognize this as a friendly exchange commonly heard in East Africa. As one approaches someone else's private quarters, the interloper says: "Hodi" (Hello -- I'm here!) and the resident responds "Karibu" (Come closer – you're welcome!)

In spite of an entire year spent in Kindergarten, and many more years of religious training in the sand pile at Sunday School, it wasn't until I climbed into the elevator of higher education that I, quite by accident, started "speaking in other tongues" and learning of other cultures. The benefits to my personal and professional life of this first "diversity experience" have been incalculable.

During college, my new found friend from Africa was a regular guest in my parents' home, and even now, forty years later, visits to my boyhood home will elicit inquiries from relatives about the man who came from the slopes of Mt. Kilimanjaro to touch their lives via the route of postKindergarten education.

This man encouraged me to come to Africa, met me as I stepped onto African soil for the first time as a Peace Corps volunteer in Tanzania, hosted my parents when they visited his country, and helped guide me through the intricacies of the bureaucracy when I was doing a doctoral dissertation in Tanzania. It's no accident that my first child, Nicholas Joseph, carries the names of the man I met in the elevator – Nicholas Joseph Marinyo.
My learning didn’t stop with that first elevator ride in college. It continued when I joined a student research team examining aspects of changing neighborhoods in Detroit, Michigan. The student team members had ample opportunity to interact as we worked and lived together for an entire summer.

One of those students, Eiddie, an African-American from Los Angeles, had a profound influence on my education. I remember to this day the decidedly different lenses that Eiddie and I brought to the dinner table discussions. Whereas my travel experiences were constrained by time, money and interest, Eiddie introduced me to her family history of traveling "by the book". Although she grew up in Los Angeles, Eiddie's grandparents were in Alabama. When the family drove across the country to visit grandparents, they carried "the book" – an African-American travel guide. As she told it, this was not a guide to sights to be seen along the way. Rather, it was a guide that identified those few establishments permitting people of color to eat, sleep, or even use the restroom.

If my first college elevator ride introduced me to the educational value of international students on campus, Eiddie's travel stories taught me the importance of assembling a diversity of domestic students as well. Neither in kindergarten, nor in the sand pile at Sunday School, had I met people who shared Eiddie's experiences. Within a few weeks of meeting Eiddie, the entire cadre of internship students was marching down Detroit's Woodward Avenue behind Martin Luther King. For this group of students, the diversity among us was a life-transforming circumstance.

The experience of diversity on campus is not only important for students. From my perspective, it's equally important to faculty. Once again, I'll cite several personal examples for illustration.

Even as the pillars of legally sanctioned racial discrimination eroded in the U.S., they persisted in South Africa under a system of racial separation known to the world as apartheid. As the evils of apartheid drew increasing condemnation from the world community, South African sports teams were commonly denied access to world competitions. Some U.S. universities took advantage of these circumstances by recruiting South African student athletes and thereby providing a backdoor route to international competition. As a new assistant professor teaching African geography at one of those backdoor universities, I found in my class two newly arrived white South Africans with firmly held views about the intellectual inferiority of nonwhites – something they had undoubtedly learned in both Kindergarten and the sandpiles at Sunday School. It was fascinating to watch their views change as an African-American pre-dental student emerged not only as the highest scoring student, but the clear intellectual leader, of the class. Their first encounter with student diversity in an American classroom challenged the very basis of everything they had been taught in Kindergarten in a much more profound way than a series of lectures from the class professor ever could. Diversity was the professor in that classroom.

The classroom diversity experience does more than just help the professor teach. It also teaches the professor. Soon after arriving at OSU, I was teaching a large introductory course. During my office hours, a very Asian looking student showed up for a visit. Being a geographer, I often try to guess students' countries of origin by looking for clues in peoples' names, accents, dress, or physical features. In this case, I was puzzled. Her name and physical features pointed straight to Japan, but her clothes and speech patterns provided no confirmation of my initial assessment. When I asked her where she came from, she said she was raised on an onion farm near Ontario, Oregon. This piqued my curiosity and forced me to learn more about Oregon history and geography.

My kindergarten experience had taught me that there were Americans here and Asians over there. It hadn't taught me that there was an Asian-American history that predated the arrival of my great grandparents on this continent. It was because of this diversity encounter at OSU that I started learning about the sad history of the American government's internment of its Japanese ancestry citizens in eastern Oregon and elsewhere in the Western U.S.

I've shared a few vignettes of my personal history for a purpose. That purpose is to illustrate some lessons I've learned that are important for O.S.U. today. For me, the lessons are as follows:

**Lesson # 1.** Many, if not most, students arriving on our campus will have no more experience with diverse people than I did when I left Kindergarten. We must not claim to have advanced their education if we send them home four years later in the same condition.
**Lesson #2.** International students, not just domestic students, contribute greatly to our ability to provide diverse educational experiences. For this reason, I view with great sadness the decade long decline in international student numbers on this campus. Today, fewer than 3 out of every 100 undergraduate students come from overseas. We need to reinvigorate our conversations about the importance of international perspectives on this campus.

**Lesson #3.** The benefits of a diverse campus accrue disproportionately to the majority students, not the minority. Let's not be distracted by arguments about preferential treatment of group X or Y by Affirmative Action or its surrogates. As my experience illustrates, I've benefited enormously from whatever practices were in place that brought an African to the elevator, Eddie to Detroit, the pre-dental student to my classroom, and the onion farmer's daughter from Ontario.

These people were not with me in my Kindergarten, they weren't with me in the sandpile at Sunday School, but they came to me through the vehicle of higher education. We owe it to our students to show them: "All They Really Need To Know They Did Not Learn In Kindergarten".

*Opinions expressed by authors of Faculty Forum articles are not necessarily those of the OSU Faculty or Faculty Senate.*
On Sustained Interdisciplinary Dialogue

In this forum paper, I present a problem: the ongoing failure of faculty to sustain interdisciplinary discourse on a wide range of important topics. My approach will follow three guidelines.

Guideline 1: When approaching a problem, draw a sketch.

Disciplined sketching allows one to see past distracting details to uncover what is fundamental to a problem.

Figure 1. A Simple Sketch Showing How "We" Faculty Tend to Behave.

In this simple sketch, the boxes contain behaviors, incoming arrows provide reasons and outgoing arrows point to consequences. To read this sketch, first read either boxed statement. Then proceed to another statement, forward or backward along the arrow. If you move forward, say "therefore," if backward, say "because." Then, read the next statement.

The above sketch is incomplete because it does not meet my second guideline.

Guideline 2: Every behavior has a reason and a consequence (possibly more than one, but at least one)
Figure 1 fails to meet this guideline because the first behavior in the chain does not have a reason (incoming arrow) and the last behavior does not have a consequence. Guideline 2 can be met by adding one statement and redrawing, as shown in Figure 2.

![Figure 2](image_url)

**Figure 2. A Behavioral Loop: A Sketch of a Pattern That "We" Faculty Tend to Act Out.**
Every behavior has a reason and consequence.

Because of Guideline 2, the sketch appears in the form of a loop. Only in loops do all behaviors have reasons and consequences. "But," you might object, "Figure 2 is not a problem." You are correct; the sketch is incomplete. To complete the sketch, I rely on Guideline 3.

**Guideline 3:** When examining complex human problems, avoid blame, practice confession.

Blame is a form of reductionism, reducing problems to parts rather than seeing problems in terms of whole patterns. Confession is not self-blame but rather honest reflection upon our own behaviors. The purpose of such reflection is to expose the context (whole pattern) within which our normal (usual, common, ongoing) behaviors arise. Guideline 3 is applied by enlarging the loop in Figure 2, adding five behavior statements, and providing several relevant arrows (reasons and consequences). The result is Figure 3.

![Figure 3](image_url)

**Figure 3. A Complex Problem That "We" Faculty Tend to Sustain.** Within the context of this pattern, all behaviors find reasons.

Read through Figure 3. Begin at any statement, then move forward (say "therefore") or backward (say "because"). Wind your way through the entire sketch, reversing directions and looping back, until you
grasp the pattern as a whole. Yes, more is involved, but the advantage of such a sketch is that it uses ordinary language and addresses our own behaviors, lest we merely blame others (recall Guideline 3). I realize that there are important exceptions to such a pattern. I also realize that other factors are involved. But I do feel that Figure 3 can serve to promote reflective inquiry.

A seminar will be held at the following times to discuss this problem (as sketched) with examples of important topics that we have not adequately examined through sustained interdisciplinary dialogue.
  Thursday, October 5, 2000 -- 3:30 p.m., MU 208
  Monday, October 9, 2000 -- 12:30 p.m., MU Learning Lounge (main floor)

Comments can be sent via campus mail to David A. Bella in the Department of Civil, Construction, and Environmental Engineering.
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A SENSE OF LOSS
By
Richard L. Clinton
Professor
Department of Political Science
Oregon State University

October 1999

When an ancient tree is felled or a graceful old building demolished, whatever replaces them seldom lessens my anguished sense of loss. With all the finality of death, what was no longer is, and I feel diminished.

Such is my feeling now as the university I have served for nearly a quarter of a century opts to replace its eloquent and time-honored Guiding Principles and Guidelines with a new, improved, committee-produced statement of Mission, Goals, and Values. Outside input was, of course, solicited, and I provided my two cents worth, which was duly acknowledged and ignored. Hence this note, the purpose of which is to lament a loss, to allow others to decide for themselves whether new is indeed improved, and to suggest that matters of this consequence ought to be voted on by the faculty.

No longer can OSU students, wondering just what they're getting into or are involved with, open the General Catalog and read the stirring assertion that "The highest aspiration of a university is to free people's minds from ignorance, prejudice, and provincialism and to stimulate a lasting attitude of inquiry. Oregon State University shares this aspiration with universities everywhere." Instead, they will confront the blander, less resonant, more prosaic statement: "Oregon State University aspires to stimulate a lasting attitude of inquiry, openness, and social responsibility. To meet these aspirations, we are committed to providing excellent academic programs, educational experiences, and creative scholarship."

No longer will OSU students be alerted to the feature that most distinguishes a university from other educational institutions: "Our social responsibility extends to offering informed criticism even when that criticism may not be well received, and we maintain an internal environment that will nurture this important contribution." On the contrary, they will now discover that "We are committed stewards of the loyalty and good will of our alumni and friends...," which carries the unmistakable implication that we must tread lightly lest we offend some potential donor.

No longer will OSU students encounter such an inspiring and nobly sculpted sentence as "Oregon State University's basic goal is to create a better academic environment for the intellectual and humane development of the men and women of the academic community and to maintain OSU as a center in which the freedoms to think, to learn, to relate, to experiment, and to develop standards of criticism and excellence are encouraged." Nowhere in the new mission statement, in fact, do the words "humane," "criticism," or "excellence" ever occur. In their place we find as a stated criterion for measuring our success "the effectiveness and productivity of engagement with businesses and constituents."

Awkwardly, abstrusely, almost forlornly, the new mission statement confesses that "Oregon State University aspires to be a top-tier university." Whatever happened, I wonder, to the old but altogether sufficient ideal of being a great university?
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"THE BUDGET ALLOCATION PROCESS AT OSU"

BY
M. Carlson, R. Frank, K. Moore, V. Tremblay, J. Young
February 1998

NOTE: Footnotes are noted in brackets. Footnotes appear at the bottom of the appropriate page when printed out; however, for those of you who prefer not to print out the paper, the footnotes are printed at the end of the document.

As members of a Budget Task Force for the College of Liberal Arts (CLA), we have spent much of last and this academic year reviewing OSU's past and current budget allocation process. Although we would like to commend the Administration for working hard to increase student enrollment and to improve the University's budget process, our work has revealed several concerns.

This document describes these concerns and makes several suggestions to further improve the budget allocation process at OSU. It is our hope that this document will lead to continued public discussion about the internal budget allocation process at OSU.

Before we begin, we would like to thank President Risser for taking the lead in developing a new budget approach for the Oregon's higher education system, and we hope that our paper contributes to this discussion as it applies to OSU.

I. The New Budget Approach at OSU

During the past year, the Administration has worked to develop a new approach for allocating budgets within the University. Initially, the OSU Administration considered using the Budget Allocation System (BAS Model), a model developed by OSSHE to determine public college and university budgets in Oregon[1].

Because of problems associated with the BAS Model, the Administration developed a new budget approach, driven, at least in part, by student credit hours (SCH). A major concern with this approach is that it potentially ignores the cost side of SCH generation, and as a consequence, growth in certain areas may actually reduce the economic viability of the University. As is evident from the figures in Table 1, there is a wide discrepancy in the cost effectiveness (i.e., profitability) among colleges [data sources can be found in the College of Liberal Arts document, "CLA Task Force on Budgets" (March 21, 1997)].

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TABLE 1: Profit per SCH for 1993-94</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>College Profit or Loss/SCH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agriculture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engineering</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forestry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H&amp;HP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Home Ec</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liberal Arts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oceanography</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pharmacy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Science</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vet Med</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
While OSU is not a private institution driven by profits alone, and while some colleges within OSU attract more outside funding than others, it is nonetheless questionable fiscal policy to underfund those units that clearly earn a profit from instruction. One could nonetheless argue that OSU will only be able to extract itself from its current fiscal difficulties by redirecting more, not less, of its resources into those units that generate profits for the institution, profits which in turn are needed to help support the higher cost programs that traditionally have been prominent features of the OSU curriculum.

II. Application of the New Budget Approach at OSU

An important concern involves the implementation of the budget allocation process during our last set of budget cuts. According to an article in OSU This Week, one third of the cut in a college's budget "was based on enrollment trends" ("Enrollment History Tied to Budget Questions, OSU This Week, March 6, 1997, p. 1). As a result, the College of Liberal Arts (CLA), for example, received a substantial cut in budget because CLA saw a large drop in student enrollment from 1990-1995.

The reason for concern with this explanation is that it is based on a very limited sample of information about OSU's enrollment and budget histories. To illustrate, consider the budget and enrollment data for a more extended time period, 1982-95 for example, a period for which data are readily available[2].

1. From 1982-95, overall OSU enrollment fell 15.5%. Of the largest colleges CLA was the only one to see an enrollment increase of 2%. Enrollments in agriculture fell 23.0%, engineering fell 23.1%, science fell 34.9%, and business fell 48.0%.

2. Although the Administration is correct to note that CLA enrollments fell from 1990-95, the Administration fails to point out that they rose dramatically from 1982-90 (51.4%). More importantly, CLA saw no substantial budget (real dollar) increase from 1982-90. Yet, CLA's 1996-97 budget is cut dramatically because of the SCH decline since 1990.

3. The enrollment decline in CLA since 1990 is the direct result of purposeful administrative cuts to popular programs (i.e., journalism and broadcast media) in an effort to cover the budget shortfall created by Measure 5. Thus, CLA budgets are cut twice: popular programs were eliminated in CLA because of Measure 5, which resulted in declining SCH and further budget cuts.

4. Enrollment declines have had no adverse effect on college budgets in the past. For example, from 1982-95 engineering had a 23.1% decline in enrollment while its budget rose 66.9%, and business had a 48.0% decline in enrollment while its budget rose 13.2%.

These examples illustrate that funding only follows SCH for CLA when SCH fall. In any case, the Administration's position that declining enrollment justifies a large budget cut to CLA relies on a very select sample of data. This makes clear how important it is for any budget model to first explicitly identify an equitable base budget or year from which to make comparisons. Budget implications are quite different if one chooses 1982 instead of 1990 SCH from which to base budget cuts.

Finally, focusing primarily on SCH may create financial incentives that are not always compatible with the fundamental goals of the University. For example, such a model may encourage departments to duplicate courses in other disciplines. Likewise, it may encourage an advisor in discipline X to advise students into discipline X, regardless of whether or not this advice is in the best interest of the student.

III. Inequalities Among Colleges at OSU

Although all units at OSU are poorly funded, we are concerned that there are serious funding inequalities across colleges at OSU that are not being addressed. Because of our recent work for the college, we focus on funding inequities regarding CLA, but other colleges may be able to make similar claims.

Our analysis demonstrates that although average OSU salaries are generally comparable to salaries at peer institutions, CLA faculty have salaries far below those of faculty members in like departments at peer institutions. The average CLA faculty member earns barely three-quarters of what faculty earn in the same field at peer institutions. To illustrate, Table 2 shows that OSU salaries are generally on par with salaries at peer institutions[3]. Table 3 indicates that of all colleges at OSU, CLA average salaries are lowest. More importantly, the "Salary Ratio" is far below that of any college at OSU[4]. For example, these figures indicate that average CLA salaries are only 77.6% of those from a national survey of faculty salaries during the 1990-91 academic year.
TABLE 2: MEAN SALARIES AT OSU PEER INSTITUTIONS
(All Ranks, 1993-94)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Peer Institutions</th>
<th>Mean Salary (thousands)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>UC-Davis</td>
<td>56.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arizona</td>
<td>53.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iowa St</td>
<td>53.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colorado St</td>
<td>51.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N. Carolina St</td>
<td>50.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OSU</td>
<td>47.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington St</td>
<td>47.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oregon</td>
<td>45.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oklahoma St</td>
<td>44.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kansas St</td>
<td>44.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utah St</td>
<td>42.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AVERAGE</td>
<td>48.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TABLE 3: MEAN SALARIES AND SALARY RATIOS BY COLLEGE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Business</td>
<td>57.7</td>
<td>79.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engineering</td>
<td>60.6</td>
<td>84.9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Science</td>
<td>51.6</td>
<td>85.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vet Med</td>
<td>58.6</td>
<td>88.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pharmacy</td>
<td>50.5</td>
<td>89.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oceanography</td>
<td>55.1</td>
<td>90.6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agriculture</td>
<td>49.7</td>
<td>98.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forestry</td>
<td>49.5</td>
<td>100.7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H&amp;HP</td>
<td>46.1</td>
<td>102.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Home Econ</td>
<td>48.7</td>
<td>103.8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liberal Arts</td>
<td>43.8</td>
<td>77.6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AVERAGE</td>
<td>52.0</td>
<td>90.9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Again, more discussion about the budget process is in order, and we recommend that the Administration establish a committee to address these salary inequities across colleges at OSU.

Finally, it is clear that the Oregon economy is changing away from traditional agricultural-extraction to high-tech industries. Thus, in order for OSU to continue to be a major contributor to development of the state and world economies, to provide a quality education in fields most relevant to the 21st century, and to attract more students, OSU must invest more heavily in the core areas of liberal arts and sciences-- a vision adopted by all of the great land grant universities in the U.S[5].

IV. An Alternative Budget Allocation Model

As administrators ourselves, we are sympathetic to the problem of developing a fair and rational budget allocation model. We also understand that it is much easier to criticize than to suggest a practical alternative. As a result, we have given this issue considerable thought and have designed an alternative that we believe is worthy of consideration.

Our purpose was to develop a budget allocation model that is consistent with the primary goals of the University. In our opinion, such a model should better reflect market conditions, better serve the public by encouraging units to become more competitive with like units at peer institutions, and allow the Administration to help identify specific objectives for the institution. This would require the following:

1. Identify a set of universities that OSU views as peers. Given the unique nature of many programs at OSU, it might be more desirable to do this by college or even by department. This would enable the Administration to set priorities and allow for differences in mission and program type (i.e., undergraduate programs, graduate programs, extension, etc.).
2. By unit (college or department), compare performance with budgets. This could include a comparison of SCH, faculty productivity (research, teaching, and service), faculty salaries, faculty FTE, staff support, and profits with those at peer institutions.

3. Fund each unit in a way that allows the unit to become competitive with peers and is based upon the unit's long-run productivity and profit levels relative to peers.

This model would better ensure the financial health of the institution by paying more attention to profits (and not just SCH). In addition, it would enable the Administration to clearly identify priority programs, since the Administration would determine each unit's set of relevant peers. It would also better reflect the market, as many faculty are concerned with working conditions and salaries relative to peers. Finally, since budgets would be tied to productivity (broadly defined), units would have an incentive to better meet the broad range of goals of the University. This would encourage all of us to improve the academic reputation of OSU.

Because a budget allocation model will have a lasting effect on the reputation and future of OSU, we would encourage the Administration to continue with its open discussion of OSU's budget process and address the concerns we have outlined above.


[2] See our memorandum (April 23, 1997) to Dean Schaffer, "Letter to Editor of OSU This Week: 'Is Enrollment History Tied to College Budgets?" for a more complete description of the data and their sources.

[3] The sample of OSU peer institutions are defined in the Oregon State University Fact Book.

[4] The Salary Ratio measures the average salary by college at OSU divided by the average salary by college at a broad-based national salary survey compiled by the Oklahoma State University. (See the "Budget Allocation System" document for details.)

[5] This will be especially important if the state decides to go forward with discussed plans to undergo "a 'massive transformation' of Oregon's higher-education system by putting the seven state campuses mostly on their own to compete for students and dollars." (Charles E. Beggs, "Planned Overhaul Stirs Waters," Gazette-Times, Corvallis, Oregon, December 9, 1997, p.1)
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"KICK THE KICKER"

BY

John E. Morris
Professor/former Chair, Zoology

October 1995

KICK THE KICKER

In a year when Oregon is the only state in the nation cutting its higher education budget, the legislature has compounded the difficulties for Oregon higher ed by voting not to rescind the "2% Kicker." Such rescission would have given some relief from Measure 5 cuts. The "2% Kicker" law requires the state to return to the taxpayers any revenue above the projected state tax revenue when the revenue exceeds the projected level by 2% or more. This one-sided law does not specify an increase in taxes when the economy is weak, nor does it permit saving the "excess" revenue for such rainy days. In other words, despite the fact that the state economy is booming, higher ed and all other state programs are forced to cut budgets and lay off personnel, but when the economy becomes weak, the higher ed budget will be cut again. Oregon citizens need and deserve quality education, but this is not the way to get it.

Because tax revenues increased more than the 1993-95 projection, individual taxpayers will receive refund checks this November for 6.27% of the amount they paid in 1994 income taxes, according to an article in the September 1 edition of The Oregonian. Corporations will receive tax credits averaging 50% of their taxes! In the presence of this bounty, state programs are starving. In fact, the total tax load for Oregonians per capita and as a percent of personal income has been estimated this biennium to place us well into the lower half of all states. The "2% Kicker" was a quickie attempt to appease voters hungry for tax reform. True tax reform sees that state services grow as the state grows and more citizens have need of its services.

I and those named below have decided that a dramatic and effective way to protest the damage done to Higher Education by the "kicker" is for us, as individual taxpayers and members of the OSU community, to forego the legislature's "Christmas present" to us and reinvest our refund check immediately in higher education. We plan to send our refunds to the OSU Foundation, where we may make a Federal Tax-deductible charitable donation specifying that this money be used directly for instruction or for activities otherwise outside state funding (e.g., scholarships, travel, building funds, etc.). Some of us have decided to give the money with no strings attached, and others will target specific uses and specific colleges, departments, or programs.

We have decided to actively protest this misguided use of state funds when higher ed and other state programs are suffering and have decided that we could show this best by returning our funds where they are critically needed. We feel that this personal sacrifice for all of us, a very difficult one for some, especially coming on the heels of a scant 3% salary increase after three years of no increases, makes a compelling statement about the commitment of state employees to their work.

We have also decided to take out a newspaper advertisement in late October or early November
publicly stating our decision to do this, in an effort to convince others to do the same. We hope that, if enough citizens are willing to make this personal statement for higher education, perhaps our Legislators will get the message that we are serious about the need to support state services.

The risk in a personal action such as this is that it will reinforce the view of some that public programs should, in fact, be funded by private donations. We strongly believe that the funding of higher education in Oregon, as well as other essential state services, are public responsibilities. We are not attempting to alleviate the budgetary shortfall imposed on higher education by the Oregon Legislature but are hoping to make a public statement that will call attention to the impact of the action of the 1995 Legislature. We see our action not as a futile parting shot toward the 1995 legislature but as an opening volley toward the 1997 session. Unless true tax reform and adequate funding of higher education and other state services are implemented soon, all of us in Oregon will suffer the long-term consequences.

The purpose of this Faculty Forum paper is to make known our personal opinions that the "kicker Law" is a bad law and to demonstrate what we see is a powerful way to make this point. We invite others to participate the same way. Those who would like to be included in the statement that will be published, or simply want more information about it, are invited to contact me (morrisj@bcc.orst.edu or 737-5339).

Thank you for considering this opinion,

John E. Morris, Professor/former Chair, Zoology

OSU colleagues who join me in this action:

Carroll W. Dekock, Prof./Chair, Chemistry: former Pres. Faculty Senate
Sally Francis, Prof./Head, Apparel, Int., Housing, & Merch.; Pres. Faculty Senate
Stanley V. Gregory, Prof., Fisheries & Wildlife
Andrew G. Hashimoto Prof./Head, Bioresource Engr.
Joe Hendricks, Prof., Sociology; Dir. University Honors College
Kenneth S. Krane, Prof./Chair, Physics; Pres.-Elect Faculty Senate
Christopher K. Mathews, Distinguished Prof./Chair, Biochem. & Biophysics
Michael Oriard, Prof., English; former Pres. Faculty Senate
Irene Rau, Bus. Mgr., Chemistry; Pres. OSU Management Association
Tudy Seistrup, Office Manager, Home Ec Extension; Pres.-Elect Office Personnel Assn.
Tony Van Vliet, Prof. Emeritus, Forestry; former State Representative
Anthony Wilcox, Assoc. Prof./Chair, Exercise & Sport Sci.; OSU Interinstituional Faculty Senate Representative

The statement below will appear in the advertisement along with the names of those pledging their refunds to OSU.

MAKING THE KICKER SCORE FOR EDUCATION

We, the undersigned, are discouraged by the recent vote of the state Legislature not to override the "2% Kicker" law. Oregon's economy was much healthier in the 1993-95 biennium than projected, but, precisely because of that, the "2% Kicker" law requires over $163 million in unanticipated state income taxes for that period to be returned to individual and corporate taxpayers. At a time when the state economy is booming and a growing population has increasing need of state services, the result of this action is that state-supported education and many other public services will suffer continuing budget cuts even though funds are already on hand to greatly improve the balance.

To help in a small way to alleviate the problem and to demonstrate our commitment to education for all Oregonians, as faculty, staff, and friends of Oregon State University, we individually pledge to send our 2% Kicker refund directly to the OSU Foundation in support of OSU educational programs or to foundations supporting other Oregon public education programs. We are hoping that this act will convince others to do the same and will convince our Legislators to remember until the next session that a strong public sentiment exists for true tax reform.
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"INTERINSTITUTIONAL FACULTY SENATE REPORT TO THE OREGON STATE BOARD OF HIGHER EDUCATION"

by

Anthony Wilcox, Ph.D.

December 1994

EDITOR’S NOTE: The traditional Faculty Forum Paper is written for an OSU faculty audience which constitutes its initial readership. Professor Wilcox’ paper, which follows, varies from this standard convention in that it was composed for and delivered to members of the Oregon State Board of Higher Education, as they met in Portland on December 16, 1994. Because of the vital importance of Measure 8 to everyone connected with higher education in Oregon, Professor Wilcox' full testimony is provided here as a Faculty Forum paper. Because the setting of the original message is central to its theme and impact, the paper's phrasing as testimony before a panel has been left unaltered. (GHT)

Interinstitutional Faculty Senate Report to the Oregon State Board of Higher Education

By way of introduction, I am Anthony Wilcox, Chair of the Department of Exercise and Sport Science at Oregon State University and representative from that institution to the Interinstitutional Faculty Senate. I have been a member of the faculty of OSU since 1987. Thank you for allowing me to speak with you today.

I state the obvious when I inform you that since the passage of Measure 5, things have been very difficult in the Oregon State System of Higher Education (OSSHE): There has been an unconscionable reduction in departments, programs and degrees; student access has been hindered by precipitous increases in tuition; and talented faculty and staff have been lost due to cut-backs or flight to more promising positions. These have been hard times for educators.

But Measure 8 has outraged faculty and staff beyond anything I witnessed during the Measure 5 years. It may be that after years of struggling with the effects of Measure 5, Measure 8 is the proverbial straw that breaks the faculty's back. It may be because Measure 8 hits everyone across the State System, where the cuts brought on by Measure 5 could be directed within each institution in an attempt to preserve the strength of the remaining programs. Or the intensified outrage might be because, suddenly, with Measure 8, it got personal. The individuals in the State System were specifically targeted.

I know that the Chancellor and the members of the Oregon State Board of Higher Education understand that Measure 8 has had a demoralizing effect on faculty and staff, but it is unlikely that you appreciate the extent of this discontent. I am here today to try to convey that to you. The presence of so many of
my colleagues in the audience should also be taken as evidence of the depth of feeling over this issue and the pressing need to respond. Focusing on the injustice of Measure 8, focusing on the lack of appreciation shown us by the citizens of Oregon, and focusing on the injury to our earnings has heightened our awareness of how badly our salaries compare to national standards. This has created a new urgency for the Chancellor and the members of the Board to act decisively to rectify this situation.

There have been some developments in the last two weeks that offer glimmers of hope. Governor Roberts has declared that the 6% contribution to our pensions will be taken pretax, which slightly reduces the financial impact. She has also delayed the implementation of Measure 8 until July 1, 1995. Also, the Republican leadership in the Senate may propose that the excess corporate taxes taken in by the state be used to support higher education rather than being returned to the businesses.

We have in Governor-elect Kitzhaber someone who pledges his support for education. President Frohnmeyer of the University of Oregon is leading one of the legal challenges of Measure 8. And President Byrne of Oregon State University has been strongly advocating across-the-board cost-of-living adjustments for faculty and staff.

We have seen where local units of government all over the state have approved salary adjustments for their employees. They know that these employees have been unfairly victimized by Measure 8. These officials have shown political courage in defending the interests of their employees. Measure 8 allows for this "window of opportunity" to adjust salaries before the measure goes into effect. Some simple-minded critics have pointed out that while such actions comply with the letter of the law, they violate the spirit of the law. An analysis of the measure reveals that it has a spirit that should be violated. Let's consider the violations enacted by Measure 8.

While teachers and city and county workers negotiate their salaries with their localities, we in OSSHE must negotiate with the State legislature. Since this is the case, the legislators should be able to fully appreciate the ways that Measure 8 is a breach of previous agreements between us and them. In one fell swoop, this measure violates two separate negotiations between OSSHE and the legislature: the 6% salary enhancement in 1979 and the wage freeze for this biennium.

As a brief recap, in 1979, when inflation was 11%, the State negotiated a 6% pick-up of the employee contribution to their pension in place of a pay increase. Faculty and staff did not request the pick-up; they preferred a pay raise, but the 6% pick-up was the only deal offered. The advantages of the pick-up to the State were the following: First and foremost, the 6% pick-up was a salary enhancement that was only 1/2 the rate of inflation at that time, so the State got away cheaply while faculty and staff saw further erosion in their earnings. Secondly, with the 6% pick-up, faculty and staff increased their take-home pay without receiving an increase in salary. Therefore, the State did not have to pay any of the increase in benefits that would be associated with an increase in salary. Thirdly, pay raises are given as percentages of the base salary, and a 6% increase in salary that year would have been compounded in future salary increases. With the base remaining unchanged, that compounding did not occur.

So the faculty and staff received a much deserved 6% salary enhancement, but it was very much on terms which favored the State. Fifteen years later, it turns out that these terms disadvantaged the OSSHE employees, for it provided a target for politicians and special interest groups with no sense of obligation to previously negotiated contracts. The true effect of Measure 8 was to rescind the 6% pay raise of 1979, but the backers of the measure disguised their intentions by targeting the 6% pick-up as a special benefit given by the State to its employees. If their motives had been honorable and they truly wished to have state employees contribute to their pensions, there would have been no condition barring the restitution of the earlier pay raise. We, the faculty, expect the legislators to see that the conditions they placed upon the pay raise given in 1979 left us vulnerable to Measure 8, we expect them to honor our previous agreement, and we expect the Chancellor and the Board to vigorously pursue this matter.

The passage of Measure 8 also violated the agreement between the State and OSSHE that salaries would be fixed during this biennium. While freezing salaries, legislators also directed OSSHE to increase teaching productivity and student access to classes. Faculty and staff were realistic about the salary freeze and responsible in accepting it as part of our contribution in dealing with the decreased funding available for Higher Education. And we rose to the challenge of increasing teaching productivity. Many of the people in the audience today were part of the teams of faculty that developed the productivity plans on each campus, and all of us have worked to implement these plans. We have increased the use of technology in the classroom. We have reduced the number of low enrollment classes. We have accentuated the role of senior faculty in undergraduate education. We have revised graduation
requirements. We have shifted resources to be able to respond to student demand for classes. In short, we have changed the culture of the academic community. And throughout this process we have been vigilant about maintaining quality in undergraduate and graduate education. The commitment of OSSHE's faculty and staff has been remarkable, and by whatever yardstick used to measure it (such as student credit hour generation or graduation rates), the results are clearly evident. The House Interim Task Force on Higher Education Review has commended OSSHE for the way it has responded to the need to increase productivity in the face of Measure 5 cuts. With salaries frozen, faculty and staff stepped up their efforts to serve the citizens of the State. Implementing Measure 8 is an appalling breach of faith. At the end of this biennium, our income will be reduced by 6%. Outrage is the only reasonable response to these circumstances.

Our economic fate is in the hands of the legislature. We have bargained in good faith, and we have been betrayed. When bold and decisive leadership is called for from the Chancellor and the Board, we find them appearing to be timid in advancing our case to the legislators. There must be institutional memory in the halls of Salem. School boards and city and county commissioners have come to the defense of their employees; you must do the same. Since Measure 8 invalidates the agreement to hold salaries constant during this biennium, give us the cost-of-living adjustments for the last two years the moment Measure 8 takes effect.

At our most recent meeting of the OSU Faculty Senate, Professor Wil Gamble spoke very eloquently concerning his response to the passage of Measure 8. He described the lessons in living that he learned from his great-grandmother. Wil's ancestors were slaves, and he would ask his great-grandmother about slavery and how it could exist in a country founded on the principle that all men are created equal and possess certain inalienable rights. Her answers resonate in his memory: that "slavery is the total absence of personal dignity in a place that is lacking in compassion." She also told him that "people do not always take seriously those things that they write down, and profess to live by and believe." The goal in life, she said, was to "survive with dignity."

Dr. Gamble decried as an affront to our dignity the injustice forced upon us because someone can purchase 50,000 signatures at $1 apiece, place a measure on the ballot, and, by a mere plurality, change the Constitution of this state. We ask that the legislators take seriously those things that they wrote down in 1979 and 1993.

The significance of an African-American professor standing up at the Faculty Senate meeting and speaking about slavery, dignity, and Measure 8 should not be lost on the members of the Board. In a recent Board meeting, you reviewed the progress toward increasing the number of minorities on the faculties at the OSSHE institutions. While some progress has been made, much more is needed. Achieving these goals requires that we be very aggressive in attracting good candidates for positions, because it is extremely competitive among colleges and universities vying to hire the available minority candidates. And, once hired, retaining these individuals is just as important. One of the devastating effects of Measure 8 is that many faculty are looking for other opportunities. We cannot afford to wait until the end of the legislative session to respond to critical salary issues. It is imperative that the Board take preemptive action. Assure the faculty that they will receive a cost-of-living adjustment. In addition, you must make salary enhancement the top priority in your objectives for the next legislative session.

Oregonians must confront the implications of continued underfunding of Higher Education. The traditional role of public higher education in the United States has been to make education available to anyone, regardless of income, who was capable of taking advantage of it and willing to work hard. In Oregon, we are in danger of abandoning that at a time when other states and other countries have decided that the prosperity of their people depends on their education. We are also doing it at a time when the number of students graduating from Oregon's high schools is about to increase dramatically. The citizens and legislators of Oregon must now decide whether they wish to provide for this generation of students the kind of accessible, high quality education that was provided for previous generations. They must also decide whether they want a system of higher education that will serve the needs of professionals and so attract new industry to the state.

The October 19th edition of The Chronicle of Higher Education reported that Oregon had the largest reduction of all the states in its support for higher education over the last two years. While Alabama, Georgia, Idaho, Mississippi and New Mexico increased their funding of higher education by 13-37%, Oregon decreased it by 15%. As you well know, we have had to drastically increase tuition to help offset this reduction in support. As a result, it is becoming increasingly difficult for Oregonians to afford to attend their public institutions. We are fast approaching a time where the tuitions will be so high that the majority of our incoming freshman classes will be from out-of-state.
Using data published in the March/April 1994 issue of Academe, OSSHE faculty are paid approximately 20% less than faculty at comparable institutions in other states. This disparity must be addressed. Measure 8 has created a discontent among faculty that makes continued service to a state that undervalues our efforts increasingly untenable. Last July, the Board recommended annual 3% salary increases for the 1995-97 biennium, and I have seen no revision of that request to the Governor. That just will not do. Measure 8 has widened the gap between OSSHE salaries and the national norm. It is time we properly compensated the dedicated faculty and staff who have worked so hard during these difficult times to maintain excellence in our public institutions of higher education.

This is the charge we put to you, Chancellor Cox, and the members of the Board.

_____________________________

EDITOR'S ENDNOTE: Following upon Professor Wilcox' testimony, the State Board formulated a resolution, worded as follows: "First, to make equity for faculty salaries a priority in the 1995 legislative session. Second, to state our unanimous and heartfelt support for faculty and staff, gratitude for their past service to the people of Oregon, and our commitment to obtain the resources necessary to offset inflationary decreases and to provide for equitable increases in salary for faculty and staff." The resolution passed unanimously. (GHT)

Opinions expressed by authors of Faculty Forum articles are not necessarily those of the OSU Faculty or Faculty Senate.
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Offensive Speech and the First Amendment in the Classroom
James C. Foster
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Background

Sometime during Fall Term 1992, the pledge class of Phi Delta Theta fraternity commissioned the printing of a sexually explicit image on a white T-shirt as a fund raising project. Designed for general sale in conjunction with the annual Oregon State University (OSU)/University of Oregon (UO) Civil War November football ritual, the T-shirt's printed image depicts a male beaver in OSU colors sexually forcing himself upon a female duck in UO colors. The posture of the male beaver is aggressive, pulling the duck's hair as he enters her from behind. The female duck is crying, as though she is asking the beaver for mercy. The T-shirt displays the phrase "Fuck the Ducks."

At some point in February, a Phi Delta Theta member wore one of these T-shirts to one of his classes on campus at OSU. The class he attended was a regularly scheduled offering in the OSU College of Liberal Arts. The course also was among those fulfilling one of the Perspectives requirements in OSU's undergraduate baccalaureate core. A female student in this class found the T-shirt so offensive that she wrote a letter of complaint to the OSU Barometer.

Question

What actions might a faculty member take in response to the wearing of such a T-shirt in his or her class, in accordance with the animating values of the First Amendment to the United States Constitution? (2)

Discussion

My view is that expressions such as the Phi Delta Theta T-shirt, which are offensive speech, require an opportune faculty classroom response to maintain an open learning environment. I think the mode that this response should take is for the faculty member to convert such a display of offensive speech into an occasion for students to discuss how to reconcile competing values of free speech and social responsibility within an academic community. Further, I believe that this response is in tune with First Amendment concerns.
Offensive Speech

The Phi Delta Theta T-shirt constitutes "offensive speech" on several grounds.

First, in the ordinary language sense of the term, the portrayal is "offensive or repulsive to the senses; loathsome." (3)

Second, under federal constitutional standards, the T-shirt may be deemed a form of "fighting words" and as "obscene." In a 1942 decision, the Supreme Court defined fighting words as "... those which by their very utterance inflict injury ..." (4) In 1973, the Court defined obscenity as a work that "taken as a whole, appeal[s] to the prurient interest in sex, which portray[s] sexual conduct in a patently offensive way, and which, taken as a whole, do[es] not have serious literary, artistic, political, or scientific value." (5)

Third, the T-shirt violates women. The T-shirt portrays a rape experience--the male beaver is having his way with the female duck against her will. He is dominating her via his penis. As such, the portrayal is a manifestation of this society's rape culture, which encourages and condones violations of women. That rape culture is rooted in a "culture of sexual inequality" that "fuses dominance with sexuality." (6)

The T-shirt is not a passing lapse of judgment. Nor is it merely, as The Oregonian dismissively saw it, "the stuff of sick humor...[s]ophomoric humor." (7) The t-shirt is a damaging form of expression. As I wrote in reply to The Oregonian editorial, the T-shirt "is symptomatic of the cultural devaluation and objectification of American women." (8)

Faculty Response

When a member of the teaching faculty is offended by something like the Phi Delta Theta T-shirt, or when a student brings to a faculty member's attention some classroom expression s/he has found offensive, the faculty member should thematize it. In other words, the faculty member should make an issue of it. An issue should be made of offensive speech for several reasons, all related to maintaining an open atmosphere conducive to learning.

First, faculty silence condones offensive speech. By not calling attention to expressions which demean, faculty members tacitly validate them. The faculty member's silence may convey the message that the speech in question is not consequential enough to merit examination. Faculty inaction can be a destructive form of action that undermines learning. In the face of offensive speech, faculty silence can silence students.

Second, faculty silence in the face of offensive speech compromise the integrity of the teaching-learning process. Education entails something of a "social contract." A central feature of his informal, yet crucial, agreement requires that classroom participants are civil towards one another. When female class members view speech like the Phi Delta Theta T-shirt, they may feel marginalized, as though they have been rendered objects of eroticized domination or, at worst, may suffer reliving past violations. Male class members may feel categorized, as though rape behavior is the litmus test of "manhood" (or School Spirit?). When a faculty member does not respond to offensive speech, or fails to make an issue of speech a student finds offensive, the classroom contract is breached because incivility prevails.

Third, faculty silence results in missed opportunity. As teachers, part of what we do involves engaging our students in conversations about their relations with other people. I submit that these sorts of conversations are pertinent to classrooms across the university. Just as writing is a necessary skill more effectively imparted "across the curriculum" instead of being ghettoized in composition courses, our orientations toward other human beings (in the Phi Delta Theta T-shirt situation, women) are as appropriate a subject for science, engineering and business courses as liberal arts courses.

I understand the impulse simply to ignore offensive speech. Why "dignify" it by responding at all? Why open up a messy can of worms? Why take up limited class time with distracting, divisive issues? my reply to these sorts of reservations is this: Being members of a general social community committed to free speech, as well as being members of an academic community committed to free speech, as well as being members of an academic community committed to pursuing truth, university professors are obligated to facilitate responsible speech. This position is a restatement of the generally held view that our enjoyment of the right to free speech carries with it a corresponding obligation to speak responsibly. (9)

First Amendment Values
In arguing that OSU faculty should respond to offensive speech by making an issue of it, I believe I am
advancing core First Amendment norms.

First, challenges are the life-blood of the First Amendment. As civil libertarian Justice William O.
Douglas wrote in Terminiello v. Chicago: "[A] function of free speech under our system of government
is to invite dispute. It may indeed best serve its high purpose when it induces a condition of unrest,
creates dissatisfaction with conditions as they are, or even stirs people to anger." (10) Making an issue
of gender attitudes such as those on display in the Phi Delta Theta T-shirt vivifies the First Amendment.

Second, under the First Amendment, offensive speech must occasion more speech. The brothers of Phi
Delta Theta are free to display their offensive attitudes towards women on T-shirts like the ones on
which they "made a killing." Likewise, students and faculty have a First Amendment right to make an
issue of those attitudes. University classrooms are ready-made forums for give-and-take over the
question of free speech and responsible speech. The First Amendment holds that "debate on public
issues should be uninhibited, robust, and wide-open . . . [even thought] it may well include vehement,
caucustic and sometimes unpleasantly sharp attacks . . . ." (11)

Third, the appropriate First Amendment posture of university officials, such as faculty members, vis-a-
vis offensive speech is neither to ban it nor tolerate it, but to harness it to principled pedagogical ends.
(12) University professors ought not to set themselves up as censors: "If some ideas are intrinsically
false and ought not to be communicated, who should have the authority to censor them?" ask law
professors Paul Brest and Sanford Levinson. (13) Tolerance is also unacceptable. University professors
ought not to ignore offensive speech: "Laissez-faire might be an adequate theory of the social
preconditions for knowledge in a nonhierarchical society." (14)

In our imperfect, hierarchical society, First amedment values should suffuse education, especially
education at a public land-grant institution like OSU. In Short, we should practice the values we preach.

(1) My thanks to Laurel Ramsey and Dave Sterns for their thoughtful reading and helpful suggestions. Thanks to Gary Tiedeman and
Vickie Nunnemaker for their editorial assistance.

(2) N.B.: This paper is not a legal memo. It offers no formal legal opinions on the constitutionality of faculty responses under either
the federal or Oregon constitutions. Rather, it is a position paper advocating a specific sort of faculty response consonant with the
First Amendment to the United States Constitution and, hence, presumable legitimate under it.


82, 92.


(8) Unpublished letter on file with author.

(9) This view accords with the institutional commitments underpinning the anti-discriminatory harassment policies promulgated in
the 12/91 OSU brochure, "Sticks and Bones Can Break My Bones but Words Can Never Hurt Me."

(10) 337 U.S. 1 (1949)


(12) My position is in contrast to Bethel School District No. 403 v. Fraser, 478 U.S. 675, holding that public high school officials need
not tolerate student speech inconsistent with its "basic educational mission, " hence could discipline a student for having delivered a
sexually explicit speech at a school assembly.

(13) Paul Brest and Sanford Levinson, Processes of Constitutional Decisionmaking: Cases and Materials (Boston: Little, Brown, 1983),
p. 1094.
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"Diversity" Courses: Blueprint for an Illiberal Education

The draft proposal for "incorporating diversity into the curriculum" recently circulated through the Faculty Senate has taken a bad idea and made it worse. The original plan (Faculty Senate Circular 10/16/91) was to introduce a single required course called "Affirming Diversity." The new plan is to require students to choose from an approved menu of soon-to-be-generated "diversity" classes, tentatively to be called "Confronting Prejudice and Discrimination." Both plans have in mind the same kind of course. Each uses the term "diversity" in a deliberately equivocal way, referring both to diversity in the curriculum and to a certain demographic diversity on campus. I know of no department in this University that wouldn't love to have the resources to broaden its teaching and research program. The proposed course requirement doesn't promote curricular diversity; it promotes an ideological agenda.

The "Diversity" Course Proposal is Ill-Concealed Ideology

The proposal's ideological nature is clear even in its grammar. Students would be asked to affirm an idea or to "confront" (expose and reject) it. Affirming and confronting are acts of the will. Our one-thousand-year university tradition is to guide students' intellects in distinguishing good from bad propositions, in pursuing truth. Right choices follow from right thinking, not (except in a broader developmental sense) the other way around. No university course should be titled to imply that it will teach students to affirm or reject something.

There is no sense in the revised proposal of any progress from a will-based to an intellect-based construct. Only one thing has changed: the original malignancy now threatens to metastasize from one course to ten or twenty. A new bureaucracy would be born, including approval committee, tenure track position, teaching assistants, and funded workshops. What a bizarre idea in an era of constricting University resources.

"Diversity" and Other Shibboleths
Has anyone bothered to examine the naked (and recently born) emperor called "diversity"? Diversity can indeed be valuable, as in the virtues of maintaining a distribution of talents in an organization. In other senses, homogeneity is more desirable, as in product quality control or equal commitment to fair play in a sport. Sometimes, it is refreshing to be in company of a wide range of views and outlooks; at other times, there is no substitute for the intimacy and implicit understanding one can share with individuals of similar culture and values. Diversity is not something unequivocally to affirm.

The course organizers confine their diversity to a very narrow subset of human characteristics. Among the myriad physical, psychological, and moral factors we employ in judging people for various purposes (e.g. height, beauty, intelligence, honesty, extroversion, artistic talent, willingness to risk), we are told already which are important: race, gender, age, sexual orientation, religion, and presence of handicap. These are most important, says OSU This Week (11/14/91), because of "concerns...about racism and other intolerance." The characteristics have been selected, in other words, to satisfy campus political groups who had the "concerns." OSU might affirm diversity in physical beauty also, but agents to lobby for it aren't strong enough. We have, then, a course theme based on political power relations rather than on intellectual merit.

A result of such politicization is that much of the student's thinking is pre-processed; she need now only affirm diversity in, or nondiscrimination against, the characteristics identified for her through campus political action. As if to dispel any uncertainty that affirmation will indeed be urged, the original course Rationale described unnamed opinions about age and homosexuality as "agism" and "homophobia." Even before discussion begins, we are told that dissidents harboring the latter opinion are fearful (weak) and sick (they have a phobia). Reasoned opinion cannot be expected from mentally ill students; medical care is more appropriate. If so, the care would be provided more effectively by trained psychologists than by university professors.

**Toward a True Liberal Education**

One could design a bona fide course on the morality of individuals' judgments about others. The course would involve distinctions between private and public choices, between various senses of the word "public" (open-to-view, affecting-many, state-owned), and between ethically charged and ethically neutral characteristics. It could not fail to examine the complex interrelations between civil and property rights and to explore the crucial role of each of these two types of rights in a free society. Such profound ethical and constitutional issues cannot be treated seriously without appealing to the best minds on the subject: to such as Aristotle, Avicenna, Locke, Burke, Kant, Jefferson, Hamilton, Austen, and Dostoyevsky. That is, of course, to ask students to pursue the fundamentals of a liberal education.

Despite pro forma references to course breadth and ideological neutrality ("liberal education," "provide a forum," "diversity points of view"), a liberal education is the farthest thing from Affirming Diversity's or Confronting Prejudice and Discrimination's soul. Any newspaper reader will tell you that "diversity" is current code language for one of the two competing views of how to enforce civil rights in America. This view is that certain groups should be officially designated as victimized and that all individuals in such groups be granted special preferences to help overcome the group's victim status. The alternative viewpoint is that violation of one individual's civil rights should not be used as a basis for compensating a second individual with the same characteristics, unless the second individual's rights also have been violated. Redress, in other words, should be accorded to individuals, not to classes. The class-based rhetoric in the "diversity" course proposal makes clear an intention to favor the one civil rights platform over the other.

Can this be justified at a publicly supported university? At any university? I argue it cannot. Impolite, uncivil, or illegal behavior on this campus should be met with counseling or administrative or legal sanctions, as appropriate, against the offending parties. The offenses are not remedied by hauling every student, guilty and innocent alike, into a classroom exercise promising to be ethically and intellectually bankrupt.

**Handling Intolerance in an Effective Way**

The mid-control character of courses on "affirming diversity" and "confronting prejudice and discrimination" becomes clear when you check to see whether the shoe fits the other foot. A growing form of intolerance on this campus is that directed toward legitimate editorials about current events. The intolerance comes in the form of a demonstration or press statement, the message of which is that the editorial irked someone and hence should be muffled. Slogans and political action replace thoughtful efforts at refutation. These are recent manifestations of the familiar attacks on academic freedom which universities have weathered for a millennium. Should the University corral the offenders into a new "course" on how to respect academic freedom? That would be insulting and patronizing. Far
more effective and, at a time of budget retrenchment, less costly is for the Administration to continue to emphasize publicly that attempts to suppress opinion and dissent on this campus will not be heeded.

By the same token, we should resist efforts to patronize our students with "courses" on how to treat on another. Pseudo-academic jargon designed to make such classes sound like part of a liberal education simply won't wash. The proposed program is illiberal, unacademic, and insulting and thus an illegitimate expenditure of dwindling university resources. If we do not recognize this now, students and taxpayers will be telling us later.

*Opinions expressed by authors of Faculty Forum articles are not necessarily those of the OSU Faculty or Faculty Senate.*
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EDITOR'S PREFACE

The two companion pieces which comprise this issue of Faculty Forum Papers were invited by the Faculty Senate Executive Committee: a statement in support of the waiver of access provision from Graham Spanier, Provost and Vice president for Academic Affairs, and a statement in opposition from Court Smith, Department of Anthropology. Under the subsequent coordination of John Dunn, Associate Vice President for Academic Affairs, six faculty members were invited to draft the statement in support. The ensuing documents are intended as an essential component of the final resolution of an issue which has stirred considerable controversy and debate on the OSU campus for several years. A faculty opinion ballot is attached, and provost Spanier has indicated that the outcome of that ballot will heavily influence the administration's continuation or discontinuation of waiver policy as it now stands. Hence, your careful reading, consideration, and discussion of the relative merits of the opposing arguments presented here is strongly encouraged as preparation for your vote.

The two papers were authored independently. Each prime author (or coordinator) was given free reign in terms of both style and content. Neither, party, by editorial discretion, was given access to the other's finished product for purposes of revision or expansion. The fact that many points of argument appear in common is a result of natural coincidence, not of prestructured outline or of ongoing mutual consultation.

Order of presentation follows the formal debate standard of Affirmative - Negative.

Finally, a warning about semantics is in order. Common campus parlance identifies the issue in question as the "waiver of confidentiality" issue, and each document herein makes some use of that terminology. Quite to the contrary, technically speaking, an individual who utilizes the current provision does not "waive" confidentiality of letters of evaluation, but, rather, authorizes it. What exists prior to the candidate's signing of a waiver agreement is his/her access to the entire dossier; what exists following signature is his/her abrogation of the right to view letters submitted by specified referees. The correct terminology, therefore, is "waiver of access" rather than "waiver of confidentiality." An awareness of this local linguistic oddity may assist the reader in evaluating an issue otherwise prone to eliciting mild confusion.

Gary H. Tiedeman, Editor
Faculty Forum Papers
In Support:

Confidentiality and the Promotion and Tenure Process:
The "Waiver of Access" at OSU

Confidentiality in the promotion and tenure process is of increasing concern to faculties and administrators throughout the United States. Ultimately the central issue concerns the desires for fairness on the one hand and candor on the other. Often these goals are perceived as being in conflict, but this need not be the case. The common objective of faculty and administrators is a system in which candidates can be assured of fair and impartial evaluations of their credentials. We believe that a system that includes an optional Waiver of Access can be both fair and impartial, and that it can work to the advantage of candidates for promotion and tenure.

By signing the Waiver of Access, candidates voluntarily waive the right to review letters of evaluation solicited on their behalf on or off campus in the process of a review for consideration of promotion and/or tenure. The candidate retains the right of full access to evaluations and recommendations by the department chair or head, departmental and college promotion and tenure committees, dean, and provost.

The use of the Waiver of Access at OSU has a short but successful history. The first discussion regarding the Waiver occurred during the 1986-87 academic year, when OSU's new promotion and tenure policies were being formulated. The discussion included an open forum sponsored by the Faculty Senate, study by a Faculty Senate committee, joint meeting between the Faculty Senate and Administrative Promotion and Tenure Committees, two debates at Faculty Senate meetings, a campus-wide faculty survey, and numerous discussions in the Dean's Council, the University Administrative Promotion and Tenure Committee, and other administrative groups.

The faculty survey response and Faculty Senate votes were almost evenly divided on use of the waiver. Many department heads and deans expressed strong sentiment that confidential peer review should be available to faculty members who choose to exercise this right. Given this background and with the urging of many administrators and faculty, President Byrne elected to make the Waiver of Confidentiality available.

The use of the waiver has coincided with an increased approval rate and a decreased number of appeals. Since 1987-88, the first year the waiver was implemented, the approval rate of dossiers at the central administrative review level has improved from less than 70% to well over 90%, a dramatic increase. The record also suggests that there is no penalty for choosing to request that letters be open. In 1987-88, approximately 85% of the candidates signed the waiver. Of the 11 individuals who did not sign the waiver, a positive decision was made in nine cases, a proportion similar to the approval rate for those that did sign the waiver. In the last two years, similar internal records have not been maintained to avoid any potential bias, but the pattern is believed to be the same. In addition, fewer faculty have found it necessary to initiate promotion and tenure related grievances since implementation of the voluntary waiver, an indicator that faculty have found the review process to be fair.

We believe a system that includes the waiver offers several advantages:

(1) In most disciplines, confidential evaluations are standard practice. In these disciplines, strict confidentiality is standard practice in reviewing manuscripts, research proposals, career development, awards etc. Reviewers are accustomed to writing such evaluations, and scholars are accustomed to considering and, if necessary, rebutting them.

(2) Candidates may regard the lack of confidentiality as an impediment. Some candidates may feel that confidential letters encourage more candid and thus often more significant comments. Denying such candidates the option of confidential letters may be perceived by them as weakening their chances for promotion and/or tenure. The Waiver must be available as an option for those candidates who feel it is beneficial. It is unjustifiable to force such candidates to participate against their will in an open process, which they believe may place them at a disadvantage. Candidates must have the option to choose the
system that, in their opinion, will result in the strongest dossier, given practices of their discipline.

(3) **Without the Waiver, it may be difficult to attract qualified and willing reviewers.** Certainly one does not wish to encourage irresponsible reviewers who hide behind the cloak of confidentiality to offer unjust criticisms of a candidate. Nevertheless, in many fields it may be difficult to attract competent reviewers without confidentiality. In an open system, forcing the candidate to settle for mediocre reviewers may weaken the case.

(4) **Faculty and Administrators may give more weight to confidential letters.** Administrators and promotion and tenure committee members may give more weight to confidential letters. In these cases, strong confidential letters from outside reviewers may serve to help insure that the process of review by administrators and colleagues is as objective as possible. It is entirely possible that those involved in the promotion and tenure process - administrators as well as faculty members - will attach greater credence to letters which adhere to standards of confidentiality. Confidentiality may work to the candidate's favor in the face of disparate opinion. Neither praise nor criticism are as easily discredited when letters are intended to be confidential.

(5) **Without the Waiver, it is difficult to obtain candid comments from students.** OSU regulations stipulate that input from students is required in matters of promotion and tenure, but anonymous written evaluations are not permitted. Students who know that a faculty member has full access to letters of evaluation are unlikely to offer significant comments. In an open system, negative letters of evaluation from students will be rare and every open dossier will include only positive student letters. As a result, the student evaluation component of the P&T process will be weakened and will be largely ignored.

Although we believe the advantages of confidential evaluations far outweigh any limitations associated with their use, we also recognize that some conditions regarding the use of the waiver may require further study.

(1) **The candidate must give informed consent.** The present Waiver of Access document provides guidance to the candidate in making an informed decision. There may need to be more detailed arguments or and against the Waiver presented to the candidate. Such a document should be developed in consultation with the Faculty Senate's Promotion and Tenure Committee and reviewed by the Faculty Senate.

(2) **Candidates should not feel coerced to sign the waiver.** There is a general perception that administrators prefer confidential letters of evaluation. It must be made clear to all that the choice of signing the Waiver is the candidates' alone. The department chair may offer the pros and cons of signing the waiver, but should not attempt to influence the candidate. Regardless of the candidate's decision, the integrity of the review process should be maintained.

(3) **The candidate should be able to participate in the selection of names from the pool of outside evaluators.** Current guidelines call for participation of the candidate in the process of selection of outside reviewers. Further discussion of the process may be called for. Letters should not be requested from reviewers with whom the candidate has professional disagreements. When candidates are asked to provide a list of names for the pool of reviewers, perhaps they should also be asked for names to be excluded.

(4) **Promotion and tenure decisions require peer input.** OSU policy indicates clearly that the promotion and tenure guidelines for each college shall insure input from peers. Given the confidential nature of letters solicited under the Waiver of Access policy, it is essential that department/peer reviewers be selected carefully. OSU is proud of its faculty's involvement in the governance of the University and believes that decisions concerning composition and selection of P&T committee members should be reviewed by the unit's faculty and primary administrator to insure that the method of selection is fair and impartial.

(5) **The reviewers should be asked primarily for an evaluation on the candidate's work and its impact on the profession.** Further discussion may be called for on the question of whether outside letters should consider questions such as whether the faculty member being reviewed would receive tenure or promotion at the institution of the reviewer. OSU faculty and administrators may not be familiar with standards for promotion and tenure at the reviewer's institution. It may be difficulty, therefore, to offer rebuttal to such comments even when the institution is known.

(6) **The candidate must have the opportunity to offer a written rebuttal to the letters of evaluation.** To
facilitate this process, the department chair (or the chair of the departmental P&T committee) should prepare for the candidate a summary of the positive and negative comments made in the letters. Current guidelines provide that the summary statements and letters of recommendation provided by department and college committees, and department and college administrators, be open for review. Such summary statements include a review of the content (without attribution) of outside letters. There may need to be more specification in the guidelines about the extent of such summaries. While candidates now have the opportunity to rebut these summary letters, the guidelines may need to be revised to specifically present the candidate with the opportunity to comment on such letters.

Recent court cases have held universities accountable for abuses of confidentiality in the promotion and tenure process. Confidentiality has in rare instances served as a means to exclude underrepresented groups, specifically minorities and women, from the ranks of senior faculty. We abhor such abuses of the legitimate process of evaluation. Our goal is to give candidates every benefit available in the promotion and tenure process. We believe that an optional Waiver of Access is consistent with this goal.

Statement Prepared By:

Linda Blythe
A. Morrie Craig
John Fryer
Joe Hendricks
Ken Krane
Henry Sayre

In Opposition:

Position to Remove the Waiver from the Promotion and Tenure Review Process

We should return to the policy used successfully at OSU prior to 1986 that allows access by the faculty member to all information used by the University in performance, promotion, and tenure evaluations. No personnel records should be concealed from the person which form the basis of these deliberations. This principle was part of the personnel evaluation process at Oregon State University until the current administration instituted "a voluntary waiver of confidentiality" for outside evaluation letters used in promotion and tenure decisions.

Oregon law does not support the current use of confidential waivers. The faculty have debated this issue many time since 1987, and in each case a majority supports making all information used in the review process available to the person being reviewed. There is no evidence showing that review information provided with a promise of confidentiality is better than evaluations where there is openness.

Why support this position?

1. It is Oregon Law. ORS 351.065 and State Board of Higher Education Administrative Rule 580-22-075 state, "When evaluating employed members, the Board, its institutions, schools, or departments shall not solicit nor accept letters, documents, or other materials, given orally or in written form, from individuals or groups who wish their identity to be kept anonymous or the information they provide kept confidential, except for student evaluations made pursuant to rule 580-22-100."

State law does not provide for waiver of this right. The current administration seeks to impose confidentiality without proper legislative or judicial authority. The Faculty Senate has not received a report from the administration on the December 9, 1987 request for an Attorney General opinion on the legality of the confidential waiver. The administrator's confidentiality waiver could cause significant State liability and expense.
The State Board of Higher Education argued the need for confidential peer reviews before the Oregon Legislature when the rules for evaluation were first proposed. Legislators rejected their arguments by passage of the prohibition on confidential information in personnel files (Recommendations from Promotion and Tenure Committee to Faculty Senate President, November 24, 1987, p.4).

2. The majority of faculty have consistently opposed confidential letters. The Faculty Senate at the June 7, 1990 meeting voted 75 to 9 to affirm its opposition to the waiver of confidentiality. The Provost (Memorandum of July 25, 1990, p.1) in responding to the Faculty Senate action summarizes previous deliberations on this issue and cautions against changing the policy "established after such an extensive process on the basis of the very limited discussion that occurred in the June meeting." The Provost indicates that there was "strong sentiment among administrators on campus that confidential peer review should be available to faculty members who desire it."

Contrary to the implications of this memorandum, this issue has been debated often and extensively. The majority of faculty have consistently opposed confidential letters (Faculty Senate Minutes and Faculty Senate Promotion and Tenure Committee memoranda and annual reports). The Faculty Senate Promotion and Tenure Committee reviewed the waiver issue in 1987-88 and removed language allowing for confidential letters submitted in promotion and tenure guidelines drafted by the Provost's Office. The Faculty Senate defeated motion 87-424-6 (November 5, 1987) to add language restoring confidentiality to the promotion and tenure guidelines. A survey of faculty who participated in a Faculty Senate sponsored forum on the promotion and tenure guidelines, before the November 1987 meeting, showed faculty opposed, 2 to 1, to confidential letters. At the January 14, 1988 Faculty Senate meeting, "No motion was made to reinstate the waiver." The Promotion and Tenure Committee sponsored motion 89-457-03, which opposed use of the waiver until the legal status was settled. This motion passed unanimously at the April 6, 1989 Faculty Senate meeting.

3. Faculty do not perceive the waiver as free choice. While the administration, both in thought and deed, emphasizes the confidential waiver as a right, those signing the waiver do not see themselves as exercising a right or free choice. Those signing the waiver feel intimidated to sign it. They fear that if they do not sign it, their promotion package will be viewed in a discriminatory way against them.

The Memorandum from Promotion and Tenure Committee to Faculty Senate President (November 24, 1987, p.3) states, "During the 1986-87 promotion evaluation process, faculty members who signed the waiver (versus those who did not) were clearly identified. Faculty Senate representatives observed that signing, or not signing, the waiver often was noted and apparently considered by the Administrative Promotion and Tenure Committee in their review of candidates' dossiers."

4. Confidentiality cannot be guaranteed. The Supreme Court of the United States unanimously ruled in January 1990 that universities accused of discriminating in tenure decisions must make relevant personnel files available to federal investigators (See 110 S.Ct. 577 [1990]). Because of the issues in the case, the court did not indicate whether this applied to other jurisdictions or the individual involved. The Court's decision raises the question of whether confidentiality can be promised to writers of letters of reference (Chronicle, Jan. 24, 1990, p. B1; ACADEME, May-June 1990, pp.31-35; and AAUP, personal communication).

Many universities and academic organizations argued before the Supreme Court in support of confidential peer review. The Equal Opportunity Employment Commission and many civil rights groups filed briefs arguing that secrecy can be used as a shield for discrimination. The Supreme Court emphasized the need to prevent discrimination. It argued that, "The costs that ensue from disclosure, however, constitute only one side of the balance. As Congress has recognized, the costs associated with racial and sexual discrimination in institutions of higher learning are very substantial. Few would deny that ferreting out this kind of invidious discrimination is a great if not compelling governmental
5. Candor does occur in open review processes. Confidential letters are alleged to provide more objective data and allow reviewers to be more candid in their appraisals. Evidence to support this assumption was not presented to the Supreme Court, and Justice Blackmun described this claim as "speculative." Bednash (1989, p.323) finds from her study of highly selective liberal arts colleges that offer half their degrees in arts and science, "Confidential review processes are not a prerequisite to selectivity."

Universities find that openness "boosts faculty members' morale and their confidence that fair decisions are being made" (Chronicle, February 2, 1990, p. A19). The University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill, has had an open system for a decade. An attorney for the University believes "the quality of external letters is about the same as it was in the years when confidentiality was the rule." During the time open letters were used at OSU, letters did provide evaluation, and the process was selective. Data provided by the Provost (Memorandum July 25, 1990, pp. 2-3) show that faculty who do not sign the waiver are promoted at the same rate as those who do.

Some assert that with disclosure, letters of reference will not be forthcoming. The University of Alaska reports a 10% refusal rate with a process that not only allows candidate access to files but permits choosing public committee deliberations (Chronicle, February 14, 1990, p. A21). When Oregon State University did not use confidential letters, no promotion and tenure dossier failed to have adequate letters of reference.

6. Maintaining trust. Operating under a policy of secrecy can hurt an institution. Secrecy limits the openness and reasoned discussion that are the hallmark of a university. Bednash (1989, pp. 323-4) notes, "Reviews conducted in a closed, confidential manner can increase the potential for inaccuracies, unchecked biases, or procedural inequities." Confidential letters breed lower morale and distrust. The OSU administration continually assures faculty of fair treatment irrespective of whether the waiver is signed or not. Yet, when information can be presented against an individual in secret, it destroys the confidence people have in fairness and openness.

7. Confidential letters are not used like peer reviews. It is argued that confidential letters of evaluation are modeled after the peer review process. The peer review process is not always confidential. Some scientific journals encourage reviewers to identify themselves. In the peer review process, even when reviews are confidential, the person or persons being reviewed receive exact copies of what is said in the reviews, with identifying information removed.

The peer review process is designed to help authors and proposal writers improve their submission. Peer reviewers have the goal of being constructive. Confidential letters are not used in this manner. For a person to effectively rebut negative information they need to know "the conditions under which a critical comment is made and by whom" (Memorandum from Promotion and Tenure Committee to Faculty Senate President, November 24, 1987, p. 3).

8. "Major" universities allow access to letters of evaluation. Typically, the reference to "major" or "leading" universities is used for the purpose of connoting that the best universities use confidential peer review. This gives the appearance that those who do not are somehow inferior. Many major colleges and universities do not use confidential letters (Bednash, 1989). These include the University of North Carolina, Florida State University, and public universities in Tennessee and Alaska.

Major universities have argued their preference for confidential peer review before the U.S. Congress, The Supreme Court, state legislatures, and many court jurisdictions. The legislative and judicial process typically supports openness and weighs in on the side of

interest" (See 110 S.Ct. 577 [1990]).
trying to reduce discrimination. The Supreme Court rejected the argument that confidential peer review was part of the First Amendment right of academic freedom. It states, "In effect, petitioner says no more than that disclosure of peer review materials makes it more difficult to acquire information regarding the 'academic grounds' on which petitioner wishes to base its tenure decisions. But many laws make the exercise of First Amendment rights more difficult" (See 110 S.Ct. 577 [1990]).

9. To read more about the issue. (Materials are in the Permanent Reserve Section of the Reserve Book Room at the Kerr Library under the title "Faculty Senate, Promotion and Tenure Documents." The Bednash book is in the same place under its title). See:


Faculty Senate Promotion and Tenure Committee, "Committee Recommendations for Changes in the Promotion and Tenure Guidelines," to Faculty Senate, November 24, 1987.
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MEMORANDUM

TO: Oregon State University Faculty

FROM: Zoe Ann Holmes, President, OSU Faculty Senate

RE: WAIVER OF ACCESS SURVEY
The content of this Faculty Forum paper has been discussed on campus for a number of years. The Faculty Senate Executive Committee and the Provost would appreciate **ALL** faculty completing the following survey and returning it to the FACULTY SENATE OFFICE by May 7, 1991 (the survey is self-addressed on the reverse side; please fold in half).

Place an X by the statement that represents your opinion:

- [ ] I favor keeping the current system which allows either for open access by candidates or the option of confidential outside letters (retain the current system allowing **waiver of access** of outside letters).

- [ ] I favor the system of open file access to all candidates, with no option of confidential letters (discontinue the current system of **waiver of access** to outside letters).

Thank you for completing the survey. Participation as well as your opinion are both critical.

*Opinions expressed by authors of Faculty Forum articles are not necessarily those of the OSU Faculty or Faculty Senate.*
Faculty Senate Papers

"WHAT I WOULD HAVE SAID"

by

Roy Arnold
OSU Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs

November 7, 1991

The November 7, 1991, Faculty Senate meeting had considerable discussion and lasted past the normal time. Dr. Arnold agreed to have a summary of his proposed remarks placed in the minutes. These remarks appear to be of interest to all faculty and, thus, Dr. Arnold agreed to have them appear as a Faculty Forum Paper.

Summary of Remarks Prepared for Faculty Senate Meeting
November 7, 1991
Roy Arnold, Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs

As demonstrated at today's meeting, the Faculty Senate provides a valuable forum for discussion and debate of important topics and issues within the university community. Admittedly, issues such as implementation of the new student information system, establishment of a core course on cultural diversity, and funding of Intercollegiate Athletics presents complex and difficult choices. Discussion of diverse views regarding such issues is important to the process of decision making within higher education.

I agreed to accept a two-year appointment as Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs following Graham Spanier's appointment as Chancellor of the University of Nebraska-Lincoln. I began this assignment on October 15. Expressions of encouragement and support during the process leading to this appointment were helpful and sincerely appreciated. I am pleased to have the opportunity to work with the leadership of the Faculty Senate, other OSU administrators, and the excellent team within the Office of Academic Affairs.

Because my appointment as Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs occurred very quickly, I do not come to the position with a lengthy list of agenda items or preconceived notions of intended outcomes or changes. It has been my observation that the Office of Academic Affairs has been quite effective and responsive. Although it is always important to review systems and processes, specific areas in need of major overhaul are not apparent at this time. I am committed to sustaining the several positive initiatives and improvements which were implemented during Graham Spanier's leadership as Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs.
Over the next several weeks, I will be visiting with groups of faculty and administrators throughout the university to "listen and learn." A better sense of issues, concerns, ideas, and suggestions will likely emerge from these interactions. Certainly the major issue facing OSU for the immediate future is the climate of uncertainty regarding future budgetary support. Although the impacts of Measure 5 on OSU's budget are known for the current biennium, state support for higher education and all other state-supported programs and services beyond 1993 is unknown. The outcome of current and future discussions and actions regarding the state's tax structure will determine whether adequate replacement revenues will be available to reduce the future consequences of Measure 5 on state support. The Governor's "Conversation with Oregon" (including sessions currently underway in the LaSells Stewart Center) is designed to gather views and arrive at a consensus regarding the levels of services Oregonians desire and the appropriate means to support those services.

Of particular challenge to those of us in higher education is the wide range of views regarding the effects of Measure 5. Our faculty, staff, and students have some awareness of its impacts on programs, staffing, and tuition. Parents of current or future students and some other clientele of OSU programs may also be aware of some of the impacts. But many other Oregonians are doubtful that any significant impacts have occurred and some are quite cynical about Measure 5 as they perceive its modest impacts on programs and property taxes to date. However, I am encouraged that more Oregonians are becoming concerned about the negative impact of Measure 5 on higher education in Oregon. For example, a recent telephone conversation with the mother of a high school senior in the greater Portland area indicated substantial concern about the level of state support for higher education in Oregon. This concern was triggered by their family's unhappiness about having to send their son out of the state to access a program that he had planned to study at OSU until it was eliminated last year. The caller wasn't faulting OSU, but rather seeking information and suggested contacts to advance the cause of higher education funding in Oregon.

Although the process of resolving Oregon's future funding uncertainty is unclear, the "Conversation" and other efforts currently underway are aimed at increasing Oregonians' understanding of the detrimental impacts of failing to implement replacement revenue sources. I do not believe that a majority of Oregonians want the potential "worst case" scenarios to happen to higher education or other state-supported programs and services.

At the same time, we can anticipate some difficult "what if?" questions along the way to resolution of the state's funding dilemma. We will need to remind ourselves and each other that this is all a part of the process and that such questions don't necessarily reflect the final outcome. This was clearly demonstrated during the last legislative session when questions were asked during legislative hearings about the potential impact of reductions in state support for specific programs that were 10 times greater than reductions actually realized.

OSU, and higher education in general, must overcome some current credibility problems as we deal with these issues. Internally, it will be important to focus on our institutional processes for responding to "what if?" budget reduction questions. How do we respond without severely damaging people and programs but still convey to Oregon's citizens that further reductions will have serious detrimental effects on our state? Our internal processes for dealing with these circumstances will be reviewed and discussed with the leadership of the Faculty Senate and with deans and other OSU administrators in the weeks immediately ahead.

We should also be prepared to make some changes within OSU. Avoiding the "worse case" impacts will require a demonstration of good faith and an effort to improve the effectiveness and efficiency of our operations. Administrative structure and organization within the OSSHE will be reviewed and evaluated. At OSU, the Faculty Senate, the Dean's Council, other OSU administrators, faculty, staff, students, and external constituents will be expected to provide input to these discussions.

In spite of uncertainty, we should be proactive in developing and implementing strategies to strengthen OSU's competitive position within higher education. Our effectiveness in student recruiting is an example. Recent Deans' Council discussions indicate a willingness for academic colleges and the Admissions Office to develop jointly and initiate some targeted recruitment efforts. Another example is development of new multidisciplinary undergraduate programs which capitalize on OSU's distinctive mix of academic strengths.

Challenges for all of us over the next two years include the following:

1) **Maintain a balanced view of our circumstances.** We should not lose sight of many positive developments, such as the state's funding of salary increases for faculty and staff, even in the face of serious budget constraints. Another example is the development of the new Office of Multicultural
Affairs and, included within it, the new position of Indian Education Coordinator. These are important resources to help OSU colleges, departments, and other units do a better job of meeting our cultural diversity goals. Their function is not to handle OSU's multicultural responsibilities for us, but rather to help us meet our responsibilities.

2) Avoid the cynicism that so easily enters into discussions and deliberations in times of budget stress. We will need to help each other focus on our jobs and think more positively about future initiatives and possibilities for OSU and Oregon.

3) Seek ways to help Oregonians work through current issues of budgets, revenues, taxes, and loss of programs and services. Participation in the "Conversation" process is a start. I am aware that many OSU and OSSHE faculty and staff are playing important volunteer roles in the "Conversation with Oregon" process. This is certainly an appropriate and potentially very important response to our current circumstance, and I applaud these efforts. Also needed are efforts to communicate to Oregonians the quality and impacts of higher education programs and the importance of continued investment in higher education to Oregon's future. We all share a responsibility to help close the credibility gap referred to earlier.

4) Be open-minded about possibilities for change and more creative in influencing the directions of change. The issue of organizational/administrative structure for OSU is an opportunity for creative thinking. Over its 123-year history, OSU has evolved and changed dramatically in response to changing needs and expectations. No publicly supported institution can expect to justify its continued existence based upon past contributions. We should expect continued change and evolution and bring our best thinking to bear in planning and directing future change.

5) Maintain communication. These times of change and uncertainty will require much greater effort at communication within the university community.

During the next two years, I am committed to giving my best effort to help OSU work through these challenges. I look forward to working with you during these challenges but interesting times.

Due to budget limitations, this will be the last paper copy of Faculty Forum Papers distributed to all faculty. In the future, they will be available, as are the Faculty Senate Agenda and Minutes, electronically or in Kerr Library Reserve Book Area. Notice of procedures to electronically subscribe and access will be submitted to OSU THIS WEEK in the near future.

Opinions expressed by authors of Faculty Forum articles are not necessarily those of the OSU Faculty or Faculty Senate.
Rhetoric and Repentance

During the week prior to the recent elections, I reviewed a manuscript entitled "Justificatory Narratives Surrounding Defense Appropriations", written by Catherine Ann Collins of Willamette University. The manuscript led me to think. The purpose of this forum paper is to share these thoughts with you. Though I draw heavily upon Collins' fine paper, I accept full responsibility for what follows.

General Concerns

Events beyond our control often "happen", but the "meaning" of these events and our responses to them are largely constructed through the stories, metaphors, and analogies that we ourselves employ. These constructed meanings form the background against which our "rational" assessments are made. We may see ourselves as rational and reasonable, and yet the background we ourselves construct may limit and direct "rational" choice. We come to see few options other than those that conform to the rhetoric and narratives that we have chosen to give meaning to what has happened. In brief, the stories, metaphors, and analogies that we employ determine our response to events as much as the events themselves. In more extreme cases, "rational" choice may be little more than the outcomes our rhetoric has left us.

Unless challenged by opposing views and reflective self-criticism, the rhetoric and narratives that we employ reflect our needs to justify ourselves. Too easily, we leave out our own roles in muddled events. Of course, we’ve been warned of this. The parable of the Pharisee and Publican (tax collector) who went to the temple to pray tells us that the one who went home justified was not the Pharisee who recalled his own accomplishments. Instead, it was the one who prayed, "God, be merciful to me a sinner."

Current National Rhetoric

Collins' manuscript examines the narrative justifications that political leaders have employed to justify violence in the form of military actions. She writes:

"By careful choice of narrative elements--story forms, heroes and villains, and the motives for action--the President, members of the Administration, and the news media covering these political elites create narratives which justify military actions and defense expenditures by defining the preparation for violence or actual violence as the logical and necessary response to the plot lines they initiate. The creation of characters, especially villains, in national stories helps us define reality. When the story form defines the "other" as alien, as villain, violence is justified by the actions, real or projected (always..."
unwarranted and alien), of the other."

Although these words were written more than two years ago, they describe the recent and continuing rhetoric we have heard from our own leaders as they compare Saddam Hussein to Hitler and tell stories of his atrocities. "But", you might object, "Hussein is in fact a ruthless, powerful and dangerous person!" I will not deny this. What concerns me is the degree to which this rhetoric has been shaped by our own need for self-justification, the kind of unauthentic justification that the Pharisee of the parable sought through his own words.

The terrible charges made against Hussein could have been made several years ago. It was at this time that he broke moral barriers that we may now be unable to reconstruct; he employed chemical weapons on both soldiers and civilians! Our objections then were virtually silent. Our rhetoric then did not define him as a Hitler. The rhetoric that we choose to employ now but not then is largely a result of our own needs. We now have needs for such rhetoric. We did not have such needs then. Clearly our needs have to do with low cost oil. If the Middle East produced broccoli and turnips instead of oil, we wouldn't be there. Moreover, without the enormous cash payments by oil-addicted nations and the subsequent sales to recover such payments, the level of weaponry in this region of the world would be far less.

I object to the rhetoric and narratives that our leaders now employ because they omit our own role in this crisis. They say nothing of our continued waste of energy, particularly over the last decade. They speak little of our historical neglect of Arab grievances, particularly those of the Palestinians. They say nothing of our own silence on Hussein's atrocities when he served our own needs and when our opportunities for nonviolent influence were greater! They say nothing of our own role in the development of a vast technological system that simultaneously consumed vast quantities of oil and produces vast quantities of sophisticated weapons distributed throughout the world.

Our own responsibilities for the current crisis, our own dismal failures, are omitted from the stories. If the analogy of "Hitler" applies to Hussein, should not the metaphor of "addiction" apply to our own desperate need for a "cheap oil fix"? To admit our own failures is not to justify or overlook those of Hussein! Rather, I am concerned that our selective rhetoric becomes the Pharisee's prayer in the parable of Jesus, self-justifying to the point that only violence may seem rational and justified and our own sins are overlooked as we focus on the sins of others.

The Plank in our Own Eye

I began with a rather general and abstract (some might say esoteric) discussion and then shifted to more immediate national concerns. Some might interpret this only as a criticism of our national leadership. They would be mistaken! In a democracy, any criticism of political leaders, however appropriate, must be self-criticism by the citizens themselves.

In four surveys between 1976 and 1988, American "opinion leaders" (selected randomly form "Who's Who in America") were asked about the importance of foreign policy goals (Holsti and Rosenau, 1990). In all surveys, the goal that received the highest percent "very important" rating was "secure energy supplies." Out of sixteen choices, the lowest percent "very important" rating was given to the goal "promote democracy." Clearly, the values suggested by these results are not the kind that justify the violence and sacrifices of war. Thus, there is now a need for self-service rhetoric that omits the real values that have guided our own contributions to the current crisis. But, it is not enough to criticize these "opinion leaders." These are the people, more than any other group, who have received the most from higher education. Their deficiencies reflect our own.

We have failed! We, university faculty and administrators, have done all the busy work needed to sustain a university, but, contrary to our own rhetoric, we have failed to sustain discourse on concerns that (1) do not fall within the specialized domains of our department, and (2) do not lead to external funding. We have omissions in our own justificatory narratives that are not at all unrelated to the rhetorical omissions of our political leaders and our most influential graduates. I will mention only one.

In recent years, I've asked hundreds of students and graduates, "Have you taken a course at OSU on energy conservation?" I don't mean a course where the subject is merely raised. I mean a course taken with the same level of discipline and effort as chemistry, mathematics, literature, or any of the other subjects that we faculty take seriously (such as the fluid mechanics course that I am now teaching). I have found virtually no students who answer "yes".
How do we explain such an omission? Self-serving rhetoric is, in large part, the answer. When we describe our accomplishments, which I do not deny, we fail to mention that what we do is largely, and sometimes exclusively, determined by the defense of turf and the hustling of research grants. Even when courses are listed that appear to break this pattern (i.e., the Science, Technology, and Society courses of the Baccalaureate core), we find very little sustained interdisciplinary discourse among the faculty. Where are the interdisciplinary faculty development programs, seminars, conferences, and other scholarly activities essential for substance rather than mere form? What does our "research" office do to facilitate unfunded scholarly work? Who in our administrative system is responsible for interdisciplinary faculty development for subjects that extend beyond the domains of departments and schools? Where is the leadership of tenured faculty on such matters? Can faculty justify tenure if they are unwilling to initiate discourse that doesn't pay? Answers to such questions are far less flattering than our self-serving rhetoric.

But, again, such criticism must not be merely directed at those "higher up in the system." For faculty, self-criticism is essential because much of our own rhetoric is cynical, shifting the blame to those higher up while justifying our own limited actions. We faculty have gone through several years of curricula revisions. The real decisions we made arose far more from the protection of turf and budgets than from our scholarly inquiries. The rhetoric employed to defend specialized turf often expressed broad and noble concerns. But, in practice, such concerns were rarely the subject of ongoing faculty discourse and inquiry beyond our specialized domains. We professors often employ cynical and self-serving rhetoric to justify our own narrowness when, in fact, few people are in better positions to sustain broad discourse than tenured professors.

Our greatest social influence does not arise from the reports we write or consulting we give. Our influence and our opportunities for real leadership arise through the ideas, skills and practices that our graduates take with them into the world. Our failures of leadership, initiative and spirit are particularly pernicious because they exert a cumulative influence long after our narrow turf battles are over and the grant money we so earnestly sought is gone. The educational deficiencies of professionals and citizens, our graduates, have accumulated within the physical and social infrastructures of our world. It is the demands of these infrastructures that the young men and women now in the Middle East are there to defend.

Am I being too harsh? Have I failed to make a connection between the justificatory rhetoric of our political leaders and our own? You tell me. I have a son in the Middle East (First Cavalry Division, U.S. Army); his recent letter tells me that forty-three have already died. Tell me, is the reason why he's there unrelated to blank looks on our students' faces when I ask them, "What have you learned about energy conservation?" I don't think so! Am I being too extreme in my assessments, too judgmental, harsh or disrespectful? I think not! Read the newspapers. As a nation, we are seriously considering actions that would send young men and women to violence and death. If such talk does not provoke critical self-reflection, I can't imagine what would!


David A. Bella
November 20, 1990
Civil Engineering

Postscript. On December 15, 1990, the Oregonian reported the following: "White House aides led by chief of staff John H. Sununu have told Energy Secretary James D. Watkins to remove conservation measures from his proposed National Energy Strategy...Proposals to stiffen auto-fuel-efficiency standards and to increase use of non-gasoline fuels drew particularly heavy fire from Sununu, chief economic advisor Michael J. Boskin and budget director Richard G. Darman...Those three top Bush aides also attacked virtually all of Watkins proposals to encourage conservation -- such as higher fuel taxes and tough energy efficiency standards for appliances -- which they denounced as unacceptable government interference into free markets."

Opinions expressed by authors of Faculty Forum articles are not necessarily those of the OSU Faculty or Faculty Senate.
"INTERNATIONALISM" AT OSU

by

Marlan Carlson
Associate Professor of Music, OSU

March 1990

"INTERNATIONALISM" AT OSU

Is "internationalism" alive and well at OSU? We are the nation's leading land-grant university in overseas research. Moreover, about 11 percent of OSU's student body come from 90 countries of the Global Village. Unfortunately, international research projects and the number of foreign students on campus represent only two thirds of the picture. Conspicuously absent in most reports on international activity at OSU are the numbers of American students participating in study abroad programs.

In August of 1988, the Council for International Education Exchange (CIEE) published "Educating for Global Competence," a report on the state of international education in America's colleges and universities. The committee which prepared this report was chaired by Thomas A. Bartlett, and its primary focus was the "balance of education" deficit that American institutions have with other countries. In this respect, OSU is typical. While 1700 foreign students will spend 89-90 in Corvallis, OSU will send about 150 students abroad. (The University of Oregon has 307 students in international study programs this year.)

The Report "recommends a major expansion of study abroad in order to improve this country's ability to meet contemporary challenges." Among the many recommendations, the following seem to be particularly appropriate to OSU:

1. "The number of college students who study abroad should be increased to at least 10% of enrollment by 1995." With about 1% of OSU students participating in Office of International Education (OIE) programs each year, even partial achievement of this goal would require a massive effort at all levels of the university. To expect the OIE and the Foreign Languages Department to effect such a change by themselves is unrealistic.

2. "Policies for faculty hiring, evaluation and reward can and should be adjusted to reflect recognition of the importance of international experience." "At present, professional academic advancement is clearly hindered at many institutions and in many fields by time spent abroad, particularly for pre-tenure instructors. Such institutional barriers will need to be modified. The goal should be a high level of internationalization of the faculty."

3. "Institutions should encourage, or even require, all departments and schools within the university to include statements in their catalog on how study abroad can be incorporated into the course of study."

4. "Senior administrators must be the leaders in developing revenues for study abroad. It is they who are most likely to persuade trustees, legislatures, alumni, foundations and corporate donors that there
is a critical national need to support this essential aspect of American education. "Is now the time to establish an endowment fund to support students who need financial assistance to study abroad?"

In addition to these CIEE recommendations, action on several other issues should be considered. 1. We should take another look at an undergraduate foreign language requirement as part of the institutional commitment to 'international literacy.' A major stumbling block, however, is that far too many American college professors seem to regard foreign language proficiency as something that ended with the Ph.D. exam, hardly an attitude that encourages undergraduates to take foreign languages seriously.

2. CLA needs to review the requirements for the B.S. degree. In the graduating classes of 1988 and 1989, 273 students earned the B.A. degree, which requires the second year of a foreign language while 774 elected the B.S. From my advising experience, the B.S. is almost always regarded as the "easier, non-language" option, which thus reduces interest in the B.A.

3. Positive incentives should be developed in order to encourage many more faculty and students to become seriously involved in international educational and academic activities. Practices which penalize students and faculty (and/or their departments) who go abroad should be eliminated. While OSU has a stunning array of study abroad programs, pitifully few students take advantage of them. Most faculty seem not to know much about these programs, and at OSU it would be easy to think that involvement with study abroad programs is largely a personal matter.

In conclusion, OSU can and should be proud of its record in the education of tens of thousands of foreign students, as well as its leading role in international research and development. It could be that these activities are what we do best, and that they should continue to be the focus of our international effort. If, however, the goals of the Bartlett Report are to be taken seriously and the education of our American students for meaningful world citizenship is to be a high priority, we will need many major changes in thinking at OSU, particularly at the departmental and college levels.

by Marlan Carlson, Resident Director
Oregon Study Center in Germany (88-90)
Associate Professor of Music, OSU

Dr. Carlson is currently residing in Germany at the Oregon Study Center.
*Opinions expressed by authors of Faculty Forum articles are not necessarily those of the OSU Faculty or Faculty Senate.*
"CONSIDER THE ALTERNATIVES"

by

Gary H. Tiedeman
President
OSU Faculty Senate

October 1989

This is a slightly revised version of an address presented University Day, September 22, 1989. It was widely quoted in Oregon's popular press.
charted. What better day for casting plans and dreams windward, for laying up ample cargo and sighting new destination? In other words, for expressing some of those concerns a faculty member could and should express about the conditions and prospects of higher education?

To convey everything I had originally intended proves to be an impossibility. My solution to this predicament will be to paint some summary sketches of what my subject matter might have been under each of three alternate titles, thereby covering a broad expanse of territory within a relatively brief run of pages. The reader, then, as the main title specifies, is invited to "Consider the Alternatives."

Alternate Title Number 1, for example, might have been "Sailing Uncharted Waters" or "Batten Down the Hatches," in tune with the nautical phrasings employed a few lines ago. In that speech, I would liken our university to an oceangoing vessel, captain and crew alike vigilant alert to surprise storms, submerged minefields, and torpedoes (something rifling toward us as "friendly fire") while we navigate the deep seas of academe, never stay too long in port, and strive to avoid becoming another Exxon Valdez. State legislatures become unpredictable riptides in this allegory, governors become daring pirates who board us under the flag of "ally," and chancellors become lighthouse keepers to whom we look for guidance and, if necessary, for rescue. Add the images of shipwreck, exploration, seasickness, and mutiny, and the possibilities here are nearly endless.

We're surrounded by hungry "schools" of fish, of course, some intelligent and inquisitive, some listless bottom-dwellers, some vicious and predatory. And what class of vessel are we, and what do we aspire to becoming? A specialized research ship, a la the Calypso? A tugboat? A steamboat paddle wheeler? A destroyer? A garbage scow? A streamlined yacht, cutting sharply through the waves with the aid of the best, state-of-the-art technology and equipment? Or, perhaps, a supply ship, plugging along, passively and reliably, in support of the rest of the fleet?

Which takes me to Alternative Title Number 2, "Getting Off the Bandwagon," or "The Perils of the Corporate University." In this speech, I launch my own torpedoes at those who would seek to define the contemporary university as, fundamentally, an instrument in behalf of economic development. Just a few weeks ago, our State Board of Higher Education held a first-ever joint meeting with the Economic Development Commission. At this joint meeting, our Governor identified the state's educational priority as raising Oregonians' earnings and ensuring that children can find jobs when they grow up: "Number 1, we want Oregon's personal income back at or exceeding the national average." More to my immediate point, however, the Governor made no comment about the quality or character of the education the children of the state are to receive (or the quality and character of the graduates themselves as human beings) -- other than the implication that all of education should lead directly to jobs and to enhancement of personal income.

Now for me, and I think for most of you, a university which deserves the title "university" is a place that educates not just for employment and higher salary but for analytic thought, for introspection, for aesthetic appreciation, for international communality, for ethnic and gender equality, all of which turn out to be, interestingly, a society's very best assurances of a strong economy with full employment! The true university is also the last and best bastion of free, unfettered, independent, often non-utilitarian, and frequently critical thought; this entire set of remarks standing as case in point. Its repertoire of free and critical thought must include the lovely irony of a Marxian perspective of economic determinism, it must include programs and advocacy of economic development, but it must also include the voices of those who challenge economic priorities and those who PROFESS that a society's stature and progress is best measured not by its Gross National Product or its Wall Street averages but by its morality, its altruism, its poetry, its art, its sense of history, its coherency of written expression.

I urge you, whatever your discipline, your department of affiliation, or your research agenda, to join me in resisting any tendency toward converting the traditional university into a corporate arm, to join me in questioning the sagacity of faculty salary packages, whether based upon video poker or upon some other non-general fund gamble, that are linked overrestrictively to economic development contributions. Those affiliated with colleges which are most naturally aligned with economic development potential (e.g., Business, Forestry, Agriculture, Engineering) must be most outspoken of all in broadcasting the critical role of the philosopher, the social scientist, the biochemist, the musician, the nutritionist, in the authentic university, and in demanding that their equally sound and valuable contributions are properly rewarded, both psychically and financially.

The health of a state, like that of a family or an individual, is indeed linked to its economic security. But wealth is not salvation, as the tombstone of many a millionaire will attest. Long-term strength and
integrity may depend less upon economic indicators than upon the constant and vocal expression of the best minds gathered together in that curious locale called "the college campus." We have the combined expertise, if we can muster forth the initiative and the proficiency, to best advise and influence others on the delicate interactions and balances between industrial proliferation and the death of the rain forest, between cultural literacy and pursuit of profit, between rampant consumerism and global warming, between unchecked population growth and mass starvation. We can assist and encourage appropriate economic development, but we must not allow the political priorities of others to shape or corrupt the content of higher education.

I now come to a third alternate title, with what I consider an alluring metaphor: "THE PROFESSOR AS SPOTTED OWL". That controversial little creature is what we sometimes resemble. Think about it. We hide away in remote reaches where no one can see or hear us except when we come out occasionally and make entertaining little noises. Our livelihood depends upon the preservation of "old growth forests" made up of classrooms, offices, laboratories, and libraries. We're rather cute and cuddly (and let's not forget "wise") as long as we stay out of everyone's way and only show up on the media in PBS documentaries. And we and what we stand for are relatively expendable when someone with a noisier and more pragmatic chainsaw comes along. Our dignity and tradition, rather than any physical lack of expressive capability, prevent our flying off to our own rescue. Yet, we have no Sierra Club, no Audubon Society, to mount an expensive and articulate campaign in our defense. In other cultures not so far away in this time, the university professor is revered and protected. We must begin to do a better, more convincing job of elucidating our place, and higher education's, in the cultural-intellectual version of the ecological chain. Otherwise, our nesting ground will be depleted, and we shall observe the march of progress from a precarious vantage point not far removed from that of the passenger pigeon and the wooly mammoth.

These, then, are three alternative titles and topics, each containing alternatives within them. I had once intended several others. One underlining the importance of expanded faculty involvement in our campus governance proceedings, for example, as is the eventual wont of every individual who served the office I now occupy. Another paralleling the continuing education we all require in our role as educator to the effective like span of the computer software upon which we have become so dependent. One condemning the State Board for its shocking willingness to forego faculty trust by capitulating in the reversal of the semester conversion decision. And, of course, one castigating the shortsightedness of a political regime which arrogantly presumes that an arbitrarily determined percentage of any university's programs are superfluous and which expects gratitude for blatantly insufficient salary increases achieved via the cannibalization of colleagues.

If the three main titles I have sketched for you share a common theme, it is the theme of alternative routes into the 1990s and the 21st Century. We can be a significant factor in selection of the best route, one that is not exclusively superhighway but which includes scenic, historical, and humanistic overviews along the way. We can learn to become more effective players in the fast-paced, high tech, real-world games of influence and persuasion we ourselves have helped to create and about which we possess ostensible expertise. Alternative? We wither, we stumble, we beg and apologize, we turn what is left of the other cheek. And higher education in the State of Oregon from featured star to supporting player, from honored guest to maidservant.

The future is ours; like what it brings or not, most of us will be a part of it for many years to come. That future will always be shaped in large part by our surroundings: a sociologist such as myself is hardly one to deny that. But we needn't be totally shaped. It is our mission, and our responsibility, to apply our combined expertise to the shaping of our state, our region, our nation, our planet. I beg you: CONSIDER THE ALTERNATIVES.

Opinions expressed by authors of Faculty Forum articles are not necessarily those of the OSU Faculty or Faculty Senate.
"STRENGTHENING THE STATUS OF TEACHING AT OREGON STATE UNIVERSITY"

by

D.S. Fullerton
Associate Vice President for Academic Affairs

January 19, 1989

STRENGTHENING THE STATUS OF TEACHING AT OREGON STATE UNIVERSITY

Over the last several weeks, I have had the pleasure of spending time with some of this University's most respected teachers -- the winners of the Burlington Northern Foundation and Elizabeth P. Ritchie Awards. We've been talking about teaching, the quality and the status of teaching at Oregon State University. In brief, they believe the quality of teaching is good. However, the status of teaching generally is not as good as it should be, even though there are many department chairs who promote and nurture teaching (including curriculum development).

Some faculty members wonder, "Does teaching count?" It certainly does to me, the President, the Provost, the Vice Presidents, and the Deans. George Keller sums up his feeling: "I think there has been a lack of promotion regarding academic programs and outstanding teachers. Research has been aggressively promoted, which may cause some people to think that is what we are all about. Wrong!"

In some departments, there is a perception that any significant focus on teaching and any increase in the status of teaching will significantly diminish scholarly output. Good teaching need not come at the expense of good scholarship, nor vice versa. Balance is the key word and the operative concept.

The comments, suggestions, and support of the Burlington Northern Foundation and Ritchie Award winners are noted with appreciation. Their continued input will be invaluable as we begin to implement a number of the recommendations presented in this paper.

Burlington Northern Foundation Faculty Achievement Award Recipients:

Daniel Armstrong, English
David Bella, Civil Engineering
Marcus Borg, Religious Studies
Sheila Cordray, Sociology
Wayne Courtney, Education
Julius Dasch, Geology
Barbara Ellis, Journalism
George Martin, Business
Laura Rice-Sayre, English
Michael Schuyler, Chemistry
Robert Schwartz, English
Overview--Reflections on the Status of Teaching at OSU

The recipients of two of Oregon State University's most prestigious awards for outstanding teaching feel that, overall, Oregon State University faculty members are good teachers. A few in every college are exceptional teachers. However, the Ritchie and Burlington Northern Foundation award winners noted:

innovative teaching need not and should not be viewed as competitive with scholarship. It is reasonable to expect that faculty can be good teachers and good scholars, and to excel in one area or the other. However, one should not be at the expense of the other.

the status of good teaching varies significantly from department to department. In some departments, teaching is part of the ongoing dialogue, and is seen at a level comparable to that of scholarship. In others, creativity in instruction is taken almost for granted, except during promotion and tenure decisions, or selection of recipients for college or university awards.

innovative teaching does not appear to count for merit salary raises nearly as much as innovative research. One of this University's most recognized and respected faculty members summed up the view with a quip, "Read our lips: look at our salaries." Some of the award winners noted that, even in the year they received their award, they received no significant raise even when legislatively provided merit funds were available. Release time can also be a much appreciated reward, but one rarely given.

staying current in one's discipline ("keeping on the cutting edge") is essential for maintaining instructional excellence. Being a good scholar, however, is not sufficient to be a good teacher. It takes time, effort and encouragement to maintain lecture notes, develop Writing Intensive Courses, redesign lifeless courses, write and grade essays rather than multiple choice examinations, and the like.

some faculty may be too timid to try an innovative teaching approach, and need special encouragement. "Fear is what keeps some from being innovative or creative, or trying something that does not involve clinging to the lectern. Moreover, some students cling even more tenaciously to the lecture method. Once a Prof. departs from the lectern, maybe to try small group mastery, that kind of student will be upset."

it is easier to get start-up or matching funds for new research ideas than for new teaching ideas or for adequate undergraduate equipment. The lack of legislative funding for equipment replacement is a particular problem. One faculty member remarked, "You can't expect us to be innovative for the 1990's with equipment for the 1960's."

the inaccurate perception continues that scholarly accomplishments have a disproportionate role in promotion and tenure decisions. It is recognized that OSU faculty are generally good teachers, so scholarship is often the deciding determinant.
Letters of timely notice will continue to be given to individuals who are good scholars but, at best, mediocre teachers.

**often, the best ideas and stimuli for improving one's own teaching come from faculty members in other disciplines.** Interdisciplinary courses, seminars, workshops, and discussions are invaluable for providing opportunities for this cross-disciplinary intellectual and teaching enrichment.

**once faculty member receive University or college awards for good teaching, they are seldom, if ever, used as departmental or college resources or mentors.** The award winners, like other faculty, do not have time to be full time mentors/instructional developers, but they would like to be seen as departmental resources. They felt as if their potential contributions in nurturing good teaching were generally ignored in their departments. They are available and willing to help.

**maintaining good teaching, developing innovative courses, and preventing instructional "burn out" and stagnation require a climate in which effective teaching is deemed to be highly valued.** Whereas good scholarship is nurtured, discussed, and praised on a nearly day-to-day basis, teaching in some departments generally receives only sporadic attention.

**for many courses, developing computer-based tutorials or "courseware" can free-up time for discussion, stimulating creative thinking in students, and encouraging writing.** However, there is an initial investment in time some faculty feel they cannot afford; that any short term drop in scholarly effort may be penalized by the department chair, dean, or administrative promotion and tenure committee.

**the faculty member's knowledge of the subject and overall course content (not volume) are the most important determinants of teaching quality.** However, delivery, creativity, organization, and enthusiasm of the instructor are also major factors. A joie de vivre in the classroom is contagious.

**students don't all learn the same way.** Some can learn better with visual aids such as overhead transparencies, others with interactive computer "courseware," and still others with small group discussions. Many experts do agree that an active involvement promotes mastery.

**most faculty will benefit from consulting services and workshops on development of writing intensive courses.** A WIC coordinator/advisor will be needed in the near future (workshops are scheduled for early 1989).

**well designed and attractive instructional aids and media can enrich courses and lectures, but are not a substitute for knowing the field or putting in time in preparation for a course and its lectures.** Similarly, difficult to read overheads, crowded slides, or amateurish videos can detract from courses.

**innovative teaching has a generally low profile at OSU.** Scholarship, new grants and contracts, and election to national organizations are reported and praised, but new teaching approaches or courses are rarely highlighted.

**some new faculty members receive little help in developing their teaching.** New faculty are sometimes "thrown in" to their classes and lectures with no assigned mentors, and little in-class support by chairs and heads. However, it would be expected that after a year or so of mentoring, most new faculty could develop approaches that best match their own creativity and courses.

**RECOMMENDATIONS**

The sense of the Burlington Northern Foundation and Ritchie Award recipients is that there is no need for a single "quick fix" to strengthen teaching at OSU. Teaching quality is already very good overall,
because of the commitment and dedication of faculty members to their students. However, the status of teaching should be significantly enhanced. The consensus is that a few workshops or lectures are not enough. Rather, they recommend an integrated approach across the entire University:

1. **Elevate the visibility of instructional innovation and teaching quality in the day-to-day life of the University.**

   The President and Provost are fully supportive

   Encourage department chairs and heads to increase dialogue, recognition, and visibility of teaching.

   Establishing teaching "Pacesetter" awards, periodic departmental seminars on instructional topics, workshops presented by the department's best teachers, and designation of departmental teaching mentors are examples of pro-active steps that could be taken.

   Expect department chairs and heads to visit each instructor in a class at least once a year and, if time permits, more frequently for instructors who have been receiving low student evaluations.

   Include leadership in strengthening of teaching as a significant element of academic administrators' own periodic reviews.

   Require periodic peer teaching evaluations for all instructors (more frequently for those with mediocre or low student evaluations), not just those who are still candidates for promotion or tenure.

   Display photos of teachers who have received awards for instructional excellence and innovation, as is now being done in several Colleges.

   Encourage the Department of Information, "The Oregon Stater," and other University publications to highlight instructional excellence and innovation.

   Schedule "brown bag" discussion groups to address different areas of instruction, from nurturing creative thinking in large classes to discussion of WIC courses.

2. **Encourage instructional innovation**

   Support and encourage faculty who "take a chance" with a new course format, a new way of teaching, or development of a totally new course. Just as all research applications are not funded, innovative courses are not always the product of first attempt.

   As resources permit, central administration and deans' offices should invest in new teaching approaches. Increased legislative funding for modern undergraduate laboratory equipment is vital.

   As is the practice in a number of departments already, as merit resources permit, reward instructional innovation and instructional excellence with merit raises.

   Although merit funds are never sufficient to reward all meritorious faculty for their contributions in teaching and scholarship, scholars should not fear becoming ineligible for these raises by investing time periodically in instructional development.

   Provide occasional "release time" for development of new courses or computer based "courseware."
3. Develop a teaching mentor system

Encourage faculty members who have been recognized for outstanding instructional skills to serve as mentors for other faculty, particularly those who are newly hired. This contribution to the University, college, or department should take the place of other assignments taking equivalent time.

Mentors would be assigned for a limited period, perhaps a year or so. Thereafter, faculty members would generally be expected to have developed their own approaches and initiatives that best match their own courses and teaching styles. In time they, too, will become mentors.

4. Schedule a few carefully selected university-wide workshops and lectures focused on instructional development

Begin a "Distinguished Teacher Lecture" series focused on strengthening teaching. A number of the Burlington Northern Foundation and Ritchie award winners have indicated a willingness to launch the series starting Spring quarter, 1989.

Begin an annual conference at Oregon State University to focus on teaching innovation -- a scholarly meeting on instruction where faculty can share successes as well as failures.

Continue CMC workshops on development and use of media.

From time to time, bring in outside leaders in the field to lead workshops or retreats topics requested by faculty, e.g., on effective instruction with large classes, or on development of creative thinking with students.

Continue and expand industry-sponsored and local programs on development of computer courseware. A courseware advisor could help many faculty who want to develop interactive programs or tutorials for students. Have CMC obtain copies of computer courseware examples for faculty to check out and review.

Schedule workshops on development of WIC's and synthesis courses. Designation of a WIC coordinator/advisor will be an important step.

Continue training programs for teaching assistants.

5. Encourage interdisciplinary seminars, courses, and discussions

Special attention and encouragement should be given to development synthesis courses across departmental boundaries. Release time, or part-time Summer Term appointments can help with the development of particularly innovative courses.

As is already done in many departments, invite faculty from other departments to give seminars and lectures. Schedule pre- or post- seminar coffees to enable faculty from both departments to meet and interact.
D.S. Fullerton Associate Vice
President for Academic Affairs
January 19, 1989

Opinions expressed by authors of Faculty Forum articles are not necessarily those of the OSU Faculty or Faculty Senate.
For the past two decades I’ve been involved in faculty governance organizations that include the Oregon State Employees Association, Interinstitutional Faculty Senate, the Association of Oregon Faculties and the OSU Faculty State. Thus, it should come as no surprise to you that I intend to discuss the role of faculty in delineating options for the immediate future.

The CHRONICLE OF HIGHER EDUCATION, in its 9-7-88 issue, has a lead article entitled: "Action Oriented Governor at Odds with College Leaders Over Charge He's Politicizing Higher Education." Since there has been much ambiguity about the situation we find ourselves in, I cannot vouch for the accuracy of the various details of this essay. Regardless of some of the specifics, however, there seem to be at least two fairly clear conclusions that can be drawn. They are: 1. Our Governor has injected himself into the management of higher education, and we have to deal with that; and 2. The prospects for significant increases in budgets for higher education in 89-90 are at best uncertain, and we have to cope with this.

I'm confident that the dialogue between State government’s representatives, the Governor in particular, and higher education in the next few months will profoundly affect our fortunes in the next biennium. We are already in a dialogue of sorts. It began in April when the Faculty Senate adopted a resolution called "A Declaration of Concern," which raised questions about the alleged politicization of higher education and the prospects of diminishing support. It also, however, acknowledged the reality that the promotion of higher education is dependent upon a partnership with the governor in solving the problems of support for what we do. The governor has acknowledged this partnership.

A recent meeting between Bob McCoy, President of the Association of Oregon Faculties and Mark Nelson, Public Affairs Counsel, and the Governor resulted in a friendly encounter in which mutual concern for the welfare of higher education was expressed, but which resulted in no promises. Thus, nothing from this meeting substantially altered our perceptions of where we are. There is, however, the prospect of significant additional dialogue.

I am convinced that unless we’re able to alter substantially the situation in the next few months, we will go into the next legislative session with reduced leadership and less than the support that we need to
do the job that we have been doing and expect to continue doing.

I would like to take an inward look, from a faculty perspective, at what we have done in the recent past, what we're doing now, and what we urgently need to do in the immediate future. A consideration of options.

From where I stand, despite some significant negatives, the basic state of the University is excellent! Here's why I think so. Take a look at what we did last year with curriculum. With the approval of the Faculty Senate, our Curriculum Council, under the leadership of Bruce Shepard, reviewed many programs, modernized some, deleted others or proposed new ones. A central example of a new program is the new Ph. D. degree in Applied Economics that is now in place.

Under the direction of Jack Davis, scores of faculty have spent hundreds of hours overhauling our curricula and converting to the Semester System. We may not have approved the change but we are doing the job well.

A Curriculum Review Commission, chaired by Frank Schaumburg, did a comprehensive study of General Education Requirements earlier this year and that program is now under the direction of Baccalaureate Core Committee Chairperson, Jean Peters. It's ongoing. Again, with Senate scrutiny and approval.

The almost thirty (30) Faculty Senate Committees have for years performed indispensable services in governance of the University. A typical example this last year was the Budgets and Fiscal Planning Committee, chaired by Margy Woodburn, which recommended the procedures for program reduction, consolidation, or elimination, adopted by the Faculty Senate. More about that later.

How about research? I read in the Summer issue of BRIEFING, published by the Southern Willamette Research Corridor, that OSU's research contracts will total over $113,000,000.00 this year. That's up substantially from last year and ranks OSU 54th among the top 100 Universities funded by federal grants for research and development. Vice President Keller, take a bow for your faculties!

Our public service record is another little noticed dimension of what we do. I obviously cannot enumerate this in detail, but it's illustrated in a conversation I had this week with Dick Scanlan, Chair of Food Technology, who pointed out to me that OSU's graduates and know-how are pervasive in the food processing industries in Oregon. I'm confident that the list of examples could be "as long as your arm." Note the awards given here today!

In the wake of this record, still more will be demanded of us. The OSSHE projected admissions increase for this year is up 17%. For OSU the projection is 12%. (See Fall Admission Summary, July 22, 1988). The new increase for OSU could be as much as 3%. Obviously, there are many out there who like what we offer.

Now, let's take a look at the demands that we have been making on ourselves. We have raised our standards for tenure and promotion. It's now tougher than ever to get tenure at OSU. The standards for promotion have also been tightened up. The hurdles have been raised. These were adopted by the Faculty Senate just this year.

So, the business of teaching, research and service is not simply "business as usual;" it's better than usual! Let those who demand excellence of us be encouraged by what we have done and what is taking place here. Personally, I have no reluctance to say to the taxpayers, our alumni, the parents of our students, and to those who govern us, if you want dedication, we have it; if you want commitment, we are committed; if you want renewal, we're doing it; if you want excellence, we display it. If we are not doing enough to promote economic development in Oregon, let's engage in dialogue. Let's derive the quid pro quo that will support higher education adequately and give the State's economy the prosperity that we all want and need. Let's do it!

Our future is held in the hands of various people and groups. We faculty are not the masters of our fates. We can be, however, significant contributors. There are things that we have done and there are things yet to be done. Let's discuss some of them.

As I said earlier, the prospects for our support next biennium are uncertain. Signals from the Governor, who proposes to the legislature, are ambiguous at best and discouraging at worst. His is the demand for "excellence," with which nobody disagrees. There is the suggestion that we might be expected, however, to reward only the best among us and leave others who give merely "satisfactory" service
with minimal or no rewards. This policy, if applied over time, will inevitably result in islands of excellence in a sea of mediocrity. This unhealthy situation could not long endure because the "islands" would remove themselves, leaving nothing but the mediocre. To use another metaphor, if the faculty are the goose that lays the golden eggs of teaching, research and service, this policy would result, at best, in producing a goose that lays only gold plated eggs!

In the face of these prospects the Faculty Senate has consistently made the same choice. No across the board salary reductions to finance deficits. The choice is to reduce or eliminate programs, which means eliminating people, and doing well those that remain. This Spring the Faculty Senate, as it did in 1981, when Leo Parks was president, adopted criteria and procedures for doing just that--and without declaring financial exigency! The prospect of financing a two (2) or four (4) percent salary increase "out of our hides," as it were, is indeed, daunting. Let's work hard to avoid doing that!

This situation creates not only the opportunity but the necessity for faculty to make a statement--perhaps many statements. (Incidentally, in my past efforts to enter into the deliberations of issues before the OSBHE, I have had to elbow my way into discussions. I think it's ironical that one of the System's greatest sources of knowledge and expertise, the faculties, is not a regular, scheduled contributor to Board deliberations. Now back to the regular script.) Positive, intelligent, wise and persistent steps are needed to avoid the worse case scenario and to obtain the best possible outcome. The players in this game are diverse--the public, the governor, the legislature and the programs competing for funds, including higher education.

There is no "cop out." We cannot, not make a statement, for no statement is a statement, albeit the wrong one! Let's enumerate some of them and trust that a number of small steps will add up to a giant leap. First, we continue to do our jobs and to publicize that fact discretely when possible. We are voters, a small minority, but many of us are opinion leaders and that can make a big difference in votes. We can focus on the Governor and the Legislature and communicate with them. We have higher education people all over the state who can do these things, and they can make a difference!

What should we NOT do? We should not rant and rave, wallow in self pity, attack the public, the governor or legislators.

What else should we do? We should use our considerable intelligence and talents to help solve our problems. A quid pro quo will be formulated from ideas. Work smart, not angry! We have an enterprise of which we are proud. Let's get the word out! Let's do it!

We faculty have established channels of communication which we must better utilize. Every one of you has several Senators. I challenge you to get into organized caucuses and come up with options for the Senate. Talk to us!

The Interinstitutional Faculty Senate has been, and will continue to be, active. Talk to IFS Senators Gary Tiedeman, Pat Wells (who is also Vice President) and John Dunn. Call up Nancy Tang, PSU, the State IFS President. Give her your ideas.

Call Bill Brandt, OSU's AAUP president. Give him some suggestions. Call Bob Becker, AOF Campus Rep. Give him a message. In addition, when you get back to the office, fill out, sign and mail the AOF membership form you have in your mailbox. Numbers are important, membership numbers are the easiest way we have to send a message.

We faculty can, and must, exercise our options. Let's not just "belly-ache" to each other. Let's hammer out some ideas and tell them to AOF President McCoy, President Byrne, Chancellor Lemman, Board President Hensley, Governor Goldschmidt, Senator Trow, Representative Van Vliet and any other senators or representatives whom you know. If you forgot the names or cannot find their address or phone numbers, call the Faculty Senate Office, we'll help you.

We, of course, recognize the legitimate interest and role that the public, the Board, the governor and the legislature have in what we do. Let's insist upon a dialogue with them about our future. Let's go after that quid pro quo!

LET'S DO IT!!

Opinions expressed by authors of Faculty Forum articles are not necessarily those of the OSU Faculty or Faculty Senate.
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by
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Why Do We Need a Core?

"His ignorance was as remarkable as his knowledge. Of contemporary literature, philosophy and politics he appeared to know next to nothing. Upon my quoting Thomas Carlyle he inquired in the naivest way who he might be and what he had done. My surprise reached climax, however, when I found incidentally that he was ignorant of the Copernican Theory and of the composition of the Solar System. That any civilized human being in this nineteenth century should not be aware that the earth travelled round the sun appeared to be to me such an extraordinary fact that I could hardly realize it."

Thus Dr. Watson describes Sherlock Holmes in the second chapter of A Study in Scarlet. When I first read this passage, I was immensely struck by it. Here was Sherlock Holmes living in a metropolis of the age, a person of many singular accomplishments, making his living in an arcane and specialized trade. He is, admittedly, a fictional character, but there was no incongruity in portraying him as lacking completely any knowledge of the Copernican Theory. This, to me, was remarkable. It raised the question whether there is any body of knowledge which is essential for being an "educated" or "civilized" person in our culture, aside from some obvious basic skills such as reading, writing, and leaving telephone messages. I have kept my eyes open for a definition of such an essential core that could be said to provide a minimum, basic education. I have not seen anything for which one could not construct an easy counterexample, such as the eminently civilized Sherlock Holmes.

To take my own field for an example. There is one class of people, who, if you set them the task of determining what a "truly educated" person should know, are sure to insist on some philosophy. Most probably this would be in the form of knowing about some "great thinker" of the past such as Plato, Aristotle, or Kant. Nevertheless, there are plenty of people, academics and other intellectuals even, whom it would be foolish to consider uneducated, but whose ignorance of philosophy and philosophers could not be more profound.

I do not intend to go on much longer. My drift, I hope, is becoming apparent. The task which the Curriculum Review Commission has been set and which they have bravely tried to accomplish is impossible. There are no educationally justifiable course requirements that can be applied university-wide to insure a minimum education for students in our culture. There is not even something close to this. On the other hand, it seems to me that on the college level there is, perhaps, enough uniformity in student populations that common intellectual weaknesses can be identified. Perhaps most Engineering
students can't write and most Liberal Arts students can't think mathematically. What such weaknesses are can most reliably be discerned, I think, by the faculty of the individual colleges. There are adequate mechanisms in place for such individual college requirements to be specified. I see no need for an additional layer of university-wide requirements, beyond, perhaps, total hours for a degree, campus residency, and a few other similar items.

Michael Scanlan
Philosophy Department
December 11, 1987
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SOME THOUGHTS ON EDUCATION

by

Richard L. Clinton
Department of Political Science
Oregon State University

January 1988

A philosophy of education should comprises both a definition of education and a prescription concerning how to educate.

As regards the definition of education, the distinction between training and education is useful. Training results in the learning of new information and skills. Education likewise involves mastering new information and skills but, in addition, entails the acquisition of a particular set of values and attitudes, without which, and despite the years spent in study or the degrees earned, one cannot rightly be called an educated person.

Among the values and attitudes essential to being an educated person, I would include the following: love of truth and learning, respect for knowledge and competence, appreciation for logic and evidence, openness to new information and fresh perspectives, and hostility toward bigotry, dogmatism, and unfairness as inimical to the pursuit of truth. Historian Barbara Tuchman put this more succinctly by simply emphasizing the ability to recognize, and a penchant for, quality.

I am tempted to add two further attributes as essential characteristics of the educated person, namely, discernment, or good judgment, and pride in one's work, but, strictly speaking, I suppose these result from a combination of education, intelligence, and character, hence some educated persons will display...
them but, alas, some will not.

The objection could be raised that what I am talking about here is liberal education or liberal arts education, which is true, yet to me these modifiers are redundant, for education is always liberating, which is precisely what distinguishes it from training. Training, if conducted well, makes one more capable but not more free. Education, properly carried out, makes one both more competent and better able to discern who one is, where one fits into the larger scheme of things, and, hence, what choices need to be make at different junctures of one's life. Without the benefit of education, these choices tend to go unrecognized and thus are made for us by our society, social class, or family or by religious or political authorities.

Education achieves its superiority over training primarily by the conscious inculcation of the values and attitudes listed above but also in some degree through the sort of knowledge it focuses upon, that is, humanistic knowledge.

The world has grown too complex and our knowledge of it too extensive for any specific core knowledge to be expected to be common to all educated persons. Nevertheless, the general focus of education that seeks to go beyond training can be stated simply enough: the story of our species and the planet on which it evolved, with special emphasis on human creativity, the grandeur of the human spirit, and the colossal evil of which man is capable.

The overarching aim of education requires this explicitly anthropocentric focus. To liberate students from the chains of ignorance, prejudice, and parochialism that confine them to the world view of their national or regional culture, their socioeconomic class, and the particular historical moment in which they live, they must be assisted in their individual quest for self-knowledge and self-understanding. As they explore the biological, anthropological, historical, and psychological dimensions of the human story and tap the insights of literature, art, and philosophy, physics, sociology and political economy, they cannot but enhance their understanding of the essential questions, for example, "What does it mean to be a human being?" "Who am I?" "Who are we as a people?" "What sorts of goals are realistic and worth striving for?" "How should we organize ourselves to pursue our common goals?" "How should I live my life?"

Human beings throughout history have had these sorts of questions answered for them by their culture and traditions. In modern societies we find ourselves cut off from these former sources of self-knowledge.

Hence, education has become increasingly necessary to modern man, but simultaneously the need for training has grown pari passu with advancing technology. And there's the rub. There are only twenty-four hours in each day and only four years in the typical undergraduate course of study.

The competing demands of education and training in the zero-sum setting of the college curriculum would be difficult enough to reconcile under the best of circumstances. In our individualist, capitalistic, and deeply anti-intellectual society it has proven well-nigh impossible. Education has been pushed back by training on practically every front, even within the liberal arts themselves.

One reason this has occurred is because institutions of higher learning have slavishly imitated the market ideology of free-enterprise capitalism, recasting their curricula in response to shifts in consumer demand and capitulating to the misplaced expectations of capitalist society that they devote themselves to preparing students to make a living instead of for living a fully human existence.

Mimicking another central feature of modern industrial society, colleges and universities have in too many ways come to resemble factories, with their specialization, standardization, assembly-line mass production, fascination with high-tech hardware, and even academic equivalents of time and motion studies.

The pressure from professional groups, graduate schools, business interests, and accrediting organizations has exacerbated these tendencies, forcing all-too-compliant schools to do their work for them. Graduate schools and businesses can train; it is the special province of undergraduate institutions to educate.

Given the perennial underfunding of higher education, yet another reason why training has displaced education, especially in the liberal arts disciplines, can be found in heavy teaching loads and large class sizes. The obstacles to promoting critical thinking and to effectively modeling the core values of the
An educated person are immeasurably multiplied under these conditions, hence the retreat to information transfer through the least effective of all means -- the lecture. As a result, the sometime caricature of the classroom with students in varying states of wakefulness scribbling notes while the professor drones on is not that inaccurate.

The triumph of training over education did not occur through Blitzkrieg but by a prolonged war of attrition. Having come about so gradually and found so many reinforcements in the larger society, there is little chance the situation can be swiftly reversed. Certainly curriculum reform and new general education requirements will not suffice. Education will begin winning battles only when good teachers are as highly regarded as productive researchers, and it will not win the war until good teachers are in frequent contact with few enough students so that each may come to know the other, at the very least through regular class discussions and the teacher's "dialoguing" in the margins of student papers.

In pursuing these worthy objectives it might be useful for institutions of higher education to adopt a new metaphor to substitute for those of the supermarket and the factory that have been employed with such pernicious results. My choice would be a garden -- a place of beauty where living things are helped to grow and where, in some mysterious way, conscientious gardeners are as nurtured by the garden as the garden is by them.

Richard L. Clinton
Department of Political Science
December 15, 1987
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"CHOICES OF INVESTMENT IN TAX DEFERRED ANNUITIES FOR INVESTORS OF CONSCIENCE"

by

Roger Weaver
Professor of English

February 1987

CHOICES OF INVESTMENT IN TAX DEFERRED ANNUITIES FOR INVESTORS OF CONSCIENCE

The State Board of Higher Education has an approved list of investment companies for employees who wish tax-deferred annuities. None of the companies on the approved list passes the standards of monitoring groups opposed to over-spending on defense, pollution of the environment, or stabilizing the government of South Africa. I would like to see the list of choices expanded to include companies which are concerned about such issues to the degree that they do not make such investments.

Joe Sicotte of the State Board office in Eugene indicated to me that expansion of the approved list would occur if sufficient employee interest warranted it. (Prior to our telephone conversation today, he informed me, he is aware of only one other time that this has "come up," as he digestively put it.) This means that in order for an individual to exercise right of choice, many must ask for that right, regardless of their personal stand on any of these issues.

So often we have no choice and our contribution to public funds are not handled with concern for the individual's beliefs, but in this instance provision is made for individual choice. In order to make that choice a real one, please call or write Joe Sicotte or Ron Anderson, Office of the State Board of Higher Education, PO Box 3175, Eugene, Oregon 97403, tel. (503) 686-5765. Ask that the list of tax deferred annuity choices be expanded in order to accommodate individuals concerned about defense, poisoning of the environment, and apartheid in South Africa. Roger Weaver
Professor of English
December 15, 1986

Opinions expressed by authors of Faculty Forum articles are not necessarily those of the OSU Faculty or Faculty Senate.
This has been a bad year for universities. We've been criticized at the national and state levels and our responses to such criticisms have not been convincing. It is time for reflection. What qualifies us to be called a University? What is essential?

OBSERVATIONS

One cannot make sense of Universities by examining their organizational charts or reading the description put out by their administrations. Rather, one should wander around the University and take note of what is actually going on. Let me illustrate.

It's a beautiful afternoon. As we move through the many floors of the University library, we observe similar behaviors at all locations. People, most of them young adults, are studying behind desks and long tables. Books, notes, and papers are sprawled on nearly every available surface. People may be working alone or in small groups. Their voices are kept to low whispers so as to not disturb others. At first, each section in the library looks very much the same, each characterized by a quiet intensity. But upon closer examination, one finds an almost unbelievable diversity of activity. Here, the intensity is directed toward ancient history; there, modern physics; nearby, toxic wastes; to the left, English literature, to the right, the U.S. Constitution. A young woman studies differential equations while her boy friend, at the same table, studies the parables of Jesus.

Later, we go to a coffee shop just off campus. It is crowded. People are at tables huddled over books and papers, much like the library, though the sound level is higher. At some tables are clusters of two to four people. If you listen, you'll hear one group arguing about artificial intelligence, another, checks and balances in government, while another group is complaining about a recent test in organic chemistry. At another table, we find a professor; he looks frustrated. He's struggling to redo his lecture notes and he's obviously not satisfied with what he has. "How can I explain this?", he asks himself. In another corner, a student is going over her lecture notes. She, too, looks frustrated, "What was he trying to say?" she asks. At another table, two students are discussing a test. "How did you answer the second question?" one asks.

Our trip through the University continues. We attend a seminar at which an intense argument arises over the use of social discount rates in resource management. We attend several lectures on professional ethics, vector algebra, organizational behavior, religion, literature, and several topics beyond our own comprehension. We arrive at early morning to see our professor still trying to get his lecture prepared before his morning class. We come late in the evening to hear several graduate students trying to explain why a piece of laboratory equipment won't work.

We spend one day simply watching a blackboard. It is filled with equations, diagrams, and notes, and then erased at least a dozen times. In the evening it is cleaned of its daily residue to prepare it for the same treatment the next day.

Each day literally tons of old homework assignments, graded tests, scratch paper, notes, drafts of papers, and computer output must be hauled away for recycling or disposal. Look through this waste and you'll find
dead ends for a mathematical derivation, rejected drafts for a paper on existential philosophy, graded tests on American history, or computer output on the simulation of aquatic ecosystems.

There appears to be little overall supervision in this elaborate system. Most people aren't forced to attend seminars. Attendance is rarely taken to class. A supervisor won't check up on our frustrated professor's lectures. Nobody appears to be needed to make sure that the people in the library remain quiet. Nobody organizes the discussions in the coffee shop. And yet, this is a system of constant evaluation and intense discipline. Papers and tests are graded. Professors are evaluated by students. Laboratory data are checked over. Mathematical derivations are examined. Philosophers, ancient and modern, are critiqued. Everybody seems to be asking everybody else to explain what they mean. The demand to "explain," to "make sense," is placed on the teenage freshman as well as the tenured professor. Throughout such explaining, the spirit of youth and the discipline of experience confront and complement each other; without either there would be no University.

If you don't see these kinds of situations, then you haven't seen the University. If you want to know what a University is, then you have to make sense of what I have described.

THE UNIVERSITY BACKGROUND

Institutions are social entities within which certain behaviors are socially reinforced. The University is no exception. The essential character of an institution is given by a background of expectations that pervasively and persistently influence the behaviors of people within it.

We can make sense of the University by identifying those background expectations that bring forth the behaviors that we observed as we wandered through the University. I suggest five background expectations that sustain such behaviors.

1. Regardless of rank, all persons (students, faculty, guest lecturers, authors, etc.) are expected to explain; to be held accountable for their claims through exposure and inquiry.

2. Explanations are tested through such questions as:

   a) What do you mean?
   b) Does this make sense?
   c) Does the evidence support this?
   d) Is this reasonable? Just? Trustworthy?
   e) Is this supported by our most trusted knowledge and experience?

3. Expectations 1 and 2 (above) are to be applied to all areas of knowledge; no topic is exempt.

4. That which has provided insight through the history of such inquiry demands respect; study is an essential expression of such respect. 1

5. The purpose of lectures, laboratories, libraries, classrooms, seminars, tests, homework, conferences, workshops, administration, and tenure is to assure the above expectations are persistently and pervasively met with spirit, honesty, and discipline.

The University is a social institution defined by the pervasive and persistent influence of such background expectations. Strong arguments can be made in support of other activities such as job training, obtaining grants, enhancing economic development, and developing a competitive athletic program. However, when such activities limit or undermine these essential expectations, when such activities are employed to justify a university and sustain its identity, then, they are in conflict with the real University.

COMMON MISPERCEPTIONS

Common misperceptions arise when the University is seen as a technological institution. From this
misperception, university education is seen as an activity through which knowledge is transferred from the teacher to the student; quality control is assured by testing the students and evaluating the productivity of the professors. Incoming students are raw resources and graduates are finished products. Teaching and research are seen as separate marketable services; both are specialized. The goal of proper management, despite much rhetoric to the contrary, is seen as increasing the productivity of the process, sustaining capital investment, marketing goods and services, assuring quality control, and securing funds (ref.1-3). The use of television, video tapes, teaching machines, productivity evaluations, marketing techniques, and faculty incentives to secure outside funding are seen as essential means for attaining such management goals. In other words, the university is seen as a knowledge industry with essentially the same requirements as any other industry. Knowledge is seen as a technological product (4).

In contrast, the University background (described previously) provides an alternative view of the University. From this view, the testing of students, while important, is secondary to the care of knowledge itself. Throughout the University, knowledge from all fields is continually exposed to questions such as, "what does this mean?" and "does this make sense?" Knowledge claims that cannot survive such critical inquiry tend to be either transformed (often after much controversy) or forgotten (if not by the faculty, then by the students). The University is not primarily concerned with the efficient production, distribution, and utilization of information. Rather, the University is primarily concerned with discovering and sustaining that which is worthy of being called knowledge. Never forget, "knowledge" is much more than "information" or "inputs" and "outputs". The title "knowledge" makes a moral claim on those who hear it; knowledge demands respect and because of this moral claim, any power (political, economic, etc.) can be confronted by knowledge and any distortion of knowledge by such power is declared a grievous moral wrong. It is the University's business to foster those practices that protect the legitimacy of such moral claims.

University faculty are not concerned with training students to do what we tell them. Rather, faculty seek to prepare people to do more than what we tell them. The primary means by which Universities transfer knowledge to other institutions is not through the reports submitted to granting agencies. Rather, Universities transfer people -- our students -- and because of their University involvement, these people have the background, spirit, discipline, and virtues (5) to nurture and care for knowledge in more trustworthy ways.

WHAT DOES THE UNIVERSITY DO?

Industry can train people for its jobs more efficiently than the University. Consulting firms can better provide timely technical reports that address the specific objections and needs of funding agencies. Television can provide more entertaining and efficient information transfer. Just what is it that the University does best that our society really needs?

In his best seller, Megatrends, Robert Naisbitt (6) reminds us that we live within an "information age." He states:

"In the information society, we have systematized the production of knowledge and amplified our brainpower. To use an industrial metaphor, we now mass-produce knowledge and this knowledge is the driving force of our economy."

Now try a simple experiment. Substitute the word "propaganda" for the word "knowledge" and re-read this same statement.

"In the propaganda society, we have systematized the production of propaganda and amplified our brainpower. To use an industrial metaphor, we now mass-produce propaganda and this propaganda is the driving force of our economy."

Now the statement sounds like something from Orwell's "1984"! The function of the information produced is to "propagate" the system that produced it. That's what propaganda is. There's nothing in Naisbitt's book that distinguishes between knowledge and propaganda so, why not substitute one term for the other? Both are information outputs. What's the difference? But, of course, there is an essential moral difference! But how does this moral differentiation occur? Unfortunately, it is far too easy to deceive ourselves. After all, the most effective propaganda is quite convincing.

We expect industry to train people to propagate itself and its products. It is no secret that the assessment studies (environmental impact studies, benefit-cost analyses) of funding agencies are slanted to propagate the agencies and the projects that these agencies depend upon (7). Look at television! Can there be any doubt that television seeks to propagate itself and the products that sustain it?

Where then can we find the nurturing of those behaviors that make possible a meaningful distinction between
knowledge and propaganda? What kind of background, discipline, spirit, and virtues are needed? What should people do in order to prepare themselves to make such distinctions? How must a culture prepare each generation to sustain this essential distinction?

No institution, including the University, can place itself as the final judge. But there are certain practices that can allow a citizenry to make meaningful distinctions between propaganda and knowledge, including propaganda produced by universities. Indeed organizations calling themselves "universities" have produced information to propagate themselves and they've been called on it as they should be! But it seems to me, these very challenges point to the essential character of the real University.

The essential character of the real University is to be found in the practices that it expects of its members (the "University background"). Look again at the expected practices that characterize the University. Is it possible to obtain a meaningful distinction between knowledge and propaganda without such practices? I think not. The distinguishing practices are essential!

Information that is able to survive and thrive within a history of such distinguishing practices deserves respect. Knowledge is the name we give to convey such respect and study is an act of respect. If a culture is to be able to distinguish between knowledge, which deserves respect and propaganda, which does not, it must sustain from generation to generation a history of such distinguishing practices. Without such caring practices, nihilism, which comes in many forms, becomes our legacy.

One should never claim that the University is the only place where such distinguishing practices occur (4). It is not. But, if we look to an institution that holds such practices paramount, if we look to an institution that instills such practices within each new generation, and if we look to an institution that has somehow managed, for better or worse, to sustain these practices for many centuries (8), then we look to the University. Let's be one.

---

1 - I have in mind the classics, history, and fundamentals (conversion of energy, checks and balances in government, etc.) that provide a common ground for reasoned discussion among people who do not share the same personal interests, ambitions, and preferences. An understanding of context, the world we live within (technology, institutions, etc.), is also essential.
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"AN OPEN LETTER TO THE CURRICULUM REVIEW COMMISSION"

RE: English Composition

By: C.W. Dane, Professor of Business Administration

An open letter to the Curriculum Review Commission:

Based on your October 7, 1987 draft, your commission might be giving serious consideration to having the "communications" component of the General Education Model consist of:

- Writing 121 3 semester credit hours
- Communications 222 3 semester credit hours
- Writing Intensive Course (WIC) at the upper division level in the student's major

I applaud your committee's reduction in the number of credit hours devoted to English composition. I just don't believe you have reduced it enough. We shouldn't devote any of our scarce General Education hours to any courses in English composition.

Entering freshman have already completed 12 years of formal instruction in English composition. These courses are taught in the student's native language using verbal skills learned from childhood. In most cases, the courses are taught by teachers who willingly critique many written assignments giving the students plenty of opportunity to practice composition. Why should one more English composition course improve the results?

Actually, most high school graduates have the English composition skills to write well. They have had years of English grammar. Students who plan to go to college usually take English courses that provide opportunities to practice different writing styles and to have their work critiqued. At college, most of these students will write well if convinced by the actions of instructors of their technical subjects that writing well is important. For that reason, I believe your suggestion of WIC's is a step in the right direction.

Sincerely,

C. W. Dane
Professor of Business Administration
October 22, 1987
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"STATEMENT OF PRINCIPLES FOR GUIDING THE LONG-RANGE PLANNING AT OREGON STATE UNIVERSITY"

February 20, 1986

The President's Long-Range Planning Commission is committed to wide participation and involvement of the total university community in the planning process. We especially invite faculty reaction and response to this Statement of Principles, as well as any other suggestions you may wish to direct to the Commission. Your comments and suggestions may be sent to any of the undersigned Commission members.

STATEMENT OF PRINCIPLES FOR GUIDING THE LONG-RANGE PLANNING AT OREGON STATE UNIVERSITY

To assure effectiveness of the long-range planning process, the following general principles have been adopted by the Long-Range Planning Commission and approved by President Byrne.

1. The aim of the entire process is to increase the vitality and effectiveness of the University in its service to faculty, students, and its varied local, national, and international constituencies.

   ◆ To achieve this aim requires an assessment of the external environment, an institutional assessment, and an analysis of the University's missions and goals.

2. The concepts of quality, flexibility, and informed choice shall guide the process.

3. The success of the endeavor is dependent on total university involvement.

   ◆ Each teaching, research, and service unit will participate in formulating the University's long-range plan.

4. Open communication and a consultative process are essential to the operation.

   ◆ Faculty newsletters, articles in the Barometer, open hearings and forums, and letters to the Commission and committees shall be used to foster open communications.

   ◆ Faculty shall be involved in the entire process on the Commission,
the major committees, at the unit planning stage, and by consultation throughout the process.

- Students, staff, alumni, and relevant external constituencies shall be consulted and involved at appropriate times in the process. Students have specific units for which they have planning responsibilities.

5. Responsibilities for the long-range planning process must be clearly delineated.

- The president -- is the chief planning officer, appoints the Commission, negotiates with the major planning units and with the Commission, and issues the University Long-Range Plan.
- The Long-Range Planning Commission -- designs, modifies, and oversees the planning process.
- The vice presidents, deans, and directors -- are responsible for the specific academic and service unit plans under their jurisdiction.
- Department administrators and faculty -- provide data, review the unit's opportunities and goals, and help set target dates for achieving them.

6. The focus of planning at all levels shall be the coherent unity of Oregon State University and of OSU as a part of the Oregon State System of Higher Education.

- The planning process must recognize the importance of the external environment in which OSU operates; the unique characteristics and strengths of OSU as a Land-Grant and Sea-Grant university; and OSU's distinctive and historic mission and goals.

7. Long-range planning must be a dynamic process involving continual evaluation, adaptation, and adjustment to changing needs and conditions.

- OSU should be prepared to capitalize on new opportunities for growth and service which promote and enhance the goals of the University.
- The long-range plan will be updated and revised to coincide with preparation of the biennial budget.

8. The budget process will be linked to the planning process to assure that resource allocation decisions in the future will be made in accordance with the long-range plan.

- Although continuing to be diverse and comprehensive, OSU may refine its programmatic emphases -- establishing priorities and allocating resources to programs and areas that advance the goals of the University.

9. The entire process shall lead to a plan that incorporates timely and effective target dates for achieving specific goals.

- The final plan shall take into consideration the sensitive interrelationship between the human, academic, fiscal, and physical elements that are involved.
| Pete Fullerton | Kinsey Green | Warren Hovland |
| Pharmacy      | Home Economics | Liberal Arts |
| Steve Lawton | Bud Weiser | Agriculture |
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"COMPUTING AND OREGON STATE UNIVERSITY'S CURRICULUM"

by

Ad Hoc Instructional Computing Committee

May 1986

COMPUTING AND OREGON STATE UNIVERSITY'S CURRICULUM

Abstract: Continual improvements in software along with steep declines in cost have made computing an essential part of many intellectual activities. Change has occurred so rapidly in the field of computing that Oregon State's curriculum has not kept pace.

This report contains two sections. Section I describes how our society is moving from the Industrial Age whose inventions augmented our physical abilities to the Information Age whose inventions assist our mental processes. Because of the importance of recently developed information processing tools, we feel Oregon State should incorporate instruction about the use of computers throughout the entire curriculum. Section II emphasizes the need to develop a university-wide plan to coordinate these curriculum changes. This section suggests that Oregon State should: (1) require every undergraduate student to take a lower-division computer applications course, (2) increase the coverage of computing methods in upper-division courses, and (3) improve the instructional computer facilities.

Section I: The Rising Importance of Computing in Intellectual Activity

John Byrne's Inaugural Address as the 14th President of Oregon State University began with the words: "Preparing for the future is Oregon State University's business. Now the world is experiencing rapid change. We live during a time of turbulence between eras of relative stability -- a time for innovation, a time of opportunity."

This section examines the opportunities created by the rapid improvement of digital electronics, computing, and electronic communications. These new technologies are moving our society out of the Industrial Age and into the Information Age. As a result we need to reassess Oregon State's methods of creating and dispensing knowledge.

The Industrial Age was characterized by the construction of mechanical machines for cutting, stamping, moving, and producing. These machines made farmers and blue collar workers far more productive. Oregon State was founded as the Industrial Age was coming into full swing, and quite naturally, the furtherance of the Industrial Age formed a large part of the institution's original charter. Quoting again from John Byrne's Inaugural Address:

On July 2, 1862, Abraham Lincoln signed the first Morrill Act which established that unique U.S. contribution to higher education now known as the Land Grant University. A purpose of the
Morrill Act as stated in the parlance of the 19th century was as follows: "The leading object shall be to teach such branches of learning as are related to agriculture and the mechanical arts in order to promote the liberal and practical education of the industrial classes in the several pursuits and professions in life."

Now, more than one hundred years later, our economy is driven by electronic instead of mechanical innovations. The Information Age is characterized by the development of electronic systems to help us think, communicate, manage, and control. These new tools promise to make office workers, managers, educators, architects, scientists, lawyers, and other professionals far more productive. They also provide us with entirely new challenges.

Table 1 compares the characteristics of the Industrial Age with those of the Information Age -- the differences are dramatic. These differences have implications for the future directions of higher education.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Industrial Age</th>
<th>Information Age</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Primarily mechanical tools that augmented our physical capabilities</td>
<td>Primarily electronic tools that augmented our mental capabilities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slowly changing technology</td>
<td>Rapid technical innovation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Output rated in physical terms: units sold, tons produced, etc.</td>
<td>Output judged by intangibles: value added, timeliness, accuracy, service, flexibility, usefulness.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rapid growth in domestic markets for goods</td>
<td>A world economy with mature markets for most goods</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Simple tools designed for specific tasks</td>
<td>Complex tools supporting numerous tasks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tools used on a stand-alone basis</td>
<td>Tools form highly integrated and sophisticated networks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inventions built by entrepreneurs using custom tools</td>
<td>Innovations occur in research environments providing ample access to machine intelligence</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1 Characteristics of the Industrial Age and the Information Age

Evaluating inventions was easier during the Industrial Age. The benefits were objective and physical: faster production, better yields, lower costs, and so forth. Innovations in the Information Age frequently produce intangible benefits. What is the value of more timely information or a more thorough analysis? Such questions don’t usually yield dollars and cents answers, but neither do questions about the value of a college education. What is the value of a more informed mind? We cannot afford to ignore the developments occurring in computing, because they provide mental tools that augment the thought processes of an educated mind.

Few of the mechanical tools from the Industrial Age invaded classrooms because they augmented our physical abilities without assisting our mental processes. In contrast, Information Age tools are essential to academic life, because they change the way professionals and white-collar workers (known as knowledge workers) approach everyday tasks. For example,

- Writers find that word processing changes the way thoughts are translated into words on paper, and editors find that electronic publishing takes word processing one step further and converts rough manuscripts into polished typeset documents.
- Analysts find that spreadsheet programs open up new ways to create mathematical models and forecasts.
- Researchers find that electronic card catalogs reduce the frustration associated with locating appropriate books, journals, and other reference materials.
- Database management systems and statistical programs provide new ways to share and extract information from large amounts of data.
- Electronic mail and bulletin board systems help distribute information far faster and at less expense than conventional mail or classroom handouts. Voice-store-and-forward systems change the rules of the game of telephone tag in favor of everyone.

This list could go on and on, and each item would describe another Information Age tool used to create or disseminate knowledge. Now compare these tools with Oregon State's mission, as presented in John Byrne's Inaugural Address:
It is Oregon State's responsibility to create new knowledge to serve as the base for the economic and social development of our society. It is Oregon State's responsibility to make sure that knowledge is put into the hands of those who can use it.

Section II: The Need for Curriculum Changes

Oregon State's response to the growing importance of computing has been haphazard. Some disciplines have introduced application-oriented computer courses, such as Ag251 Computer Applications in Agriculture, Ba131 Introduction to Business Data Processing, and Ls199c, Personal Computer Applications. Science and Engineering have relied primarily on programming-oriented computer courses. In the last two years the bulk of instructional computing has shifted from the university’s central mainframe computer to newly established departmental computer laboratories. This shift has been spearheaded by individual colleges, including Business, Engineering, Forestry, Liberal Arts, and Science. Some problems with this decentralized approach to computing include:

- The instructors of most upper-division courses cannot assume that their students are competent computer users with adequate access to computing equipment. Many students have not even been exposed to the basics of using a computer, such as how to format a disk or operate a typical application program. This makes it difficult to include computer-based assignments in upper-division classes.

- Many students graduate without an adequate exposure to computer applications in their major field. As the quality and variety of software has improved, it has become much more important to know how to use and select software than to know how to write programs. In some colleges students are exposed to general-purpose software, but are not given an opportunity to interact with special-purpose programs designed specifically for their major field. For example, this year's accounting students will graduate without any hands-on experience with a computerized accounting system.

- The proliferation of small departmental computer laboratories has led to inefficiencies in both supervision and student access. Each lab requires lab monitors, and many of the labs are located in buildings that are not open in the evenings and on weekends. Because each course's students are restricted to a particular lab, an assignment in one course can swamp one lab while other labs remain temporarily unused.

- Some colleges have not acquired their own computer facilities and consequently are provided with no access to computing other than the obsolete central mainframe computer with its inadequate software.

These problems are serious and should be solved. Therefore, our committee recommends that Oregon State should begin immediately to: (1) require every undergraduate student to take a lower-division computer applications course, (2) increase the coverage of computing methods in upper-division courses, and (3) improve the computer facilities available for instruction.

Step 1: Require all students to take a computer applications course

Every entering student should be required to complete a basic course in functional computer competency or demonstrate comparable competency. Courses that fulfill this requirement should be offered at the freshman level to provide students with computer skills and tools as soon as possible. This requirement would allow every instructor of upper-division classes to assume that their students have been exposed to a common body of knowledge about the use of general-purpose software.

Several ways of delivering this instruction are possible. One large enrollment class might be taught by the Computer Science department, or courses might be offered by several colleges with students allowed to select one course from the cafeteria-style offerings. The focus of this course should be on basic competency skills and applications, but designated sections might emphasize particular applications, such as statistical analysis, spreadsheet construction, or graphics, in order to prepare students for their particular major.

Regardless of how this required course is offered, it should cover all of the following topics:
- A basic understanding of how computers work.
- The basics of operating a microcomputer.
- Major application software areas, including: word processing, spreadsheets, data management, statistical data analysis, and graphics.
- Social issues in computing.

We do not see programming as an essential skill, although a knowledge of programming is helpful in understanding how software and hardware operate.

One argument against requiring a computer competency course is the possibility that, in the future, freshman may arrive on campus with adequate computer skills from high school coursework. We don't believe this argument. Most students arrive on campus with inadequate writing skills for college work even though they have taken many years of high school English. There are good reasons to believe the situation will remain similar for computer skills. For example, most high school-level computer courses emphasize programming over application software, teach the syntax of a particular programming language instead of teaching general software design methods, and show students how to use particular application programs rather than teaching them how to compare and select programs. Even if these deficiencies in high school curricula are eventually corrected, there will still be a need for our students to take a college-level course in the use of computers.

**Step 2: Increase the Coverage of Computing in Upper-Division Courses**

A general computer literacy course is only the first step toward the goal of integrating computing into the entire curriculum. Once basic computer skills have been acquired, each student must have the opportunity to prepare for advances work in their major. We expect that coursework for this intermediate level will continue to evolve over time and reflect the modern use of computers in the various disciplines. We also expect advanced computer-oriented courses to develop in many areas.

The complete program is thus a beginning course to establish a least common denominator of basic skills, intermediate level courses emphasizing skills of the student's discipline, and advanced coursework in which computing is thoroughly integrated.

For all of this to happen the curriculum improvements must receive highly visible support from the administration. Faculty must be encouraged to reevaluate course and curricular goals in light of the rapid developments in computer technology. They need time to contemplate the computer-inspired changes on their discipline. This should be encouraged by providing some faculty members with released time to create computer-based classroom assignments and course materials. Finally, when the faculty makes major curricular modifications, the administration will need to implement the changes with adjustments in staffing and teaching assignments.

**Step 3: Improve the Computer Facilities Available for Instruction**

Instruction computing is characterized by small, individual projects that are well within the capabilities of today's personal computers. It is an unusual instructional computing assignment that requires or benefits from the capabilities of a mainframe computer. Yet almost all of the general university funds earmarked for computer instruction -- currently almost half a million dollars a year -- are restricted so that they must be spent on the university's obsolete Cyber computer. The software for the Cyber is difficult to use and inadequate for the types of computing needed for instruction. The Cyber is so inappropriate for instructional computing that over $100,000 of the instructional computing fund will remain unspent at the end of this school year due to lack of demand. (Nonetheless, this money will be given to the computer center to cover part of the shortfall in their budget.) Clearly, the university needs to change its method of supporting computing and update its computing equipment.

Another problem is the university’s pay-as-you-go method of charging for computer usage. In the days of punched card computing, it may have been acceptable to charge for each computing run. But now that computers are applied to everyday intellectual activities, the need for computer services is similar to the need for centrally supported telephone and library systems. Users should not be charges each time a computer is used. The current computer center funding policy has lead to a profusion of inefficient and poorly utilized departmental computing laboratories. Again, a university-level response is needed.

If each student is to acquire functional computing skills, it is essential that the University establish computing laboratories where these skills can be developed and used. Oregon State’s Program Improvement Request for
the 1987-1989 biennium proposes the establishment of two laboratories, each containing 50 personal computers and a sufficient supply of peripherals, including low and high-resolution printers, graphics facilities, and plotters. Software for student use would include both general-purpose personal productivity tools (word processors, spreadsheets, database managers) and specialized software for use in specific courses. We believe that Oregon State should implement this part of the Program Improvement Request immediately, even if it is not specifically funded by the legislature.

This Faculty Forum paper was prepared by an ad hoc Instructional Computing Committee.

Curt Cook         Sheila Cordray           Ken Krane            Frank Schaumburg       David Sullivan
Computer Sci.     Sociology                  Physics               Civil Engineering        Business

Opinions expressed by authors of Faculty Forum articles are not necessarily those of the OSU Faculty or Faculty Senate.
I am pleased to have the opportunity to address you on this, my second day as Vice President for Academic Affairs and Provost at Oregon State University. I have received a most warm welcome from the faculty, staff, and administration, and I am grateful for the confidence you and President Byrne have shown me in selecting me for this position.

I would like my remarks today to be the first in a yearly series of addresses to the Faculty Senate in which I might outline some goals and plans for the year. In addition, I will plan to attend all Senate meetings personally during the year, schedule permitting. I plan to have available at every Senate meeting a written summary of important actions, issues, and announcements that might be of special interest to the faculty. I will also make myself available for questions and comments at each Senate meeting I am able to attend to the extent that the Senate agenda permits.

Before I outline some initial impressions about Oregon State University, I want to take a moment to reflect on one aspect of the past year. You have undergone the most significant administrative reorganization in the history of this university, and I think we will all come to appreciate President Byrne's decision to structure Oregon State University in a manner that is more customary for comprehensive institutions of higher education in the United States. Perhaps the most important part of this reorganization is the creation of the position of Vice President for Academic Affairs and Provost. I want to publicly acknowledge my debt and gratitude to Bill Wilkins, who had the difficult and challenging task of launching the position, defining the initial scope of it, and making it work during a time of change. I can't tell you how pleased I am to join an institution and an office where so much works so well. All of my previous administrative appointments have involved stepping into chaos, poor morale, serious financial disarray, and a vacuum of leadership. Bill has done an exemplary job and should be credited with laying a most impressive foundation for the future. Please join me in publicly thanking Bill and wishing him well during his forthcoming sabbatical year.

Oregon State University is a remarkable success story. During the course of my interviews and my first days on campus, I have had the opportunity to familiarize myself with much of what we have to offer as a university. I have read thousands of pages of reports, reviews, proposals, plans, and public
relations material. I have also now had more than 100 meeting involving several hundred of the faculty and staff. (Please forgive me if I do not remember your names at first!) We can be proud of what we have here and especially of the accomplishments of our many talented faculty.

But in stepping into this new position, I am more concerned about our potential than about our achievements. I see my principal responsibilities, shared with the President and other Vice Presidents, as advancing this institution to a position of increasing national and international leadership and visibility; strengthening our service to the people of Oregon; insuring that the education we provide our students is up to date, intellectually sound, and of the highest quality; enhancing the quality of life for students, staff and faculty members on campus; insuring that we hire the best faculty and staff who we can attract to Oregon State; rewarding those outstanding faculty that we already have here; finding ways to improve the efficiency of management of the university in areas such as personnel actions, computing, office automation, and administrative procedures; and providing leadership for programs that will enhance our ability to attract to the faculty, staff and student body individuals from underrepresented groups. I want us to take the next big step in all of these areas.

Oregon State University is a leader nationally in many fields, but we can do better. The obstacles are at times formidable: faculty and staff salaries are too low; teaching loads are not competitive in some units; inadequate start-up funds for laboratories, equipment, and staff assistance for new faculty; employee benefits that might be improved; and bureaucratic policies that occasionally seem to get in the way. But all of these limitations, and the many others I haven't mentioned, can be corrected. I am going to try.

Today I would like to summarize several initiatives that I hope to launch in the immediate future. I will welcome your input on all of these ideas and programs, and indeed encourage each of you to write to me directly, or through the appropriate Senate committees, about these and other programs.

1. First, I am pleased to announce that Professor Pete Fullerton has accepted a three year appointment as Associate Vice President for Academic Affairs. His appointment follows several months of able service as Acting Associate Vice President. Dr. Fullerton's assignments will include many of those traditionally part of the Dean of Faculty portfolio, as well as supervision of several academic support units and a substantial number of new responsibilities.

Professor Mimi Orzech has accepted a three year appointment as Assistant Vice President for Academic Affairs, following several months of impressive service as Acting Assistant Vice President. Dr. Orzech's assignments will include many of those previously held by the Dean of Undergraduate Studies, as well as supervisory responsibility for several academic support units and a range of special assignments. I am pleased to have the opportunity to work with these two most capable individuals.

2. Effective immediately, and as indicated in my remarks about Dr. Pete Fullerton and Dr. Mimi Orzech, all new administrative appointments made through my office will carry specific fixed-terms of service, with the opportunity for continuing renewals. This approach allows for in-depth periodic evaluation of Deans, Directors, and other managers reporting to the Vice President for Academic Affairs and Provost. Such a system is now in place in some of our Colleges. However, I will encourage Deans and Directors to make appointments of chairs, heads, and others for appropriate terms. I will also review with incumbents how we might move each of them to a system of periodic review.

3. The Senate today received a committee recommendation regarding fixed-term appointments. Upon receipt of the Senate’s recommendations, I will endeavor to institute a new policy on such appointments by the end of fall term. This is a most complex issue. Our policy must allow us to attract and keep the best faculty we can while protecting the financial integrity of the institution.

4. It is clear that there are substantial variations in workloads across campus. Several units have unusually high teaching loads, including the Colleges of Health and Physical Education, the College of Business and the School of Education. There also can be little doubt that one of our largest academic units, the College of Liberal Arts, has a standard teaching load that challenges faculty to sustain a program of research or creative scholarship comparing favorably with colleagues in peer institutions. Reducing teaching workloads is a challenge since we do not wish to reduce student credit hours. Nevertheless, through curriculum review and attention to course scheduling and sequencing, we may be able to make some initial improvements. I have already begun to discuss this problem with Dean Robert Frank and have asked him to conduct a careful study of how we might begin to reduce teaching loads for faculty who are productive scholars in the College of Liberal Arts. In order to facilitate this plan, I am prepared to guarantee that, barring serious financial circumstances, the College will not lose any faculty positions during the next two years, even though many of its faculty might be teaching fewer courses. I will be reviewing the workloads in other Colleges with their Deans as well and hope to launch efforts in those units to free more faculty time for scholarship and professional development.
5. All faculty members should have an opportunity to further their professional development, including travel to professional meetings. Some of our colleges have insufficient funds to support travel to even one meeting a year for some of their faculty. I will seek to create a special pool of funds beyond those already available to support faculty development and professional travel. In addition, we will streamline the procedures leading to faculty development and travel awards now administered centrally. Such a program is not only good for the faculty member, it is good for OSU. We must not underestimate the importance of our presence at professional meetings as a way of marketing our university, attracting graduate students, and recruiting other faculty.

6. In collaboration with Vice President Trow, we will appoint a task force to study the problem of student attrition. Stated differently, we wish to improve retention. This will be an important emphasis during this year.

7. To further enhance the visibility of the university, and to accept the special role of universities in recognizing distinguished national and world leaders in education, government, and industry, I propose that we reestablish the OSU tradition of awarding honorary doctorates to deserving leaders in their fields. We would thereby rejoin the many leading institutions of higher education that grant such recognition. This program would need to be established so it does not diminish in any way the honor we have bestowed on recipients of our Distinguished Service Awards.

8. To further bring distinguished Americans to Oregon State, as well as to enrich the cultural and political awareness of our students and faculty, I plan to work with the Lectures and Convocations Committee to establish a Provost's Lectureship. This would be an occasional lecture and will provide additional opportunities to expose our students and faculty to national leaders, particularly eminent women and minorities.

9. With the concurrence of Dean Lyle Calvin, I would like to institute a policy, to be effective next fall, prohibiting graduate students whose native language is not English from teaching until such time as they have been deemed proficient in spoken English at a level appropriate to their assignment and so certified by the English Language Institute. I will ask the Senate to consider this matter and hope that there is agreement that such a policy would serve well both our undergraduate students and the graduate students involved.

10. There is nothing more important for the Vice President for Academic Affairs and Provost than matters relating to faculty appointments, faculty development, promotion, and tenure. I want to continue the tradition of making the university’s expectations clear and facilitating faculty development that encourages promotion and tenure. The Provost has the delicate responsibility of making personnel decisions that will promote excellence, but that will also be equitable and humane. We must recognize diversity across academic units and we must remember that many individuals are hired to do work that does not necessarily fit our traditional expectations for faculty research, scholarship and teaching. There are some improvements to be made in the manner that we conduct our tenure and promotion reviews at Oregon State. Although it would not be appropriate to change any policies that would significantly affect this year’s deliberations, I have been working with central administration staff, the Faculty Senate President, and the chair of the Senate Promotion and Tenure Committee to find ways to streamline the process once a dossier reaches the administration building. I will be working with your Senate representatives during the year to reexamine the overall process with an eye to next year. One specific change I would like to discuss relates to the confidentiality of outside letters. I would like to give the faculty the option of waiving the right to see evaluative letters. A policy by which letters are open to faculty members may restrict an outside evaluator's willingness to present an objective assessment of the candidate. I have therefore asked our legal counsel, in consultation with the Office of the Attorney General, to prepare a draft -- and I underline the word draft -- of a form that would be available to faculty on a strictly voluntary basis -- and I underline the word voluntary -- that could be used to waive one's right of access of such letters. This is similar to what we do with letters of evaluation for undergraduate and graduate students and is a procedure with which we are all familiar. I will ask the Senate as well as Deans and Department administrators to consider this proposal.

11. I would like to announce the establishment of a Provost's Art Prize. This prize will be given annually to a work created by a student and judged meritorious in a competition overseen by a faculty committee. The winning student would receive an appropriate cash prize and the work of art would become part of the permanent collection of the university and displayed in the administration building or another appropriate location on campus.
12. A high priority of mine is the encouragement of interdisciplinary cooperation. We have had great success with such ventures already, for example in the interdisciplinary research centers reporting to Vice President Keller. In cooperation with other Vice Presidents, I will look for opportunities to bring faculty members together from different units for research, instruction, and unstructured exchange of ideas. I will continue to sponsor the informal brown bag luncheon series started by Bill Wilkins to bring together faculty and staff from around campus, as well as from off campus. This series will be open to all faculty and staff and will feature informal presentations of research and scholarship by faculty from all of our academic Colleges.

13. Oregon State University's general education curriculum for undergraduates is seriously in need of reform. In addition, we need to examine the entire range of educational opportunities outside of the classroom. I would like to work with the Faculty Senate and the Long Range Planning Committee Curriculum Task Force to launch a major study of our curriculum. It is my hope that we will consider moving away from a curriculum with little coherence -- the current format by which students simply choose courses from a long menu in each category -- to a curriculum that has themes, emphases on certain skills, and a rationale that projects what the OSU faculty consider an appropriate array of courses for a graduate of the 1990's.

14. I will soon meet with various groups concerned with issues pertaining to women, including the President's Commission on the Status of Women and the Women's Center Advisory Group. Among the topics I would like to address are day care, sexual harassment, affirmative action, dual-career issues, maternity leave policies, and the classroom climate for women. Similarly, I will soon meet with groups concerned with issues pertaining to minorities, including the Minorities Task Force. We will want to examine and perhaps redesign our entire approach to affirmative action in the recruitment of faculty and students in view of Oregon State's difficulties in seeking and attracting underrepresented groups to our campus.

15. I will initiate discussions on how we might further improve the way we manage budgets, personnel forms, and student records. Vice President Trow and I have discussed the need to simplify procedures pertaining to registration, advising, and related student services. I believe much can be accomplished even within the constraints currently imposed in conjunction with the development of the Total Information System. We will also embark on a program of office automation in Academic Affairs, not just to improve our own procedures there, but to lay the groundwork for future electronic communication with the Colleges.

16. I hope to launch this spring, in anticipation of the fall 1987 term, a faculty associate program. This program would bring a faculty member into central administration for one year, on a half-time basis, to assist with special projects. It is an opportunity for interested individuals to sample administration without making an irreversible career shift. I see it as an especially useful way to help prepare individuals for possible future administrative appointments. Such a program would be geared to faculty relatively early in their careers, with special emphasis on attracting women and minorities to such an internship.

17. To facilitate communication among the academic administration, I will propose to the deans the establishment of a new group and the continuation of another. The Dean's Forum would be a new group consisting of only the deans and would be chaired by the Vice President for Academic Affairs and Provost. This will become a key body that discusses academic and administrative policy, and helps chart the direction for the university. The Academic Council will continue and will include the deans as well as broader representation by directors of the university's other units centrally involved in Academic Programs.

18. I plan to look consistently for opportunities to expand the social consciousness for our students. It is important that the university provide for its students an environment in which there can be open discussion of social issues facing them personally and the world around them. I hope that a growing number of our lectures, conferences, and cultural events will focus our attention on issues such as Apartheid, poverty and unemployment, family disruption, disarmament, and social injustice and discrimination in its many forms.

These are some of my initial ideas and impressions. I welcome your comments on them and hope that all of you would agree that some of these goals are worth pursuing with vigor. I look forward to working with you in the years ahead, and I want especially to wish you well as we begin this new academic year together.

Graham B. Spanier
October 9, 1986
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ABSTRACT: Last month the Milne Computer Center issued a PLAN FOR MAINFRAME COMPUTING recommending the immediate purchase of another major upgrade to the Computer Center's CYBER 170 mainframe. Although the immediate upgrade would provide an increase in raw computing power, it crushes any short-term hope of improving the quality of mainframe computing on campus and seriously compromises our long-term options by investing in dead-end technology.

The PLAN FOR MAINFRAME COMPUTING implies that we face a serious CYBER capacity problem in FY 1985-1986. Our investigations show otherwise. In Section 1, we use three forecasting techniques to predict the demand for CYBER computing. These techniques show that OSU's mainframe computing usage has been flat for the last two years and predict that CYBER usage is not likely to grow significantly next year. Section 2 describes the amount of computing we can expect from the CYBER next year. In the last twelve months a number of substantial performance upgrades have increased the CYBER 170's capacity by more than 50 percent. Section 3 suggests alternative computing growth paths that provide immediate growth in computing capacity and also build toward a healthy long-term computing environment.

The Milne Computer Center is responsible for providing general purpose computing facilities for the entire university. Last month it issued a PLAN FOR MAINFRAME COMPUTING that makes a number of recommendations for the 1985-1987 biennium. Reviewing this plan carefully is important, because the decisions we make now will affect our computing environment for a long time.

The PLAN FOR MAINFRAME COMPUTING proposes a quick fix solution to a short-term mainframe computer capacity problem. It recommends that we immediately acquire another major upgrade to the Computer Center's CYBER 170 mainframe. It also suggests that we should acquire a new mainframe from an as yet unselected vendor. These two recommendations are at odds with each other. The proposed fix will purchase equipment with a brief usable life and will compound our eventual conversion problems.

The issues involved in developing a good growth path for a university computer center are exceedingly complex, and to date the issues have not been adequately discussed at the university-wide level. This memo supplies some important facts that are missing from the Computer Center's plan and makes some tentative recommendations. Overall our impression is that the Computer Center's plan would set OSU back by about a year in developing a healthy high quality computing environment.

This is not a convenient time to make long-term decisions about mainframe computing. We are in the process of hiring a new director for the computer center. Last month John Byrne proposed a new administrative
structure that includes the establishment of an Associate Vice President for Computing and Communications. Administrative computing is migrating -- probably in FY 1986-1987 -- to a new centralized State System of Higher Education facility. Personal computers are invading all aspects of campus computing. Large-scale computing projects are shifting to departmental facilities and National Science Foundation supercomputers. All of these changes are occurring swiftly and promise to have a significant effect on the long-term demand for mainframe computing. Given the turbulent state of computing on campus, it is not surprising that a task force consisting exclusively of Computer Center personnel should recommend a stopgap solution to their immediate operational problems. After all, they are the ones who face the day-to-day tasks of running the Computer Center.

The PLAN FOR MAINFRAME COMPUTING is discouraging in its scope. It reacts to problems rather than seizing opportunities. Its five criteria for an acceptable plan are designed to protect existing users and ensure that mistakes are not made. These criteria are important, but are they the most important considerations? Where is a list of needs for mainframe computing? Where is the vision of what we are trying to accomplish? Where does the PLAN FOR MAINFRAME COMPUTING fit within the University's plans for personal computing, networking, printing, and communications? Only in an emergency should tactical decisions be made without reference to a master plan. Bluntly stated, we should not continue to upgrade an obsolete mainframe; we should begin converting to the next mainframe.

1. FORECASTING THE DEMAND FOR CYBER 170 COMPUTING

Forecasting demand for computing is difficult. As many different techniques as possible should be used to allow for tests of internal consistency.

1.1 FORECASTING BY EXAMINING GENERAL TRENDS IN COMPUTING

The PLAN FOR MAINFRAME COMPUTING correctly states that the demand for mainframe computing has been consistently underestimated throughout the history of computing. The continued growth of mainframe computing has surprised doomsayers who often call mainframe computers "dinosaurs." Thus, all other things being equal, mainframe computer services should continue to increase in importance.

Another truism is that the demand for computing is driven by the availability of useful software. It is on this dimension that the Computer Center's CYBER 170 series computer comes up short. Although the 170 series provides a tolerable programming environment, it doesn't run most applications software. Commercial and educational software is written first for IBM and DEC computers and is rarely modified to run on Control Data Corporation (CDC) computers. The PLAN FOR MAINFRAME COMPUTING says there "is an identified need for software packages such as SAS, SPSS-X, large scale LP models, report generators, versatile editors, powerful graphics tools and easy to use communications facilities." These important tools are missing from the 170 series software offerings. Other missing software categories include word processing, spreadsheet processing, and other personal productivity software packages. Now that the CYBER 170 series machines are no longer in production by CDC, there is little hope for improved software. Also the NOS operating system used by the CYBER 170 series is downright difficult to use. It totally intimidates first time users. Without improved software, there is unlikely to be a substantial increase in demand for mainframe computing.

The role of mainframe computers is shifting within the field of computing. Mainframe computers are becoming database machines that provide communications and access to a wide range of peripheral devices. Simple processing tasks, such as editing and programming, are being picked up by less expensive minicomputers and personal computers. Large-scale computing tasks are shifting to more capable supercomputers. Mainframe computers are appropriate when many people need to interact with large data sets, as with administrative computing. These considerations suggest that we will continue to see instructional and research tasks migrate from the CYBER 170 to departmental minicomputers, personal computers, and off-campus equipment.

A final trend to consider is the consistent declines in the cost of computing worldwide. For the last decade the cost of microcomputing has fallen between 20 and 50 percent compounded annually. The cost of mainframe computing has fallen less dramatically but has declined consistently. These declines in cost have caused mainframe computer usage to increase elsewhere. Against this trend has been the rising cost of computing provided by the Milne Computer Center. The rates for CYBER 170 services increased in three of the last four years. Last year the rates were held constant; the rates for next school year have not yet been set. The Task Force on Large-Scale Computing (part of the STRATEGIC PLAN FOR COMPUTING developed last year) had this to say about the cost and capability of our current mainframe:

The facts are clear. We have 1/7 - 1/2 the capacity of comparable universities. the CYBER 170 has a small central memory (132K 60-bit words), no virtual memory capability, is slow (1/20
the speed of a CDC 7600 and 1/300 that of a CRAY), has small but expensive mass storage capacity, and has costs that are 2-6 times higher than those of machines with greater capability.

In conclusion, although the potential demand for mainframe computing is undoubtedly increasing on campus, little of the potential demand is likely to be converted into actual usage on an augmented CYBER 170.

1.2 FORECASTING DEMAND BY CONDUCTING SURVEYS OF USERS

Unlike most businesses, the Computer Center does not normally survey its customers to predict next year's sales. The last two user surveys conducted by the Computer Center were prepared as part of the STRATEGIC PLAN FOR COMPUTING in June and September 1983. Clearly these surveys are of little use in predicting FY 1985-1986 computing demand. As a result we have no quantitative data about the level of satisfaction and plans of administrative, research, or outside users of the CYBER 170.

Fortunately the University Computer Committee conducted an instructional computing survey in January 1985. The survey was sent to all instructors who used the CYBER in their winter term classes. When the responses were weighted by the number of dollars spent in each respondent's class, there was more than an 80 percent return rate for the surveys. To expedite the processing of data, questionnaires for classes with at least $2,000 of winter term spending authorization were given the most analysis. Twenty-one responses representing more than 60 percent of the total spending authorization fell into this category.

The survey's results are surprising. Very few instructors of the "big 21" computing courses would elect to continue using the CYBER 170 in fall 1985 if given the option to use microcomputers. Only 24 percent of the dollars are spent by instructors who would prefer to continue using the CYBER. Seventy-two percent of the dollars are spend by instructors who would prefer to use microcomputers. Among all the courses surveyed, microcomputers were preferred over the CYBER by a 52 percent to 38 percent margin.

It is hard to tell how much the instructional computing survey tells us about next year's demand for CYBER 170 services. At least in the short-term, nearly all of the funds that are granted on a university-wide basis for instructional computing (over $450,000 per year) are held captive by funding and administrative procedures that effectively require using the CYBER 170 even if it is grossly inappropriate for an instructor's class.

1.3 FORECASTING DEMAND BY EXAMINING RECENT USAGE FIGURES

Trends in computer usage are easiest to evaluate with the help of graphs. Figure 1 shows the Mine Computer Center's quarterly accounts receivable billings for "Central Processor Time." Figure 2 is similar to Figure 1 except that it graphs "Total Processor-Related Charges," an account grouping that includes central processor time, file storage, and a wide range of other miscellaneous services.

Both Figures 1 and 2 show a consistent yearly usage pattern. Computer usage is low in the summer and grows to a peak in the spring. Both graphs reflect dollar amounts, not constant amounts of computing services. The Computer Center's rates increased by an average of 5 percent between Spring 1983 and Summer 1983. Thus, if a true comparison of the demand for mainframe computer services is desired, the height of the first four bars in each of these graphs should be increased by 5 percent. Overall, Figures 1 and 2 show that the total demand for mainframe computing at OSU has been remarkably constant over the last two years.

In August 1984 the Honeywell computer was turned off after having been used for only four years. It is still sitting in the Milne Computer Center, unused. Presumably, the Honeywell users switched to begin using the CYBER this school year. The graphs show that CYBER central processor usage has risen by about 10 percent over a two year period, because the Honeywell computer is no longer being used.

Figure 3 tracks "CYBER SRU Usage" for the three year period from January 1982 to January 1985 as reported in the Milne Computer Center's Access newsletter. This bar chart tells essentially the same story as the earlier figures. Timesharing usage appears to have stayed about the same; batch usage varies more dramatically month-to-month and has risen slightly.

2. FORECASTING THE SUPPLY OF CYBER 170 COMPUTING

Unused central processing time is wasted computing capacity. Processing capacity cannot be stored like wheat until needed. This creates the problem of leveling peaks in demand to match a constant source of supply. The Computer Center's rate structure helps by making evening and weekend processing rates significantly cheaper than prime time rates. Still, no matter what is done, the demand for computing on
Friday at 4:00 p.m. of dead week will exceed the supply. Thus, it is not surprising that the PLAN FOR MAINFRAME COMPUTING reports response times "in excess of 10 seconds and waiting queues of 30 or more users" during peak periods of use. From this perspective the necessary amount of processor capacity is clearly a judgment call.

A computer's capacity depends heavily on the capabilities of its peripherals. The PLAN FOR MAINFRAME COMPUTING does not mention that the Computer Center has purchased and leased four major upgrades to the CYBER 170 in the last 12 months. In May 1984, a memory upgrade was purchased for $20,000 with a monthly maintenance cost of $489. This increased central memory by 48 percent from 132K 60-bit words to 196K. It is an interesting commentary on the field of computing that an equivalent memory upgrade for an IBM Personal Computer (512K 8-bit words) costs about $300. In August 1984, a CDC front end communications process with a 64-channel capacity was leased for $3,478 per month including maintenance. In November 1984, a disk drive and controller were leased for $2,825 per month including maintenance. This increased disk capacity by 76 percent and provided faster disk access. Finally, in March 1985, the number or peripheral processing unity (PPUs) was increased from 10 to 14 at a monthly lease cost of $1,795. This resolved the last input/output bottleneck and left the central processing unit as the limiting performance factor during peak processing periods.

The cumulative effect of these upgrades has been to raise the number of users the CYBER 170 can handle from 80 to 130. In the April 30th open forum discussing the PLAN FOR MAINFRAME COMPUTING, Tom Yates (Director of the Milne Computer Center) said that these upgrades had caused "certainly more than a 50 percent increase in capacity." Yet the graphs in the previous section show nowhere near as large an increase in actual usage. It appears that we already have enough CYBER 170 capacity for FY 1985-1986.

If we follow the PLAN FOR MAINFRAME COMPUTING and upgrade the CYBER 170 again, the central processing speed will increase by another 90 percent at a purchase cost of $64,000, plus $1,433 per month for maintenance. It is unrealistic, however, to expect that total throughput would increase by 90 percent. It can be expected that some part of the system other than the central processor would limit performance first.

3. A RECOMMENDED COMPUTING GROWTH PATH

Upgrading the current mainframe is only one way to increase the University's computing capacity. Better alternatives exist. For example, in the last few months the University Computer Committee has put together numerous proposals designed to establish microcomputer laboratories for instructional computing. All of these proposals have been postponed indefinitely based on uncertainties dealing with administrative issues, such as location, budgeting, and ownership. On a substantive level, it is undeniable that microcomputers provide more computing per dollar and offer better software for most instructional purposes. Instructional computing demand is quite "peaky" in nature, so removing it from the mainframe would improve the mainframe's response time for all other users.

Oregon State University needs better mainframe computers that provide a wider range of applications software and work well in a distributed processing environment. This probably will require using machines such as an IBM 4300 or a number of networked DEC VAXs. Rather than upgrade the current mainframe, we should begin the process of converting to a new and better computing environment. Upgrading the current mainframe will only make the conversion process more painful later.

In order for OSU to enjoy the benefits of technological change, we must have a university-wide master plan to provide better access to modern computer equipment and software. Last year's STRATEGIC PLAN FOR COMPUTING identified many of our long-term need; what we need now is a plan of action. If the plan is to succeed, it must be enthusiastically backed at all levels of the university. We need to keep OSU on the forefront of the information age.

Curt Cook
Computer Science
Sheila Cordray
Sociology
Ted Lewis
Computer Science
George Martin
Accounting
Jim Richman
Oceanography
Michael Schuyler
Chemistry
David Sullivan
Business
Barry Shane
Management

PLANNING FOR MAINFRAME PROCESSING IN A DISTRIBUTED COMPUTING ENVIRONMENT
May 13, 1985

The Faculty Forum offering entitled THE EVOLUTION OF COMPUTING AT OREGON STATE UNIVERSITY asks, "Where does the PLAN FOR MAINFRAME COMPUTING fit within the University's plans for personal computing, networking, printing, and communications?" The answer is that advances in all of those areas (including mainframe computing) are proceeding in accordance with the recommendations set forth in the July 1984 report OREGON STATE UNIVERSITY STRATEGIC PLAN FOR COMPUTING. The report was produced by a committee appointed by Vice President Parsons, who directed the committee to "help develop institutional goals and strategic plans for computing."

This year's accomplishments have been directed toward achievement of an effective distributed computing environment. Examples of the accomplishments include,

Personal Computing - more than 800 microcomputers have been acquired through the Faculty PC Program and the Resale Program.

Networking - the first phase of a broadband local area network (LAN) has been installed. Subscription to the BITNET international network has been initiated.

Printing - dial-up service has been added by the Department of Printing. Use of the Computer Center's Laser Printer has expanded.

Communications - higher speed data communications services have been provided for the Cyber. The LAN offers a 4-8 fold increased upper limit for intercomputer file transfers. DATALINK communications software has been refined.

Mainframe - the number of users, applications software field size limit, available disk space, and the speed of data communications have all been increased. A full-screen editor has been implemented.

The mainframe plan proposed for the next biennium advocates continued emphasis on enhancement of distributed computing by acquiring another mainframe which has outstanding applications software and will interface well with the hundreds of work stations on campus. The plan also includes a cpu upgrade to the Cyber 170/720, which is now overloaded, partially as a result of the aforementioned mainframe changes. Those changes have added significantly to the overhead 'cost' borne by the cpu; as more micro-to-mainframe communications traffic occurs, the cpu will become saturated. Deferring the cpu upgrade would introduce an unacceptable level of risk of mainframe failure.

Thomas L. Yates
Milne Computer Center.

Opinions expressed by authors of Faculty Forum articles are not necessarily those of the OSU Faculty or Faculty Senate.
AFTER 1984 -- A LOOK TO THE FUTURE

By

D.S. Pete Fullerton, Faculty Senate President

January 1984

Besides being of special literary significance, 1984 is a very important transition year for Oregon State University. It is the year we will select a new President, plan for the 1985 Legislative session, and hopefully it will be the last year faculty will do without merit and cost of living raises.

The Faculty Senate Executive Committee, ASOSU, and MUPC have all encouraged the campus community to begin a dialogue about OSU's future. Invitations were sent to all faculty last week to write Faculty Forum papers on this important subject.

We all hope that the Oregon State University of the late 1980's will keep the best of today's OSU -- especially our excellence in teaching and research, and our genuinely friendly community of students, faculty, and staff. But we can be better.

Three changes top my own 'wish list' for OSU's future:

1. Competitive Faculty Salaries. In good economic times and bad, the Oregon Legislature has generally been miserly with faculty salaries. The 1983 Legislature was no exception: no faculty raises for two years. The new OSU President, above all else, needs to be an outspoken champion for fair and competitive salaries, and equally important, affordable in-State and out-of-State tuition.

2. A 1980's Image. OSU is the leading research center in Oregon. We've developed beyond a traditional "Land Grant" image. The OSU Foundation has taken a "pioneering" role in helping shape a 1980's image:

"And at OSU, the pioneer is more than a symbol OSU is proud of its present day pioneers:

Oceanographers discovering new evidence for the origins of life on the Pacific sea floor;

anthropologists using computer-generated maps to learn more about climate and human development;

engineers creating crystals that are revolutionizing electronics and our sense of how the world is put together;

geneticists breeding improved strains of plants and animals to feed a hungry planet"

You can help us blaze new trails. Share our vision of tomorrow

(from "PIONEERING An Oregon State Tradition" OSU Fund, 1983, used with permission)
3. Additional Graduate Programs in the College of Liberal Arts. OSU is unique among research universities its size in not having a variety of graduate programs in the arts, humanities and social sciences. The MAIS degree is just not enough. The CLA faculty has in the past unsuccessfully tried to convince the State Board that additional graduate programs are vital. Future CLA efforts to develop selected graduate program proposals deserve campus support.

Other hopes for OSU's future:

-A Smaller, Stronger Post-Secondary Educational System in Oregon. With a declining population of college-age students, the people of Oregon just can not afford all 48 post-secondary institutions (community colleges, private and public colleges and universities) they now support.

-Reaching The OSU Foundation's Four Funding Goals -- Then Four More! The Foundation has committed its considerable efforts and talent to the development of four key programs at OSU: The Center for Gene Research and Biotechnology, A Center For the Humanities, the Marine Science Program, and Materials Science Research.

-Adequate Library Support!

-New Buildings and Improvements. I have much to learn about OSU construction needs. Two that seem especially important are remodeling and equipping the Computer Science building (the old Farm Crops building); and building one of the two new buildings proposed for CLA (one planned for Coleman Field, and another for the south portion of the site of the present Strand Agricultural Hall). Many other building and improvement needs certainly exist -- additional Engineering research facilities, as just one example.

-Improved Financial Support for the OSU Theater.

-More Instructional Computer Resources. The campus is very short of micro computers and computer terminals -- a crucial area for improvement if OSU is to remain a modern center of higher education.

-Additional Faculty. Faculty shortages exist in several areas across the campus. Computer Science, Engineering and Pharmacy are but three examples.

-New Equipment. Examples include modern X-ray crystallographic and protein microsequencing facilities, and instructional equipment in many laboratory courses.

OSU has many other campus needs, including State support for Summer Term. Other faculty and students will point out other important areas.

1984 is a pivotal year for OSU for identifying and discussing new directions for our future. I invite you to join in the discussion. It is also especially important that we select a new OSU President who can successfully lead the campus in its 1980's "pioneering" efforts. D.S. Pete Fullerton
Faculty Senate President

Opinions expressed by authors of Faculty Forum articles are not necessarily those of the OSU Faculty or Faculty Senate.
AUTHORSHIP, ACKNOWLEDGMENT, ETC.

By
Donald B. Miller, Civil Engineering
February 1984

AUTHORSHIP, ACKNOWLEDGMENT, ETC.

The following occurred at OSU in recent years.

1. As part of a M.S. degree program, a graduate student wrote a report describing part of a sponsored (NSF) research project. The student report was subsequently revised and excerpted by the principal investigators and used as a chapter in an NSF report. About 70% of the chapter, including some conclusions, was taken verbatim or nearly verbatim from the student report, yet the listed authors of the chapter were the principal investigators; the student’s name was omitted.

2. A research paper, as published in a scientific journal, listed 3 authors: 2 graduate students and a faculty person. Several years later the journal paper was recycled as a chapter of a report for the U.S. Department of Interior. The chapter and the journal paper were nearly identical, differing only in a few sentences. But the USDI report chapter omitted the names of the graduate students, and there was no indication that the chapter had a previous existence as a journal paper.

3. A research group included principal investigators, research assistants, graduate research assistants, etc. A typical major report from this group listed as participants: Principal Investigator, Co-investigators (2), Research assistants and associates (7) and Graduate Research Assistants and Fellows (9). But another major report that included many members of the same research group listed as authors the Principal Investigator and Co-investigators. There was no acknowledgment of other participants even though at least 15 Research Assistants and Graduate Research Assistants had participated in the project.

Comments: These situations are examples of irregularities and inconsistencies in listing of authors and participants of research reports. Including as authors those whose contributions to a report are insufficient to qualify for authorship is another likely problem in listing authors.

The three examples occurred in three different schools. How common such situations are is unknown.

Recommendations: OSU should adopt criteria and guidelines for authorship and acknowledgment for participants in published research. The criteria and guidelines should be part of the Faculty Handbook.
Donald B. Miller
Civil Engineering
February 1983
Opinions expressed by authors of Faculty Forum articles are not necessarily those of the OSU Faculty or Faculty Senate.
THE DEMERITS OF GRADING ON A CURVE AFTER WITHDRAWAL

By
Gary Musser, Robert D. Kiekel
October 1984

THE DEMERITS OF GRADING ON A CURVE AFTER WITHDRAWAL

In a recent debate on the merits of various withdrawal-from-course dates, the following argument was advanced: Students should not be sympathetic to other students withdrawing because it can affect the grades of the students who stay in the course. For example, if a student has a "C" grade and everyone below him withdraws, he will be at the bottom and will have to work his way back up (our interpretation - he will be failing and he will have to earn a "C" relative to the class of remaining students).

This argument suggests that whatever the composition of a class, the course grades must fit a "curve" or have a normal distribution. Taken to the extreme, this argument suggests that if a class ends up with five students, a professor may feel obligated to assign each of the grades A, B, C, D, F to the students irrespective of the level of mastery of the material presented. Hence, someone must fail (and someone must be an A student).

Grading is a difficult procedure at best. To many professors with experience it becomes more of an art than a science. From term-to-term students change but "A" papers become easier to recognize just as do the "F" papers. To make the process more "precise" we may use numbers to justify our conclusions. But as professionals we should be able to recognize quality work when we see it.

From any point of view the assumption that course grades will have a normal distribution after all withdrawals is incorrect and unfair. Not only is it unfair, it can be demoralizing and may actually encourage withdrawals. It seems that setting reasonably high standards for our students and rewarding all who attain those standards is a fairer way to treat and motivate our students.

Gary Musser, Mathematics
Robert D. Kiekel, Foreign Languages
February 28, 1984

(*Based upon discussions in the Faculty Senate Meetings of January 1984 (#406) and February 1984 (#407). See Minutes for background information.)
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THE FACULTY'S ROLE IN ITS OWN FATE

By
Thurston E. Doler

October 1984

THE FACULTY'S ROLE IN ITS OWN FATE

Some significant changes have occurred in the last three years in the procedures for generating budgets for higher education and the shepherding of these budgets through the Legislature. An awareness by faculty of these changes could make a great difference in the faculty’s decisions about their role in that process.

In the thirteen years preceding the tenure of the present Chancellor, support for higher education in Oregon declined steadily. In 1967-68 the Department of Higher Education received 24.4% of General Fund expenditures, but in 1979-81 that percentage had decreased to 12.5%. This represented a decline of Higher Education's share of Oregon personal income from 1.09% to 0.83% in the same period. [A CASE FOR EQUITY (1981); Prepared by the Faculty Salary Committee of the Association of Oregon Faculties, P.O. Box 12945, Salem OR 97309.]

This decline in support for higher education in general was reflected in the buying power of faculty salaries during the same period. Real buying power of UO-OSU salaries declined twenty-five percent (25%) during that same period. [Ibid., Table I.]

A sign of our declining fortunes in the Legislature during that period is seen in action taken by the 1979 Legislature in its returning of $70,000,000 "surplus" dollars to the taxpayers. In that same year, based on the Portland CPI, inflation in Oregon was 13.9% and the appropriation for salary and wage adjustments for state employees, including faculty, was the State's assumption of a 6% PERS "pick-up," which is still in effect. This action was the result of a collective bargaining agreement negotiated by the Oregon Public Employees Union, consisting of classified employees, with the Executive Branch. Ironically, faculty were represented, de facto, by a union in which they had no representation and no voice!

When William "Bud" Davis became Chancellor, he initiated a strategy of bringing to bear on the promotion of higher education the resources and influence of all available agencies. In the initial months of his tenure, his out-reach to the grass roots included his visiting of every area of the State and all the newspaper editors in Oregon.

A second move was to establish the Vice Chancellor for Public Affairs position in Salem, the site of political activity. And, thirdly, he sought the cooperation of available faculty groups in formulating educational objectives and budgets and in taking his case to the Governor and the Legislature. The Association of Oregon Faculties (AOF) with Bob Davis as its Public Affairs Counselor, has been utilized primarily, although AAUP has also been a consultant. The basic strategy has been to focus on the channels of political power the influence generated through these various sources (i.e. grass roots, AOF, etc.).
AAUP) in promoting the fortunes of higher education. Advice and information from these groups were sought, obtained, and utilized as the Strategic Plan was put together in 1982-83. Parenthetically, the OSU Senate's Executive Committee also, in response to the invitation to do so, supplied extensive revisions of the plan to Larry Pierce, the Chancellor's representative.

The same coordinated procedure that was used during the last biennium in formulating budgets for higher education and taking them to the Legislature is again under way. Prospects for having a coordinated effort in taking the case to the Legislature presently look good. There is, however, fierce competition for General Fund resources from which higher education is financed. [If the Property Tax Limitation Measure passes, (Ballot Measure 2) that competition is bound to escalate greatly.]

A second significant decision that was made in preparing the 1981-83 budget was to disconnect salary budgets for academics from those of classified staff. For several biennia prior to 1981, decisions on salaries and wages were usually postponed to near the end of the legislative session awaiting a Collective Bargaining agreements between the OPEU and the Executive. When these agreement were reached, their basic provisions were applied to all public employees, including academics. However, budgets presented by higher education to the 1983 Legislature provided for salary monies independent of classified employees. This disconnect procedure allowed for treating faculty salaries and benefits independent of other State employees. During that 1983 session, salary adjustments for faculty, although funded retroactively for the denied adjustments of the previous year, were 2% higher than those for other agencies. This approach has its inherent risks, but it also presents the opportunity for us to make our own case for the needs of academic employees and higher education.

There are several critical, although manageable, steps in the process of formulating budgets and getting them passed. The first step is generating budgets, such as salaries and program improvements, and having them approved by the OSBHE. That has been done for 1985-87. The second step is to have higher education's salary budgets included in the budget that the Governor presents to the Legislature. That is now in process as the representatives of faculty work with the Chancellor and his staff.

A third, and final, step is the taking of the package to the Legislature and securing its passage. That step has a new and vital ingredient that began in 1981. That new ingredient is the influence of the faculty through its selected representatives. This dimension needs an immediate boost if faculty are to realize the maximum influence for which they have the potential. The Oregon State System of Higher Education presently has about 4285 faculty members with 0.50 FTE or more with the rank of instructor or higher. Approximately eleven hundred (1100) of these belong to the Association of Oregon Faculties (AOF) and approximately six hundred (600) to the American Association of University Professors (AAUP). There is, of course, considerable overlap in these memberships, but the maximum membership is 1700 faculty, or 39%. I suspect the number of people involved as members would come closer to 32% of the total potential.

In spite of this low membership level, the Chancellor, the Governor, and key legislators have worked extensively with these faculty representatives. Their influence could be significantly increased, however, if a majority of faculty were members. The impact of faculty groups is generated in two ways. First, political impact tends to be proportional to the extent to which faculty representatives are perceived to speak for their colleagues. Secondly, the additional monies generated through increased membership finance more readily and completely the gathering of information, the financing of publicity, and the employing of staff who are involved in our lobbying effort.

If another 1700 academics decided to join the present 1700, the results could be astonishing!

Up to this time, the Chancellor, the Oregon State Board of Higher Education, and the Governor seem to be working in concert to improve significantly the funding of higher education for the next biennium. The State Board at its meeting July 26-27, for example, approved an 11-1/2% per year salary adjustment for each year of the 1985-1987 biennium. This salary item is one of a group of "Decision Packages" totaling $147,800,000 which is part of a budget request package of $641,267,000 for 1985-87. [OSBHE Minutes for July 27, 1984, Schedule 1.] This budget, which represents a substantial increase over the 1983-85 Biennium, will be submitted to the Governor and, we hope, to the Legislature.

Our present coordinated activity is the continuation of a long process back to necessary funding for higher education and it has no guarantee of success. Its probability of success, however, would be enhanced greatly if each person who reads this paper became a member of the faculty groups which are promoting our budgets for the next biennium.

Thurston E. Doler
Department of Speech
July 26, 1984

Opinions expressed by authors of Faculty Forum articles are not necessarily those of the OSU Faculty or Faculty Senate.
Research assistants were excluded from submitting Faculty Forum papers, therefore I am presenting the following on behalf of the Research Assistants' Committee:

The Research Assistants' Committee feels it necessary to respond to Drs. Matthews and Morris who have objected to the inclusion of research assistants in the collective bargaining unit. We wish to respond to inaccuracies and assumptions made in their arguments, not to promote or object to collective bargaining. This is necessary because their ideas are based on limited personal experience which fosters incorrect opinions of the role of research assistants.

Underlying their arguments is the feeling that professors are different from research assistants and being together in such a group is objectionable. We agree with that feeling to some extent; we are not professors and as important as our duties may be, they are generally different from the demands made on professors. We are not trying to be similar, however research assistants have much in common with research associates and instructors and these similarities are being overlooked.

The University has three main purposes; teaching, research and public service. The research assistant performs the task of research in a way similar to the research associate and some research professorial faculty. Many research assistants also teach - not by lecturing to formal classes, but by training graduate students, thereby giving them skills and insight into the accomplishments of research. Although the research assistants do not have doctoral degrees, neither do instructors, extension agents (with professorial rank) and others (librarians, administrators and computer center personnel.) We have more similarities than differences with other members of the faculty. Our position is rightfully an academic one, as it is for 600 other fixed term faculty members.

Research assistants are faculty and as such have a stake in the University. We are committed to our jobs and are governed by faculty rules. We are not asking to be considered equivalent in status to professors, but as the Employment Relations Board has noted, we have a community of interest and we perform duties similar to other non-instructional faculty. We deserve recognition for the value of our services; that research service is of growing importance to the University.

The University is in transition and some old ideas will have to give way as roles change. We cannot do this by ourselves; we need the help of all faculty. In that regard, we have no objections whatsoever to department heads being included in the collective bargaining unit. We should all be working together by focusing on our common goals and interest.

Fred Hisaw
Department of Zoology
March 2, 1983
Opinions expressed by authors of Faculty Forum articles are not necessarily those of the OSU Faculty or Faculty Senate.
"WITH FRIENDS LIKE THESE"

by

Nancy F. Leman
Department of English

March 2, 1983

WITH FRIENDS LIKE THESE

Some of my friends do not agree with me on the subject of collective bargaining for the OSU faculty. I'm sorry they don't see the advantages of bargaining because I'm afraid they'll check the box for "no representation." But more than the fact that they're on the other side, I'm bothered by some of the arguments they've shared with you through the Faculty Forum and the Faculty Forum Papers, and I'd like to tell you my views on those subjects.

My friend John Morris traced for you the progress of his thinking about bargaining. In 1980-81, when he was President of OSU-AAUP, I helped him as his Vice President; the following year, he helped me, immensely. Together we went through some tense times with the beginnings of this bargaining process. Our mutual goal (I think he would agree) was to keep AAUP in the running if the OSU faculty came to bargaining, but, like the narrator in Robert Frost's poem, it seems that

Two roads diverged in a wood, and I --
I took the one less traveled by,
And that had made all the difference.

Only I hadn't realized until I read his Faculty Forum Paper how divergent our roads had become. John Morris wrote

An analysis of collective bargaining on university campuses during the past thirteen years of its history suggests that the presently mandated industrial model has not worked and, at best, offers marginal salary increases in exchange for serious losses in traditional academic values.

In the first place, I think we should realize that higher education contracts are not based on the "presently mandated industrial model" in the sense that they spell out twenty-minute rest breaks, time clocks, safety rules and inspections, or even the speed with which the assembly line moves through the plant. These are matters of working conditions that are frequently found in industrial contracts, and they just do not appear in the contracts for higher education. Each faculty contract addresses itself to the conditions of the campus for which it was designed.

In the second place, salary increases, despite what you may hear, are not the most important aspect of a faculty-administration contract. For instance, the argument that PSU Professors' salaries have lagged behind those of the other two Oregon Universities is not a good argument against faculty bargaining in higher education. The circumstances are different there. PSU has always lagged in salary.
John Morris's citations were the standard ones; I would suggest only that some have been superseded by recent studies. Writing about collective bargaining is a cottage industry; some people make their living by doing it. Victor Baldridge and Frank Kemerer, for example, have been writing on this subject for more than ten years. In their most recent publication, *Assessing the Impact of Faculty Collective Bargaining*, AAHE-ERIC Higher Education Research Report No. 8, 1981, Baldridge and Kemerer have this to say, only one of many positive comments, about their latest questionnaire survey of the same 240 institutions they had surveyed in 1974, plus all other unionized institutions:

> Although all respondent groups see unions as having at least some positive influence on wages, benefits, and job security at their institutions, the highest success ratings are given to obtaining fairer grievance procedures. Institution-oriented and union-oriented respondents agree that collective bargaining has helped channel and regulate conflict through the grievance procedure. The belief is strongest at public colleges and universities.

I'll admit that there are also negative assessments of bargaining in this study, but not as negative as the earlier citations on Dr. Morris's list would have us believe.

Turning now to my friend John Block's public statements, I'll start by discussing his presentation at the Faculty Forum, where he was amused by PSU's preoccupation with parking. Several clauses in PSU's Agreement were devoted to it, he said. John Block is right; parking matters at PSU, where a parking permit costs more than $200.00. (Ann Weikel, President of PSU-AAUP, told me that.)

Even at OSU parking is a lively topic. Some of the most heated Faculty Senate meetings here have dealt with parking regulations. Remember when Nedry Burris tried to explain the (then) new "dangler" system to our Senate? It doesn't surprise me that PSU faculty wrote parking clauses into their contracts. (I doubt, however, that we would do the same. But then we might write a clause on basketball tickets, and that wouldn't be too surprising, either.)

People say, "You can prove anything with statistics." I don't know whether that's true, but I do know you can prove almost anything with collective bargaining clauses. I have twenty pounds of them in my tiny office, and some of them are great. (John Block found some that weren't so great.) Every university contract has its own style, and none is the "mandated industrial" style.

Lastly, I'd like to assure Christopher Mathews that the Faculty Alliance has already petitioned to add chairs and heads to the OSU faculty bargaining unit, just as we said we would. Who is the faculty? Dr. Mathews asks. For the present, it's the members of the bargaining unit as determined by the ERB, but with the addition of the chairs and heads as soon as we can add them. If the faculty perceives itself differently from this ERB-determined unit, it can seek to adjust the size and composition by further petitions. As Everett Hansen said repeatedly in the Faculty Forum, "Collective bargaining is a process."

There has been considerable talk about collegiality, one of those great concepts like motherhood and apple pie that we all hope to have some of. John Block thinks collegiality deteriorates under collective bargaining; he is entitled to his opinion. I know of campuses where the reverse is true. The OSU faculty has a chance on March 9-10 to enrich its collegiality by reaching out through collective bargaining for a greater share of participation in the destiny of the university.

Nancy F. Leman, Department of English. March 2, 1983

*Opinions expressed by authors of Faculty Forum articles are not necessarily those of the OSU Faculty or Faculty Senate.*
COLLECTIVE BARGAINING

by

Ross Carroll
Department of English

March 2, 1983

In talking with my colleagues in the English Department and in reading the Faculty Forum Papers, I have concluded that the most cogent arguments against collective bargaining fall primarily into three categories: collective bargaining will undermine collegiality; collective bargaining will fail to improve faculty salaries and benefits in times of financial difficulty; and collective bargaining will encourage standardization and discourage excellence. As an advocate of collective bargaining, I would like to look more closely at each of these concerns.

The collegiality question seems to contain two elements: that collective bargaining divides the faculty itself, and that it places the faculty in an adversarial relationship with the administration. Concerning the faculty itself, it seems clear that the faculty divisions already exist, and the discussion of collective bargaining has only brought about a healthy discussion of those differences. In fact, I might argue that had the administration intentionally set out to divide and weaken faculty, it could not have done a better job, and it is these existing divisions that weaken all of us. One is not a faculty member at Oregon State, one is tenured, tenure track, fixed-term/renewable, fixed-term/part-time/soft money/non-renewable -- the list goes on, and none of these groups has much common interest with any other. A yes vote on March 9th or 10th won't automatically unify the faculty, but we need an organization which recognizes that we are all part of the essential function of research and instruction that this university offers, and within which we can begin to forge a community of interest which will serve the best interests of all of us. Defining those common interests may be difficult and even painful at times, but until we do we will remain divided and conquered.

Concerning the adversary relationship that collective bargaining might establish between faculty and administration, perhaps a better description would be an advocacy relationship. This, I think, is more than just semantics. The faculty needs an organization which can do more than complain and point out that we already are losing some of our best people to other institutions or to the private sector. These losses occur only after the problems have already gone on too long, and are best addressed by an organization which speaks first for faculty and which is empowered by faculty. Negotiation does not, as one writer has suggested, violate the principles of the proposed Peace Studies program; negotiations are a recognition that two communities of interest are involved and that each is empowered to work for a solution to differences which is acceptable to both. At the moment, the administration has both advocacy and power; the faculty has neither.

The second point argues that regardless of how strong the faculty alliance may be, it cannot bargain for funds that are not available. To whatever degree this is true, it ignores the effect a union can have on how funds are allocated. In a typical tax levy for a school district, for example, voters know exactly what programs they are voting for because bargaining at the K-through-12 level has clarified faculty status, salaries and benefits. Voters might know that failure to pass a levy will eliminate a district's hot lunches, advance placement program, and activities busses. If they vote down the levy, they know...
those programs will not exist because they have chosen to eliminate them.

In higher education, however, it is the university's responsibility to provide programs with the money allocated, and "sound fiscal management" dictates that this is often done at the expense of personnel. Thus, instead of saying that we cannot provide a certain program at a certain level of funding and that funding must be increased or the program reduced or eliminated, we employ pay cuts, larger classes, or fixed-term or part-time employees to provide a service the legislature is not really willing to fund. The ultimate extension of this idea is that with maximum "efficiency" and "productivity" we can do anything with nothing. The long-term effect is already quite clear; life may not be perfect for K through 12 teachers, but they certainly enjoy relatively better pay and benefits, more job security, and more clearly defined and equitable personnel procedures than we have in higher education. Their sole advantage has been in collective bargaining.

Finally, there is absolutely no reason to believe that collective bargaining will discourage excellence. Excellence, first of all, comes from within, and those of us who are committed to our work, who value the recognition of our colleagues, and who take pride in the accomplishments of our students will continue to strive for excellence regardless of the vote on March 9th and 10th. To suggest that we will not is false and furthermore is a disservice to the integrity of the faculty. Collective bargaining will not end merit pay and will not eliminate standards for tenure. It will give faculty a stronger voice in setting policy in these areas, and thus will serve to encourage excellence. It will also, to the benefit of the majority of us poor plodders, serve to adequately compensate mere competence, itself no small achievement at the modern university.

As many have pointed out, collective bargaining will not be a panacea for Oregon State University, but the Faculty Alliance does offer a framework within which faculty can work together for the greatest good of all of us. Our first step must be a yes vote. Then the real work will begin.

Ross Carroll
English Department
March 2, 1983

Opinions expressed by authors of Faculty Forum articles are not necessarily those of the OSU Faculty or Faculty Senate.
COLLECTIVE BARGAINING - WHERE ARE THE FACTS?

by

William Firey, Mathematics
&
Gary Musser, Mathematics

March 3, 1983

When deciding how to vote on this critical issue, we need to find the facts which support claims that are made. After reviewing the Faculty Forum Papers and attending two meetings, we have concluded that the Faculty Alliance seems to rely on promises and emotions while the antiunion speakers and writers appeal to research studies and personal experience. In the one pro-alliance paper that did quote research, the researcher was associated with NEA Research, hence his findings may be biased. In the Faculty Forum meeting, again there were several instances of emotional promises without factual backup. One case of emotion versus reason was especially bothersome. After a representative from the Attorney General's office carefully stated various aspects of collective bargaining law, an OEA official attempted to discredit him by calling him "a person who is legally charged with representing the management side," yet never disagreed with his factual statements. Applause (by some) followed.

Apparently, one of the most important potential benefits of a union is that it may improve our salaries. The Alliance stated that since 1971, the Portland CPI rose 239.6%, public school teachers' salaries increased at a rate of 220%, and we have done even worse. The argument is given that OEA has been instrumental in increasing teachers' salaries. Even though it appears that OEA has been successful in getting funds transferred from higher education to secondary/elementary education, teachers still have not kept up with inflation. When Alliance representatives were asked if salary ranges would be leveled, their answer was that it was possible, but not probable. But, the union would seek to put in higher floors. Inevitably, higher floors mean lower ceilings in a closed system! The retort to this statement was that through the union's negotiations, more money would be available for salaries, i.e., we would get a bigger share of the state budget. Yet, when a union official was asked to name any states where higher education received a greater share of the state budget after the faculty affiliated with a union, not one example could be provided. Review the effect of unionization on salaries at PSU provided in the OSU Faculty Economic Welfare Committee Report of 2/15/83.

Finally, it appears that the Alliance is asking us to buy a pig in a poke. They have not produced even a sketch of the by-laws which would govern their proposed bargaining unit. How and by whom will the bargaining leadership and the legally responsible bargaining representative be chosen? How and to what extent will the faculty have a voice in deciding to accept or reject a contract? Who will choose the bargaining issues? When and by whose choice will a fair-share agreement, requiring each faculty member to contribute to the costs of bargaining, come into effect? At the Faculty Forum meeting, the alliance leadership displayed a disturbing ignorance on several such major legal questions. The Alliance gives oral assurances that all these details will be worked out to our satisfaction. We need more than such vague statements; we need considered, precise, published answers to these questions before
handing over to the Faculty Alliance this power that they seek. In the words of one of the Alliance leaders: "It is increasingly important that we get specified procedures out here so that you can see what you're voting on." We couldn't agree more. The Faculty Alliance has had months to provide us with accurate facts: where are they?

We close with a plea to each faculty member: VOTE. By law, one more than 50% of THOSE WHO VOTE will determine the outcome of this election. You cannot be neutral on this issue by not voting. EVERY faculty member's vote is meaningful!

March 3, 1982

William Firey
Professor, Mathematics
Oregon State University

Gary Musser
Professor, Mathematics
Oregon State University

Opinions expressed by authors of Faculty Forum articles are not necessarily those of the OSU Faculty or Faculty Senate.
WHY SHOULD COLLECTIVE BARGAINING BE FOREVER?

by

Norman E. Pawlowski
Food Science

March 2, 1983

Collective bargaining has been an issue on the tongues of OSU's faculty for nearly ten years. Those in favor have the support of several outside organizations who would like to add OSU to their empire and clout. We are told that if we are unhappy with collective bargaining, "it would not require more effort than signing cards for another election" to terminate it. Will our representatives give us the same support and effort in disbanning collective bargaining as they did in forming it? Who will print the cards? Who will push colleagues to circulate and sign them? It is not a simple task.

The horse helped build America. For this we are grateful. We still give our thanks and respect for what the horse has done for us. But most families no longer own a horse. Its task accomplished, why should we support and keep horses? Likewise for collective bargaining. Why should a union be given lifetime tenure on the day of its inception? If the union is confident that it can serve us well and will continue to serve us well, let it prove this claim. Let it say, "you will not be sorry you voted for the union." Let it write into the election statement, "continued existence of the union will be voted upon by the faculty every five years." Skeptical faculty might be persuaded to vote to give collective bargaining a try if such an escape guarantee were in the election statement. This would prevent the union from becoming the "dominant partner of the marriage."

Is an escape clause fair to the union? Is it fair to the staff employed by the union? One could just as well ask, is it fair to hire a consulting engineer for a limited period of time? Need we outline the analogy? OSU employs many research associates, who are on a fixed term appointment. These researchers are among the most productive people on campus. Yet, these faculty members cannot obtain tenure. If this is fair for our colleagues at home, it is certainly fair to a union.

Would a union be powerless if the "opposition" felt it could outlast the union? If the administration behaved in such a manner, the need for a union would be strengthened.

Voting in collective bargaining without an escape clause is, in my opinion, burning our bridges behind us. I see no need, nor advantage to burning bridges. Norman E. Pawlowski
Food Science
3/2/83

Opinions expressed by authors of Faculty Forum articles are not necessarily those of the OSU Faculty or Faculty Senate.
THE ISSUE IS GOOD COLLECTIVE BARGAINING

by

Floyd B. McFarland
Department of Economics

March 3, 1983

THE ISSUE IS GOOD COLLECTIVE BARGAINING

Our problems have long and complex roots, going back even further than "the good old days" when the Legislature found itself confronting budgetary surpluses. They let the position of Higher Ed slip back then, and it is still slipping. Quality is deteriorating. When we literally "fell off the guage" of comparator schools, administrators of high rank provided us with another scale, so that we are now back into the middle ranks, and anyone who chooses, snoozes. Shall we wait around to see if history really repeats itself?

By no stretch of the imagination is collective bargaining per se going to solve our problems. Only united effort and grim determination put into practice can do that, and only with time. So let us get started. The Oregon economy is going to be somewhere between a mess and a disaster area for the remainder of this decade, it appears, and the legislators are going to dabble grease only to squeaky wheels. If we continue to sit rather meekly, which is really all we can do until we get united, we will get only nice words and a nod of spite or scorn for continuing to play the role of sheep.

University faculty collective bargaining started slowly and with a clouded record of success in the United States, but has surged forward in recent years to include more than half of total faculty in the country. The recent success stories are of importance to us, whereas the early failure are not -- simply because we learn. How to draw upon the most successful experiences, to emulate the good and avoid the bad, clearly is the issue with us. Of course it is true that the very best schools have tended not to turn to collective bargaining. Unfortunately, that is not us; faculties under stress and strain have gone to bargaining in great numbers, and that's us. Yes indeed --- how we all wish that we did not need collective bargaining!

We need to avoid nit-picking issues such as the number of office hours and the like, as Portland State has shown readily can be done, and encourage the U of O to follow our lead. When we get all three Universities of the Oregon System pulling effectively together, and some of the colleges, so that we are not merely making polite requests via a commonplace commercial lobbyist, we will finally succeed.

Floyd B. McFarland
Department of Economics
March 3, 1983

Opinions expressed by authors of Faculty Forum articles are not necessarily those of the OSU Faculty or Faculty Senate.
Faculty Senate

Faculty Forum Papers

March 1983 Collective Bargaining - Collective of the Mediocre

By

Charles E. King
Department of Zoology

February 24, 1983

Earlier today I met my General Zoology class of 234 students. Tonight will be devoted to preparing for tomorrow's graduate class in Population Biology. In the interim I have spent a couple of hours in the laboratory, conferred with two colleagues and a graduate student on theses research, participated in the selection of a topic for next week's journal club, revised part of a manuscript, slipped out for a quick noontime swim, helped an undergraduate locate a research advisor, discussed an upcoming field trip with a colleague, skimmed through a new issue of Nature (reading one article and noting two others that should be read, but probably, won't), surreptitiously attended a faculty forum meeting, talked with a colleague at another university, kidded and been kidded by a secretary, and started to grade a stack of term papers.

Sounds like a typical day in the life of an OSU faculty member? Obviously not because I also signed several travel requests, ok'd the purchase of a $78 calculator by the department's accountant, and asked three of my colleagues to serve on a committee. These activities, it seems, can only be performed by management and one can not be both faculty and department chairman.

By mutual agreement of the "Faculty" Alliance (not all of whom hold professorial ranks) and the OSU "Administration" (all of whom do hold professorial ranks and have extensive backgrounds in classroom instruction), departmental chairmen have been excluded from participation in the important decision on unionization. In reaching this political conclusion, both groups have acted on self-interest at the expense of common sense and concern for the welfare of the university. It is precisely this type of action that destroys collegiality and illustrates the dangers of unionization. A similar pattern evolved at the University of South Florida which unionized while I was a faculty member at the institution. Deans became adversaries. As at PSU, distinctions between outstanding or barely adequate performances in teaching and research, were lost in common across-the-board salary adjustments. Unionization did not increase the size of the pie; it did endure that all individuals received an equal serving independent of their merit. If unionization would solve the real problems of our research assistants, or would make OSU a better university by building excellence in the liberal arts, I would be an ardent advocate of collective bargaining. Frustration is a powerful motivator. Let us hope it does not change OSU into a "collective of mediocre."
March 1983 Collective Bargaining - Establishment of Clear Structure

By

Kermit J. Rohde
Organizational Psychology

February 24, 1983

For a number of years I was a directing member of the Personnel Research Board. One of its major findings, generally accepted now by all in work psychology, was that heads of organizations who were good performed well in initiating structure.

We studied many organizations there, and I have watched many others since. For an organization of its size, Oregon State is a near classic in chaos. Not only does most organization which exists at Oregon State exist only in the minds of administrators, but also those bits of organization change with administrative whims. Committees are set to work, and when finished, find the action has already been taken elsewhere. As one official said of another when explaining such an occurrence "he forgets." Many important structures have no written reference to which those working within them can refer. Other written rules are meaningless (e.g., some of the materials in the Faculty handbook never have been operative).

One effect of collective bargaining would be to force the establishment of clear structure. Already, the mere call for an election have brought about the identification as to which persons have faculty status and which persons do not, a matter which the Faculty By-laws Committee has for years tried to get the administration to clarify.

The structure which bargaining would establish may facilitate the effectiveness of Oregon State; it may not. (It will depend on the competence of the OSU Faculty to build one.) But as a general organizational rule, organization is better than chaos.
March 1983 Reflections on Faculty Unionization

By

Steven T. Buccola
Department of Agricultural and Resource Economics

February 28, 1983

I offer a few reflections on the proposal that on March 9 and 10 we embrace a faculty labor union.

1. The essence of the proposal is that we surrender the rights that we now possess as individuals (and to a certain extent collectively possess through the Faculty Senate) to negotiate the terms of our employment. Those rights henceforth would belong solely to the union.

2. By concentrating their bargaining power in the hands of a single agent, workers may improve their incomes if (a) management has some surplus to distribute and (b) management does not respond by concentrating its own bargaining power as well. In the present instance, it is not clear that either (a) or (b) hold. Taxpayer revenues are continually pursued by competing public lobbies and there is no basis for the union's implicit claim that it would provide better lobbying services than those we have presently. Further, administrators would be forced by newly-concentrated union power to centralize their own negotiating functions. The net result could just as well be lower as higher faculty income. Recent give-backs of employee benefits by major industrial labor unions are a clear case in point.

3. The situation worsens when we consider the costs of operating the union. Many of these costs are the obvious ones financed by union dues, such as those of staffing the union office and contributing to union-selected political campaigns. Other costs are hidden but far greater. They include the increased administrative time required to satisfy bureaucratic procedures mandated in union contracts, which usually are more complicated than those employed without a union. (At the present writing, we have no idea what our contract would look like.) Higher administrative expenses cannot improve prospects for faculty salaries because each competes with the other for a share of the higher education budget.

4. Most of us, with an ill-developed (or quickly exhaustible) taste for mass politics, would tend to become alienated from the posturings inherent in the bilateral negotiating process. The result would be a shift in power from less politically-oriented to more politically-oriented individuals on campus. Organizers claim that unionization would increase faculty participation in decision making. The truth is it would only put the faculty's portion of decision making into a new and fewer hands, namely into those of union officials and, periodically, of simple voting majorities of union members.

5. In order to long survive, any labor union eventually must adopt an adversarial tone in its relations with “management.” It is the best hope the union has of drawing member's attention to its activities and of attempting to justify dues and payments. Current union literature on campus already bears a distinctive us-them theme. The adversarial tone is appropriate, perhaps, in certain industrial or national political settings. But it is inconsistent with my understanding of how a university should operate: namely, with faculty, department heads, deans, and president sharing not only administrative responsibilities but a common identity and a common purpose. It is no accident that when examples of unionized faculties are brought forth, the names of our nation's best universities do not figure prominently.

6. Finally, I object to the implication of the collectivization proposal that my department head is my manager and I am his worker. Like most faculty members, I spend a significant portion of my work time on administrative committees and I consider myself a part of management. It would be harmful for departmental relations to raise an artificial legal barrier between department heads or chairmen and other faculty members. When cooperation turns to conflict, our professional productivity and taxpayer's perception of our productivity surely will be the first to suffer.
Faculty members should realize that they cannot vote against unionization by staying away from the polls. If we oppose unionization, we must walk over to the polls and say so on March 9 and 10. The law states that a majority of voters, not necessarily a majority of faculty, will decide the outcome.
March 1983 Collective Bargaining - Evaluation of Faculty Forum

By

R.G Hicks
Civil Engineering (x4273)

February 28, 1983

I had the opportunity to attend the faculty forum on Thursday, February 24, titled "A Faculty Union at OSU" and came away somewhat confused. Here we are about to vote on the collective bargaining process, but we have no idea what will be contained in the contract. Important issues such as wage scales, work loads and hours, role of faculty in administering research studies, and other equally important items do not appear clear even in the minds of Everett Hanson (President, OSU, AAUP) and Margaret Lumpkin (first Vice President, OSUFA).

What was particularly disturbing was that when the proponents for collective bargaining were asked if proposed bylaws would be available prior to the election, Professor Hanson said that there wasn't enough time to prepare one. However, Professor Lumpkin stated that if we would like one, she would put one together before the election. If this is the case, it appears to me we are voting on a "pig-in-a-poke" and not a well thought out collective bargaining process.

Equally disturbing is the continual comparison to existing union contract at Portland State, Western Oregon State, Southern Oregon State, U. of Connecticut, California State University System, and U. of Rhode Island. I would hope that OSU faculty would consider our university to be more prestigious than these universities. Why not make comparisons with universities such as California, Stanford, Texas, Illinois, Washington, Wisconsin, Michigan, etc.? These universities and many others equally distinguished do not participate in collective bargaining.

Also evident at the meeting was some uncertainty on the actual bargaining process. It appears to me that attorneys (at least on the management side) will be doing the negotiating. The "Faculty Alliance" will not be negotiating with the administration but with attorneys representing the State Board of Higher Education. How can we be assured that OSU will get its fair share of the distributions? Equally important, who will represent the faculty at the bargaining table and how will they be selected? This, too, is not clear.

I certainly share many of the concerns of the faculty and their pursuit for a "better deal" with the administration. It is clear that many administrators do not relate well to their faculty. This could be because many of them have been away from teaching, research, and scholarly activities so long they do not understand the problems we face, particularly in situations with increasing enrollment and fixed budgets. Perhaps an alternate way of addressing the problem is to require that Deans and Department Heads serve fixed terms. They would be selected from OSU faculty or from faculty outside the university. This should result in a situation where the front line administrators are better aware of the problems and needs of the faculty, since they too will have recently been involved in teaching and scholarly activities. They also would be in a better position to communication these needs to the President. Maybe then the quality of education life at OSU would improve. It is ironic that his procedure is also used at prestigious universities such as California, Stanford, and many of the other previously identified.

Though there are a number of major problems which need to be addressed at OSU, collective bargaining in my opinion, is not the way to correct them.
The inauguration of Ronald Reagan at the very moment the hostages were released was the perfect combination to produce a feeling of transition and a mood of change in our country. There is now a sense of national effort to regain America's self-confidence in its role as a leader in the world, the strong defender of democracy. This mood of change gives decision-makers in both state and federal government this opportunity to shift priorities and re-allocate resources. We are now in a critical period. The decisions of the next few months will have a strong impact on the future. We will see many changes.

The challenge of change is to recognize what the future holds in regard to fundamental social needs and values. This is the problem. The changes we are seeing reflect the growing preoccupation with national defense, military power, and short-term U.S. self-interest. Our government leaders, reflecting the mood of the country, intend to restore the confidence of Americans that the U.S. can play a dominant role in the world. Unfortunately the world has changed. The U.S. has a new role in the world but many of us seem not to have noticed. International interdependence is a present reality, not an abstract theory. Our national self-sufficiency is now only an historical fact. In this new world, our future well-being depends upon cooperation with and support from other nations with different traditions, cultures, governments, and languages with which we are nearly completely unfamiliar. The links between the U.S. and the rest of the world are extensive and growing rapidly. These links affect our lives and livelihoods. Our economy is now tightly linked to the international marketplace. About one dollar in every three in farm sales comes from exports; one manufacturing job in six depends upon exports. A decision made in Saudi Arabia or Nigeria raises the cost of a gallon of gas in Gladstone or Newport. A good harvest in Brazil lowers the price of a cup of coffee in Corvallis. A drought in the U.S.S.R. enables farmers in Eastern Oregon to buy new combines, but it may also force Salem shoppers to pay more for a loaf of bread. The Bantam Book you read, the Keebler chocolate chip cookie you nibble, even the Alka Seltzer tablet you take are the products of foreign-owned companies. In a similar trend, U.S. investment has reached the point where one-fourth of each new dollar invested goes abroad.

It is this interdependence that is the real challenge of change. Our state and national leaders must recognize that what is needed is to educate Americans to their new role in the world and to make decisions based on the realities of interdependence. What we need for the future is the strength of knowing how to understand and to benefit from the changes producing interdependence.

Why do we so often ignore our new role in the world? The difficulty for Americans is that much of the rest of the world has developed within a framework of dependence upon other countries; whereas we, for the first time in our national existence, have become dependent on others. We are now, like most other societies throughout history, directly affected by important events and decisions over which we have little or no control. The dominance of this country is giving way to a shared partnership with other countries and cultures. This change is difficult for most of us to accept.

In higher education we have entered a critical period. President Reagan has given a lower priority to federal support for education. Budget cuts have been proposed that would reduce U.S. support for developing countries and international agencies. At the state and local level a similar situation exists. A small but growing number of educators are voicing support for a higher priority to be given to international education. (International education is used in the broad sense and refers to the process of acquiring knowledge of the existence, diversity and interrelationship of the countries and cultures of the world). At the same time, these voices are not as loud as those calling for a reduction of financial support to education at all levels.
Proponents of international education are left with the curious result of decreasing budgets and declining programs when it is obvious that America's economic and cultural dependence on others is increasing. The Global 2000 International Studies Report have stated the case for a higher priority for international education, but remain in urgent need of improving the international dimension of the education of our citizens. We need more support for understanding other countries and cultures. Overall, the response of the American educational system to the challenge of preparing citizens for effective coping in an interdependent world is woefully inadequate.

The major educational need is in the classroom. We must develop the international dimension of each course and each discipline. We do not need new courses as much as we need new attitudes. We need encouragement to change existing courses and curricular offerings, to infuse an international component into the subject matter, whether it be in engineering, education, military science or sociology.

The decline in language learning is a serious problem. It affects our ability to remedy the balance of payments problem. It has implications for our national security. Consider our potential for misunderstanding the Soviets of the Chinese or the Iranians. Consider the fact that there are more teachers of English in the U.S.S.R. than there are students of Russian in the entire United States. It is going to be far more difficult for America to survive and compete in a world where nations are increasingly dependent on one another if we cannot communicate with our neighbors in their own language and cultural contexts.

Oregonians should give careful attention to the decisions of the next few months, both in Washington, D.C. and in Salem. Where we must strengthen our country is in the classroom where we should educate students to minimize the present difficulties we have relating to, understanding, and working with people of other nations. The present mood of change must include support for developing our national strength by improving our ability to understand interdependence and its implications. Those countries with citizens able to learn and understand the traditions of others, who are able to converse in the language of their associates, will have a competitive advantage in every aspect of global affairs. Are our schools and colleges preparing these citizens?
General Education Models (GEM) Project OSU Faculty Survey RE: General Education Report of Findings
By

The GEM Committee:

Carol Carroll - French
George Carson - History
Richard Clinton - Liberal Arts
Michael Coolen - Music
Lloyd Crisp - Speech Communication
Warren Hovland - Religious Studies
Roger Penn - Student Services
Jack Rettig - School of Business

September, 1980

Last spring the GEM committee distributed to 985 faculty members a survey focusing on the goals of general education. Specifically the questionnaire defined ten dimensions often embraced by the concept of general education and asked each faculty member to rank each dimension on two scales: A) for its relative importance to the general education of all students graduating from OSU and B) for the relative success we are presently achieving in providing it.

Because research on survey methods indicates a decline in response rate for every question pertaining to the respondent's identity, we sacrificed requests for information that would have enabled us to report rankings by school, discipline rank and age, etc. Nevertheless, because the School of Business handled the collection of their questionnaires separately, and because the College of Liberal Arts faculty had responded to the same survey the preceding spring, we can at least provide three displays of results for comparative purposes. The response rate in the CLA survey, with follow-ups, was an exceptionally high 74.6% (167 of 224). Among the OSU faculty at large, without follow-ups, the response rate was a very gratifying 47.6%. These rates are prima facie evidence of the widespread concern at OSU for the student's education.

The ten elements, dimensions, or goals of general education listed (and defined fairly specifically) on the questionnaire were:

- Aesthetic
- Communication
- Historical/Cross Cultural
- Analytical
- Ecological
- Reading
- Citizenship
- Ethical
- Synthetic
- Value

Obviously all ten items are important, some would say equally important, aspects of a general education. It is, indeed, a frustrating task to try to rank such a list of "essentials". Nevertheless, some patterns of greater need for certain dimensions that for others could exist among OSU students, hence the rationale for surveying those who are in the best position to have observed such patterns.

It should be recalled that the questionnaire was originally designed for use within the College of Liberal Arts, hence it omitted dimensions falling outside the purview or CLA (such as Mathematics, Science, Technology, etc.). Unquestionably these dimensions are of crucial are of crucial importance to an adequate general education in today's world, but because of our university's structure they fall within the bailiwick of the College of Science, which declined our invitation to join us in reexamining the effectiveness of OSU's present...
The rankings of the ten goals by the OSU faculty are as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Business</th>
<th>CLA</th>
<th>Other Schools</th>
<th>All OSU Faculty</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Communication</td>
<td>Communication</td>
<td>Communication</td>
<td>Communication</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Analytical</td>
<td>Analytical</td>
<td>Analytical</td>
<td>Analytical</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Synthetic</td>
<td>Synthetic</td>
<td>Ethical</td>
<td>Tie: Ethical &amp; Synthetic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Reading</td>
<td>Ethical</td>
<td>Synthetic</td>
<td>Tie: Ethical &amp; Synthetic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Ethical</td>
<td>Reading</td>
<td>Reading</td>
<td>Reading</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Citizenship</td>
<td>Citizenship</td>
<td>Citizenship</td>
<td>Citizenship</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Value</td>
<td>Historical/Cross Cultural</td>
<td>Ecological</td>
<td>Ecological</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Ecological</td>
<td>Aesthetic</td>
<td>Value</td>
<td>Historical/Cross Cultural</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Historical/Cross Cultural</td>
<td>Ecological</td>
<td>Historical/Cross Cultural</td>
<td>Aesthetic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Aesthetic</td>
<td>Value</td>
<td>Aesthetic</td>
<td>Value</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The consensus on what constitute the most essential dimensions or goals of general education for OSU students is striking; all agree that the six areas of greatest importance are 1) communication, 2) analytical, 3) ethical, 4) synthetic, 5) reading, 6) citizenship.

The internal consistency of these responses is shown to be high by the reoccurrence of the same six dimensions in the top six places in the section of the questionnaire that asked the faculty to list the five most important goals of general education. The rankings there for all OSU faculty were:

1. Communication 7. Value
2. Analytical 8. Ecological
3. Reading 9. Others (usually science - and technology-related)
4. Ethical
5. Synthetic 10. Historical/Cross Cultural

It is sometimes debated whether general education refers more to the development of certain basic skills or to the acquisition of a certain core or body of knowledge and values. Astutely, we think, the OSU faculty rejects this as a false dichotomy. At OSU general education is clearly conceived as embracing skills (analytical, communication, synthetic, reading) plus substantive knowledge (ethics, citizenship, and, somewhat less centrally, ecology, history, and aesthetics).

The questionnaire also asked the faculty to make a judgement, based on the students each has known, concerning how well or poorly each dimension is presently being provided at OSU. For a variety of reasons, many declined to hazard an answer to this question. The somewhat puzzling results of the responses received follow (ranked according to declining success):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>All OSU Faculty</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Ethical</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Ecological</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Reading</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Citizenship</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Analytical</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>All OSU Faculty</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Synthetic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Historical/Cross Cultural</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Value</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Communication</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Aesthetic</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Perhaps the most significant inference supported by the data from this section of the questionnaire is the very
low degree of success currently being achieved at OSU in the communication dimension of general education, the dimension that everyone considered the single most important element of the general education complex.

Those of us working on the revision of OSU's general education program are very grateful to all the many faculty members who contributed their time and thought to respond to our questionnaire, especially to those who wrote additional comments. We are encouraged by your responses, for we understand that the goals of general education will not be met in any specific set of courses but must be achieved in part in every class a student takes.

Again, thank you for your assistance.
Ballot Measure 6 will be rerun at the polls this November 4. This is basically the same Measure we voted on and defeated in 1978, except that this time around it's even worse. Additionally, I have been told that the Measure, as it has been drafted, is constitutionally correct so there will be no loopholes allowing flexibility in its interpretation.

Ballot Measure 6 proposes a rollback of assessed valuation to the 1977 level of which 1% would constitute the property tax base. It would then allow at most a 2% per annum increase in those assessed valuations - and all this with no current state surplus. Since many communities are committed to projects currently on their books and operations will have to compete with each other for the remaining funds available.

What does Ballot Measure 6 mean for the people of Oregon under our current system of raising tax revenue (so different here from that in California and many other states in that we have the 6% limitation rule)? The statement I was given by the Government Relations Director of OSEA is that if Ballot Measure 6 were in effect last year, there would have been 52% reduction in local services. Figures specific to the City of Corvallis, which I received from our City Manager, independently confirm this statement to within a few percent. From a democratic point of view perhaps the most serious threat contained in Ballot Measure 6 is that it seeks to limit the concept of majority rule. Tax levies would require affirmation by 2/3 of the people voting in order to pass, i.e., only 1/3 or these voting could stop any such levy. As you know, many levies when passed are paid for by the issuance of general obligation bonds. Since bonding ability is basically proportional to the assessed valuation, a significant reduction in this capacity would accompany passage of Measure 6. Thus, sometime in the future, it would appear that a community could, after gaining the necessary 2/3 vote, find itself incapable of initiating its approved projects not because it lacks the ability to pay over the long haul but because it has exhausted its bonding limit. (Easily done on the basis of an assessment level determined in 1977 and incremented by, at most, 2% per annum since.)

I need hardly remind you that public elementary and secondary education are programs funded from property taxes. Figures from the Legislative Revenue Office indicate that passage of Ballot Measure 6 would result in a 45% reduction of local participation in the public schools and a 55% reduction of that participation in the community colleges. This is in turn would force massive state aid with its attendant loss of local control.

Many of you worked to defeat this Measure when it was presented two years ago. Since then, the legislature has provided tax relief and eliminated any legitimate need for Ballot Measure 6. I hope you will work against this Measure again this year to such an extent that it doesn't continue to surface at every subsequent election.

Vote NO on Ballot Measure 6 on November 4.
As a Professor of Military Science at Oregon State University, I feel an obligation to keep the faculty informed of changes within the Army and the ROTC program which affect this campus. As a "Land Grant College" OSU has always been involved in military training and that condition continues on the modern campus. All four Services, Army, Navy, Air Force, and Marine Corps, are represented here in an admirable manner. Our cadets and midshipmen consistently take high honors when compared to others nationwide. Specifically, within the Army ROTC, we have continued to earn the reputation of "West Point of the West" as evidenced by our Juniors placing first out of 72 institutions at the Fort Lewis Advanced Camp last Summer.

Recent changes in the defense force structure necessitating a reduction in the number of officers required for the Active Army have been interpreted by some as indicating a diminishing requirement for ROTC training. Such cannot be further from the truth. In consonance with the basic American concept of defensive preparedness, as the standing Army shrinks back to its peacetime size, our civilian reserve force must increase in size and capabilities. The effect on ROTC is to cause a shift in the proportions of those allowed to go on extended active duty and those who are trained for reserve duty. This is a desirable sifting, except in the eyes of students seeking a military career. Nationwide, the percent of commissionees going directly to the Reserve has risen from almost none to approximately 40 percent and will continue up to 60 percent. Here at OSU it has risen from zero to 21 percent and may creep higher. We at OSU have consistently commissioned a disproportionately large number of Regular Army lieutenants who are focused on a military career. This infusion of officers from the college mainstream, and particularly form Oregon, has done much towards insuring that the American Military shares a philosophical foundation with the rest of our society and is not developed in isolation.

Students planning their overall programs should now, more than ever, consider taking advantage of the executive management training offered through the ROTC. Those not desiring a career can now be guaranteed reserve, rather than active duty, at a geographical location of their choice, where they can pursue their civilian occupation. In so doing they (1) learn planning, decision making, supervisory skills, and leadership techniques; (2) share their philosophical orientation with the Military, thereby enriching both themselves and the service; (3) honor the responsibility we all have to future generations by serving our country; and (4) develop an additional source for annual income and eventual retirement benefits. All students, especially those with the goal of entering management within their chosen career fields, should be advised of these opportunities.

There is another change which has taken place within the relatively recent past. The Army has made great strides towards the inclusion of the very latest management practices. The theory and techniques developed by researchers and practitioners in the business field have been aggressively adopted by the military. Organizational behavior, group dynamics, operationalized motivation schemes, and organization theory are all subjects of intense study both during officer preparatory training and advanced officer (executive) workshops and seminars. The most sophisticated computer systems are utilized at all echelons within the defense structure for general management, tactical and technical planning and control, and fiscal management. The U.S. Army Research Institute for the Behavioral and Social Sciences has established an enviable reputation for both development and field implementation of advanced interpersonal behavior facilitation programs. These facts normally have low visibility because they are not considered public relations material. The University community, though, can appreciate the tremendous strides they represent when compared to the image portrayed by films and television. This "new" Army should be known for what it is, not what the image-
The faculty need to know the facts so that they can advise students from a reality-based position.

On a more parochial level, we at OSU Army ROTC now offer a program with multiple entry points to anyone with two or more years of university education remaining. Cadets may receive ROTC and academic credit for coursework or may simply take part in a number of outdoor and military activities for only ROTC credit. Details are available from the Military Science office.

The changes in the standing Army strength, leadership training and challenges within the Army, and the OSU Army ROTC program are all pertinent to the OSU faculty. We guide and advise students concerning their professional and intellectual growth and cannot help but have an impact on their managerial development and ethical reevaluations. We therefore need to present to them the options available through military training here at Oregon State University.
Recently my department chairperson made an annual review of the faculty in the English Department. Part of his report on me reads: "Service to Students: 2-Ineffective (in view of the absence of student evaluations)." Since a number of faculty seem concerned about student evaluations and the way they are obtained and used, I think my response appropriate for a Faculty Forum Paper.

Dear Mr. Chairperson:

First, a couple of details for the record and to refresh your memory.

1. I have always invited students to evaluate my classes, even though I will not use the computer evaluation cards, or evaluation forms which are punched into computer cards. At the end of the term I tell my student (a) to whom to write; (b) to write after they receive their grades since the grade for them is an important measure of my fairness or lack of it; and (c) to sign or not sign their letters as they choose. (Unfortunately, legal opinions have complicated the use of unsigned letters, even though an instructor agrees to their use.)

2. I have not always refused a standard form. When, in the fall of 1976, the department developed a form requiring written responses, I used it. However, the Dean of Faculty told you not to read them because they were not signed. I called the Dean. If I signed a statement releasing you and all other administrators from any legal liability, would he permit use of them. You should remember the answer - No!

I offer these examples to argue that, although I have refused to submit to punched holes, I have tried to obtain written evaluations, signed or unsigned.

Why, you may ask, am I so uncooperative.

Well, think about those holey computer cards. That rectangular hole becomes the substance and form of a student's thought, judgement, and articulation. A hole! Can it be anything but an insult? Computers do not even feed upon the cards; they feed upon the holes in the cards-upon emptiness, vacancy, nothingness. Buried somewhere beneath the more recent layers of your administrative crust there surely lies at least a thin layer of an earlier literacy touchstone. Through it don't see the symbolic meaning of an evaluation that originates in nothingness? If you and other administrators do not see it, I'm convinced students do. No wonder, as one committee chairman on evaluations reported, students punched out holes to create interesting designs.

For English teachers to as students to reduce ideas and judgement to empty rectangulars is to undermine everything we try to teach about writing - denotation and connotation, sentence structure, concrete examples, organization, tone, style - all of those subtle, but significant elements which combine to produce a unique expression of thought and feeling.

Even as administrators insist that holes are thoughts, they appoint inter-university committees and intra-university committees, apply for state grants and federal grants, hold conferences and short courses, establish competency tests and remedial workshops, in an attempt to cope with why Jane and John can't write. The absurdity of it. Ah, Beckett! Ah, Barth!

Still, you may insist, what's so great about written student evaluations, which some poor administrator or personnel committee must read?

Sorry, examples again instead of holes. There is in my file a letter from a student who is highly critical of me. In fact she calls me a “fucking asshole.” I do not question the genuineness of her feeling, but I do think an insightful reader would see that her remark arises in part from my refusal to give her a final exam ahead of, and separate from, the rest of the class.
Also in the file, and from the same year, is a long, highly complimentary letter from another student. But again a sensitive reader should be able to see that it is undoubtedly too laudatory.

My point? Just that these letters illustrate that a written statement tells a reader something about the student evaluator as well as about the teacher being evaluated. That's an important something. Holes are nothing.

So I must continue to prefer not to value nothingness, and you will continue to prize it. Rather than a hundred computer printouts with 3.763, give me one gusty letter calling me a "fucking asshole." At least I know there is mind, feeling, and commitment behind that letter. In her curses she believes me to be alive and human. She believes herself to be alive and human. And unlike the unknown citizen of Auden's poem, she refuses to bow down, shrivel up, and disappear into a hole.
May 1978 - The Uses and Misuses of Student Evaluations

By

Charles F. Warnath
Psychology

April 26, 1978

Student evaluation of their college courses has a long tradition. In the 40's the faculty of the university which I attended accepted them as a routine part of each course. These evaluations were designed and analyzed by students and published in a special issue of the school newspaper. The main purpose of the evaluations were to tell students very specifically what they might expect when they signed for a course and, secondarily, to tell instructors how students reacted to specific aspects of the course. The items were developed by students to answer the questions which students have about a course: quantity and quality of the reading; tests and papers; value of lectures or discussions; willingness of instructor to meet with individual students; and the like.

Now, I am not trying to sell this format as the best of all possible approaches to student evaluations but rather to contrast this format with the system which seems to predominate at OSU in order to raise some questions about what we are doing. The most basic difference between the two systems is that the one described was student sponsored and operated. It had no official sanction except that faculty members gave up one of their class periods. Although it was assumed that faculty and administrators could read the results as well as the students, there was no implication that administrative decisions would be affected by those results. Students evaluated aspects of the course, including the instructor's participation, primarily with the intent of telling other students what they might anticipate in the course and not with the intent of "sending a message" to the administration. By including items on the reading, papers, homework assignments, and tests, students were made aware that the course was a total learning experience and not restricted to aspects of the course in which the instructor was personally involved.

Secondly, the purpose of the evaluation was clear: students were evaluating courses for the benefit of their fellow students. Evaluations which are supplied through an administrative office can carry mixed messages to students, particularly when no effort is made to feed back to students any of the information which has been collected. This is particularly true where, as in the case of the official OSU evaluation, all items relate to some function or characteristic of the instructor. Perhaps it is a fine point, but I believe there is a difference in the set with which student responds when the focus of the evaluation seems to be entirely on the instructor, with that evaluation going to the administration, and when the focus is on the course with the feedback going to the instructor or to other students.

Third, the specificity and baseline of the questions encourage a significant difference in the types of responses which students will make to the items. In the evaluation described, the items were designed to elicit responses to specific aspects of the course based on individual quantitative or qualitative judgments, not on a scale requiring comparisons with other courses or other instructors. With generalized items and an unspecified baseline for responses, the probability exists that students will respond with different item interpretations and react with different comparison scales. To test this possibility, I gave the items appearing on the OSU punch card to two of my classes and asked them to respond in terms of what the items meant to them and how they made decisions about their ratings. It was obvious from their responses that there was little agreement on the meaning of the items and that their judgements covered a wide range of expectations and individual experiences. For instance, "Clarity of Presentation" was responded to by some students in terms of whether the instructor speaks in a loud, clear voice.

So far as the baseline for responses is concerned, the OSU punch card implies some sort of comparison but the student is left with the task of deciding the criteria by which he/she will judge "average" and the
extremes. As might be expected, students differed in terms of responding from their personal experience with the particular instructor, comparing the instructor to others (whether all, others in the department, or those most clearly remembered is not clear), or making judgements against some sort of "ideal expectation." For example, on the "Concern for the Student" item, some apparently rate on the basis of such specific factors as the instructor's lack of concern for them while this same characteristic indicates to the other students the instructor's mastery of the subject. The baseline used by students for judging an instructor's "Availability" shows almost no consistency. While some students rate on the basis of the number of posted office hours, others rate on the basis of whether or not the instructor was in his/her office when they personally wanted to talk to the instructor.

Moreover, in classes where attendance is not mandatory and test items are not keyed specifically to class presentations, some students may spend few hours in class and, yet, in the OSU evaluation, they are required to make judgments about the instructor which they can only reasonably through an on-going contact with the instructor in the classroom.

As reported in recent issue (December, 1977) of *Teaching Psychology*, numerous studies indicate a consistency of ratings for an instructor teaching the same course at different times; however, the prediction of the ratings for an instructor from one course to another can drop almost to zero. The point which the authors of this research project were attempting to make was that, because of the lack of consistency of ratings for instructors teaching different courses, students could not predict the quality of course or characteristics of instructor in another course. The results of this research also indicate that only a fraction of the variance in the ratings seems to be due to the characteristics of the instructor held by all students and that the criteria for those judgments are the ones which they personally apply.

Fourth, where the student is encouraged to select a rating for every item by the omission of a "No Opinion" or "No Basis for Judgment" choice, some students are obviously making judgments on the basis of second-hand information or a "halo effect" carry over from other items. This is likely to occur when a student has not had personal experience which he/she generally uses as the basis for rating a particular item. The clearest example would be that of the hours posted but be rated below average by a student who has never made an attempt to meet with the instructor. Being forced to make some rating, the student may well use one item to reinforce his/her feelings, good or bad, about some other aspect of the course. One of my colleagues teaches a large lecture course for lower division students during the same term that he teaches a small, upper division class. While the lower division students give him low ratings on "Availability," his upper division students give him very high ratings on the same item. It seems logical that he is equally available to both groups except for immediate after-class contact.

And this brings me to my final point. The effectiveness of a particular course is not simply a matter of the instructor's "teaching well." What goes on in a class is a complex transaction between the instructor and a number of individuals with a variety of needs, expectations, and personal characteristics. The very instructor style and class design which excite some students can (and do) turn off other students completely. For those students who are passive listeners and do only what is specifically outlined for them to do, the class which requires their participation and initiative may be perceived as disorganized and the instructor as not doing his/her job. This variation in response extends even to the course details such as the source of reading materials. In classes where I have no text, some students complain about having to spend time withdrawing books from the Reserve Room while others are enthusiastic about the choices they have in their reading.

From the comments made by student representatives on a committee to draw up guidelines for student participation in administrative reviews of faculty as well as comments I have heard from students in general, it would appear that students assume that there exists a set of judgments about an instructor held by all students and that the criteria for those judgments are the ones which they personally apply.

The purpose of the above discussion is not to build a case for abolishing student evaluations. That would
be a futile gesture at this point since they have become an integral part of consumer politics and a staple in the public relations "concern for students" approach to potential students and their families. Student evaluation of faculty are now too much identified with "accountability" to be eliminated. Beyond that, I do feel that direct student input should be considered in administrative decisions about faculty since the alternative is to rely on hearsay and the gripes of disgruntled students who complain to chairmen, deans, and the president. Moreover, instructors can learn from good student feedback about aspects of a course which would improve the learning possibilities for some of the students.

My hope is that the points I have raised will sensitize faculty to some of the problems involved in student evaluations and that poor evaluations with ambiguous items can result only in misinformation. The purpose and goals of an evaluation must be absolutely clear to the students; the items must be specific; and the baselines for making the projective test which allows the student to respond from individual, often idiosyncratic, interpretations. With ambiguous questions to which students respond with only their own personal baselines as a guide, neither the instructor nor the administration can expect to receive helpful information. Since everyone seems to be taking the results of our present evaluation forms seriously, it would seem that faculty should become more concerned about the instruments which generate the information which administrators are using to make judgements related to salary, tenure and promotion.
May 1978 - International Education: A Neglected Resource

By C. Warren Hovland
Religious Studies
May 8, 1978

In a society where the search for "roots" has become increasingly important, I would like to suggest that the programs offered through our Office of International Education can provide a valuable adjunct to student's educational experience. Through foreign study programs third and fourth generation Americans are finding some of the values and traditions of our ancestors as a source of self-understanding and a clarification of life goals. Entering another society and staying at least a year in that country, learning another language, trying to understand its history and culture can provide the student with a perspective and educational dimension that can be achieved in no other way. Having observed this process for the past two years in the German Study Program, these seem to be some of the more obvious values:

1. A reduction of parochialism and the tendency to stereotype. The day to day association with a variety of different types of people in another culture helps to reduce stereotypes like: "All Frenchmen are great lovers"; "All Germans are fat and hard working." Our students also encounter stereotypes like: "All Americans are rich and culturally deprived." By experiencing friendships with students and with families some of these stereotypes are reduced. "Pseudospeciation," the tendency to regard our own society as superior and ultimate, is thus minimized.

2. A less naive and more critical analysis of our own society. Exposure to politically sensitive and more sophisticated students challenges our students to examine their assumptions about American democracy. Frequently they discover that foreign students actually know more about America then they do. As Robert Burns aptly put it:

   O wad some power the giftie gie us
   To see ourselves as others see us.
   It wad fra monie a blunder free us.

3. A time to reflect on the meaning of education. Students who have been conditioned to think of education in terms of credit hours and GPA's are confronted by an alternative view of the educational process which stresses individual research, much greater freedom to pursue individual interests and offers little supervision or control. Many students respond with uncertainty at this lack of structure but when they experience the positive results they are encouraged to view their own learning in a new light.

4. A moratorium from pressures at home and society. The demand to conform or get into an established groove is temporarily suspended while students are abroad. As Erikson has pointed out such a moratorium is a need for some individuals to achieve a genuine sense of their identity.

5. A discovery of the importance of language. Language is a basic tool for understanding people, societies, cultures. Most Americans are "language-poor" and by studying at universities where students often know two, three, or more languages and where one has to really know the language to communicate with people is a great learning experience.

6. Encounter with great art, music, ballet, theatre, and museums. Many of our students have a minimal exposure to these resources in America or universities. In Europe it is a substantive part of student's experience and a critical analysis of each performance is a regular part of the experience. Population centers provide daily performances of great masters and the art collections are freely available to all.
A true center of learning is not local or statewide or even limited to national borders. Oregon State University has a responsibility to educate for global interdependence. Like all institutions of learning we should make the study of world affairs, Western and non Western civilization, foreign languages, international relations, international economics and agriculture and the encouragement and opportunities for study abroad an integral part of undergraduate and graduate programs.
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December 1978 - International Education: A Neglected Resource

By

Sally Malueg
Professor of French and
OSU Interinstitutional Faculty Senator

November 30, 1978

Recently all faculty members received a document entitled "Faculty Lobby Proposal" from the Lobby Activating Committee set up by the Interinstitutional Faculty Senate. The initial response to the proposal here at OSU has been gratifying to date. However, the greater the number of faculty members supporting the lobbyist effort, the more effective a lobbyist can be. Hence this plea to those of you who have not yet submitted pledge forms to think carefully about the importance of faculty representation in Salem.

As you should realize, faculty members have not always had a voice in legislative matters of concern to them. While state system, institutional, and administrative points of view have generally been well-represented, they do not always correspond to faculty views. During the last session with its effective Student Lobby, faculty members were for the most part conspicuous by their absence. In order to insure that the faculty voice is heard, a great many faculty members have decided that the tie has come to support a faculty lobbyist.

What can a lobbyist do that faculty members cannot do alone? A lobbyist with the help of the Association of Oregon Faculties can ascertain the concerns of faculty members that require action by the Executive or Legislature and coordinate united efforts by the faculty to address common problems and common concerns. A lobbyist can be on the spot in Salem day in and day out; keep track of legislative committee and subcommittee agenda and hearings, especially those called upon short notice; and notify the Association when it seems advisable for faculty members to present in Salem. A lobbyist can become acquainted with individual legislators to know their interests and concerns and to represent faculty concerns to them; press for solutions to the problems of higher education with the appropriate elected officials; and explain faculty views on higher education to communication media and opinion makers.

What are the alternatives to a faculty lobbyist? Collective bargaining is not an immediate likelihood on this campus. Other statewide organizations which might offer lobbying opportunities have been neither highly effective nor totally sympathetic to faculty in the past. Short of accepting silence or ineffective, disorganized representation, there seems to be no alternative.

Why spend money on a faculty lobbyist? What better place to channel your money to assure faculty input in the legislative, decision-making arena. The cost is modest in comparison to dues in some other professional organizations and downright cheap in terms of bargaining union expenses. Some of you may ask whether you can afford the less than 1% of your salary represented by the pledge amounts. At the same time you should ask yourself what will happen in the long run if we continue to be without full representation.

As the Interinstitutional Faculty Senate recognized in proposing a faculty lobbyist for the institutions of the OSSHE, there may be shortcomings and difficulties in this course of action. Yet, this seems to be a necessary and inevitable course given the context of Oregon's way of dealing with higher education. Ponder carefully and move quickly; the moment of decision is upon us.
Dear Colleagues:

During the last session of the Oregon legislative assembly, I had occasion to present faculty interests regarding budget matters and other legislation affecting higher education.

I was disappointed to discover that concerns of faculty, in matters affecting educational policy and practice as well as faculty economic welfare, were given low priorities by the officials and agencies I had previously believed were deeply involved in advancing our professional interests.

The intermittent efforts of individual representatives of faculty bodies to explain and support faculty interests has not been effective. There is no tendency among legislators, state executive officers, or public employee bodies to develop and defend an environment supportive of our professional and personal interests. It seems clear that professional interests of faculty are now unrepresented before the Oregon legislators. The current proposal that faculty support a professional representative in Salem should provide for continuing and responsive clarification of our interests in legislation. Such representation is not only desirable, it may be necessary.
January 1977 - A Letter to a Dean

By

Irvin Isenberg
Biochemistry and Biophysics

December 16, 1976

As part of my responsibilities as Chairperson of the Committee to Evaluate Dean Clavering, I went through his files and found the following letter. I am incorporating it in my report and append it herewith.

Irvin Isenberg
Biochemistry and Biophysics

Dean Hemmon R. Clavering School of Parking Campus

Dear Hem:

I want to thank you for your offer to make me Chairperson of the Department of Small Car Parking, but I must decline. I find it would mean sacrificing a lot of the Committee Work that I enjoy so much.

I do not take this step lightly so I am writing to remind you of the events of the last four years, events which led to the formation of our School. I know you were in on them from the start, you may need no reminder, but I want to put things in perspective, and explain my decision.

You may recall that my involvement began when one of your Assistant Deans appointed me to the Committee on Small Car Parking. At our very first meeting it did not take us long to realize that no-one had as yet defined precisely what a small car was. To clarify our charge, a Subcommittee on Small Car Definition was formed with me as Chairperson. We were a serious, hardworking group. We interviewed much of the Faculty and met diligently for many weeks.

One day it came to our attention that the students had appointed a similar body: The Student Committee on Small Car Definition. To avoid needless duplication of effort, we therefore appointed a Subcommittee to meet with the Student Committee. This led to a Joint Subcommittee on Small Car Definition, which was a good thing, in fact, a classic case of serendipity. For you may recall that, through our contacts there, we learned that a group of students had been meeting to protest the lack of Peoples Parking Lot at OSU. A demonstration had been planned for Homecoming Weekend. There would be a Picket Line, a Grass Stomp-In and a Flower Pull-Up. The Third World Congress on Peoples Parking had denounced the formation, as they put it, of "So-Called Peoples Parks, which were in fact just Imperialist plots to keep the People from Parking." A Peoples Park sounded very nice, but where could the People Park? A Grass Stomp-In and a Flower Pull-Up were definite, and non-negotiable, unless the Administration agreed to pave the entire So-Called Peoples Park and use it for Peoples Parking.

At this point a Subcommittee was formed to meet the emergency session with a Subcommittee of the Executive Committee of the Faculty Senate. I was Chairperson, and we were a very serious subcommittee, meeting night and day, thrashing out the entire issue, until at last it was decided by a vote of 24 to 17 to form a subcommittee to meet with President MacVicar and inform him of the serious possibilities.

We went to the Administration Building but as we went up the elevator we realized it was too late. We could already here the chanting "Peoples Park No! Peoples Parking Yes!" and we stopped at the fifth floor and went down.
Our worst fears, though, were unfounded, for even as we were riding down in the elevator President MacVicar was meeting with the leaders of the Student Sit-In all had agreed that the So-Called Peoples Park should be paved over and, for a show of amity, and to atone for past sins, President MacVicar and Vice President Popovich should show up with the first bucket of cement.

Unknown to us, however, a disident group had denounced the Sit-Ins for compromising with the enemy, and exploded a bomb in the Ladies Room at Home Ec, luckily when no-one was in it. Of course, this hit the newspapers which denounced the Faculty for coddling the students and demanded that the State Board meet.

The State Board met and also denounced the Faculty who, it said, was ignoring the legitimate aspirations of the students and not listening to them. It was only at State Board insistence, they pointed out, that the students served on committees, graded the Faculty, and decided on promotions and tenure. However, no student had as yet been made a Dean. Even the Dean of Students was not a student. It was things like that that caused students to set off bombs in the Ladies Room. What else could they do? They were desperate.

The State Board ruled, therefore that every Dean should have at least two Assistant Deans who were students and these Assistant Deans were to monitor all of the Dean's telephone calls, and sit in on all of his meetings.

You will of course, recall that the State Legislature refused to appropriate any money for the new positions. If the faculty wanted to coddle students and encourage them to set off bombs, let them take the money for the Student Dean positions out of the faculty salary and teaching budget. That wasn't the business of the State Legislature. They were fed up to here with all that nonsense on the campuses.

Somebody pointed out that the President had more than 32% of the money he needed in the fuel budget. Maybe this was too much. If he could get by with only 10% of the money he needed, he could use the savings to pay the salaries of the Student Deans. However, he didn't like this, for some reason, and the decision was made to take the FTE out of each School budget.

The trouble was that we weren't yet a School and we didn't have any budget. So a Committee on Student Deans of Parking was established to come up with recommendations. While I was not the Chairperson - you were - I was, of course, on the Committee. You will perhaps remember that I was the one who suggested that we generate FTE by offering courses in Parking, and a Committee on Curriculum was established with me as a Chairperson.

We quickly came up with a list of appropriate, initial courses: Pkng 65, Remedial Parking; Pkng 130, 131, 132, Introduction to Parking; Pkng 251, 252, 253, Philosophy of Parking, Preq. Pkng 132; Pkng 360, 361, 362, Human Sexuality and the Back Seat, Prez. Pkng 253; Pkng 490, Reading and Conference.

You were the one who pointed out that there was this purist from the Philosophy Department, who would be sure to denounce any course called Philosophy of Parking in The Faculty Senate. So somebody suggested that we call it Critique of Pure Parking, but it didn't do any good, because it was denounced anyway, and by the same guy, too.

About this time I forgot to go to two of my subcommittee meetings. It wasn't intentional; I just forgot. But even so, there were complaints and my Chairperson called me into his or her office to talk to me about it. I was so embarrassed, I could hardly look him or her in the eye. I explained that it had just gotten too difficult to remember all of the meetings. It wasn't only me, either. It was a very widespread problem. He or she said that it was understandable that people might forget, and maybe we could appoint a Committee to come up with a recommendation. I was appointed Chairperson.

It didn't take too many meetings to realize the way out. We would get a number of computer terminals and every day, when we logged in, the computer would list all of our Committee Meetings for that day, with room numbers and meeting times.

With a grant from a small private foundation, we put in an order for 17 terminals. As luck would have it, though, we put the order in at exactly the wrong time. There was a jurisdictional dispute between the State Purchasing Center in Salem and The Computer Hardware Evaluation Board in the Chancellor's office in Eugene. It seems that each group had a section whose function was to hold up purchases of computer equipment. However, the people in Salem only had the right to hold up purchases for 8 months, whereas the one in Eugene could hold a purchase for 16 months. The Salem group felt this was unfair and, until the issue clarified, they refused to accept and hold up any order at all.
You may remember that I was the one who discovered the solution. Salem had only 13 FTE for holding up purchases whereas Eugene had 26. Therefore the amount of time a computer purchase was held up per person holding up the purchase was the same in both offices. No one had the right to feel discriminated against. Everyone held up every purchase the same amount of time.

I suppose it was things like this that made my reputation.

Now that we have our computer terminals I haven't missed a single Committee Meeting. After all that effort I really can't see giving up everything just to become Chairperson. I hope you understand.
February 1977 - In Union There Is ---- By

Jesse F. Bone
Veterinary Medicine

January 11, 1976

I note that in the efforts to establish a union for the faculty of Higher Education in Oregon, one of the protagonists has succeeded in stating the precise thing that increases my apprehensions. I quote:

"What seems to be forgotten is that collective bargaining (unionism) as an issue is here to stay. If, indeed, the faculty at OSU do vote against collective bargaining next year or whenever, that does not mean that collective bargaining (unionism) has been voted down forever. A defeat is a temporary thing!"

The corollary to this statement is that A VICTORY IS A PERMANENT THING - and that's what worries me. Once we get the monkey on our back, we won't be able to get rid of it.
February 1977 - Survey Report, AD HOC Committee on Word Processing

Pat Wells
Administrative Office Mgmt.

January 18, 1977

At the beginning of the 1975-76 academic year an ad hoc committee consisting of Dr. Pat Wells, chairman, C.W. Peckham, Emma Raymond, Irene Sears, and LaDonna Whitney was established to study the campus-wide needs for word processing and how best to provide secretarial support to the campus. In order to understand these needs, the committee solicited the cooperation of schools and colleges in responding to a relatively simple survey.

Secretarial and faculty or administrator questionnaires were prepared by the committee. The spring, 1976 class in Office Organization and Management assisted in the distribution, collection, and preparation for the computer, and the analysis of the questionnaires.

Following are the conclusions drawn from the data collected:

1. From 81 to 100 percent of the typing time is involved with typing from longhand for the majority of secretaries.

2. A limited amount of typing is done from machine-dictated material.

3. A minimal amount of material received for typing is through shorthand dictation.

4. The greatest problem campus secretarial personnel face is the lack of legibility of handwriting received from faculty and administrators.

5. The majority of typed material done on campus goes through one or more revisions.

6. Most material which is typewritten when generated does not require revising.

7. The majority of the faculty and administrators responding to the questionnaire spent between one and two hours a day generating written material. Twenty-nine percent spent between three and four hours a day in this task.

8. Between 41 and 60 percent of all written material in the departmental offices consists of one page or less.

9. Normal turnaround time is between one-half and one full day for most short documents in most offices.

10. The overall quality of secretarial services on campus meets with approval.

11. The most highly rated secretarial services deal with written material which is less than four pages in length.

12. The more involved research-type material is not being produced satisfactorily.
Based on the data collected and conclusions drawn, the following are recommended guidelines for providing better secretarial support to meet campus needs:

1. As much material as possible should be generated through the use of machine dictation.

2. Instruction on the art of dictating should be made available to all faculty and administrative personnel.

3. An OSU style manual or recommended reference books which include acceptable formats, punctuation, capitalization, etc., should be available to faculty, administrators, and secretarial personnel.

4. The possibility of using more form-type letters and paragraphs should be investigated.

5. Word processing equipment should be available in at least one centralized location for handling the more complicated research-type material.

6. Any future purchase of word-processing equipment should be reviewed by a university-wide committee appointed by the Dean of Administration.
My role as Parliamentarian of the Faculty Senate has brought me into association with numerous faculty who state their opinions about its activities and quite a few of their statements denigrate the Senate's accomplishments. Many of us, I suspect are more prone to criticism than to commendation on any topic, but regardless of the disposition to criticize I am convinced that a great number of faculty, perhaps a majority, believe that what the Senate does is of little consequence. Any criticism implies, I think, that the critic has some idea of what a more desirable result would be, and I trust that these critic's ideas of "something better" will provide the impetus for some useful alterations in Senate performance.

During my tenure at OSU the Senate has changed rather slowly, and is now in a metamorphic process that could produce a somewhat new organization. A recent impetus to that change occurred last fall when the President of the University discussed with senators some thoughts for making it a more "effective" organization. Subsequently, the Senate Bylaws Committee, chaired by Frank Adams this past year, has presented several bylaw amendments and will probably recommend others which purport to improve the organization. I had the opportunity to present to this committee some of my own ideas for change, and I want to discuss those and others in this paper.

My experience with parliamentary groups leads me to believe that among the factors which most commonly govern the operation of legislative groups are their committee structure, agenda control, officer scheme and selection, and power to implement their decisions. The Faculty Senate is a unique organization in many of the just enumerated categories and this uniqueness, I think, accounts to a great extent for the manner in which it operates.

First a look at the committees. Normally, a legislative body will formulate its own committees, provide for filling them with its own members, select or determine the selection of committee officers, prescribe rules of operation, and frequently control the agenda. By comparison, the Faculty Senate's bylaws delegate to the Executive Committee the task of appointing committee members and officers (Article III) with no stipulation that these members be senators. The Senate does retain control of standing rules for committees through its Committee on Committees, and it does have the authority to create both standing and special committees as it sees the need. However, the practice of appointing to committees and to officer positions faculty who are not senators, while having the commendable effect of involving many more faculty in affairs of the University and relieving senators of doing that committee work, has the disadvantage of removing from the Senate's deliberations those people who are (or should be) most knowledgeable on the reports committees bring before the Senate. A proposed bylaws amendment, recently introduced by Adam's committee, would allow committee members the "privilege of the floor" during deliberations on their reports. If this amendment passes and these non-senators do, in fact participate freely in the debate of their proposals, this provision could alleviate some of the present problem. Under present practice, committee reports are debated by senators who have had little, if any, exposure to previous discussion of the committee proposal. The chair of the committee is usually the only one of the committee available to answer questions, and the whole Senate, then, tends to duplicate the committee's work, including the proposing of amendments from the floor. This is always a time consuming process and is frequently an inefficient one. It tends to cause the Senate to operate as a committee, an improbable function for almost one hundred people.

Control over the agenda of an organization is control over what it does. The Executive Committee, on which the Senate is well represented, is charged with drafting the Senate's agenda (Article XI), and individual
senators and faculty may submit to the Executive Committee may refuse to include a suggested item on its agenda, I expect that it seldom does so. Another avenue for getting an item on the agenda is to present it as a main motion from the floor of the senate (Article X, Section 1). The motion from the floor may, of course, originate with some non-sector upon whose behalf the senator is acting. I do not know how often agenda items are presented by individual faculty to the Executive Committee, but I do know that very few original main motions are presented on the floor of the senate. The main reason, I suspect, is the absence of caucuses, among faculty and senators, which afford the opportunity to generate ideas which faculty want the Senate to consider. I have seen enough main motion presented from the floor however, to demonstrate the feasibility of this approach to get Senate consideration.

I mentioned above the role of the caucus. I was once invited as chairman of the Senate's Bylaws Committee to attend a noon meeting during which one school systematically covered the forthcoming Senate's agenda. I do not know how widespread or frequent these caucuses are, but they are suggested by the bylaws (Article III), which state that, "it shall be the responsibility of the members (senators) to seek the opinions of their constituencies." If caucuses were held systematically and frequently I expect that many things faculty now merely gripe about would find their way before the Senate for its consideration. At any rate, it is apparent to me that faculty, and senators, are not fully using their opportunities to generate agenda items and probably not using all opportunities to engender faculty support for agenda items which are generated.

When the Senate completes the pending provisions for electing its own President and Vice President, it will have created faculty officers with whatever prestige those titles represent. The power of these offices will be, in my opinion, more that of a Phil Lang than of a Jason Boe. I mention this to suggest that the Senate could endow its President with considerably more power. Under the present bylaws the Senate could delegate powers by instructing its officers to perform designated functions such as referring (originally) bills to committees, appointing ad hoc committees and/or chairmen of those committees, and representing it in prescribed situations. It could for example, give the President, or a designated individual or committee, specific instructions to present its views to a legislative committee. This very important matter is one which I expect to discuss in another paper.

That matter of power! Article X, Section 3 states: "Actions taken by the Faculty Senate are subject to approval by the President of the University." While Articles II and III give the Senate broad sweeping perogatives to consider topics of interest to faculty and to the purposes of Oregon State University, Article X states categorically that Senate decisions are advisory only. Consequently, many faculty consider the Senate's actions to be of little, if any, consequence. This position is, I think, a grave error. Although decisions on University policy are subject to executive veto, there are perogatives of expression in representing the faculty which constitute a broad area of influence which is so akin to power that it should be cultivated carefully. (The public employees collective bargaining law is the only source that I know of for potential alternation of this faculty position of powerlessness). Let us take a look at the matter of influence versus power. I have known of several instances on this campus, some recent, in which recommendations of the faculty as expressed through the Senate or some other faculty group were followed by the executive. There are, admittedly, contrary examples, but I do think that there is causation here. I believe that what we do in the Senate is of more consequence than the venting of our collective spleens!

Finally, I must assert specifically what I have implied. There exists a large reservoir of little used procedures through which faculty could pursue in the Senate a great many objectives. Through formulating special committees, broadening agenda, and instructing officers the scope of the Senate's influence could be broadened. These things will happen, however, only when we faculty individually and collectively make them happen.

Bylaws and rules of procedure are formulated by people to assist them in the pursuit of goals. An organizational scheme can be constructed, I admit, that will run itself and produce some results automatically, but that is not the ideal legislative situation. People with goals and with means to pursue those goals still have to produce a program and our Senate cannot escape that prerequisite of achievement. We seldom, if ever, get more than we are willing to settle for. When we insist upon more "accomplishments" from the Senate, I think we will get them. We have the ability!
Faculty Forum Papers

October 1977 - Laboratory Safety at O.S.U. - And what to do if you need it or Working may be Hazardous to your Health

By

Donald B. Miller

June 10, 1977

"The lack of safety consciousness on the part of many high school and university teachers is practically criminal."

J. R. Leach, Head, Safety Management Program, NIH

"If a university is screaming that it cannot make necessary safety improvements because it is broke, the real reason is probably that it has not given safety a high enough priority. Safety should be a standard part of a school's budget - just like such other essentials as salaries, equipment, office supplies, and heat."

G. T. Gatewood, Environmental Health and Safety Engineer, Harvard University

Here are some examples of unsafe conditions or practices at O.S.U.

Eye protection is frequently not worn, even though workers use strong acids, strong bases, and other hazardous materials, or workers are in areas where there are pressure or vacuum equipment, or grinding or machining operations.

**Remedy.** Provide workers with safety glasses and require that they always be worn in lab as minimum eye protection. Face shields or goggles should be available for supplemental protection. Plastic eyeglass-type protectors are not satisfactory for steady use because they don't fit well and they become fogged. (Oregon requires goggles or glasses with sideshields to be worn when working with hazardous chemicals).

Food is stored in same refrigerator as chemicals.

**Remedy.** Have fridge or storage for food only.

Mouth pipetting of chemical and biological materials is commonplace. This unsafe procedure is taught in some courses.

**Remedy.** Students and staff should be taught safe pipetting procedure and required to use it.

Effectiveness of hoods, particularly older ones, is uncertain and unknown. Lab ventilation in old buildings is poor.

**Remedy.** Hoods should be tested for adequate air flow (usually 100 ft/min) at various door positions. Don't do any work that may release hazardous materials to the air if hoods or ventilation are inadequate.

Chemicals are stored in unlabeled or inadequately labeled containers.

**Remedy.** All containers should have contents clearly marked. If containers are reused, old labels should be obliterated.

Individuals work alone in laboratory.

**Remedy.** No easy solution. Hazards vary greatly with nature of research and should be assessed for each situation. Hazardous operations should not be performed when aid is not available.

Labs have only one exit. This prevails in ancient buildings (Ag and Apperson), in modern buildings, (Oc-I) and apparently in buildings now being planned (Oc-III).

**No easy remedy.** Alternative interior or exterior exits are needed. And don't construct buildings with on-exit
labs, whether or not permitted by building codes.

Lack of elevators in old buildings (Ag., Apperson) necessitates hand carrying equipment, supplies and samples upstairs to upper floors. The objects may be large, or heavy, or chemicals in large glass containers. When the arms are full, hand rails can't be used.

No easy remedy. Dumbwaiters or elevators needed.

Besides the specific unsafe conditions already listed, the status of lab safety at O.S.U. is manifested in more general ways.

Example: The Safety Procedures Handbook, the only required safety reading material for O.S.U. employees, is completely inadequate as a guide or even a starting point for lab safety.

Example: New staff and students often receive little or no safety orientation and instruction.

Example: Except for certain radiation hazards, there is no medical monitoring program (e.g. blood testing, urinalysis) for workers who may be exposed to hazardous materials or environments.

Comments: Some improvement is observable (lab showers and eyewash fountains are being installed) and safety is better in some departments that others, but generally, it is poor. Poor lab safety is a result of ignorance and apathy that prevail at all levels - students and lab workers, researchers, supervisors, and administration. In this environment, how can someone deal with an unsafe situation? Fortunately, an individual concerned about poor lab safety has an outside resource, the Occupational Safety and Health Administration (OSHA). The activity and impact of OSHA is becoming a major factor in improving lab safety in academia as well as industry. For example, Stanford, M.I.T., Cal. Tech., and Princeton have been fined for OSHA violations, and required to correct deficiencies (the fines were small, but the corrections cost up to $400,000). The inspections and citations usually followed accidents or complaints by employees. (For more about OSHA and lab safety see a special 13 page report "Chemical Lab Safety and the Impact of OSHA," H. J. Sanders, Chem. Eng. News, 24 May 1976)

In Oregon, OSHA is administered by the Accident Prevention Division of the Workmans Compensation Board. It investigates complaints and inspects working conditions relating to health and safety. A complaint concerning a recent accident in the Chemistry Department resulted in citations for lack of showers and lack of side shields on safety glasses in areas where corrosive materials were stored and used. The citation for lack of side shields is ironic because Chemistry already required eye protection in labs; in other departments hazardous chemicals are used with no eye protection at all. Citations describe the safety or health hazard, specify corrective action to be taken by a certain date, and may involve fines. (Chemistry Department was fined $15.00 for each of the two violations.)

If safety or health hazards are not corrected when brought to the attention of supervisors or departments, complaints can be made by writing or phoning Robert Kennedy or Sandi Marsters, Accident Prevention Division, Workmans Compensation Board, 2447 Oakmont Way, Eugene, 97401, phone 686-7562. The complaint should be as specific and informative as possible, but can be anonymous. Safety complaints are usually investigated within a few days, but investigations of health or industrial hygiene problems may have a lag time of several weeks.
October 1977 - Some Little-Known Facts About a Well-Known Retirement Plan

By Peter Anton

September 28, 1977

PERS will succor us; we shall not, in our declining years, want.

If that is true, its truth is due largely to recent improvements in the pension part of our retirement benefit - the part that is paid by the State. The part we buy for ourselves is by monthly deductions from our paychecks, i.e., the annuity, has not fared well and is in need of improvements. I'll suggest some shortly.

Consider first the recent record of what has been done with our annuity money. I choose the interval 1970 - 1976 because it is the period during which we have had the option of making our contributions either to the fixed or to the variable plan.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Fixed Plan</th>
<th>Variable Plan</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1970</td>
<td>5.09</td>
<td>7.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1971</td>
<td>6.27</td>
<td>9.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1972</td>
<td>7.46</td>
<td>13.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1973</td>
<td>0(!)</td>
<td>-16.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1974</td>
<td>5.50</td>
<td>-18.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1975</td>
<td>7.50</td>
<td>18.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1976</td>
<td>7.75</td>
<td>18.58</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Very interesting - but how are we doing? These figures do not tell us. When the variable plan was first made available to us, we decided to, or not to, go into it. Was our decision a happy one, or should we now be eating our hearts out? How are we to compare the outcomes?

What we need is a pair of percentages that will let us compare the two plans, not just year by year, but for the entire seven - year interval. This pair of percentages will give us the answer to the following question: What constant rates of annual interest, compounded annually, would, had they been in effect for the respective plans from January 1, 1970, through December 31, 1976, have given us the gains that were actually experienced by the plans during that period? These rates are the measure of the seven-year "performance" of each plan. They are not difficult to calculate (though PERS must think the effort formidable, for they do not make it); a little labor produces these results:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Fixed Plan</th>
<th>Variable Plan</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>5.79%</td>
<td>4.39%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

That is the true comparison of outcomes over the entire period. Not what you would call sparkling performance in either case, but clearly the fixed plan has done better - so far.
As a matter of speculation, assume (to take some reasonable figure) that the fixed plan continues in 1977 to gain at the 7.75% rate of last year: what rate of gain would the variable plan have to show in 1977 for the average annual rates of gain since 1970 to be equal? I.e., how well would the variable plan have to do this year in order for someone who had been in it from the beginning to be as well off as if he had been entirely in the fixed plan since the beginning? Answer: 18.3%. Don't hold you breath.

Turning from what can't be remedied to what has been, there was, until this month, a restriction on our PERS annuity that was highly disadvantageous: we were not, upon retirement, permitted to make a lump-sum withdrawal of the balance in our account. This was a piece of paternalism intended to prevent the lumpenprofessoriat from squandering the funds it is forced to accumulate for use in the years of retirement. But now that we can get our hands on it we can get our hands on it we can do very much better with it than PERS does for us. Consider this. With an accumulation of $50,000 in the annuity account upon retirement, PERS will pay out, from the annuity account only (ignoring the payout due to the pension), for a man aged 65 who has a wife aged 63, $323.43 per month. If his wife outlives him, she continues to get the same amount as long as she lives. When both have gone to a better world, the account goes to hell: it is wiped out. However, if that couple had taken that $50,000 in hand at the time of retirement, they could have invested it in AA-rated corporate bonds which, with an easily obtainable yield of 8.05%*, would have given them-you've guessed it--$324.43 per month. And when they were both dead their estate would have $50,000 worth of bonds in it.

There's a catch here, to be sure: if the $50,000 were withdrawn in a lump upon retirement, there would be income tax to pay on that part of it due to interest or capital gains. This might be of the order of $30,000, and the tax on it perhaps $8,000, so there would be only $42,000 to invest. That would yield less money per month to live on, but it would also keep the principal from dying with the principals.

There's a better way. If we were permitted to put our monthly annuity contributions not into PERS but into a tax-deferred annuity scheme, such as one of those we may at present contribute to voluntarily, we would have either a much larger accumulation upon retirement than we can get with PERS because we would be contributing before-tax money instead of after-tax money, or alternatively we would have the same accumulation as if we had stayed with PERS, but larger net paychecks during our working years owing to tax deferment on the contributed funds. Finally, we would have much greater flexibility as to use of funds upon retirement. Of course, we would also have full tax liability as our tax-deferred annuity was paid out to us, but we'd be in a lower tax bracket than we were in during our earning years: we'd pay less tax than we presently do.

The pension part of the retirement benefit is also in need of attention. Pension benefit is calculated by a formula of which one factor is your final average monthly salary, i.e., your average monthly salary during your highest-paid three years of the ten years preceding compulsory retirement. These, of course, will normally be your last three years. But the years taken into account by the formula are calendar years, not academic years. So if you retire, as is the custom in academia, in June of year n, that year-your academic year of highest pay-is not counted for purposes of calculating your pension benefit: you were on the pay roll only through June, so your earnings for calendar year n are relatively low. Thus, half your year of highest earnings does not count toward your pension benefit.

Our fathers, who are in Salem, ought to have all these matters drawn to their attention. An effective union might concentrate their attention wonderfully.

A final note for those who teach part time or do other work on someone's payroll after retirement. You will continue to make contributions to Social Security (6.05% next year) on your earnings, even though you have begun to draw Social Security pay-in one pocket, out the other. What is not widely known is that such further payments to Social Security may be used, at the end of each year in which you have made them, to recalculate your social Security benefit. A professor who retires but then teaches one-third time might earn $8,000 for his work and thus get SS credit for a year of $8,000 earnings. When his original benefit level was calculated by SS, he had to take into account early working years, when the maximum SS credit allowable was much less than that (e.g. $4,200, $4,800, $6,600). A year of low credit can be replaced by a year of higher credit for purposes of recalculating a new and higher benefit level. There is no limit to the number of these annual recalculations.

I still receive requests from faculty members for copies of my Faculty Forum Paper of last April concerning the delights of the tax-deferred annuity program, but I'm unable to oblige; I simply haven't any left. Shouldn't there be a copy in your department's files?
"November 1977 - A Faculty Lobby in Salem" By

Thurston E. Doler
Speech Communication

November 1977

The matter of faculty lobby at the Oregon Legislature is an idea whose time came in 1975, in 1977, and will come again in 1979. I like to think that by 1979 we shall have organized our faculties in a manner to act systematically in responding to proposals that would effect our lives and in initiating our own bills in pursuit of our needs as we see them.

During the recent session several measures were introduced which purported to regulate some aspect of faculty employment. An example was H.B. 2702 which would have legislated the publishing of anonymous student evaluations of classes and teachers. Responses were made by faculty to these proposals when they were scheduled for public hearings, and several faculty, including the Dean of Faculty and the Vice Chairman of the Faculty Senate, spent considerable time and some money commuting to Salem and appearing before committees. These people testified as their best judgement dictate in giving their opinions as individual faculty. I think they did a good job in the aggregate and I have no argument with the quality of their presentations. The problem, as I see it, was the absence of an organization to anticipate the introduction of bills which might be in our best interest, and lack of machinery to monitor, plan and appear with extensive preparation for the measure at hand. We were always on the defensive as we reacted to someone else's initiative!

I am aware of the line to be drawn between faculty speaking for themselves or for Oregon State University or the System of Higher Education. This difference will have to be closely guarded. But with the continuining propensity of the legislature to consider proposals which have a direct bearing on the lives of faculty and students of the University, I think faculty need their own representatives who are empowered to represent majority faculty views on strategic matters.

A further apparent problem is the general lack of popularity of higher education in the legislature. As I become better acquainted with more legislators and people who deal with it I discover that they do not have a very accurate idea of what I think higher education is all about and what the role of the faculty is in the educative process. I am willing to bet that with a presence there we can turn this thing around.

The kind of response to this situation that I am advocating takes only three things - besides the will to act. They are organization, people and money. We need an organizational base; we need a way of selecting people to represent us; and we need a system of meeting whatever expenses are incurred. Where do we find them?

There is some possibility that the faculty will choose collective bargaining and that the CB agent could meet part of our need. Since nobody now knows exactly what scope of activity would be generated by a bargaining unit, I do not think we should wait to see whether CB is chosen or not. Why not proceed to meet a need that will be there regardless of the CB movement?

So, where do we get the three vital ingredients of organization, people and money? I would like to see the Faculty Senate take on the job and see what can be generated. Much is already being said about this very possibility, and the vital missing ingredient now seems to the will to act. This impetus will be provided by the senators' constituency as we insist upon their action. If we intend to be organized and into action by the 1979 legislature, we have to do it this year. The foundation work must be laid this spring to be ready to move into action a year from now. All we need to get a start is to put the item on the agenda of the Senate's meeting and set the debate in motion. I hereby invite the Executive Committee of the Faculty Senate to place this
question on the Senate agenda.

Note: This paper was written prior to the distribution of a questionnaire from the Senate's Executive Committee regarding the topic of faculty lobbying.
"October 1977 - Problems of Collective Bargaining"

By Fred W. Decker

October 28, 1977

Shall tenured faculty members, already threatened (because of tenure) with exclusion from the benefits of the new national law banning forced retirement for age before 70, now also suffer loss of the benefits of tenure if they fail to pay union dues or the equivalent?

That question has arisen elsewhere, notably at Ferris State College in Michigan, as observed by Dr. Russell Kirk in his lectures and articles. Academic freedom may have only academic value if the university gets forced into dismissing faculty members who refuse to pay union dues or "fees".

The strike threat might prove counter-productive when undertaken by faculty unions. Prof. Bengt Lofstedt of UCLA observes that in many disciplines the strike threat might simply prompt elimination of programs which are tolerated at best as frills by some unsympathetic tax-paying supporters.

Leading faculty members around the country like Prof. John Fawcett of the University of Mississippi have asserted in the context of academic freedom that professors must be granted a basic right to work.

At the University of Bridgeport many faculty members reacted in dismay when they learned that their own national professors' organization had obtained an "agency fee" clause in the collective bargaining contract. Those traditionalists felt they did not want to compel their colleagues to pay, for they considered this an invasion of free choice and academic freedom.

Prof. Vernon Jones of Clark University considers the amount of time on union matters and the amount of money collected from faculty union members "alarming", especially in the case of public school teachers. He proposes a blue-ribbon research panel which would in effect perform calculated arbitration in advance of any dispute so that objective criteria would lead to a theoretically determined pay rate for each type of faculty position. His system, designed for public school faculties, would perhaps even more readily serve the needs of faculty people in higher education.

Faculty members at OSU preparing to vote during 7-8 Dec. 1977 on collective bargaining and on a choice of bargaining agent may want to know in detail the potential commitments they might thereby make, as well as the alternatives open to them. For this reason an assembly of recent issues of the UPAO monthly Universitas in which the authors named above and others take up various aspects of faculty unions in higher education will await the perusal of colleagues at OSU in the Reserve Book Room of the Library. Just ask for the "Universitas Counter File."

Let it not be said later that we did not fully consider what we had voted ourselves into.
January 1976 - Whither CLA? By

Stephen J. Hawkes
Department of Chemistry

December 24, 1975

I am flattered that Professor Sprinker attributes such sophisticated motives to my misgivings on the role of an improved College of Liberal Arts. I must, however, disown them. My reasoning lies with the particular benefits of his proposals to OSU.

I am prepared to believe with both Professor Hovland (October issue) and Professor Sprinker (December issue) that critical dialogue between humanists (I am grateful to Professor Daniels for correcting my nomenclature) and technologists is at least desirable and perhaps necessary but it remains to be shown:

(a) that such dialogue should take place at OSU

(b) that such dialogue would take place at OSU if the College of Liberal Arts were strengthened

(c) that the benefit of having it specifically on this campus would be proportional to the expense of producing it.

It should be easy to prove that it would occur. If the coexistence of well-supported colleges of science and liberal arts on the same campus leads inevitably to useful dialog between their faculties on the socio-technological issues discussed by Professor Hovland, then presumably this is going on at almost every university in the world and a vast literature must be emerging. Is Professor Hovland's reference to Pirsig an example of this? If so, I am unimpressed.

If such a mass of discussion and literature is occurring there is no advantage to humanity or to Oregon's taxpayers in adding to the volume. Rather it should provide encouragement to other pursuits where some original contribution might be made. If there is no such volume of dialogue at other universities, then improving OSU's capability in the liberal arts will probably not produce it either.

In neither case does the possibility of discussion between OSU's scientists and it humanists provide reason for further inroads into our limited tax resources.
Some time ago I expressed my doubts about the virtues of unionization of the academy. I said, I believe, that what academe could lose in freedom might be more that it would gain in money.

I notice that initial steps have been taken to restrict individual freedom; possibly as a consequence of the recent salary increases which have augmented the number of dollars in our pockets, and the rate of inflation that erodes their value.

A recent letter from the OSEA states - "like it or not, 'fair share', union shop, mandatory contributions - call it what you will - is here to stay." All of the sudden, OSEA, which was a voluntary organization, has now become an advocate of compulsion and coercion. The pattern is plain; no matter what group the academy chooses to represent it, that group will become a fixed parasitic growth upon our incomes and our liberties.

There is a lot of noise about opting for a union shop in academe where we can close our doors on "outsiders" and shout slogans at our "enemies" in the administration and the legislature. Personally, I don't like it, but I fear that I shall be forced to endure it. I do not like adversary relationships. I disapprove of the implied or exercised use of force to coerce priveleges or benefits which are not earned. I do, however, believe that individuals who work should be rewarded, but I cannot see where a reward for the productivity of an individual should be applied like a blanket to those who fail to produce.

I do not like the idea of relinquishing my freedom to a union steward. I do not like the idea of living in a union shop, or being muzzled if I want to say or do something that I feel should be said or done. I do not like even the idea of being a mass man, a statistic, a number to be manipulated by some union administrator. Unfortunately, I am a moral coward as well as a physical one and I have no desire to be forced into becoming a martyr for my beliefs. I would rather be left alone and allowed to pursue my own destiny, with guidance and help perhaps, but not with the authoritarian tyranny of a union-employer consortium to control my actions.

I chose academe over a quarter of a century ago because it offered me the freedom to do the things I liked to do; to work with young people in an intellectually stimulating atmosphere free for the most part from the constraints of government and from involuntary organizations. I liked the air of freedom and the interchange of ideas, but now the air is loaded with political smog, and the interchange is becoming a melange of accusation, recrimination, and evaluation. Maybe this is a reflection of the times and maybe this, too, will change, but the lessons that history teaches are that changes will be for the worse rather than the better. I loathe the very thought of the lockstep society which is descending upon us, and about which I can do nothing.
If humanists and scientists at OSU have nothing important to teach each other, if our inquiries are unrelated, then the College of Liberal Arts has no business on this campus. OSU students are wasting valuable hours taking required courses in history, political science, English, and psychology, when they could be enriching or polishing their training in a chosen scientific or technical field.

Strangely enough, however, institutions like Massachusetts Institute of Technology, Harvey Mudd College, and California Institute of Technology seem to believe that strong liberal arts programs are vital to their students’ scientific and technical educations. The finest liberal arts colleges continue to require students in humanities to have a serious initiation into the sciences.

Professor Hawkes (January issue) seems to have forgotten that academic disciplines are merely arbitrary makes set by human intelligence around parts of the vast and seamless web of the universe we perceive. Mathematics is undeniably related to music and painting, as Renaissance culture makes so obvious and as Einstein frequently reminded us. Literature, psychology and history dealing as they do with the experience of a species of living creature, investigate the same forces that geology, archaeology, biology, and even chemistry examine. Human values are important in business, forestry, and engineering, just as the arts depend on science and technology to provide an understanding of the structure of the cosmos and man's relation to it. It is terribly shortsighted to ignore that essential unity of our enterprise as intellectuals, scholars, and teachers. To do so is to make a mockery of the idea of a university. To do so is to condemn each discipline to see along its own narrow shaft of light into the whole world we need to understand.

Academic disciplines have become vested interests for their members, who then religiously guard them with increasing suspicion and hostility against any outsiders who claim to have a corner on truth. Members of each priesthood tend all too often to behave like the proverbial blind men trying to describe the elephant. Is it the chemists or the physicists who proclaim that the creature is cylindrical and tough on the bottom, because all they can feel is a foot? Do we humanists pronounce the true beast to be affectionate because we feel the trunk curving around to investigate us?

Every teacher and every student is nourished and grows by seeking to understand, synthesize and meaningfully organized as much knowledge as he or she can absorb. The constant quest for knowledge, as a mutual enterprise, is what academic life is supposed to be about. How foolish to suggest that scientists and humanists would waste time and tax resources by trying to cooperate and bring their disciplines closer to the original harmony they shared in the age of Socrates, Plato, and Aristotle.
March 1976 - "In House" Evaluations By
Margaret Lumpkin
Education
February 27, 1976

It is apparent that an "in house" evaluation of a President or of a Chancellor is not an evaluation at all. Accountability must be impartially and methodically assessed. To rely primarily on employees to assess their employer is procedurally suspect and will not establish credibility with Oregon taxpayers.

University administrators have frequently compared university management with corporate management. However, in the evaluation process, the President and the State Board seem to be satisfied with a procedure used to evaluate faculty, not corporate management. Faculty is evaluated at periodic intervals by students, peers, and supervisors. For a President or a Chancellor, there is no closely associated peer group or superior group of professionals within the system. Accountability of an administrator is a vital to Oregonians as the accountability of faculty.

Following the State System's analogy of corporate management one step further, a management consultant firm specializing in evaluation of higher education should be employed. The most recently reported use of a management consulting firm in Oregon was 1969-70 Legislative Fiscal Committee's employment of Warren King and Associates, a Chicago based firm, to complete a study entitled "Management Review and Analysis of Public Higher Education in Oregon".

A qualified management consulting firm will surely rely on a systematic faculty evaluation as one factor in an objective, organized evaluation of a president. In addition, certain other aspects of management review will be assessed. Policies dealing with management, personnel, communications, long range planning and staffing will be examined. Financial management, budgetary controls and general managerial controls will be assessed also. A previous Oregon State System of Higher Education study included an assessment of the interfacing between the executive and the public, the legislature, and the Oregon State Board of Higher Education.

The vast expenditures of state funds for higher education warrants the expenditure of a fraction of a percent for an evaluation of the managers of Oregon's Institutions of Higher Education, individually as well as collectively.

Oregon State, as the state's first university to evaluate a President, must be the leader in the evaluative process. An "in house" evaluation is suspect to all; an external evaluation is clearly required. The schools of Business and the Chancellor's Office can recommend nationally know private management consulting firms, the State Board of Higher Education can direct the firm to assess the stewardship of a President (or Chancellor), the faculty can responsibly fulfill its role as one facet of the evaluative procedure, and the public will be assured that an unbiased assessment of accountability has occurred.

Let us individually and collectively urge the State Board of Higher Education to rescind the decision to keep the evaluation of President MacVicar "in house" and, instead, to authorize an externally directed evaluation.
"April 1976 - In Union There Is ---?" By

Jesse F. Bone
Veterinary Medicine

March 16, 1976

I became increasingly apprehensive over the possibility of unionization of the academy. Everything I read indicates that academicians will be trading in a great deal of valuable intangibles for a mess of promised pottage.

The latest of these indications that valuable intangibles will be lost is outlined in the recent OSEA letter concerning the selection of a new president for OCE. Faculty involvement in the selection of presidents, and - by extension - the selection of chairmen and heads of departments, and deans of schools will be abolished under unionization. The divorcement of faculty and administration into adversary groups will be complete.

As it is, without unionization, the divorcement of the chancellor's office into an adversary group vis a vis the faculty of the state system of higher education has already occurred. Unionization would simply complete the process. In practical effect it would place the Union (faculty) on one side of the bargaining table and the Chancellor's Office (administration) on the other. Note that the privileges and perquisites of both faculty and administration would be absorbed by the Union and the Chancellor's Office. The end result would be that neither faculty nor administration would exercise any effective control of their destiny, and that two essentially outside groups would determine the working conditions, performance standards, and qualifications of everyone in higher education.

Since it has already been amply demonstrated that absentee overloads seldom realize or recognize that needs and wants of their serfs and subordinates, it is hardly necessary to belabor the point that if we opt for an adversary relationship, we are in effect promoting our own destruction in everything except possible financial gain.

And if you don't believe me, let me give these quotes from the OSEA letter (emphasis mine):

"The Chancellor wondered whether the usual involvement of OCE faculty members should be continued in this matter (e.g. the selection of a new president) since that faculty had "opted for collective bargaining."

..."the present instance may afford the opportunity for further limitation of the rights and privileges which have already suffered significant erosion over the past five years"

"But until collective bargaining comes to Oregon campuses, faculty members, organizations, and governance bodies will have to be vigilant that - as a minimum...traditional faculty rights are not abridged."

Can you see where this is leading? The road is plain, primrose bordered, and paved with good intentions.
Visions of Sugar Plums

Fantasize a little. Let's ask the IRS and the State income tax people to:

- Stop withholding income tax on part of our earned income
- Lend us each month, cumulatively, an amount of money equal to the amount formerly withheld for taxes
- Allow us to retain the use of this borrowed money for as long as we like - 10, 20, 30 years or more
- Charge us no interest for the use of money
- Permit us to use the money to earn interest or to invest in a mutual fund in the hope of making capital gains
- Defer income tax liability on such earned interest or capital gains so that we may reinvest the gross amounts of such earnings.

Fantasy? No. This is reality: all these provisions are in effect for the fortunate few, of whom we faculty members are some.

What makes it possible for you to use otherwise-tax money in this way are the misleadingly named "tax-deferred annuity" plans. The name is doubly misleading in that (intelligently handled) part of the deferred tax can be avoided entirely, so that what began as a deferral of tax liability becomes in effect a partial exemption from tax liability; further, if you elect to participate in a TDA plan you do not thereby commit yourself to purchase an annuity, as we shall see.

The rest of the story

The provisions described at the outset are not, of course, the whole story. The rest of it is:

(1) You must forgo the present enjoyment of some of your current income by depositing a fraction of it to a TDA account; in short, you must set aside some money as savings. (Anyone who supposes this provision to be immediately disqualifying in his case because he needs all of his net paycheck each month may be making a serious mistake!)

(2) Tax on the tax-deferred income, and on the compound interest and/or capital gains accruing to the TDA account does come due, both on the principal and the interest on the interest or gains, in the year(s) in which funds are withdrawn from the account.

(3) There is a "front-end load" payable to the carriers of these plans and deducted from each contribution as it is made, so that not all of the money deposited in such plans is "working". The three companies that are authorized by the State to offer TDA plans to us charge, respectively, 4 per cent, 5 per cent, and a charge higher than 5 per cent but not in general specifiable because the percentage is a function of the amount deposited.
Why the full story is a happy one

As to (1):

The income you forgo the present use of (i.e., save) is, in effect, partially "matched by otherwise-tax money. The rate of this "matching is a function of your federal and state marginal tax rates. (Simply adding together the percentages which represent the respective marginal tax rates will approximate the total effective marginal tax rate, but such an approximation will always be somewhat higher than you true effective total marginal tax rate, owing to the fact that federal and state taxes are inter-deductible.)

The effect of such "matching" is easily calculated. If you TDA load (commission) is 5 per cent, the formula for calculating the amount of money you can put to work in your TDA account for a given amount of current income forgone is:

\[ W = \frac{.95F}{1-R} \]

where \( W \) is your total "working dollars", \( F \) is the number of dollars you forgo the present use of, and \( R \) is you total federal-state effective marginal tax rate expressed as a decimal fraction.

Example: You are prepared to forgo the present use of $50 each month (\( F=50 \)) and you total effective federal and state marginal tax rate is 35 per cent (\( R=.35 \)). Plugging these values into the formula:

\[ W = \frac{.95\times50}{1-.35} = 73.07 \]

Outcome: Your paycheck's net is reduced by $50, but this $50 puts another $23.07 to work for you earning interest (as high, currently, as 8 per cent). This total of $73.07 is 46 percent greater than the amount forgone of you net paycheck - and any amount you choose to forgo, whether smaller or larger than $50, will put 146 per cent of that amount to work for you.

If your marginal tax brackets are higher, you advantage increases too: if the total effective marginal tax rate is 50 per cent, \( W \) becomes 1.9 times \( F \), so that each dollar forgone puts $1.90 to work! The advantage of the TDA over ordinary savings is startling, and this advantage is enhanced by the fact that while interest on ordinary savings is fully taxed as earned, interest in the TDA account is tax-deferred for further compounding.

As to (2):

You become liable for income taxes on any amount withdrawn from you TDA account in the year in which you withdraw it, but even if such withdrawals were to be taxed at your present marginal tax rates you would be much ahead for having had the fee use of otherwise-tax money and for the full compounding of untaxed interest. However, the expectation is that you will have much lower marginal tax rates when you make withdrawals from your TDA than you had when you were making contributions to it.

Example: You go on a year's sabbatical at half pay and you are awarded a tax-free research grant for the period of your leave. You need more money for your year's living expenses than your half pay and grant will provide. You stop contributions to your TDA and make a partial withdrawal. Since your marginal tax rate is greatly reduced due to your having a taxable income that is only half your normal income, your tax liability on your TDA withdrawal is also reduced. The effect of this is a permanent exemption from tax for some of your pervious income.

Example: You become ill for an extended period and draw only long-term disability insurance payments, and Social Security disability payments. None of this income is taxable. Again, you stop making contributions to your TDA and you can withdraw an amount from it such that your personal exemptions and your deductions fully offset the amount withdrawn, so that you have no tax liability at all on these funds. In this way thousands of dollars of tax-deferred income can become tax-exempt income. (But this is the hard way).

Example: You make no substantial withdrawals until the time of your retirement. At that time you choose to purchase an annuity that will allow you to receive a monthly income for life, or over a specified number of years (there are many options). Your Social Security income is not taxable, nor is that part of your PERS annuity payments that represents a return of capital. Thus, a substantial part of your normal retirement income does not count as income for tax purposes, so that your marginal tax rates are relatively low. Even if your total retirement income from all sources, including your TDA annuity, were equal to your present salary, the income tax you would have to pay on that income would be lower than the tax you presently pay. (You
also receive double personal exemption from age 65 on, as does your spouse.) So deferring tax liability until
tirement is likely to result in partial tax exemption.

As to (3):

All that can be said about load is that it is unavoidable and that it is a small price to pay for the advantage
of a TDA account. If your preference is to invest your funds in stocks, two of the TDA plans available to us
offer that option. Note that if you were to choose instead to invest in a no-load mutual fund you would be
making such investment entirely with after-tax moneys and consequently would have fewer dollars working
for you there than would have in a TDA fund. Moreover, your income from the no-load fund would be taxable
as earned. The price paid to avoid a small commission can be a large one!

Some TDA plans have lower loads than others, but load is not everything. Other provisions of the several
plans differ significantly as to withdrawal provisions, permissibility of switching funds back and forth from
interest-earning to stock-investment, interest rate paid, annuity options, and annuity payout rates. This last
consideration is especially important: for identical annuity options, how many dollars per month will a plan
pay you in retirement for each thousand dollars of TDA accumulation? The amount of the load must be
weighed against these considerations.

Finally, the load burden may seem more bearable if you think of it as being borne by the borrowed tax
moneys you TDA makes available to you. As rationalizations go, this one is less objectionable than most.

How to make the most of previous savings, if any

Now, to expand on my cryptic observation that you may be making a mistake to rule out a TDA account
for yourself at present because you require all of your present net pay for running expenses: if, nonetheless,
you have managed to set aside some savings for use as emergency funds, you are in a position to start a
TDA plan and to do so without impairing the availability of those funds. If your savings are now earning (fully
taxable) interest at a bank, savings and loan society, or credit union, you can arrange to have a sum
equivalent to the amount of your savings deducted from your paychecks and placed in an interest-bearing
TDA account; you can then withdraw your savings from your present thrift-institution account and use them
for living expenses. You cash position will be unchanged, but your earnings on your savings will be much
greater than before because you will be receiving a higher rate of interest, tax-deferred, on a substantially
larger capital, due to the "matching" tax money that will also be deposited to your TDA account (e.g., 146 per
cent of your savings amount if the load is 5 per cent and the net of your marginal tax bracket is 35 per cent).
You will not have to make any further contributions to your TDA account unless and until you feel able to do
so, and your TDA funds are as liquid as your savings account were in that you can make a partial withdrawal
of your money (if you have chosen a plan that permits this) or full withdrawal at any time.

For those who can take advantage of a TDA plan, a thrift-institution account is not thrifty.

Strategy for impending retirement

If your time of retirement is near, you are - or ought to be - in an especially good position to start a TDA
account since your salary is relatively high and your expenses less than when your children were going to
college. You should have substantial savings and you should also have considerably more money coming in
each month than you require for running expenses. If this is your condition you can shelter from your current
high tax rates the salary you will receive from now until retirement. You do this by contributing to your TDA
account the maximum permissible amount for each remaining paycheck. (The maximum permissible
contribution for a late starter could be of the order of $1000 per month.) You then invade your previous
savings as necessary to defray your living expenses.

In the time left for making contributions to your TDA account you will not get much benefit from the
other provisions of the plan, but you will get the benefit of two significant tax breaks: your current taxable
income will be so greatly reduced as to lower your current tax rate; you will also make withdrawals from your
TDA account whether in a lump or in installments, at a time when your marginal tax rates will also be
reduced. If effect you will have tax-sheltered your previous savings retroactively! Timely hindsight can be
almost as good as foresight.

TDA accumulation and thrift-institution accumulation compared

Currently 8 per cent interest, compounded annually, is available to TDA participants. Typical interest on
time deposits at a thrift institution is currently 6 per cent. Using these rates of interest and assuming a 5 per
cent load on TDA contributions we can make comparisons of outcome.
A. If your total effective marginal tax rate is 25 percent and you elect to forgo (save) $100 per month of your net pay, then:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>At the end of year</th>
<th>You will have forgone net pay of</th>
<th>At 6%, taxable, your accumulation will total, net</th>
<th>In TDA at 8%, tax-def’d your accum. is</th>
<th>And TDA accum. exceeds thrift accum. by</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>$ 1200</td>
<td>$ 1229</td>
<td>$ 1585</td>
<td>29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>3600</td>
<td>3856</td>
<td>5146</td>
<td>34%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>6000</td>
<td>6724</td>
<td>9299</td>
<td>38%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>12000</td>
<td>15103</td>
<td>22963</td>
<td>52%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>18000</td>
<td>25545</td>
<td>43039</td>
<td>69%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>24000</td>
<td>38557</td>
<td>72537</td>
<td>88%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>30000</td>
<td>54773</td>
<td>115880</td>
<td>112%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>36000</td>
<td>74981</td>
<td>179564</td>
<td>139%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

B. Calculating on the same assumptions but for a total effective marginal tax rate of 35 per cent:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>At the end of year</th>
<th>You will have forgone net pay of</th>
<th>At 6%, taxable, your accumulation will total, net</th>
<th>In TDA at 8%, tax-def’d your accum. is</th>
<th>And TDA accum. exceeds thrift accum. by</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>$ 1200</td>
<td>$ 1225</td>
<td>$ 1827</td>
<td>49%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>3600</td>
<td>3821</td>
<td>5938</td>
<td>55%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>6000</td>
<td>6623</td>
<td>10730</td>
<td>62%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>12000</td>
<td>14642</td>
<td>26495</td>
<td>81%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>18000</td>
<td>24341</td>
<td>49660</td>
<td>104%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>24000</td>
<td>36108</td>
<td>83696</td>
<td>132%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>30000</td>
<td>50343</td>
<td>133707</td>
<td>166%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>36000</td>
<td>67579</td>
<td>207190</td>
<td>207%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note that these calculations of outcomes assume no change in applicable interest rates over the indicated periods. These rates may be expected to change, up or down, over a period of years. Note also that much of the advantage of the TDA plan over ordinary savings plans is due not to the greater interest offered by the former but to the "matching" tax dollars the TDA plan allows you to employ, and to the compounding of tax-deferred interest in the TDA.

A special break for those who have not set up a TDA earlier

The law provides a "catch-up" provision for anyone who has not contributed the maximum allowable annual amount to a TDA plan, or who has not contributed at all. In accordance with a fearfully complex formula, you can make up very large contributions from your salary to a TDA if you elect to do so. Anyone who has substantial savings in a thrift institution is in a position to do this, as described earlier. In any case, it is obviously to anyone's advantage to contribute as much as is permitted to a TDA at all times. (The permissible annual maximum too is calculated by a complex formula.)

A consideration for stock-market investors

In conclusion, here is a question for those who have preferred to invest available funds in securities and to manage their portfolios themselves: at your marginal tax rates, what average annual rate of increase from capital gains and dividends would you have to achieve in order to equal the accumulations on your capital that you could realize by having that capital supplemented by tax "matching" funds in a TDA at eight per cent annual interest? The investor who does not find the answer to this question unsettling compels my admiration while stretching my credulity.
April 1976 - U.S. Savings Bonds Are A Ripoff  By

Robert R. Claeys
Eng. Exp. St.
March 16, 1976

I believe President MacVicar gave his colleagues poor financial advice in January in recommending the purchase of U.S. savings bonds. I would agree with Milton Friedman, Professor of Economics at the University of Chicago, that these bonds are a "ripoff" (G.T. Feb. 12, 1976).

Where America invests its money is very important to the future of this country. One should ask: Where and how will the borrower use my money, and will the rate of return compensate for the risk involved and for inflation? Is the money borrowed by the Federal Government used to develop new industries and jobs? Very little. Is it put to other good uses? Only a small portion. I believe Federal borrowing has a long term negative effect on the economy.

The rate of return is low, even after tax considerations. As for safety, the same government backs both saving bonds and saving accounts. Government safety is over rated; everyone thought New York bonds were as good as gold. In the past ten years the Federal Government has been borrowing heavily to pay current bills; and, if continued, will eventually lead to bankruptcy and a new form of money. Since saving and loan institutions invest in local housing, their investments are probably the safest; and the money is put to good use in the local community.
The January 1976 OSU Library Letter to the Faculty contains a two page statement in favor of unrestricted duplication of copyright material by educators and libraries. Together with this statement is a plea to the faculty to write letters to Congress promoting this so-called "fair-use" doctrine.

While I am not opposed to limited copying of professional or technical publications by educators and librarians, I think that asking for unlimited copying privileges by academe is asking for the right to steal. Possibly those "professional" publications which do not pay authors or which require authors to pay for having their creativity exploited should be denied copyright protection, since their built-in safeguards of charging for publication and a captive readership virtually guarantee them as adequate income. But for that segment of the writing-publishing trade where authors receive advances and royalties and where publication is a speculative effort that results in financial return to both parties, a request for unrestricted copying privileges is morally wrong.

For some strange reason, many people do not regard an author's work as proprietary. From the beginning of writing, publishers, copyists, plagiarists and others have made authors' lives poorer. It should be evident that literary works are property. They are the result of hard work, creative thought, and commercial activity. They belong to the publisher and the author and should be subject to the same legal protection which is given to other forms of wealth. It is particularly reprehensible that copying without compensation should be endorsed by educators and librarians. These are the very people who should be the philosophical, intellectual, and moral exemplars of mankind. To listen to academe advocating the right to steal is like listening to a minister advocating fornication.

Barbara Ringer, the Registrar of Copyrights, has suggested licensure to protect authors and publishers from raiding by so-called "fair-use" advocates. Insofar as this applies to authors who write for income, I can see no reason why strict licensure should not be applied - even though it would make libraries licensed premises'.

I cannot see where payment by the page for copying those works produced by authors who write for income is anything but fair. I doubt if anything can be done about individuals who make copies for personal use, but institutional copying can and should be controlled. There is no justification for educators taking without compensation the fruits of the creativity of others.
In higher education in Oregon, students are educated in an atmosphere devoid of the democratic processes of checks and balances. I doubt if a majority of the faculty or students recognize that AR 12.000 and 12.100 of the OSBHE establish a hierarchy in which full authority is delegated to the president with no effective checks and balances from faculty.

To illustrate the accuracy of this statement, begin with AR 12.000 and AR 12.100, "The President is delegated full authority to administer the affairs of his institution in accordance with Board Policies, Budgets and Standards and shall have the right to preside over the legislative body of the faculties of his institution and have the right of veto over their decisions subject to the review of the chancellor. He shall have the right to define the scope of authority of the faculties, councils, committees, officers of his institution subject to review by the chancellor and when not otherwise specifically defined by Board Action."

In spite of the Dean of Faculty's statement of October 14, that the "Faculty Senate plays a significant role in the governance of the University, particularly in academic affairs", these regulations as well as the Faculty Senate Minutes clearly demonstrate the inability of the Senate to provide the much needed checks and balances needed to create a democratic community of scholars. While the Senate may serve as a forum for introducing and debating innovative ideas or policy, it has no legal power to enforce any of its decisions. At this point in institutional governance, the Senate can and has refused to rubber stamp policies which it cannot accept. The Senate cannot be used to comply with AR 12.030 which states that, "The President shall develop and recommend to the Chancellor in consultation with the appropriate committees or members of his institution as he deems necessary and/or advisable". The Senate can refuse and has refused to dignify policies which it believes detrimental to students, faculty or OSU as a whole.

This refusal of the faculty to approve certain policies seems to have little impact on policies. The President may select another group to represent consultation with appropriate committees to do so. This is not a very productive function for Faculty Senate.

Current law leaves the faculty members who believe that faculty members play a "significant role in the governance of the University" with two alternatives; change O.R.S. 352 on which AR 12.000 and 12.100 are based, or use the one law already given to us by the legislature, the collective bargaining law.

Assess the performance of the Interinstitutional Senate and the academic climate at our last legislature and decide if we have the potential for changing AR 12.000 and AR 12.100. Do we really have a choice between legislation and collective bargaining?
It may be of interest to OSU staff and faculty to consider the similarities and dissimilarities between data processing and word processing. This paper is written to identify assumptions which word processing and data processing professionals and users may have that could cause confusion.

Data processing can be defined as a sequence of operations, usually mathematical, that are performed on facts and figures. Word processing can be defined as a sequence of operations, usually syntactical, which are performed on words.

The modern concept of word processing has been widely accepted in the business world as a means of gaining efficiency and cost reduction in the office. It is a proven technique, now finding many users in all levels of government.

Word processing involves the efficient use of procedures, equipment, and people with a systems approach to office management. Basically, word processing is a method of producing typed documents. The "documents" can be anything from a single page letter, to a report, or even a large publication. The common thread is that all of these "outputs" are created in the same basic way:

1. The author originates the document by dictation, longhand, etc.
2. The document is typed in a rough draft or final form on a typewriter.
3. The typed document is returned to author for review and correction, or signature.
4. The finished product is dispatched.

This activity must be done in an orderly manner to obtain efficiency which is how the term "system" applies.

Computer word processing is the utilization of computers in the information input, editing and output cycles involved in the creation of a document.

An example of the differing perspective can be seen in two views of the word processing facility. To a data processing professional the word processing facility might be seen as terminals connected to a central processor using a purchased software package for application programs or as automatic typewriters which can be programmed for numerous revisions. A word processing professional and user sees the same physical setup as a complete publishing function (albeit limited) using computer technology. The expectations from such a combination can be very high. The fact that these terminals are few in number should argue for very close management scrutiny to assure delivery of potential services. The first distinction of the data processor seeing the application as a small and the word processor seeing the application as large is not unique to just current and potential OSU applications and therefore should be readily addressed.

The following points are less apparent and therefore deserve more attention because of their somewhat hidden nature. First of all it is important to realize that word processing is automated (though more sophisticated reference may use the term "electronic") copy preparation regardless of the devices or procedures used.

**Electronic Data Processing (EDP)**  
**Automated Copy Preparation (ACP)**

A. **DATA**  
A. **TEXT**
1. **Characteristics**
   - Repetitive
   - Periodic
   - Rigid Format

1. **Characteristics**
   - Repetitive
   - As Needed
   - Variable Format

2. **Operationally Oriented**
3. **Output Receiver Oriented**

2. **Administrative Oriented**
3. **Input Preparer Oriented**

**B. SYSTEMS**

- Develop once, produced multiple times
- Written once, revised multiple times, produced repetitively

- Input: forms oriented
- Input: voice, fresh or marked copy

- Storage: DPC function
- Storage: source or input functions

- Maintenance: systems function
- Maintenance: source of input function or centralized functions.

**C. RULES**

- Primarily numerically and logically oriented
- Primarily grammatically and syntactically oriented

**D. SCHEDULES**

- Rigid
- Ultra Rigid
Bernard I. Spinrad has imputed to himself pontifical powers of nuclear omniscience in writing ex cathedra from his quasi-prestigious citadel of technologic insolence (Faculty Forum Papers, OSU, October 1975).

Spinrad's "conviction" that nuclear power is the "most desirable" source of electrical energy "now available", rests on no more credible foundation than his own "misleading forensics" coupled with a plea for the "honor of a profession" now apparently in doubt in his own mind.

Spinrad's outrageous hateur pronounces "leading opponents of nuclear power" as "shockingly ignorant". I presume he would include R.E. Bellman, J.T. Edsall, P.R. Ehrlich, L. Inglis, L. Pauling, H. Urey, G. Wald, and D.D. Watson (Committee for nuclear Responsibility), along with the National Committee To Stop Environmental Pollution, the Task Force Against Nuclear Pollution, and the trouble-making nuclear analyses and appraisals published in Environment, June 1975, vol. 17(4) Sheldon Novick, "A Troublesome Brew"; Environment, July/August 1975, vol. 17(5) D.F. Ford and H.W. Kendall, "Nuclear Misinformation".

Spinrad engages in the spurious use of the analogy (which is not logic) in saying that it is not necessary for the department of religion to defend itself against astrology. Fact is, that it would be equally asinine to expect astrology to defend itself against religion or even Spinrad. Analogies prove nothing, but have been used historically by hood-winking Jesuits to make a metaphysical appear plausible and rational. Bernard I. Spinrad could conceivably benefit from a reading of his namesake Claude Bernard (1813-78) who wrote: "Whereas the scholastic is . . . , the experimenter, who is always in doubt and never believes that he has achieved absolute certainty, succeeds in becoming the master of phenomena and in bringing nature under his power".

Spinrad disregards the telling arguments of the "antinuclear movement" because he apparently cannot provide valid answers. Thus under the smoke screen of "garbage" vilification, he dismisses informed intellectual opposition, as if he were defending untenable conflicts of interest. Better for Spinrad the Great to condescend from an assumed position of mitral magnificence and arrogance to make credible reply to a scientific, public, economic, moral and ethical issue. Until the all-knowing fission nucleologist answers intelligibly, responsibly, and scientifically on major points of conflict in lieu of "charging off" with a crackpot essay composed of an assured self-apotheosis spewing forth nonsensical personal opinion against dissenters, there shall remain those of us who are unperturbed by accusations implicit in compostable assertions. Spinrad's abrasive insults generate plenty of heat but without a flicker of illumination.

Spinrad might demonstrate how one can proceed with construction of liquid metal fast breeder reactors and meanwhile have "faith" in the outcome of further research, as well as trust that no disaster will eventuate. In theory the dangers in that program are immense. Since apparently during the next forty years or so, the above-mentioned reactors will not be able to produce electricity as cheaply as existing sources, why start them? Instead, in this interval of grace, we could develop alternate safe sources of power (solar and geothermal, wind and wave electric, ocean water temperature differences) while cautiously using current hydroelectric power and some of the remaining fossil fuels (gas, oil, coal). Thereafter, any residues of fossil "fuels" (chemically-bound energy low) could be reserved as raw material for the manufacture of durable goods.

Spinrad should know that D. F. Ford and H. W. Kendall maintain that research in nuclear safety has been either diverted or sometimes distorted, and that there has been concealment of research and inaccurate
reporting on many occasions. Emergency cooling systems are subjected to severe criticism. Storage of nuclear wastes may be for as long as a half-million years, long after known fission fuels are exhausted. How can storage be achieved with guaranteed safety from national and military catastrophes and from human intent, error, or lethargy? I can list a dozen substantial objections to nuclear technology in its present state of the "art".

It should bemuse Spinrad that there circulates in Oregon an initiative petition to prohibit nuclear power plant operation. The measure proposes a Constitutional Amendment (Oregon) to prohibit all nuclear plants in the State, except for small plants for research and medical purposes. Included is a prohibition of transportation and storage of nuclear fuels and wastes. The Trojan plant would be condemned and acquired by the State, with requests for Federal funds to cover major costs. Any alternative use of Trojan would be by vote of the people.

And what is the moral of all this? Look first, before you leap. Don't leap first and then reflect as you assess the damage. Be mindful of the ram who counseled as he went off the cliff --- "I didn't see that ewe turn".
November 1975 - Improve the Writing

By
Bill Brandt
Botany

September 26, 1975

If the notice in the Staff Newsletter represents the sort of help given at the Communication Skills Center, students and faculty who wish to improve their writing had best look elsewhere. Does the Center offer as its example of directness and precision "Continually ongoing minicourses will be offered weekly throughout the year."? Do members of the center really prefer weak, passive verbs? We stoically accept writing of this kind in professional journals; in OSU's catalogue, academic regulations and procedures, official letters, textbooks, and handouts; and in Faculty Senate resolutions. But we have a right to expect a Communication Skills Center to set a better example.
November 1975 - Nuclear Power without questions? Some questions

By

John E. Morris

October 16, 1975

Dr. Spinrad’s appeal (Fac. Forum, Oct. ’75) that was leave decisions about nuclear power to the nuclear engineering profession raises a deeper question, which I really would not have imagined would come up at an academic institution. Should such decisions be made by an appeal to authority rather than by a debate on the facts? Perhaps ecologists should make all decisions about environmental issues, dentists should write our laws about fluoridation of water supplies, physicians should decide about euthanasia, the military should decide whether we make war. As an embryologist perhaps my opinions about whether abortion is murder should have more weight than those of the philosopher or lawyer.

I appreciate and respect the fact that nuclear engineers know more about the design of nuclear facilities than most of us, but does it follow that they should make decisions about something that may directly affect my life and that of my children? Does Dr. Spinrad's special training really validate his judgment that all people opposing nuclear power are "ignorant" and that their writings all are "distortions of logic" and "garbage"? To be sure, even some nuclear physicists (and maybe some nuclear engineers too, Dr. Spinrad?) have been detractors. I do not consider myself as an opponent of nuclear power; perhaps I can be convinced as well as Dr. Spinrad that it is the most desirable method. But while Dr. Spinrad is concerned that petitions being circulated to the public in Oregon "are slowing down or stopping... nuclear plants in the state", could it be a healthy sign that the public is finally perhaps going to have a chance to review the facts in the matter?

The problem of how to generate electricity is obviously no longer one solely of engineering, but because of the sheer magnitude of the demands on our resources and the potential for impact on our environment the question is of concern to everyone and should be dealt with by an informed electorate. Hydroelectricity, fossil fuel, nuclear, or any other means of generating electricity on a mammoth scale is going to have both advantages and disadvantages. The correct choices can only be made when all the fact are known. We all have read of de facto nuclear accidents, physiological damage by radiation, and problems of nuclear waste disposal. If Dr. Spinrad has considered all of the relevant facts in becoming convinced that "nuclear power is the most desirable method for generating electricity which is now available to us", then he should not fear opposition; for in the end those facts will convince the rest of us, too.
The October issue of Faculty Forum Papers began with a note from B.I. Spinrad of the Nuclear Engineering Department. He treats with contempt critics of nuclear power, twice summing up their position as "garbage" and concluding that their cause is "crackpot." Their publications, he tells us, "bristle with errors of fact, selection of data, and distortions of logic." Their arguments on ethics and morality, he dismisses. Eight times he uses the word "professionalism" or a cognate to suggest that the best judges of the value and dangers of nuclear power are those who "have made it (their) life's work to study nuclear phenomenon and nuclear energy." He solicits support against currently circulating petitions which he says "have the purpose of slowing down or stopping the furnishing of electrical power from nuclear plants in this state."

To begin with, I would like to say that Professor Spinrad misstates the purpose of the petitions which he warns us against. If he had read the ballot title of the Oregon Nuclear Safeguards Initiative and if it were not his intent to misrepresent it, or if he were not guilty of a distortion of logic he would state that its purpose was the removal of federally imposed insurance liability limits; the assurance that nuclear plant safety systems had been tested and found effective in substantially similar systems; and that wasted disposal techniques be found that preclude radioactive escape. In other words, the petition wants the citizens of this state to be protected from the dangers of radiation and to ensure that in case of a nuclear disaster they, at the very least, be allowed full financial compensation for losses. These seem to be eminently reasonable requests and if the effect of this initiative's adoption is the "slowing down or stopping (of) the furnishing of electrical power from nuclear plants in this state" then so be it and do we not all gain from its passage?

It is, of course, understandable that Professor Spinrad and his fellow professionals are disturbed by opposition to their life's work. Their distress reveals to me how inherent conflict of interest is to the nuclear industry. The conflict is exemplified by the legislators who have so much to say in determining the use of nuclear power - many of whom directly benefit from its adoption. The late Senator Kerr of Oklahoma (also chairman of the board of Kerr-McGee, a leading nuclear supplier) is a flagrant case. It is exemplified by so-called "public" utilities which are more interested in a "satisfactory return on investment" than the public interest and which are already financially committed to nuclear energy. It is built into the character of A.E.C. which directs the agency to both promote and regulate nuclear power. As to other "professionals" I quote Dr. Harold Urey, a pioneer of nuclear physics:

"I mistrust, in a way, everyone who has worked on the problems. They have spent a substantial fraction of their productive lives trying to make power by nuclear method. If we don't build these plants their efforts will have been wasted, thrown away. This leads to a prejudice on the part of all such people - so it's very difficult to trust them. And for that reason I doubt what they have to say."

I call upon Professor Spinrad and his colleagues to change their aims form convincing the public to educating the public; to acknowledge that essential safety research has yet to be performed; to reveal for analysis the compute codes on safety systems that give 5 billion to one odds against nuclear disaster; lead us and who think conversation is a far better answer to our energy problem; and, yes, to discuss the ethics of their profession.
November 1975 - Standards For An Evaluation

By

Margaret Lumpkin

October 31, 1975

The rationale for a review of a President (or Chancellor, Dean or Department Head) of a state supported institution of Higher Education is similar to that of the review of faculty members. One immediate value is the identification of areas in which the person is performing with distinction. Recognition should be accorded to that performance. Another immediate value lies in assessing the performance of the individual with resulting definition of areas needing improvement. An ultimate value is to be able to re-assess the performance at a later time and to assess progress or lack there-of in areas that formerly were designated as needing improvement. Of course, there are other values.

It is not possible to obtain a balanced, representative view of a University President (or other administrative officers) by a hit or miss evaluation by the faculty. Only some of those who actively support or actively oppose the President will take pen in hand to reply to the committee. Obviously, neither the axe-grinders nor the enthusiastic supporters can give the type of information that can be dignified by calling it an evaluation.

In order to be consistent with current and proposed procedures for evaluation of faculty, I suggest that a systematic evaluation of the President be made which utilizes the following elements:

1. Use of objective instrument based on the guidelines and designed by a faculty committee with acknowledged expertise in the design of such instruments.
2. All faculty with academic rank be sent the questionnaire; i.e., all persons eligible to vote in Faculty Senate elections.
3. If legal (an Attorney General's opinion is presently being requested), the evaluations should have the same degree of anonymity as student evaluations of the President or of student evaluations of Professors.
4. The summary of the evaluations should be available to board members, interested citizenry, students, and faculty, and may be released without the consent of the President. (From many points of view, I am not certain that I agree with this disclosure; however, it is consistent with proposed OSBHE policy).

The standards set by the committee to evaluate the President are of critical importance in establishing the criteria for review procedures for all administrators in Higher Education. Since our President is first of the higher level administrators to be evaluated, we are thrust into a leadership position. I urge the committee to lead in openness and fairness through the adoption of the same type of procedures by which the faculty is judged.
November 1975 - Whither CLA?

By

Stephen J. Hawkes
Chemistry

October 21, 1975

Professor Hovland’s letter in the October issue seems to suppose that if we had a vastly improved College of Liberal Arts there would be fruitful dialog between the faculties of science and humanities leading to improved understanding and informed discussion on the technological-humanitarian issues of our time.

There would not.

Scientists and humanitarians would remain in their separate colleges and, if they have dialog on these issues at all, would find it in regional or national forums. There is no substantial reason for OSU to supply anything other than scientists to these. Let Eugene supply the humanitarians.

Neither would our students have the benefit of the dual education. In 18 hours of H. and S.S. our science students will continue to get introductions to History and English Literature and so forth, while students of the humanities get the beginning sequence of professional science programs. In neither case will they be equipped with the sophistication for a multidisciplinary approach to sociotechnological problems. The difficulties inherent in the general education of our students are formidable, but there is no reason to suppose that prestigious College of Liberal Arts would proportionately improve the University's ability to resolve them or even improve it significantly at all.
Bernard Spinrad’s plea in the October Faculty Forum to trust the "professionals", or, more precisely, those "professionals" who are ardent advocates of nuclear energy, is disturbing in its technocratic arrogance.

He says, "Hardly any of the leading opponents of nuclear power have even given serious attention to the study of nuclear engineering. By professional standards, they are shockingly ignorant." This sweeping indictment of nuclear critics as uniformed, misguided demagogues is a deplorable tactic to discredit those with whom he disagrees. First, the implicit assumption that only nuclear engineers have credible opinions on nuclear is absurd. Secondly, the leadership for the nuclear critics is derived from the scientific community. On August 6, 1975, more than 2,000 members of the nation’s technical and scientific community signed a declaration on nuclear power and submitted it to the President and to Congress. The declaration was prepared under the auspices of the Union of Concerned Scientists, Cambridge, Massachusetts. Spokesman for the declaration is Dr. Henry Kendall, Professor of Physics, Massachusetts Institute of Technology. In releasing the declaration, he said:

"We wish to make plain, both to our nation's decision-makers and to the public at large, the profound and widely shared anxiety in the scientific community about hazards associated with present Administration and industry plans to build large numbers of large nuclear power plants in our midst and, additionally, to export reactors to nations abroad."

Professor Spinrad goes on to say, "In the nuclear profession we have not bothered to answer them in detail because all this seemed clear to us," and "I still don't think that we should have to respond to garbage."

This kind of "professional" statement is analogous to an argument that foreign policy should be determined by the generals and land use planning should be done solely by the planners.

It seems to me that the economic, social, environmental, and engineering issues related to a national commitment to nuclear power are among the most complex and profound of any facing our nation today. We need reasoned debate and a mutual willingness to learn. Puffery and arrogance in the same of professionalism lends sound, not light, to the debate.
There are about 300 P/N courses (or sections of courses) currently offered at OSU, and having just completed my first (and possibly last) experience in instructing such a course, I am compelled to comment openly. I had a group of honors students in UH 111 Colloquium, of which six hours credit is required of those who wish to graduate with honors, so all my students were in the Honors Program. The advertised topic for this course was centered on a recent book that dealt with a new concept of the origin of life, regular assignments were made, and the class meetings centered on discussions of the assignments along with related topics occasionally introduced by the students.

Attendance varied from perfect to as low as 50%. One student revealed in the last week that he hadn't yet obtained a copy of the book, hence could not study. A short essay assignment was fulfilled by only 60% of the students on time. I judge that 2/3 of the group came to class unprepared, even though rather sharp and clear directions were made that contributions to the class discussions were expected. There was no authorized final examination for the course.

I was faced with the problem of assigning grades of P/N when I really had sufficient information to assign P+, P, P-, M+ and N grades. I'm sorry, dear inventor of P/N grades, I simply found more than two levels of performance. Since I would be embarrassed by assigning any N grades to honors students (less than 0.2% of P/N grades are reported as N grades at OSU), this means that all students, according to their records, performed equally well. This, to me, is an insult to the conscientious student.

The inventors of P/N grading must have had something in mind other than the grading of courses aimed toward any particular level of achievement. Or, is P/N grading intended primarily for courses that have little or no content, or to avoid embarrassment to the instructor of evaluating student achievement? A P grade for a student who attends only half the time, and who obviously hasn't done any assignments, implies that he is learning as much or more by not doing these things. This further leads to the conclusion that the student can essentially buy a portion of credits needed for graduation without even attending class. And this, I'm told, actually occurs at OSU. Does this eventually lead to the prompt payment of tuition as the only requirement for a bachelor's degree? This concept of a college education has already been formulated, known as Baxter University in Florida, wherein a student takes no courses (why bother with any grading, let alone instruction) but graduates if he pays tuition regularly for four years. This arrangement, of course, obviates the need for classrooms, library, administrators, and most of all faculty.
My conclusion from this experience is that P/N grading is a cop-out on the parts of both students and faculty. In our efforts to insure a maximum of happiness for both, the onus of having to measure up to a respectable level of academic achievement and to measure that level itself has been removed.

The proponents of P/N grading, no doubt, have advanced sufficient arguments in defense of this sort of procedure, but my actual experience with such a course leaves me academically distressed. My heart goes out in gratitude to the inventors of quantitative evaluations of academic performance. I am fully aware that tradition has become a naughty word, but what has happened to academic excellence and its identification?

December 26, 1973

W. H. Slabaugh
Department of Chemistry
Professor Warnath on Collective Bargaining

I welcome Professor Warnath's contribution on collective bargaining. Understandably, he as an officer in A.A.U.P. wishes to sell his organization. I wish him luck because I am a member of his organization too. But I am also a member of O.S.E.A. and see its advantages even more clearly.

Professor Warnath objects to O.S.E.A. because its membership includes non-academic people in state employment. What he does not say is that we would be in entirely separate bargaining units. Faculty input would determine our bargaining objectives. As in any democratic organization the quality of the people participating is crucial.

As Professor Warnath states, our negotiators must "be both knowledgeable about and sensitive to the priorities of faculty concerns." The bargaining committee would include the best faculty members we could find, plus some professional negotiators. Without some professional guidance faculty negotiators would find themselves at a severe disadvantage when facing professionals.

The O.S.E.A. has professional negotiators and a staff. More would be needed if we faculty would use O.S.E.A. as our bargaining agent. However, the additional expense would be considerably less than for an organization which at this time lacks such a staff. O.S.E.A. is more likely to be able to finance collective bargaining for faculty without an increase in dues than any other organization.

The state will continue to bargain with O.S.E.A. for classified employees no matter which organization is chosen by the faculty to represent us. If we are in entirely different organizations the divide and conquer technique can be used against us. If we are all in O.S.E.A. an impasse in either bargaining unit would pose a political threat to any governor.

Collective bargaining will come when one organization wins a certification election. Such an election may be for one campus or for the entire system of higher education. To secure such an election some organization must petition the Public Employees Relations Board and furnish signatures from 30% of the potential bargaining unit members. Once one organization has fulfilled this requirement, other organizations may present petitions signed by 10% of the bargaining unit in order to gain a place on the ballot.

Before the Board sets a date for an election it must decide several questions. What should be the extent of the bargaining unit? Should it be campus-wide or system-wide? Who is eligible to vote? For example, should department chairmen be considered members of the bargaining unit? The Board then decides these issues and determines which organizations have met the requirements to be placed on the ballot.

At the election the outcome is determined by a majority of those voting. On the ballot there are two issues to be decided: (1) whether or not the majority voting wish to be represented by some organization and (2) which organization should be given certification. If two or more organizations are on the ballot, the first issue is likely to be decided in favor of collective bargaining. Forty per cent of
the total membership in the bargaining unit is likely to be a majority of those voting if all who sign make it to the polls. (O.S.E.A. policy is to require signatures from a majority of the bargaining unit before it seeks an election.)

If a majority vote decides that there will be collective bargaining, the votes for particular organizations are counted. The one receiving a majority is certified as the bargaining agent. If no organization has a majority, the Board conducts a run off election between the two organizations receiving the highest number of votes in the first election.

Once an organization has been certified, it has a status that no faculty organizations have had so far. Those with whom we would bargain must do more than listen to us politely. They must bargain with us in good faith. If we achieve system-wide bargaining the Chancellor and his negotiators will bargain with us. However, they will not bargain over their recommendations to the Governor. Instead they will serve as the Governor's agent and possess the power to complete agreements with us. They must make offers and counter offers. The negotiations may continue for months always under the possibility of reaching an impasse.

What happens if we reach an impasse? In the first place, the newspapers would publicize the event with speculation as to what the result might be. The first step is mediation where a third party tries to aid both parties to reach a settlement. If mediation fails, a prestigious fact-finder is appointed. He hears both sides and makes a recommendation. In case either side rejects his recommendations, he publicizes his findings.

After all attempts to resolve an impasse, public employees are permitted by law to strike unless their strike would create a danger to health, safety, and welfare of the public. For those employees not permitted to strike compulsory binding arbitration is provided. Someone like the fact-finder is given authority to make the decision after listening to both sides.

It is doubtful that the process would proceed through all the steps outlined. Most of the political leaders of this State would insist that the Governor bargain responsibly with us. His budget is not the last hurdle but it is the crucial one. The legislature must fund the budget. They sometimes cut it but seldom add something more for us. The last legislature was more sympathetic to employee interests than any in a generation, but we lost out anyway. They would not change the Governor's budget. Instead, they said we should have bargained with him.

The process of collective bargaining can be long and involved. The Chancellor and the Governor are exposed at each step. Any impasse, unless obviously caused by our unreasonableness, reflects unfavorably on their public image as to how well they are doing their jobs. We can not expect miracles, but we should receive better treatment than what we have been getting.

Collective bargaining will take more than good will. It will require staff work, professional negotiators, and an involved faculty. No doubt other organizations like A.A.U.P. could serve us after they have raised their local dues and built a competent staff. We in O.S.E.A. are ready any time a majority of faculty members wish our services.

Lafe Harter
Department of Economics
January 1, 1974
A COLLECTIVE BARGAINING AGENT --
THE CHOICE IS STILL YOURS

OSEA has not been designated as the bargaining agent for the O.S.U. faculty - or for any other state system faculty - as implied in local newspaper articles. The fact is that the "ballot" referred to was simply a survey to determine whether enough interest existed at the present time among faculty for collective bargaining to make an effort by OSEA or any other group a worthwhile investment of time and energy. The results are obviously not entirely conclusive. Only about one-half of the state system faculty responded and no breakdowns of returns from the different institutions was offered. An informal inquiry among faculty on other campuses indicates that some did not receive the survey. Part-time people are to be excluded if OSEA does become the bargaining agent (a factor not publicized prior to the survey); so we do not know how the results were affected by the votes of people who did not realize that they would be excluded from an OSEA bargaining unit.

One fact is perfectly clear -- the OSEA State Executive Board has decided to proceed with a formal election on the O.S.U. campus. The question facing O.S.U. faculty is whether it will allow itself to be organized by default by an organization which, with the considerable resources available to it from a large classified membership, can undoubtedly mount a very professional campaign. The O.S.U. faculty should ask itself whether it is willing to cast its lot with an organization whose orientation has been to the problems of clerks, typists and custodial staff and whether, being in the minority in such an alliance, its particular needs and special working conditions can be adequately served.

Despite the fact that OSEA can make the point that it is already well organized and financed to represent other state employees, a faculty member must recognize that no blanket organization representing diverse groups can afford to lobby for some special or unique consideration for one of its units unless it can be balanced off against some special gain for the other groups which it represents. Logically, the power in a blanket group will flow toward the sub-groups with greatest membership and financial input.

OSEA has pointed to the fact that its classified personnel received a slightly higher percentage increase than did the faculty at the last session of the legislature. This tends to obscure several relevant points: (1) OSEA has had faculty branches on state system campuses and was, in effect, committed to representing its faculty membership but was ineffective in its efforts, (2) classified salaries are embarrassingly low (ask your department secretary what she earns) and lobbying to pull people above the poverty level is simpler than making a case for a group which are perceived by the public (rightly or wrongly) to be earning substantially more money than the average worker, (3) the OSEA orientation to collective bargaining is essentially the traditional industrial model requiring the rigid lock-step system tied to seniority basic to most unions and antagonistic to the incentive systems.
which professionals have used for motivation, and finally (4) although salaries must be a critical issue in any negotiations, faculty have much to lose in areas related to their working relationships and their current freedom to innovate and adjust to changing conditions within higher education if the bargaining agent is not sensitive to their unique situation.

Collective bargaining does not create money although it may force some immediate reallocations and insure that procedures are clear and that no one works below the scale for his/her position. Collective bargaining cannot insure that no one will lose his/her job as the inability of OSEA to prevent the current cut-backs in custodial staff on the O.S.J. campus should make crystal clear.

There are alternatives to OSEA but faculty must be willing to invest their time and energy to encourage those alternatives. AAUP is one alternative... It has a long history of defending the rights of college faculty and of formulating the statements used as guidelines by most administrators in colleges and universities. It has worked effectively for faculty but its quiet low-key style of operation now poses a problem in the face of the more militant confrontations of the unions competing for faculty allegiance. It has in the past waited for an invitation from the faculty member involved before stepping in on grievance matters. It has not sought to impose the values for which it stands on administrators or faculty. Where campuses have been quiet, AAUP has rightfully been charged with being simply another once-a-month luncheon club. However, AAUP is in the process of change. It has won virtually every college collective bargaining election which it has contested and recently succeeded in overturning the University of Hawaii collective bargaining agreement written by AFT which eliminated tenure.

Oregon AAUP does not have the financial resources of OSEA. Its leadership, with the exception of an Executive Secretary, is composed of volunteer faculty members. This weakness is, at the same time, its strength since faculty can be assured that their fellow faculty will work exclusively to meet their unique needs. Within the organisation are lawyers, economists and labor negotiators. It does not lack professional expertise.

However, AAUP does need a significant increase in concerned membership. It needs substantially increased funds as well as a willingness on the part of faculty to devote time and energy to assure that when collective bargaining is voted in the bargaining agent will be the organisation which has been working over the years to protect faculty interests. Without AAUP, for instance, the state system would very likely have had a tenure quota system and regular part-time people would probably not have been included on tenure lines. Much yet needs to be done, but AAUP will quite literally go out of business in Oregon if faculty do not become concerned about the present situation and support its efforts to make a contest of the upcoming collective bargaining election....

Charles Warnath
Psychology
January 31, 1974
EVERYTHING YOU ALWAYS WANTED TO KNOW ABOUT THE FACULTY ACTIVITY REPORTS ........

...................BUT COULDN'T FIGURE OUT WHO TO ASK

Among the least popular pieces of paper crossing each faculty member's desk must be the quarterly Faculty Activity Report. While it is bad enough that one must go through the professionally distasteful task of formally accounting for one's time and effort, additionally there is the common feeling that the report takes more time to complete than should really be necessary. And overriding these undoubtedly minor annoyances is the frustration of not knowing who ultimately uses these figures, and for what purposes. These factors often result in a report prepared with a minimum of care and accuracy, and therefore possessing questionable validity. The following pages are an attempt to alleviate some of the above problems by explaining the uses to which the Faculty Activity Reports are put, and by indicating the steps being taken to reduce the effort needed to fill them out.

Five copies of the Faculty Activity Report are produced. One goes to the faculty member, and another is kept in the faculty member's school by either the Department Chairman or the Dean. Most schools make very minimal use of this data since they have access to resumes and other more appropriate personnel information upon which to base their decision-making. A third copy goes to the Office of Budgets and Personnel Services, where it is microfilmed and added to the faculty member's personnel file, with no evaluation of the data being made. The fourth copy of the Faculty Activity Report comes to the Office of Planning and Institutional Research, and the final copy is sent to the Chancellor's Office. It is at these latter two offices that various reports are generated from the data. To better explain the contents of these reports, it will help to briefly review the format of the Faculty Activity Report itself. The report is organized into five sections as follows:

Section I: Personnel Data -- this section contains data identifying the faculty member and his or her position.

Section II: Funding -- this section identifies the accounts from which the faculty member is paid and the percent of the annual salary rate provided by each account.

Section III: Activity Detail -- this section identifies the distribution of the faculty member's effort (measured by time spent) over specific categories of academic activity.

Section IV: Course Data -- this section identifies the teaching duties assigned to the faculty member, and the student enrollment and facilities use data corresponding to these courses.

Section V: Additional Activity Specifics -- this section allows the faculty member to identify other specific accomplishments or activities performed.
It should be noted that Faculty Activity Reports have been collected over the past 40 years at OSU. The format of this form, and the reports generated from it, have changed quite a bit during these years. Although each of the State institutions is required to submit Faculty Activity Reports to the Chancellor's Office, the form distributed at OSU has been modified to present data in a more useful format. Following is a description of the reports which are currently prepared on a routine basis from the Faculty Activity Reports.

USE OF THE DATA

1. Computation of Average Faculty Workloads by Budgetary Unit

The average number of hours spent by faculty members in various academic activities, taken from Section III of the Faculty Activity Report, is aggregated and averaged for each budgetary unit (usually synonymous with department). The averages are then further broken down and displayed by rank within department. No finer level of detail is presented, and hours spent by individual faculty members are not considered. For the academic year 1972-73 the average workweek for full-time teaching faculty for various departments ranged from 45 hours to 64 hours, and the university-wide averages were as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Professor</th>
<th>Assoc. Prof.</th>
<th>Asst. Prof.</th>
<th>All Ranks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Teaching Service</td>
<td>27.7</td>
<td>32.2</td>
<td>33.0</td>
<td>31.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Counseling and Advising</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>4.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curriculum Planning</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>2.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Un-sponsored Research</td>
<td>8.6</td>
<td>7.8</td>
<td>10.8</td>
<td>8.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Committee Activities</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>3.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrative Activities</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Service</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Hours Per Week</td>
<td>53.1</td>
<td>53.5</td>
<td>55.6</td>
<td>53.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This report is prepared by the Chancellor's Office at several-year intervals. The principal reason for the report (as is the case for many of the statistical studies done by the Chancellor and by the University) is to maintain the ability to respond to questions or demands by external agencies. This Workload Report has been used to refute recurring accusations that a faculty member with, say, a nine hour teaching load is being paid by the State for only nine hours of work each week. Such reports are thus quite valuable, even though they may play no significant role in the administrative decision-making process at either the Chancellor's Office or the University.

2. Computation of Cost for University Programs

A second, and more important, use for the data in Section III of the Faculty Activity Report is in the calculation of costs for the programs of the University. The Legislature has mandated the use of a large computer simulation model (now being implemented at the Chancellor's Office) to analyze program costs at each of the State institutions, and OSU is independently studying the possible use of
other costing models to aid in the resource allocation process. A major task involved in such models is that of distributing the expenses of the university over each of the instructional, research, and public service programs being carried out. Included is the task of distributing the salary paid to each faculty member over the programs to which he or she contributes. This may be accomplished in one of three ways:

(a) By assignment -- a faculty member's salary is assigned to various programs in proportion to that person's formal assignment in the program. For example, if an instructor teaches two 3-unit courses, the instructional wages would be equally divided between the two courses without regard to the time and effort put into either course.

(b) By supervisor's estimate -- a Department Chairman is asked to estimate the amount of time and effort his faculty members put into each of their activities. This allows for reasonably realistic cost allocations without the need to elicit large-scale cooperation from an entire faculty.

(c) By faculty questionnaire -- each faculty member is asked to estimate the amount of time and effort actually spent on each category of activity so that costs may be apportioned on the basis of this personal accounting. This method carries the greatest potential for accurate and meaningful cost distributions, but also can be susceptible to widespread abuse.

Section III of the Faculty Activity Report has been designed to furnish the information necessary to implement method (c) above. It should be noted that for these costing calculations the total weekly number of hours reported by a faculty member is of no interest -- all that matters is how these hours are distributed over the listed activities (and hence over the University's programs). However, it is generally much easier to estimate hours spent per week in a given activity than it is to state the percent of one's workweek devoted to that activity, so the average number of hours is requested as data from which percentages may be calculated. It is important to emphasize that no evaluation or analysis is made of an individual faculty member's distribution of effort; the individual distributions are automatically aggregated and then combined with many categories of support costs before a total program cost is reported.

The two studies described above are the only uses to which the information in Section III of the Faculty Activity Report is put. All other reports are based largely on the information in Section IV, and are described below:

3. Cost-Load Study

For each budgetary unit, the total number of student credit hours taught, the total number of FTE faculty members, and the total faculty wages are calculated. It is then possible to compute student/faculty ratios, costs per student credit hour, and student credit hours generated per FTE faculty member (called productivity ratios). Such calculations may be criticized in many regards, including the fact that all of a faculty member's instructional wages are credited to his classroom or course teaching alone, and that the productivity ratio may seem to be a rather meaningless concept. These criticisms are well-founded, and have prompted the current interest in the more sophisticated costing techniques
described above. However, it should be noted that in the absence of a detailed Faculty Activity Report, the Cost-Load Studies currently used would remain the only source for such information. These studies are used by the Chancellor's Office to justify expenditures for funding purposes, so it certainly appears desirable to eventually implement the most accurate and valid costing model possible.

4. Course Size and Section Size Reports

The Chancellor's Office prepares two reports summarizing the data on the number of students enrolled in each course and section listed in Section IV of the Faculty Activity Report. The Course Size Report lists all courses with enrollments under 10 and all courses with enrollments over 100, and then displays the number of courses offered by each school for different levels of student enrollment. The Section Size Report details the number of students enrolled in each section of every course offered by the University. Both reports are used by the Board's Office of Academic Affairs to judge demand for various course offerings and to help evaluate requests for new programs and new campus units. This information must be obtained from the Faculty Activity Report rather than from the Office of the Registrar because certain data (such as the number of students in each lab or recitation section of certain courses, or the number of students handled by individual faculty members under the reserve course numbers) is not available from any other source.

5. Space Utilization Study

The Chancellor's Office prepares a report detailing the usage of each room on campus from facilities usage data in Section IV of the Faculty Activity Report. The number of students in each room during each hour of the day is displayed by type of room, and is compared to the capacity of the room. This report is returned to the University, where it is used by the Facilities Planning and Use Committee to help evaluate requests for additional space, or to reallocate space between departments or schools. The report is also forwarded to the Legislature in a highly summarized form.

The five types of reports described above are the studies routinely generated from the Faculty Activity Reports. Occasionally other special studies are undertaken upon specific request; for example, the Office of Planning and Institutional Research has collected information for some departments on their total number of FTE faculty. However, the use of individual Faculty Activity Reports for evaluative purposes at the University or State level has been almost nonexistent. In the past six years there have been only a few occasions when a Faculty Activity Report has been requested by the President's Office, and there has been an instance (in the mid 60's) when the State Ways and Means Committee asked the Chancellor's Office for all Faculty Activity Reports from a specified department on one of the State system campuses. With the exception of these quite isolated cases, all analysis and evaluation of individuals through their Faculty Activity Reports is done at the department or school level.
PREPARATION OF THE FACULTY ACTIVITY REPORT

For the past several quarters, filling out the Faculty Activity Report has been a painstaking process. In large part this was due to the physical change taking place in the Report; as it was changed to take up only one side of the paper there was insufficient time to arrange for the preprinting of data. The Office of Planning and Institutional Research is now taking steps to alleviate this difficulty. It is anticipated that the Faculty Activity Reports distributed Winter Term will have Sections I and II preprinted, allowing the faculty member to catch and correct errors on the University's faculty personnel file. Efforts are now underway to enable partial preprinting of Section IV, with Spring quarter 1974 as the target date for implementation. And finally, Section V of the Report has been eliminated entirely since there is no need for this information at any level higher than the individual school, and most schools have their own means of securing the same information.

When all of these procedures have been put into effect, the only work required of the faculty member will be the following:

(a) Read Sections I and II, and make corrections if necessary
(b) Fill in Section III in an abbreviated form to be specified at a later date.
(c) Fill in Column (11) of Section IV.
(d) Add to Section IV any teaching assignments not already preprinted. This will be necessary for some lab and recitation sections, team teaching activities, and individual instruction under a reserve course number.

In this period when the legislative buzzword is "accountability" and the resources available to the University remain severely limited, it is unthinkable that resource allocation decisions be made in ignorance of basic information on the costs and demand for the programs of the University. The new computer costing models now being developed are earnest attempts to supply comprehensive information realistically describing the consumption of resources on a programmatic basis. It is hoped that by making the data input process as efficient and painless as possible, and by keeping faculty members informed of the uses of the data they are asked to supply, that the faculty cooperation so necessary to this process will be forthcoming.

Stefan D. Bloomfield
Assistant Director
Planning and Institutional Research
February 5, 1974

(Editorial note: The above paper which provides information about Faculty Activity Reports might be considered more appropriate for an administrative memorandum than for a Faculty Forum Paper. However, the Faculty Senate's Executive Committee felt that the inclusion of this paper was appropriate because of the widespread faculty interest and concern regarding the form and use of these reports; additional justification for including this paper in the OSU Faculty Forum Papers is saving of the cost of a separate mailing. DBN.)
COLLECTIVE BARGAINING - AN ALTERNATE VIEW

It seems that it might be an opportune time to ask my colleagues to consider the point of view that collective bargaining might be counter-productive to faculty welfare on this campus. I am prompted to write this because I detect a sinister 'underground' movement to 'persuade' or frighten faculty members into the belief that we have no choice on this campus but to go ahead into collective bargaining.

I believe the opinion I will relate is no extremist's viewpoint. Until November's Faculty Forum I, like many others, had an open mind as to whether or not I would vote for collective bargaining if and when the issue comes to a vote.

That the faculty of this institution has entered a 'low era' in its morale is not open to debate. Dissatisfaction with how things are run and downright worry about prospective future developments in administrative prejudices and power are rampant; this is clear from the volume of words on the subject published lately in this Forum and in Newsletters from OSEA and AAUP and elsewhere. There is no argument to be made in response to the shout that individual faculty members have been subject to unfair decisions by insensitive administrators. Harsh decisions have been made and I have been as alarmed at them as we all have been.

The crux of my argument lies in the conviction that the proponents of collective bargaining are in essence proposing to respond in an immediate fashion to a problem (faculty welfare) which is, of course, ultimately of long range concern. My fear is that a 'quick fix' approach to this long term problem will in itself lead unavoidably to a lessening of faculty and institutional prestige and quality, and thereby result in our own suffering.

The truths about harsh faculty treatment are met equally with the truth that this treatment results from two independent factors: the 'tight' economics of this period, and the development of an increased managerial staff and concomitant outlook in university governance. The scenario we need for a boost in faculty morale is an easing of the financial stringency and a more enlightened (educated?) outlook in some administrators. Neither of these is on the horizon at the time of writing.

Collective bargaining requires that we the faculty accept the ways of the administration, and appoint hard-headed bargainers to sit down opposite the administration and knock out a contract. In the process, as pointed out by Charles Warnath in his December 1973 Faculty Forum Paper, "faculty would have to give up something in order to get some other things." What would we be prepared to give up? This is difficult to answer; we would certainly have to give up some of the tangible benefits we now have (examine any extant contract), but what concerns me more is that we shall also relinquish a claim which I value as highly important in the long run, and which we are presently still able to
make. This is the claim that we are men and women of reason and intellect; seekers of the truth; we value our profession above our personal gain. Throughout history society and society's elected representatives have valued university faculties for the indispensable resource they are.

It is impressive to consider the support we have traditionally enjoyed from most quarters. Despite quotations to the contrary, we do have an array of supporters when it comes to matters of interest to the faculty; from the Offices of University President, Chancellor and indeed Governor we have derived support in achieving our present level of relative dignity and comfort. Whilst it is true that not all the publicly stated aspirations of our administrators may be consistent with the welfare and intellectual integrity of our institution, these are matters which have been in the past and can be in the future resolved by reason and education. Equally valuable to faculty welfare has been the lobbying done on our behalf by such groups as AAUP. Quite recently and without collective bargaining AAUP were successful in seeing that faculty notices of appointment recognized our responsibilities as we see them and not how some others see them.

What of the future? With collective bargaining we might gain some comfort from more clearly defined conditions for faculty dismissal, and we might gain some salary increases (but who will be the necessary loser to provide us those dollars?). In the process however, we would have forever lost our claim to being rational individuals who can sit down with our administration and talk about objectives which we see as advantageous to the institution. We would, on the contrary, be bound irrevocably into the position of being the adversaries; we would have confirmed the administration's view of us as employees to be managed in an unimaginative manner. To go to collective bargaining would be to throw any goodwill left into the faces of those senior administrators from whom we have had, and could continue to have, support; and we would construct forces which would forever work to push faculty and administration to opposing poles on most if not all matters.

Another matter about which we all share concern is our prospective stance vis-a-vis striking. The concept of a body such as this faculty threatening to strike, or indeed actually interrupting the education of our youth and the continuance of our research, must be distasteful to any rational person. Hence it is of interest that in the article 'What is Actually in a Faculty Contract', we read "The faculty agrees not to strike and the governing board agrees not to lock out any employees for the duration of the contract". This is surely reasonable and indeed would be our only tenable stance. But what of the recognized need for each of two bargaining groups to have a platform of strength from which to bargain? Is not a threat to strike just about the only strength this faculty could claim? The only conclusion is that we would be starting in a weak 'bargaining' position.

In summary, it is my conviction that we should not be prepared to threaten to withhold our services to society; if we capitulate in the face of present pressures, and resort to argumentative tactics and threats, we forever relinquish our claim to being persons of superior intellect and reason; we would have 'sold out' and joined the ranks of others who resort to 'fighting' tactics in place of

1 Attached to the memo sent to all faculty Feb. 5, 1974, by Lois A. McGill
rational argument to accomplish their aims. This would be ironic at a time when most of us would argue that diplomacy is preferable to confrontation in world affairs; are we to assume two moral standards - one for national government and one for university government?

In our administration there are some who recognize that a faculty, or indeed any working team, will be most effective and will accomplish the most and the highest goals when working in an atmosphere of confidence and optimism rather than in an atmosphere of fear and distrust such as presently exists here. Let us give that viewpoint a chance to correct our ills.

It seems probable, then, that we, our institution, and our profession would each benefit from a strong resolve to restate our belief in the wisdom of humanity in matters such as the evaluation and the possession (or lack of) a superior faculty at our Universities. We have more to lose than to gain by resorting to collective bargaining and all that would follow in the troubled times ahead. Miniscule short term gains would be soon overwhelmed by an irreversible trend towards demise of our institution.

C. J. Bayne
Zoology Department

3/4/74.
Decline in Faculty Salaries at O.S.U.

During the fall quarter of 1973, the Faculty Economic Welfare Committee collected statistical data on the rapid decline of faculty salaries during recent years when compared with nineteen other Institutions of Higher Learning. These data have been compiled and charted in a series of graphs for easier interpretation. The committee is particularly indebted to one of its members, Professor Curtis Mumford, for compiling most of these statistics and for drawing the graphical representations.

Figure 1 compares average U of O and OSU academic salaries combined, ranked with average annual salaries of 19 other institutions of higher learning. To insure comparability among data only 9-month teaching staff salaries have been used. In the "Report of the OSEA-AAUP Joint Salary Committee ----- Faculty Salaries at Oregon State University", issued to all faculty of OSU on March 16, 1973, that committee states:

In recent years, salaries at Oregon State University have steadily declined in relation to similar institutions. Several years ago, OSU ranked in approximately the middle position of the 21 institutions which the legislature identified for comparative purposes. OSU currently ranks 19th, 17th and 16th for the professor, associate professor, and assistant professor ranks respectively.

Figure 1 shows that for all ranks combined, OSU and U of O together ranked 8th among the 21 institutions in 1957-58 but had dropped to 16th position by 1972-73, and to 17th by 1973-74.

Other data collected by the committee (but not reproduced
in this paper) show that between 1956-57 and the next year 1957-58, the combined position of professors at OSU and U of O went from 14th place to 8th place. Associate professors went from 13th to 5th places and assistant Professors from 15th to 7th. This improvement in comparative position was largely due to the support of Dr. John R. Richards who was at that time Chancellor for the State System of Higher Education. We quote from Minutes of the Faculty Welfare Committee Meeting of October 27, 1956, to which Dr. Richards had been invited:

Dr. Richards explained that the State Board is thoroughly convinced of the necessity of raising academic salaries and, at the present time, is working toward the realization of a salary fund for the year 1957-58 (not including monies for additional staff) which will be 25 per cent larger than the fiscal year 1955-56. ... Dr. Richards said that his goal will be to reach, by appropriate means at least 80 per cent of all the members of the next State Legislature, and further, that he was going to do his level best to reach them all.

Again we quote from the report of the OSEA-AAUP Joint Salary Committee of March 16, 1973:

...the faculty needs strong advocates at all administrative levels particularly in the Chancellor's office, the Board of Higher Education, and the Governor's office if significant salary improvement is to occur. The stark realization is, however, that we have no real advocates.

Also mentioned in the OSEA-AAUP report is a plan proposed 4 or 5 years ago by the Governor, designed to bring academic salaries up to parity with the 19 other institutions in 4 years. This plan was never adopted by the legislature. It is estimated that as of 1973-74 an overall increase of 13 per cent would have been needed to raise the average 9-month academic salary at OSU
to the average of the other 19 institutions.

Figure 2 compares index numbers for the average annual salaries of 9-month academic staffs, all ranks combined, and the per capita personal income (U.S.). An index number of 100 was assigned to the OSU salary amount for 1957 and for the per capita personal income (U.S.) for 1957. It is again emphasized that Figure 2 compares index numbers and not dollar values.

Several comments are in order. The charts again show the substantial increase in salaries from 1957 to 1958, and the fact that changes in academic salaries and the per capita U.S. income advanced at a comparable rate until about 1968. However, after 1968 per capita personal income increased at a much more rapid rate as indicated by the steeper slope of the per capita personal income curve over that of the academic salary curve. The charts clearly indicate how, after 1968, and in particular from 1972 on, the gap between the curves has rapidly diminished and in particular the fact that the per capita personal income index has now surpassed the index for academic staff salaries at OSU. It is expected that later statistics will show a further degeneration in this situation.

Other conclusions that may be drawn from the figures are left to the peruser. This information is faithfully submitted on behalf of the Faculty Economic Welfare Committee.

William H. Simons

March 30, 1974
FIGURE 1. All ranks average "U of O and OSU Academic Salaries Combined" ranked with average annual salaries of 19 other Higher Education Institutions, 1957 to date (Academic-Year Teaching Staff).

SOURCE: Division of Analytic Services, Oregon State System of Higher Education.
Faculty Economic Welfare Committee, Oregon State University, March 1974
FIGURE 2. Index numbers of average annual salaries of 9 months academic staffs, all ranks, U of O, and OSU; and Per Capita Personal Income (U.S.).

ECONOMIC INCENTIVES OR DISINCENTIVES?

The Administration has announced that all academic personnel performing satisfactory service will receive raises of $500 each if they are on 9 months appointment or $610 if they are on 12 months appointment. In addition to these across-the-board raises there will be some merit raises. Approximately 30% of the salary adjustment funds will be devoted to these merit raises. Administrators are cautioned to "... not simply apply them in some arbitrary and nearly uniform fashion to a high percentage of the faculty." Instead they should recognize the extraordinary merit for not more a "minor, but still substantial fraction of the entire faculty... It would seem reasonable that less than half of the faculty would qualify..."

The Administration "regrets the inadequacy of the total resources available but believes that, consistent with the long-term policy of the institution, some discretion must be permitted and encouraged to recognize those individuals who have contributed more significantly than others to the function of the university." Consequently the Administration has rejected the recommendations of the Faculty Welfare Committee and the Joint OSEA-AAUP Salary Committee that all funds be divided across-the-board by a combination of lump sum and percentage increases.

Faculty group recommendations were based on the fact that the cost of living in the past ten months has increased 10% and the rise may be accelerating. With a total salary improvement fund of 5% there is no way which the funds can be distributed without the vast majority suffering a serious erosion of their living standards. This coming salary increase climaxes a four year series of raises in which each year the total salary increase percentage was less than the increase in the cost of living. The short-fall for most of us was substantially more serious. The majority have always received less than the stated average as set by the legislature. For example, while our neighbors would be expecting us this year to receive a 5% salary increase, most of us will receive only $500. On a salary of $12,500 the percentage is 4%. For a salary of $15,000 the percentage is 3-1/3%.

Surveys of faculty on this and other campuses show that when the expected cost-of-living increase is 5%, the majority oppose merit increases if the available funds for everyone total only 5% of the salary budget. When the available funds are equal to 10% (with a 5% cost-of-living increase), the faculty would divide them on the basis that half would be awarded across-the-board and the other half would be used for merit pay. We agree that the
incentive pay should be used to upgrade the faculty and to stimulate performance. However, we do not believe an effective system of incentives can be maintained with so little money.

Any highly mobile scholar of national reputation is likely to require incentives other than the monetary ones we can offer him. Unless his raises drain the salary improvement funds of his department his salary is not likely to keep pace those of scholars of similar stature elsewhere. Department chairmen dislike giving raises higher than their own and they hate to face colleagues who have to be slighted in order to provide raises for the stars. In any case, the star surrounded by low paid colleagues is likely to find his optimal professional advancement lies elsewhere. He may stay but not for the money we can give him.

Incentive pay on the scale offered in recent years is not likely to be effective for the lesser lights either. Most people will stay but will they be motivated? To test this proposition take a figure which represents the least raise your chairman would dare offer you. Then subtract it from the most you can conceive he would give you if you worked as hard as you possibly can. (To be realistic do not assume necessarily that you would receive the highest raise in your department.) You may call the difference your incentive margin.

Notice that the value of your home rises each year more than your incentive margin. Consulting fees can easily keep you ahead of the game and in time may give you independence. Even a textbook with only a moderate success can put you far ahead. Keep writing them and your salary itself can look small. If you can't do anything else, you can moonlight or make investments on credit. If money is your only incentive, you need do only what is necessary to keep your job. It is not economically rational to do more.

Why is it that most of us work hard regardless of the lack of financial incentives? It is because habits and values change slowly. Loyalty to the university, to our colleagues, and our students survive despite discouragement. We still have our professional pride. And we have hope, hope that collective bargaining will reverse the trend.

It is believed that collective bargaining will increase the salary improvement fund sufficiently that we can create an effective incentive system. With more money we can stimulate our people and at the same time afford some effective top scholars. They can add to our professional careers rather than pose threats to our economic well-being. We too wish to participate in quality education, but our wishes will never be granted unless we fight for them.

\[\text{Lafe Harter}\]
\[\text{Department of Economics}\]
\[\text{April 2, 1974}\]
COLLECTIVE BARGAINING

In my opinion, Professor Bayne's April Faculty Forum Paper and Professor Drotning's talk at the April 10 AAUP-OSEA joint meeting were blows against the idea of collective bargaining on this campus which should not go unanswered.

Professor Bayne writes seductively, but he exhibits only superficial knowledge of collective bargaining. He suggests that employer-union relationships can be only "head-hunted . . . opposite," "fighting," "adversaries" affairs. In fact, employer-union relationships fall along a wide continuum ranging from open warfare to collusion. Most relationships fall in the middle ground: controlled conflict - accommodation - cooperation.

Precisely where a particular employer-union relationship falls on the continuum is determined more often than not by factors on the employer's side of the table. Employers generate in their employees attitudes and behavior patterns that tend to mirror their own.

Professor Drotning, a man experienced in collective bargaining, should have realized what he was doing. I spoke with him after the meeting, and he knows better. His message, essentially, was "Collective bargaining in higher education can be botched, and it was botched at SUNY." That's good to know, but it's not the whole message we needed to hear. We needed suggestions on how to avoid botching the process in Oregon. Drotning didn't provide them, leaving the impression that botching may be inevitable. An unfortunate impression, because it's not correct.

Collective bargaining is a way of dealing with certain kinds of problems. If you don't have the problems, you don't need it. If you have the problems, but are willing and able to solve them by yourself, you don't need it, either. But if you have the problems and can't solve them alone, it makes sense to think about joining forces with others who share your difficulties. Even by working together you still may fail to solve your problems. And it's true that you'll have to pay a price. But how viable are your alternatives?

Jack L. Rettig
Business Administration
April 13, 1974
PROFESSOR BAYNE ON COLLECTIVE BARGAINING -- COMMENT BY MURRAY WOLFSON

There is no doubt that Professor Bayne did the faculty a service by expressing his misgivings about collective bargaining in a clear and forthright fashion in the April issue of FACULTY FORUM PAPERS. I think he is wrong, but his appeal to reason makes it possible to discuss this issue in a reasoned manner. Moreover, Professor Bayne described the present situation in a manner that bears repeating:

That the faculty of this institution has entered a 'low era' in its morale is not open to debate. Dissatisfaction with how things are run and downright worry about prospective future developments in administrative prejudices and power are rampant; ... individual faculty members have been subject to unfair decision by insensitive administrators. Harsh decisions have been made and I have been as alarmed at them as we all have been....

He then identifies the cause of the situation:

The truths about harsh faculty treatment are met with the truth that this treatment results from two independent factors: the 'tight' economics of this period, and the development of an increased managerial staff and concomitant outlook in University governance. The scenario we need for a boost in faculty morale is an easing of the financial stringency and a more enlightened (educated?) outlook in some administrators. Neither of these is on the horizon at the time of writing.

Professor Bayne is telling us that a root cause of the present situation lies in the inadequate funds appropriated by the State Legislature for Higher Education, which constituted a reduction in the inadequate Governor's budget, which in turn was a reduction from the insufficient request by the State Board of Higher Education. He does not like the flirtation with managerial methods which have interested the President and others, but his own analysis shows that they are not independent of the crunch on Higher Education. Perhaps they are willing cogs in the wheel. Perhaps they regard the economics of the era as a fact of life, and view themselves as making the best of a bad situation.

Probably the truth combines some of each, but it is clear that Professor Bayne's policies for remedy are in conflict with his analysis. What does he propose to do about the 'low era'? "Sit down with our administration and talk about objectives which we see as advantageous to our institution." He notes: "It is impressive to consider the support we have traditionally enjoyed from most quarters. Despite quotations to the contrary, we do have an array of supporters when it comes to matters of interest to the faculty; from the Offices of University President, Chancellor and indeed Governor, we have derived support in
achieving our present level of relative dignity and comfort..." That is to say, we are asked to reason with the very people who it has just been argued are not really able to do much to change the situation. What such an approach really boils down to is the following message to President MacVicar: "Go fight our battle with the Legislature for us! We will support you with our superior powers of reason, but you get in there and strike the rock and produce the money." It is hard to see how we can ask others to succeed in doing what we are unwilling to do for ourselves:

The reason that Professor Bayne is driven to this approach is that he misunderstands the nature of the current crunch in education in Oregon. He thinks the Legislature and its agents somehow do not understand what they are doing. Sweet reason will show them the error of their ways. There is no explanation in Professor Bayne's paper for "the 'tight' economics of this period", but he is sure that we can talk the Legislature out of it, without the 'adversary' relationship inherent in a contractual relationship, and, a fortiori, without a collectively bargained contract.

Professor Bayne over-estimates the force of reason, because he neglects the fact that the Legislature and its agents, the State Board of Higher Education are buyers of our services. If we must use the word 'adversary' to describe that situation, then so be it. These agencies are charged with husbanding the taxpayer's funds, getting the most for the least expenditure. Indeed, if they are rational, they will point out there are alternative uses for State funds clamoring to be implemented, and they would be derelict in their duty if they spent one penny more than they had to in order to operate the System of Higher Education. That puts the burden upon the faculty to demonstrate that an adequate amount is necessary for the operation of the universities, precisely because the faculty will not stand for either inadequate salaries or the "managerial revolution" which is derivative of it. That is the real appeal to reason, not sweet talk.

How is this appeal to reason to be implemented? Some years ago it was done by threatening to withhold our services; this was not a strike, but simply taking a job elsewhere or, more important, not coming to OSU in the first place. These were characteristic of a rising demand for academic labor. But now the situation has changed. Demographic and economic factors have made enrollments at Universities level off so that the market elsewhere is very tight in most professions. Moreover, the absence of growth in the Oregon system makes it unnecessary to attract substantial numbers of scholars from outside. The longer people live at one university, the more difficult it is to move, especially with the environmental advantages now so prominent in determining public tastes. Unless we act collectively to convince them otherwise, the Legislature will quite rationally observe that such decline in staff as may be observed, is precisely what they want to see happen in light of the diminished demand for education. They will sit on their hands. We have to convince them that they must improve the system financially.

How? Of course we could strike. We could have a quasi-strike over a 10 year period as the best brains leave OSU in response to offers elsewhere, despite the bad market conditions. Fortunately it is not necessary
to do this. The Public Employee Relations Act requires that collective bargaining be carried on in 'good faith' by both parties. They may agree to fact-finding and arbitration. 'Reason' takes on a different meaning under such circumstances. It amounts to maintaining parity and equity with similar situations elsewhere, and to the preservation of existing relations. Of course it is not 'reason' in the logician's sense of the word, but it has the effect of requiring that a compromise be reached between the positions of the bargaining groups. This is part of labor law for the very purpose of avoiding strikes except in complete break-down situations. 'Reason', in this sense of the word, is on our side as the report of the Faculty Economic Welfare Committee which shared the issue of Faculty Forum Papers with Professor Bayne showed. OSU salaries are deteriorating with respect to other institutions, and with respect to Personal Income generally in the U. S. The salary schedules proposed by the Oregon State System of Higher Education themselves are ignored. A very clear case for 'reason' can be made on our behalf, but only if the collective bargaining 'in good faith' mechanism is implemented.

Now about contracts, adversaries and collegiality: Although he does not say so, Professor Bayne reasons as if we are not involved in a contractual relationship with the State System. Obviously, this is not so. But the terms of that contract are often ill defined, and in particular are subject to amendment only by the employer. Consent of both parties is not required with respect to compensation, privileges or duties.

Professor Bayne's desire for collegiality leads him to accept a vague and one sided contractual arrangement, and in my view he finds himself in much the same position as a man who enters into a partnership with his best friend. He imagines that no contract is necessary; bargaining is to be avoided between them. All too often he finds that there is a contract implicit in the law; he finds himself liable for all the debts of his partner; he finds that the partner does not behave as he ought; new conditions come up and there is disagreement as to what is to be done. But no mechanism exists for dealing with the disagreement. Love does not conquer all. Friendship is best maintained by either spelling out the details of the arrangement beforehand, or spelling out a mechanism for dealing with unforeseen events -- or both. That is why lovers marry, friends sign contracts, and why lawyers collect fees.

Consider what has happened to Oregon State faculty as a result of the vague way our employment is specified. The State Board ignores the salary schedule it has promulgated and presumably shown to prospective faculty; it has adopted a set of new rules regarding Promotion and Tenure which affect the conditions of work of every one of us; it has tinkered with our retirement and health insurance system; it has stood on its right to refuse to give adequate grounds for non-renewal of persons hired without tenure; and, despite the decision of Faculty Senate, the University still maintains a closed-file system of personnel records. Whether any of these measures were good or bad is actually beside the point. There was no requirement that the faculty approve the amendment to their terms of employment before the changes were instituted. In fact, there is a strange sort of bargaining of contracts between faculty and the State System. It occurs at the point of hiring, and then ceases until a threat of departure
can be mounted. If there is a threat to collegiality, it is the unilat-
eral way in which the contract is amended during the terms of its 
force.

AAUP thanks Professor Bayne for his praise in our handling of the 
changes in description of 'instructional service' instituted by the 
Executive Office in this year's Notice of Appointment. He should know 
that what made the AAUP's argument was the fact that faculty had agreed 
to a definition of instructional service upon hiring and the change was 
a violation of that contract, whether it was intended as such or not. 
This incident was a precursor of collective bargaining, not an alterna-
tive to it.

Merely writing things down does not destroy collegiality. On the 
contrary. The issue is: What is to be written down? If Professor Bayne 
thinks that vagueness ought to be written into certain portions of the 
contract, or some issues ought to be left to precedent, he ought to ex-
press himself along that line. Perhaps he simply wants to endorse the 
Faculty Handbook as a working set of rules. AAUP fought long and hard 
to have the Faculty Forum present a prototype contract, and it tried 
to build reward for excellence, collegiality and faculty participation 
into it. One can have collegiality with a contract, and likewise one can 
have managerial methods without it. It all depends on the quality and 
dedication of the faculty in their negotiations. This is why AAUP has 
decided, as the faculty professional organization, to put its name 
forward as a prospective bargaining agent.

A last frank word among colleagues. One suspects that it is the word 
'collective' that sticks in Professor Bayne's craw more than 'bargaining.' 
If collective means a senseless leveling of salaries and incentives, 
regardless of contribution, then the misgivings are well founded. But 
it need not be so. At present the standard for compensation of outstand-
ing contribution is as unilateral as the rest of our actual contract. 
How many faculty feel that they are not rewarded for teaching, or research 
that does not lead to funds or political points with special interest groups? 
The AAUP position has consistently been for an improvement in the faculty 
participation in merit decisions. This view was included in the Faculty 
Forum Prototype Contract even though it meant disagreement with OSEA. 
No doubt there are bad contracts that undermine collegiality, but there 
are good ones as well.

The trick is to get enough money so as to make it possible to re-
ward merit without starving the rest of the staff. That is why President 
MacVicar's salary decision was wrong in my view. First of all it uni-
laterally discarded the faculty view which was that, in view of the two-digit 
inflation and the miniscule amount of funds available, the only humane 
thing was to virtually divide it up and blunt the real salary cut due to 
inflation. Second, the decision tended skewed the income in favor of the 
50 per cent of those judged especially meritorious when inflation was 
making a cut in the income of the rest.
Maybe there is an ideal world in which everybody shares collegial love and there are no conflicts of interest, but not on this planet, and certainly not in our times in Oregon. Face it: The net effect of wishing for the ideal is, in practice, the destruction of collegiality, lowering of incentive toward excellence in teaching and disinterested research, and increasing pressures toward reduction in staff through incomes lowered by inflation. I share Professor Bayne’s ideals, but in practice collective bargaining is the only way we have to work toward them. It is not a "quick fix" but a long range program for improving the University.

Sincerely yours,

Murray Wolfson
Professor of Economics, President AAUP

April 23, 1974
Options on Campus

PERS results last year revealed to many faculty members that the freedom did not fully exist to choose whether to have their retirement funds invested partly in common stocks or not. Still, freedom means freedom to make choices, whether in seeking academic truth or in determining one's economic destiny.

The PERS options have now turned out not really as wide choices as many faculty members had thought. The "zero gain" year of 1973 now shows that the "fixed fund" included common stocks in sizable amount, despite the widespread impression that stocks appeared only in the "variable" fund.

The "zero" gain on the "fixed fund" apparently resulted from decisions by the Legislature to allow common stocks in the "fixed fund", culminating in the allowance of 35% in stocks by the 1973 Legislature, without permission of the people whose payroll deductions went into a fund called "fixed". Stock losses of 16.4% in 1973 thus offset any reported gain on the "truly fixed" portion of the mislabelled "fixed fund".

The variable fund lost enough on common stocks in 1973 to bring the four-year gain on stocks well below the overall gain in some "variable" funds of commercial companies in the same four-year period 1970 through 1973.

Those willing to take the risk on equities, therefore, got denied the fullest rewards, while those unwilling to take risks on stocks got legislated into the risk anyway.

Official testimony at Salem on 24 April before the Senate PERS probe revealed that even the "truly fixed" portion of the "fixed fund" would have shown "a substantial loss" if the long-term low-interest bonds got rated at present market values instead of their redemption values at maturity.

A mere "paper loss" has become quite real if one retires this year or if the stock market slumps further while interest rates rise.

The suggestion of a new option might appeal to those who want the high interest yields paid on U. S. Treasury borrowings for 13 and 26 weeks, since a "negative gain" could never occur without Governmental collapse. Moreover, some faculty and other employees among the nearly 84,000 PERS members might want to select a commercial fund or a bank trust for retirement funds. Why not permit them to make such a choice?
How many other states which followed Oregon's lead into common stocks for retirement funds have similarly denied their public employees, including faculty members, the reality of choice held out to them? (Oregon led the way, and now some UPAO members survey the national scene to determine how closely the other states followed the Oregon precedent of legislating compulsory risk-taking. Colleagues who know facts can help this survey by advising me directly.)

What choices do academic ears really get on the subjects discussed openly on campus? At the University of Chicago on 20 March the attempt to present Prof. Edward C. Banfield for a scheduled lecture got aborted by rowdies, according to press reports. Prof. Milton Friedman and Vice President D.J.R. Bruckner had to escort the visiting speaker from the hall. President Robert D. Clark at the University of Oregon has an "open platform" policy under which people proscribed elsewhere can speak at the U of O. But Dr. Clark indicates that supporters of such speakers of the Left have protested "that the university should not allow speakers with whom they disagreed politically and 'morally' to present their views in a forum on campus."

Dr. Clark has asked, "By what principle, then, is the university to function?" Whether hazed and driven from the platform or silently never scheduled on a campus where a militant group objects to their presence and speeches, numerous outstanding academic articulators do in fact never speak on many American campuses where their opponents on the same controversial topics do get regularly invited to speak. The speaker fees paid by students and taxpayers thus support slanted speaker schedules. What answer should President Clark's question get?

The following list of questions pose some specific issues on which I hope faculty colleagues will develop consensus. Perhaps other questions relevant to the foregoing discussion should join this list. I welcome answers and comments dealing with these matters and would welcome individual replies from colleagues. These matters also deserve further discussion by contributors to Faculty Forum Papers.

Opinions on Options for "Purse and Ear":

1. Will security and benefits of faculty retirement funds significantly attract and hold desirable faculty members? (YES or NO?)

2. Should faculty members be compelled to have their retirement funds invested in common stocks, as Oregon law provides?

3. Should options provide for investing both faculty deductions and institutional contributions so that faculty members can select a truly guaranteed "no-loss" fund like U.S. Treasury Bills?
4. Whereas Oregon's "variable fund" gained overall 12% during 1970 through 1973, the comparable Metropolitan stock fund gained 27%. Should faculty members be allowed to designate commercial annuity funds and bank trusts for their retirement deductions and employer contributions?

5. Oregon's "fixed fund" included stocks and reportedly earned an overall 20% during 1970 through 1973. U. S. Treasury Bills (13 and 26 week "T-Bills") sold by the Federal Reserve free of commission have recently paid over 8% interest and are assured against loss. Prof. Milton Friedman recommended them in his column in Newsweek, 8 Oct. 1973. During 1970 through 1973 a "Rolling T-Bill Fund" would apparently have gained over 20%. Should faculty members be allowed to designate such a fund as an option for their own salary deductions and employer contributions to retirement?

6. As a taxpayer, do you favor putting tax collections into common stocks for up to 35% of retirement funds reserved for state, school, county, and city employees as now provided in Oregon law?

7. Should speaker funds assure appearance on campus of those whose views are not acceptable to many outside the campus under the "open platform" concept?

8. Should campus speaker funds be obliged to assure balance so that controversial topics get fairly treated from opposing viewpoints?

9. In case violence prevents expression of one side of a controversial subject, should campus speaker funds be withheld from that entire subject?

10. Do you favor complete freedom of choice and abolition of mandatory student fees now paying campus speakers?

Kindly address responses to the undersigned at the address below.

Fred W. Decker
Atmospheric Sciences
(National President, UPAO)

29 April 1974.
Comments on the Faculty Salary Situation in the School of Agriculture

The "straw" which prompted this paper was an article entitled "Visitors to Investigate College of Liberal Arts" by Linda Hart, which appeared in the April 24, 1974 Barometer. The essence of the article was that faculty in the College of Liberal Arts were paid lower salaries than faculty in the College of Science. According to the Barometer article, a board of visitors requested by President Robert Mac Vicar, is to ascertain whether discrepancies exist between the funding of liberal arts and other schools at OSU.

My purpose is not to argue whether discrepancies in salaries exist between liberal arts and science. If discrepancies exist, presumably the board of visitors will identify them and hopefully the discrepancies will be resolved. My purpose is to point out that salary discrepancies, other than those between liberal arts and science, exist at OSU. Table 1 contains the average salaries for the professorial ranks in a number of schools and colleges at OSU. The salary discrepancies between the College of Science and the College of Liberal Arts are not very different from the salary discrepancies between the School of Agriculture and the College of Science, or for that matter, between the School of Agriculture and most of the other schools or colleges.

The rank of associate professor in the School of Agriculture is a particularly interesting case. The average salary for associate professor in the School of Agriculture is lower than the average salary for associate professors in other schools or colleges by the following amounts: B & T - $2472; Pharmacy - $2091, Engineering - $1541, Forestry - $1506; Science - $1344; Education - $980; Home Economics - $930, and Liberal Arts - $268. To illustrate further the extent of the discrepancy note that associate professors in the School of Agriculture are paid less than assistant professors in Pharmacy and B & T, and barely more than assistant professor in Engineering, Forestry and Education.

President Robert Mac Vicar's letter of March 28, 1974 to the faculty of OSU regarding salary adjustments for 1974-1975 enumerated five short-range goals which are sought by the faculty compensation plan which may very well vary significantly from individual to individual and from year to year. Second on President Mac Vicar's list of five short range goals was the following. "From time to time through a variety of reasons inequities may develop, and these need to be corrected." Perhaps as the Barometer article of April 24 suggested, such inequities exist in the College of Liberal Arts. I would suggest that severe inequities also exist in the School of Agriculture, particularly at the rank of associate professor.

My father often said that one should not complain unless he is willing to offer a remedy. The following partial remedy for the salary situation in the School of Agriculture is offered. Academic personnel, in the School of Agriculture, most of whom currently hold 11 month appointments could be reappointed on 9 month appointments at their existing annual salary rate. Some would argue and I would argue, that certain programs and projects in Agriculture need to be
pursued on an 11 month basis. In order to accomplish this, the programs in the School of Agriculture would be reviewed. Those programs which need and warrant funding on an eleven month basis would be identified. Additional funding for faculty salaries (at a rate of 122% of the present annual funding) would be sought from the appropriate state or federal agencies. If the programs are worthwhile, and I am certain most of them are, then these services should be paid for on a realistic basis. A number of research programs in the School of Agriculture are currently funded from federal grants or contracts. The salary adjustment, for personnel on these projects (from 9 months to 11 months), could be paid from the federal grants or contracts as is currently done for 9 month faculty at OSU.

This is one possible remedy. There are probably other approaches to solve this problem. The poor salary situation in the School of Agriculture is a very serious problem which demands immediate attention.

Sincerely,

R. A. Scanlan
Associate Professor in the School of Agriculture

Table 1. Average Salaries of Various Schools or Colleges at Oregon State University

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School or College</th>
<th>Professors</th>
<th>Associate Professors</th>
<th>Assistant Professors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Agriculture</td>
<td>18277</td>
<td>13493</td>
<td>11948</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liberal Arts</td>
<td>16987</td>
<td>13761</td>
<td>11825</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Science</td>
<td>19536</td>
<td>14837</td>
<td>12321</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pharmacy</td>
<td>19390</td>
<td>15584</td>
<td>13583</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B &amp; T</td>
<td>18636</td>
<td>15965</td>
<td>14263</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engineering</td>
<td>18519</td>
<td>15034</td>
<td>13155</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forestry</td>
<td>18702</td>
<td>14999</td>
<td>13336</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Home Economics</td>
<td>18752</td>
<td>14423</td>
<td>11903</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>17495</td>
<td>14473</td>
<td>13238</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. All salary figures on 9 month basis.
2. Salary information obtained from office of Budgets and Personnel Services, OSU.
3. Average salaries for schools or colleges at OSU on December 31, 1973.
A "PERS TEST" For Bargaining Agents

Organizations now seeking election as collective bargaining agent for the faculty have an excellent chance to demonstrate their prowess as vigilant and effective protectors of faculty financial interests prior to a bargaining election.

Success in dealing with the PERS investment law can add the equivalent of substantial across-the-board pay increases. Failure to forestall further stock losses legislated by the law putting every PERS member into common stocks can result in losses far greater than any early pay boosts likely under the most optimistic bargaining. Reform should remove the compulsory stock market risk and should result in better management of the funds voluntarily put into common stocks. The "Oregon Growth Fund" of PERS common stocks has performed poorly compared to a sampling of other funds and market averages presented to the OSU Chapter of University Professors for Academic Order (UPAO) and summarized below:

Percentage gains of various funds:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Oregon PERS &quot;Variable&quot;</td>
<td>7.47</td>
<td>9.47</td>
<td>13.87</td>
<td>-16.39</td>
<td>12.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California PERS &quot;Variable&quot;</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>22.7</td>
<td>18.1</td>
<td>-23.4</td>
<td>14.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dow Jones Industrial Average</td>
<td>9.2</td>
<td>9.8</td>
<td>18.5</td>
<td>-13.3</td>
<td>23.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metropolitan Variable &quot;A&quot;</td>
<td>8.8</td>
<td>19.7</td>
<td>20.6</td>
<td>-18.5</td>
<td>27.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oregon PERS &quot;Fixed&quot; Fund #</td>
<td>5.09</td>
<td>6.27</td>
<td>7.46</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>20.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oregon PERS &quot;Truly Fixed&quot;,</td>
<td>4.98</td>
<td>5.49</td>
<td>5.79</td>
<td>6.04</td>
<td>24.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>exclusive of stocks in fixed fund.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Overall 1970-73, inclusive, gain comes from assuming a single initial sum with only the annual percentage gains and losses accumulated in the fund. First line thus gives \(1.0747 \times 1.0947 \times 1.1387 \times 0.8361 = 1.1200\), i.e., 12% gain.

# "Fixed" includes up to 35% common stocks commingled with those of the Oregon PERS "Variable" fund in the "Oregon Growth Fund" portfolio of common stocks.

Note: The Dow Jones Industrial Average "fund" would consist of an even spread of the 30 "blue chips" as they make up the "Dow", a feasible purchase for PERS.

In a new era of Brazil-type inflation and rising interest rates no one should be obliged to have his retirement funds in common stocks to any degree, and only a Special Session of the Legislature can correct this compulsory feature of the present defective law. Moreover, those who still want to be in common stocks voluntarily deserve a better chance to make gains comparable to the market average.

Which of the would-be collective bargaining agents can demonstrate ability to get action now instead of procrastinating until the 1975 Session? By that time this and other such questions might be purely academic indeed!

Fred W. Decker, Atmospheric Sciences

20 May 1974
A FACULTY COLLECTIVE BARGAINING UNIT DEFINED

Recent events have pointed out a misunderstanding concerning the composition of a faculty collective bargaining unit as presented to PERB by O.S.E.A. It was not the intent of OSEA to exclude any faculty, but neither was it the intent to force participation against the wishes of disinterested groups.

The O.S.E.A. collective bargaining unit was made in consultation with representatives from each institution of higher learning with the exception of Southern Oregon College. Prior to establishment of this unit contact had been made with the County Agents Association. They stated that the county agents were not interested in collective bargaining. They made this statement after making a survey of the county agents. Subsequently, at the request of Dean Cooney, every county agent's office was solicited for signatures requesting that they become a part of the O.S.E.A. bargaining unit. O.S.E.A. obtained 6 valid signatures out of 156 from this solicitation.

A solicitation was made of the Agricultural Experiment Station faculty out in the state. Ten valid signatures were obtained out of a possible 27 and O.S.E.A. is going forward to add them on as a part of the bargaining unit.

It is the intention of O.S.E.A. to help all possible faculty groups to become interested participants in the collective bargaining unit as soon as possible.

Myron G. Cropsey
Agricultural Engineering
May 31, 1974
One of the most celebrated terms in Thomas S. Kuhn's The Structure of Scientific Revolutions is "paradigm," which embodies his notion of the sense in which activities are defined and controlled by tradition. An operative tradition is one that has proven its ability to order the experiences of a given social constituency; Kuhn was especially concerned about research traditions that provide the scientific community with criteria to distinguish one activity from another, set priorities on those activities, and enable the community to perform whatever common activities make it a community at all.

A university in the classic sense in a community. Although the passion of the human race for institutionalizing its activities has not spared the university, the survival of the idea of community has been basic in the history of the university, and as a community it has had just such a concept of tradition as Kuhn described. Kuhn's problem was the transition from one tradition to another, specifically in scientific communities, which he considered enjoyed a relative insulation from contingent social conditions external to the traditions of the community. Kuhn used concrete examples to illustrate the sense of development in science; theorists of social change now treat Kuhn as a significant and original contributor to that field, once his ideas on development and revolution are defined generically.

The university as a community also has a relative insulation from contingent social conditions external to the traditions of the community. The insulation works both ways; no one connected with the university in this country since the end of the second world war should be unaware of the way social conditions have generated forces that jumped the insulation barrier. The California oath controversy marked outside society's breach of the barrier when it attempted to control what the university community studied even if it was pertinent to the university's purpose as a repository of knowledge. The student and faculty activism of the sixties over the Vietnam war issue marked the university society's breach of the barrier in the other direction. But these episodes are significant because they are exactly that--episodes, and extraordinary ones. They reflect a problem that has always characterized the relations between the larger society and any limited community within it--i.e., how much autonomy the limited community shall have.

If you are thinking the bow is bent, make with the shaft, we have now come to it. The breach of the university's insulation now threatened is more insidious because it is one which would substitute an alien for an indigenous tradition. What most characterizes the industrialized society in which we, and increasingly the rest of the world, live is the concept of interchangeability of parts and mass production. In fact, we
have made great progress in developing techniques for monitoring these characteristics in what is vulgarly called computer technology. It is not irrelevant to point out that the computer was an industrial development; taken over by the university its study becomes either a training school unit function or it is transformed into a "thinking machine," the study of which is a legitimate university function. Either way, the result is the same: the unit in any set of units which can be submitted to computer processing is interchangeable--any unit is treated exactly like any other unit.

I hope I need not elaborate on the relation of this characteristic to the much discussed sense of alienation, either in society at large or in the university in particular. One of the features of the student movement of the early sixties was certainly the feeling (right or wrong) that the individual student was unnoticed or ignored by those in the university who should have been concerned with students. This idea was circulated outside the university and applied to universities in general, both those where there was a basis of truth for the feeling, and those where there was not. But the more the administration of universities adopts the concepts of the industrial tradition in society, the more it attempts to substitute cost benefit analysis for providing opportunities to individuals to realize their capacities for education, the more it introduces inventory control for new product development, and assembly line restraints in place of the autonomy to perform the common activities that make the community a community at all, the more it fosters the environment in which alienation festers.

One might assume, of course, that a particular public university, i.e., one which is supported at the state's expense, might legitimately deviate from the tradition (in Kuhn's sense of the pattern characterizing a particular community) of universities. For example, the governing body of the institution, and the administrators designated by it, might set up an institution whose primary purpose is to provide the vocational training, at various levels of sophistication, for the operational personnel in an interchangeable-parts-mass-production industrial society. The conceptions behind such an enterprise clearly reflect that society's concept that since no unit is different from any other all sets of units may be treated alike. No unit is indispensable; another identical unit can replace it at any time. The administration of such an institution could logically be ordered along industrial production management lines and monitored by computer technology. I would call it a trade school rather than a university, but that is beside the point.

The point is that trade schools have a paradigm of their own. The classical guild pattern, which is as old as that of the university, is that the masters control the acceptance of apprentices, the licensing of journeymen, and the quality of the product. The administration of any institution is properly limited to facilitating its functions. The function of a university, or the function of a trade school, is not the same as the function of, say, the IBM Corporation or the United States Marine Corps, both estimable communities in their own right with their own traditions. To make the administration of these several institutions interchangeable is to introduce grave risks and potential harm to their functioning under their accepted tradition. Out of the profound objectivity of a historian, observing IBM and the Marine Corps from the
outside, I am inclined on the basis of their superb records to favor letting IBM construct computers and the Marine Corps train marines rather than vice versa—if the traditional thinking machine and combat machine is wanted.

Yet in this age of specialization, interchangeability of parts, and mass production, I think the quality of the trade school and the university are endangered by the administrator or the members of governing boards who act as though these institutions can be operated by transferring the superficialities of industrial management (monitoring techniques) to them. The manipulators of these techniques ask the wrong questions, in the wrong order. A simple illustration: a trade school to train wheelwrights offers two principal forms of instruction; (1) making rims, (2) making spokes. The new director, a cost accountant formerly with the Patagonia Egg Merchants' Association, after studying the curriculum discovers that the rim-making course costs $2.49 per student credit hour, and that the spoke-making course costs $7.99 per student credit hour. By abolishing the latter and converting to the former he expands the school's capacity to train wheelwrights 300 percent at no increase in cost. Of course the wheelwrights trained there cannot make wheels, and nobody will hire them, but by that time the director, on the strength of his cost-cutting ability and unsentimental independence of tradition, has been appointed by the Board of Higher Education as Dean of the College of Arts and Sciences at the state university.

Paradigms, as traditions in Kuhn's sense, have reasons for existence. The university tradition has expanded and adapted over a long period and has retained its constituency under heavy pressure at times. Change is perfectly possible within the terms of an operative tradition if its elements are able to deal with new experiences while not losing their identity. The university is confronted by a new tradition that has established itself in industrial society, with conditions radically different from those in effect when the university tradition was institutionalized. Practitioners of the new tradition sometimes infiltrate, sometimes are imposed, on the university community. The more this happens the more the dichotomy between "administration" and university "community" grows.

The university tradition does not properly maintain the indispensability of any given element, idea, or individual, but rather the uniqueness of the individual, idea, or element. An administrator who acts as though a university were an industrial enterprise for the production of inanimate articles or abstractions confuses the community and destroys its capacity to function as such. In the last analysis those competent to judge the work of apprentices in the community, charged with certifying programs in learning its tradition (and in the case of the universities in Oregon legally so charged), and qualified to determine the standards of performance for the masters of the tradition are the members of the community itself. An administrator who arbitrarily overrules the considered judgment of the faculty on what constitutes satisfactory academic performance or professional standard, or imposes a practice violating the clearly expressed interests of the community does not facilitate its functioning.
However tenacious a tradition, its constituency may sometime find itself surrounded with problems that defy solution. I think such a crisis may occur when "administration" and "community" find themselves attempting to follow different traditions. In Kuhn's analysis, a community thus disorganized must come up with a way to put things in order; attempts to refurbish old tradition, conscious search for new or more functional organizational devices, singleness of purpose versus intentional proliferation of alternatives—a community's cultural resources may be tested before a new consensus is clear. The more complete the consensus the greater will be the stability of the community. Without the unanimity necessary to support a new sense of community, the traditions may be less secure, and a "revolution" result merely in confusion and permanent conflict. A community, as Kuhn uses the term for his study of scientific revolution, whether college, trade school, or land grant university, is entitled to administrators that reflect its particular traditions.

Admittedly problems have occurred as higher education in the United States shifted from elite to mass education. The community of higher education changes when as many as 15 percent instead of 5 percent of the secondary-school-completion age group go on to higher education, as is happening in many modern countries. The change is accentuated when, as in the United States, as many as 50 percent of the age group enter higher education. Education shifts to the transmission of skills for specific technical elite roles. Interest groups and party programs subject higher education policies to increasing pressure; the university ceases to govern itself and often falls into the control of those under the spell of managerial techniques. Will it be possible in such circumstances to preserve and defend the best of the values for which quality education has stood?

"As do other institutions," wrote President Edward H. Levi of the University of Chicago, "a university asks much from the society. It does seek to justify as being important to mankind what might otherwise be regarded as an unproductive way of life. 'I do believe in intellectual excellence,' Lord Snow recently said to an apparently startled interviewer. 'I think!' Lord Snow continued, 'a society pays a very high price if it stops thinking that intellectual excellence is a good thing.'"

Society starts paying that price when it seeks to impose the standards peculiar to other communities on the community that is a university. The problem of the relationship between society, or the state, and the university is not a problem that faculty flow model staffing plans or trade union collective bargaining, or any other technique will solve ipso facto. It is a problem we will have always with us, whose solutions vary in time and place but whose method of solution depends on governing boards who recognize and administrators who admit that the pursuit of knowledge and the transmission of the results for the benefit of society and its members, young and old, must be delegated to the pursuers. What is, and what is not, an adequate contribution to the extension, the mastery, or the transmission of knowledge by the 15,000-odd members of a university community whose studies range through dozens of more or less esoteric subjects from accounting to zoology is not within the capacity
of nine individuals, lay or otherwise, to determine, let alone one individual.

Men and women of good will may indeed differ about the best means of achieving the same goals. But a board which selects administrative officers to clamp down on the faculty, and then tolerates the persistent expression, in word and deed, of contempt for academic faculties by such administrative officers, cannot be described as men and women of good will. For evil to prevail, as Jefferson pointed out, it is only necessary for good men to be silent. One scarcely knows whether admiration or pity is the more apt sentiment when contemplating the efforts of a faculty which tries, against all odds, to preserve students from being cheated of the experiences due them in an institution ostensibly operated for their higher education: the opportunity for academic stimulation, for achieving technical proficiency, for intellectual contemplation of the world and its many aspects from the vantage point apart that a university provides. There will, of course, always be some who attempt to avoid the opportunities, administrators who connive at the evasion, and compliant faculties which do not care.

I, for one, care.

George Barr Carson Jr.
Professor of History

September 30, 1974
Retirement Fund Investments

The September 1974 issue of "Universitas" of the University Professors for Academic Order (UPAO) includes an article which provides the following tabulation comparing the performances of various kinds of investment funds for retirement, such as Oregon's PERS. Colleagues interested in this subject will find the article by Max Shapiro in the June issue of Dun's Review (OSU Library) also rather a revealing commentary on the various retirement and pension fund investments.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Oregon PERS &quot;Variable&quot;</td>
<td>7.47</td>
<td>9.47</td>
<td>13.87</td>
<td>-16.39</td>
<td>12.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California PERS &quot;Variable&quot;</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>22.7</td>
<td>18.1</td>
<td>-23.4</td>
<td>14.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CREF (Stocks)</td>
<td>-3.22</td>
<td>20.25</td>
<td>17.09</td>
<td>-18.14</td>
<td>11.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TIAA Deferred Annuities</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>5.25</td>
<td>5.25</td>
<td>5.75</td>
<td>23.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TIAA Settlement Annuities</td>
<td>6.25</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>7.50</td>
<td>30.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U.S. Treasury Bills, 13 wk.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>24.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>{Bought at first auction,}</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U.S. Treasury Bills, 26 wk.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>25.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>{1970, and reinvested. Δ}</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dow Jones Industrial Average</td>
<td>9.2</td>
<td>9.8</td>
<td>18.5</td>
<td>-13.3</td>
<td>23.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metropolitan Variable &quot;A&quot;</td>
<td>8.8</td>
<td>19.7</td>
<td>20.6</td>
<td>-18.5</td>
<td>27.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oregon PERS &quot;Fixed&quot; Fund</td>
<td>5.09</td>
<td>6.27</td>
<td>7.46</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>20.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Δ Exclusive of stocks in fixed fund.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oregon PERS &quot;Truly Fixed&quot;</td>
<td>4.98</td>
<td>5.49</td>
<td>5.79</td>
<td>6.04</td>
<td>24.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NOTES: * Overall 1970-73, inclusive, gain comes from assuming a single initial sum with only the annual percentage gains and losses accumulated in the fund. First line thus gives 1.0747 x 1.0947 x 1.1387 x 0.8361 = 1.1200, i.e., 12% gain.

Δ A "rolling T-Bill" account: this simply means an initial sum for the purchase of T-Bills, immediately reinvested in T-Bills every 13 or 26 weeks, as indicated, from earliest 1970 through the end of 1973.

The Dow Jones Industrial Average "fund" would consist of an even spread of the 30 "blue chips" as they make up the "Dow", a feasible purchase for Oregon PERS (a two-thirds billion-dollar fund) and for other such large funds.

# "Fixed" includes up to 35% common stocks commingled with those of the Oregon PERS "Variable" fund in the "Oregon Growth Fund" portfolio of common stocks.

30 September 1974
Fred W. Decker
Atmospheric Sciences
---the dying university

In recent studies, there has been an approach to analyze the attitudes of persons confronted with a non-curative disease and facing certain death. Briefly, the attitudes progress as follows: 1) Denial, 2) Anger, 3) Bargaining, 4) Depression, 5) Acceptance.

The question arises. Are these attitudes truly only those of such persons or are they really attitudes that all of us develop when faced with what appears to be fruitless endeavors? Do we not all undergo such a five-step sequence with varying degrees of rapidity? Do not some of us become entrenched in any one area, never to move to another? Do not some of us move toward the end of the sequence only to have another event occur which returns us toward the beginning? Does not the sequence of events reflect on some of the behavioral attitudes of our colleagues on this campus? Should we strive to achieve the last step, acceptance of an incurable situation, or are there alternatives?

The deterioration of a once viable institution is more than that of a futilely dying person, or is it? Are we willing to accept its death attitudes or will we maintain our hope to the last that a cure will be found? It is all too apparent that any single cure for the institution would be difficult to obtain. However, would surgery be an answer? Can we adequately remove sites of administrative necrosis without endangering the life of the institution? Would therapy with administrative review decrease the spread of rampant incompetence? Are there other actions to be taken? And last, but in no way least, do we cure the disease but lose the patient? Is the life to be saved worthy of the risks involved?

I think it is.

George H. Constantine, Jr., Ph.D.
November 4, 1974
ON WOPersonS, HUPERSONS AND CHAIRPERSONS

The latest C&EN has a few words on the sexes which may interest our faculty. They quote from the wilds of middle America, and I hereby shamelessly lift the section in toto, as follows:

"I have noticed several uses in the past few weeks of the neologism* 'chairperson.' The latest edition of Webster's dictionary lists 'chairman' as 'the administrative officer of a department of instruction (as in a college)' and recognizes the word 'chairwoman' as a 'female chairman.' [It does] not recognize the word 'chairperson.'

"I believe that the use of this term reflects a misunderstanding of the letters 'm-a-n' in the word 'chairman.' These letters are not pronounced 'man' as in 'The man was elected secretary, but 'mun' as in 'craftsman,' 'horseman,' 'woman,' and, of course 'human.' Unless we are ready to speak of 'craftsperson,' 'horseperson,' 'woperson,' and 'huperson,' I suggest that we not use the word 'chairperson' in University correspondence."

*Ed. note: Webster defines "neologism" in part as "a meaningless word coined by a psychotic."

Octave Levenspiel

4 November 1974

Octave Levenspiel
Chemical Engineering
Does Collective Bargaining Matter?

It is becoming increasingly evident that this university and the OSHOE are reaching the time when collective bargaining may become a way of life. To date, like many other faculty, my inclination has been to wait before openly expressing an opinion pro or con on this issue. I must admit that given the economic state of our profession one tends to lean toward a pro answer providing the bargaining were to be in the field of economics only. However, a strong belief that such a move would be only a beginning towards undesirable results prompts me to take a strong stand against collective bargaining.

In the last few years there has developed a growing trend of managed academia coinciding with a loss in traditional shared responsibility. The addition of collective bargaining to this only exacerbates this problem. My concept of collective bargaining may be naive. To me it means the "sitting at a table" where one side, management, sits opposite the "managed". Further, it means something is given up to gain something else. While it would be nice to conclude that this would be limited only to salary or non-salary benefits, it is hard to believe that other matters, including those academic, would not enter into the bargaining process. Are we willing to take this risk? I think not.

The very heart of a university is localized in that which we call academic freedom. This permits us not only to explore new horizons in research but equally in teaching including presenting that which we know as we see it. It permits us to share responsibility for developing creative intellect by providing sound bases for such development. Any deterioration of this shared responsibility ultimately leads toward erosion of the quality of the university. My opinion is that collective bargaining diminishes shared responsibility and academic freedom. This is at a time when the survival and growth of the university is highly dependent on improving the quality of that institution.

Let me say that I would be amongst the first to argue that it is not enough only to be against something without providing an alternative. The alternative is for the faculty to become more "active" and less "reactive". (We were invited to do so on faculty day.) It is time we exerted ourselves and lead in academic matters. We need to express ourselves so that there be no doubt where we stand and battle to assure ourselves that our stands are not only heard but acted upon. This means sharing in the policy making at all levels in the positive sense of leading where this is appropriate and necessary.

As to the means, I confess of knowing no other way than that of a faculty senate which is assertive and concerns itself with real policy making. This needs to be a senate that concerns itself less and less with reacting, trivia, or exercises in futility and more and more with leadership in scholarly endeavors.
Toward this end I would suggest concentrating each year on one or a few areas and developing a position that is positive. For example, if we believe that central to a university is provision for a strong program in liberal arts, then we should develop a stand that will assure this including funds where necessary. If we believe we are losing the economic battle then we should develop a strong position emphasizing not only why this is so but what remedies are feasible.

The development of a more effective faculty senate which is central to these arguments in my opinion will likely require change. This change needs to be such that the body has a significant input into the affairs of the university. To a degree it means a willingness to more readily accept committee recommendations providing these have been developed in a responsible manner. Committees should provide opportunities for input from interested faculty. An approach to this is that of announcing meeting dates including an agenda of topics to be discussed. If this becomes too burdensome an open hearing on topics may be a suitable alternative. After this, when a committee reports, the report should present a recommendation together with the reasons for this conclusion. At present, I think this is reasonably well done.

The senate should concern itself with major policy and as much as possible avoid the administration of these policies. If the administration of a policy is contrary to what is believed to be the meaning, the senate should express this in clear definite terms.

It is my opinion that the most crucial administrative unit in shared responsibility is that of the department or similar unit. This means that a need exists for these units to develop stands on policy matters and have a means to express these to the governing faculty body including its committees. This requires that the committees provide before the fact information about those areas in which it is currently concentrating. To work, it may be necessary to limit the number of committees.

It should also be pointed out that if shared responsibility is to function it means that the administration must accept the concept. If not the alternative becomes one of a change from shared academia toward adversary procedures.

Let's start with the premise that we honestly want to improve the quality of this university. Then let us through shared responsibility state explicitly how we believe this can be done.

R. W. Newburgh
November 22, 1974
Student Interest In Evaluating OSU Administration

Do students wish to evaluate the OSU Administration in the way they already evaluate professors and courses?

Given a chance to indicate what aspects of the university the students considered it most important for them to evaluate, one group has recently given priority ratings to items on a list of services they receive at OSU. While not yet fully developed as a scientific survey reaching a fully representative sample of students, still I believe the ratings given by the students provide a significant indication of the general direction of student priorities for expanded evaluation beyond merely the classroom and the professor.

The sample survey asked students who had just completed a course evaluation to indicate what other aspects of the university community they would "consider most important to have such an opportunity to render an evaluation." On a list of 14 activities the students were asked to give a rating number 10 to the most important, 9 to the next most important, etc., in their opinions of priorities to assign. The totals of the priority rating numbers given by the students appear below:

1. Registration and scheduling of classes and exams: 245
2. Administration (Pres., Deans, Dept. Chmn.): 211
3. Incidental fees (Convos, OSPIRG, etc.): 184
4. A.S.O.S.U. (Govt., Funds, etc.): 161
5. Student Advising: 155

The other activities trailed behind with 117 down to 62 points in this order: Spectator Sports, Student Health Service, OSU Daily Barometer, Off-Campus Housing, MU Food Service, Campus Housing, Memorial Union, Dorm Food Service, and KBVR Programs & Production.

Before accepting a role as chief scapegoat for adolescent student unhappiness, perhaps the faculty should insist that all aspects of this University come under evaluation by students and that the method of evaluation provide protection against anonymous mischief as well.

Fred W. Decker
Atmospheric Sciences

20 December 1972
ANONYMOUS STUDENT EVALUATION OF TEACHING

It seems incredulous that either faculty or administration will accept anonymous student evaluations of teaching as evidence for salary, promotion and tenure. How much credence should be given to such evaluations? Do these anonymous documents become a matter of public record in the personnel file of each faculty member?

Our local expert in the area of letters to the editor, the Gazette Times, will normally not print letters without the name, address and a handwritten signature of the writer. At such times as the Gazette Times does accept anonymous letters, those letters published are carefully screened. No such policy protects the faculty from the capricious or malicious.

The student evaluation of teaching form, like many examinations, can have ambiguous questions or convey a particular concept in the mind of the author that is interpreted with a different set of value judgments by the person answering. For example, on one evaluation form a question obviously written by a "clean shaven" author drew a very negative response from a student. His response was, "Personal appearance very poor. No beads, no levis, no leather jacket."

Or how about the student who claims that the instructor doesn't talk loudly enough because his cheap tape recorder won't pick up the lecture in the back of the hall?

Communication by both the written and the oral word seem to be a problem. Under the system of anonymous student evaluations there is no possibility for communication. There is no possibility for the accused to confront his accuser. If the administrator uses this hearsay evidence to deprive a professor of salary, promotion or tenure, it would seem that the administrator renders his verdict upon the recommendation of an anonymous jury.

Originally student evaluation of teaching was designed to help improve instruction. Within the span of two or three years, student evaluation of teaching has become an administrative tool to reward or punish the professor.

What has happened to academic freedom? Shouldn't the faculty member be accorded the same civil rights enjoyed by others?

December 21, 1972

Karl F. Drlica
Physical Education
Evaluating Evaluations

The academic community has begun to evaluate student evaluations of teaching effectiveness, judging from three articles which appeared in the December, 1972, issue of "Universitas" cited below and now on deposit in the Reserve Book Room of the Library for faculty perusal.

In "The Teacher Evaluation Frenzy - Its Causes and Consequences" Prof. George H. Douglas of the University of Illinois asserts that the students do not necessarily evaluate "purely objectively, with the altruistic motive of improving teaching quality at their institutions" but rather use evaluation for "the imposition upon the institution of student educational ideology...to pressure professors into conformity in matters of grade distribution, work load, and the like." Prof. Douglas says the "surrender of professors to the current rating fancy...is a negation of the original purpose of the college.... (which is) high quality, rigorous, adult education."

Prof. Charles A. Moser of George Washington University writing on "Teaching and Its Evaluation" suggests that evaluators who make decisions on pay, promotion, and tenure "should have the opportunity to observe a teacher directly." He writes, "The evaluator should not be wholly satisfied with hearsay reports, either from students or from other faculty." He recommends three sources as "written course materials, evaluations of students and fellow faculty, and his own direct observation" for the evaluator to use.

At the University of Florida the University Senate has received a proposal that each professor's file be available for summary of the evaluation by the student government, which would then publish the resulting summaries. In his article on "Teacher Evaluation" Prof. Arthur A. Broyles asks why professors should be singled out for the "honor" of publication of their confidential personnel data. He answers, "I suspect it is because professors as a group no longer have the desire to struggle for their own welfare." He warns of the risk of "increased antagonism between students and professors" likely to arise from publishing summaries of the contents of professors' files.

D. W. Phelps
Health Department

December 29, 1972.
The January Faculty Forum discussion of anonymous student evaluations of teaching staff opens a whole Pandora's Box of possibilities which are in complete harmony with the egalitarian concepts that characterize the Jacobin democracy of our present society. The concept can be expressed in two words: Evaluate Everything.

If it is right and proper that anonymous student evaluation of teaching staff is germane to University operations, then it is equally proper that anonymous student evaluation of all other staff, e.g. administrative, service, maintenance, and research, is equally germane. And if it is proper that student evaluations are encouraged, it is equally proper that staff evaluations be encouraged.

If it is proper that anonymous evaluations are included in a teacher's file, it is mandatory that similar evaluations be included in every staff member's and student's file. Anything less is discrimination of the most arrant sort. Furthermore, all relevant data derived from these evaluations should be published in the Barometer and posted on broadsheets for the information of all. Only in this way can the University gain a proper insight into its appearance and relevance.

But for adequate evaluation, the process should not stop here. Departments, offices and agencies should also be evaluated anonymously; not only by the students, but by the staff. Every facet of the University should be involved so that the benefits of anonymous critical review could be shared by everyone to the end that University operations would be improved and strengthened by this particular form of catharsis.

Consider what could be accomplished:

An incredibly detailed amount of input would be generated that would provide employment for numerous evaluators, clerks, civil servants, and computer technicians who are not presently on the University staff (not to mention the custodial technicians and the environmental pollution specialists who would be needed to dispose of the paper).

New construction would be required to store the records, and conceivably a computerized data bank would have to be established to retrieve relevant data for researchers, investigators, and morbidly curious individuals.

Numerous entirely new ad hoc committees could be appointed to consider various aspects of the evaluation and prepare summaries, recommend remedial
action, and consider future possibilities for extrapolation of the evaluation data.

Diminution of student and staff effort to obtain data necessary to generate demonstrations, parades, and counter-demonstrations would be facilitated. Similarly, legislative investigations would be aided and public interest groups representing voters, taxpayers and taxing agencies could obtain insights into University organization and operation not otherwise available.

And before anyone would realize what had happened the academic year would be over and the University would be ready for the next round of anonymous evaluation. This could go on indefinitely since there are always enough changes in staff, students and agencies to require new evaluations.

Perhaps the best things that could occur from this activity would be that it would keep students occupied without the necessity for them to study; and would keep staff occupied without the necessity for them to administer, teach, research, or perform normal housekeeping. Conceivably these evaluative activities could continue until the University crumbled into dust from lack of conventional activity, or until the taxpayers got tired of watching the amusing spectacle of Education undressing herself in public and decided to spend their money on more esthetic and appropriate burlesque.

However, I like to think that there is a variant in this particular Pandora's Box. As classicists may recall, the last thing in the original box - after all the plagues and pests were loosed upon the world - was hope. In this box - hopefully - the first thing released would be the hope that we are sane enough to recognize that an egalitarian approach to an essentially authoritarian structure is stupid and futile and productive of nothing but chaos and disruption.

Jesse F. Bone
Veterinary Medicine
January 18, 1973
DECISION-MAKING IN PROMOTION AND
TENURE CASES

In reaching decisions concerning promotion and/or appointment to indefinite tenure of faculty members, the faculty and administration of a modern university face severe problems. These arise from:

1) the several demands (teaching, research, and service) that a faculty member must meet. The relative importance and the identification of these roles are not well defined.

2) the difficulty in obtaining and evaluating evidence regarding the past performance of the candidate in these areas.

3) the even greater difficulty in estimating future performance (an evaluation generally considered critical for tenure appointment) of the candidate in each of these areas.

The authors have participated, at Oregon State and other universities, in many such decisions. The gravity of the problem has caused us to give it considerable thought and we suggest that the difficulties in making such decisions fairly and justly and in a well-documented fashion require more rational public discussion than has been the case thus far. We wish to add at the outset that, although in our experience the process in general leads to acceptable decisions, it contains the risk for major errors and that such errors are not uncommon.

Before proceeding further, we wish to state that we assume at all levels that the faculty member performs, at least nominally, the formal duties required of his function such as teaching courses assigned to him, presenting in these courses subject matter relevant to the course and of required minimal quality, meeting his students and discharging his share of the departmental functions.

It is only with respect to the first of the three problem areas outlined above that the rules of procedure of a university give much help. In most large land grant universities general policy holds that all three areas of activity are of importance. There appears to be a consensus that truly outstanding performance in all three is not to be expected of any individual and that a healthy university faculty will have a spectrum of abilities over this range. Thus, some individuals may be truly outstanding researchers, average teachers and perform only limited "service" functions. Others may exhibit relatively little research productivity, but be truly inspiring teachers or contribute strongly in service to university, state and country. The large university needs all types and each and the whole benefit from interaction with the others. However, two general rules seem to apply, especially in consideration for tenure:
1) Some competence in every area is expected.
2) Outstanding performance in at least one area is mandatory.

The real problems, of course, arise in judging what is meant by "outstanding". Let us consider teaching and research separately, for the sources of information and methods of evaluation are quite different. We shall not discuss the evaluation of service functions, for it seems to us that these are more easily defined and measured and, since teaching and research are the basic functions of a university, play a somewhat secondary role in the evaluation.

Teaching - There are no universally accepted measures of good teaching. There are, of course, opinions as to what information should be sought. Some would rely upon student evaluation while others maintain that such evaluations are worthless, especially if obtained at the time the course was taught. The student's immediate reaction to a course may bear little relation to what he has learned or will retain, and objective methods for evaluating the long-term learning in the diverse classes of a university do not exist. A study of considerable interest in this respect, published by M. and B. Rodin in "Science" (vol. 177(4055), p. 1164-1166, 1972), concludes that the correlation between quality teaching of enduring value and student evaluation can be negative. Others tend to rely on evaluation by colleagues and department heads, but many would point out that this depends largely on hearsay and is biased by the social relationships within a department. It may be noted that the situation is further complicated by significant differences in teaching procedures between undergraduate and graduate courses. Many instructors are not equally proficient at both.

Thus, it comes down to this: only the remarkably good teacher or the abysmally poor one can be easily identified. Consequently, faculty panels and administrators only really consider teaching ability in such instances. While this is unfortunate, there is little else they can do. Department heads, in recommending faculty members for promotion or tenure, will routinely report that "X" is a good teacher. No one can say nay, but the very uniformity of the response renders it of little use.

Research - Here the evidence is more concrete but the evaluation of it still difficult. The evidence consists of two sorts: publications describing the research, and the evaluation of the research by colleagues within and outside the university. We note that the status of an individual among his peers nationally and internationally is a function, not only of his published research papers, but also of other, less concrete components such as the stimulation in written and spoken word provided to his colleagues, his degree of leadership in developing research, his willingness to cooperate and share and many other imponderabilia.
It is often suspected that "counting" of publications is the principal criterion applied by administrators, but in our experience the evaluation is almost always more sophisticated. And this it must be because:

a) Publication of a paper in a journal for which it must be passed upon by referees prior to publication is more meaningful than publication in media which automatically accept whatever is presented. Even within the set of refereed journals it is widely acknowledged that there are several levels of excellence and rigor in each field. Hence, it is not just a question of how much was published, but also where.

b) The number and length of papers that must be published for a comparable contribution to knowledge varies widely from discipline to discipline and even changes with the evolution of a single field of endeavor. For example, a biochemist may routinely publish five or six short papers per year, a mathematician one or even less, yet both may be contributing equally to scholarship. In a highly competitive field, the scholar may opt for frequent brief publications to serve his field better, whereas in a more leisurely one contributions tend to be more comprehensive, longer, and less frequent.

c) The style of individuals varies in a way which bears no relationship to their overall impact on human knowledge: some present their material in many small packages, others are honored for only a few major contributions in a lifetime. Some may seek out problems that are difficult and time-consuming to solve and carry a large risk of failure while others mold their careers from more rapid and sure undertakings, sometimes even with a calculating eye on the realities of academic life.

For these reasons, a record of publication alone is difficult to judge. Even more important, it is insufficient. The value of a scholar to a university derives largely from the quality of the colleagues and students he attracts to the university, and the way he inspires them, by teaching and example, to seek the truth above all else. Thus, to judge his value we must look to the respect he commands among his peers in his own and related fields in and outside his university. It is not enough that he be highly regarded locally; the university will not grow through internal mutual backpattting, and the dangers inherent in small closed communities are obvious. Thus, the administration and faculty panels must turn to outside evaluation.

A new problem then arises. How are the evaluators to be chosen? Very often those who make this decision are not themselves expert in the field of the candidate. Because of this, there is frequent reliance upon individuals suggested by the department in question and by the candidate himself. There are obvious dangers here, but if the reviewers are chosen from a variety of schools in good standing, are not close personal friends of the candidate and exhibit themselves the markings of
eminence in their field, one usually feels relatively safe. One thing is clear: such outside referees provide a much more reliable index of the stature of the candidate in his field than any local review. In case of doubt, this is the advice that should be listened to.

All such means of evaluation leave one question unanswered: will the candidate in the future perform in a manner consistent with his past record? We submit that there is really no way to ascertain this, that all opinions are guesses, and that they should be disregarded. Every university has examples of people who have at some point simply stopped being productive in a scholarly manner, and of others who have unexpectedly caught fire. Even the device of looking for recent lapses in bursts of activity turns out, under close scrutiny, to be unreliable.

Scholarship and research, especially in some fields, are not production-line oriented. A physicist, for example, direct his interests to new kinds of problems and require several years of reorientation before he begins again to produce. A mathematician may encounter unexpected difficulties in the development of a line of analysis which may delay him for months or discover, when all has been brought to a successful end, that a colleague elsewhere, unknown to him, has just developed the same and already published it. In last analysis, an estimate of future performance is entirely predicated upon judgement of his past performance.

The system of decision-making as outlined above, seems inefficient and fraught with possibility of error. However, it is not easy to see how it can be improved, and years of effort by those involved in the process have not resulted in any significant changes. It must also be said that, in the main, it has been used with success by the most outstanding universities. Indeed, it is the mark of the weak universities to disregard these criteria, in particular the outside peer review, and to rely strongly on internal judgement by colleagues or administrators, or on highly codifiable criteria such as seniority, teaching load, grant dollars, number of Ph.D. students and similar quantifiable parameters. In the long run, the standing of a scholar and of his university are what they are in the eyes of the outside expert beholder, whether he judges by the quality of scholarly output or by the quality and number of graduates. Only at their peril can universities place their own internal judgement of the quality of personnel and product over that of the world they live in.

K. E. Van Holde
professor of Biophysics

Tj. H. van Andel
professor of Oceanography

January 17, 1973
AUTHORITY

Last January I wrote that education was an authoritarian system. As a result I have received a number of telephone calls and notes taking issue with me on this point. I am forced to conclude from this that the dissenters understand the limited definition of the word but have little concept of its broader meaning or of its place in a free society.

Admittedly, the word "authority" is not popular. Indeed, for the past decade there has been a widely publicized revolt against authority on campuses and elsewhere. Authority has become confused with coercion and enforcement and has gained the reputation that it is opposed to the ideal of freedom. Nothing could be farther from the truth.

Authority is not coercion. It is not based upon force or the threat of force. It is not the tyranny of the cabal or the inept majority, nor the tyranny of the ruler and his henchmen. It is, on the contrary, the preserver of order in a free society; the tangible expression of the moral and cultural consensus that must prevail if a free society is to exist. Freedom is not possible without authority - without a decent respect for the judgment that is embodied in professionals, specialists, officers, and administrators. A free society is built on a framework of laws, rules, customs, ideals, beliefs and associations that are essentially consensual and authoritarian rather than imposed and coercive. Ideally, the interactions between people combine to produce both the expression and the acceptance of the fact that some individuals and groups have more expertise and knowledge in certain areas than do others, and that judgments of these knowledgable persons form the moral and intellectual basis of a free culture. It is education's task to help produce such authorities, and at the same time to exercise authority over those in whom it is being produced in order to foster disciplined thinking and to preserve and promote a free society liberated insofar as possible from any form of tyranny.

One cannot equate freedom and coercion, but freedom and authority are synergistic. Authority is a vital element that is necessary for the proper evaluation of social works, art, science, education and law. Without it there can be neither taste, nor justice, nor learning, nor a social order. There can be only anarchy or absolutism.
To confuse authority with coercion is to confuse intellectual or moral consensus with brute force. The one is arrived at by an association of free people, the other is imposed by a despotism or a mob. Revolt against authority is ipso facto a revolt against freedom. Its consequences are cultural sterility, lack of social consciousness, infantilism, exhibitionism, sensuality, materialism, cowardice and a general degradation of both the nation and the people who inhabit it. Carried to its logical extreme, revolt against authority becomes revolt against life itself. It is respect for legitimate and duly constituted authority that is a mark of culture and civilization, not this revolting sickness of our times that has the temerity to at once demand a dictatorial ruler, tyrannical majority, and the authority of pressure groups - and the gall to call such a melange "freedom".

Jesse F. Bone
Veterinary Medicine
February 23, 1973

[Editorial note: Professor Bone's paper above was the only one submitted for publication in the March issue. With his permission and as an economy measure, publication of Professor Bone's paper was held for an April issue. But again no other papers were received by the end of the month deadline and again Professor Bone kindly consented to have his paper held until May. When the following paper from Professor Harter was received shortly after the deadline and when the above matters were reported on April 9 to the Faculty Senate's Executive Committee, they asked that both papers be published in this April issue. DBN.]
Collective Bargaining for Professors in Oregon

In the next few weeks we shall witness a campaign to bring collective bargaining to professors in Oregon. Some will embrace it eagerly and others will approach it with dread. We who have been watching it spread across the nation are surprised how the momentum is increasing. The question may now be changed from "should we" to "how do we live with it".

Why are we faced with collective bargaining when by tradition we are dedicated individualists? Why should we experiment with collective bargaining at the expense of our collegial system? The answer is that many of our colleagues feel they are no longer appreciated by the public, by the administration, and by the students. Our economic well-being is threatened by the financial squeeze imposed by taxpayers and the legislature. While our neighbors clog the roads with their campers, trailers, and boats, we are told that the public cannot afford to finance higher education adequately. Our salaries with a few exceptions have trailed the rise in the cost of living. We can see no end to inflation and no prospect that the state will grant us any substantial relief.

In the last biennium the bulk of the faculty received $400 or 4% which ever was smaller in the first year of the biennium. The situation was worse in the second. While the papers stated that the average increase was to be 3%, the vast majority received far less than that. In effect, talented, hard-working, and long-serving professors were told they did not deserve the average. Meanwhile the cost of living has inexorably mounted. Now in this biennium the Governor recommends 5% average increase in each year of biennium. However, most of us suspect that after merit money is subtracted there will not be enough to provide raises sufficiently high to compensate for the rise in cost of living for the majority (unless administrators change their methods of distribution). Even if everyone receives a flat 5% increase, such raises are not likely to represent significant improvements in anyone's standard of living.

But our salaries are only part of the story. Our university and its sister institutions are in a severe financial bind. During the period of rapid increases in enrollment we over-extended ourselves. We created new programs, sometimes at the expense of student-teacher ratios. Yet what we did was modest compared to what our competitors did. Because our legislature was never generous, we stretched our resources thinly. Now we are experiencing a small decline in enrollments. While having a few less students in each class does little to reduce our costs, our base budget is cut significantly. Unless the legislature modifies its financing method or compensates us for our loss, we face even more financial trouble. Unfortunately the Governor and the legislature find higher education an expensive luxury with a priority ranking below property tax relief and other politically attractive programs.
Austerity forces administrators to make unpopular decisions. There is no popular way to handle cuts in programs which means loss of jobs. When some people face higher work-loads because of shifts in enrollment or loss of colleagues, often there can be little relief. These whose work-loads are dropping have more reason to be anxious than thankful.

There was a time when all new colleagues could expect to receive tenure if they performed reasonably. Today few can have such confidence. At the very least the final tenure decision is delayed, and for many may be negative. Until then the non-tenured undergo yearly evaluations explaining why they are not making it.

A few years ago anyone who received tenure could believe that his promotion to associate and finally to full professor were merely a matter of time. No one can hold such views realistically today. After several unsuccessful evaluations many will suspect they may never make it.

Full professors can no longer feel they have it made either. Student evaluations remind most professors that they are nothing special. When they compare their ratings with their colleagues they discover them to be about average (whatever the average rating students assign). Faint praise also comes to them from departmental evaluations unless the chairman has something special to say or understands how to motivate people. By and large both student and administrative evaluations are likely to be disappointing. Most of us are not thrilled with evaluations which do not distinguish us from our colleagues.

We keep hearing that the tenure system is under attack. Students would abolish it and some administrators are unhappy with it. Members of the public and the legislature keep asking how can they get rid of the incompetent. While we know that Oregon is not likely to take on a further disadvantage by becoming the first and perhaps only state to abolish tenure, the contempt such a desire expresses irritates us.

Our collegial system seems to be eroding. We no longer have the influence we once had. Our administrators have become a remote elite. They may be good men and women, but they are less and less our men and women. The Chancellor has bluntly told us that he does not represent us. His responsibility is to the Board. We should shift for ourselves.

Elsewhere organized faculties are making economic gains through collective bargaining. In our own state we find the members of the legislature listening respectfully to the classified employees who have collective bargaining. It is obvious to those of us who have talked to members of the legislature that they regard the agreement bargained through two months of negotiations between the governor and the O.S.E.A. as a firm commitment. The Governor recommends 6.5% for them and only 5% for us. It is also obvious that his recommendation for us is a figure which we may or may not get. Many of the legislators have told us flatly that we should organize.
After a meeting with legislators, members of the Southern Oregon College faculty took this advice seriously. Within days after 13 out of about 250 faculty members (all first year teachers who are not entitled to one year timely notice) received termination notices, the majority petitioned the state Public Employees Relations Board for a bargaining election. Because a majority of both the Portland State University and Oregon State University faculties had expressed interests in collective bargaining in informal surveys, the O.S.E.A. Board of Directors decided to seek a state-wide election in which it might gain exclusive representation. The decision will be ours to make in the next few weeks.

At this point competing organizations do not appear strong enough to challenge O.S.E.A. The American Federation of Teachers lacks strength and would have little chance unless the A. F. L. -C. I. O. would pump in funds. Its advantage would be the considerable power of organized labor in Oregon and its influence with the legislature. Like the A. F. T. the N. E. A. has very little membership among professors. Its advantage would be with the support of its affiliate the O.E.A. The third competitor is A.A.U.P. While it has a special appeal to faculty members, insufficient members have joined to make it a strong contender in Oregon. Furthermore, it lacks the strong allies of the A. F. T. and N. E. A. O.S.E.A. has the largest number of members: 1400 out of about 4500 potential members. It will need more before it can commit itself definitely. It has the advantage of 16,000 total members including classified employees. No legislature can afford to earn the antagonism of this organization.

What would collective bargaining mean? Except for the economic gains most faculty members may see little difference on the surface. No one seriously expects turmoil and strikes. Political pressure is more likely. We will see contracts both on the state level and on the campus level spelling out both the rights and responsibilities of faculty members and administrators. When we have a grievance, we will no longer need to plead. A grievance procedure will handle the situation. We will win some and lose some. At least we will know where we stand. Such traditions as academic freedom, faculty participation in curricular matters, relations with students, and other matters are not likely to change. We will have a voice and a vote in whatever organization wins, if we join it. Then we can make it what we want it to be.

L. G. Harter, Jr.
Department of Economics
April 5, 1973
As a member of the English Department I periodically receive complaints from OSU faculty asking, "Why don't you people teach our students how to write?" But the faculty needs to improve its own writing, as is illustrated by the "Report of the Ad Hoc Committee on Faculty Workloads." Take for instance the sentence, "The university as an institution is a structure that has developed over centuries to transform inputs, consisting of faculty and student efforts, into outputs, or products." What does this Frankenstein's monster of a sentence say? Cleared of most of its meaningless phrases, it says, "The university transforms inputs into outputs." After "centuries" of development, that is what we do, apparently, though I do not understand what transforming inputs into outputs means.

Or take the sentence, "The committee believes that accountability of the University to the supporting public requires the identification of improved measures of University output and faculty performance despite the problems of identifying and measuring inputs and outputs." Through this underbrush of verbiage one can faintly discern some meaning, which seems to be, "The University ought to find better ways to evaluate the things that it does." A harmless but maybe reasonable suggestion.

On the other hand, take the sentence, "The second important problem in measurement of faculty and University performance derives from the fact that instruction, research, and public service are complementary in their production in the sense that fewer resources are required to produce the several and diverse University outputs together at the same institution than if they were produced separately." Even with a machete one could not hack his way through to the meaning here.

Presumably the report of the Ad Hoc committee was meant to communicate, since it was printed (no doubt at some expense) and distributed to the faculty. But meaningless phrases, inflated diction, and modish jargon about inputs and outputs communicates nothing, except perhaps a headache or rage. At the least, a shrewd person would be intensely suspicious at so much obfuscation.
This is not meant as an attack on the people who wrote the report. They have simply contracted a badly infected rhetoric, an ailment that used to flourish only in Government bureaus and big business but is now spreading everywhere. It is meant as an attack on a kind of writing that has neither grace nor simple clarity. Until the faculty itself writes well it can expect little from the students, since writing, like other skills, is learned mainly through imitation. And until faculty reports are well written, the printing and distributing of them is wasteful, since few can or will read them.

Willard Potts
English Department
April 24, 1973
A Question About Our Representation By O.S.E.A.

The events of a year ago in regard to our Major Medical Insurance may serve as an illustrative example of the problem of faculty representation by O.S.E.A. The insurance pool of which we were members was changed from a national college faculty group (T.I.A.A.) to the employees of the State of Oregon in general. One unfortunate result was that the several plans of coverage made available were those negotiated for all state employees in general, and did not include one specifically designed for faculty members. Another result was a very substantial increase in our out-of-pocket expense, despite the introduction of a state contribution towards the premium payment. These changes, which were lobbied for by O.S.E.A., may have been to the advantage of state employees on the average, but were certainly detrimental to the O.S.U. faculty.

Wouldn't the same sort of problem arise if O.S.E.A. became the official bargaining agent for the O.S.U. Faculty?

John T. Yoke
Chemistry
April 26, 1973
Authority and Responsibility

If the OSU faculty adopts compulsory union membership or universal financing of the faculty union, this may well come about as the result of the same administrative neglect, alienation, and mismanagement which prompted unionization elsewhere. Prof. L. G. Harter in the April issue of Faculty Forum Papers described the way in which higher education administrators nationwide stand aloof from their onetime colleagues as a new and "remote elite" who at times contribute to the widespread contempt for faculty when wishing out loud for an end to tenure. Evaluations, often based on hearsay, damn teaching faculty with "faint praise", as Prof. Harter describes it.

Capricious assignment of teaching loads would rank high on any nationwide listing of administrative abuses which push faculty members reluctantly toward collective bargaining. From reports of colleagues at national meetings many can confirm that gross distortions exist in the teaching duties assigned among colleagues where all of them get paid entirely from "Resident Instruction" funds or the equivalent. It is not unusual for one-fourth of a departmental faculty to do more than half the work of teaching and production of new teaching materials. When questioned, some administrators rationalize such irregularities as necessary to lure research grants. But the more heavily loaded faculty members note that (1) the released-time research often has little if any relevance to the remaining small amount of teaching performed by the faculty researchers, (2) the heavily loaded teaching professors get little recognition, if any, for the fact that their teaching loads preclude grantsmanship, and (3) even the production of widely used textbooks for their own courses will not rate accolades in annual evaluations.

Authority, as Prof. Jesse F. Bone observed in the April issue, is "the preserver of order in a free society." It is the "working under orders" as declared by the Roman captain in Luke 7:8. Authority is constructive when it expresses responsibility to its source and when its competent use assures accomplishment of the objectives stated by the source of that authority. Many professors in the nation believe administrators tend to act arbitrarily and with no relation to their responsibility for wise use of manpower, talent, and resources within the academic tradition.

The "collegial relationship" which Prof. Harter sees as "eroding" did at one time exist with teaching faculty and administrators bound together by cordial ties of common endeavor as a company of teaching scholars. Many present faculty members sought to participate in serious adult education and did it with production of instructional aids for their own students which would prove worthy of widespread adoption by others guiding students to the frontier of knowledge or to the threshold of professional careers. Sadly today many veteran faculty members feel themselves ignored by administrators too busy with "management"
to cultivate faculty morale with words and deeds of recognition. And the managers make some loyal professors feel trapped when denied pay raises because, they suspect, cynical officials regard them as not likely to give up tenure to seek better opportunities.

A widespread suspicion exists in the U. S. among many teaching faculty that the evaluators merely reinforce their previous evaluations and decisions when they render new annual evaluations. The more elaborate the evaluation system, therefore, the more entrenched and buttressed with documentation will become the faculty "pecking-order" reflecting prejudices of academic administrators who wish to impose their own bias rather than provide catalytic leadership toward evolving a collegial set of goals, objectives, and policies.

Teaching faculty members also have abundant reason to suspect that some of the country's administrators favor grantsmen over teachers. Grants bring overhead funds, and at some universities these become "slush funds" not subject to the budgeting and purposes prescribed by the governing boards for other funds. Urging all the faculty to seek grants for research may, moreover, merely divert some competent talent to "blue sky" research of a useless nature. Inevitably, some thus diverted to grantsmanship will be lost forever to teaching and to the critical scrutiny of their subject matter to improve course content.

Across the nation many highly qualified teaching professors trying to uphold standards of learning have encountered student scorn in the anonymous evaluations. These provide the documentation for administrative acts discouraging such traditionalists by denying pay, promotion, or both without due process. Not uncommonly the evaluations by academic administrators have no great basis in observation but rely upon circumstantial evidence and unreliable sources for unproven conclusions.

Authority may inevitably be exercised capriciously if people in authority do not feel an obligation to act responsibly. Senate Bill 1 in the 1973 Session of the Oregon Legislature contains provisions which could promote such a feeling of responsibility in Oregon and thereby provide a national model for correcting the defects described above. SB 1 came from the Interim Committee on Education and is at present before the Senate Educational Committee. It provides for setting educational goals and objectives and for evaluating personnel. It in Sec. 9 mandates the State Board to "assign highest priority to the teaching-learning process" at state institutions of higher education. In Sec. 11 the bill requires evaluation of faculty according to the actual duties, i.e., teachers for teaching, researchers for research, and administrators for administration.

Copies of SB 1 can be obtained from the Bill Room at the State Capitol or from the Senate Education Committee. Colleagues interested in testifying on this bill may contact the committee office or file statements with the committee.
Constructive action on SB 1, possibly amended to require employment of external, impartial, independent, and professional evaluation, could go a long way toward ameliorating the unhappy circumstances described above, whether or not colleagues opt for a union as collective bargaining agent.

Support for the higher education provisions of SB 1 in Sections 9 and 11, or constructive proposals for change in those sections can today work toward accomplishments which must otherwise await years of negotiation and bargaining, even with the most effective professors' union.

Fred W. Decker

30 April 1973

Fred W. Decker
Atmospheric Sciences
Proposed OSU Faculty Records Policy

The proposed OSU Faculty Records Policy states: "The faculty member has the right to review with appropriate University personnel any information contained in his personal file." This policy if adopted will be to the detriment of the University and, in the long run, to the detriment of the individual faculty member.

The evaluation of a faculty member's performance is based in part on letters from colleagues, outside reviewers, and students. In order to guarantee a clear, critical, and forthright evaluation, it is essential that the authors of these letters remain unknown to their subjects. We can well imagine the reluctance with which a student will give an opinion of a professor, knowing that this opinion may well be read by that professor. We can also imagine the bland comments that we will write about our colleagues in order to spare ourselves future embarrassment on meeting them in the halls. We can sense the difficulty of extracting critical discussion from outside reviewers who know that their remarks will not be held in confidence.

Should this policy be adopted, the written subjective evaluations in the files will degenerate to cautiously phrased comments of little value. Subjective evaluation will then be based on oral statements, of which no record will remain, or, worse yet, on what one remembers of someone else's oral statements. Adoption of this policy may well lead to a decision-making process that is more, rather than less, capricious than the present one.

T. Darrah Thomas
Chemistry
May 14, 1973
From A Smear Born of Ignorance

or

A Little Knowledge is Dangerous

John T. Yoke has, in the May 1973 Faculty Forum Papers, focused upon a misunderstanding which may be prevalent on our campus and concerns major medical insurance, the Oregon State Employees Association, and collective bargaining. The following chronology of events should assist those faculty who have been without benefit of additional information.

The 1969 O.S.E.A. General Council passed a resolution (Working Conditions No. 11) calling for an impartial study of the State Services fringe benefits. A resultant Blue Ribbon Committee appointed by O.S.E.A. and composed of members from O.S.E.A., the state legislature, and private industry, reported June 30, 1970, that the most needed fringe benefit was improvement of, and state monetary contribution toward, medical and hospitalization insurance programs for state employees. Subsequently, the governor appointed a committee (known as the Governor's Task Force) to draft medical legislation identifying four plans: basic, major medical, a comprehensive combination of the first two and the Kaiser Plan.

Our present medical and hospitalization insurance plan, and the $10.00 per month state contribution became law during the 1971 legislative session. Immediately, the seven member State Employees Benefits Board, not O.S.E.A., was charged with finding a carrier and administering the program.
It should now be apparent that O.S.E.A. did not write our present medical and hospitalization insurance program, nor did O.S.E.A. find it necessary to "lobby" in support of medical and hospitalization insurance program statutes which were by then already enacted. O.S.E.A. had, through General Council, sought a state monetary contribution toward, and improvement of our medical and hospitalization program during the latter 1960's. O.S.E.A. continues to seek improvement of the present plan.

The "very substantial increase in our out-of-pocket expense" covering additional major medical benefits, was in reality approximately $8.00 per month for 291 former T.I.A.A. members with families from the group of 3,150 faculty and staff and O.S.U. who are presently members of the Blue Cross Plan. It is questionable that four persons who really complained to the Employment and Staff Benefits Office about the premium increase were spokesmen for the faculty.

John Yokel's vague "same sort of a problem" concerning the O.S.U. Faculty and O.S.E.A.'s interests as a bargaining agent is actually nonexistent. One should remember that any collective bargaining agent is hired to work toward goals specified by members of the bargaining unit, even a faculty unit.

Frank W. Adams
Agricultural Chemistry
May 11, 1973
Secretary, O.S.E.A. - O.S.U.
Faculty Chapter No. 72
Advance Notice of Criteria for Faculty Evaluation

Proposed state tenure rules for faculty include the requirement that institutions establish criteria for the periodic pre-tenure and post-tenure evaluations of faculty members. However, the proposed administrative rules for the State Board of Higher Education presented for the Public Hearing on 22 May left open the matter of revealing such criteria in advance so that presumably the criteria might not actually come to light until the time of making the annual evaluation.

A suggestion on behalf of the University Professors for Academic Order (UPAO) presented at the hearing asked that the Board consider including "provisions for making known to each faculty member the criteria which will apply to the evaluation of his performance...at the beginning of the period of service over which he will later be evaluated." The UPAO statement also suggested providing for appeal of the "appropriateness of the criteria" for any individual faculty member in the light of his duties.

Objective evaluation needs a definitive statement of criteria before the period of service evaluated rather than to leave the way open to the suspicion that the criteria have been selected subjectively afterward. Moreover, a faculty member who knows in advance the standard to measure his performance will more likely demonstrate superior performance. If the criteria do not truly fit his own assignment, then he should obtain a reconciliation of criteria and assignment before a substantial part of his service year has passed, lest inadequate communication result between professor and evaluator.

Colleagues who believe the foregoing concepts advanced by the UPAO represent academic good order should file supporting statements with the State Board. The proposed administrative rules regarding tenure are still open in a public hearing which was continued from the meeting of 22 May to the 23 July meeting of the State Board of Higher Education. Communications in writing or oral statements will be received by the Board for the 23 July meeting. The proposed tenure rules obtainable from the Chancellor's Office at Eugene deserve scrutiny by all faculty colleagues, and the Board deserves a candid faculty response via the Public Hearing. "Speak now, or forever hold your peace!"

Fred W. Decker,
Vice-President, UPAO.

Atmospheric Sciences

31 May 1973
FACULTY PERCEPTIONS OF
PROMOTION AND PRACTICES AT OSU

In March, 1973, the AAUP Subcommittee on Promotion and Tenure (then consisting of W. P. Stephen, Chairman; Peter C. List, G. J. Masilionis, David W. Schacht) distributed a questionnaire to almost all regular OSU faculty at the rank of instructor and above. The questionnaire dealt with existing practices at OSU with respect to tenure and promotion of faculty. The findings summarized below, represent the perceptions of roughly 29% (396 people) of the faculty at OSU, in all its various schools and colleges. In explaining their findings, the Subcommittee decided to use a narrative scale of language based on percentages of responses to individual questions. The scale follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>% response:</th>
<th>0-10</th>
<th>11-20</th>
<th>21-30</th>
<th>31-40</th>
<th>41-50</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>narrative</td>
<td>hardly</td>
<td>a small</td>
<td>a small</td>
<td>a signi-</td>
<td>a near</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>language:</td>
<td>anyone</td>
<td>number</td>
<td>minority</td>
<td>ficant</td>
<td>majority</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>minority</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51-60</td>
<td>61-75</td>
<td>76-90</td>
<td>91-100</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a</td>
<td>a signi-</td>
<td>a vast</td>
<td>nearly</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>majority</td>
<td>ficant</td>
<td>majority</td>
<td>everyone</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>majority</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This report does not discuss all of the results of the questionnaire, but rather those which the Subcommittee took to be most important. The findings are split into three sections: Section A reports the perceptions of faculty about practices and procedures on promotion and tenure at the institutional level; Section B reports on perceptions in respect to the Dean's office level; Section C reports on perceptions at the departmental level. The greatest depth of response occurs in this last section due to the fact that the questionnaire concentrated on perceptions of faculty at the departmental level. In each section, perceptions about the desirability of certain practices are also reported.
Section A: General Procedures and Practices in the University

1. A significant majority of the respondents feel that it is not desirable that tenure should be accompanied by promotion in rank.
2. A vast majority of respondents feel that promotion in rank should be accompanied by significant increase in salary.
3. A vast majority of respondents think it desirable that there be periodic evaluation of the tenure of chairmanships and deanships.

Section B: Procedures and Practices of the Dean's Office in the respective Schools and Colleges at OSU

1. A significant minority of respondents at the time the questionnaire was distributed (March 12, 1973), either had not been given and/or had not read the tenure and promotion guidelines distributed by the Dean of Faculty's Office, yet nearly all respondents thought it desirable that they do so.
2. A significant minority believe that their school or college does not have a promotion and tenure committee to review recommendations from departments. Yet a vast majority think it desirable that they have such a committee.
3. A significant minority feel that discriminatory practices of an unjustifiable sort (36%) have been evident in respect to promotion and tenure on the part of their Dean's office. And nearly all respondents think that such practices are undesirable, when they exist.

Section C: Procedures and Practices at the Departmental Level

1. A near majority of respondents claim that they have not been informed of changes in departmental policies on tenure and promotion prior to their implementation, yet nearly everyone thinks it desirable that they should be so informed.
2. A significant minority of respondents believe that they have not been given a statement of departmental policy on tenure and promotion, yet nearly everyone thinks it desirable that they be given such a statement.
3. A small majority claim that they have not been given detailed information as to the exact nature of their duties and responsibilities in their departments.
(A near majority have not been given a verbal statement of such duties and responsibilities, though a vast majority think it desirable that they should. And a significant majority claim not to have been given a written statement, though a significant majority think it desirable that they should.)

4. The vast majority claim that a departmental committee is used to screen and recommend faculty for tenure, and nearly everyone thinks this is desirable. As for the method of choosing the committee members, a significant majority claim that the department head or chairman is involved, but only a small majority believe this is desirable. A near majority claim that the members are elected by departmental faculty, yet a significant majority believe this is desirable. Hardly anyone thinks the dean is involved, and the vast majority think it is desirable that he is not.

5. A small minority claim that departmental committee recommendations accompany in toto those of the departmental chairman or head to the dean, and the vast majority think this is desirable.

6. Criteria for granting promotion and tenure: presently a significant majority of respondents think the most significant criteria are currently prepared by departmental faculty; a vast majority think them currently prepared in addition by the departmental head or chairman; a majority think them prepared by the president's office; and a small number think them prepared by the faculty at large (faculty senate). Yet a vast majority think departmental faculty should be involved; only a majority think the departmental head or chairman should be involved; while a significant majority think the president's office should not be involved; and a significant minority think the faculty at large in the institution (faculty senate) ought to be involved.

7. Materials considered in evaluating faculty for promotion and tenure: a vast majority of respondents think that teaching effectiveness, research effectiveness, service to the institution and the community, are considered, and that letters of evaluation are currently used, in such evaluations. Nearly everyone thinks that teaching effectiveness is a desirable criterion for evaluation; while a vast majority think that the other criteria are also desirable. Only a small number of respondents presently claim that classroom visitation by peers and by department head or chairman are used in evaluating teaching effectiveness, yet a significant majority believe both methods are desirable. A vast
majority claim that formal evaluation by students is presently used as a method in such teaching evaluations, while a significant majority think this is desirable. In addition a significant majority of respondents claim that other means are used in such evaluations and a vast majority think these other means are desirable.

8. Departmental procedures on promotion and tenure: only a small minority of respondents claim that they were asked to appear before the review committee, the department head, and/or the dean, yet a significant majority think it is desirable that they should be allowed to appear. A vast majority believe that faculty peers should be interviewed by either the review committee or the department head in making the evaluation about tenure and promotion, yet only a near majority think this is presently done.

9. Nearly everyone thinks it desirable that a faculty member not recommended for promotion and/or tenure be given reasons for this decision, yet a small minority claim this is not being done. When asked whether current standards for awarding promotion and tenure contribute to high morale, low morale, or do not make an important contribution to morale in their departments, only a small number (18%) thought that they contribute to high morale, while a majority (52%) thought that they contribute to low morale, with the rest maintaining that they do not contribute in an important way to morale.

10. Only a small minority of the respondents claimed to have been denied either a promotion or tenure award. Of these, a significant majority were given a verbal statement to this effect by the departmental head or chairman, while only a small minority were given a written statement. Yet a vast majority of respondents would like to have both a written and a verbal statement.

11. A small number of respondents were not aware that denial of promotion and tenure could be appealed (18%).

12. A significant minority (37%) of faculty respondents claim that unwarranted discriminatory practices in respect to promotion and tenure were evident in their departments while nearly everyone finds this to be undesirable. Perceptions about the frequency of such discrimination varied considerably within schools and colleges in the university, from a low of 9% of the faculty respondents in one school to a high of 80% in another.

Murray Wolfson
President, AAUP
August 22, 1973

David Carlson
Current Chairman,
AAUP Subcommittee on Tenure
and Promotion
At the risk of making public the fact that I have been slow-witted in not seeing it earlier, I have now come to realize that something is radically wrong about the way faculty members of the College of Liberal Arts are compensated, and what the remedy must be.

Here is a sample of some interesting figures, showing median starting salaries (i.e., for the first year in rank) of full professors, nation-wide. These figures are salary-only amounts; they do not include fringe benefits. All are computed for nine-month years.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Full professor of</th>
<th>Median starting salary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>French</td>
<td>$15,100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>German</td>
<td>16,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>History</td>
<td>15,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Languages (misc.)</td>
<td>16,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philosophy</td>
<td>15,300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychology</td>
<td>16,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sociology</td>
<td>15,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spanish</td>
<td>17,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Those who are familiar with typical starting salaries for professors in the College of Liberal Arts will observe that the median salaries shown in this table are not greatly out of line with what CLA professors are actually paid, but they will also notice that the great majority of CLA full professors who have been in rank from five to ten years are still at the level of these first-year-in-rank salaries.

Properly academic readers of what I have set down thus far will chide me, as they should, for failing to specify the year to which the data of the table apply, and the source of the table. I hasten to rectify the omission: the figures are excerpted from a report (which includes data for many disciplines, not just those I have cited) of the Commission on Administrative Affairs of the American Council on Education, and the full table, for all ranks and disciplines, may be found in The Chronicle of Higher Education of February 12, 1968. That’s right, 1968. The median starting salaries shown are for the academic year 1967-68!

I trust that the point has now been adequately made, but a little elaboration may do no harm. A certain full professor of philosophy whom I know intimately, now at last, in his sixth year in rank is to be paid a salary equal to the median starting salary for philosophy professors, nation-wide, six years ago. This cannot be owing to the fact that somebody up there does not like me (I am, in fact, well known to be thoroughly lovable), for my case is typical among full professors in the CLA. Moreover, CLA faculty of other
ranks have not, by the medians of the full table, been adequately paid either.

Faculty members in other schools of the university may wish to consult the source I have cited, or more current salary data if it is available by rank and discipline, to compare their own salary levels with those of their colleagues at other American universities. They may not like what they find.

My reluctant conclusion is that there is only one measure that can restore salary equity for us: unionization, at the earliest possible time.

I have not been enthusiastic about unionization in the past, but at the age of 52 I find that I am not too old to learn the hard way. Nor have I seen fit to join the OSEA, supposing that I had not enough in common with forklift operators to justify membership in an organization that embraces them and other non-academic types. Now I propose to join the organization, because it is the only organization that is pressing hard to represent the faculty in collective bargaining. If it is not the ideal organization to represent us, it is the only one that has shown any likelihood of doing so in the near future.

Peter Anton
Philosophy Department

September 18, 1973
Objectivity in Evaluation

For evaluations to have clear meaning we must know the desires of the evaluators which influence approval or disapproval of the teaching. The answers provided by my students in large courses last Spring Term indicated 38% favor classroom only course content with no reading assigned outside class, while about 50% wanted a list of questions from which all testing would come verbatim and 40% disapproved the answering of student questions in class. Disparate preferences among students in the same class will tend to frustrate efforts to earn good ratings unless instructors can arrange for the students holding opposing views to assemble as separate class sections which get treated according to their preferences. Such adaptation deserves consideration by the overwhelming majority of faculty members reported by the ACE as believing that promotions should depend upon teaching effectiveness measured at least in part by student evaluations (1).

"Appropriate student input" needs definition not yet stipulated by the new administrative regulations on tenure adopted by the State Board on 23 July 1973. In addition to possible contradictory preferences among students cited above, impediments to meaningful evaluation may include increasing student boredom with evaluations (2) and the susceptibility of any audience to dramatic illusions.

An amusing experiment at USC arose from published suggestions "that student ratings of educators depend largely on personality variables and not educational content" (3). In their experiment the USC investigators "programmed an actor to teach charismatically and nonsubstantively on a topic about which he knew nothing." The USC researchers reported that their experiment supported the hypothesis that "given a sufficiently impressive lecture paradigm, an experienced group of educators participating in a new learning situation can feel satisfied that they have learned despite irrelevant, conflicting, and meaningless content conveyed by the lecturer." Using the name "Dr. Myron L. Fox", the actor lectured to educators, psychiatrists, and administrators. The audience reaction reported on evaluation forms gave him very high numerical scores. Although these graduate audiences should have penetrated the fraud easily, they entered notes on the evaluation form such as "excellent presentation", "warm manner", "good flow", "lively examples", and "relaxed manner".

As "Professor X" says, "The professor who today would be great is one who combines wisdom with good stage presence. In short he has to be half ham." (4) Ernest van den Haag suggests it is likely that students will confuse present enjoyment of education with other returns from education (5). Dr. Fox doubtless provided enjoyment for his experienced graduate audiences.
The USC experiment points to the possibility of "training actors to give legitimate lectures as an innovative educational approach toward student-perceived satisfaction with the learning process", and the investigators also suggest providing "the scholar-educator with a more dramatic stage presence". Such emphases on classroom dramatics suggest the evolution of new patterns of higher education in which theatrical production techniques become important ingredients with experts in such productions contributing importantly to the administration of future colleges to enhance the teaching effectiveness. Possibly the pure subject-matter expert will assume the role of technical consultant to the writers, producers, and actors instead of himself vying for ratings as dramatic articulator. By 1984, a scant decade away, we may already see many recorded presentations on video cassettes leading to the lifelong educational advancement suggested by L. G. Heller (6).

Having clearly defined goals, criteria, and procedures for evaluation, universities may more surely ward off the evils of an academic spoils system and avert the accusation of subjectivity in conducting evaluations and making decisions on tenure and promotion. Leaving the criteria unstated or ambiguous, using irregular evaluation procedures, and failing to focus on priorities and clear objectives will invite such incidents as those reported in the press concerning the sudden dismissal last April of a 25-year veteran zoology professor from his tenured position at Idaho State University with the ensuing $2 Million lawsuit begun in August (7).
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Fred W. Decker
Atmospheric Sciences
THE UNMENTIONABLE IN FAIRYBOOK LAND

OR

"Let's Face It"

As one of a handful of men from Liberal Arts who formed a chapter of the American Federation of Teachers at OSU in 1967, I have followed with interest and amusement the recent palaver about collective bargaining. When we formed AFT, we received considerable vituperation from some of those who have most recently joined the cry for collective bargaining.

In those earlier days these critics hollered that AFT was a divisive force because it refused to accept that administrators and faculty were cozy colleagues working for the same ends. AFT's position was, and is, that administrators work for their own power, prestige, and salary increases and they will sell out the faculty to achieve them.

With the ascension of MacVicar, the validity of AFT's position has become increasing evident. In a variety of ways he has demonstrated both by acts and by words that he is working for the bosses above who hold him responsible, and he in turn is the boss who holds the minor foremen--deans and chairmen--responsible. They are his men, working for him, not for the faculty.

I appreciate the honesty of the man in making that position clear. He did so the first time he met with the Liberal Arts faculty and told us he would not tolerate our system of electing chairmen. He might, he said, go so far as to permit some secret consultations, but he would not allow any public voting because the faculty might choose someone who would not do his bidding and he would have to veto the choice.

One small group of sycophants, singing a tune of economics, chorused the superior wisdom of MacVicar. Although they did not represent the majority, the Liberal Arts faculty--the torch-bearers of Thoreau, Jefferson, Veblen, Socrates, and Christ--did not have the guts to refuse. So today we have secret consultations followed by a preferential vote, the results of which are never reported to the voters. In short, we can all prefer Moe, get Joe, and never know.

Now that the message of just who it is the administrators work for has gotten through to a number of faculty who refused to believe it seven years ago, we hear a cry for collective bargaining. Furthermore, we receive a clarion call to rally
around the white knight who will carry our banner into battle—none other than OSEA, some of whose illustrious leaders deplored the "unionism" and "unprofessionalism" of AFT back in 1967.

Before I join this latecomer on the field of battle, I want to know what weapons it is prepared to use. Talk? Even the students don't listen to most of us. Political clout? A total of 7,000 or fewer faculty throughout all of Oregon? Come now! The combined clout of OSEA? Maybe. But will the faculty really benefit from joining its interests with those of other state employees? I can't forget that as a consequence of being thrown into a state-wide employee group I now pay, in addition to the state contribution, twice as much as I did before for practically the same medical coverage.

Besides, labor history seems to show that numbers alone are not effective. The numbers must be matched by weapons and guts. Will OSEA use the weapon found effective by auto workers, truck drivers, prance pickers, aerospace workers, farmers, housewives, and filling station operators? The STRIKE! And the threat of STRIKE! When faculty requests are ignored by the bosses will OSEA call us to strike? And if it does, will we have the guts to answer the call?

Tell me no tales about public employees being barred from striking by state law. Public school teachers in the past ten years have defied such unequal laws. Their leaders have been beaten, arrested, jailed, and fined. But they have continued to win contract after contract improving the lot of teachers and students alike. These successes were not won through the mamby-pamby efforts of the old National Education Association, but through the militancy, be it good or bad, of the American Federation of Teachers. Its thrust has been so strong over the past few years that even the NEA has now become as militant or, in some instances, more militant in order to revitalize its sagging organization.

This letter is not, however, a plea for you to join AFT. Our local chapter is presently inactive. Nor is it a plea not to join OSEA. It is simply to suggest that before voting for collective bargaining or choosing OSEA as your bargaining agent, you ask yourself what weapons you expect OSEA to exercise in your behalf and what weapons you are prepared to exercise in your own behalf. If neither OSEA nor you are willing, if necessary, to use the STRIKE as a weapon against the bosses, then I suggest both of you will have capitulated before the battle begins.

Robert Jones
English Department
October 29, 1973
Rationale for Women's Studies

It may be shocking to some that any mention of sex should intrude upon our sacred intellectual quest. Yet women do encounter locked doors in the halls of learning. Women's Studies is one means of opening those doors. Women's Studies also provides opportunity to improve education for all our students. Perhaps this forum will help answer some of the many questions we are often asked.

Oregon State now provides equal educational opportunity for women and minorities. It is not enough to make this declaration, however, and expect it to become a reality for women without Women's Studies. Women still perceive their intellectual and economic roles very narrowly. Women as professors in the classroom and women administrators help to broaden women students' horizons and strengthen their aspirations.

Women are largely invisible in the traditional university curriculum. The answer to the question, why not Men's Studies? is that we already spend millions of dollars on Men's Studies under the guise of the traditional disciplines. As a matter of fact, it is possible for a student to graduate in many areas and know nothing about the role of women in their particular discipline.

Women's Studies is that realm of interdisciplinary knowledge which explores the nature of women, their role and contributions through the various disciplines. Courses therefore must be generated and offered within departments. A Women's Studies course, for example, might be called Images of Women in Literature and be offered by the English department. The only specific Women's Studies courses which may be offered are an introductory course and an occasional Women's Studies seminar. F.T.E. generated by the program thereby would go to participating departments. At the same time, responsibility for maintaining academic rigor and integrity rests quite properly within the specific discipline involved. At least this is the approach we would prefer campus.
There were 17 Women's Studies courses taught in the United States in 1969. Today there are 2700. Even though universities represent only 12 percent of America's higher education, 42 percent of these 2700 courses are taught in the universities.

Oregon State has already assumed a position of leadership in Women's Studies among Oregon's universities. One of our primary goals is to restore to civilization the lost knowledge about women. Much corrective scholarship is needed so that students can be provided with the rich heritage of women and not just that of man's world. We no longer want curriculum to be sexually stereotyped so that students can begin to learn about women, their past and their future.

We are rapidly approaching the time when we need not sex label people but can learn to appreciate each other's individual differences. Women's choices should be dictated by their qualifications, interests and personal goals not by patriarchal traditions that put women down as inferior in the name of mankind's progress. Oregon State University is dedicated to serving the needs of Oregon's people. We believe we'll meet those needs of 52 percent of our population better with a Women's Studies program.

November 5, 1973

Jeanne Dost
Director
Office of Women's Studies
SALVAGING WHAT WE CAN THROUGH COLLECTIVE BARGAINING

While many of our colleagues are eager to embrace collective bargaining, a number hold back. They ask, "We, bargain with the University? Preposterous! We are the University!"

Behind the idea that we are the center of the University is the claim that we are professionals. We know our specialties better than any outsiders. No one else can judge the qualification of the people we hire and retain as well as we can. Consequently, our basic unit is the department, the members of which share a common discipline.

As professionals, we believe that we should be self-governing. At least we should share the responsibilities of governance with administrators. We assume that we and they are men and women of goodwill and reason. Our community of interest is sufficient that decisions are determined more by reason than by the exercise of authority. Our ideal is that decisions emerge from a consensus.

Our concept of University does not minimize the role of the administrator. Instead, we conceive of him as a leader and not a manager. He provides stimulation, wise counsel, and resources. Knowing his people intimately, he seeks to learn of their hopes and ambitions. When he uncovers sources of initiative which can lead to better programs, he answers, "Why not?" He sifts through the various opportunities in order to nurture the development of his organization. How he allocates the resources at his disposal determines its direction of growth and its success. Even if he can give little but his personal encouragement, he stimulates those who take initiative.

His most important task is in aiding his colleagues in the recruitment of new faculty with the highest possible qualifications. Any institution with a high concentration of highly competent people will be a strong one. It will fulfill its mission with distinction and provide excellent opportunities for its faculties to advance professionally. Under such conditions, leadership becomes a channeling of initiatives, rather than the creation of programs by administrators.

While this ideal is seldom reached, the pursuit of it has led some of America's colleges and universities to provide a higher educational system admired the world over. Many of the best minds in the world have flocked to our shores to join our institutions both as students and scholars. In the process, we have created the greatest concentration of quality scholars and scientists in the world. We have also trained vast numbers of people who sustain our leadership in technological developments.
At least by some standards American colleges and universities have been highly successful. We think our decentralized professional organizational structure has been partly responsible. Yet that structure makes no sense to outsiders. When they cannot fit our structure on to a tidy line and staff organizational chart, they cannot see how anything but chaos can result. During the student uprising of a few years ago, the public demanded to know "Who is in charge?" and no recitation of committees, councils, and senates could satisfy them.

When state after state faced financial difficulties, political leaders demanded to know exactly what was the public getting for its money. They hurled the term "accountability" at educators as a challenge. All of the successes of higher education could be written off as accidents unless educators could explain, evaluate and measure what they were doing. In other words, administrators should use management tools to govern their faculties.

Students also demanded accountability from faculty members. They insisted upon rating teachers and upon having a voice in the retention and promotion of professors. Within a short time, student rating of teachers became another management tool.

When legislatures failed to produce the resources, administrators could no longer operate in the old style. Instead of encouraging initiative by providing resources, administrators began taking resources away. They were forced to act as though professors were employees to be discarded when no longer needed.

So far the tenure system has survived the attacks on it. It is obvious to us that students, the general public, and even some administrators are not happy with it. They see it as a barrier to the efficient management of employees. The Board members insist that a significant number of us are lazy, incompetent or even senile. They think that once we have tenure, we no longer have sufficient incentives to do our jobs. Obviously, they view us as employees stuck in dull jobs instead of professionals with rewarding careers.

Fortunately, the Board members know that if they lead the nation in striking down our tenure, they may endanger all of our Oregon universities and colleges. Consequently, they have developed a new set of policies to fulfill their objectives. Promotions and tenure under them will be more difficult to achieve. We will be subjected to numerous written evaluations. These will be useful when the important decisions are made by stranger administrators, instead of by peer group colleagues. They can also be used to build cases to support discharges. On peril of losing our jobs and being forced to change careers, we will have the incentives required to force us to do our jobs. If we fail to measure up, the administration is to "humanly but firmly" terminate us.
We are to have a career development program for all of us whether in our early years, mid-years, or late years. It may be that the program will provide opportunities or it may be another attack on academic freedom. Traditionally, as professionals, we have followed our own intellectual interests consistent with our abilities. In maximizing our own professional careers, we have believed that we were making our departments and universities stronger. Now in the age of grants and accountability, we may be required to subordinate our interests in order to maximize the interests of an administrator, a department or a university.

While many of us fight the idea of collective bargaining, we find the legislature included us in a collective bargaining law. When we complain about their treatment of us, legislators tell us we should use their law. They see us as employees. In fact, everyone does, except us.

If our universities were among those who compete for the best minds at considerable expense, we would have the dignity and respect we crave. But, the fact is, those who are over us cannot understand our concept of a university. It is time we stop living in a dream world of first class universities. We must salvage what we can by collective bargaining. At least some of our collegial system may yet be saved.

Lafe Harter
Department of Economics
November, 1973
AAUP'S NINE-MONTH FACULTY RETIREMENT PLAN

Professor Maxine Warnath's Report on OSBHE, to Oregon Federation of AAUP, dated November 1, 1973, elaborates on the Nine-Month Faculty Retirement Plan mentioned earlier in the AAUP Federation Newsletter.

Off hand, the proposal appears to have merit but it may ultimately be more harmful than helpful. Its objective is to obtain determination of the PERS pension on the basis of annual salary rate instead of actual salary received during the period of employment. So far so good. The important point that is missed is that teachers or faculty on 9-month appointments currently get credit for a full year in the formula or 33% more time than they actually work! A request for a change from actual salary to salary rate could be counteracted by a reduction in credit from a full-year to actual time served, 9 months or 0.75 basis in the formula, for persons on 9 month appointments.

Interestingly, OSU Chapter 72 of OSEA introduced a resolution, to both the 1972 and the 1973 sessions of the OSEA General Council, that would have allowed gradual instead of abrupt retirement by computing the PERS pension benefit on the basis of salary rate. However, the computation would have deducted time not served. For example, a faculty member who began service at age 35 could have elected at age 61 to reduce his service by 20% each year of his remaining years before 65. If he were allowed to incorporate in the formula his salary on a rate basis, say $15,000, as the average of his best three years in the last ten, with an average of .50 service after 60, his pension would have been computed as follows:

\[
\begin{align*}
27.5 \text{ years of PERS membership} & \times \\
\left( \frac{\text{average of half-time from 61 till 65}}{3} \right) & = \text{average yearly salary rate of best three years in last ten} \\
\times & = \text{$4125.00 yearly pension.} \\
\end{align*}
\]

This would compare to $4500.00 for retirement after full-time service to age 65.

The AAUP proposal is much more generous than the OSU Chapter 72 proposal since it would compute the pension incorporating the salary rate but without reduction for time actually served. The result of the proposal would be a boost of 22% in pension benefits solely from consideration of salary rate instead of salary actually received.

This proposal is unrealistic and politically naive as it does not take into account the danger of losing credit for time actually not served by teachers and faculty on 9-month appointments.

The full scope of the problem is probably best understood if we ask: "Where will the money come from?". Employer contributions are determined on the basis of total payroll and then are invested as judiciously as possible to maximize earnings. The contributions and the earnings over a period of time, the longer the better, are then actuarially used to project what formula pension can be paid out equally to all participants irrespective of factors that could justify unequal payments. Already, the pension computation ignores sex which actuarially should give males a higher pension than females because males do not live as long. Another recent discrepancy is that participants with 25 years of service at age 62 or with 30 years of service at age 60 can
now receive pensions that are not actuarially reduced and this means windfalls of 24% and 40% higher pensions respectively than would otherwise prevail. Who pays for such actual and potential windfalls or true instances of discrimination? In the case of the unisex pension the male participants do, since they would be entitled to higher pensions on the basis of their lower life expectancy. The windfalls to early retirees who meet the unique requirements, of 25 years of service at age 62 and 30 years of service at age 60, are paid out of funds that could otherwise be distributed equally to all participants.

The AAUP proposal for computation of the formula benefit on the basis of salary rate without reduction for time not served would result in a pension 63% higher than it should be when equitably computed and 22% higher than currently computed. The additional 63% in pension benefits would really not be paid by the employer but more truly skimmed from all other participants on 12-month appointments.

I would also ask how would the 12-month appointees and those who get summer term appointments be treated equitably? There is a serious matter of equity in this whole question. I therefore urge my colleagues to fully examine the impact of this AAUP proposal before promoting it much further. I feel concerned that it could ultimately result in reduction of time of service for persons on 9-month appointments in the computation of pension benefits.

Paul E. Bernier

November 15, 1973
COLLECTIVE BARGAINING:
A PROBLEM OF DISCRIMINATION

I agree with the principle of Professor Anton’s recent Faculty Forum paper calling for collective bargaining. As one in an almost identical situation to Professor Anton -- in rank for five or six years and only now having struggled to the first salary step of my rank -- the appeal of unionization is compelling. I, too, feel that the system has failed me. So long as I must compete with other members of my department for a fixed amount of meager salary funds each year, the chances of my ever reaching an "average" salary for my rank are virtually non-existent. I want to be judged on my own merits without the attendant guilt feelings that if I receive an extra $100, someone else in my department must receive $100 less than he/she might have received. I want to be freed from the collective faculty suspicion that we are second class citizens because there always seems to be a shortage in the money available to us while "they" -- the administrators -- somehow leap forward with inevitable regularity by amounts few of us can ever hope for. And so, collective bargaining presents a strong attraction.

At the same time, I feel that attempts to rally support for OSEA because it is allegedly the only organization actively pursuing collective bargaining is not only simplistic but factually incorrect. I am no more willing to buy the first organization whose leadership talks about collective bargaining than I am to buy the first house shown me by a salesman because it is raining and I need shelter...I figure that I would have to live with both for some time. To support an organization simply because it talks about action without examining its effectiveness in achieving desirable results for academic personnel or assessing its commitment to the values in higher education is to abandon rationality under the pressure of an emotional reaction to a very real grievance.

It is important, therefore, that the organization which represents faculty in collective bargaining be both knowledgeable about and sensitive to the priorities of faculty concerns over and beyond the financial returns issue, important as that may be. The ability to negotiate on matters of coffee breaks, playground coverage and seniority in the typing pool does not necessarily assure that a bargaining agent will know the first thing about how much to give and how strongly to stand fast in bargaining on issues of college faculty working conditions. Faculty members have entered their jobs with certain expectations about work conditions for faculty on a college campus and the types of satisfactions and rewards they want to receive. I suspect that these expectations are different both quantitatively and qualitatively from those of school teachers and clerical staff. This is not to say that the expectations of college professors are better or more desirable -- simply that they are different with a different priority level of components. Collective bargaining is just that: a bargaining arrangement between two parties who exchange concessions during negotiations toward an enforceable contract. You give something to get something. One does not simply become a union member, sit back and wait
for larger pay checks to arrive. Centers of influence shift -- sometimes subtly, sometimes dramatically. Relaxed and informal relationships may become structured around requirements and regulations... Some individuals gain and others lose control over parts of their environment.

I do not believe, as some members of the leadership of OSEA do, that the welfare of the faculty is enhanced by pooling the membership lists of faculty and classified staff. The potential disadvantages of this arrangement seem obvious. Any proposal to improve the direct or fringe benefits for faculty may have to be modified or eliminated unless its gain could be measured against some gain equally desirable to classified staff. Any bargaining agent which represents both groups might be expected to place high priority on comparability of gains for both groups, paralleling the types of demands and concessions made by faculty with those of classified staff.

Faculty should be aware that they have had organizational representation in the informal bargaining which has already been going on. To the extent of its resources and the limitations imposed by massive faculty indifference, the State Federation of AAUP has been representing the faculty at the highest academic decision-making levels. In addition to its informal inputs at the monthly meetings of the State Board, it has engaged in numerous hours of negotiation through the past year with administrators at the Chancellor's office over work rules and provisions of the tenure guidelines. The accomplishments of the AAUP State Federation representatives in eliminating the quota system, including part-time faculty in tenure lines, clarifying and delimiting the fixed term tenure category, and making other contributions to the tenure guidelines are detailed on P. 3 of the October issue of the AAUP State Federation Newsletter which each faculty member should have received. This service has been a tremendous bargain for most faculty since relatively few have been willing to invest even a small amount of their financial or energy resources in an organization attempting to represent their particular needs.

The needs of faculty, however, are much too varied and numerous to be adequately served by any group or organization on an informal basis, no matter how dedicated those who do its work may be. We do seem to be moving inexorably toward formal collective bargaining. The organization which faculty choose to represent them will make a significant difference in the lives of all of us. No matter who writes the contract, faculty will have to give up some things in order to get some other things of greater importance to them...What we get and what we give up will in large measure be determined by the sensitivity of the bargaining agent to those things which are most and least important to the majority of its constituency.

It is critically important that faculty learn as much as possible about bargaining procedures generally and, most importantly, what critical issues for faculty the possible bargaining agents are willing to support. All will press for increased salary -- but the formulas by which salaries are determined can vary widely as an examination of contracts already ratified in higher education will quickly reveal. Beyond the purely economic matters built into a contract, the whole range of working conditions will be up for negotiation. Unless you know what the negotiating priorities of the possible bargaining agents are, when it comes time to vote, you may saddle yourself with an agent which has exhausted its resources after financial
matters have been settled and which simply considers issues such as tenure or individual initiative to be of little consequence -- or even antithetical to collective bargaining... The AFT, for instance, did bargain away tenure at the University of Hawaii. You should be clear about the advantages and disadvantages of local and statewide bargaining, keeping in mind that local control of contract details are lost when one agent is representing several diverse units and negotiations must reflect compromises between the priorities of the different units.

During the period of time we have left to us before a decision will be made, faculty members would do well to apply their research and analytic skills to the practical problem of collective bargaining. When an election is called, as seems certain, we will have only ourselves to blame if our vote reflects an emotional response to one issue or our apathy toward the informational efforts of the potential bargaining organizations and we end up with an agent which doesn't understand the full range of faculty needs or must balance their demands against those of some non-faculty groups which it represents.

Charles Warnath
Psychology

11-26-73
OSEA and Medical Insurance

I would like to refute the inference made by Robert Jones in last month's Faculty Forum that OSEA threw him into "a state-wide employe group I now pay, in addition to state contributions, twice as much as I did before for practically the same medical coverage."

OSEA had nothing to do with the termination of the TIAA major medical insurance plan at OSU. OSEA has consistently lobbied for State participation in health-medical insurance programs. The Legislature finally chose to implement the request in 1971 by creating the Oregon Employees Benefits Board and allocating $10 per month per employe. This contribution was increased to $15 per month by the last Legislature. The OEBB chose four plans: basic, major, combination, and health maintenance. Unfortunately, the state law disallowed participation in any other ongoing plan by simply denying payroll deduction for other than its four plans.

Contrary to your opinion and that of a number of your colleagues, OSEA itself would have benefited if the insurance contributions had been made to existing programs since it had medical insurance programs in operation and these attracted and kept its own members in the association.

You have assumed that because the TIAA major medical program cost less than the OEBB major medical plan that it meant an extra expense to the TIAA insured. Your assumption, according to Professor Lester Strickler, Professor of Insurance at OSU, is incorrect because the two plans differ substantially. There is a great deal more coverage in the present plans and careful study of the plans will show this. Also, you must take into account the spiraling cost of medical care that has occurred in recent years.

Myron C. Cropsey, Agricultural Engineering Department
November 1973
In assuming a more active leadership role in developing faculty personnel policy statements preparatory to collective bargaining, the executive board of A.A.U.P. has addressed itself to several current issues this term. One specific issue which involves all faculty and which is to be resolved this year whether or not collective bargaining is implemented later is the issue of your individual position description. This first individual position description is of critical importance and it should accurately reflect your current university responsibilities.

On July 23, 1973 the State Board of Higher Education passed AR 41.010 Section 5 which stated that yearly notices of appointment shall include:

"b. Description of position offered (including reference to any unusual duties)"

On August 22, 1973 the members of the OSU Academic Staff received a copy of these revisions in the Administrative Rules from D.B. Nicodemus, Dean of Faculty. The following notation regarding individual position descriptions was made:

"Provision 5b is new. In the time available, the preparation of an individual position description for each academic staff member and its inclusion on the Notice of Appointment did not seem feasible. Therefore, this fall, on an interim basis and subject to later modification after consultation with the appropriate faculty bodies, item 5b will be implemented in a much simpler manner using available information in our computerized personnel data system."

The question that is uppermost in many minds is through what process(es) is the individual position description to be written for each faculty member already employed by the University? What later modification will be made and by whom? Which are the "appropriate faculty bodies" to write your position description ---- or mine?

We must assume that AR 41.010 Provision 5b will be implemented by July 1, 1974. We must also assume that plans must be made for this implementation. The vital question is to what degree will we as faculty members be allowed or encouraged to develop our own position description? Surely those of us who have been here for several years must have some idea of the professional jobs we have been paid to perform!

I propose that we explore the idea that has already been implemented in at least two schools. I propose that faculty members employed prior to implementation of 5b actively participate in the writing of his/her individual position. As a guide, the faculty member would define his/her position in terms of:
1. Recent reports of service to the institution.
   a. Instructional responsibilities.
   b. Research accomplishments and other scholarly achievements, or where relevant, other creative or artistic achievements.
   c. Professionally-related public service.
   d. Institutional service, which includes but is not limited to the contributions made through departmental, school or institutional governance, service to students and student groups.
3. Other criteria which the faculty member wishes to employ.

After this description of previously accepted professional performance is completed, the following steps would be taken:
1. The faculty member and the department head (heads in joint appointments) discuss the description in terms of present and future staffing plans.
2. In situations where there is substantial agreement between the discussants, the position description is forwarded to the appropriate administrative officer.
3. Where there is substantial disagreement in the perceived position due to future staffing plans or for other reasons, the school or departmental elected salary, promotion and tenure committee shall facilitate an agreement.

Of course, in the defining of a position description, certain campus inequities in teaching, advising, research loads, and other professional expectations become glaringly evident. This topic must be resolved another day and perhaps, in another way.

As the individual faculty member participates in the preparation of his/her own position description, we begin to approach one of the tenets of A.A.U.P.; faculty participation in determining his or her own future. And more importantly, we take one small step towards humanizing this unwieldy mechanistic power structure known as Oregon State University.

Margaret Lumpkin
November 30, 1973

N.B.
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During the academic year now drawing to a close, many of us have been participants in or witnesses to discussions concerning collective bargaining by faculty members in higher education. Some of us have taken positions on the matter, some seem interested but uncommitted, others apparently could hardly care less.

Most of the people I've talked with are not as well informed as they would like to be, despite a number of articles, meetings and Faculty Forum Papers on the subject. It is for that reason that I offer, with some reticence, my third Faculty Forum Paper of the year. I write, not as an advocate or opponent of bargaining, but as chairman this year of a joint AAUP-OSEA committee which has made a continuing study of the collective bargaining situation in American higher education. For the information of interested faculty members, I'll mention briefly what we've done and then try to summarize what we've learned.

We have read everything we could find on collective bargaining in higher education: law, opinion, research reports, news items, copies of negotiated agreements. We have met with colleagues, researchers, public officials, and representatives of would-be bargaining agents. We have attended interinstitutional conferences on the subject. We hosted a small interinstitutional meeting of our own. We have discussed our findings among ourselves and informally with others. We make no claim to expertise, but we have made a sincere effort to discover the who, what, how and why of collective bargaining in higher education today.

Occasionally we have spoken to faculty members who thought the committee was formed to organize the campus. They thought we intended to pass out leaflets, call meetings, give speeches, circulate petitions, and generally raise hell. This, of course, never was the case. We were a study group, and our sole mission was to study and report.

Well, what have we learned? We've learned that there is a growing interest in collective bargaining on campuses across the nation. It is a bottom-up movement, with community colleges following the lead of primary and secondary schools, and with four-year institutions following behind the community colleges. It is an East-to-West movement, with most of the action to date being in the states of New York, New Jersey, Massachusetts and Pennsylvania. There also has been activity at four-year colleges and universities in Michigan, Wisconsin, Nebraska and Hawaii.

At the beginning of this academic year, about 6% (50,000) of the nation's 836,000 higher education faculty members were employed under the terms of collective bargaining agreements. In terms of campuses, about
180 of 2,700 were organized. The great majority of these were community colleges or technical institutes; only six of some 1,800 four-year colleges and universities had contracts at that time (Southeastern Massachusetts University, Central Michigan University, Rutgers University, City University of New York, Long Island University, and the University of Wisconsin—in the latter for Teaching Assistants only).

Since then, bargaining elections have been held, or are about to be held, at such diverse four-year institutions as the University of Rhode Island, the 26-unit campus of the State University of New York, the 13-unit college system in the state of Pennsylvania, Wayne State University, Eastern Michigan University, Adelphi College, Boston State College, the Nebraska State College system, Oakland University, the New Jersey State College system, St. John's University, the U. S. Merchant Marine Academy, Brooklyn Polytechnic Institute, and the University of Hawaii. Note that I am referring only to four-year institutions; many additional two-year institutions have been organized.

Professor Joseph W. Garbarino of the University of California (Berkeley), the leading researcher in this field, estimated at a recent conference that bargaining elections have been held at about 35 four-year institutions and/or systems thus far. No one can state the exact number of faculty members involved, as a year-end survey had not yet been made. It is quite evident, however, that a number of campuses have moved at least as far as holding bargaining elections during the current year. Perhaps eight or ten contracts have been negotiated and signed.

The bargaining agents selected by faculties thus far include the American Association of University Professors, the National Education Association, state employee associations, independent faculty groups, and the American Federation of Teachers (AFL-CIO). As one would expect, the philosophies and bargaining styles of these organizations vary considerably. Elections to date have tended to be fairly close, with runoffs not uncommon. Normally the bargaining agent is elected by a simple majority of those voting; almost always this is a minority of the total faculty. It is still too early to say how successful the elected agencies will be in developing broad-based faculty support.

Bargaining objectives to date can be classified roughly as defensive and offensive. Defensive bargaining aims at preventing erosion of faculty rights and benefits or at recovering those which have been lost. The focus often is on procedures and due process. Offensive bargaining seeks to obtain new concessions. Its emphasis often is on economic concessions, but it may involve non-economic issues as well.

As many negotiations include both defensive and offensive issues, it might be helpful to think in terms of a bargaining continuum. Bargaining such as that at Boston State College recently, in which the main objective was simply to put existing governance procedures into contract form, would be near the defensive end of the continuum. The bargaining at CCNY last year, with its heavy emphasis on economic concessions, would be near the offensive end.
The emerging pattern, as I see it, is one in which a bargaining agent is chosen primarily in terms of its bargaining philosophy vis-a-vis the issues in a given situation. This is not to deny the effects of other factors, such as the forces of personality or organizing skill, but I think the basic criterion is as indicated. It therefore would appear that as long as issue packages continue to vary, each of the bargaining agencies will be able to find a place in the competitive market.

We were not able to identify a definitive set of conditions necessary and sufficient to bring collective bargaining to a university or a university system. We doubt that anyone has such information at the present time. Given that situation, let me take the risk of comparing higher education with American industry. Obviously, bargaining is not universal in industry. Most large organizations are unionized, but many smaller ones are not. Key elements of the labor force are organized, but a majority of workers are not. Yet, all parts of an industry are affected by the presence of bargaining anywhere in the system. I suspect that bargaining in higher education eventually will develop along similar lines.

Our committee has learned how to call for a collective bargaining election should the need arise at OSU. We have met with representatives of four bargaining agencies (AAUP, OSEA, AFT, NEA) which conceivably could represent OSU faculty members in bargaining. We have tried to evaluate each of those organizations in terms of its bargaining philosophy and capability. We have considered the pros and cons of coalition bargaining, along with the prospects for creating a completely new bargaining agency. We have considered the matter of appropriate bargaining units and the question of who, really, is our employer for bargaining purposes. We have been briefed on the law by experts. We may not have touched all the bases, but we have tried.

It has become obvious to the committee that interest in bargaining varies from campus to campus throughout the Oregon State System of Higher Education. While no one would claim, for example, that there is a surging demand for bargaining at OSU, responsible colleagues from the University of Oregon tell us that we can expect a vigorous push for collective bargaining on that campus in the near future. A combination of factors, including repercussions from the current fiscal emergency, has brought this about. You may well hear the rumbles before this paper arrives.

What kinds of events could lead the OSU faculty to collective bargaining? I've come to believe that any of several things might do it. In the short run, it could be triggered by any serious threat to faculty security. Emasculation of the tenure system could do it; violation of faculty rights during an emergency could do it; continued austerity coupled with inequitable allocation of merit pay increases could do it; even a general accumulation of miscellaneous grievances might do it.

In the medium run, I could see the OSU faculty being forced into bargaining by happenings elsewhere. Imagine a state university system with three units, A, B and C. At some point, one of the units, B, organizes for collective bargaining, while A and C remain unorganized.
B exerts pressure upon the management of the system and gains concessions. What will happen at units A and C if they are not granted similar concessions?

To intensify the illustration, assume that the concessions gained by B are financial. Assume further that management is unable to expand the system's total pool of financial resources, and that the concessions won by B must be extracted from allocations normally given to A and C. Now what happens at the latter two institutions?

The third situation in which we might move into collective bargaining could develop over a longer run. It could come in response to the gradual emergence of professional managers in academic administration. I think we need to face the fact that increasingly, universities actually are going to be managed. In many cases they are going to be managed by people who are not, and never have been, academics. Some faculty members will not be terribly fond of the new managerial approaches to decision-making, and I can see this leading to collective bargaining in certain situations.

Collective bargaining could bring the faculty some advantages. The advantages usually sought include job security, economic benefits, a greater voice in policy formulation, and dependable, well-defined procedures for handling grievances. There also would be costs. In addition to the financial costs of bargaining, we could expect to lose something by way of flexibility in handling problems, recognition of individual differences, and perhaps in faculty-administration rapport. As we weigh the pros and cons of bargaining, the decisive factor will likely prove to be the quality of management at our institution.

So much for the thoughts and activities of this year's collective bargaining committee (Fred Harris, Lafe Harter, John Keltner, Helen McHugh and myself). Whether or not the local chapters of AAUP and OSEA will support a similar committee next year remains to be seen. I rather suspect they will. Although the composition of the committee may change, it will be good to know that at least one faculty group is keeping in touch with developments in bargaining and is prepared with facts and knowhow should a need for bargaining arise.

Jack L. Rettig
Business Administration

April 24, 1972
SOME REFLECTIONS ON GOOD TEACHING

It should be axiomatic that anyone who is a good teacher desires to teach the truth. Once a good teacher gets five minutes beyond definitions and simple historical reviews of the subject matter of his lectures, he soon gains the impression that he is not certain whether or not he is telling the truth. In general, he finds that he does not know what the truth should be. Most individuals are so disturbed by questions of what they should teach that sooner or later they start seeking for information that will more closely approximate the truth. Since the definition of truth is elusive, their search usually ends by eliminating and replacing the more erroneous facets of standard or textbook information. The man engaged in research to provide better materials and techniques is also a good teacher.

Basically the 7,000,000 or more students, to whom Jesse Bone refers in his Faculty Forum article, do not come to colleges and universities year after year for one to eight years with the continual realization they are not learning anything useful. The vast majority must feel they have gained something at a university, for if they really felt that university attendance was futile, they would look for the nearest job and leave the university as soon as one was found.

The students may not learn to shine shoes or to sweep floors, but they have accumulated some information, useful or not. They have learned to accumulate information (slowly or rapidly) and thus are trained to pick up some of the additional information they may need. The vast majority leave college and fit very well into the square world in which they were delivered.

Because of the teacher driven to research by the inadequacy of his subject matter, year by year the textbooks and lectures contain better and better information. And it is hard to see how even a few college students find these gains useless. It is more likely that a few of the poorer college students are unaware of the changing world and why it is changing.

For whatever reasons students go to college, most find their lives easier, pleasanter and more productive and profitable than they would have been without college, and some could have developed themselves equally well, and, frequently better if they had not gone to college.

The trust of university education had always been toward better and better teaching through research. Without research, teaching would remain standard and stereotyped. The only other possibility for teaching without improvements through research would be a vague wandering in the darkness.
That universities can be improved there is no doubt; that it is possible easily to tamper gainfully with a university, I doubt; but that the universities are not meeting the demands of the public, because of too much emphasis and greater rewards for research, is belied by the fact that annually the public sends its children to the colleges and universities in untold numbers. And 90% or more of these subsequently fit well into a world whose directions are not easily defined.

Hugo Krueger
Fisheries and Wildlife
April, 1972
Recruitment of Minority Groups

At intervals someone in the faculty reminds us that we do not have a fair representation of minority groups on our faculty. I am sure that the administration is reminded of this fact by either representatives of minority groups from off campus or by officials from the federal government. It is also true that most departments have investigated in their fields and find no candidates. At least I know this is true in my own.

This is a predicament, and while it may be an excuse at present, I don't think we can go on forever in this situation. For our own selfish interests, as well as for the good of these peoples, I believe that we should make a serious effort to recruit promising students in the minority groups. This appears to me a practical way to remedy this inequity.

It is perfectly clear that some minority groups are able to make substantial headway in our society, while others do not. I have no wish to downgrade the efforts of any group, but it appears to me that little or nothing has been done to help the native American Indians of this state and yet this group represents a substantial minority. I believe that some of our recruiting efforts might well be directed toward the Indian reservations in this state.

26 April 1972

Myron G. Cropsey
Academic Improvement Also Needed

Bargaining and other measures to protect academic personnel deserve thoughtful consideration by faculty people. Still, there remains a need for improvement of higher education as a basis for justifying the public support of the campus and the granting of rights enjoyed by university professors. Concerning the relationship between the public and the universities, the University Professors for Academic Order has issued this evaluation:

A DEEP and powerful tide of public discontent with the present state of American higher education has been broadly evident long enough so as to leave no reasonable doubt that a turn in the course of the huge academic complex must occur, and even now is beginning to take place. Still unanswered, however, is the question: From what sector will come the leadership that will shape the destiny of the Academy during the final quarter of our 20th century?

INDECISION of many college and university administrations in dealing with the campus violence of the recent past has inspired little public confidence that administrations at many points can be depended upon to exert the vigorous leadership our times will require.

FACULTIES, on their part, too often have seemed unwilling to divert enough attention from their classroom or scholarly duties so as to provide the substance and purpose of a new and greater era in American education. They have seemed too often to react only defensively, more preoccupied with preserving their own rights and privileges than with restoring the synchronism between the Academy and the mainstream of American thought. Congenitally ill-disposed toward expressing themselves through organizational channels, these faculty members have watched in frustration while many of their largest, oldest and most prestigious professional associations have been perverted at the national level into political instruments, overtly and routinely espousing partisan ideological causes remote from, and in abdication of, the purposes of professional advancement for which they solicit their own support.

IMPATIENT with an apparent deficiency of leadership from within the educational establishment, the public has begun to assert its right of accountability through various external means and agencies. Financial stringencies, now more often the rule than the exception at all levels of both public and privately-supported education, clearly reflect this dissatisfaction. Legislatures are ringing academic alarm-bells as they become progressively more inquisitorial in reexamining the present-day justifiability of many traditional academic privileges. Many other straws are in the wind.

ONE CONCLUSION seems inescapable: if strength and leadership for building the American higher education of the future are not generated from within the Academy, they most certainly will be supplied from without—at a cost of painful readjustments within the profession and also, much more importantly, with real threat of dilution of the basic principle of academic freedom. A corollary conclusion seems equally valid: Truly professional teachers and scholars concerned for the integrity of American education and its future effectiveness along the track of its soundest traditional principles must provide the central, if not ultimately the only decisive, demonstration and defense of those principles.
To foster academic excellence and support the principles of academic freedom and responsibility through a national professional and protective association, the University Professors for Academic Order (UPAO) at the time of incorporation in 1970 issued the following statement of UPAO purposes:

1. To foster and maintain the integrity of the academic teaching profession;
2. To study, improve and facilitate the lawful governance of university and college administrations;
3. To advance and promote the study of the legitimate ideals of higher education within the framework of the constitutional and ethical values upon which the government and social order of the United States have been founded;
4. To preserve and advance the ideals of the freedom to teach and freedom to learn;
5. To promote policies intended to maintain and increase the scholastic excellence of members of the academic teaching profession and research scholars;
6. To promote suitable academic standards for colleges and universities and their teaching and research staffs;
7. To study, promote and advance the professional interests of the teaching and research staffs of colleges and universities;
8. To promote cooperation between members of the academic profession;
9. To cause the promotion of lectures and studies on the issues bearing upon the aims aforementioned.

In implementation of the foregoing purposes the UPAO annual conventions have adopted resolutions which commit the UPAO to these policies:

To defend the principles of the academic freedom and tenure wherever these privileges are responsibly exercised;
To investigate and counteract to the limit of its resources any acts of unfair discrimination against members of the profession which impinge upon these principles;
To adhere to the ideal of the university as a place for instruction, learning, and the seeking of truth through research and reflection—a bulwark against the forces of entropy assailing our society rather than as an instrument of social change or an organization for the furtherance of political objectives of whatever complexion,
To seek clarification of the proper roles of administration, faculty, students and staff as elements of the academic community;
To resist demands from any source that the university politicize itself by taking stands on questions that are not properly its concern, or permitting small groups acting in concert to infringe upon the rights of the majority of the academic community;
To minimize the use of the classroom for the proselytizing of students to any political ideology, reemphasizing the responsibility of the university and the individual professor of presenting their courses as officially announced;
To uphold the high calling of the university professor, in sum, as one which imposes an obligation to preserve and advance the continuity of the American tradition through maintenance of high individual and institutional standards of competence, responsibility, and accountability to the American public.

We invite colleagues to discuss these concepts with UPAO members at OSU and in all available faculty forums.

Fred W. Decker
Atmospheric Sciences
5 August 1972

Karl F. Drlica
Physical Education
THE CASE FOR EARLIER EARLY RETIREMENT

1. The economic interests of employers and employees do not always coincide, but neither do they always diverge. We are concerned here with earlier optional early retirement, and it needs to be said first that implementation of a plan to make such retirement possible is clearly to the advantage of both employers and employees. Increasingly widespread recognition of this mutual advantage, both in the public and private sectors, accounts for the strong recent trend toward earlier retirement, at the option of the employee.

2. The present PERS retirement plan permits state employees to retire, at their option, up to five years before compulsory retirement age of 65. (Special provisions for firemen and policemen are not treated here, but the general discussion below applies equally to them.) An employee who elects to retire before compulsory retirement age will have his annual current service pension dollar amount reduced by a factor which depends on the earliness of the retirement, as shown in the following table:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Factor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>60</td>
<td>.6060</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61</td>
<td>.6665</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62</td>
<td>.7348</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63</td>
<td>.8121</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64</td>
<td>.8999</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

These reductions reflect only actuarial considerations, i.e., the fact that those who retire before age 65 will, on average, receive retirement payments over a longer period of years before they die. But, of course, total annual retirement payments are also further reduced for the early retiree because average income during the working years, years of service, and the amount contributed by the employee toward the annuity part of his retirement plan will all be less than they would be if he retired at age 65.

3. What is proposed here is that PERS be amended to permit optional retirement at any time after twenty years of service, without regard to age.

4. It is obvious that implementation of this proposal need not result in any additional cost to the State; the reduction factors shown in the table above need only be computed, according to standard actuarial tables, for ages younger than 60.
5. While there cannot be any financial disadvantage to the State in this plan, it is not unlikely that it would save the State money, for an employee who elects to retire at, say, age 50, and whose salary has reached a relatively high level, may have been doing a job that could be done with equal effectiveness by a much younger replacement, and at a much lower salary. In the State System of higher education, for example, a retiring full professor may, in certain circumstances, be replaced by a young instructor at half the former’s salary. While replacement of high-salaried retirees by lower-salaried employees is not the rule in civil service, neither is it uncommon.

6. The advantage to the employee is obvious. He may, at age 50 or 55, have accumulated some capital, or he may have some permanent source of income such as a trust fund, so that he can count on a certain income for the remainder of his life. However, that income, unsupplemented, may be insufficient for his needs. Under the present PLRS plan, an employee who finds himself in this position cannot afford to retire until he has reached age 60, when he can begin to draw State retirement payments. One who is in this position may not be the most enthusiastic worker if he sees himself as merely time-serving for five or ten more years until he is eligible to draw retirement pay.

7. One can only speculate about the rationale for not permitting optional retirement before age 60 -- the rationale of the present PLRS plan. There are those who think that the refusal to allow retirement pay to be drawn before that age was simply copied from industrial retirement plans that have this feature, without any consideration of the reason for it. It is well known, however, why some industrial retirement plans have this feature: many such plans do not have any provision for vesting. Under such a plan, an employee who does not remain with his employer until earliest retirement date receives no benefits at all, and the employer knows that only a small proportion of his work force will ever draw retirement benefits. This, of course, is certainly not the reason for the provision against retirement before age 60 in the PERS plan.

8. Another theory as to the reason for the restriction is that it rests on “moral” grounds, i.e., that if it were possible to draw retirement benefits before age 60, some employees would quit their State jobs, start drawing retirement benefits, and then take jobs with private employers. Thus they would be employed and receiving retirement benefits from the State at the same time, and this would be somehow improper. Anyone who holds this view may not have given the matter adequate thought. This is not to deny that a State employee who elected to retire at, say, 50, under the plan proposed here, might not then take other employment. However, not a few who now retire under the present PERS plan at ages 60, 65, and even 70, do the same, and there seems to be no objection to that on grounds of improbity. More to the point, the present PLRS plan, due to its vesting provision, does permit an awkward sort of “retirement” before age 60. That is, an employee who
quits his State job after the vesting period will (if he wisely leaves his contributions to the PERS plan on deposit) receive retirement pay under the PERS plan, even if he goes to work for another employer, though not until he reaches age 60. The point here is that there is no significant difference, from the "moral point of view" between:

(a) leaving State employment at, say, age 50; working for a private employer from age 50 to, say, age 70; and drawing PERS benefits from age 60 on, and

(b) leaving State employment at age 50, working for a private employer until age 70, and drawing (much smaller) benefits from PERS from termination at age 50.

The ultimate cost to the State is the same in both cases because of the actuarial reduction in benefits that would be made in case (b); but case (b) is not possible under the present PERS plan.

9. In the end, the case for earlier early retirement comes to this: An employee who wants to retire before he is 60 years old is an employee who should be encouraged and enabled to do so. Those who are tired of their work do not make the best workers and it is not in their interest, nor in the State's interest, to put an obstacle in the way of their retirement. Yet the present PERS plan does just that. In effect, it says to the State employee, "You may start to draw retirement benefits at a certain level any time after you are 60 years old. If you are younger than that and would like to retire earlier, you may do so, but you'll get no retirement benefits until you are 60. You do not have the option of retiring earlier and receiving reduced retirement benefits to the time of your death." This arbitrary dictum breeds resentment in employees, tends to make them time-servers until they reach minimum retirement age, and prevents the State from replacing such time-servers with new people who might be expected to show more dedication to their jobs. Since the remedy is simple and without cost there is reason to hope that those who are in a position to apply it will soon do so.

Peter Anton
Philosophy

August 21, 1972
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Logically Speaking

I enjoy, in my own fashion, the claims that mechanized education will solve the problems of basic teaching, and that a system of mechanical information transference that substitutes devices for teachers on the premise that learning is essentially a transfer operation is an innovative concept.

According to protagonists, aggregations of audio tapes, correlated with filmstrips, motion pictures, and appropriate sensory stimuli of various kinds, carefully edited to remove digressions and annoying mannerisms, are the solution of all basic teaching problems. Such aggregations can be prepared for almost any basic course of instruction.

Programmed, step-by-step systems are logically the most efficient and economical way to implant basic information and techniques into students' minds and have been shown by short range studies to statistically improve student absorption, retention, and comprehension.

In addition, the mechanized courses have a number of advantages:

1. They can be stored in a relatively small space when not in use.
2. They can be edited or modified to include new and/or more relevant material.
3. They are not subject to serious deterioration, and with proper maintenance should last indefinitely.
4. They can be prepared by the finest minds and the deepest thinkers in the field or discipline being studied.
5. They have high initial but low maintenance costs.
6. They can be easily transported or duplicated.
7. They will release progressive educators from the routine demands of classes and allow them to pursue important research without interruption.
8. They will free school administration from the tensions and problems created by numerous conflicting opinions hatched by faculties and by faculty-student interactions.

These advantages, properly administered, should alleviate many sources of pressure on institutional budgets.

Information transfer via mechanical aids can readily be supervised by one or two clerk typists per school or department who know how to operate simple filing systems and how to push appropriate buttons. Using an
appropriate filing system which is open to student selection, programs
can be developed which will allow a student to select course offerings
which provide a greater or lesser amount of material for independent
study. In time, with advances in techniques, it should be possible to
eliminate the clerk typists and store all data in a central repository
linked via telephone lines to appropriate classrooms. Ultimately the
classrooms and costly and wasteful buildings can be eliminated by piping
the data directly from the central repository to dormitory or apartment
rooms.

Parenthetically, I do not think that dormitories or apartments should be
eliminated although this, too, could be done. After all, a university
or college also exists to give students an opportunity to interact with
each other and forms an intermediate step between the insularity of the
home and family and the open living of the outside world.

Appropriate individualized examinations would be automatically keyed to
student information requests and based upon student selection of course
material and computerized to compensate for performance variability and
challenges. This should maximize feedback throughput and turnover without
producing the usual spectra of dropout and copout.

In time, a central national repository of information and examination
could be developed and connected with each school. The whole could then
be administered by the DHHEW and effectivity of output, input and throughput
could be constantly monitored and maintained. Individual student intake
could be identified by social security numbers and a running sequence of
progress reports based upon intake and feedback could be computerized,
statistically analyzed, and made available to education researchers.

This should effectively solve the problem of basic information trans­
ference between repository and student. What then would be left would
merely be to maximize input, or student intake. Anyone who has dealt
with students will realize that it is a basic datum that no two students
are alike. Therefore input will always remain a constantly varying
variable, unless in the interests of improved learning a suitable
replacement is developed for the students.

With this final innovation, the institution can move onward and upward as
an organization devoted to the highest ideals of administration and research,
and will thus maximize education's contribution to human progress.

Jesse F. Bone
Veterinary Medicine
September 8, 1972
MORE ON EARLIER EARLY RETIREMENT

Professor Anton, in his contribution to the September 1972 issue of the OSU Faculty Forum Papers, presented a case for earlier early retirement. His arguments are valid and well presented. He is probably right in stating that the minimum age of 60 for retirement is simply a carry-over from the days when most retirement programs had no vesting provision. He is also correct in stating that permitting an employee to retire before the current earliest permissible age of 60 would present no additional cost to the employer - State or other public employer. I question his statement that a retiring professor could be replaced by a young instructor at half the former's salary because the actual salary data at OSU do not seem to support the statement.

I do not disagree with Professor Anton's objective, which is, if I read him correctly, simply to allow retirement before the age of 60. I would even suggest that his proposal of 20 years as a minimum requirement is also unnecessary. In theory and solely on the basis of individual freedom, one should be allowed to retire any time after meeting the current minimum vesting period of five years if one does so willingly and fully aware of the implications. TIAA-CREF, in its brochure, "Planning a Retirement System", states: "A minimum age for early retirement need not be stated if annuity contracts like those of TIAA and CREF provide the retirement benefits."

Professor Anton should, if he is not already, become a member of the Oregon State Employees Association and submit his proposal to the General Council of that Association where it would have the benefit of exposure to a large representative group of public employees. Personally I have already brought his proposal to the attention of the Public Employees Retirement Conference which is currently busy discussing proposals to be submitted to the forthcoming Legislative Assembly.

Unfortunately the case so well presented by Professor Anton is far from typical. Very few individuals have other significant income or are so dissatisfied with their occupation as to consider early retirement. A retirement program is a group enterprise to help assure a reasonable purchasing power to its participants at retirement age. Although a pension is no longer considered a reward or a gratuity but truly deferred compensation there is still some confusion as to the degree of responsibility of the employer with respect to that pension. Should there be a minimum age stated to prevent employees from taking early retirement who later would want to continue working? Some believe the interests of employees should be protected against themselves while others would likely favor the maximum of freedom even though decisions would at times be unfavorable to the interests of the individual.

As one individual who has devoted some time to improvement of our retirement program in Oregon I can think of a number of aspects of early retirement which should be touched upon to understand fully its implications. I will touch only upon the economic but the social and psychological are also of great importance but much more complex.
No one can quarrel with early retirement when the participant is granted the actuarial equivalent of his benefits at age 65, the current compulsory age. However, this actuarial equivalent or reduction, although equitable, is usually not acceptable to most employees who argue for the same benefits that would be available at age 65 after 30 years service irrespective of age at retirement. This demand if granted would represent a substantial windfall because such early retirement, which could occur, say at age 50, would mean that the employer would assume the financial responsibility for a pension twice as large as would be paid that same employee at age 65. Furthermore, the employer would not have the opportunity of funding that obligation over as long a period of time as would normally be available had the employee served until age 65. When early retirement is permitted without the full actuarial discount it results in a windfall of funds which could otherwise be equitably distributed to all participants.

When considering early retirement one should be aware of the fact that the years nearest retirement age are usually those in which a person normally saves a greater portion of his salary. This is the reason why, as an example, AAUP, in its statement on retirement, recommends that the retirement benefits at age 65 should be a higher proportion of terminal salary than when retirement is at age 70. It is evident that shortening the working years in addition to eliminating the possibility of an improved terminal salary as well as the actuarially reduced benefit can represent a major reduction in retirement benefits.

Notwithstanding the expressed concern, genuine or not, of politicians over inflation, historical evidence points out that inflation is the lesser of two evils in our modern society. This means that early retirement, whether or not it is actuarially equivalent, will expose an ageing retiree to a longer period of inflation and thus increasingly inadequate retirement benefits. Admittedly there are efforts made to alleviate the effects of inflation such as the current cost of living adjustment factor in the employer's pension and the option of the variable annuity but these are only partially successful protection of the purchasing power.

Another factor of some importance is that, notwithstanding much talk to the contrary in the youthful segment of our population, the standard of living of our modern society will likely continue to advance. Standard of living, in contrast with cost of living which is affected entirely by price level or inflation, refers to the increased economic productivity that makes available an increasing number of "advantages" such as a second automobile, air conditioning, color TV, a boat, a beach or mountain home, an electronic oven, an electronic calculator, etc. Retired persons should not be excluded from this "better life" in contrast to working persons whose income more or less automatically adjusts to this advancing standard of living over a period of time.

Anyone considering early retirement should be very much aware of the arguments on both sides of the issue. Few individuals are in the position, described by Professor Anton, of having other significant income but even then it is important to be well informed of the consequences of early retirement because it may be more painful and longer than one expects.
Of interest is the considerable amount of attention currently given to early retirement in the State of Oregon, particularly in the State System of Higher Education, where it could become a convenient tool in personnel management during the current period of retrenchment and financial emergency. The subject will undoubtedly be debated by the forthcoming Legislative Assembly. Let us hope the results are justice and equity for all concerned.

Paul E. Bernier
Poultry Science
September 29, 1972
A CONTENTIOUS BONE

I deign to pick a bone with Dr. Bone (FFF, 10-'72), relative to his snide sardonic sarcasm on learning efficiency — the implications of which are quite reminiscent of similar and related provisions in the projected and approaching inhuman society of George Orwell's 1984.

Fact is, students rightly insist on the personal relationship in learning — something lacking in any mechanical and electronic supplementation to the process. Thus the professor, like sex, is here to stay, and by popular demand. A "society" which will not afford him, is not worthy to be called a human society.

If one relies on mechanical learning for man, he may with equal invalidity depend on the novel and mechanical, artificial insemination to perpetuate his species. As for choice of methods, just give me the good old days.

As a final thrust in behalf of the much maligned professor who allegedly spends too few hours per day in duty, let us be reminded that this professor is very much like the little white bull: It is not so much the amount of time he spends, as it is the importance of what he does:

Howard B. Hullemann
Zoology
October 16, 1972
IN DEFENSE OF TENURE

In recent years the tenure system has come under attack from many directions. One of the aims of these attacks is to get rid of the "deadwood." Those who want to abolish tenure argue that the tenure system makes it impossible to fire the incompetent and unproductive teacher. They also feel that tenure is not necessary to guarantee academic freedom and to insure a certain degree of job security.

I recently read a report on tenure by Kingman Brewster, President of Yale University. One might argue that the situation at Yale is different and that his comments don't necessarily apply to O.S.U. I don't think so. Brewster's remarks are applicable to any institution of higher learning where tenure is granted. His remarks in fact touch on issues involving tenure which are currently being discussed and debated here at O.S.U. The following are excerpts from his report:

"Of all the folkways of university life, perhaps "tenure" is least comprehensible to those whose professional or executive life involves the staffing of other forms of organized activity -- business, finance, government, or non-profit service. In prosperous times the tradition of academic tenure evokes amazement. In times when colleges and universities are struggling for financial survival, tenure is challenged with increasing frequency.

How, it is asked, can we talk glibly about the knowledge explosion or the exponential rate of change -- with all its risk of rapid intellectual obsolescence -- and at the same time lock ourselves into lifetime obligations to people in their mid-thirties? Not only do we risk becoming stuck with the obsolete, but we remove the most popularly understood incentive to higher levels of performance. Furthermore, since even in financially easy times, university resources are finite, every "slot" mortgaged for a full professor's lifetime blocks the hope for advancement by some promising members of incoming generations. When resources are so tight that the faculty must be pruned, because of tenure most of the pruning is at the expense of the junior faculty. Many juniors are more up to date in their knowledge of new methods and problems in fast-moving fields and many of them are more talented than are some of the elders.

The Association of American University Professors has recently taken some pains to make it clear that tenure is not an absolute protection against dismissal. They say that a person can be fired for gross misconduct or neglect of duty. They assert that even a person with tenure may be terminated for financial reasons. Such termination is permissible in their eyes, however, only by a process which puts the burden of proof upon the university and in which the victim's faculty peers are both judge and jury, subject to final disposition by the trustees.

The practical fact in most places, is that tenure is for all normal purposes a guarantee of appointment until retirement age. Physical or mental incapacity, some chronic disability, some frightful act of moral turpitude, or persistent neglect of all university responsibilities have on a very few occasions in the past resulted in "negotiated" termination settlements. However, even in extreme circumstances there is a deep reluctance to compromise the expectations of tenure.
The defense of tenure usually falls into two categories: the need for job security, in order to draw good people into underpaid academic life; and the need to protect the academic freedom of the faculty.

Both of these points are valid; but put thus simply, both grossly understate the significance of tenure to the quality of a first-rate university.

The argument based on the recruitment of faculty, is underscored by the simple fact that as long as most institutions grant tenure then any single institution must go along in order to remain competitive. This is probably true.

The job security argument arose when university faculty were grossly underpaid in comparison with other professional callings. They were even more disadvantaged when compared with the marts of trade and finance. This is still true, especially at both ends of the ladder: the bottom rungs of starting salaries, and the higher rungs of top management compensation. In the middle range, however, academic salaries are not grossly lower than the earnings of other professional callings. So, the use of job security as bait to persuade people to take a vow of "academic poverty" is not a sufficient argument.

The rationale of academic tenure, however, is somewhat different from job security in the industrial world, especially in an institution which wants its teachers to be engaged in pushing forward the frontiers of learning. This lies in the fact that contributions to human knowledge and understanding which add something significant to what has gone before involve a very high risk and a very long-term intellectual investment.

If teaching is to be more than the retailing of the known, and if research is to seek real breakthroughs in the explanation of man and the cosmos, then teachers must be scholars, and the scholarship must be more than the refinement of the inherited store of knowledge. If scholarship is to question assumptions and to take the risk of testing new hypotheses, then it cannot be held to a timetable which demands proof of pay-out to satisfy some review committee.

Even with their privileges and immunities our academic communities are often too timid in their explorations. The fear of failure in the eyes of the peerage inhibits some of our colleagues, even when they do have tenure. Too many seek the safe road of detailed elaboration of accepted truth rather than the riskier paths of true exploration, which might defy conventional assumptions. Boldness would suffer if the research and scholarship of a mature faculty were to be subject to periodic scorekeeping, on pain of dismissal if they did not score well. Then what should be a venture in creative discovery would for almost everyone degenerate into a safe-sided devotion to riskless footnote gathering. Authenticity would replace discovery as the goal. The results might not startle the world, but they would be impressive in quantitative terms and invulnerable to devastating attack.

Purely economic connotations of "job security" greatly understate the distinctive aspect of the academic calling. At its best the university expects a person literally to make a lifetime investment in his special way of looking at the human and natural experience, in the hope that he will contribute something of permanence to the understanding of some corner of the universe.
The second, and most highly touted, rationale for tenure is academic freedom. This concern, traditionally, has focused on the privilege of immunity from "outside" interference. Within the memory of those still active, "McCarthyism" is the most telling nightmare.

Of course there are corrupting influences, financial, institutional, and professional. By and large, however, of all the types of institutions which gather people together in a common effort the university remains the least inhibiting to a variety in ideas, convictions, styles, and tastes. It encourages its members to pursue doggedly any idea in which they have confidence. Progress in the world of thought depends on people having enough freedom and serenity to take the risk of being wrong.

This struggle to preserve the integrity of the institution and the freedom of its faculty members from external coercion is never over. However, despite the winds of controversy inherent in a troubled time, whetted occasionally by demagogic desire to make academia the scapegoat for society's ills, the ability of a strong university to give its faculty convincing protection against such threats will depend more on the steadfastness of the institution as a whole than it will on tenure.

The dramatic image of the university under siege from taxpayers, politicians, or even occasional alumni is a vivid but not the most difficult aspect of the pressures which tend to erode academic freedom. The more subtle condition of academic freedom is that faculty members, once they have proved their potential during a period of junior probation, should not feel beholden to anyone, especially Department Chairmen, Deans, Provosts, or Presidents, for favor, let alone for survival. In David Riesman's phrase teachers and scholars should, insofar as possible, be truly "inner directed" — guided by their own intellectual curiosity, insight, and conscience. In the development of their ideas they should not be looking over their shoulders either in hope of favor or in fear of disfavor from anyone other than the judgment of an informed and critical posterity.

In strong universities assuring freedom from intellectual conformity coerced within the institution is even more of a concern than is the protection of freedom from external interference.

This spirit of academic freedom within the university has a value which goes beyond protecting the individual's broad scope of thought and inquiry. It bears crucially upon the distinctive quality of the university as a community. If a university is alive and productive it is a place where colleagues are in constant dispute; defending their latest intellectual enthusiasm, attacking the contrary views of others. From this trial by intellectual combat emerges a sharper insight, later to be blunted by other, sharper minds. It is vital that this contest be uninhibited by fear of reprisal. Sides must be taken only on the basis of the merits of a proposition. Jockeying for favor by trimming the argument because some colleague or some group will have the power of academic life or death in some later process of review would falsify and subvert the whole exercise.

As a practical matter of personnel policy, the very fact that the professorial promotion is a lifetime commitment of university resources makes the departmental and committee process of promotion to tenure much more rigorous and hard-headed than it otherwise would be. If there were a confident feeling that mistakes in judgment could be rectified by some later review process we would all be soft and give colleagues of whom we are personally fond an excessive benefit of all doubt. Realization that the commitment is for keeps helps to hold the standards high.

So, I would venture that whatever gains might be made by reserving the right to a
second guess would be more than offset by the laxity which would come to soften the first guess. In short, we would not have as good a senior faculty as we now do, if tenure were not the consequence of promotion to senior rank."*

(*Excerpts from the Report of the President of Yale University, August 28, 1972.)

Peter R. Fontana
Physics Department
October 20, 1972
ONE AFFIRMATIVE ACTION OFFICER: MINORITIES OR WOMEN?

In the six years that I have worked at OSU, there have been many changes. Friends have come and gone, styles have changed, behavior and appearances of both students and faculty have changed somewhat, and some attitudes have changed. Although we have become more aware of the problems encountered by minorities and women, we are not, as a whole, really conscious of the subtle prejudices which exist in our own thinking.

Living in Corvallis, or anywhere in Oregon, is a very relaxing thing; and we tend to become complacent because we are very, very sheltered with respect to the hassles and pressures of congested urban living. We are not made continually aware of poverty, overcrowding, noise, and pollution. We live a comfortable life in a small, rather conservative community. We sometimes fool ourselves into believing that all is well with the world, since all is well in Corvallis. When a malcontent brings something unpleasant to our attention, we tend to push this reality aside and try not to think about it. In many ways, we have done this with the women employed on this campus. OSU has done many positive things for women and minorities as a result of the investigation by HEW and at times of its own volition. An Affirmative Action Office was established, many committees were formed, and some of the female academic staff salaries were raised following analysis of faculty women. But is that enough? I think not.

It is now easy for us to recognize racism, but we cannot always see sexism. We take it for granted; and when a woman resents some snide remark, she is thought of as a sore head or a poor sport. If you hear something like "women are good with their hands, and they don't mind doing detail work," try inserting "blacks" or "chicanoes" in the statement to hear how it sounds. We are easily reminded of other racist cliches of former times.

OSU has an Affirmative Action program. The director, Tony Brich, is also the Director of Budgets and Personnel Services. The current one and only Affirmative Action officer is Karla Brown. Bob Gutierrez was also an Affirmative Action officer; but he recently resigned to work as a staff assistant in the President's Office, and a replacement is being sought. Apparently, due to lack of funds, there will be only one position as Affirmative Action officer for the 73-74 fiscal year (the position that is currently open).

Bob Gutierrez's vacancy most likely will be filled by a minority person. This position, now a research assistant
Unclassified, will become a classified position (Program Executive I) as of July 1, 1973. The position now held by Karla Brown is funded until June 30, 1973. This action puts the women and the minorities in a very peculiar position. There will be only one position to represent two vastly different groups. It can be said that a minority person would surely take the interests of women into consideration; however, it does not seem to follow to some observers that a woman could as easily understand the problems of minorities—especially a white woman. And that is true. But why is it not true that a minority male or any male could be so understanding of women's problems?

Minorities must be represented. That is obvious and necessary. However, women too, must be represented; and as of July 1, 1973, they very well might have no voice in Affirmative Action. Only 15% of our academic staff are women, but why must they have no representation once again?

Although this university is suffering from serious economic pains, which may or may not improve the next two or three years, there always seems to be a little bit of money tucked away somewhere for emergencies. We all know that there are small untapped resources here and there if they are really needed. I cannot believe that two full time positions in Affirmative Action would pose an undue financial strain on this strong university. One person can only do so much and the responsibility of both minority and women's problems is too large a job for only one individual, no matter who accepts the post. Which group is going to lose out in the trade off?

It has been emphatically and clearly stated that only one position will be supported as of next July. But we must have two. Otherwise, the women at OSU will have been very subtly snubbed again. If this fact doesn't upset a good number of women on this campus, then we have accepted our "place" and we will still be enjoying our complacency. When the next financial crisis arrives on the scene, who will be the first ones to go?

"Last hired, first fired."

This phrase used to be true for women and minorities. Now it seems to be true only for women. Perhaps women have now lost even their decorative function. Sigh, things have changed!

Kay Porter
Computer Center
October 24, 1972
THERAPY FOR CREDIT: THE NEW HIGHER EDUCATION

We find ourselves in a novel and disturbing situation. A radical departure from the higher education we all know and love has been introduced into the curriculum in the form of courses intended to affect personality structure and effect behavior changes by direct assault upon the student's psyche. The code word for this academic aberration is "small-group techniques". Other terms referring to the same undertaking are "group processes", "process training", "small group behavior", "group dynamics", "sensitivity training", "T-groups", and "encounter groups", but this list does not pretend to be exhaustive. Irreverent sceptics sometimes use the term "feelies", by way of reference to a prominent feature of such groups (e.g., the ritual hug after a soul-shattering vituperative exchange between "trainees").

These "courses" in fact constitute therapy for credit. That instructors of them (who prefer to be called "facilitators", lest it be mistakenly thought that they would teach anything to anyone) are engaged in therapy is urgently denied--to admit it would be to admit that this is not education at all, in any ordinary sense of the word--but that denial is a quibble. It is based on the contention that their students are not ill, and that hence the facilitator cannot be administering therapy. We might as justly be criticized for saying of firemen that they were "firefighting" in a case where there turned out to have been only smoke, but no fire. If anyone contended that the firemen could not be firefighting, since there was no fire, we would rightly respond that that is a quibble. That the facilitators' doings are not improperly characterized as therapy is all the more apparent to us when we become aware of the fact that the very same techniques they employ may also be employed on people who are not well, e.g., by a clinical psychologist on his patients. Moreover, one definition of "therapeutic" is "gradually or methodically ameliorative" and the amelioration of what group-process facilitators like to refer to as "hang-ups" is precisely what they have in mind to do.

Without attempting to describe fully what goes on in such courses (it be育儿s my powers of description), it may serve to delineate the general nature of the business to point out that the focus (perhaps too strong a word) of it is primarily on "the individual's personal reactions in the here and now." A practitioner of the art on this campus, for credit, is quoted in the Barometer ("Class Offers Knowledge Beyond Regurgitation," Nov. 12, 1970, pg. 3) as saying of his class, "We deal with the immediate, not what happened in the past. What's happening now between you and me, brother." Typical of the business is extremely candid appraisal of members of the group by other members of the group, made in the presence of the group. Tears and rages are not infrequent. Part of being totally candid is the use of language not ordinarily heard in the classroom.
The following is a verbatim account of the beginning of one such course, taken for credit at this university, by an undergraduate student: "When we came into the classroom on the first day, oriental music was playing. The professor was sitting on the floor in what he said was a 'semi-lotus' position. He told us to close our eyes and explore our bodies mentally." That this account is not the invention of a student's warped sense of humor is certain: the faculty member whose course that it is has acknowledged its accuracy before an UASS academic committee—without a blush. Those who may have seen blindfolded students being led about the campus by other students may now correctly surmise that this further exemplification of the higher learning is another element of such courses.

I do not wish to say that encounter groups, elsewhere than in the university (and they are widely available elsewhere), are necessarily a bad thing, nor that those who "facilitate" them are necessarily quacks who endanger mental health. I do confess to grave reservations about this business, and I have no doubt whatever that some facilitators who have practiced their art on this campus for credit may be a real menace. I am aware that at least one student in such a course given on this campus attempted suicide here. But I am prepared to credit the judgment of those whose judgment I must respect when they tell me that participation in a properly run encounter group by a person who is "normal" often has salutary effect, even though "small group techniques" are admittedly experimental, and, according to a statement in a document from our Counselling Center "have never really been evaluated to determine just how, when, or where they may be used appropriately."

Now, I do not presume to instruct my colleagues as to what is and what is not suitable for inclusion the curricula of this university. We do not all have precisely the same concept of higher education. Still, we are the keepers of it, and it is for us to decide what changes are to be made in it. With respect to encounter-group courses, I cannot recall that we have approved of any such radical departure, nor even that we have discussed it. Yet we do now have a large number of such courses in our university: no fewer than 27 courses "involving small-group process theory and training" were identified by catalog designation to the university Curriculum Committee last year!

This is in no small part our own fault. We have let it happen, by simply not paying attention. The curriculum committees of several of our schools and of the university have routinely approved them and the Faculty Senate has rubber-stamped them. But it is not entirely our fault that these radical departures from what we normally think of as courses have crept past our curricular watchdogs and into our catalog, for the syllabi submitted when requests are made to institute such courses are, judging from those I have seen, a little less than candid. They look like syllabi for real courses. What they do not say is what actually happens to the student in the classroom when he enrolls in those courses. Perhaps this accounts in part for our slumber.
In 1968 (as a result of the unfortunate incident mentioned earlier), a committee was set up to make recommendations concerning the dangers of these courses and suitable control of them. That committee (which, I am told, ceased to function after it made its report in March of 1968) did not question the academic legitimacy of such courses, however. It is now a little past high time to do that.

The School of Humanities and Social Sciences will shortly convene a School meeting, the purpose of which will be to discuss this question in all its ramifications and perhaps to go on record as explicitly approving or disapproving of courses of the kind in question. Other schools, and especially those other schools that now have such courses in their curricula, may wish to do the same.

I append a list of the 22 courses mentioned above. The list was prepared by Professor Keltner and submitted to the Curriculum Committee of the Faculty Senate in February of 1971.

Peter Anton
Philosophy
October 30, 1972

Courses in the 1970-71 Catalogues which involve Small Group Process Theory and Training.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course Code</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Hours</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Psy 314</td>
<td>Human Adjustment</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psy 361</td>
<td>Group Dynamics</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soc 430</td>
<td>Theory of Small Groups</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SSc 423</td>
<td>Small Group Behavior</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SSc 424</td>
<td>Theory of Conflict</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sp 111</td>
<td>Interpersonal Speech Communication</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sp 231</td>
<td>Conduct of Meetings</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sp 323</td>
<td>Group Discussion Processes</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sp 423</td>
<td>Communication and Leadership in Small Group Discussion</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sp 408</td>
<td>Workshop in Communication and Sensitivity Training (summers only)</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SSc 407</td>
<td>Theory and Practice of Group Process Training</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EA 361</td>
<td>Human Relations in Business</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IA 513</td>
<td>Behavior in Business Organizations</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ed 296</td>
<td>Leadership Training</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ed 508</td>
<td>Workshop in Counselor Training</td>
<td>TWA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ed 577</td>
<td>Counselor Training: Group Methods</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ed 587</td>
<td>Practicum</td>
<td>TWA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ed 488</td>
<td>Ed. Personnel Relations</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FL 222</td>
<td>Marriage Preparation</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FL 223</td>
<td>Family Living</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FL 507</td>
<td>Interpersonal Relations</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PE 456</td>
<td>Perceptual Motor Skill Training</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
If there is a better way, let us find it!

I enjoyed Dr. Bone’s presentation on the mechanizing and computerizing of the educational system. If as is advanced in various schools of thought, man is a machine product "developed" out of a deterministic universe, then this proposal should be the most sensible, the most effective and probably the most economic way to "educate" students. There have been men, following philosophical convictions of this type, who were courageous enough to act on their convictions and committed suicide. Such despair and hopelessness of really being a significant human being is tragic. It is triggered by a dualism in thought which views human reason as autonomous and, therefore, must accept the facts of the universe and the mechanistic aspect of man as being the only reality and that one not significant and is yet aware of the facts of his own personality and individuality, which to each man is significant.

This irreconcilable dualism can lead then either to a man machine at the end of a tape recorder or to a communal drop out exploring the humaness of our being. The rejection of our "normal" societal format by some of our "youth" to find reality is merely the other side of the same thought form that leads to Orwell's 1984. What is my option, do I willingly follow the described route of making education a more economical process or is there an alternative? The view that I am a created significant being with personality and reason not as opposites but as integral parts of my being having a purpose in being in terms of the creator and his creation will remove the dualism or schism of reason and reality. Such a "novel" view has possibilities that could lead to development of interpersonal relationships not only among students (this irreconcilable inconsistency in "logically speaking" will have to be deleted) but also among faculty and students. This will no doubt open up possibilities of creativity and value sensing experiences for many. In such a perspective the teacher may even find a significant reason for wanting to teach other than the economic benefits of putting on a new reel or changing the card deck.

John Sanders
Civil Engineering
November 2, 1972
POLITICIZATION OF THE UNIVERSITY

This is a protest against those colleagues who blindly go about politicizing O.S.U., heedless of the harm similar activities have caused in other American universities and of the actual destruction of scholarship in South American, European, and Japanese universities. We can speak as individuals or as "Citizens For" this or that candidate, but when we label ourselves "Faculty" we are such not as individuals but only in relation to the university. What we have in common is our scholarly work; we are as diverse as any other group in opinions on politics, religion, and life style. I object to the wearing of political buttons by professors in the lecture hall and by administrators in their offices. I object to finding my campus mail box stuffed with political propaganda (which I suspect has been printed on university machines). I object to "Faculty For" advertisements in the newspaper. I object to the turning of campus buildings into picture galleries of candidates, and to the clutter of bulletin boards (even ones supposedly restricted to laboratory safety notices) with election signs. I object to letters to editors signed as "Professor of -" or as "Chairman, Department of -". We all know of other universities where one's evaluation by his peers and department chairman is based more on the holding of "correct" views than on scholarly competence. Are we in the danger of that happening here?

John T. Yoko
Chemistry
November 6, 1972
Both major parties have agreed on one aspect of the election (and even the third party on the Oregon ballot does not disagree) that it is the clearest choice of the century. Yet, Oregon State students when interviewed by the Barometer find no differences between candidates. One wonders a bit at the nature of the education they are getting here.

Kermit J. Rhode
7 November 1972

It was rather interesting to note that last year a faculty senator made a strong speech in which he said the faculty as a body should not concern itself, should take no position on matters outside the university. This year's first faculty meeting when President McVicar advocated working against and voting against a proposition on the state ballot, that senator said nothing. When it was pointed out in the library report that the OSU library, in order to keep pace with comparable university libraries, should be spending two million a year instead of one, the senator made a speech saying the resources of the nation would no longer allow universities to have complete libraries. Interesting that we should be concerned about spending the resources of the nation for a library budget, but not the 5 billion, enough for 2,500 such budgets, spent for just the spring reaction, the mining of harbors, and the bombing of cities, part of the Southeast Asian war.

It would seem that deciding what is and what is not outside the university is not a simple matter.

Kermit J. Rhode
8 November 1972
STUDENT EVALUATION OF TEACHING

Recently, there has been considerable emphasis placed, in this and other universities, on student evaluation of teaching performance. Many of us have been so evaluated, and have been pleased when our students tell us we are doing a good job, distressed when we are criticized. In at least some departments, such evaluations are being seriously considered as a part of the data used in deciding upon recommendations concerning promotion and/or tenure.

This seems, on the surface, entirely sensible. After all, the argument runs, who is better able to judge the quality of education than those who are supposedly being educated? Further, early studies showed what appeared to be a small positive correlation between student evaluations of instructors and learning.

However, a study has recently appeared which should give us cause for concern in relying too much on such evaluations. In the September 29 issue of Science (Vol. 177, pp. 1164-1166) these studies are described. I urge all of you who are involved in the evaluation of faculty to read this paper. A brief summary follows:

The paper begins with a brief critique of previous studies of this kind. The criticisms made seem, at least to me, to be appropriate. The experimental study involved students and teaching assistants in a large calculus course. The students were tested, throughout the term, with sets of problems. The teaching assistants were not permitted to see the problems before they were administered. Mean performance of the students in each section was measured. At the end of the quarter, the instructors were evaluated by the students, and a mean rating given to each instructor.

The results can be summarized briefly: Overall, there was a strong negative correlation between teacher evaluation and class performance.
Particular data are striking; the students of the most highly evaluated instructors performed worst, and the three sections who evaluated their instructors the lowest were the best performers on the objective tests!

I expect that there will be strong arguments concerning this and similar studies. We should not regard the issue as settled. But we should at least be very careful in placing too much reliance on student evaluations, at least if "learning" by students is what we seek to maximize. The study raises the disturbing possibility that student evaluations are essentially popularity contests, and that the most popular teacher may sometimes be the one who demands (and obtains) the least from his students.

K.E. Van Holde
Biochemistry and Biophysics
November 10, 1972
ANYONE FOR GOLF?

In 1952, 18 years ago, OSSHE purchased Nellie Beach's farm located just across the Willamette River from Corvallis for the purpose of building an 18 hole golf course and a recreation area for Oregon State University. Those seniors in 1952 that heard about the proposed golf course will soon have their sons and daughters enrolled at OSU, and we are still talking about the golf course. How much longer will it be?

Oregon State is one of the few universities on the Pacific Coast without a golf course. Pacific Lutheran, Washington, Washington State, Idaho and British Columbia are a few in the northwest who have courses.

In the 1950's such people as Don Martel, Don Wilkinson, Fred Merryfield, Karl Drlica, Clair Langton, Bill Paul, Jim Barratt, John Dilworth, Gene Terway, A. L. Strand, G. M. Robertson and many others worked on the preliminary layout of the course. Some even went so far as to actually stake the holes to see if a course would be feasible.

What are the benefits to be derived from the development of this area?

1. It could provide a golf course within walking distance of the campus for students, staff and townspeople.

2. It would provide recreational areas and facilities that would relieve some of the burden already placed on the overloaded Corvallis park system.

3. It would open up new and relevant fields of instruction in physical education and recreation.

How can such a project be financed?

1. Locate an "angel".

2. Donations and contributions from friends and alumni.

3. Contributions from faculty, staff, students and townspeople.

4. Student body funds.

5. Receipts from greens fees.

Anyone for golf?

Karl F. Drlica
Physical Education
December 30, 1970
A Proposed
Outdoor Educational and Recreational Area
for Oregon State College

- Rowing, boating, and canoeing
- Camp Education outdoor laboratory
- Picnic and recreation areas for social events
- 18-hole golf course
- Putting greens and driving range
- Club house with dressing rooms, showers, and social rooms

On the east bank of the Willamette River and north of the Van Buren Street bridge
Opinion, Debate, and The University

"Faculty Forum"(*) for January 1971 brings this intriguing excerpt:

The distinction between debatable and undeniable subjects—between opinion and knowledge—abounds in the dialogues of Plato. It is epitomized in the distinction between virtue and geometry. Virtue cannot be taught because it is debatable, while geometry can, just because it is not debatable. From the contrast emerges a principle: the teachability of subjects varies with their debatable character. And the principle furnishes some guidance for the ordering of a young man's studies. He should proceed from the undeniable to the debatable, from the realm of knowledge to the realm of opinion. He should not proceed conversely. This latter way may be, doubtless, be more exciting, more stimulating, and more spectacular, for the young alone are precocious and can be pushed with little effort to express with confidence opinions which astonish their elders. Their parents, anxious about their education and hopeful for their future, are readily impressed by any evidence of precociousness and would gladly see in it proof of the presence of genius. There is, besides, something eloquent and arresting in the spectacle of a young man of twenty having settled so soon questions which his parents, at the end of their lives, find have never been settled to their own satisfaction. Yet the admiration dims a little when youth begins to instruct age, finds fault with its convictions and prejudices, demands to take the realm of opinion in its own hands, and justifies the demand by what has gone on in the school. Nature, thinks Plato, has provided enough healthy opposition between youth and age to make us cautious of increasing it by education. He seriously questions whether the young have any right to opinions about the unsettled before they have reasonably mastered the settled. His reason is profound. It is not that he would keep things forever as they are, for he put the perfect city in the sky where it need never change and let Ulysses make the choice we are to remember. He was a revolutionist, a man of novel ideas, and Socrates was put to death. Clearly his recommendations is not that of a stand-patter. His reason is that disinterested discipline may give a man balance, while interested discipline most assuredly will not. He knew well enough that opinions early formed are the hardest to outgrow, and when outgrown often leave a man without chart or compass, while those later formed are far more susceptible to change and adjustment. In spite of the protests of youth, it is age and experience which are liberal. It is age and experience that hesitate to cramp and confine and close the door of opportunity, for, otherwise, youth would not be allowed to be what it is. It is not young men who do justice, but old men, even rich old men like Cephalus, who do it and do it without troubling themselves very much about what it is. So Plato would keep the young out of the realm of the debatable until they had matured a little in the realm of knowledge. Then he would let them into the former, trusting the grace of God to do the rest. —From The Son of Apollo by F. J. E. Woodbridge (Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1929).

Does the university set a good example in dealing with controversial subjects? Some academics question the whole procedure of having itinerant speakers like a socialist M.P. from Northern Ireland now touring the U.S. provided with lush lecture fees for uncontested, non-debate lectures on topics clearly debatable. Members of audiences cannot insist upon answers from such a speaker who evades or claims not to understand a question from the floor. Debate with a qualified adversary can best assure full exposure of controversial topics.

The American universities do no credit to their academic stature in generously financing these "single acts", regardless of box-office appeal. Universities have a higher tradition than merely to put on side-shows which do not utilize the style of the Cambridge debates. Students, whose fees pay these speakers, deserve a more intellectual exposure of contemporary controversial topics than frustration by severe time limits, a speaker's evasion of floor questions, false "facts", and the lack of a skilled adversary spokesman on the platform. How better can university students enter "the realm of the debatable" than through demonstration of the adversary approach in the highest style of university debate?

23 Feb. 1971

Fred W. Decker

* "Faculty Forum", Nashville, Tenn., published by agencies of the National Council of Churches, United Methodist Church, Presbyterian Church U.S., and campus Christian Foundations.
TENURE AND ACADEMIC FREEDOM

Recent remarks that have been appearing in the public press regarding removal of tenure for academic personnel have many serious implications that should be of vital concern to all of us. Tenure is directly connected with academic freedom. Without tenure the present over-reaction and repressive atmospheres could push us closer and closer to the prophecies of "1984".

Within our own lifetimes we have experienced the governmental control of education in Japan, Germany and Russia. Fear of reprisal by independent thinkers combined with "sympathizers of the system" can result in the rewriting of history to fit the needs of those in power. Da Vinci had the airplane on the drawing board, but who invented it? Was the radio invented by a German or a Russian? It depends on who writes the history.

The search for truth is the prerogative of the academician. It is not only his prerogative, but it is his responsibility. Control of university thought by governmental bodies will stifle the search for knowledge and the exposition of it.

Just because there may be a horse thief in eastern Oregon, it does not follow that all people from eastern Oregon are horse thieves. Nor does it make sense to say that because there is a radical or indolent professor on a campus that all professors are radicals or indolent. It still remains to be proven that Oregon students are bombers, and yet both students and faculty are being figuratively tried, convicted and executed.

Over 2,300 years ago Socrates drank his cup of hemlock for daring to express his opinion. Academic freedom has been a cherished part of the university system from its inception 700 years ago. Tenure, too, was a part of system administered by the guilds of master scholars.

In the 13th century students and scholars were involved in "Kent State" incidents. In Paris in 1200 A.D. five students were victims of soldier brutality after a tavern skirmish. Again in Paris in 1229 seven of eight innocent students were fatal victims of "police brutality".

The faculty is in an acrimonious situation between the students' struggle for more voice and freedom in university affairs and the taxpayers' struggle for more voice and more control. Without tenure the faculty is in a precarious position and eventually teaches only what is prescribed by the Ministry of Education, or he moves to more challenging areas.

February 25, 1971

Karl F. Drlica
Associate Professor of
Physical Education
Coach of Rowing
This year promises to be another grim year for salary increases. Although in the last two years salary increases for most of us fell short of the increases in cost of living, we can expect further deterioration in the next two years.

Our Chancellor recommended to the Governor that our salaries be increased by 7.49% in the first year and by 5.88% in the second year. The Governor trimmed these figures to 6% for the first and to 4.35% for the second year. Prominent members of the Joint Ways and Means Committee of the Legislature are quoted by the press as saying that they will cut these figures by at least a third.

Representatives of the O.S.E.A., the A.A.U.P., and the Inter-institutional Faculty Senate have testified before the Salary Subcommittee of the Ways and Means Committee twice and will again. They have also testified before an ad hoc committee organized and chaired by Representative Ingalls. This committee was composed of representatives of districts where colleges and universities are located. During all of these hearings representatives from O.S.U. University of Oregon, O.C.E., and Portland State University have worked together.

Despite our efforts, the prospects remain dim. You might ask what is causing our trouble. The answer lies in the fact that our tax system with its present rates simply cannot meet the claims arising from expenses of a state with an expanding population and a growing economy. Without increasing our tax rates we have not been able to cover our needs adequately even before inflation began. We have made many economies over the years, some real and some false or temporary. Support for many programs in the state has grown so thin that further erosion may soon prove serious. Some time in the future this state will face a serious crisis unless the people agree to raise taxes.

The political leaders of the state insist that the people will not permit any increase in taxes, at least in the foreseeable future. While inflation increases the need for additional revenues, it also stiffens opposition to increased taxes. Our leaders may be right. Perhaps only a serious crisis can create the climate necessary for a tax increase.

In the meantime, the Legislature will wrestle with the conflicting claims of welfare costs, school support, property tax relief, the cost of higher education, and other urgent expenses. The effects of limiting support for higher education are not as noticeable as some others. As long as our campuses swarm with students, compete effectively in athletic contests, print numerous diplomas, and possess the superficial characteristics of colleges and universities, we find it difficult to demonstrate the erosion of our institutions. We are simply not believed when we assert that lack of support will seriously harm Oregon's most valuable asset. Changes in quality are subtle and develop slowly. Members of the Legislature may even believe that temporary austerity may not produce permanent damage. We know that even temporary austerity means opportunities which may be lost forever. Prolonged austerity would doom us to mediocrity.
Somehow we must persuade our fellow Oregonians that our colleges and universities are not luxuries but are necessary investments in Oregon's future. Not only can we afford quality education, but we cannot afford to allow our state to be without it.

L. G. Harter, Jr.
Chairman
Faculty Economic Welfare Committee
February 26, 1971
TO ACT OR NOT TO ACT

I am sure that most of us notice a tendency among our fellow citizens to do things, to act positively, to change, modify, adjust and otherwise fiddle with social, political and physical mechanisms. We accept this tendency as "normal", "progressive" and "prudent"; indeed it is characteristic of our society, but whether it is all that is claimed by its protagonists is a moot question.

I have come to a reluctant personal conclusion that most of us who wish to change things have no idea what is involved and merely want change for change's sake. They seldom offer alternatives that are any better or even as good as the thing they wish to alter, and in general they have no conception of the interactions that usually make the change less efficient, more complex, and more expensive than the original situation. In virtually any field of human endeavor, there are ways to make a process more complicated, more difficult and more wasteful of material and labor. There are always people who think in terms of problems rather than situations, who think in terms of victory rather than accommodation, who think in terms of empires and pyramidizing complexities. And there are always those who think "as they ought to be", rather than "as they are".

It is odd that in thousands of years of human civilization, the idea has never become established that there is no virtue in creating or exacerbating problems merely to keep people busy trying to solve them. I suppose that it is natural for people to congregate to do things, to make great decisions and to alter mechanisms, but it is not rational. There appears to be a natural tendency among men to loathe solitude and reflection and to band together to find problems whose immediate solution is vital to our health, morals, stability, sanity, etc., etc. The fact that such groups invariably create more problems than they solve is apparently never noticed, and the new problems are happily seized upon by other groups which in turn proceed to add further complexities to existence.

I wonder why it never apparently occurs to people who think in terms of problems that the process is much like that of a degenerative disease that feeds upon and ultimately destroys its host? Does it never occur to those who deplore the social economic and ecological morass of today's civilization that the whole mess is the direct result of fostering expectations that rise faster than ability to fulfill them? Has the Malthusian equation never been applied to desires as well as food? It seems to me that the comparison of
the geometric rise of wants and the arithmetic rise of the capabilities to
satisfy those wants is just as valid as the geometric rise in population
and the arithmetic rise in food supply. We can, of course, forestall the day
of reckoning with temporary expedients, but we can do no more than delay it.
It seems that we have no idea of proportion since we are invariably trying
to do now the things which we cannot do until next year or maybe next cen­
tury. We seem to be obsessed with immediacy and have neither the understand­
ing of history nor evolution that will allow us to apply logic to our lives.

We must say things when nothing needs to be said. We must do things when
nothing needs to be done. We must create Utopia today, or at least no later
than tomorrow. We must replace the old familiar irritations with ones we
are unable to comprehend. And as the adrenal response increases with every
new complexity we introduce, the general adaptation syndrome of society
becomes increasingly strained until the insoluble pressures will inevitably
collapse its fabric and we will drown in the sea of problems we have created.

It seems to me that this is a time for retrenchment rather than ex­
acerbation, that instead of applying the classic dictum "Don't STAND there!
DO Something!", we should apply another dictum that might read "Don't Just
Do Something! STAND THERE!"

February 25, 1971

Jesse F. Bone
Veterinary Medicine
I. The University as a Setting for Learning

One continuing gripe of many professors is about the seeming divergence of student-faculty-administration views of university life. Let's explore some differing conceptions of the "reality" that is the university, starting with the more prosaic student-professor relationships. What do many members of each sub-community make of their interaction? The following ideas represent some superficial but hopefully suggestive interpretations of differing orientations from various vantage points.

A. Student Orientations (and Professorial Interpretations of Student Roles)

Probably most students take a pragmatic view of their university experience: it's pretty much what one has to undergo in order to get a better job, possibly find a wife, and get to the real business of living. From the student point of view, perhaps in caricature, the GPA (grade point average) seems to be the top goal. This viewpoint certainly is not acknowledged as a worthy long-range goal in terms of the scholarly professor's orientation. Apparent student attitudes may be paraphrased thusly: "Why give obeisance to learning when it's your record (or GPA) that counts!" Probably a large proportion of students "deep down" think this way, although only a small proportion may be so frank as to express this attitude to their mentors--the profs who grade them and who may serve as writers of letters of recommendation to their prospective employers.

Professors generally feel that student-teacher contacts leading to favorable letters of recommendation prove of greater importance than grades in job placement and that students are overlooking a good bet by not "cultivating a prof or two." Perhaps this latter orientation is functional mainly for graduate school bound students for whom both course grades and favorable references pay off. But more than most students probably realize until late in their higher educational career (if at all), men in business concerns give considerable although varying weight to teacher evaluations and reports of extracurricular activities in assessing how "well rounded" are their prospective employees. Often all too late, many students come to realize the value of good contacts with teachers--usually when facing the challenge of completing applications for employment.

The student is not alone in facing problems of allocating time and energy most efficiently. He may not consciously decide how he plays "the college game," but he is making choices nonetheless. Perhaps his choice of means to the goals of job, marriage and philosophy of life by default (that is, by putting them off until later) seems "OK" to him. After all, isn't "doing one's own thing" or "getting by" or "living now" most important?

The professor is "only human" in tending to judge student behavior (and the apparent choices evidenced by that behavior) by standards more ideal than the ones he uses to judge his own behavior choices or his choices when he was a student. Be that as it may, the professor interprets much student behavior as "resistance to learning" and as "trying to get by with as little serious effort as possible." Among the questions which may be raised concerning the faculty member's impressions of college student behavior are these: Are these generally accurate assessments?
From whose viewpoints may such evaluations be judged valid? Under what conditions is such behavior likely to predominate? Considering the situations faced by students, are other interpretations closer to the mark?

B. Professor Orientations (and Student Responses to Professorial Expectations)

The professor has greater freedom of choice within the university setting than has the student. He can choose what his students must study "to aid them in their mastery of the subject matter," that is, upon what they will be graded. But the "prof" as well as the "stude" is caught up in the grading and credential allocation system. The teacher may be more aligned on the side of "management" in "the community of scholars." Within that frame of reference the instructor can't fully appreciate student behavior. Yet he sympathizes with students in general. After all, he was one himself—once. He may even consider himself still a student; but if so, he conceives of student roles differently than does the present-day student.

The teacher often keeps trying to change student orientations and priorities. He tries to remain hopeful that many students will realize and practice a spirit of inquiry which embodies its own intrinsic rewards such as satisfactions experienced in the process of learning. Yet the teacher is often, if not continuously, discouraged by the apparent iceberg-like attitudes of student resistance expressed in concern for points on exams and relative standing on the curve after each exam. The questions, if any, raised after an exam by most students seem far from the mark of an inquiring mind. The prof prefers that exams be seen and used as learning devices having feedback functions and thus serving as means toward at least intermediate goals. The student's attitudes he hopes to encourage might be expressed in statements such as: "I'm trying hard to find where I missed basic understanding in regard to this topic" or even, "How may I improve my reasoning in support of the correct choice I made for this multiple choice item."

C. "The Meaning of Learning" -- A Tentative Conclusion

Assuming that the foregoing expressions of ideas are reasonably accurate interpretations of student and professorial viewpoints, let us consider this "simple" conclusion: Learning for the student isn't what it is or should be, as seen by the professor. Further facets in exploring the meanings of learning could be profitably pursued; but let us consider more specifically the various goals and means generally implicit in people's conceptions of the university. This will involve our investigating possible conceptual models or "ideal images" of the university held by some students, some faculty members, and some administrators.

II. Organizational Models of "The University Reality"

The conceptual models of the university are characterized in Blau and Scott's classification, a mutual benefit association (to/for the students), a service

---

Peter M. Blau and W. Richard Scott, FORMAL ORGANIZATIONS. (Chandler, 1962), pp. 42-58. "A Classification Based on Prime Beneficiary. ... Four types of organization result from the application of our cui bono ('who benefits') criterion: (1) 'mutual benefit associations,' where the prime beneficiary is the membership; (2) 'business concerns,' where the owners are the prime beneficiary; (3) 'service organizations,' where the client group is the prime beneficiary; and (4) 'commonweal organizations,' where the prime beneficiary is the public-at-large. ..." (p. 43,4,6). A dittoed page of Blau and Scott's description of characteristics and problems of each type of formal organization—especially the dilemmas of overbureaucratization—is available from Wm. A. Foster, Sociology Department, upon request.
organization and partly a mutual benefit association (to/for the professors), and
lastly, a business concern and partly a commonweal organization (to/for the admin-
istrators). How so? Do these different and frequently divergent conceptions
make sense to various participants in university life? Let’s give a try at some
characterizations and judge for ourselves.

A. Students’ Conceptions of the University

Some among the students are pushing for greater weight or "say" in the pro-
cesses of university operation. Their model for justifying their desire for
increased participation seems to be mainly that of a democratic voluntary associ-
ation in which students would be represented in the policy formulation processes.
Such an organization is exemplified by a consumers’ cooperative, at least in theory.
Students are technically free to drop and/or change courses—or even universities—if
they don't like or find "relevant" the products offered therein. Naturally they
want to improve the service, perhaps in a "having your cake and eating it" sort of
way. Students tend to overlook or de-emphasize the problems inherent in big (and
thus bureaucratic) social operations—be they educational, religious, governmental,
or private industry. Their ideal is likely represented by the type of formal
organization classified as a mutual benefit association. Some students might
idealize this goal as a "cooperative commonwealth."

B. Administrators’ Viewpoints Regarding the University

This ideal goal of many students stands in contrast with the model seemingly
held by many administrators. While giving lip service to quality education, they
are caught in a bind of "efficiency" due in part to trying to coordinate (manip-
ulate?) numerous students and a diversity of professors and functions. The problem
of balancing contradictory goals of quality-quantity are many and varied. Such
issues are generally "resolved" by focusing on quantifiable measures of efficiency.
This resolution is often undertaken at the behest of trustees and for public
higher educational bodies, is in turn due to legislative demand to justify "wise
management of the educational trust" to the general public. Many administrators
tend to give greater weight to quantity while continuing to profess concern for
quality.* After all, how does the intangible quality of learning in an educa-
tional process get measured—let alone effectively measured?

And just what is the model of the university held by many administrators? I
suggest that it is the image of the business concern.** Conceiving of the university
as a private corporation adds some important nuances of meaning. The university
is seen as a business at least to the extent that it uses businesslike methods
and criteria for evaluation of the "product lines." Of course the university is
established and maintained to function in the interests of serving (1) the public
and (2) the student-clients by providing educational services. In the light of
these functions it would be conceived of as a commonweal organization and a service
organization respectively. Do these public functions exhaust the possible conse-
quences of universities? Are there not latent or less-recognized functions of

* Such public calls for increased excellence, when not supported by material means
for their achievement, are seen as "bureaucratic lip service" by many nonadministra-
tors both within and outside the university. Is the judgment that many university
administrators are guilty of such lip service well deserved?

** Note Blau and Scott’s characterization of this type of organization in the foot-
note on the previous page.
"training the fitable and sorting out the unfit" for smooth transition into the standardized corporate world of work? But let us not digress at this juncture.

There are disadvantages in adhering to the model of the business concern however, since the limitations of "bureaucracy" afflict many universities and certainly all large ones. As a result, top administrators and most of those down the line are caught in the muddle of bureaucratic machinery, now "facilitated" by computer technology. Whether or not an accurate account of bureaucratic functioning, Parkinson's law seems to have relevance in university governance!

C. Professors' Expectancies of the University

Now let's reconsider the professor and his multivalent orientations. He faces contradictory goals which result in persistent decision-making problems. Even if he doesn't recognize conflicting goals, he is torn between different means of promoting scholarly learning. The teacher also has frustrations and inner dilemmas regarding students, administrators, professional colleagues, the public, and himself. He has limited resources of time, energy (and money!) to allocate among school, family and community participation. He needs leisure for keeping open opportunities to gain perspective and recharge his emotional-intellectual energies. The problems of balancing teaching, research and community service constitute the standard role conflict of the university professor.

The professor, in many senses similar to the student, generally desires greater opportunities for sharing in policy formulation and implementation in the university, particularly his own branch of it. He already has more responsibility and accountability in decision-making than does the student; but a major question in this regard is felt by many professors, namely: How equitably is this "privilege" distributed among faculty members in terms of proportional representation by schools and departments within the university? Of course the further question is likely to be raised: Should it be?

Many teachers tend to view the university as more of a service organization than a mutual benefit association or a commonweal organization. The professor's position is conceived of as that of a colleague on a professional staff, while at the same time he may recognize partial validity of the perspectives held by many students and administrators of "the university reality." Ramifications of these differing self- and other-perspectives need consideration but will not be undertaken in this paper.

III. Summary

Differing views of learning in the university context held by many students, professors and administrators are suggested in this paper. In many respects, members of each subcommunity have their distinctive sets of goals for the university and in turn emphasize differing means for their attainment. To briefly consider the various views, I have focused on four models of the university conceptualized as "ideal types of formal organizations," based on the classification of Blau and Scott.
This is a preliminary formulation presented in the hope of stimulating individual thought leading to discussion and possibly to constructive ferment in our "university community." Such joint explorations may clarify possible underlying misunderstandings among participants in the university. I hope that such resulting interchange as develops will serve as a basis for increased communication and more effective cooperative endeavor.

Wm. A. Foster
Sociology Department
February 25, 1971
GUIDELINES FOR PREPARATION OF MANUSCRIPTS FOR THIS PUBLICATION

The "OSU Faculty Forum Papers", a publication for the exchange of faculty opinions concerning university affairs, is published monthly through the office of the Dean of Faculty with the assistance of a faculty advisory committee. Guidelines for this publication were approved by the Faculty Senate on March 7, 1968 and appear in the March 15, 1968 edition of the Staff Newsletter. The guidelines contain the following directions for the preparation of manuscripts:

a. Must be authored by a faculty member eligible for election to the Senate according to the provisions of Section 2 of Article IV of the Bylaws.

b. Should be typed in a form which can be reproduced directly without the need of retyping or rearranging. Short papers of one or two pages may be typed with either single or double spacing to make best use of full pages. Longer papers must be single spaced. Other requirements:

(1) Use 8-1/2" x 11" plain white bond paper (sub.20)
(2) Type on one side of page only
(3) Do not number or fold sheets
(4) Leave at least 1-1/2" margin at the top of all pages

c. Should not exceed a reasonable length. A six page limit is suggested, including displays such as tables or graphs. If this limit is exceeded, publications will require approval of the faculty advisory committee.

d. Should be signed (use black ink) and dated by the author at the end. The author's name and a subject, if appropriate, may be typed at the heading of the first page of the paper.

e. Manuscripts are to be submitted to the office of the Dean of Faculty. Receipt of each manuscript will be acknowledged. For each monthly publication, the deadline for the receipt of manuscripts shall be noon of the last full working day (Monday thru Friday) of the preceding month.
A MEANINGFUL COMMENCEMENT

We can only take the President’s statement that the Seniors should continue to attend classes the last week of Spring term at its face value, as an expression of uninformed hope. Those of us who are experienced in teaching such classes know that the Seniors have not attended in the past in any significant numbers, and will not do so now. I urge my colleagues to join me in compiling Senior attendance lists that last week, and sending them to the President. He might come to realize that the "meaningful commencement" decision means, in fact, that our courses have been chopped administratively by ten percent.

The other thing we can do is to find out which Faculty Senators voted for this nonsense, and try to replace them in coming elections. It is interesting that the Senate Minutes, distributed to all faculty and dated April 9, 1971, show that a roll call vote was taken; the roll call record itself is not revealed.

The Seniors should, of course, have a commencement with meaning. This should be done by putting commencement back one week, not by moving grades forward one week. "But what would you expect the Seniors to do that week?", asks my Dean. "You couldn't keep them around". Why, I'd expect them to do just what they would do in whatever week came between grades and commencement - to have a last party, to leave town for the beach, etc. Why is it more meaningful if that week is the last week of regular classes?
Some suggest that commencement should be while the other undergraduates are still around, so that they can play in the band (the "vital campus" hypothesis). Is an old teacher really being too conceited to question whether that band music can compare to classroom instruction for one week?

Many people at OSU seem blind to what goes on in the rest of the country. The only two commencement schemes our administrators can think up are not only no good, but also atypical. Reportedly, OSU's odd custom of premature Senior graduation goes back to the Depression, and was designed to give our Seniors the advantage of a week or two in the market place over the competition from Eugene. These days, it is just one more example of the minimal importance placed on formal teaching. Just suppose somebody chopped ten percent off the athletic schedule!

Those of us who regularly have classes of Seniors mixed with other students can look back to 1970, when for the only time all our students finished the whole term and got graded on a common basis. Apparently all we can look forward to is continuing administrative interference with the classroom.

John T. Yoke
Professor of Chemistry
April 22, 1971
"Anti-Intellectual, Anti-Knowledge, and Anti-Science"

President Leonard W. Rice of Oregon College of Education included the following remarks in his speech of welcome to the Oregon Academy of Science on April 10, 1971:

"A powerful mood on the campuses these days is anti-intellectual, anti-knowledge, and anti-science. When this mood exists, intuitive and poetic truth are valued without scientific truth. Emotion is stressed, not research, patient observation, suspension of belief until the evidence is in, and respect for facts.

"Curious correlations are evident. For example, the people in the arts have become ecologists. Scientists who struggled so long with ecological problems in the face of public indifference may welcome this new attention to ecology, but they can scarcely avoid some ambiguous thoughts when they see the science of ecology turned into a passionate belief.

"Another thing occurring where knowledge is deemphasized is an intense preoccupation with power. The notion appears to be that we don't need more research and knowledge; what is needed, rather, is action. Politics, then, supplants knowledge as a primary concern, because politics is about the adjustment and exercise of power. The academic institution is seen as an instrument for direct political action.

"It might appear that as an administrator and an English professor I would welcome all this. Administrators are engaged in politics, and they occasionally suffer because faculty don't see the importance of being political. But I am political enough to know that an academic institution cannot survive as a political agency that takes direct political action. As an English professor I value poetic and intuitive truth. But I don't want poetry at the expense of science, and I don't trust intuition unaccompanied by knowledge. I do look for the unspoken and non-speakable meanings in contemporary music. I shall be guided by these meanings as I find them, but not in contradiction to scientific and historical evidence.

"I have spoken these condensed and oversimple thoughts to you because I think that scientists particularly, but by no means alone on the campus, know the values in rationality and knowledge. Institutions whose business is discovery and communication of knowledge are not luxuries which we can't afford in bad times. The too simple moral of my remarks is as follows. Scientists on campuses should help see to it that knowledge remains the primary emphasis there, and they should also be political enough so as not to allow politics to become the dominant focus of attention."
Dr. Rice reminded us of the dangers in stressing "not what you know but what you feel." History supports him in the pungent comment that "emotion without intelligence leads to superstition." We see plenty around us to urge with him that the cause of knowledge must not be lost.

Symptoms of modern-day passionate anti-intellectualism appear in such phenomena as the heavy sale on many a university campus of books on long-discredited astrology and other fantasies. Professor E. U. Condon has observed that many public decisions including those on the financing of science are made by people who cannot tell the difference between science and pseudo-science, a situation not apparently relieved by the widespread distribution of university degrees.

Arthur C. Clarke's recent startling projections about life in the year 2001 could easily get aborted by the lack of valid knowledge by decision makers, lack of perspective by scientific specialists, and especially lack of meaningful and prompt communication among all elements of society.

The university has an unique task before it to enable modern man competently to probe and evaluate any field of knowledge and the ability to articulate his own field of expertise to assist others.

Anti-intellectualism can even infiltrate the academic research establishment so that unwanted data get ignored (c.f. Allan M. Carter, pp. 132-140, Science, 9 April 1971, and E. F. Holzman, p. 847, Science, 5 March 1971). Science must always nurture careful attention to details in the tradition of Kepler's discovery of the true orbit of Mars through noting a discrepancy of only eight minutes of arc in its observed position, compared to earlier theory.

The university has a special reason for cultivating candor and meaningful inter-disciplinary communication. Nowhere else in society do we find such a potentially intimate intermingling of all intellectual disciplines. The unique academic mission consists not so much in the origin of new knowledge as the collection, evaluation, and diffusion of valid knowledge within the entire intellectual community. Thus, a healthy academic attitude toward politics would contribute urbaniy, rationality, and justice to the political climate through the activities of individuals participating in the political process exemplifying thereby the reasoned, academic approach.

The university can hardly claim or expect blank-check support for esoteric research when many of its graduates seem as unaware of the implications of Kepler's revelation of the true orbit of Mars as those citizens of his native town who sought to burn his mother as a witch in 1620, nearly two decades after he determined the laws of planetary orbits.

The diffusion of knowledge today appears as the greatest creative task the modern university can perform, along with the promotion of candid communication among all intellectual disciplines. This would probably make the library the vital heart of the university and the scene of vigorous, illuminating dialogue. Let the light shine!

30 April 1971

Fred W. Desker
Academic Freedom

There is a certain amount of truth in the statement that educators are the ultimate egotists. Their demands for "academic freedom", which are actually demands for privilege have no reasonable justification in modern society since educators are neither persecuted nor muzzled. As a class, educators have the innocent conceit that they are experts on (almost) everything and that a specialist in limnology can abandon his shallow ponds and move confidently and expertly through the deeper, more troubled waters of university administration and national policy. As long as this conceit does not spill over into reality, it is amusing but not harmful. But when this concept of academic freedom involves such curious statements as have appeared in Forum papers, such as: "Faculty should be encouraged to freely teach, publish and discuss their views on any issue," and to be responsible but not accountable for "the examination of controversial issues throughout the university, including classroom discussions," it is time to examine an instructor's role in education.

It is disturbing to note that academic-freedom statements virtually all contain the expressed or implied idea that an instructor should have the privilege of abandoning his subject matter and promoting personal attitudes, prejudices and opinions on subjects which may be entirely outside his field of expertise. This is not academic freedom. This is academic license.

It was Dr. Jerome Bruner of Harvard University, I believe, who stated that both the process and the goal of education was disciplined understanding. To attain such ends requires a considerable amount of rectitude on the part of both instructors and students. It involves for the instructor, the professional and moral obligation to stick to the subject matter and refrain from wandering into fascinating bypaths of opinion, and for the student an obligation to learn. It is a two-way street of mutual interaction for the purpose of disseminating and acquiring information and acquiring a methodology for examining, evaluating, storing and utilizing it.

A classroom is not a public opinion forum. It is a narrowly organized assembly gathered together to pursue a specific aspect of human knowledge. In essence, it is a captive audience which has been assembled more or less voluntarily with the implied qualification that the material listed in the syllabus or the catalogue will be the material which is taught. It is, therefore, proper academic conduct for both instructor and students to attend to business. Inappropriate discussion or comment is undisciplined behavior that neither promotes the process nor the goal for which the class is assembled.
I do not wish to convey any idea that I am opposed to freedom of assembly, conscience or speech. I am merely saying that there is a proper time and place for teaching and for pontification and that I oppose the kooky concept that academic freedom is some special kind of license that allows its possessor to commit mayhem in the classroom. Everyone - including academicians - is entitled to the freedoms guaranteed by the law of the land, but no one has any right to inflict personal opinions or attitudes upon a captive audience that has not been assembled by force.

As long as the choice of subject matter is more or less a matter of student option and departmental requirement, it is the responsibility of the teaching faculty to stick to the subject and reserve exotic opinions for specific seminars, the quad, the coffee shop, the faculty senate, the soapbox and the press. Education is too serious a business for either faculty or students to take liberties with it.

Jesse F. Bone
Veterinary Medicine 5/24/71
Faculty Forum Paper

One must ask if Professor Bone has been on a leave of absence from the world when he talks about the modern society in which "educators are neither persecuted nor muzzled." The incidents of persecution are so numerous one need neither look around nor go back in time. In Idaho, a historian is being dismissed and his department head relieved because he proclaims publically an Indo-Chinese history which does not agree with the official version of the Fuhrer in Washington (though it does agree with that of the other historians). In Florida, a woman faculty member is being fired because of a speech she gave on invitation to the Chamber of Commerce. Angela Davis' lectures in California were probably the most carefully monitored in academic history. No charge of irrelevance to the subject could be made. Nor could academic fault be found; as a matter of fact, they were judged to be of exceptionally high quality. Yet she was dismissed. The AAUP found that her rights were violated. The regents clearly state that it is her "public" speeches for which she was dismissed. Later she was imprisoned without bail and now languishes in jail while waiting trial on a charge of accessory to a murder while those facing more serious charges have relative freedom. Her mentor, the world famous Herbert Marcuse, is being ousted from his post for teaching his subject matter but too well.

Although it lags in most things, Oregon State certainly does not lag when it comes to repression. During my first days here, when an economics professor, without mentioning his academic position, expressed his views on taxation in a letter to a newspaper, a state legislator tracked him down and warned him against such future actions through the chancellor and the president. Subsequently he
was expressly invited by the president to leave and did. The campus has been in an uproar about the dismissal of Alan Young, and the courts and the Board about that of Professor Papadopoulos. It is possible that Young did go outside his field in class, though in English that is hard to show, but no charges of this nature were levelled against him nor against Professor Papadopoulos (unless you consider the failure to wear socks a non-verbal advocacy of clothing style). But both of these men were clear advocates of verboten views. More recently OSU is now terminating the employment of a very competent counselor because he quit as a member of the Army Reserves.

There is no secret about this procedure. The faculty member on the dean's selection committee stated openly that it is "the kiss of death" to have any known views on any topic. A recently promoted administration official advises his faculty that to get ahead you must do as he does, tell Congressman Wyatt the SST is wise even though you know professionally it is folly because that is what the Congressman wants to hear. Another administrator brags to his friends that he withholds or grants favors to faculty on the basis of the person's expressed political opinions.

Just a tiny glance will show that the favored faculty are openly and passionately conformist or silent. Of course, it characterizes itself as stable, virtuous, sensible, etc. - and it is certainly sensible from a selfish point of view for I have never heard of an instructor even admonished for expressing the conformist view in class no matter how frequently he did it.

If not convinced, may I suggest that Professor Bone try a little experiment. Take a public controversial stand especially on our invasion of Asia and watch his fortunes fade.

Kermit J. Rohde
July 29, 1971
Professor Rohde is, I am sure, well aware that when one deals with people, one thinks in terms of relativity. Insofar as my statement that educators are neither persecuted nor muzzled is concerned, I must admit that I was thinking in relative terms and left off the qualifying adjective that would have made the statement more academically precise. I shall amend it to read "virtually no educators are persecuted or muzzled", because quite probably somewhere in this country -- although not in Dr. Rohde's examples -- some educator may be persecuted and muzzled by his dean, his department head, or his wife.

And now, with that ridiculous aspect out of the way, let us take up some of the seven instances which Dr. Rohde cites.

Angela Davis is not imprisoned for what she taught or said at UCLA. She is in the pokey because of unlawful flight to avoid prosecution as an accessory to murder, which (heaven forfend!) has nothing to do with her classroom activities.

The notorious Herbert Marcuse is in the process of being retired rather than being fired. Firing a tenured professor, although not an impossibility, is hardly worth the effort. He is neither being persecuted nor muzzled, although he might well be the latter since he is renowned for biting the hand which feeds him. However, I understand the administration of UCSD is acting on geriatric rather than gnathic grounds. In any event it is only reasonable to rid UCSD of Marcuse
since an intelligent person is not motivated to hand biting by fear
and incomprehension as might be the case in a lower animal, but by
motives more related to malice, mendacity and misanthropy. An apostle
of armed and bloody revolution should not be drawing sustenance from
the public he wishes to liquidate, unless he is in a more appropriate
institution than a university.

I have no knowledge of the contretemps in Idaho and Florida to
which Dr. Rohde alludes, but in his brief description of circumstances
I read nothing but "dismissal", "relieved" and "fired", which are not
synonyms for either persecution or muzzling in my dictionary. As for
the Fuhrer (sic) in Washington, why inject bad German, Naziism and
the Republican Party into the argument? We are merely concerned with
persecuting and muzzling of educators, not the larger issues of
national politics and next year's election.

I also have no knowledge of persecution and muzzling here at
Oregon State. Of course, there are many things I miss, and there may
well be platoons of persecuted professors on the campus. Assuming that
there are, the question arises - are they really persecuted? They have
the right to resign and move to a climate more to their liking. I
know of no obstacle to such action. I suspect that if they are indeed
persecuted, they are also masochistic since they persist in remaining
here. I also suspect that the "uproar" over Mr. Young and Professor
Papadopoulos is one of those things which is more sound than fury, as
I have seen no mass resignations from either the English or Mathematics
departments in protest of the terminations.

I cannot see how any administration worthy of the name can do
otherwise than to insist that teachers confine themselves to their
subject matter in the classroom. Neither can I see that a teacher who
turns classes into sounding boards for nonsequential opinions and personal propaganda has any business teaching. Such people are the academic equivalents of the power plant workman who heaves monkey wrenches into the dynamos. Perhaps in Dr. Rohde's opinion, the man who tries to brainwash a captive audience is not as damaging to society as the industrial saboteur. I disagree, but I am one of those people who believe that a major purpose of education is to improve society rather than disrupt it.

As for quitting the Army Reserve being a reason for termination, Dr. Rohde has to be joking! I personally know the head of an important department, three deans and several professors who quit the Reserve and went on to academic fortune. And conversely, I also know some people who stayed in the Reserves and didn't do well at all in the academic field. In making this statement, Dr. Rohde should be commended for inserting it in the Faculty Forum (which is a journal of opinion) rather than including it in his classroom lectures.

In passing, it is wryly amusing to see my thesis about some professors spouting off on subjects where they have no expertise so neatly confirmed by Dr. Rohde (a psychologist) who "knows professionally" that the SST is folly. Perhaps it is, but Seattle is now one of the two most depressed urban areas in the United States. Personally, I don't know whether it is folly or not, but I have read that about a hundred and twenty thousand jobs have disappeared or have been damaged in the Pacific Northwest because the SST project was dropped. My personal opinions on this subject and upon the reasons for the existence of Representatives and Senators are available to anyone who asks for them, but it is my opinion, not my professional expertise, the asker will get.
Finally, I shall take Dr. Rohde's challenge. I hereby state categorically that I am opposed to the United States invading Asia. I shall also state this in my classes if I can work the statement into the subject matter. If I cannot, I shall state it before and/or after class in the presence of as many students as possible, and I shall make it abundantly clear that I am opposed to invading Asia. And having said my piece, I shall await persecution by an outraged Fuehrer and his administration -- and watch my fortunes fade.

Jesse F. Bone
August 16, 1971
Department of Veterinary Medicine
Improvement in Teaching via Toastmasters

Toastmasters International in October celebrates 47 years of service to men seeking improvement in speaking, to men who want personal development in communication and leadership. Many OSU men have found their teaching has benefited from this remarkable non-profit educational movement founded by the late Dr. Ralph Smedley. All Toastmaster clubs provide maximum opportunity for each man to participate vocally in every meeting while progressing at his own rate in the assignments of the training program.

Corvallis has the following three clubs which welcome OSU staff, faculty, and students as well as all other "men on the move":

Benton Toastmasters meet Friday noon in a new location, the OSU Federal Credit Union conference room, NW 25th and Jackson. President is James Barbour (Campus Phone 1865). The club immediately seeks veteran Toastmasters who may have recently arrived in Corvallis to participate in organizing the fall program especially to serve the interests of campus men.

Corvallis Toastmasters Club meets Monday evening for dinner at Wagner's. President is Dr. Dan Panshin (Campus Phone 3354). The premier local club, this club resumes a well-established program involving men throughout the city.

Yawners Toastmasters Club meets Tuesday morning for breakfast at Wagner's. President is Dr. Richard Waring (Campus Phone 82). This year-round club conducts an outstandingly productive program.

All OSU men have a standing invitation to visit these clubs. They may secure additional information from the Area Governor, Dr. Bert E. Christensen (Phone 753-3788).

Toastmasters get experience in preparing different types of speeches, lectures, and papers for various kinds of audiences with the local club providing evaluations and recommendations aimed at improving the effectiveness and appeal of each speaker's presentation. Maximum progress derives from the friendly atmosphere of the evaluation and the recommendations for improvement.

Toastmaster Club participation offers an exceptional opportunity to any man sincerely interested in improving his communication skills for classroom effectiveness.

28 September 1971

Fred W. Decker
The Executive Committee has appointed Ted H. Carlson, Associate Professor of Journalism, to replace J. K. Munford as a member of the Advisory Committee. Continuing members on this faculty review body include W. A. McClenaghan and James Park.

On October 5, 1967 a proposal was made to the Faculty Senate for the establishment of a monthly publication for the exchange of faculty opinion. Such a proposal was approved by the Senate on December 7, and guidelines for the OSU Faculty Forum Papers were adopted on March 7, 1968. These guidelines were published in the March 15, 1968 issue of the Staff Newsletter. Instructions for the preparation of manuscripts appear in Appendix E of the Faculty Handbook. The first issue appeared in April, 1968.

Since its beginning, no formal evaluation of the Faculty Forum Papers has been conducted. The Executive Committee encourages members of the Faculty Senate to review the guidelines and to seek reactions from their constituents concerning the effectiveness of this publication. The Senate may wish to give some direction regarding the continuation of the publication.

Below are listed some data on the publication:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Academic Year</th>
<th>Number of Issues</th>
<th>Number of Papers</th>
<th>Number of Pages</th>
<th>Cost of Printing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1967-68</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>$169.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1968-69</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>378.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1969-70</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>370.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1970-71</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>320.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>$1,238.90</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Average number of papers per issue: 2.4
Average number of pages per paper: 2.2
Average printing cost per issue: $59
Average printing cost per paper: $24

Fifty-one different faculty members have been the author or co-author of at least one paper. It is purely coincidental that this number also equals the number of papers; several papers were signed by more than one author, but several faculty members submitted more than one paper (2 have submitted 6 papers, 1 submitted 3, 7 submitted 2, and 41 have submitted 1 paper).

In accordance with the guidelines, each manuscript has been reviewed by at least two members of the Advisory Committee. This review is conducted only to identify potential legal problems. Such problems have been identified in about four cases. Each case has been resolved by the committee in consultation with the author. In two or three cases, the Advisory Committee has sought the advice of the Executive Committee.
THE GRAND ILLUSION OF FACULTY INDEPENDENCE AND ITS IMPLICATIONS FOR COLLECTIVE BARGAINING

Events in more recent years have reflected accelerating interest in the consideration of collective bargaining as a medium for expressing faculty positions. As examples, OSEA has held several chapter meetings on this subject, the Interinstitutional Faculty Senate has a committee currently studying it, both AAUP and OSEA have recently formed a joint committee for examining this topic, and an ever-widening number of faculties throughout the U.S. have turned to this type of vehicle for exercising their voices.

When collective bargaining is brought up in various private conversations with colleagues, it is soon discovered that the major hangup is the concern over the potential for damage to faculty independence and for tarnishing of the profession. There is a strong tradition among professors that a thing most cherished is this independence; that is, the ability to be one's own master.

My thesis in this Forum expression is best expressed by this simple challenge to you, my fellow faculty members: show me one single significant area where you truly can say that you are now your own boss.

To follow my line of reasoning, we can start with faculty conduct codes which, although assuredly overdue in some respects, pose serious threats to some basic professional freedoms via their opening the door to potentially capricious and otherwise harmful interpretations by some administrators. Next, there is the matter of attacks upon tenure and the serious consideration being given today to performing drastic surgery on this system.
Curricular development is still another area being eroded, with circumstances pointing toward gross invasion of this assumed stronghold. In particular, the growing role for budgetary elements in educational decision-making is making it abundantly clear that professional input can be overridden by administrators wielding budgetary clubs. Finally, one can note such other developments as the standards being laid down for faculty advancement without proper consideration of faculty viewpoints and the increasing talk about removing sabbatical privileges.

In terms of my earlier issued challenge, I am seriously concerned by the apparent apathy that exists among us in regard to these happenings. Is it possible that there are just not enough people who have been directly affected yet by these events? Alternately, is it merely a case of not keeping up with these changing times? As still another possible explanation for such apathy, are we afraid of reprisals for speaking out against these kinds of moves? Whatever the reason might be, I submit that, if we lay any claim at all to being professional people, then it is imperative that answers be given and that integrity thereby be maintained.

In thinking about such events this way, there will be those who will agree that conditions around us are worsening but will argue that collective bargaining, with its "union" connotations, is not the solution. To those who would so argue, it can be pointed out that actual experiences—especially in our own state—do not bear out this fear. For example, collective bargaining for non-academic public employees in Oregon has not been accompanied by militant, union-like tactics. Instead, the product has been marked improvement in employer-employee relationships and on a plane wherein responsibilities
and mutual respect have prevailed. As a reading on something closer to our own circumstances, it is of great interest to note that the Oregon State System of Higher Education has just recently signed its first collective bargaining contract dealing with faculty personnel, this being the one negotiated with OSEA on behalf of University of Oregon faculty people located at Tongue Point. The true significance of this particular contract lies with its providing at least a partial answer to those who believe that faculty conditions are so specialized that collective bargaining will not work. In other words, it is a real eye opener to consider the content of this Tongue Point agreement.

In summary, my message is one of urging all of you to listen better than you have so far, as the discussion of collective bargaining proceeds toward more definitive lines. I especially urge that you think more carefully about the validity of your long-held objections to this idea and that you consider with great care the positive possibilities that this vehicle offers. In the end view of this scene, the stakes are high, since they involve the very notion of a profession and that is indeed most dear to all of us claiming membership. Looked at in these ways, it is a case of professionalism being enhanced, not lowered, by the advent of collective bargaining for faculty personnel.

Lester B. Strickler
Professor, Business Administration
October 22, 1971
COLLECTIVE BARGAINING

Collective bargaining by faculty within the State System of Higher Education became a reality in Oregon on October 15, 1971 when a contract was signed between OSEA representing the academics at Tongue Point and the University of Oregon. All faculty should give serious thought to this action.

Ten years ago the faculty, or at least the chemists, would have said about such collective bargaining: "Not for us." But presently it is evident that bargaining for salaries, fringe benefits, and grievances is becoming imperative. Faculty members are realizing they must rethink their stand when they see the advantages gained by the classified and less-educated employees who require the State System as employer to negotiate with them concerning the necessities of life. In contrast to this classified group, academics are becoming increasingly aware that they themselves are dependent on the generosity and whims of the many levels of administration in the State System as employer, levels which may or may not have either the desire or ability to secure the needed salary adjustments and bring benefits for the faculty under them.

"We may be professional scientists or educators but we are amateur negotiators" is the way a Shell chemist put it recently. He continued that "we lacked the economic and professional clout to get things done." This need for solidarity and expertise is being realized also by the students as they negotiate their needs and wishes.

Personally I am glad that faculty organizations through committees are beginning to consider collective bargaining. However, it is also imperative that each of us becomes informed about the needs and process so that we are not naive in our judgment of changes which can so radically affect our life pattern. I do hope that appropriate committee reports and pertinent literature will be made available to all of us for evaluation and personal decision. The Faculty Forum would be an appropriate media for this purpose.

Paul H. Weswig
Agricultural Chemistry
October 28, 1971
I've enjoyed this little episode reported by Douglas McGregor in

The Human Side of Enterprise:

"An agent of the Textile Workers Union of America likes to tell
the story of the occasion when a new manager appeared in the
mill where he was working. The manager came into the weave room
the day he arrived. He walked directly over to the agent and
said, 'Are you Belloc?' The agent acknowledged that he was.
The manager said, 'I am the new manager here. When I manage a
mill, I run it. Do you understand?'

"The agent nodded, and then waved his hand. The workers, who
had been intently watching this encounter, immediately shut down
every loom in the room. The agent then turned to the manager
and said, 'All right, go ahead and run it.'"

Had I ever been required to "take sides" in the episode, I probably
would have supported the agent. More revealing, perhaps, is the observation
that until recently I tended to see such conflict as happening to other
people. Today I can see it happening to myself. "The times," cries the
folk singer, "they are a changin'."

While each of us lives in a unique and partly private world, we all
are affected by changes in our mutual conditions of life. It seems to me
that one of these changes, brought about by a number of forces within and
without academia, is a growing cleavage between university faculties and
their administrative hierarchies. It seems to be happening in Oregon
and indeed within our own institution.

I find this a matter for deep personal regret. But the hard fact is that the warm colleague relationships I once knew and loved are almost gone. In their place I find formalism, polarization and a growing trend toward adversary relationships. The rate of change has quickened in very recent years.

It is useless to point a finger of blame. We all are responsible; we all are victims, faculty and administration alike. We are caught up in growth, in financial crises, in civil rights, war, in the times. We are imperfect mortals moving along together on this ball of earth, striving for what we individually believe to be right and just, and in the scuffle we are changing our relationships with each other.

Beneath the footwork lies a basic issue: a shift of power from faculty to administration. It is a shift - part actual, part potential - which many faculty members consider unwarranted, or threatening, or both. Some feel that firm, organized effort is needed to protect their rights and interests.

I think it would be a mistake for anyone to assume that the tenure controversy constitutes the entire problem. While tenure is a factor, the problem involves the total fabric of rights and rules. Traditional faculty "rights," "prerogatives," "inputs," - call them what you will - seem to be eroding rapidly in many important areas, such as work loads, scheduling, control of curricula, performance appraisals, promotions, salaries and perhaps others. The erosion has followed a change in administrative attitude and style, which in turn has its own causative factors.

It seems unlikely that we can go back. We are locked into our times. We must go on. We might, however, look to history for guidance. Cleavages similar to those now developing in the university occurred long ago in other
segments of society. McGregor's little episode reveals a fairly typical result in the industrial sector. Some professional groups recently have reacted in similar ways.

I am not at all sure that many of us would wish for that kind of solution, but hard-nosed unionism certainly is among the possible ways of dealing with oppressive management wherever it occurs. People respond to their environments. Those who feel abused, ignored and threatened band together. Unions arise in response to needs; managements generally get the kind of employee relations they deserve.

Unfortunately for us all, managements in the public sector often are faced with severe external pressures and constraints. As these and other pressures build, employee groups must meet them or pay the consequences. There is evidence to suggest that academic people in Oregon have begun to pay some of the same consequences that have driven their counterparts in other states to collective bargaining.

Perhaps I am too pessimistic. I hope so. But in all honesty I see no signs indicating a reversal of the trend. The loss of faculty power in Oregon and at OSU, which has resulted from external pressures, administrators who yield too readily to those pressures, a thirst for power by some administrators, unfortunate administrative appointments, student unrest, and a fragmented too-passive faculty, seems likely to continue. The forces are in motion and our divided faculty presently appears to be in no position to fend them off.

While I have no ready-made solution for the problem, it seems to me that our faculty almost inevitably will be driven to some form of collective bargaining.

Collective bargaining is not a dirty word. It is a response to reality,
an honorable and workable system for protecting rights and balancing power
carried out under law by many kinds of employee "associations" and "unions"
and their employers. It means that rules are established bilaterally, rather
than unilaterally. It means that the rules are followed. When disputes
arise, it provides a fair and dependable system of appeal and resolution.
In short, it means the settlement of differences through negotiation by
parties of roughly equal, rather than unequal, power.

Collective bargaining is not without its human and financial costs, but
competently handled it can foster understanding, peace and productivity. It
even can be creative. It will come to OSU when enough of us believe that
its benefits outweigh its costs. Its ultimate form will depend upon pooled
judgments, but its arrival in some form may come sooner than we think.

Some of us, as members of an AAUP/CSEA committee on tenure and collective
bargaining, are trying to develop and weigh alternative approaches in anticipa-
tion of the need. At this point we are simply a study group with no commit-
ment to any particular approach or organization. We are analyzing the situa-
tion and talking to a variety of people from on and off the campus. We know
there is much to learn.

If you have an input for us, we (Fred Harris, Lafe Harter, John Keltner,
Helen McHugh and I) would be happy to receive it. At appropriate times we
will try to communicate what we have learned. Meanwhile, every member of the
faculty would be wise, at the very least, to let the idea of collective
bargaining percolate through his mind.

Jack L. Rettig
Professor, Business Admin.

November 22, 1971
A WORD OF WARNING

The moral fortitude required of Les Strickler and Paul Weswig in publicly recommending consideration of collective bargaining as a means of united faculty action must be recognized and applauded. I take this opportunity to add my support to the recommendation to consider unionization, although I see little probability that we can maintain our rights to provisions for academic freedom and tenure if we abandon our claim to professional status.

I wish to propose a way in which the faculty may receive professional advice in seeking the proper means and in avoiding pitfalls while attempting to organize for collective bargaining. I recommend that each faculty member donate 0.1 of 1% of his annual salary to provide a fund to bring to the campus professionals with expert knowledge and experience in the problems of unorganized workers. I suggest that Harry Bridges, Cesar Chavez, Leonard Woodcock and the presidents of other unions not notorious for adherence to sweetheart contracts be requested to send their top organizers to the campus at our expense. These speakers would be assigned the topic "How May Unorganized Workers Obtain Protection?" The speakers would be instructed that they are not being asked to organize the faculty but that they are requested to inform the faculty of the best ways to approach the problems of organization. The students must be invited to participate in these discussions which, ideally, would be arranged under the aegis of the Faculty Forum.

The reason that the management of the State System currently views the development of the adversary relationship inherent in the bargaining process with such great equanimity is their belief that apathetic faculties will opt to have a company union as their agent. The line of least resistance for the faculty (and greatest comfort for management) would be to allow either OSEA or AAUP to handle the duty. I've been a member of both these organizations for 24 years. At times I have been active in both organizations. Experience has led me to the same opinion of them that I have of the Faculty Senate. They more nearly serve the purposes of management than those of the faculty. These organizations require much time and energy of concerned faculty members in return for a mostly unfulfilled promise of eventual benefit to the institution.

The faculty's needs probably will be served best by a new agency erected specifically for the purpose of bargaining with management. Whether this agency should be local, statewide or national in its scope has yet to be determined. As of now, I am sure of one thing. The faculty as yet is in no position to make an intelligent and informed decision. However, I firmly believe that the procedure I have proposed is workable and will be effective. As evidence of this belief I pledge $20 to initiate a fund to bring informed professional organizers to the campus so that we may be instructed in how we may protect ourselves from management.

The word of warning mentioned in my title has already been sounded in my first paragraph. I see little probability that we can maintain our prerogatives of academic freedom and tenure if we abandon our professional status for the untested protection of collective bargaining.
In spite of the fact that some members of the legislature and of the State Board, the Chancellor, some institutional executives, some deans and even some department chairmen have made obvious attacks upon the security of our professional prerogatives of tenure and academic freedom, these same people continue to express a preternatural concern that their attacks will result in unionization and an adversary relationship between the faculty and management. The repetitive insistence with which these members of the managerial establishment parrot this common refrain has made a great impression on me and forces me to conclude that management views such an eventuality as desirable and that their doleful dirge is as phony as plastic grass. In fact, the managerial establishment at Oregon State University has already discussed the probable success of moves to replace notices of appointment by limited term contracts.

If management considers unionization and collective bargaining more desirable than tenure and academic freedom should the faculty accede passively to this desire? What alternative does the faculty have? I recommend that a grass roots, do-or-die resistance be organized by the faculty and students at all of the institutions of the State System. The public should be informed that the struggle to retain tenure and academic freedom is a fight to preserve the intellectual stature of the institutions. I further recommend that the faculty senates, the interinstitutional faculty senate, OSEA and AAUP not be involved as these are "officially recognized" organizations and are subject to control by management. Individual members of these bodies may use them as platforms from which to obtain public recognition and understanding of the fight being waged by students and faculty against the anti-intellectual stance of management.

A concerted effort to involve the students must be made. Ever since the war there have been increasing protests by students that they are being treated as mass produced, inanimate objects. I am certain a majority of them will appreciate the further decline in their rights to a true education if the classroom becomes a union shop.

There will certainly be a few of my colleagues so bemused by the claims of the ultimate superiority of the methods of American Business Management that they will want to argue that Higher Education can surely benefit by similar methods. I can only remind such individuals that the managers are the same wonderful people that have given this country the Edsel, the FTX, the Atomic/Vessel Savannah, the SST, the Pentagon Papers, Lockheed, Amchitka Island, the Corps of Engineers, the U-2 incident, the 1950 version of the University of Massachusetts, the Kent State and Jackson State massacres et cetera ad nauseum. We cannot afford to servilely permit the managers to inflict similar disasters on the Oregon State System of Higher Education.

Harry K. Phinney
Professor, Botany & Pl. Pathology
November 19, 1971
COLLECTIVE BARGAINING AND THE DECISION PROCESS WITHIN THE UNIVERSITY
by John H. Keltner

The remarks of my colleagues on collective bargaining in this and previous issues of the Faculty Forum concern all of us. We are facing important changes in the structure and organization of higher education. According to Robert Theobald these changes could bring the destruction of institutionalized education in this country and a return to highly individualized systems. The increasing numbers of able and qualified students dropping out or just not entering higher education should be recognized as something more than the usual erosion process.

The pressures upon the institution of higher education are growing rapidly and are felt by all of us. Public insistence upon greater accountability of the administration of educational systems must not be scorned nor ignored. Students' insistence on work that has greater relevance to their real world cannot be avoided.

Eventually the complaints and the attacks fall upon the faculties. The pointed and critical questions now being raised about our systems of tenure, promotion, hiring, salary determination, purposes and methods of instruction, scope of courses, freedom within the classroom, etc. are only preliminaries to the big attack. These challenges are not mere continuations of discontents from other generations and other times. They may have their roots in other eras but they now represent substantive and insistent questions about the continued existence of faculties with any degree of autonomy and freedom. To take flight from the arena where these matters are being fought out is to engage in truly fatal "headinsandism."

As this struggle for our very existence becomes clearer we are becoming more and more aware of collective bargaining as a reality of public life. Since President Kennedy's Order 10988 made it possible for federal employees to bargain with their employers, the expansion and sophistication of public sector bargaining has moved rapidly. Public employees at every level of government are organizing and bargaining. Teachers in the public schools in Oregon, for example, have been involved in the process (called "consultation" to avoid the onus of the word "bargaining") for about five years. In the last legislature, substantive changes were made in the law to make bargaining processes more functional and viable.

In the Eastern part of the United States, some colleges and faculties are now moving into bargaining postures in the face of real threats to their welfare and professional freedom. These threats are no less here than they are in the East. We are simply less aware of their significance and reality.
There is no way in which we can avoid involvement in bargaining processes. We must confront this reality with a concert of effort quite uncommon to the academic community. Failure to achieve this concert will simply hasten our professional demise.

Many of us have viewed with disdain what we considered a "process of the crass marketplace." Too many of us feel that we are above such involvement in the determination of our personal welfare. This kind of olympian seclusion from reality will bring us nothing but hemlock in our wine.

There is truly nothing unprofessional about the bargaining process. It has a long and distinguished history. Labor vs. management bargaining is hardly the exclusive area of its application. Agriculture has used the process for a number of years in the coops and in the struggles between the growers and the processors. International affairs have, almost since the beginning of the nation states, relied on various forms of bargaining out the conditions of the relationships between nations. The statesmanship of men like Ralph Bunche, Dag Hammerskold, Trigrye Lie, and others came into being as they became bargaining agents and later mediators in the realm of international bargaining (called diplomacy). The church has long depended on forms of collective bargaining to conduct its affairs. Ecumenical efforts throughout the centuries have involved occasional massive bargaining events as well as almost daily negotiations for the favor of deity.

In our own University, we have engaged in considerable collective bargaining as we struggle to develop curricula and courses. We regularly become embroiled with each other about our respective rights to offer certain courses or our relationship to the academic community itself. While many of these are individual confrontations there are many which are part of a process of working out decisions suitable to the university community. In these instances, representatives of various groups negotiate with each other to accomplish curriculum adjustments. While we have called this process by many other names, it is frequently one of the purest forms of collective bargaining. There is, thus, no reason for us to turn away from collective bargaining about our personal and professional welfare on the grounds that it is below our dignity. We, ourselves, have dignified it in our own deliberations. It is reasonable to do so.

Intense bargaining between the faculty and the administration of higher education is inevitable now. Thus, it is necessary for us to organize in a fashion unfamiliar to the academic profession. Provincial differences of academic genre must be set aside. As a total faculty we must address ourselves to the task of getting into condition for the events to come.

As we do this several questions arise. Must we adopt the same game rules now used by the private sector in the labor vs management
bargaining? Are there unique dimensions which can be developed to fit our particular conditions and personalities? Where does collective bargaining fit into the University scheme of decision-making?

I'll tackle the last question first. As I see it, bargaining is only a part of the process whereby individuals and groups make decisions. It is neither the best nor the worst way in which to arrive at a mutual commitment which can guarantee action. If we should set the various processes into a continuum I think we would all agree that the most desirable decision-making process would be joint deliberation which results in a voluntary commitment of all persons involved in the problem. At the other end of the continuum are those processes which involve unilateral decision-making by individuals or small power groups and the enforcement of these decisions on all others regardless of position. Sometimes, at this level, the decisions are imposed by force of one kind or another.

Ranging between the extremes of full open joint decision-making and closed unilateral decisions are the processes involving bargaining. When the joint deliberation processes fail to achieve results which can be translated into necessary action, we quite naturally begin to choose up sides. At this point the bargaining process can begin work. Rather than declare war, we gather our force and power from our constituencies, select representatives or agents and send them to bargain out the conditions of our relationship with each other. Factors of persuasion, argument, power, influence, and strategy become involved. The representatives and/or agents at the bargaining table must be experts in the processes of bargaining. There is no substitute for this skill at the bargaining table.

Arising out of the bargaining relationship are two third-party processes which are receiving greater attention in the public sector bargaining than ever before. Mediation is a process whereby a disinterested third party assists the parties in working out a decision. Mediators do not make any decisions, they have no power to enforce any decisions, and they cannot force the parties to any decision which mediators might believe is justified. The mediator is, essentially, a catalyst to the decision-making through bargaining. He is there because both parties have recognized that there are conditions which make it difficult, if not impossible, for them to work their problems out alone. Mediators are called in to provide privileged communication channels, to assist in making suggestions for settlements which the parties may have overlooked, to encourage the parties to work the problem through and to help one or both parties "save face" when they are overextended.

When the parties are unable to find agreement, even with the help of a mediator, they may then seek the help of another kind of third party, an arbitrator. At this point the parties to a dispute agree to give away their right to make a decision themselves. The
arbitrator hears the arguments from both sides and makes a decision which both parties have agreed to follow prior to the appointment of the arbitrator.

It is important to all of us to recognize the quite different functions of the two kinds of third party intervention. Mediation does not abridge the function of both parties to make their own decisions. Arbitration, by mutual agreement of the parties, takes away the right of the parties to make their own decision. Obviously, if the parties wish to protect their right to make decisions, they should attempt mediation first. Arbitration should be used only after all other possible peaceful processes of reaching decisions are exhausted.

It won't take X-ray vision for you to recognize, immediately, that as the joint processes cease to work, we tend to move to other means of decision-making in the University. These conditions have been present from the beginning.

It is becoming apparent that the present conditions in the University no longer allow for joint deliberation and decision-making on many matters in the University of direct personal concern to us as faculty members. Where once faculties could deliberate on policy and then see it applied, now their policy functions are being abridged by no less than the legislature itself. Where once the Chancellor may have been the voice of the professional faculty, he now is the administrator of the public's universities. As such he is answerable not to the faculty but to the government and the people of the State. It is no shock to me that Chancellor lieuallen spoke as he did on his visit here last month about his role in relation to the faculty. He is a realist in this respect. He is the resident manager of the people's institutions of higher education in this State. His job is to see that these institutions produce what the people of the state want them to produce.

Likewise, deans and department heads are less and less representative of their faculties and more and more middle-managers of the university enterprise. Their responsibilities to the faculty as such are diminishing and their responsibilities and accountability to the top management of the university is increasing. More and those seeking to fill the administrative positions in the University are looking for professional managers rather than academicians. This makes very good sense in terms of the present condition of the university as a state enterprise.

This condition brings an inevitable scism between faculties and university administrations. The personal and professional welfare of the faculties as such is less a direct concern of the administrators than is the maintaining of the institution and its service to the government and the people of the state. Insofar as the welfare and condition of the faculty is directly related to the output and the responsibility of the university in the eyes of the public the administrator is concerned with the faculty. You and I may feel that the welfare of the faculty is the first priority matter
matter in the maintenance of the institution. This view is not necessarily held by the professional administrator.

Under these circumstances it becomes necessary that the faculties of the universities seek ways of protecting and advancing their own welfare in order that they may perform their tasks as teachers and researchers with maximum effectiveness.

In the face of the growing scism we have several alternatives. Among them is the attempt to increase the amount and broaden the scope of the joint decision-making processes within the university and within the state government in relation to the welfare of the faculties. Attempts at this, while weak at best, have indicated that we are not very effective. Our own decision-making processes are almost grossly inadequate to handle such matters. Some of the evidence for that can be seen at almost every faculty senate meeting.

Another alternative is to abandon any effort to be a part of the essential decision-making concerning our personal professional futures. This choice I reject immediately. I still think that I have a right and a responsibility to be a party to the decisions regarding my own professional future.

The last alternative is some sort of collective bargaining. This is not an unhappy alternative for it provides us with possibilities of an even greater voice in our own welfare than we have had in the past. It seems to be the only responsible alternative which we can handle.

There is no reason why we have to adopt the form and style of bargaining used in private labor-management relations. Ours can become a different type, designed to meet our unique situations. It may be that we will have to experiment with a four-sided bargaining: faculty-students-administration-public. In such manner it may become an advanced form of representative joint decision-making. We can also introduce mediation processes much earlier in the situation than is typical in the private sector and thus bring to bear the talents of the mediator in helping us solve our own problems. It is also possible that we can develop a greater and more effective use of arbitration when our differences become organizational disputes.

Beginning the preparation for bargaining is not easy nor is there a clear path to follow. We must examine the existing organized faculty units to determine their viability as representatives of the faculty. Such units would include the faculty senate, the faculties of the several schools, and the faculties of the departments.

If these units cannot or are not allowed to handle the functions of working out the relationship with the employers, we must then seek other organization forms on which to build our strength. One thing is sure, we must find some form of organization which will give us
maximum power to bargain with the administrators and policy makers. Without a soundly organized faculty constituency which will, if necessary, back up its agents and representatives with action, there is no use even beginning. We have at present several possibilities which must be examined: The AAUP, The OSFA, The AFT, and the possibility of a new faculty unit of statewide nature.

Beginning, also, brings on the problems of selecting, preparing and supporting those representatives who must be our voice at the decision-making table. These people, whether they be representatives chosen from amongst our own people or trained agents whom we employ, must be expert in the skills of negotiation and bargaining. The state employers are learning through their negotiations with the classified personnel that the unskilled negotiator is a serious handicap. With that knowledge they are bringing in more skilled people to represent them at the table. We must be prepared to do the same.

So, I think we are on our way whether we want to go or not. The inevitable is here. We simply delayed too long in refining our own joint decision-making processes so that they would provide ample protection for us (the faculty). Now we must take the necessary steps to provide protection within the system now emerging in the state university complex. Each of us must assume responsibility and share in the effort and sacrifices or all of us will suffer immeasurably!

John Keltner

November, 1971
Collective Bargaining For Faculty Members

Will the faculty of Oregon State University join the trade union movement? A few years ago such an idea would be unthinkable. Today a small but growing number of professors would eagerly embrace collective bargaining. Others view this prospect with revulsion. Meanwhile the majority are unaware of the events which are changing the world we have known.

At this point it is difficult to determine if Oregon professors will adopt unionism in any significant numbers in the near future. Because it can happen here, we should explore the possibilities and implications.

Men join unions because they feel unable to influence the important decisions which determine their careers. When their employers treat them as groups and not individuals, they discover they have but little influence and almost no bargaining power. The exercise of arbitrary power by their superiors can damage their careers and sometimes even end them. When hope of advancement through individual achievement is replaced by the realization that one is but an unimportant member of an undifferentiated group, one is ready for unionism. Finally when other groups seem to be making gains by organizing, unionism may come quickly.

University communities would seem to provide infertile ground for unionism. Professors have possessed status, influence, and security such as people in few other professions enjoy. Although compensation in terms of the required training has always been modest, most of us have had significant and regular pay increases, at least until the last few years. Professors in comparable universities outside of Oregon have done even better. For most Oregon professors there has been the chance to move elsewhere if conditions here should change for the worse.

Professors have been treated here as professionals and not employees to whom regulations must be applied. Under President Strand who ran his own show, professors felt they had influence. We were smaller then and he was readily accessible. Although the Senate was hardly responsive to the faculty, he seemed to be. At least many felt they had his ear.

As the University grew, President Jensen introduced more administrative machinery and procedures. At the same time he transformed the Senate into a body representing faculty. In numerous other ways faculty responsibility and influence grew.

A University such as ours is highly decentralized. In our departments we determine who our colleagues shall be, our course offerings, our standards for promotion, how to cover for sick colleagues, and in some cases who the chairman shall be. We have some influence in the choice of deans and other administrative officers.

Most matters in a university are decided by contending influences and not by exercise of power. We gain the impression that the logical arguments and skillful negotiations win most of the decisions. We would be shocked if an administrator refused to listen to us and made a decision clearly contrary to our interests.
We call our system of university governance the collegial system. It is also a congenial one. As long as it continues to function and we continue to enjoy security, status, and reasonable gains in our standard of living, unionism is not likely to take hold. Unfortunately, many of us are concerned that these conditions are being eroded away.

As we have grown into a larger university, individual influences become less and less. New layers of administrators insulate the top decision makers from the rest of us. A new high rise office building isolates the higher administrators from the rank and file of professors.

Pressures from the outside force administrators to perform in ways they have not before. When they have fewer funds to dispense, they must make difficult decisions which may harm some person's career. They also foreclose on the dreams of many to build their departments and schools into towers of strength.

Also from the outside comes the demand for accountability. If administrators must be accountable, they cannot afford to share the responsibility for decisions. How can a department be permitted to follow its own hiring practices, if they lead to the loss of millions of dollars of contracts? Can a department choose its own chairman if its choices perpetuate mediocrity for the department or create trouble for the University. In countless ways this trend toward accountability, if continued, may lead to what may appear to faculty members as arbitrary decisions. A feeling of powerlessness could replace the present feeling of being influential and appreciated.

Lack of resources may continue the trend of increasing the student teacher ratio. Small classes may be eliminated and work loads increased. Professors may have less and less classes in which they and students have any meaningful relationships. Not only is the type of loss unfortunate in itself, but it leads to dissatisfaction on the part of students. Often the students blame the faculty members rather than the situation. They charge faculty members as being dull, irrelevant or even incompetent. Then as a reaction to the accountability drive, students' secret reactions are solicited to be used in considerations for promotion, tenure, and retention.

The students with some public backing attack faculty tenure policies. Members of the legislature also believe in some change. At present the Board of Higher Education has a committee studying the situation. Although President MacVicar of O.S.U. and President Clark of the U. of O. have taken stout stands in favor of tenure, the Chancellor declines to say anything except that some sort of change is in order. Furthermore, he asserts that it is not his function to protect the interests of the faculty. This attack on tenure along with the expressed dissatisfaction by students strike at the feelings of security by faculty members.

While the legislature has usually exercised parsimony when deciding on our raises in pay, they were particularly stingy this last time. They showed themselves subject to pressure from groups having more power than we have. It is obvious that as long as our state's fiscal affairs remain in their sorry state we shall suffer. There is no prospect for improvements in the near future. The tactless remarks of our non-faculty friends and neighbors that they shall vote for no tax increases indicate that our prospects are dim.
The feeling of being influential may be decreasing. Decisions in the future may seem arbitrary as administrators follow the collegial system less and less. They may appear as bosses instead of colleagues. If we lose tenure, the relationship of bosses to employees can be quickly established. At the same time the feeling of insecurity can motivate faculty to seek unionism. Frustration over salary matters can initiate demands that we must have organizations strong and tough enough to be effective. If we see other universities making what appear to us as substantial gains under unionism, we may join the parade.

No one can say exactly what unionism will mean. Experience at other universities is only fragmentary. Furthermore, the crisis conditions under which it arose affected it in ways that might not be comparable to our situation.

But unionism would alter many of our relationships. We could no longer be as individualistic as we are. Effective bargaining depends upon solidarity and preventing members from going off in all directions. It also depends upon developing a clout, either political or economic. The former is difficult without intensive organization and almost universal participation. The latter implies the ability to close institutions. To do so would require a toughness, intolerance, and a willingness to undergo grave risks. The better organized we would be, the less would be the need for the tough approach. We might never need to utter an overt threat in order to receive reasonable treatment. Yet the possibility is distressing.

The administrators would act differently if we were unionized. The trends I have noted would be carried out still further. Instead of dealing with us as individuals, they would bargain with our representatives. Consequently, they could not afford to be as candid or as generous. They would have to hold back considerations which they could use as bargaining counters.

Many of our existing committees and councils might be eliminated, curtailed or made into joint union-employee bodies. The informal give and take relationships would be altered. We would live under a collective bargaining contract instead of day by day accommodations.

We would lose something under collective bargaining. Perhaps we shall lose these things anyway. If the public, the legislature, and our administrators destroy our collegial system, we would have little to lose. Instead we would have the gains which can come from strength.

Regardless whether we eventually turn to collective bargaining, we should in the meantime strengthen our professional organizations: the A.A.U.P. and the O.S.E.A. We should follow events carefully and not interpret every mistake of an administrator as evidence of the collapse of our present system. It is not closed yet. Later if we find collective bargaining is in our interest, let us approach it carefully and thoughtfully. Let us retain as much of our collegial system as we can. It was an ideal which was never completely realized, but our believing in it made us professionals instead of mere employees.

L. G. Harter, Jr.
Department of Economics
November 30, 1971
GUIDELINES FOR PREPARATION OF MANUSCRIPTS FOR THIS PUBLICATION

The "OSU Faculty Forum Papers", a publication for the exchange of faculty opinions concerning university affairs, is published monthly through the office of the Dean of Faculty with the assistance of a faculty advisory committee. Guidelines for this publication were approved by the Faculty Senate on March 7, 1968 and appear in the March 15, 1968 edition of the Staff Newsletter. The guidelines contain the following directions for the preparation of manuscripts:

a. Must be authored by a faculty member eligible for election to the Senate according to the provisions of Section 2 of Article IV of the Bylaws.

b. Should be typed in a form which can be reproduced directly without the need of retyping or rearranging. Short papers of one or two pages may be typed with either single or double spacing to make best use of full pages. Longer papers must be single spaced. Other requirements:

   (1) Use 8-1/2" x 11" plain white bond paper (sub.20)

   (2) Type on one side of page only

   (3) Do not number or fold sheets

   (4) Leave at least 1-1/2" margin at the top of all pages

b. Should not exceed a reasonable length. A six page limit is suggested, including displays such as tables or graphs. If this limit is exceeded, publications will require approval of the faculty advisory committee.

c. Should be signed (use black ink) and dated by the author at the end. The author's name and a subject, if appropriate, may be typed at the heading of the first page of the paper.

d. Manuscripts are to be submitted to the office of the Dean of Faculty. Receipt of each manuscript will be acknowledged. For each monthly publication, the deadline for the receipt of manuscripts shall be noon of the last full working day (Monday thru Friday) of the preceding month.
The problems stated by Dr. John Morris in the Faculty Forum Papers for December 1969 have concerned the Library staff for a number of years. We are in sympathy with Dr. Morris’ objectives. There is, however, some misconception and some incorrect information included in his statement. We would like to set the record straight.

The purpose of the Library is to make the maximum number of books, journals and other library materials available to the maximum number of interested persons. We are not in the “book storage” business. If the Library collection is not used and used intensively, it is useless. The policies which were approved by the Faculty Senate Library Committee and which had the support of the Faculty Senate and the Council of Deans were designed to increase the collection usefulness for all.

These policies were conceived with the intent that the interests of all members of the campus would be better served. They were initiated in an attempt to recognize the needs of a fast growing student enrollment and regular increase in the number of faculty and staff. Our purpose was to have Library materials available in the library as often as possible, or immediately recallable when needed. At the time the policies were initiated, it was recognized that changes would be inaugurated as necessary to meet different situations. Also, it was recognized by the Committee that we could not and would not please everyone.

The basic statement of Library Policy Relating to Faculty was published January 6, 1967 in the Staff Newsletter. This policy has been unchanged since that time except for a revision of the policy pertaining to the purchase of Library materials from non-library funds. This revision, dated October 1, 1969 has not been published in the Staff Newsletter. It was sent to all Department Heads and Deans since it involved primarily procedural matters concerning a new way of purchasing materials for working collections in departments and schools.

In response to specific items raised in the paper published in the Faculty Forum, Library policy is as follows:

Unbound periodicals do not circulate. They may be checked out for two hours. Bound journals circulate to faculty and graduate students for three days. Officially there are no renewals, but
there is no practicable way to enforce this. Requested material is not renewed. Failure to comply with the regulations will result in graduate students being assessed 25¢ an hour until the item is returned. Faculty who fail to return items on time or when requested are a different matter. There are no teeth in any regulations which we have and faculty members are generally not fined. In instances where there are difficulties, the Director of Libraries solicits the assistance of the Department Head, or if necessary, the Dean of the School. So far this has proven effective.

In some cases, exceptions are made for materials for which there is a special need, especially monographs in the field of taxonomy. Certain heavily used journals are restricted to library use.

Extended privileges for restricted materials are the result of an active rather than a passive process. Special arrangements must be made with a professional staff member in the Library Division concerned, for all extended loans of bound journals or other restricted materials to a faculty member or graduate student. Such materials may be recalled at any time. The Library would appreciate being told when it appears an exception has been made that is detrimental to the interests of others.

Monographs are charged to faculty on extended loan. The first two weeks of the loan is rightfully reserved for use of the faculty member who charges the book out for his personal use. If at the end of two weeks, there are requests for the item, the faculty member is contacted and asked to please return the book. With perhaps one or two exceptions per year, our request for return to the Library has been granted. To the faculty member who checks out books for graduate students or other students in a particular course, we point out that such materials are more susceptible to loss and that they are subject to recall upon request after the initial two-week charge period. The only sure way that materials can be made available to students in a specific course is to place them on reserve in the Library. In our statement of policy we have suggested that Library materials needed for extended periods of time in the department must be purchased from non-library funds by interdepartmental requisition. Many faculty members do it this way; others purchase required items from their personal or from grant funds.

In response to the suggestion that a messenger service should be instituted whereby library books could be returned to the Library, "much the way campus mail is collected," may I suggest that service is now available for returning books (not bound journals) through the campus mail. Return is restricted to only one book at a time and is done at
the sender's risk, but it is possible.

In response to the questionnaire which was to be returned to Dr. Morris, the first statement suggesting the prohibition of circulation of all library holdings is unrealistic. Second, we currently prohibit circulation of bound journals beyond the three day period. Third, it is fine in principle to make faculty privileges automatically short term unless extended privileges are specifically requested. Unfortunately, however, the Library has no lever to use for prying these short term items from the faculty member except recourse to the Head of the Department or the Dean of the School. Additionally, it would require a quarterly inventory - a process neither the Library Circulation staff nor the faculty would particularly like.

The appropriate place to request a review of existing circulation restrictions and policies is the Faculty Senate Library Committee and I am sure this body would be quite willing to review a request from any person who feels that the present policies are not satisfactory and who could provide the justification for review.

Rodney K. Waldron
Director of Libraries

December 15, 1969
A Greater Restriction of Library Book Circulation is Urgently Needed

Part II

In the December issue of Faculty Forum Papers I stated my arguments for increasing the research value of Kerr Library by having greater circulation restrictions on its holdings. I want to thank those who took the time to mark and return the opinion questionnaire appended to that letter, and I especially want to thank the many who expanded on their views when they differed from the choices given. There were 321 faculty or other staff who responded. This figure includes three who did not identify themselves. Because several comments were repeated often, I have tabulated them below along with responses to the items in the questionnaire.

From these data and from the individual comments people added, it is obvious that the vast majority of the respondents agree that some changes in the circulation policy are desirable. Less than 9% (item #5) recommended no change at all and about 50% (items #1, 2, 3, 4, and 10) saw a definite advantage in tighter restrictions of one kind or another. Item #3 was checked by 11 of the 28 checking #5. The other respondents offered other kinds of schemes for increasing circulation.

Key to Tabulation

(Items 1 through 5 are given as they appeared in the December, 1969 paper)

"I favor the policy (or policies) for Kerr Library circulation indicated:

1. Prohibiting circulation of all library holdings.
2. Prohibiting circulation of bound journals.
3. Initiating a messenger service for returning books.
4. Making faculty privileges automatically short-term unless extended privileges are specifically requested each time a book is checked out.
5. Keeping all existing circulation restrictions and policies.

Other
6. Modify #2 to prohibit circulation of bound journals except for a very brief period (i.e., 1-2 hr) to permit copying.
7. Modify #2 to prohibit circulation of bound journals beyond one to a few days.
8. Same as #4 but require renewal of book or journal kept beyond a specified time.
9. Allow the faculty no special privileges; student and faculty the same.
10. Faculty privileges all short-term without extension.
11. Make borrower's name available to anyone asking for it rather than keeping it secret.
12. Impose fines or some form of censure on faculty who abuse loan privileges.
13. Improve the library copy service; for example, provide a no-wait do-it-yourself copier, the use of which could be charged to an account number.
### Questionnaire Items

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School of H &amp; Ss:</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>11</th>
<th>12</th>
<th>13</th>
<th>Total Respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Anthropology</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Architecture</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Art</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economics</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geography</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>History</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Modern Languages</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Music</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philosophy</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychology</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sociology</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speech</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School of Science:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Atmospheric Sciences</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biochem. &amp; Biophysics</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Botany &amp; Plant Path.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chemistry</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Entomology</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Science</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geology</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mathematics</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Microbiology</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oceanography</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physics</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statistics</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zoology</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional Schools:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agriculture</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business &amp; Technology</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engineering</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forestry</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Home Economics</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pharmacy</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Div. of Physical Ed.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Radiation Center</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water Res. Res. Inst.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sea Grant Marine</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advisory Program</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extension</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Computer Center</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Library Staff</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O.S.U. Administration</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Health Service</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KOAC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>unsigned</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTALS</strong></td>
<td>15</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>220</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>321</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
I emphasized the point that a library can only be useful when its holdings are available for study and that its usefulness declines when one must wait for books to be returned at his request. Some writers were opposed to greater restriction because they need to refer to volumes in their offices and laboratories. A compromise solution, as was pointed out by several respondents, might be to restrict only those journals requested the most (i.e., a sort of negative feedback control) or those journals published within the last 5 to 10 years. Apparently a considerable amount of the demand for extended privileges comes from those who do studies involving old books, journals, and manuscripts that no longer can be purchased for private libraries and only rarely circulate. Clearly, revised circulation policies should consider these points.

Mr. Waldron was kind enough to show me an advance copy of his letter appearing in this issue of Faculty Forum Papers. His comments add emphasis to some of mine and reflect some of the ideas expressed by questionnaire respondents. He emphasizes the fact that library rules for faculty have "no teeth" in them. As he implies, this is in need of immediate correction, and 16 of the respondents will agree with him on this (item #12). He also mentions the 3-day limit on bound journals. As was evident from the questionnaire responses (see item #7), this limit is not widely known or respected. It certainly needs emphasis and enforcing as Mr. Waldron indicates. Finally, he points out that Campus Mail is available for book return, a fact I did not know until I received comments from some respondents who now use it. Judging from the large number of people who favored the initiation of such a service (item #3), this should come as welcome information. Presumably my ignorance of this service is the misconception and incorrect statement Mr. Waldron attributes to my original letter. This service is outlined in the January 6, 1967 Staff Newsletter and is discussed by Mr. Waldron in his current Faculty Forum contribution.

Respectfully,

John E. Morris,
Assistant Professor
Department of Zoology
We Need to Support the Minority and Special Services Program

I believe at this time that the faculty of Oregon State University should support the Minority and Special Services Program at O.S.U.

If we are sincere in our belief that minority groups should be given a chance to become a part of the American system and contribute to its well being, then we must see to it that they are able to stay and compete in the university. If we bring minority groups here we can do three different things with them: we can do nothing for them and flunk them out; we can pass them regardless of how well they do and lower our standards; or we can give them some meaningful assistance so that they can successfully compete. This latter is the type of program we should support. If we fail to provide adequate counselling and tutoring we are having them participate in an exercise of futility. These students no doubt have the intelligence, but they do lack adequate background training.

Whether you are a liberal or conservative, radical or reactionary, it is my opinion you can with a good conscience support this program.

I was pleased to read in the April 3 issue of the Staff News Letter that the Executive Office supported this program. I hope that the faculty will see it this way and give the program the financial support that it needs.

Respectfully yours,

Myron G. Cropsey

Dept of Agricultural Engineering

April 7, 1970
Dear Colleagues:

As a matter of human nature, it seems required in times of stress, that we exacerbate our woes by self pity, by imagining that we alone have suffered such trials, that our situation is unique and, therefore, there is little reason to seek counsel from others. Because "misery loves company," I have been seeking evidence that in fact, our situation is not uncommon. By chance, I recently came across a quotation by Jacques Barzun that confirms my belief that our problems at Oregon State are not unique but are symptomatic of an illness common to many institutions of higher education today (The Center Magazine, III(2):51).

"Making the university more worldly has enormously increased the power of professionalism both inside and outside the university. The Mandarin system is now in the saddle everywhere, and with all its usual features: vanity, self-seeking, faddishness, and punishment for the naive, who are usually the geniuses. The contemporary spectacle of the curb market in prestige, with its bargains and bribes and daily ranking of men on the big board, is a reproach to intellect; and the goal of public service which frequently leads to genteel prostitution in the halls of industry and charitable foundations, is no less a reproach to morality. We keep speaking of a company of scholars, but what we have in our new Babylons of higher learning is a scrimmage of self-seeking individuals and teams, the rugged age of gilded research. This commercial outlook, re-enforcing professionalism, explains the absence of original ideas in almost every field of learning and will insure the continuance of that dearth for as long as the boom lasts."

And then, too, I found the following in an essay by William Arrowsmith (Campus 1980, ed. A.C. Furich, p. 125).

"Why don't administrators take the stump on behalf of their policies? There is, I suspect, only one answer, and it is not powerlessness, but lack of policies and ideas, and a long habit of prostration before success. A man cannot stump for programs he does not have, and this is why so many administrators talk such dreary rubbish. They have, quite literally, nothing to say. Alternatively, they are the prisoners of their origins, the professoriat from which they emerged and whose assumptions and aims they share. Hence, they conceive of their task as the encouragement of the status quo and, when confronted with the crisis of education, claim, like Clark Kerr, that chaos is positively good for us, or, like President Perkins, that we can reconcile teaching and scholarship by the simple device of abandoning liberal education."
I believe that my colleagues of the Faculty of Oregon State University would do well to read and re-read these two statements and ponder seriously their relevance to the current academic crisis on this campus. In like manner, I believe that every administrator should, in addition, read again this admonition contained in the report of the Ad Hoc Committee of the Faculty Senate (Gill, Glicksberg, Wehausen): "...but we believe that each person who opposed tenure should ask himself if he would have made the same decision if each man had been unobtrusive outside his academic life, spending his leisure time playing, say, bridge, golf, or the piano."

The time is near at hand when all concerned must face the question of this institution's raison d'être. But we are not alone facing a need for the justification of our institutional existence in terms of our educational function, but also the justification of our actions as an intellectual community. We must not allow ourselves to be bound to ritual and convention. Our intellectual insight must not be blinded by prejudice and emotion. We must remain a forum for the new, the different, the controversial as well as the repository for the old, the traditional, the accepted. We cannot allow the fad of the moment to interfere with our intellectual life.

Most serious of all the sad results of the present conflict is the interruption of communications, never very freely resorted to on this campus. The tendency to defend decisions that have been challenged by citing pretended, irreproachable standards or goals effectively stifles discussion. The putative standards of individual and institutional excellence have been arbitrarily adopted and are themselves being widely and seriously questioned. Moreover, the decisions as to institutional goals remain to be made. Nevertheless, the advocacy of these so-called "standards" makes opposition difficult because of the ease with which the "professional standards" of an opponent may be made the subject of debate rather than the substantive issues involved in a questioned decision. If this is a conscious strategy, then it can only be compared to a politician's espousal of church, flag and motherhood when otherwise lacking an adequate defense for his performance or program. If the adherents to this strategy deny that there is a conscious effort at diversion, then there remains only the alternative that they have succumbed to illogical reasoning.

Whatever the basis for these differences of opinion, there is only one means to a satisfactory solution. This is, of course, a full and frank discussion of the substantive elements. The intrusion of peripheral matters, particularly of personalities only further polarizes the issues without any hope of final resolution by intellectual processes. While there is no question but that "the administration" has legal authority to make arbitrary decisions predicated on assumptions of need for "the good of the institution" or the "protection of the image of the institution," it is also incontrovertible that reliance on the power of position to force compliance with or "acceptance" of a decision is unworthy of the intellectual community. When reasons are promulgated
that involve "position," "prestige," "size," money, conformity or other non- or anti-intellectual concepts, it become obvious the educational function has truly been lost to sight. When the "institution" or "the administration" begins to acquire greater significance than the educational function, it is obvious that the power to direct has been usurped by individuals who are not scholars interested in ideas but are simply people seeking some form of personal satisfaction or professional aggrandizement. This is usually associated with obvious desire for power or prestige or with the pursuit of causes antithetic with the educational process.

Not uncommonly, when the aggressive, messianic administrator fails to persuade by rhetoric, the next ploy is tendentious reorganization. When vigorously assailed by logic, the ultimate weapon is progressive isolation and emasculation of the opposition. The combative gamesman views this as a legitimate road to victory, but to the educator, it represents defeat of the principle of free interplay of ideas. To the institution it marks a failure to achieve the status of a university and to the public it lends credence to the idea that the educational process is really like any other business venture.

What scholar has time for gamemanship, for power plays, for consideration of political advantage? What teacher worthy of the title would dare defend a classroom position by authoritarian dictation? Faced by these tactics and rebuffed in their efforts to obtain proper intellectual consideration of essential principles, the Faculty of Oregon State University is falling into disarray. Those who feel their professional or social lives are not directly affected seek neutrality. Those driven by strong personal ambitions have opted for the position calculated to do their careers the most good (or the least harm). A large proportion of the Faculty, however, still vocally express their concern for humanitarian, intellectual and educational principles and stoutly refuse to accept less than an intellectual assessment of their grievances. While we still hope that time or circumstances will provide us this relief, it is a matter of real grief to many that this has not been automatic, immediate and unquestioned.

"--our motto too, will be "Publish or Perish"--but by "publish" we mean simply "make public." Some men "make public" by writing books, others building institutions, others teach, still others are. All of them will, one hopes, have a place in the new university" (William Arrowsmith, The Center Magazine III (2):50).

---

Harry K. Phinney
Department of Botany
March 30, 1970
A Suggestion on Commencement Procedure

There has been a great deal of thought and consideration given by many people, to the university commencement procedure. As the number of graduates increase, the desire to maintain a worthy, intimate and meaningful procedure for all concerned is seemingly impossible. Mass production techniques and computerized traffic control can indeed run the graduates through a line, but what happens to the personalized and relaxed atmosphere that the Academe tries to create for those involved?

It seems to me a suggestion worthy of consideration would be for each School to conduct its own commencement program with the Dean of the School presiding. I am aware this would eliminate some university-wide activities such as the ROTC Commissioning ceremony. However, this, like the administering of degrees, is in need of the personalization that is now being lost in numbers and it could be conducted in a special ceremony for the candidates, their families and friends. Timing and places for holding the School ceremonies could be scheduled so that not all would be held at the same hours.

It would appear that the commencement parade and program spectacular is done more for the university than for the graduates. In our modern, populous society of today, the need to retain personalized relations becomes increasingly difficult. Even a university that tries to provide all things for all its students must recognize that when its students leave the family, their leaving should have an intimate relationship that should be meaningful. I realize that a great many details would need to be coordinated, but these are resolvable if a desire to do so is present.

April 21, 1970

Head, Dept. of Veterinary Medicine

J.M. Dickinson
WE OWE IT TO OURSELVES

Each of us has a stake in our minority program. We cannot afford to allow the efforts to recruit minority students to falter. We must provide the resources necessary to support these students to the point where increasing numbers can achieve academically.

There is no doubt that we have to have patience and a certain amount of faith. Our traditional indices of academic prediction are only minimally valid for these students -- their school records are generally poor and aptitude tests such as the SAT use a vocabulary and work style which handicaps them. With special assistance in making the transition to college requirements plus a knowledge that there are those who believe that they can achieve, many of these students have defeated the usual predictors and have succeeded in programs at other four-year colleges. The most critical predictor for the minority student's chances of success seems to be his motivation to succeed -- a characteristic which is, without doubt, difficult to assess prior to his actually entering college. It is this factor on which the college is taking a risk -- but it is a risk worth taking for the returns to the student and to the college can be great as a result of a relatively small investment.

We must accept the risk not only because Oregon State has a responsibility for involvement in the education of the minority students as well as the white students of the state but also because the simple fact of American minorities on our campus adds to the total educational possibilities for all of us. The minority students, despite their relatively small number, raise questions about our educational processes that we have too much taken for granted. We can't expect that 50 or 100 or even 500 in a student body of 15,000 will directly affect the life of each Caucasian student. We can expect, I believe, that the presence of these students will cause some schools and departments to reevaluate their procedures and what they offer students in light of the questions and special problems which these students pose.

Can we in good conscience withhold from entire identifiable groups in our state the opportunity for their sons and daughters to move into the same types of professional and managerial jobs open to the white graduates of our institution? We have slighted the education of the children of the non-whites too long; they are citizens, too, and we cannot simply sluff off all of their young people to the two-year technical schools. There are potential engineers, pharmacists, businessmen and college instructors among them. We may have to work harder to develop the potentials of minority students but we cannot avoid our responsibility in finding ways of attracting and graduating them in significant numbers.

We can rationalize our way out of the immediate problems we face in coping with the dilemmas posed by experimenting in the education of non-whites. We can make the obvious point that our current Minority and Special Services Program is weak and potentially incapable of assisting very many students. We can maintain, with some justification, that we may be simply encouraging one more failure for some of these students. We can point to the more adequate services for these
young people in community colleges. We can even be inwardly thankful that we are presently isolated from the impact of the major social problems confronting the rest of the country. Unfortunately for some of us, after we have faced up to all these excuses for inaction, we are forced to ask ourselves how we can justify our personal lack of involvement and our institution's reputation for aloofness when we have not made a significant effort to use the resources available to us to meet this human need.

As a land grant college we are supposedly dedicated to solving the practical problems facing the state and nation. OSU has done its share in increasing food production, improving the efficiency of business and commerce, upgrading the skills of our white youngsters for coping with a predominately rural society. However, our major domestic problems today are the problems of an urban and transient population -- and we are only beginning to readjust our priorities to take this fact into account. Outside Corvallis, the presence of the non-white is a fact of urban America and we are in danger of indulging in miseducation unless we take part in offering higher education to these people and encouraging their presence on our campus as part of the educational experience of our white young people who are going to be living in a racially mixed society. We simply cannot afford to educate our white students in isolation from any possibility of contact with a resident non-white population.

The state should recognize the need for increasing the numbers of non-whites on all college campuses by financially supporting the students and the efforts to help them succeed academically. There is no question about that but we cannot simply sit and wait until political and economic pressures force action. We in the OSU community must do now whatever we can do to sustain and increase our small Black, Chicano and American Indian communities until more adequate support is made available from official sources. A few dollars invested in our minority students through the OSU Foundation may be one of the best investments we can make in our institution.... an investment which is really a contribution to ourselves.

Charles Warnath
Director, Counseling Center
April 22, 1970
GUIDELINES FOR PREPARATION OF MANUSCRIPTS FOR THIS PUBLICATION
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On Student Protest

Student protests will continue. The majority of the protesters will want to be peaceable, but a minority of militants, impatient with the official indifference toward peaceful protests, will, as they have in the past, use violence. The targets of their violence will be any buildings or offices that symbolize official power, whether campus, city, state, or national. All the world has heard our presidents, from Nixon, to Johnson, to Kennedy, to Eisenhower, to Truman, assert that the only argument the enemy respects is force, or the threat of force. Whether the enemy is the Soviet Union, China, North Vietnam, or Cuba, he responds, we are told, only to the threat of nuclear annihilation. The militant protestors have absorbed this doctrine. To them the present enemy is the Nixon administration and all the satellites of this administration, including the universities. Instead of the intimidating threat of nuclear power, however, they have rocks, clubs, bottles, and Molotov cocktails (off campus, working underground, are the nihilistic terrorists manufacturing and being blown up by dynamite bombs). They smash a few windows, demolish some offices, burn a few buildings, confront the police and the National Guard, and finally are jailed. In the process hundreds of non-violent demonstrators are clubbed, tear-gassed, and Maced, and, in one of the latest demonstrations, some are shot to death. The administration, together with all its satellites, continues undeviatingly (but deviously) its policies; its power is undiminished, and it is openly contemptuous of the "bums" who don't appreciate how lucky they are.

Well, as some campus signs ask, what comes next? The question is inseparable from another question: what do they want? What the protesters, violent and non-violent alike, want is not only withdrawal from Cambodia and Vietnam, not only an end to our adventuring in Southeast Asia, not only a reduction in the power of the industrial-military complex; not only an end to the pollution of earth, air, and water, not only the abolition of poverty, not only full and equal participation by citizens of all colors in the social, civic, and political life of the community and the nation, not only influential student participation in university government. They want all these, yes, but they want something more, something that exceeds the sum of all these separate but related wants. They want such a revolution in values as will do away with the present moral squalor, the cheating, the lying, the hypocrisy, that characterize business and political life. They do not want to see university-trained automotive engineers forced to prostitute their talents by designing cars that appeal to the adolescent mentality; they do not want university-trained scientists lured into the kind of research that produces horrifying chemical and bacteriological weapons or, in the realm of the absurd, the ingredients that add a new sales gimmick for producers of tooth paste, deodorants, mouth washes, etc.; they do not want law-school graduates corrupted by devising ways for huge corporations to evade tax and other laws; they do not want to see graduates in humanities and social sciences sell themselves by using their talents to invent more effective ways to induce consumers to buy more and more superfluous trivia.
So what comes next? How is this revolution in values to be achieved? How can honesty, integrity, decency, good taste, intelligence in industry and government be substituted for the prevailing dishonesty, charlatanism, vulgarity, and cunning? Moral persuasion will not do it. Mass demonstrations will not do it. Letters to congressmen will not do it. (Granted there are many honest, intelligent, concerned men in Congress, but their power and influence are limited. The career of Senator Eugene McCarthy is an illustration.)

And so we come back to the use of force. As the use of force by the militants increases, the use of force by the government will increase. More and more armed troops will be called upon to quell the violence. It is not beyond belief that tanks will patrol city streets, curfews will be imposed, search of individuals at air and rail terminals will be conducted, FBI and CIA agents will sit in classrooms and churches, infiltrate PTA groups and other organizations, and various government agencies will compile even more elaborate dossiers of anyone suspected of subversive intentions.

Then what? The vast majority of white citizens, from the lower middle class to the upper middle class, will experience little change. Their taxes may be heavier, their feeling of insecurity may be intensified somewhat, but their government and business leaders will assure them that all is well, that freedom and democracy have prevailed, that the country is sound.

Most of the dissenters will have been jailed. The news media will have been prevailed on not to give publicity to their cases. A new generation of students, numbed by propaganda into acquiescence, will prepare themselves for careers in business and industry. After twenty years or so gas masks will have to be worn by those outside air-conditioned buildings; but after another five years somebody who wanted to show his power will have pushed a button and most of America and most of Europe and a large part of Asia and a bit of Africa will have ceased to be.

*Documented evidence of dishonesty, charlatanism, etc. may be found, to name only a few sources, in C. Wright Mills, The Power Elite; Joe McGinnis, The Making of a President; Senator William Proxmire, Report from Wasteland: America's Military-Industrial Complex; William MacGaffin and Erwin Knoll, Scandal in the Pentagon; the speeches and published writings of Ralph Nader; and almost any TV commercial.

E. A. Schroeder
Department of English
May 13, 1970
PROPAGANDA and ENLIGHTENMENT

Consider for a moment the difference between propaganda and enlightenment. Propaganda is a technique which can be used by any individual or organization to spread specific attitudes, doctrines or practices. It is the art of influencing others to behave as you wish them to behave. It denigrates the individual and ideally would turn people into conditioned animals who react blindly and in unison to cues. Its goal, in essence, is to convert mankind into a mob.

Unlike a group of individuals, a mob can be manipulated. A mob reacts; it does not think. It emotes; it does not reason. It responds to stimuli by action. It can be constructive, but usually it is destructive. Its principal effects upon those who are part of it are a loss of personal identity, a suppression of critical faculties, and a feeling of intense emotional involvement. A mob is irresponsible, tyrannical, inherently uncontrollable, and potentially very dangerous. What is worse, the propagandized individuals who form a mob have an abiding tendency to be mob-thinkers who parrot doctrine and slogans rather than express thoughtful opinion based on unbiased consideration of facts.

Enlightenment, on the contrary, involves individual judgment based upon the individual's own abilities and talents. It is the antithesis of a mob and is essentially a constructive process. It promotes rational behavior. It produces situations where the individual thinks for himself and becomes more of an individual in the process. It is, perhaps, the highest form of learning, and the most difficult, for few of us can resist the slothful temptation to become propagandized, to let others do our thinking and make our decisions.

To lead our own lives and to form our own judgments is not easy. Yet this must be done if the human race expects to progress. Advancement is an individual thing, and human advancement in general is the sum of individual efforts. No mob, however noble, has ever made any significant contribution to human progress.

Just because one person has managed his life well and as a result has become outstanding in some aspect is no proof that he can manage anyone else's life except his own. Any assumption that anyone can dictate the precise course to be followed by others is belief in authoritarianism, which has been an outmoded doctrine for over a generation. And anyone who today applies such a dictum to others is an arrogant propagandist. Those who teach should enlighten. It is the duty of an educator to present true and unbiased facts, to avoid
propaganda and to explain how to solve problems. It is not his province to give predigested answers, complete with slogans and cues.

I think that this is what bothers me most about all this recent fearful unrest in our nation and in the world. In my value system, mankind must develop. It cannot stagnate or stand still. It must grow and evolve to cope with its technology. It can only evolve through enlightenment.

Propaganda is a hopeless method through which to improve the human race. Yet everyone seems to be trying to propagandize. We are so busy correcting everyone else's faults that we pay no attention to our own. And somewhere along the line we have lost our sense of humor and the ability to laugh at our pretentious asinities.

Reason appears lost in a deluge of slogans. Judgment seems to have vanished under a horde of trampling feet. Emotion has apparently replaced thought, and discussion has been supplanted by glib obscenities. Belief in mutation has overthrown the idea of evolution.

This last idea is completely terrifying. Consider for a moment that major mutations in living organisms are better than 99% lethal or detrimental. What, then, is the probability of human survival in a mutating social and political environment, where changes are dictated according to the slogans of mobs responding to propagandists?

Note that I am asking a question. I do not know the answer, but I am apprehensive that it is not good.

May 18, 1970
Date

Jesse F. Bone, D.V.M. 
Professor
A Proposal for Faculty Action

This paper relates to the university and to the faculty. It is motivated by the developments, attitudes, actions, and issues that are dividing and debilitating the nation. The turmoil has increasingly focused in and around university campuses. We observe student groups, for a variety of reasons and on a variety of issues, taking stands and making choices. As their choices have involved the universities, administrations have had to make choices. In terms of the university triad, i.e., students, faculty, and administration, student groups have taken the initiative with administrations following. Recently we have heard a fourth voice, the public, and they seem prepared to make choices. As I see it, university faculties have tended to assume an ever weaker role in the turmoil solution process, and it is costing us. Each time a party to this university-public controversy makes a decision, the faculty loses a degree of freedom. If the faculty remains silent, a degree of freedom is lost when students make a choice, when the administration reacts, and when the public voices their views and takes a stand. This reduction in degrees of freedom—reduction in choice—is a sacrifice we, the faculty, need not make. I ask your indulgence as I make some observations and a suggestion.

On campuses where the politics of social change has been associated with a breakdown in the traditional education, research, and public service missions of a college or university, and where there has been physical destruction and intimidation, there seems to be at least two common characteristics. These are (1) the lack of an explicit statement from faculties regarding their position on the proper role of a college or university in the nation's politics and an expression of their attitude toward the use of violence in facilitating change and (2) the lack of an established, operating, and relevant mechanism that provides an opportunity for dialogue on matters not found in the traditional curriculum and that allows for on-going appraisal of the intra-university or college functions and the relation of those functions to society. On campuses where the students have felt the established procedures for expressing protests were inadequate, or that the people in authority were unresponsive, and where on-campus challenges to established authority and acts of physical violence have been most noticeable, the faculties have not only been divided on the social issues, but they have also been divided or unprepared on what constitutes the role of the university and on how complicit they will be in attempts to utilize the university as a political instrument.

There is increasing evidence that the public, the "silent majority," is becoming more intolerant of the on-campus activities of students and faculty. There is every evidence that the public and their legislators will not continue to pay the bills without demanding and getting more control of intrauniversity activities. Even in Oregon, where the level
of campus turmoil has been moderate to say the least, the public protest over the apparent "lack of discipline and responsibility" on the part of students, faculty, and administrators is reaching ominous proportions. It seems to me that the threat of both intervention by the public into university affairs, and the prospect of continuing internal turmoil, should provide adequate motivation for this faculty to make a positive contribution toward compromise of the present dilemma.

I think this faculty could make such a meaningful contribution to the university and to the State System of Higher Education if they would do two things. These are:

1. Join together and unanimously endorse a statement which:
   a. Philosophically accepts the right of individuals, both students and faculty, to express their opinions in dialogue, and challenge established procedures, values, and institutions.
   b. Simultaneously repudiate the use of violence on campus as well as other acts that serve to disrupt the regular functions of the university.

2. To make the faculty statement on academic freedom and the repudiation of violence meaningful, I propose that we develop a safety valve—a mechanism, probably a committee or commission, through which we can provide for on-going and systematic evaluation of the activities, functions, and role of the university. This mechanism should allow for examination of such questions as relate to:
   a. The role of ROTC on campus and the cost and benefit to the university and to society of banishing this program.
   b. The role of government contract research on campus, and the cost to the university, the state, and society of refusing to accept this kind of research.
   c. The relationship and relevance of the various curricular designs to the "real world."

I regard these two initiatives as politically interdependent. The statement on violence, intimidation, and academic freedom would provide information to the public, the students, the administration and, equally important, to ourselves. The provision of a safety valve mechanism is absolutely essential if the statement on philosophy is to appear an expression of "good faith," i.e., apparently honest and credible. If this faculty would follow through on these challenges, I think we could
do three things. First, student activists and the public would know where the faculty stands with respect to the use of violence and intimidation on campus. In the event outside student activists attempt to make Oregon State University a "more respectable" center of social protest, this will provide the administration with more certainty about one element in the equation of university control. Second, we will have provided a viable and meaningful mechanism for evaluating proposals for change. And third, we can, in the process, attempt to improve the environment in which the university attempts to achieve its more traditional missions.

Gary W. Sorenson
Economics
May 20, 1970
SILENT FACULTIES

On May 6, 1970 the following telegram was sent to President James M. Hester of New York University. It was signed by Oregon State University Acting President Roy A. Young along with the presidents of the other six publicly-owned colleges and universities in the State of Oregon.

"The chief executives of all seven state-supported Oregon colleges and universities would like to join you in a telegram to President Nixon advising him that it is time for direct communications with him to clarify the status and causes of unrest in American college and university campuses.

"We believe a meeting should take place promptly in order to open lines of communication between the White House and many campuses where students feel their points of view are being ignored and their motives overgeneralized and misinterpreted.

"This lack of communication contributes seriously to the wave of unrest tragically racing from coast to coast.

"We believe the tragedy at Kent State and the many planned campus memorials scheduled for this Friday would be an appropriate time for leaders of Western, Mid-Western and Eastern universities to join with the President in making a specific effort to relieve these dangerous tensions which threaten this nation."

A similar telegram was sent to President Nixon.

Two days later on Friday, May 8, the OSU Faculty Forum was convened, having been called by petition of twenty faculty members in order to discuss the interrelated topics of "Violence and Disorder on Campus" and "The War in Southeast Asia". At that meeting I introduced the following resolution, which was adopted by a vote of 71-56. (The total of 127 votes cast is out of approximately 1100 resident faculty members eligible to attend and vote in a Faculty Forum.)

"In response to the appeal of a bipartisan group of five U.S. Senators, including Senator Mark Hatfield of Oregon, we support and endorse Amendment #609 to H.R. 17123 which states that unless there is a formal declaration of war, all U.S. troops will be withdrawn from Cambodia within thirty days after the passage of this amendment. Furthermore, if troops
are still in Laos or South Vietnam as of December 31, 1970, no further funds shall be spent in Southeast Asia for any purpose other than the safe and systematic withdrawal of United States military personnel and the termination of military operations, the exchange of prisoners, and the arrangement of asylum for any Vietnamese. It is provided that withdrawal of U.S. military personnel should be completed by June 30, 1971 unless Congress approves a finding by the President that additional time is required. We urge that every possible effort be made to insure the passage of this amendment."

The motion to adopt the resolution included a stipulation that the resolution and the vote by which it passed should be transmitted to each member of the Oregon Congressional delegation and to President Nixon.

These separate actions by the President of the University and by a portion of its faculty are extraordinary events, as was correctly pointed out, in regard to the latter action, by Professor Emery Castle in a letter of May 14 distributed to the members of the OSU Faculty Senate.

During the month of May, six college students have been shot to death during police actions on college campuses in this country. During the month of May, the President of the United States has launched an invasion of the sovereign nation of Cambodia, without so much as informing the Congress of his intentions. Massive protests, principally on college campuses, have arisen, and counter-protests against the protesters are now being undertaken. Violence against people and against property has occurred on both sides. Hundreds of college campuses have been closed or struck, either temporarily or for the remainder of the academic year. These, too are extraordinary events.

A letter writer in the Oregon Statesman of May 17 quotes President John Kennedy as saying "there comes a time when there are priorities over and beyond that which we have traditionally considered the fundamental purpose of the institution". I must confess my ignorance as to the institution to which he was referring, but I submit that the wisdom of the statement, whether or not it is an accurate quotation, cannot be overlooked and bears special relevance to the current discussions regarding "misuse of the Faculty Forum".

There are times when the faculty of this university has the right - has the obligation - to meet together as a whole, to discuss - in the words of the Faculty Senate Bylaws regarding the Faculty Forum - "any matter of general faculty interest", and if they are so disposed, to pass resolutions and to make their opinion known to others, whether on campus or off. Recognizing that
we are responsible for our actions and our words, and that these must not be undertaken lightly, we must also acknowledge that we are responsible for our inaction and our lack of words. We must not now or at any future time emulate the silent faculties of Adolf Hitler’s Germany. If the OSU Faculty Forum is not the proper vehicle for the faculty to meet together in this fashion, then the proper vehicle must be devised.

If current efforts in the Faculty Senate to rewrite the by-laws concerning the Faculty Forum result in more efficient and precise rules for convening and conduct of the Forum, then these efforts deserve the support of all of us. On the other hand, if it is the intention of the Senate to restrict use of the Faculty Forum to Senate business, then we as faculty members need to know that something is being taken away from us. We need to insist, and to let our Faculty Senators know that we are insisting, that a proper substitute be provided to us by the Senate.

James R. Brown
Faculty, Mathematics
May 21, 1970
Curricular Reform Through Flexible Time-Credit Arrangements

As a university and its administrative units grow in size and complexity, there appears a tendency for faculties to change curricular offerings to favor administrative convenience and to neglect underlying educational goals. The tendency appears even among teachers of the greatest dedication and competence, one of the results being what is perceived by many as an inflexible, "lockstep" program of course offerings. Moreover, the result is that students are obliged to forego a full assimilation of knowledge in any one field in order to "carry a full-time load" of five, six, or even seven course "packages" at a time.

During the winter and spring terms of 1969-70, the Student-Faculty Council on Academic Affairs devoted a substantial fraction of its meetings to the consideration of existing curricular offerings at Oregon State University. The Council concluded that a reduction in the number of course modules to be handled by the typical student in a term, by whatever means, has a high probability of increasing the quality of education at Oregon State University, particularly for undergraduates.

Currently and in the recent past, discussions at OSU about reducing courses per term without reducing credits per term have centered on the concept of a University-wide change from 3-credit to 5-credit courses. The Council wishes, with this paper, to urge recognition of the many other alternatives to such a lockstep solution for a lockstep problem.

In addition to often-mentioned 5-credit course proposals, there are other possibilities based on various changes of credit and/or changes of duration to be associated with an offering. One example would be the presentation of the core of a course (probably as three lectures per week) for three credits, the option being available to the qualified student to add 1 or 2 credits to the value of the same course with the successful completion of appropriate additional work satisfactory to the instructor. (In a sense, this plan is already available in those areas where lecture and laboratory courses are closely but not mandatorily associated) A second example would be the offering of courses with more limited scope for fewer numbers of credits and of proportionately shorter duration, say six weeks for two credits. The obvious results may be seen in the comparison of two hypothetical programs for a term:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>5 courses @ 3 credits</th>
<th>1 course @ 3 credits</th>
<th>1 course @ 2 credits</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>15 credits in 5 packages</td>
<td>15 credits in 4 packages</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Aside from the reduction in the number of modules from 5 to 4, the student electing the second program would have only 3 modules to handle during the last third of the term.
In full realization that any fundamental change necessitates costs and inconveniences, the Council urges consideration of three points. First, the inconveniences involved in curricular change of the sort suggested here would be, and should be, handled at the departmental level, and thus remain at the discretion of the department. Second, in the Council's opinion, the benefits clearly exceed the costs in terms of the criteria associated with quality education. Finally, in view of the action of the Faculty Senate on May 21, the academic year 1970-71 seems an excellent time to discuss these alternatives.

R. Charles Vars, Jr.
Department of Economics
Faculty Co-Chairman, Student-Faculty Council on Academic Affairs
May 29, 1970
Faculty Voting

How would the entire faculty vote on today's questions? Why not find out?

Maximum thoughtful participation in any faculty vote could now occur through the medium of the punch-card employed in a recent poll of student opinion. This modern channel of communication provides a highly desirable expression of the faculty's considered judgment. It can also assure faculty decision as to the questions which deserve faculty commitment and academic involvement.

We propose the formal recognition of the "Faculty Convention of OSU" as a voting body with all who have academic appointments at OSU to have votes in it. Regular or special Faculty Forum meetings would provide for verbal arguments on the questions appearing on the punch-card Faculty Ballot. Members would receive the ballots by mail and would return them by mail or personal delivery a day or so after the Forum meeting.

On each question proposed by a specified number of members the voters would first indicate whether to announce any result of the poll at all, thus deciding whether to accept the question as an item of business for the Faculty Convention. Also, in addition to the pro or con votes on the question itself a voter would have the third option of voting to abstain. Decisions will occur in a calm and reasoned manner and in a deliberative atmosphere at a time chosen by the voter free from parliamentary manipulation and confrontation.

We expect to present this proposal to the President of OSU for authorization. We hope that our colleagues support this concept of intellectual democracy which retains faculty control of the issues in terms of faculty relevance.

Those who wish to see such a plan implemented may endorse it by signing in the space provided below and sending this sheet to any one of the sponsors signing this proposal:

I endorse the foregoing proposal.

(Signed) ________________________________ (School) __________________________

18 May 1970

Fred W. Decker
Keith J. Oles
Olof O. Breedon
Joseph Boye

[Signatures]
An Approach to Faculty Involvement

At the time of this writing, Oregon State University does not reflect the atmosphere of crisis that was a characteristic of some Oregon campuses and many national campuses last year. We have had no confrontations, bombings or strikes. But the issues that were associated with last year's turmoil across the nation have not disappeared and there is no necessary reason to believe campuses in general and our campus in particular will retain its facade of tranquility.

A group of OSU faculty has recently been reflecting on the campus events of last year, the public reaction to campus developments, and upon the institutional and philosophical foundations that have affected the ability of universities or colleges to absorb the continuous shocks of day-to-day crisis.

The group drafted a statement of personal beliefs about what a university is and about certain relationships within the university. The statement was considered for publication in the local newspaper. On reflection that appeared unwise, for there would be no way of determining the degree to which the whole faculty of Oregon State University identified with it. Furthermore, it was clear that considerably more thought should go into such an expression of beliefs. For these reasons, we are offering the statement for the faculty's consideration and we ask for response. In particular, does the faculty think a statement like this is constructive? Is the statement complete? What definitions or additional material are required to provide substance to the statement?

The statement of beliefs or principles we offer for your consideration is as follows:

1. We believe in an "open" university where controversial issues can be discussed.

2. We recognize that the members of the university community are also citizens who have interests that are not limited to the university curriculum.

3. Our concept of the university is broad enough to provide for intellectual involvement in both traditional academic discipline lines as well as in issues of current social concern.

4. We subscribe to the principle of academic freedom such as that expressed in the OSU Faculty Handbook and the AAUP 1940 statement.
5. We believe that in a university the pursuit of knowledge and open exchange of ideas requires an atmosphere free from intimidation and physical provocation.

6. We recognize that the university community consists of a multitude of identifiable groups having a multitude of interest and philosophies and we believe that, except for the State Board or its agent, no single campus group or collection of campus groups can arbitrarily determine the university's destiny or mission or the disposition of its physical facilities.

7. While we believe the university, in all its aspects, is amenable to self-examination, appraisals, and, perhaps, reformation, we think that this process of self-examination and internal change must, like free academic inquiry, take place in an open and intimidation-free environment—an atmosphere that is conducive to objective and systematic analysis rather than one charged by impending crisis.

8. We believe that the character of the university makes it essential that there exist a set of "rules of the game" that reflect the conditions necessary for an open intellectual and academic atmosphere. These rules must reflect the civil liberties assured by civil law and violation of the rules would provide cause for appropriate disciplinary action.

9. While we believe it is the responsibility of both the students and the faculty to maintain an open university environment, it is also true that the immediate responsibility lies with the institutional chief executive.

10. And lastly, we accept our portion of this responsibility.

Robert R. Becker  
Biochemistry

Douglas M. Egan  
Business Administration

C. W. Hovland  
Religious Studies

James G. Knudsen  
Engineering

Robert O. McMahon  
Forestry

Gary W. Sorenson  
Economics

October 27, 1970
Academic Order and Representation

Do our representatives really represent us?

That question arises among citizens of city, state, and nation as well as the members of faculties and student bodies. The "Oregon System" of initiative and referendum has provided a means for going directly to the voters on particular issues, and the proposal for a punchcard city opinion ballot in Corvallis would apply this principle for the advice of the City Council. But faculties, and ours in particular, generally lack such an approach to the questions considered by a Faculty Senate.

Unfortunately, in elections of members of the Faculty Senate the philosophies of the candidates concerning issues before the Senate do not emerge clearly. Moreover, we seldom know what issues will come before the Senate at the time we elect Senators. Hence, the Senators elected hardly have a mandate for any particular position. Actually, as among peers in the faculty those whom we elect to the Senate can hardly claim a "blank check" to exercise a vote as a matter of personal privilege, either. Instead, I submit that they have a trusteeship to investigate the issues, inform their colleagues, and finally to sound out the opinions among their constituents with the aim of voting as their colleagues desire.

If such a trusteeship is to be effective, a Senator must know exactly who constitute his constituency, and his people must have some ultimate method available for registering their vote on any particular issue if they desire. To this end a proposal appeared last Spring which would provide a means for taking any question to a vote of the entire faculty so that the entire membership could decide (a) whether to make a decision at all and (b) whether to approve the proposal or reject it. This voting proposal would use the punchcard ballot method and provide for a vote by mail so that all could vote.

Since a large number of our colleagues subscribed to the proposal in the last spring issue of the Faculty Forum Papers, it does appear that the Administration and Senate have a responsibility to consider seriously this proposition advanced in the interests of academic good order.

29 October 1970

Fred W. Decker
GUIDELINES FOR PREPARATION OF MANUSCRIPTS FOR THIS PUBLICATION

The "OSU Faculty Forum Papers", a publication for the exchange of faculty opinions concerning university affairs, is published monthly through the office of the Dean of Faculty with the assistance of a faculty advisory committee. Guidelines for this publication were approved by the Faculty Senate on March 7, 1968 and appear in the March 15, 1968 edition of the Staff Newsletter. The guidelines contain the following directions for the preparation of manuscripts:

a. Must be authored by a faculty member eligible for election to the Senate according to the provisions of Section 2 of Article IV of the Bylaws.

b. Should be typed in a form which can be reproduced directly without the need of retyping or rearranging. Short papers of one or two pages may be typed with either single or double spacing to make best use of full pages. Longer papers must be single spaced. Other requirements:

   (1) Use 8-1/2" x 11" plain white bond paper (sub.20)
   (2) Type on one side of page only
   (3) Do not number or fold sheets
   (4) Leave at least 1-1/2" margin at the top of all pages

c. Should not exceed a reasonable length. A six page limit is suggested, including displays such as tables or graphs. If this limit is exceeded, publications will require approval of the faculty advisory committee.

d. Should be signed (use black ink) and dated by the author at the end. The author's name and a subject, if appropriate, may be typed at the heading of the first page of the paper.

e. Manuscripts are to be submitted to the office of the Dean of Faculty. Receipt of each manuscript will be acknowledged. For each monthly publication, the deadline for the receipt of manuscripts shall be noon of the last full working day (Monday thru Friday) of the preceding month.
Academic Order and Purpose of The University

"Critic of society" -- or "seeker after truth"? Some university spokesmen have in recent years claimed for the campus the function of handing down judgments on contemporary society, and some would focus the university purpose on action to reform society. Where does this leave the old concepts of "collection and diffusion of knowledge" and the role of "seeker after truth" declared in the OSU Creed?

Does this new activist role really fit the university, an institution which evolved originally for teaching, for speculation, and for the testing of ideas? The goal of activism can assuredly produce "diffusion" -- but a diffusion of the resources, facilities, effort, and purpose, suggest some scholars today.

If the university generally adopts activism with attendant demands for contemporary relevance and early commitment by undergraduates, will the would-be student then have to cultivate an indifference to the constant campaigning so as to study and to contemplate, to try ideas for fitness, to observe debate, to debate, and to change sides without making lifelong commitments for partisan causes? Will he have to school himself toward becoming a lifelong learner by first overtly schooling himself to reject commitment?

Did the university historically gain academic freedom as a concession by society in order to provide society with a fearless critic? No, Angus Armitage seems to answer in describing Copernicus' life at Bologna. He indicates that the unique legal status of the university student community as "a little state with its own rulers and laws" grew out of the desire by downtown businessmen to attract the non-citizens to that university city, where otherwise the faculty and students from outside Bologna would not enjoy the civil rights of regular Bologna citizens. In modern times the transient scholar has these civil rights anyway, making such special extra-legal concessions no longer necessary for the survival of the university. Instead, today many a scholar feels he needs a refuge from the constant campaigning environment now developing. Scholars also deplore the diversion of effort and enthusiasm from the classical collegiate competition of wit and logic in university debates where all who attend must necessarily expose themselves to expressions of opposing sides. They cite the recent Cambridge Union debate between editor William F. Buckley, Jr., and economist John Kenneth Galbraith aired by KOAC-TV as superior to the non-debate causist advocacies by individual campus speakers. Mass campaign movements and exhortations tend to close minds and to harden them against intellectual flexibility.

The university's new "critic" role now assumed on many a campus will thus move the academy not toward the objective, critical evaluation associated with one definition of "critic" but rather toward campaigns and duress instead of freedom and voluntarism in the search for truth.

"Great numbers of students and even faculty now in our institutions of higher learning either do not understand or consciously reject the idea that the purpose of the university is to advance learning and to analyze everything around it as nearly disinterestedly as is possible in an imperfect world, and that it betrays its calling as soon as it takes an institutional stand on an issue or transforms itself into an instrument of political action," writes Prof. Charles A. Moser of George Washington University, National Secretary of University Professors for Academic Order (UPAO) in the October 1970 issue of "Universitas".
"Ideally, institutions of higher learning subscribe to the principle of academic freedom, by which is understood freedom of learning, teaching, and research as well as freedom of speech in communicating the results of investigation in one's particular field of specialization. This is an ideal which is rarely attained in reality," continues Prof. Moser. "Scholars have at least as many intellectual vested interests as other people, and certain scholarly points of view may be suppressed for some time by the unwillingness of the scholarly community to entertain them. Political considerations have also played a role in the composition of university faculties. Scholars have generally considered themselves politically liberal and looked suspiciously upon those few who emerged from their academic training with a different political point of view. Indeed there is often greater pressure for intellectual conformity in the academic community than in society at large, perhaps because intellectual matters are more important in the universities than in society at large. Consequently, a selection process has occurred, leading to the entrenchment of the politically liberal professoriate. Professors with conservative political convictions have found obtaining appointments difficult, especially at the more prestigious universities (it is partly for this reason that some of them have been experiencing the greatest difficulties in recent years). Still, the professoriate at least paid lip service to the ideals of academic freedom and political impartiality and in many instances upheld these ideals in practice.

"The current student generation, frequently encouraged by younger faculty members, has decided that the time for discussion and reflection -- those purposes for which the university traditionally exists, but which ordinarily lead to a recognition of the complexities of a problem and a realization of the difficulties of resolving it -- has passed, and the time for action arrived. Many of these young people, having no commitment to this idea of the university, if indeed they know what it is, have set out deliberately to take it and its considerable resources over as an instrument for accomplishing political ends instead of organizing new and specifically political organizations to do the same thing. It is, after all, easier to subvert already existing organizations, such as the university, than to build new organizations from the bottom up."

Prof. Moser declares, ",. the university administration should assert its commitment to the concept of the university as a place for teaching, learning, research, and the free exchange of ideas and opinion. In order to make this assertion credible, the administration and the faculty should examine themselves searchingly to make sure that the university does in fact adhere as closely as possible to the ideals of scholarship -- that research does not become the investigation of masses of trivia, that teaching does not become preaching, that students have the opportunity to formulate their own ideas and participate as fully as they properly should in furthering the legitimate purposes of the university."*

27 November 1970
Fred W. Decker

ORGANIZATION OF THE ARTS AND SCIENCES

Over the past year or so there has been talk about merging the School of Science with Humanities and Social Sciences. Because the idea seems to have aroused little enthusiasm at the grass roots or any other level, there is danger that it may not be pushed, so that for reasons ranging from apathy to mistrust the project will fade away.

It may be that burial in silence is the fate most fitting. However, I wish that the proponents of change would re-think the matter, for a real problem exists, and they have missed it. The real problem is that even our present two Schools are conglomerations that make little sense. But they contain sub-groupings that do belong naturally together, and I suggest that we ought to be looking in this direction instead.

The arguments one hears for consolidation boil down essentially to: "this is the only way for a real university to be organized". There is also the argument that faculty salaries would be more fairly apportioned among disciplines. We can confidently dismiss that one, and turn to the substantial questions: what is a real university? and how should it be organized?

There are questions to which answers are plentifully available, and only a foolhardy man would be absolutely sure that he could pick the right one. I shall therefore be content with the more modest aim of looking backward, in the hope of gaining useful perspective.

The medieval "universitas" was essentially a guild or corporation of teachers or of students, sometimes of both. Very early the University of Paris developed its Four Faculties, which were imitated by the rash of universities that sprang up in the Germanies and elsewhere. Unless an institution of higher learning had Theology, Law, Medicine and "Philosophy" it simply was not a university. Even today the University of Stockholm, which was founded less than a century ago and has no Theological Faculty, is legally a "Högskola", while Lund and Uppsala are "Universiteter". Much the same is true of the "Hochschule" and "Écoles supérieures" farther south.
Our American universities are apparently much less tidy. The word "university" here can mean almost anything and almost nothing. However, the following would probably describe the basic genuine article fairly well:

An American university consists of a central core of the humanities, the social sciences, the natural sciences and the mathematical sciences, in symbiosis with various professional schools. It provides training and diplomas at several levels, including that certificate of successful apprenticeship in research, the Ph.D.

It is the organization of that central, "non-professional" core which has become a question, not only here but elsewhere. It is analogous to the Faculty of Philosophy in the medieval university, but its direct American ancestor was the primitive liberal arts college (such as Harvard, Yale, New Jersey, or Corvallis) which was established in the wilderness, that the people might have an enlightened clergy. It grew. The new-fangled sciences were eventually added to its original curriculum of Latin, Greek, mathematics, logic and rhetoric. But usually it remained "the College" - though its faculty had increased a hundred fold and it had taken on postgraduate teaching as well as service jobs for new professional schools in engineering, agriculture, medicine, law, business, education, journalism and what-not. The Dean of a typical large College of Arts and Sciences now presides over an empire which no mortal could hope to comprehend intelligently. It is vast in size, overwhelming in its variety and in the complexity of its relationships both internal and external. It is a conglomerate of "departments", "institutes", "centers" and "programs": dozens of them jumbled together higgledy-piggledy.

With the growth of knowledge, both the lordly Philosophical Faculty of Europe and the modest backwoods "academy & college" of America have developed into sprawling monsters. To many they seem not only awkward but unworkable. Thus European Faculties of Philosophy have been divided into Faculties of Natural Sciences, of Mathematical Sciences, of Humane Letters, etc. The University of Chicago formed Divisions (e.g. Physical Sciences, Biological Sciences). It was felt that fragmentation into fewer, more cohesive groupings was preferable to the complete fragmentation that generally prevails in a large, heterogeneous Faculty or College, whose "unity" is specious, at best.

In my own discipline today there is a strong national trend toward forming Divisions of the Mathematical Sciences. Such a division (or school) typically includes traditional "Pure" and
"Applied" Mathematics, Statistics and Computer Science. Departments in these disciplines have much in common. They also have broad campus-wide responsibilities: for instance, out of the 6000+ enrollments in our Mathematics courses, 5/7 come from outside the School of Science and 1/7 from other Science departments. (The remaining 1/7 come from our own majors, undergraduate and graduate.) We have far more business with the School of Engineering than with all other departments in Science put together.

Looking at the rest of our "Arts and Science" complex, I can see similar natural groupings in the Biological Sciences, the Physico-Chemical Sciences, the Earth (or Environmental) Sciences, the Social Sciences, Language and Literature, the Fine Arts.

Would it not make more sense to start thinking about some sort of reorganization that is really functional, instead of just "thinking big"?

During his much too short tenure as Dean, Vernon Cheldelin began moving toward something of this kind in the School of Science. It got no farther than a grouping of departments in the catalog. We do not know what he might have accomplished had he lived, but I am sure that his lively intelligence would have produced ideas worth thinking about. We could do far worse than to re-consider his thoughts.

Arvid T. Lonseth
Professor of Mathematics
January 13, 1969
SALEM PROSPECTS + FACULTY APATHY = SALARIES GLOOM

One would think that our faculty would be interested in seeing maximum pressure brought to bear in obtaining betterment of their compensation position. However, the circumstances existing currently cast some real doubt about this presumption. These circumstances, in particular, consist of much-evidenced faculty apathy in the face of grossly inadequate salary actions being contemplated in Salem.

In examining, first of all, the current outlook for our compensation plans' funding, it is necessary to understand that OSSHE requests have centered on obtaining a U of 0 - OSU unweighted salary average (of all ranks) that equals the median of 19 competing institutions' averages. In 1957-58, after just having inaugurated this competitive comparison as a base for argument of our position, we were successful in obtaining a number 8 ranking. In succeeding bienniums, we have steadily lost considerable ground, reaching number 13 in 1961-62 and a still lower number 16 in 1968-69. Some idea as to the size of our deficiency can be gained by noting that our salaries currently are at 95 percent of this special average. In dollar terms, the gap separating us from the indicated goal amounts to an estimated $670. Using a special system in which averages are weighted by the numbers in each rank, our dollar deficiency today amounts to $901 for all ranks and $1,681 for full professors.

Looking at what is planned for the upcoming biennium, the Chancellor has courageously asked for moneys sufficient to achieve our target position in 1969-70 and to maintain that number 10 status in 1970-71. On the other hand, the Governor's budget recommendations call for funds that would leave us in number 16 for the first year of the biennium and then advance us one slot in the second year. However, Governor McCall has indicated that his recommendation is part of a long-range plan for gradual attainment of our target number 10 spot by 1975-76. In its particulars, this plan would advance us by one percent per year from the 95 percent level to the 100 percent one. Although these figures proposed for the upcoming fiscal period must of necessity be viewed as merely one input element for the legislature in ultimately making the decision, it is noteworthy that past bodies have rarely raised such sums. In fact, the more common practice has been to lower the amounts that have been requested by the Governor.

Thus, the contemplated action in Salem should be cause for genuine pessimism on the part of all faculty members in the system. These current plans, combined with the record in recent time periods, clearly show a highly injurious tendency to disregard our very reasonable goal of obtaining competitive salary levels. It should be noted that, in the past few bienniums, our alarm over the neglect of our case has been soothed by an appeal to wait out Oregon's revenue troubles induced by a sagging state economy. However, the state's income picture has improved notably in the past year and, accordingly, the contemplated salary treatment under such changed conditions evidences a dangerous inclination to not meet our needs.
One very grave implication follows and that is that Oregonians will have to face the consequences of a second-rate (or, more correctly, a 15th-rate) higher educational system. Although testimonial evidencings often seem difficult to come by, are there any among us who would not agree that compensation scales have very definite ways of getting reflected in the quality of the educational effort? Thus, we are indeed inviting educational inferiority if legislative intent is not challenged.

Turning to the matter of faculty apathy and its contributions to our plight, your colleagues who currently represent your interests in these economic areas are unanimous in the view that lack of adequate professor concern is seriously hurting our cause. Consider, for instance, the weakened position of our Chancellor in attempting to win support for his position on our salaries when he has such meagre evidence of faculty concern. Again, if you were a legislator, and you had the customary spending request dilemmas, would you actually give serious consideration to more higher education salary moneys if there were no vocalized opposition to the lower figures? Concerning this subject of our image with legislators, it is real food for thought that our two local legislators (who, naturally, are higher education friends) have repeatedly expressed puzzlement at the low level of faculty interest displayed in the area of economic welfare.

What are the specific bases for the feeling that there truly is an apathetic attitude present within our faculty? One prominent evidence was afforded by the pathetically low number (not over 35) who turned out for the January AAUP meeting to hear Dr. James Tattersall describe our predicament and ask for our help. Again, it can be seen in the extreme difficulties recently experienced in getting a person to chair a special inter-organizational Faculty Action Committee on Salaries. Similarly, the OSEA Chapter 72 President has received a host of turndowns (and, as of this writing, no acceptance) in his attempts to obtain an OSEA representative for the afore-mentioned Salaries Committee. As another manifestation, a Senator's comment upon the gravity of our salary problems -- at the December meeting of the Faculty Senate -- failed to produce a single response from the assembled representatives. Finally, this apathy is abundantly reflected in the very poor attendance at special faculty organization-sponsored group meetings held in recent years with our local legislators.

In a broader sense, these attitudes are mirrored in the relatively limp support given to the several faculty organizations that have worked so hard on trying to improve our economic status. In case there are any who do not understand how salary betterments are achieved, it is an inescapable fact that we are dependent upon state legislative action for betterment of our financial position. Given these circumstances, it is high time that faculty people realize that membership (and, on occasion, even active involvement) in AAUP, OSEA, and/or AFT adds greatly and vitally to the effectiveness of such organizations in bringing about the required political pressurings. After all, the way the lobbying game is played, it is imperative that the lobbyist speak from a strength of maximum numbers. Too, the more extensive
the participation is in such organizations, the larger the funds become for supporting the research activities so important in building our case to be presented. Hence, your membership in these professional associations is considerably more significant than you might think it is.

You now have the essential facts on contemplated salary actions and you know how some of the more active observers view faculty attitudes. Is this stance of indifference the impression we really want to create? If it is, then we had better be prepared to accept the sorry treatment that results from legislative review of our case. If it is not, then we need to start acting like we really are concerned.

There are a variety of ways that our concern can be made known, but one more concrete way presents itself in the immediate future. At a special meeting on Tuesday evening, February 18, these matters affecting our compensation picture and what can be done about flexing faculty muscles will be treated as part of a presentation on the subject of "Professional Negotiation and the Professors". This session is sponsored by OSU Faculty Chapter 72 of the Oregon State Employees Association, in cooperation with the local chapters of the American Association of University Professors and the American Federation of Teachers. We hope you will help in dispelling the notion that we don't care about scrapping for salaries by turning out in massive numbers for this meeting. Let's make sure that we show the public and our legislators how concerned we can get about proper compensation, February 18, Food Tech 117, 7:30 p.m.

If you have unavoidable commitments at the time of this meeting, your comments on the situation and your suggestions for action can be forwarded to any of the persons listed below.

Myron Cropsey (OSEA) Ag Eng
Floyd McFarland (AFT) Econ
Bob Newburgh (AAUP) SRI
Les Strickler (Fac Welf Comm) Bus Ad

Lester B. Strickler

January 31, 1969
PROFESSIONAL NEGOTIATION AND THE PROFESSORS

Shocking. This is how I, as a new assistant professor on the OSU campus, view the Oregon state legislature's support of higher education. The session, "Professional Negotiation and the Professors" sponsored by the various campus professional groups on February 18 was a real eye opener. Certain very important points were made at the meeting, and I would like to take this opportunity to list the ones which impressed me, so that they will not be forgotten.

1. Eleven years of faculty lethargy and blind dependence on the legislature has seen a steady deterioration in our position.

2. Faculty salaries in the Oregon University system are usually compared with those at 19 other selected schools in the country. When this comparison began eleven years ago, we ranked eighth. Over the years our position has steadily eroded so that now we stand sixteenth.

3. The legislature's answer to this problem is to choose 19 new schools so that the Oregon system will once again rank respectably. While this answer is both laughable and tragic, it does bring home the fact we can not depend on the legislature to initiate improvement.

4. Divided appeals to the legislature through a number of organizations will probably continue to be ineffective. The three state universities must give strong support to a single representative body.

5. A faculty senate, negotiating for the faculty of the three schools, is an interesting proposal, judging from its success in California.

6. With the legislature's present lack of support, to even maintain the status quo we will have to consider limiting enrollment.

7. While not a pleasant alternative, limiting enrollment is preferable to further sacrifice of quality.

W. Curtis Johnson
Assistant Professor of Biophysics
February 19, 1969
Are you listening or are you just hearing? If all you hear are sounds and fury, you are not listening. Don't let the noise deceive you. Pause a moment and listen; someone is trying to tell us something. The message is buried in noise but can be filtered out and deciphered. The text of the information is this in essence.

Since World War II there have been major cultural and technological changes. The attitudes, social mores and values of the 1920's, '30's and '40's are no longer pertinent. This country is no longer an insular "entity" with only internal "consumer" demands to shape our course. We no longer have an expanding economy based on illimitable natural resources and millions of acres of free land that the economically deprived social groups can be promised as "pie in the sky" to make their lot better.

For twenty years we have been educating the present generation. Not in our schools, there they have been "trained", not educated. It has been the mass media of communications and the ease and speed of travel that have truly educated the present generation of college age. They are aware. They have accepted the facts and recognize the necessity for action. They have looked to see who in the "establishment" is doing something about these problems. This is the "involved generation". They know that decisions and acts consumated now will determine the kind of lives they and their children will face. Having seen that the establishment is spinning its wheels; that the intellectual community has involved itself in endless discussions without consequent action; that the educational system still limits its activities to the transfer of facts and the institutions of higher learning are involved in the charade of seeking "prestige" through "research", they know there must be change.

We should not be misled by the seeming inconsequence or irrelevance of the subject of the early confrontations between the activists and the power structure. These are only skirmishes in which they will try their strength and learn the skills necessary for command in the field. For the activists to lose a confrontation over a petty matter would be a minor setback for there are many more trenchant causes awaiting their attention. Conversely, if the establishment can be brought to its knees and made to look weak and stupid for having chosen to oppose the redress of some apparently inconsequential matter, the gain will be significant. A bit of hair is not what it may seem.

Can the activists be criticized for seeking what they know must come? How can we question their goals? For two decades the power structure of all kinds of social, educational and political institutions has avoided positive actions on the most pressing questions of our times. At least these young people are attempting to accomplish something.

Let us examine just a few of the goals of the activists of this college generation:

1. To bring some consideration to the ethical and moral implications of political acts locally, nationally and internationally. Can you deny that our state and national political establishments continue to perform their duties by the expedients of horsetrading, backscratching and pork barreling?
2. To establish between nations the same concepts of juridical procedures that are almost universally accepted as normal between individuals.

Can you deny that major international policy decisions are commonly determined on opportunistic, jingoistic or economically selfish bases?

3. To provide universal equal social, economic and educational opportunities to all of our citizens without consideration of race, color or economic status.

Can you deny that two decades of legalistic and legislative maneuverings have resulted in practically no measurable advance in obtaining equal opportunity for the masses of socially and economically deprived of the United States?

4. To provide a system of education that will make available to each generation the knowledge and understanding to cope with the new problems and opportunities that they will face.

Can you deny that "educational" institutions are primarily limiting their efforts to the production of highly trained technicians? Or deny the fact that fear of displeasing the establishment causes most if not all instructors at this institution, and most others, to limit the discussions of controversial matters or the pronouncement of viewpoints known to be contrary to the accepted opinions of society? Can you deny that society has failed and is failing to solve its most serious problems of overpopulation, severely deprived populations, destruction of the environment and the rape of natural resources?

Can you deny that practically every major institution of higher education today tries to convince society of its contributions in terms of the millions of dollars committed to research; in terms of the percentage of the staff supported by outside funds; in terms of the magnitude of capital construction; in terms of the number of faculty members "honored" by election to national or international groups and that there is literally no effective emphasis on the quality of the instructional program or the qualifications of a staff member as a teacher or educator?

5. To destroy all systems that measure all change by various economic standards and not the single standard of the welfare of society.

Can you deny that the legislative programs in this country and others are decided on purely economic criteria; that monetary return or its equivalent and not social, sociological or cultural criteria determine the acceptability of programs?

6. To put in power men of intellect, understanding and action who can inform, instruct and lead society in its struggle for existence.

Can you truly deny that the men in power in the social, industrial and political life have toaded to cliques and pressure groups, or that they have been fearful to upset the outmoded social and economic organizations inherited from a time so remote that they have no relevance today?
If you honestly feel that you can deny these truths then "wake up and smell the coffee". A new day has dawned. A day of change. It is here, now, today. You have no more time for procrastination; no time to argue and defend. Change you will or, as with all else that is unchanging, become simply a point in history.

If you doubt, then listen. The message is there. The phraseology is strange and it is couched in a jargon unusual to our ears. It offers a threat and a promise that many cannot accept, but accept it we must or we will find our fine institution closed. Closed by the edict that we lack relevance.

Harry K. Phinney
Professor of Botany
March 13, 1969
REMARKS ON THE GOVERNMENT OF OSU

With the arrival of the Revolution on campus, our system of university government has been subjected to review and criticism from various quarters. I wish to contribute to the debate.

My point is that central authority within this university is being weakened and that is unfortunate.

The drift has been apparent for several years. Recently, the process seems to be accelerating. Pressures are developing from several sources: the Athletic Department wants extensive autonomy; John Fraser wants student power; some of the faculty want faculty power; the OSUFT favors both student and faculty power; black power, oddly enough, has not as yet been an issue. President Jensen, who might be expected to offer opposition to the disseminators, has shown himself no friend of concentrated executive power. While so far carefully retaining his prerogatives, he has continued his policy of encouraging faculty and student participation in governing.

Some results have already begun to emerge. First, in the Milton matter, the burden of solution to what well might have been defined as an administrative problem has been shifted, however confusingly, to a variety of committees. Second, creeping bi-cameralism, with all its 18th century trappings, is hard upon us. During its last meeting in March, the Faculty Senate passed a not very radical measure in a fairly radical fashion. The bill, which concerns "Student Rights, Freedoms, and Responsibilities," is to be "adopted" when accepted by a simple majority vote of both the Senate and ASOSU and "effective" when signed by the president. It worried some of the senators that a regrettable precedent was being established, and it worries me, too.

OSU, I believe, is now ready for neither student nor faculty government and certainly not for a combination of the two. Our not being ready has nothing to do with the quality of the faculty and student body. It derives, rather, from the stage of development at which the institution finds itself. As a university, we are still very young and in need of radical innovations. The best way to achieve these innovations is through strong, progressive executive leadership. Faculty and students are certainly appropriate sources of advice but incapable of consistent constructive action. If their authority is increased, the result will be to contribute to the maintenance of the status quo. Operating almost necessarily without the basic innovative tool of legislatures, i.e., disciplined political parties, the senates and their committees will usually serve as forces for negation.

The local AAUP Committee on Faculty Government has just recommended that the university adopt the national's 1966 "Statement on Government
of Colleges and Universities." It is a moderate document, calling, in the words of its editorial preface, for "appropriately shared responsibility and cooperative action among the components of the academic institution." The same preface reasons that American institutions of higher learning have now reached the point in their evolution at which such sharing becomes advisable. No doubt, but for those of us who continue to linger in our springtime, the lion's share will hopefully remain with a resourceful president.

Nothing in the above should be taken as an argument against consultation. Faculty and students must speak frankly, and the executive must listen. But then, of course, he must act.

Should our next president decide that student and faculty government are to be encouraged, then all is not lost. There is a slight chance that after the creation of honest factions one or the other might gain control and give the direction necessary to continue our conversion. If this is to be the case, we shall need some new rules. The first, in my opinion, should see the president and dean of faculty removed from the Faculty Senate. Then, at some point, the legislature will have to be given the power to legislate. But even with appropriate reforms, it is unlikely that we can achieve anything through faculty leadership but the preservation of what we already have, and that is insufficient. It is not that we produce too few leaders, but rather too many. Therefore, I hope that before the advocates of increased power for the university's components seek new results they will join in encouraging President Jensen, the acting president, and the new president to maintain central authority. At OSU it is not an outmoded form of government. It will remain for several years our best weapon in the struggle to eradicate the twin images of mediocrity and anti-intellectual conservatism that continue to plague us.

David B. King
Associate Professor
History Department
March 31, 1969
COMMENCEMENT OR NO COMMENCEMENT

On December 5, 1968, the Faculty Senate voted to approve the recommendation of the Council on Curriculum and Academic Policy, "that beginning with the 1970 Commencement the custom of excusing seniors from the last week of classes and final examinations be terminated and that the commencement week committee be requested to recommend changes in date and commencement procedures, as appropriate and necessary." I submit that each member of the faculty should look closely at the implications of this action and decide for himself whether this leads to a path he believes OSU should follow in the years immediately ahead.

At first glance, it appears that there must be considerable logic in favor of breaking a tradition conceived in the horse-and-buggy days when the history of our first 100 years was being written. This action permits us to tidy up our spring term schedule and fit all our students into the same neat mold. There is to be no more "disruption" of spring term classes by releasing graduating seniors from one week of their some 120 weeks of undergraduate classes. "Academic considerations", (whatever that means) dictate that we can no longer tolerate this disruption and this lack of completion of the full term's requirements by these graduates.

What is the price we are going to pay for this modern improvement? First, it will be the death of the outstanding commencement program which has become a classic in the western United States. Such a program cannot be presented if diploma recipients are to be held in class through final exam week. If each graduate is to receive his own diploma, commencement cannot be held until a minimum of three working days after final exams are over and term grades are turned in. This much time is required for the Deans and the Registrar to make final certification of those students barely meeting graduation requirements. This means that the program could be no earlier than the Thursday following final examination week. In 1970, this will be June 18. If the program is held over until Saturday or Sunday to permit more friends and parents to attend, the date would be June 20 or 21. All three dates are after June 15 when nine-month faculty are no longer expected to be on campus. All dates are after the non-graduating students have left the campus so that participation by the band and the various student service groups cannot be expected. Dormitories, sororities, and fraternities will normally have been closed so that any graduate who wishes to remain for commencement will have to make special arrangements for board and housing. These pressures along with the possible prospects of delayed
reporting time on jobs and late registration for summer graduate programs should weed out all but the most tenacious and leave ample seating room in the Coliseum for a single program for many years to come.

An alternative is to hold commencement on the Sunday immediately before or the Saturday or Sunday immediately after final exam week. On either weekend no diploma could be given. The program might consist of a walk-through where anyone who wished might receive a diploma case. Or the program might feature a major address with no graduates marching across the stage. Again, the anticipated interest in and participation by students, parents, and friends in this type of program should not tax the seating capacity in the Coliseum for many years in the future.

Your Commencement Week Committee has been charged with the task of attempting to put together a commencement program under these terms and conditions. The fact that "other schools are doing it", brings little encouragement when we investigate the quality and the acceptance of such programs. Rather than sponsoring an uninspiring token program which is poorly attended and poorly supported, it would seem far better to make a clean break--eliminate the program and mail the graduates their diplomas.

In either case, what have we lost? Those 150 or more people who are waiting outside the Coliseum for the doors to open at 12:00 noon and the other 5000 who are there by 1:00 p.m. so they can wait another one to two hours inside for the program to start at 2:00 p.m. can tell you something about what we will have lost. For many of these people it was their first and perhaps will be their only visit to our campus. For virtually all the 10,000 who attend, it is a memorable day in which they share in this moment when some relative or friend is recognized as an individual by receiving his diploma from his Dean at the center of the stage.

To some of us faculty who have seen many commencements come and go and have grumbled about participation to the faculty member next to us in the procession or seated next to us on the main floor, some of the values of this student's shared experience may have gone unnoticed. One of the major complaints of students today is the impersonal treatment they receive and the lack of recognition as individuals. Removing this bit of recognition and the knowledge he will receive this recognition at the end of four years of study certainly appears to be a step in the wrong direction. Our image as a university is viewed in different ways by students, alumni, non-college citizens, legislators, voters, and tax payers throughout this state. I believe that this image has been enhanced and our support strengthened by our annual demonstration of recognition and concern for each and every graduating student. This impression is gained from some 15 years of mingling with these people while ushering at commencement time and visiting with them in other parts of the state.
The talk of the necessity for giving up our present form of commencement due to growth of numbers beyond the Coliseum seating capacity is without foundation. Split commencements on the same day have been successful in the past with as many as three programs being held in the men's gym before the Coliseum was available.

If we once break our tradition, we will never again be able to capture that same feeling and attitude that makes our present program work. If we feel we have something worth keeping, let's take another long, hard, earnest look at it and let our faculty senators know of our feelings. If we feel that universal student conformity and classroom convenience outweigh the values accrued from our traditional commencement program, then let us make peace with ourselves and with our students.

Dale E. Kirk
Professor of Agricultural Engineering
April 21, 1969
A Modest Proposal

For the last few months there has existed on this campus a controversy between the Department of Intercollegiate Athletics and the rest of the campus. The controversy seems to me to be of the following kind— that the athletic department believes that a relaxation of certain of the rules dealing with appearance of athletes will lead to a loss of success in athletics. In other words, that if men are allowed to wear beards, mustaches, or sideburns, that the teams on which they participate will win fewer games, or be less successful in those games they do win. Many people who are not in the athletic department agree with this belief, and many people disagree.

It seems to me that this belief is subject to experimental analysis.

I therefore propose that for the next five years, that athletes be permitted to be clean shaven or not, as they prefer, with no pressure of either kind from the athletic department or the individual coaches.

At the end of the five year period, a statistical analysis can be made of the relative successes of the various team and individual athletes, and these data compared to a similar analysis made of the previous five years, ending in 1969, in which all of the athletes were in fact clean shaven.

Depending upon the outcome of this experiment, the various factions on the campus may then decide to what extent performance in athletics depends upon personal appearance, as defined here.

Annette Baich
Assistant Professor
Biochemistry & Biophysics
April 22, 1969
"HAND-OUTS" AS A TEACHING AID

It seems that each individual teacher has to develop his own style of instructing to suite his students' needs. Although general guide lines for public speaking are available, each generation of instructors is compelled to include more modern techniques of teaching concepts. This trend has resulted in a multitude of teaching approaches, depending on the combination of instructional aids one selects. During the past three years I have been giving several courses on both the undergraduate and graduate levels, and have employed one useful technique with the assistance of the Department of Printing. So-called "hand-outs" of summary and comparative tables, diagrams, sketches, and maps have been prepared and these were in most cases sufficient to serve as a basis for presenting in a brief, yet thorough, manner the gist of the subject matter discussed. This technique is neither new nor revolutionary or radical - it is rather simple and straightforward, and as I found it to be successful I would like to give here my reasons for using this method:

1. The drawing of diagrams and sketches on the blackboard is rather time consuming; consequently, only a limited amount of material can be covered per lecture. If each student has a copy of the data to be discussed more topics can be treated in greater depth.

2. Complicated diagrams cannot be faithfully reproduced on the blackboard. An alternative is the use of slides projected against a screen which is excellent for effective public speaking. For classroom instruction, however, it has the disadvantage that the projected data is actually withheld from the students because they do not have their own record to review and digest the lecture at leisure later on. Since tables, diagrams, sketches and maps often contain the most vital information, hand-outs are particularly useful in this case.

3. If complicated diagrams are reproduced on the blackboard, most students, just like I did as an undergraduate, will concentrate on getting all the information into their note-books and cannot really pay full attention to the understanding of the material presented. Using hand-outs, the students can follow all explanations given by the instructor on their own copies. This approach is particularly successful if the diagrams are projected and explained on a screen, and the students do not have to worry about note-taking.

4. I remember, that whenever information was given to me as an undergraduate or graduate student, I was very reluctant to trust the reliability of my own notes, and for this
reason often discarded them after completing the course. If the information had been
given to me in the form of hand-outs prepared from the original sources, I would have
retained the material for future reference purposes.
5. The often mentioned "Knowledge Explosion" is such that [a] More efficient teaching
methods have to be developed to present more material in a given time. (Or shall we in­
crease the 4-year curriculum eventually to five years? The insufficiency of a 4-year
degree is already being felt as many companies prefer to hire M.Sc. graduates.) (b) Some
courses have no text books so that students have to rely wholly on their lecture notes.
(c) Many text books are out-of-date and have to be supplemented by data extracted from
journals, etc. (d) Many of the better students want to be challenged by additional in­
formation. All the above points can be neatly covered by the use of hand-outs.
6. The older conservative methods of instructing are too restrictive for those teachers
that prefer to be imaginative and inventive, creative and constructive in the student­
professor dialogue. Being able to prepare hand-outs will offer some challenge to keep
up-to-date and the results are of benefit to both students and instructor.
Preparation of hand-outs: Xerox copies of the diagrams, sketches, tables, etc., are made
and cut to the smallest possible size. The copies are first fitted by trial-and-error,
and then glued, on a 8½" x 11" sheet of bond paper in such a manner that available space
is used as economically as possible. These copies can then be used by the Department of
Printing to reproduce by various techniques the required number of "hand-outs".
Suggestion: Since using hand-outs in class-room instruction has so many advantages I
suggest that this simple teaching aid could find wider application. Every opportunity
should be given, especially to new staff members, to prepare the most necessary hand­
outs in establishing their courses. Should there be any doubts regarding the full effec­
tiveness of hand-outs as a teaching device, a pilot study could be initiated. The ex­
cessive use of this instructional technique may become too expensive so that the hand­
outs have to be limited, at least initially, to students majoring in a particular dis­
cipline. For reasons given by the Director of Libraries in a circular of April 15, 1969,
it will have to be determined in the future to what extent multiple-copying will infringe
the copying and publishing laws. Permission may have to be obtained from the publishers
and perhaps 1 or 2 cents per copy will be charged.

Karl H. Wolf
Assistant Professor of Geology
April 26, 1969
Student Unrest

Deliberate evaluation of the common defenses against the changes being demanded by the disaffected students appear to run the gamut from "we've always done it this way" to "daddy knows best". However, these arguments take many disguises. Sometimes the phraseology is "it's a conspiracy" or "they don't have any constructive programs" or worst of all "I cannot understand why higher education should come under attack at this time". The basic positions are obviously resistance to change and appeal to AUTHORITY.

However stated, this resistance to the introduction of novel viewpoints should be alien to the academic community. If there is any environment in which a full airing should be possible, it is in the university. At times I am constrained to assume that many of my colleagues have forgotten the classical definition of the university as a community of scholars, or that, on some biased basis, they are excluding the students from that community.

As an ecologist I like the simple definition of a community as an assemblage of interacting entities. If the university is to survive it is imperative that the essential parties immediately participate in free and frank discussions, uninhibited by any possibility of repression or reprisal. To be more specific, these discussions must be between the faculty and the students. There must not be any element of the administration to cloud the issues with representations of "policy" or "authority". There can be no consideration of political expediency nor demands to moderate the discussions to protect "public sensibilities" or the "image" of the institution.
There will be those who object that this degree of freedom will result in punitive action by various agencies, primarily meaning the legislature. There is but one answer to this argument. We have been given the mandate to form a university. If any agency has the power or authority to lift that mandate they may do so but they must accept the responsibility for that action just as the members of the academic community must accept responsibility for the destruction of the institution if it allows the community to deteriorate through irresponsible acts of commission or omission. The anarchistic element among the students has its strongest allies in those political figures that threaten to visit fiscal and forceful reprisals upon the institutions. If the anarchists cannot close the institution by force, all they need to do is to needle the reactionary element and threaten its peace of mind sufficiently to get the kind of "knee jerk" response they want.

Quite frankly I'm tired of listening to characters that "think" with their hearts or their guts or their pocketbooks. Furthermore, I'm tired of the rampant anti-intellectualism of the past 20 - 25 years. I'm tired of the big town promoters, celebrities, influence peddlers, and hired representatives of business interests, the small town lawyers, real estate salesmen, and insurance peddlers who try to say, "here is your institution; you are responsible for its success but you must run it our way".

For 25 years we have seen the academic community face the apparent necessity of accepting accommodation with self-seeking, self-perpetuating elements holding the political strings. These elements have, in their ignorance, visualized the institutions of higher education as another kind of business. They have seen it becoming bigger and bigger business and they have tried to institute the methods and measures of the business world in the educational functions of the institutions. They have seen to it that those appointments they control directly are filled with agreeable people and they
have authorized or condoned repression of dissenting elements at all levels. We have seen the rise of new elements in the academic world. We can now speak of bio-politicians and edu-businessmen. The vocal, opportunistic, ambitious anti-intellectual of the academic community has sought to profit from this situation with no thought, or at least no regard, for the effect on the community. He has eagerly sought approbation and promotion to seats of "power" by toady ing to the power structure.

Today sees the harvest of the acts inspired by these misconceptions. The products of the subverted, industrialized academic institutions are not all coming off the assembly line crewcut, clean shaven with the ticky-tacky little boxes for minds that the designers intended. In fact many do not stay to the end of the assembly line. Many more that could and should do not even essay the trip.

Harry K. Phinney
May 9, 1969
It is believed this report will be of general interest to the faculty.

COMMENTS ON THE FACULTY CONFERENCE AT VILLAGE GREEN
on April 11 and 12, 1969

The Faculty Conference raised the question, "Whose University? The Administration's? The Faculty's? The Student's? The Public's?" not to establish ownership but to explore the inherent conflicts over a number of pressing issues. These conflicts arise because each group unconsciously tends to adopt the view that the university is mainly theirs despite any legal technicalities. Such views color their appraisal of the pressing issues facing the university.

In order to provide as representative a membership as possible, the committee chose the participants with the aid of the computer. The committee set quotas for each rank and each school. Quotas for schools followed FTE (full time equivalent) but no attempt was made to allocate membership among the departments within the school. It was believed that this process provided opportunities for lesser known as well as the better known faculty members. Seventy two members out of a sample of 300 were selected.

Because of the organization of the conference, no one person attended all meetings of the conference. Each person carried away a different picture as to what happened. At most, no more than three people attended the same meetings. Consequently, any summary of the conference must necessarily be impressionistic. It can only provide a little of the flavor of the discussions.

When each member of the conference arrived, he discovered that he would be discussing the issues from the point of view of one of the following constituencies: the administration, the faculty, the students, or the public. The first group meetings were organized into these four constituencies. In these meetings each group of 18 discussed from their assigned point of view the following issues:

A. Goals and Functions of the University as Related to Society
B. Determination of Academic Requirements
C. Faculty Status and Personnel Problems
D. Rights and Responsibilities of Individuals in the University Community
E. University Communications

F. Extra-Curricular Activities

These first sessions served as preparation for the second. Each of the four groups sent three members to each of the six second groups. Consequently, in the second session each group had representatives from each constituency. Instead of discussing all six issues, each group in the second sessions concentrated on just one. Instead of discussing it from one point of view of one constituency, it covered the views of all four. At the end, each group chose a member to summarize its discussion to the entire conference at the last meeting.

The last meeting served as a wrap-up. A panel consisting of the representatives from the previous meetings led off the discussion, which in time involved most of the conference members. Finally at the end, the conference returned to the question "Whose University?" Because this last summary session was the only one at which all members attended, the remainder of this report draws heavily upon what was said then.

A. Goals and Functions of the University as Related to Society

Members of the conference could agree on several functions of the university. It should educate students to help prepare them to live and work in the world. In doing this it should provide guidance for the students and allow opportunities for them to explore a range of fields before settling upon a vocational choice.

The University should be more than a dispenser of knowledge and a trainer of students. As a community of scholars it should use its resources to create new knowledge and explore the problems of this world. It also should provide service to the public through its extension programs, use of consultants, and university participation in the solution of the wider community's problems.

While most could agree upon the desirability of these three traditional functions of the land-grant college (teaching, developing, knowledge and service to the community) disagreement between the constituencies centered upon priorities. Students object to research interfering with teaching. While some of the public seek particular types of research for their own or the community's economic development, other members of the public, such as parents, side with the students. Many faculty members see themselves going stale without the intellectual stimulation from their research, but some others would like to be free from such burdens.
According to some of the participants, the greatest point of conflict arises from the desire of some students to make the university a vehicle for social change. These students see many injustices in our society and believe a failure of the university to take stands in their causes is immoral. Their beliefs as to America's foreign policy, racial discrimination, the existence of poverty, the power of huge corporations, and other supposed evils are held with such moral fervor that they cannot tolerate any deviation from their views.

Although some faculty members agree with them entirely, many will only admit that there are injustices which should be corrected. They would take part in such reforms only as individuals, but would not involve the university. To them the university is a community in which it is safe to examine critically and objectively the strengths and the weaknesses of our society. Members may point out the need for change and may participate in their implementation, but they have no right to involve unwilling colleagues. If the university adopts a program for social change, individual members of its community would no longer have as much freedom as before to analyze and to describe society as they see it. The youthful protestors' vision of society may not turn out to be absolute truth. A commitment to their programs could preclude the shift to better approaches if freedom is limited.

Yet the university should develop the critical facilities of its students. Also it should develop among the students a sense of social responsibility. By educating individuals accustomed to free inquiry and the exercise of responsibility the university makes one of its contributions to the future of society. With its generation of new knowledge it makes its other. Further, it dare not go.

Members of the conference believed that more students and faculty should be involved in the determination of goals and functions of the university. They were pleased to learn more about the commission recently appointed to make such a study.

B. Determination of Academic Requirements

The discussion on determination of academic requirements barely touched upon what requirements for a degree should be or what courses should deserve academic credit. Instead, discussion centered on what type of education should be provided for the student. It also included talk on the students' role in deciding that type of education.

The issue of education versus training immediately attracted attention. Members pointed to the professional training aimed at providing students with a vocation. Such training is not
enough, they said. The university should educate the student for his role in society. But such education does not mean indoctrination of the student for the acceptance of the status quo. The student should learn to examine society not only to appreciate what already exists, but also to see the opportunity for changes for the better.

Students demand what they call relevant courses. Such courses provide opportunities for examining the important issues of today. They want new and different courses, because the present ones in the social sciences which aim to do this are inadequate. Professors lecture to large classes from notes acquired years ago. Instead, classes should be smaller, courses should be more up to date, and there should be a chance for interchanges of ideas. Unfortunately, budgetary restraints inhibit the adoption of such reforms.

A number of schools and departments are including students on committees which determine curriculum. Membership on such committees should represent real power and not mere token recognition of student demands. However, many conference members felt that student representation should not go so far as to give equal power to the students. The faculty as experts in their fields should retain the final responsibility for deciding curricular matters. In the exercise of this responsibility the faculty should rise above the parochial interests of their disciplines. They should think in terms of the broad education of their students. Their responsibility includes viewing education from a university-wide basis as well as that of their particular department.

C. Faculty Status and Personnel Problems

Discussion began with the determination as to what is meant by the term faculty. Agreement emerged that the term includes teachers, researchers, and some civil service or administrative personnel holding faculty rank. Some people questioned whether all of the personnel in the third category should be included.

Members expressed a concern that guidelines should be established to provide uniformity throughout the university in granting tenure and promotions. Apparently, the lack of standards uniform among the various schools and departments causes a certain amount of dissatisfaction. Yet the problems in achieving such uniformity received almost no discussion among the conference members.

As in the other discussions, the role of the students commanded considerable attention. The practice of allowing students to have full voting powers in the School of Education in granting tenure was greeted with mixed emotions. It was recognized that
students feel strongly that tenure should not be given poor instructors even though they were scholars. The students also insist that they should have a voice in retaining stimulating teachers who may not otherwise meet faculty standards. While faculty members recognize the stake of students in such matters, not all of them wish students around when colleagues are being discussed. They may seek the opinions of students but do not wish to be pressured. The granting of tenure, they say, is an internal faculty matter. Choosing life-long colleagues should be done only by faculty members and not by others. The students move on, but faculty members stay on. Also as professionals, the faculty members are better able to judge the competence and potential of their colleagues.

Discussion touched on such subjects as increasing the power of the Faculty Senate, providing new faculty members with clearer contracts spelling out both duties and responsibilities, and the encouragement of faculty members to participate in the affairs of the outside community. Inevitably, low faculty salaries received some attention. Members declared that a way should be found to keep the salaries of new faculty members and old faculty members in a proper relationship. Paying new faculty higher salaries than the older members with similar if not better qualifications creates considerable dissatisfaction.

D. Rights and Responsibilities of Individuals in the University Community

No discussion of rights can be made without some concern with responsibility. If people have rights without responsibilities, there is danger of confusing license with freedom. Also, one person's right implies some other person's responsibility. Today, too many people demand their rights without recognizing the interdependence of rights and responsibilities in the community.

Students claim the right to a "relevant" education which prepares them both for a vocation, and understanding of the society in which they live. They wish to change society and expect the university to join them in their efforts. Furthermore, they demand a role in determining the type of education which they will receive.

The student claims conflict with the faculty concept of academic freedom. There was question as to what constitutes reasonable academic freedom and when does it infringe on student and public rights. No consensus emerged in the form of a conclusion.

Many faculty members did express the claim to a right of protection from disruptive acts by other faculty members,
students, or outside demonstrations. They see the administration as responsible for the enforcement of university regulations. Such regulations should be reasonable, penalties consistent with offenses, and enforcement strict. They were adamant in their belief that giving license to illegal, immoral, and disruptive acts would breed only irresponsibility.

The corollary to the right of students to a relevant and stimulating education is the faculty responsibility to improve their techniques. Faculty members should use teacher evaluation forms to guide themselves. Also teacher evaluation should be used in considerations of granting tenure and promotion. Students should participate in these evaluations, but popularity among students should not be the sole criterion.

The administration should guide the course of the university with the participation of the faculty. It must consider the wishes of the public, but it should also screen the demands of the public to those consistent with the goals of the university. The smooth functioning of the university is the prime responsibility of the administration. Its chief right is the assignment of priorities for the use of the available resources.

The public has the right to expect that the university will carry out its functions without disruptions. It carries the responsibility to provide the resources necessary for the fulfillment of those functions.

E. University Communications

The conference considered the adequacy of existing communications and their weaknesses. Some felt that adequate channels are open, but people are not aware of them. Apathy prevents many of them from using such channels as do exist. Students, in particular, should be informed as to these means of communications and should be drawn into their operations.

Much concern was expressed over individual faculty member's avenue of communication directly to the administration either over or around immediate superiors and department heads or chairmen. Some felt avenues do not exist. The administration seems to be isolated, but perhaps the faculty make it that way. Discussion indicated that staff members fail to read readily available publications of communication. At a time when the administration cannot solve the pressing problems without active participation from the faculty and students, better communications are vital. Little was said over the problems of establishing such communications.

The greatest breakdown in university communications arises with the advising program. The advising at the department and
school level is very inadequate. The "low-man on the totem pole" or the youngest member of a department usually gets the job of advising. Lacking information and not knowing where to seek it, he bungles the job of advising.

Better intrafaculty communications are desired by many. Despite the Staff Newsletter, the Faculty Forum, and even the Barometer, the word does not get around. The Faculty Senate is loaded with older, administration-oriented faculty members. New faculty should be drawn in. Although the conference members did not suggest how, they thought the faculty should come down out of their ivory towers and participate in the activities of the university.

Some faculty members have too many activities. They should be spared some of these, but not to the exclusion of all outside activities. Consulting programs should be developed more extensively. In general, communications with the outside community should be improved as well as those within the university.

F. Extra-Curricular Activities

It was generally felt that students should have authority and responsibility for their own extra-curricular activities. These activities should not interfere with either instruction or other functions of the university. Not everyone agreed with the placing of responsibility for extra-curricular activities with the students. They pointed out that such activities are part of the broad education of the student. Also the public holds the administration accountable for these activities, both formal and informal ones. Usually pressure develops only when something goes wrong. This "brush fire" approach allows problems to develop to the point that they are difficult to solve. Until the faculty accepts more responsibilities, the administration is left both to deal with the problems and to explain them to the public.

Some of the members of the conference warned that faculty members should also exercise care in their own extra-curricular activities. Such activities should not interfere with instruction. Faculty members should descend from their ivory towers to view the problems of the world, but they should not get lost in the process. The generation of knowledge and its dissemination are their principal functions.

Discussion on the above six topics ranged wider than can be shown here. It also overlapped more than these pages indicate. Throughout each session the rights, opinions, and roles of students were emphasized. Many recognized the difficulty of picturing themselves as students again. They found the roles of administrators and of the public almost as difficult to understand.

Students claim the right to a "relevant" education which prepares them both for a vocation, and understanding of the society in which they live. They wish to change society and expect the university to join them in their efforts. Further-
When the conference turned to the original question, "Whose University," one answer was as follows. It is the public's with the administration as the hired management, the faculty as employees, and students as customers. Such an answer failed to draw either enthusiasm or agreement.

Finally, it was proposed that the university is not the exclusive property of any one group. Instead, it is a community of people with shared interests. Although it contains the possibility of conflicts, it also possesses the basis for agreements. It is reason and accommodation which binds the community together rather than the use of power to maintain rights. The emphasis on power leads to confrontations which divide the university. We explore conflicts not to demand our rights but to resolve the conflicts. In times such as these we should stress our common interests and our ability to seek reasonable solutions. We may require protection of our rights and responsibilities, but the spirit of the university would be dead if our decisions should be made upon the basis of power other than reason.

The conference itself demonstrated the power of reason and the use of communications. It also provided faculty members not usually included in the formal deliberations of the Faculty Senate and other committees the chance to come together and share views. We may not have reached many conclusions, but we understand each other better.

Dr. L. G. Harter, Jr.  5/9/69
Chairman, Faculty Conference Committee
First the Faculty Senate was confronted with the Dawson motion and now with the Strickler resolution, both expressed in deplorable language and both aimed at slapping the wrists of faculty members who endorsed the student boycott of classes.

The Dawson motion was considered by the Senate on the eve of the anniversary of the assassination of Martin Luther King, Jr., and had it passed would have constituted a repudiation of his nonviolent methods of protest and by implication a denunciation of the man's life and work. Fortunately, it can be assumed that the timing was coincidental and that no overt racism was involved.

With equal irony, the consideration of the Strickler resolution comes after the report of the Human Rights Commission which held that an individual's rights had been violated. The fact that the Commission was set up in response to the boycott is a demonstration of the value of this nonviolent protest.

In our judgment, a clear cut distinction must be made between nonviolent demonstrations for just cause and violent protest. When student demonstrators speak out against injustices which are not being remedied through normal channels, they deserve faculty support. To do otherwise is to fall victim to the Richman syndrome: if students, black or white, were being burned in the University incinerators, what percentage of faculty members would hold their noses to avoid the stench and continue to teach their classes?

We feel that the time of the Faculty Senate would be better spent in considering a resolution to honor the man who used the boycott as a meaningful tool in the establishment of human rights rather than in
arguing whether or not to reprimand these faculty members who took a stand for human rights. We urge that April 4th be permanently designated on the University calendar as a memorial day in honor of Dr. King and that a nationally known leader of nonviolent protest be brought to the campus on that day as a Convocation speaker to remind us of the value and nature of Martin Luther King's work.

May 13, 1969
GUIDELINES FOR PREPARATION OF MANUSCRIPTS FOR THIS PUBLICATION

The "OSU Faculty Forum Papers", a publication for the exchange of faculty opinions concerning university affairs, is published monthly through the office of the Dean of Faculty with the assistance of a faculty advisory committee. Guidelines for this publication were approved by the Faculty Senate on March 7, 1968 and appear in the March 15, 1968 edition of the Staff Newsletter. The guidelines contain the following directions for the preparation of manuscripts:

a. Must be authored by a faculty member eligible for election to the Senate according to the provisions of Section 2 of Article IV of the Bylaws.

b. Should be typed in a form which can be reproduced directly without the need of retyping or rearranging. Short papers of one or two pages may be typed with either single or double spacing to make best use of full pages. Longer papers must be single spaced. Other requirements:
   (1) Use 8-1/2" x 11" plain white bond paper (sub.20)
   (2) Type on one side of page only
   (3) Do not number or fold sheets
   (4) Leave at least 1-1/2" margin at the top of all pages

c. Should not exceed a reasonable length. A six page limit is suggested, including displays such as tables or graphs. If this limit is exceeded, publications will require approval of the faculty advisory committee.

d. Should be signed (use black ink) and dated by the author at the end. The author's name and a subject, if appropriate, may be typed at the heading of the first page of the paper.

e. Manuscripts are to be submitted to the office of the Dean of Faculty. Receipt of each manuscript will be acknowledged. For each monthly publication, the deadline for the receipt of manuscripts shall be noon of the last full working day (Monday thru Friday) of the preceding month.
WHAT FACTORS INFLUENCE ATTITUDES OF FACULTY?

How does the OSU faculty feel about situations involving administration-faculty relationships, economic factors, community, working conditions, ...? As many are well aware, these and other factors can play a large role toward attracting new faculty and retaining present faculty members at OSU.

In an attempt to learn more about faculty attitudes regarding the above items, the Committee on the Profession of the OSU Chapter, American Association of University Professors, undertook a survey of faculty reactions to factors which were felt might contribute to satisfaction or dissatisfaction. To accomplish its objective, a questionnaire containing 91 questions on working conditions, community, faculty-administration relations, economic, personal and family, student, appreciation and rewards, and miscellaneous items was sent to 1300 OSU faculty members near the end of spring term, 1968, with a covering letter by Dean Nicodemus. Faculty members were not identified except as to age, number of years at OSU, tenure, school, rank, and highest degree. One set of responses dealt with intensity of feeling about staying or leaving OSU. Five hundred sixty-six faculty members returned the forms; this sample was representative of the total except that a higher proportion of tenured faculty responded.

The Committee on the Profession wishes to acknowledge both the AAUP and OSEA who contributed to the project financially. We also are appreciative of the assistance given by Dean of Faculty, David Nicodemus. Further, appreciation is extended to the OSU Counseling Center clerical staff.

Of the eight sections, the order of importance was: working conditions, economic items, faculty-administration items, student items, personal and family, other, appreciation and rewards, and community. The three most important questions under working conditions were: (1) intellectual satisfaction of job, (2) intellectual challenge of job, and (3) teacher morale. Regarding economic items, rating of OSU's salary schedule with other universities, salary and retirement benefits rated as the first three. Under faculty-administration, the most important three questions were: (1) cooperative and competent administration of department, (2) competent teaching staff in department, and (3) competent university administration. Other important questions were: motivation of students (student section), and personal satisfaction of job (personal and family).

Over all 91 questions, the most important were: (1) personal satisfaction of job, (2) intellectual satisfaction of job, (3) intellectual challenge of job, (4) cooperative and competent departmental administration, (5) motivation of students, (6) library facilities, and (7) freedom to work and study in one's own field.

Several of the questions were significantly related to whether a faculty member intended to stay or leave OSU employment. The top five attitude items having a significant relationship to "leaving" responses were: (1) low satisf-
faction with academic rank, (2) inadequate opportunity to participate in University affairs, (3) slow promotions, (4) autocratic departmental administration, and (5) poor quality of advice of department head on instructional problems.

An analysis of the 91 items was made on the basis of "favorable, unfavorable, or neutral" responses. An item was indicated as having an unfavorable or a favorable effect if 40 percent or more of the respondents so designated. On the other hand, if 60 percent or more of the respondents indicated an item as unimportant or neutral, the Committee considered that item to have little import on faculty.

Only 11 of 91 items elicited unfavorable responses, whereas 27 items elicited favorable responses. In the unimportant category were 18 items. The remaining 35 items could not be categorized into favorable, unfavorable or unimportant but had response splits such as 50% neutral, 25% favorable, and 25% unfavorable.

Greatly different types of questions provoked unfavorable and favorable reactions. All but three of the 11 unfavorables related directly to financial consideration while only one of 27 favorable items (cost of living) was of a financial nature. Faculty opinion seems to be more weighted toward favorable than unfavorable responses and higher percentages of faculty were willing to check more favorable than unfavorable items as important to them.

The following 11 items were those selected by 40% or more of the respondents as unfavorable: (1) rating of salary schedule with other universities, (2) faculty work load, (3) ranking of retirement program with other universities, (4) adequacy of research funds, (5) salary level, (6) adequacy of retirement benefits, (7) financial provisions for study leaves, (8) opportunities to attend professional meetings, (9) amount of research time available, (10) adequacy of funds for purchasing recent publications, and (11) adequacy of opportunities for travel. Interestingly, there was no difference between faculty designated as stayers or leavers with respect to checking these items as "unfavorable".

On all 27 "favorable" items a higher percentage of tenured faculty than non-tenured faculty indicated greater importance and a higher degree of adequacy. Also, on most items, about 10-15% more of the faculty indicating they were staying or planning to stay gave "favorable" responses than those who indicated they had accepted another job or were planning to leave. Difference tended to range even higher regarding such questions as competency of departmental administrators, favorableness of work atmosphere, departmental reputation and prestige, intra-faculty relations, satisfaction with academic work and degree of teacher morale.

The top ten "favorable" items were: (1) personal satisfaction of job, (2) intellectual challenge of job, (3) adequacy of schools for children, (4) cooperativeness of departmental teaching staff, and (5) of departmental administrators, (6) competency of departmental teaching staff and (7) departmental administrators, (8) degree of academic freedom, (9) favorableness
of work atmosphere, and (10) competence of university administrators. Although these items plus 17 others were checked as important and "favorable" by 40 or more percent of all responding faculty, they drew 4-10 times as many "unfavorable" responses from leavers as faculty intending to stay. On these 27 items, less than 10% of staying faculty gave "unfavorable" responses while 15-35% of leavers gave "unfavorable" responses.

On the whole, unfavorable responses were almost entirely related to financial factors while favorable responses were indicated for job satisfaction and related working conditions. Interestingly enough, community items including politics, size and recreational opportunities were of least importance to the responding faculty.

Should any faculty member wish more complete information on this faculty attitude survey, a summary will be made available upon request, phone 3341. Suggestions as to further surveys and studies regarding the profession, its status and responsibilities will be welcome. AAUP Committee on the Profession taking part in this project were T. E. Bedell, W. A. Foster, R. O. McMahon, and H. L. Wilson under chairmanship of C. F. Warnath, 1967-69.

Thomas E. Bedell
Assistant Professor of Range Management
October 27, 1969
Effect of Class Cancellation on Multiple Section Courses

There are many courses with multiple lecture sections, each of which may have numerous subsections of recitation, laboratory, etc. Freshman chemistry, in which I participate, is an example. Each section is expected to cover the same material in the course of a term. It is especially important in sequence courses that this is accomplished, as student registration in subsequent terms is scrambled among the different sections.

Because a term may not begin on a Monday, and because of holidays such as Thanksgiving, it often happens that some sections have fewer meetings than others. This problem is compounded by Administrative cancellation of classes.

We are all engaged in a consideration of University goals. A paramount goal should be the uninterrupted meeting of courses of instruction.

Convocation programs should have enough intrinsic merit to attract a respectable audience during evening hours. Other occasions of Administrative authorization to students to skip classes suggest a high level confusion as to priority of goals.

John T. Yoke
October 29, 1969
The Study of Education at Stanford

I would like to bring to your attention the Study of Education at Stanford, especially since we are engaged presently in a similar study through the Commission on University Goals. This "major and thorough study of Stanford's educational programs and objectives" (as President Sterling characterized it) was carried out under the direction of a steering committee composed of students, faculty, and administrators. Numerous subcommittees and hundreds of people were involved. In November, 1968, nearly two years from the inception of the study, the steering committee issued the first of its Reports to the University. Thus far nine of ten reports have been issued. These reports present the committee's conclusions and specific recommendations for strengthening the university as well as the basic premises and much of the information on which they were based. Most of the reports are more than 100 pages in length; about half of this consists of appendixes. These are the titles:

I. The Study & Its Purposes
II. Undergraduate Education
III. University Residences and Campus Life
IV. Undergraduate Admissions and Financial Aid
V. Advising and Counseling
VI. The Extra-Curriculum
VII. Graduate Education
VIII. Teaching, Research, and the Faculty (not issued)
IX. International Education
X. Government of the University

Although this study is directed at one university, it has, I think, much wider significance and great importance. Stanford is one of the finer universities in this country. It is very likely, therefore, that its problems and weaknesses are to be found or will emerge at many other universities. Moreover, a great deal of useful general information is presented in the reports. But, most importantly, their conclusions and recommendations can provide a stimulus and basis, if not a model, for our own thinking. They were intended to be far-reaching and to stimulate discussion. As the committee put it at one point: "The most important of our recommendations are ground-clearing in character; they are designed to free both teacher and student of trammels that restrain the freedom to teach and to learn that ought to characterize the university." (II, p.3) We may find that we disagree with many of their recommendations or that they are not applicable here, but they are well worth consideration.

It would be impossible and, I think, inappropriate for me to try to present a comprehensive description or evaluation of the Stanford Study. Consequently, I shall merely present (largely in its own words) what I take to be the essential ideas of the first report (I), which attempts to state the basic premises that underlie the more specific conclusions and recommendations of the committee; then
I shall simply list a number of the more important or striking recommendations made in reports II and X—as many as space permits. Hopefully, this will provide enough ideas and acquaintance with the Study to stimulate your thinking and your desire to read these and the other reports in full.

First, let me point out that copies of these reports are available from:

Study of Education at Stanford  
Room 107, Building 10A  
Stanford University  
Stanford, California 94305

They are free to students and faculty of Stanford and, perhaps, to alumni and friends of the University. I understand that there is a charge of $10.00 per set to others. At least one set will be available on reserve in the Reserve Book Room of our library, under my name I was told.

Even on a cursory reading of *The Study and Its Purposes* it becomes clear immediately that one idea or premise is paramount. I think that it is best stated in an appendix:

> This principle is repeatedly enunciated throughout the reports in the motto that the university is a place to learn to "think freely and to think well." This idea is held to be a crucial part of the general conception of education which underlies essentially everything in the first report and, thereby, essentially everything in the entire Study. In fact, the very first point made by the committee in the first report is that freedom is part of the very meaning of "education": "The word "education" comes from the Latin verb *educere* meaning 'to lead forth.' To lead does not mean to compel, or to push, or to pull." (p.10) More generally, education is conceived as a continuous, life-long process of discovery. Thus, education not only cannot be compelled but it cannot be limited to the classroom or reduced to units of credit.  

On the basis of this fundamental premise and related conception of education the committee concludes or maintains:

> First, that "the university can never educate in the true sense of the word;" it can only "supply the environment and the means necessary to insure that those
who have come here may educate each other and themselves." (p.10)

Second, that the university should neither be the indentured servant of the social order nor committed to promoting social change. 'Neither of these views can be accepted if the university is to maintain for its members the capacity to think freely and well.' (p.11) The university "can serve society best only when its members are left free to pursue the scholarly interests that are vital to them." They also reject the notion that the university must be directly useful to society, i.e., "relevant." They argue that this is a limited and mistaken conception of what is useful or relevant and that "such activities should arise from the intellectual and social ambience which the university fosters" rather than be incorporated into the curriculum. (p.12)

Third, that students (Stanford's students, at least) should be as free and independent as possible in pursuing their educations.

This freedom to choose what knowledge and what disciplines to learn may be Stanford's greatest gift to the student. For to choose he must think about himself and about the world in which he is involved. And this process of thought may contribute more to the student's educational development than any number of required university courses. His education is not imposed; it is his own. (p.13)

This does not mean that the University should blithely let the student "do his own thing," and then react with indifference when he falters or fails. Instead the University should offer the student every means of assistance it can to help him make his decisions: its wisdom and advice, but not its compulsion. The University should also help the student to discover new interests, lead him to analyze his old objectives, and to explore the many fields and endeavors open to him. He should be able to learn above all how one goes about acquiring knowledge. The freedom that we seek to promote includes the freedom from the crippling constraints of easy self-indulgence, a freedom that comes only when standards of excellence are recognized and emulated. (p.15)

Finally, the committee relies heavily on this premise in its attempt to reconcile the demands on faculty to specialize and to provide "general education" to undergraduates. (We might add that undergraduates also are faced with analogous demands.)

We suggest that the demands of specialization and generalism are not irreconcilable. Within almost every specialist there lurks a generalist who can be coaxed to emerge. What it takes to coax him, however, is precisely what the traditional academic curriculum denies
him: the opportunity to help a beginner comprehend, not his field as a whole, but those aspects of his field about which he cares most deeply. Let the objective of curricular planning be to encourage the faculty member to teach what he likes to teach and the student to learn what seems vital to him—the Intellectual History of Europe in the Nineteenth Century rather than the History of Western Civilization, Modern Consciousness rather than Freshman English, ...— and from this common freedom may emerge a form of general education far better suited to the characteristics of a university than that to which we pay lip service now. (p.14)

The University cannot in any event impress on its students the total content of present knowledge, and it is impossible to choose what exactly it is that every student should know without imposing arbitrary constraints on the range of free inquiry. Instead, we believe that the important thing is for students to learn to find out what they do not know and then learn how to find out about it: to think freely and to think well. And the generalities can proceed from the specific, for the teacher at his best is concerned with the range as well as the depth of his discipline. (p.14)

The report concludes with a recommendation which the committee regards as its single most important one:

The University should seek to sustain a spirit of self-examination and self-renewal, which can be supported by a variety of institutional devices including: (a) A standing committee of the Senate, with student membership, to concern itself with identifying institutional problems and seeing to it that they receive attention. The first task of this committee should be to monitor the progress of SES recommendations. (b) An Academic Planning Office to assist faculty, student, and administration efforts to obtain the data upon which rational planning must depend. (p.16)

(Note that in the following list of recommendations they are numbered as they are in the Stanford reports. In some instances only portions of a recommendation are listed.)

II. Undergraduate Education

1. The University curricular policies and requirements for the freshman year should be as follows:
   a. For each student, a one semester writing experience integrated with a course, which may but need not be Freshman English.
   c. For as many students as possible, a first-semester Freshman Tutorial taught by a regular faculty member and directed either toward conveying
the style of intellectual inquiry in his field of knowledge or toward illuminating the relationships between his and other fields of knowledge, or toward both.

5. Each school or department should be permitted to prescribe not more than one-half of the undergraduate major's total program, including courses required to be taken in fields other than the field of concentration.

6. The School of Engineering should provide optional degree programs that meet the limitation expressed in Recommendation 5.

12. Areas that call for early attention in new course development include: science and technology for the non-specialists; mathematics and computer science for the non-specialists; interdisciplinary and problem-oriented studies in the humanities and the social sciences; professional school offerings for the undergraduate; and the practicing arts.

17. Both faculty and students should look upon the class schedule not as a commitment but as a reservation of time and space for use as needed. The number of times a class will meet and the length of each session should be determined by the instructor in accordance with the nature of the course material and the needs of the students.

18. The academic calendar should be modified to include a two-week reading period, free of scheduled academic obligations, prior to the examination period at the end of each term.

19. The University should adopt a semester calendar, in which the academic year begins immediately after Labor Day and ends in late May.

20. The unit-credit system should be replaced by a course-credit system. A "course" should not be quantitatively determined by contact hours, number of days per week, etc., but should be determined by the individual instructor, subject to departmental approval. Four courses per semester (or three per quarter) should represent the standard academic load. The maximum regular load should be five courses (four under the quarter system); the minimum, three courses (two under the quarter system). Thirty-two courses (36 under the quarter system) should be required for the bachelor's degree.

23. Faculty members should be urged to employ essay examinations wherever appropriate. In order to encourage such examinations, a minimum of two weeks should be allowed between a final exam and the date on which course grades must be filed with the Registrar.

29. (b) The present "D" and "F" grades should be eliminated, and the sole penalty for failing to complete a course satisfactorily should be the loss of credit toward graduation.
   (d) The "pass" option should be extended to include any course, subject only to the consent of the instructor and the department concerned. No limit should be placed on the number of pass courses that a student may take.
X. Government of the University

4. The Board of Trustees should seek to increase the diversity of its membership with respect to such factors as age, occupation, cultural and racial background, and place of residence. This effort should give a high priority to adding members who are actively engaged in teaching and scholarship at other universities and colleges.

7. Membership on Board committees should include Stanford faculty members and students as well as trustees.

14. Part-time service by faculty members on the presidential staff should be strongly encouraged.

20. Deans of schools and other university-wide officers of academic administration should ordinarily serve a term of five years, renewable once.

21. Heads of departments should ordinarily serve a term of five years, renewable once.

26. Consecutive membership on a standing committee should be limited to two three-year terms. A person should be eligible for further appointment only after an absence from the committee of three years.

32. No faculty member should serve on more than one standing committee. In order to enforce that rule and to reduce scheduling problems, a special time should be set aside weekly for meetings of standing committees. This two-hour period should be kept free of scheduled classes and major campus events.

37. The University should officially recognize the need for enhanced and better focused faculty and administrative attention to the problems of undergraduate education.


Department of Philosophy
October 29, 1969
A Greater Restriction of Library Book Circulation is Urgently Needed

The Kerr Library reaches its peak usefulness in the summer shortly after journals and books have been returned for inventory. After this any intensive research becomes increasingly complicated; one must wait several days for needed books to be recalled, and many potentially useful references go unseen because one hesitates to recall a book from another staff member unless he is sure he needs it.

It would be valuable to know the reasons why faculty members keep bound journals and books for extended periods. I suspect, in the absence of any hard facts, that only a very small number of volumes are actually being used in the compilation of reviews or bibliographies, the only use of extended loan privileges that may be justifiable. I suspect that the vast majority of books presently checked out to faculty fall into one of the following categories: 1) books which the faculty member has finished reading but which he is too indifferent or forgetful to return, 2) books of particular importance and reference value to the faculty member which have been checked out for his personal library, and 3) books checked out for graduate students or for students in a particular course. There is no excuse for books being held out for long periods for any of these reasons. Anyone doing so is making students and his colleagues suffer and is misusing library funds. All books needed for extended periods for personal or course requirements should be purchased by personal or course funds. The Reserved Book Room at the library is available for course books.

If you feel as I do that a university library should be a place for research and not a free source of personal reference material, I urge you to make your opinions known to the Faculty Senate Library Committee. I recognize the fact that it may take some time for general acknowledgement of the importance of having all the books available all the time to all the university community. In the interim at least the habitual misuse of extended privileges due to indifference can be reduced as follows: 1) institute a messenger service whereby any library books would be picked up for return at the individual departmental offices much the way Campus Mail is collected, and 2) make extended privileges an active rather than passive process by requiring that all books wanted for longer than specific period, say two weeks, be checked out on a special form. Neither of these suggestions would abridge any present privileges but probably would cut down greatly on the length of time books are out of the library.

Last Spring in an issue of the Staff Newsletter Rodney K. Waldron, Director of Libraries, invited comments about restricted circulation of bound journals. According to a summary he later distributed only 227 letters were received, about 50% of which were from graduate students, and only 9 of which favored restricted use. Because 90% of the letter writers were from only 5 departments one is led to the conclusion that a relatively few individuals organized letter-writing campaigns and that
the decision to continue with existing policies was not based on a representative sample. Therefore, I am asking all faculty members wanting a voice in this matter to mark the ballot below and send it to me. I am not a member of the Faculty Senate Library Committee or of any other group making library policy. I am just one individual who is very tired of not finding journals and books that I need, and I would like to see changes instituted that would make the library more useful to everyone instead of just those who get the books out first. Regardless of the outcome of this survey I will send a summary of the results to Dr. McMullen, Chairman of the Library Committee, and to Mr. Waldron. Also I will submit it for publication in this Forum, and will keep the ballots for anyone who cares to stop by to see them.

Respectfully,

John E. Morris, Assistant Professor
Department of Zoology
November 18, 1969

Send to: J.E. Morris, Zoology (Must be received by Dec. 19 to be included in the summary)

I favor the policy (or policies) for Kerr Library circulation indicated:

_____ prohibiting circulation of all library holdings.

_____ prohibiting circulation of bound journals.

_____ initiating a messenger service for returning books.

_____ making faculty privileges automatically short-term unless extended privileges are specifically requested each time a book is checked-out.

_____ keeping all existing circulation restrictions and policies.

_____ other (explain:)

Name:
Title:
School or Department:
To: Members of the OSU Faculty
From: D. B. Nicodemus, Dean of Faculty

"OSU Faculty Forum Papers" is to be a monthly publication for the exchange of faculty views concerning university affairs. At the October 5, 1967 meeting of the Faculty Senate, Professor Peter Anton presented the proposal for this publication (see minutes of Meeting 223). The proposal was discussed further at the November 2 meeting and approved by the Senate on December 7, 1967 (see minutes of Meeting 227).

Guidelines for the publication, developed by a faculty advisory committee (Castle, McClenaghan and Munford), were approved by the Senate on March 7, 1968. These guidelines were published in the March 15, 1968 edition of the Staff Newsletter.

"OSU Faculty Forum Papers" will be published monthly through the office of the Dean of Faculty with the assistance of the faculty advisory committee. (James Park now serves in place of Castle.)

The guidelines contain directions for the preparation and submission of manuscripts. Papers intended for the May 1968 issue should be received by the Dean of Faculty by noon on Tuesday, April 30, 1968.
A Proposal to Merge the Schools of Humanities and Social Sciences
and of Science -
Invitation to Discussion

An indirect outgrowth of the first Faculty Conference, held last spring in Newport, was the formation of an informal ad hoc committee to study the desirability of creating a single school from our present schools of Humanities and Social Sciences and of Science. The committee consisted of faculty drawn from both schools, reasonably broadly representative of the various disciplines. As a first step in the study, members of the committee discussed the merger with many of you who read this, sometimes by attending departmental meetings, sometimes individually. The deans of the schools involved were approached, as well as deans of other interested schools, the dean of faculty and President Jensen. The intent here was to inform these individuals of the activities of the committee, without at this stage seeking their direct support for anything beyond our investigation of sentiment throughout the university. This support was freely given.

As we had anticipated, reaction from faculty members contacted ranged from unbridled enthusiasm through cautious interest to opposition to the proposal. However, while our sample was neither complete nor scientifically selected, the predominant response was favorable. We were, therefore, encouraged to devise a plan whereby consideration of the merger could take place, with the maximum opportunity for the broadest possible participation by the faculties directly concerned and the provision of the possibility for an expression of opinion by at least the representatives of the whole faculty. To this end, we proposed the following steps be taken:
(1) A meeting among members of the ad hoc committee, the deans of the two schools, Dean Nicodemus, and President Jensen so that an account of the preliminary opinion "survey" would be given and support sought on its basis for step (2):

(2) Separate meetings of the two schools to be held under the chairmanship of Dean Nicodemus to discuss the merger in principle, with the academic pros and cons to be debated rather than administrative details. If both schools showed by vote support for the merger in principle, then we proposed moving to step (3):

(3) A special committee to be appointed by Dean Nicodemus and/or selected by vote of the faculties to study administrative details and prepare a document which would govern the amalgamation if finally approved. This to be followed by:

(4) Joint or separate school meetings to debate, modify, or rewrite the instrument. If agreement on these important administrative matters could be reached, then

(5) The Faculty Senate would be asked to approve a resolution seeking action by the administration to bring about the merger.

It is not the purpose of this paper to advance arguments in favor of or against the merger, although clearly Faculty Forum Papers provide one opportunity for expression of opinion on this matter. The purpose is rather to inform those who may not have heard of the movement, and to seek the support of all faculty members for a free and open discussion of the proposal. Whether at this time you support or oppose the proposal to amalgamate, we hope you will join in a debate which, whatever its outcome, should benefit the university by inspiring a close look at some of its parts.

March 12, 1968
25 April 1968

FACULTY FORUM PAPERS
Oregon State University

Dear Colleagues:

The paper by Messrs. Wilkins and Hull sought reactions to a proposed amalgamation of Science with Humanities and Social Sciences. My reactions are admittedly unpolished, but I feel they are cogent.

For the proposed College to succeed, we must FIRST have one, and preferably two, preexisting conditions.

First, a Dean willing to accept the post, who is endowed with proper aggressiveness and a suitably broad academic outlook. The aggressiveness must be tenacious without belligerence. The breadth must be across lines of professional traditionalism, across lines of teaching and research, and across lines of graduate and undergraduate emphasis.

Second, we need a much more substantial University commitment to the Honors Program already in existence. Until we can show the little College will work, leave the big one alone.

I am delighted the Faculty Forum Papers have come to be. On with the debate.

WILLIAM F. LOVEY
Student Draft Deferment

Should college men have a draft deferment?

A Presidential candidate speaking to OSU students recently questioned their right to deferments and broadly charged discrimination on the basis of wealth or race. Having "let them have it", according to the press report, he called for a "lottery to replace the present deferment system". Thus, many college men students got unsettled in their confidence that their deferments really have the justification of future, more needed, and effective national service than they could have rendered upon graduation from high school. His verbal battering of the student deferrees here at OSU and elsewhere shoved onto these young men a burden of implied guilt for social "imbalance" in uniform caused by factors (like reenlistment) beyond the control of influence of the individual students struggling to find themselves and to attain excellence in their own callings.

We on the committees which sponsor convocation speakers, needless to say, cannot take responsibility for all that such speakers say. But all of us on the faculty do have to prepare ourselves to advise students to avoid impulsive responses to such flights of purple rhetoric as that of the speaker cited above.

In time of war any deferred man might feel pangs of self-doubt because of his status. But the entire concept of deferments supposes that they will largely result in maximizing the direct or supporting military effectiveness of the nation's manpower, either in uniformed or in civilian roles. We cannot afford to play roulette with the nation's brainpower, which should study first and serve later.

The draft does not pretend equality of peril, comfort, or glory. Intended as selective service, the draft system aims at a war-time need for each man to serve where and when the national needs and his personal qualifications best place him.

Non-shirking college students need the steadying influence of faculty advisors to offset florid oratory of visiting politicos. We have the opportunity to encourage the successful student in his accomplishment and also to help the uncertain student find the area in which education can enhance his ability for later service. Many of us have steered young men into alternative programs when they got discouraged about their academic accomplishment and felt inclined to "enlist and get it over with". We as faculty members render a tangible national service when we thereby keep these young men advancing toward higher service functions.
One can hope that individual students will get deferred to study as either undergraduate or graduate students so long as they advance in needed categories, and we can hope that no arbitrary cut-off will force all of them, ready or not, into uniform without regard to the nation's defense need for some men of the most highly advanced education.

Each OSU commencement sees many graduates doffing academic regalia and assuming the uniformed responsibilities for which they prepared while deferred. Many OSU alumni serve today more effectively in either the active or the reserve forces because of their preparation to do so while attending OSU.

We can all raise some valid questions about the draft and national policy, such as the matter of trade and aid for nations which materially support the enemy who kills our draftees and volunteers. But let us on the faculty bolster the morale and constructively advise the young men who conscientiously improve themselves to serve America while deferred to attend college.

Fred W. Decker
Associate Professor of Physics
Member, Convocations and Lectures Committee and Pre-Medical Advisory Committee
Why Work at Teaching? G. W. Maloof

With more emphasis each year on research activities on campus, should a corresponding de-emphasis on teaching and advising be a consequence? One is tempted to state a flat "no" and argue, if pressed, that research is "learning" and "keeping up". Certainly this view is valid, when kept in context.

But the current policies of one of our larger schools seem to go much beyond simply recognizing the value of research with reference to the basic responsibility of this University: to teach its students.

Despite the large and growing research budget, most of the support for this institution still comes from the Oregon taxpayer, who thinks his money is going to buy the best possible teaching for our students. Moreover, our students are still mostly undergraduates. Whatever else, the Mosser awards were a clear statement of the views of the Oregon Legislature on this point.

How, then, does an administrator discharge his obligation to evaluate and promote teaching?

Does he deny a professor tenure who has received multiple awards and recognition for teaching?

Does he refuse to promote several others even when they have professional stature and current publications in "good" journals?

Does he substitute number for quality in evaluating publication records?

I feel that it is partly because of "administration" like this that students across the nation have begun to feel that only the students can save our Universities.

I agree that we want people primarily interested in research; I say only that we also need people primarily interested in teaching. Above all, we need administrators sensitive to the difference, who respect both talents.

Giles Wilson Maloof
Assistant Professor of Mathematics
School of Science
Dear Colleagues:

I could be way out in left field, and I certainly am out of my proper field, but after reading the paper by Wilkins and Hull on unification of the School of Humanities and Social Science with the School of Science, I feel that the authors have failed to consider two important points.

The two departments, besides being somewhat culturally incompatible, are financially and developmentally incompatible. Humanities and Social Science is a relative newcomer among the Schools of the University. Science is well established. The needs are greater for Humanities and Social Science which is still in a developmental stage. The channels and competitive position of Humanities and Social Science are not as well established as they are in Science. Under the present arrangement Humanities and Social Science would be dominated by Science from a communications viewpoint, which I feel would operate to Humanities' and Social Sciences' detriment.

Financially, the School of Science depends a great deal upon Federal grants, or "soft money". While this is adequate at the moment, it is not permanent, and any abrupt reduction in Congressional generosity may well be reflected in severe strains within the School of Science. This large amount of "soft money" is not available to Humanities and Social Science and in consequence they have had to build on a state money, or "hard money" base. Admittedly the dollars aren't so numerous or available, but they are more certain. Financially speaking, Humanities and Social Science is on a firmer footing than the School of Science. In a union of schools it is not inconceivable that in these easy times Humanities and Social Science would be dominated by the presently stronger and richer School of Science, and in harsher times, when "hard money" becomes important, Humanities and Social Science would be sacrificed by the dominant part of the union.
Somehow I cannot feel that it is to Humanities and Social Sciences' benefit to join such a union. It is too much like the "Owl and the Panther":

"As I passed by his garden, I marked with one eye
How the Owl and the Panther were sharing the pie.

The Panther took piecrust and gravy and meat
While the Owl had the dish as his share of the treat.

When the banquet was finished, the Owl as a boon
Was kindly permitted to pocket the spoon.

While the Panther took knife and fork with a growl
And finished the banquet __ _____ __ ____."

Sincerely,

J. F. Bone, DVM
Professor

JFB:gm
The paper in the May issue of Faculty Forum Papers by Professor G. W. Maloof contains several items which it seems to me require comment.

I believe that there are three basic responsibilities of a university, not one. These are to conserve the knowledge and culture of our civilization, to extend that knowledge by research and expand that culture by creative additions to it, and to transmit to students through teaching not only a prescribed body of information but the excitement of increasing it. I do not consider these activities as antithetical or even separable; I would not raise one above another in importance; I believe an adequate discharge of one responsibility requires an adequate discharge of all. In any one faculty member, one activity may be emphasized, but the absence of any other severely limits, perhaps essentially, his ability to meet his full responsibilities as a member of the university academic community.

If the financial support of the university comes from sources unaware of the equal importance of these basic responsibilities, as implied by Professor Maloof, I believe it is the responsibility of the faculty and administration to educate the sources rather than accept or foster their error. I am not convinced, however, that the Oregon taxpayers or State Legislature view the mission of the university as narrowly as has been implied. While we seek to increase the holdings of our libraries and state support for research as well as for resident instruction, we already enjoy sufficient benefits in all these areas at least to suggest the breadth of view I infer.

The manner in which an administration recognizes the quality of the faculty always involves the difficult matter of evaluation of human activities. It is not disgraceful to admit that some inequities may occur and mistakes be made. But in the School of Science, which by implication seems to be the "larger school" referred to by Professor Maloof, there has been a major effort to avoid errors and inequities while upholding high standards. (I do not imply any lack of such effort in other schools, but I am incompetent to speak for them.) The membership of the personnel committees of each department is filed in the Dean's office and known to the department faculty. Every promotion and tenure recommendation is forwarded from the department to a school committee of members elected by the school membership (in 1967-68, half were appointed by the Dean, but these will be replaced by elected members from 1969-70 on). Support by the professional peers of the recommended faculty member is sought from outside the university by the school committee. The school committee then makes a final recommendation to the Dean. Any faculty member may appeal directly to the school committee if he believes his departmental committee has unjustly passed him over; and to the Dean if the school committee actions displease him. At every stage of this procedure, it is intended that teaching and research be evaluated with level emphasis. Provision is made for both the man primarily interested in research and primarily interested in teaching; but if "primarily" means to the exclusion of the other activity, whichever one it is, then my thesis concerning
the multiple responsibilities of a university and of its faculty in carrying them out implies that no recommendation for promotion or tenure would be made in such a case. The fact that two committees are involved indicates that a solitary opinion on this matter is not decisive.

Since no single administrator is involved in the promotion and tenure of a faculty member, Professor Maloof's use of masculine third person singular, even rhetorically, conveys an improper implication. But to offer my answer to the questions, I believe it quite proper for a personnel committee not to offer tenure to the holder of teaching awards if that is his only qualification. Promotion of men of broadly recognized professional stature is assured by outside evaluation; but if the stature is only intramurally measured, I can believe a personnel committee might not consider it significant. The matter of numbers of publications usually generates a good deal of thermodynamically inferior heat among its discussants, but I believe sensible men recognize that both quality and quantity are suitable criteria of worth. While a large quantity of garbage doesn't change its character by being published, it is usually understood that a steady rate of contributions of average importance can substitute for a number of outstanding advances. Since it is given to few of us to make outstanding advances, I am happy with that understanding.

It seems possible that misunderstandings of the purposes of a university, and of the relevance of the academic processes to support those purposes, may well be one cause of student unrest across the country. We have, perhaps, assumed a broader understanding of our community than exists even among some of its members.

It is incumbent on all of us, therefore, to provide the necessary understanding by open discussion of our customs, folkways, procedures, and difficulties and to seek relevant suggestions for improvement from any informed source. It is in this spirit that I offer the foregoing remarks for consideration.
FACULTY INVOLVEMENT IN THE WELFARE OF STUDENTS: THE BELL IS TOLLING

Oregon State is fast becoming one of the few bastions of calm complacency in higher education. The quiet OSU student is a fringe benefit offsetting for some faculty their low salaries and other inadequate financial benefits. The attraction of a campus without the problems disrupting other colleges cannot be denied. The question is: "how long can our idyll last?" There are those who categorically deny any possibility of a Berkeley at OSU. Perhaps -- but the list of colleges which have been confronted by demands of students (both Black and White) has grown to impressive length since those early Berkeley days. Are we really so much out of the mainstream of higher education that it can't happen here? Are we so unlike other institutions that we can remain untouched by the widespread eruptions within American higher education?

When we look to the north, we find the president of the University of Washington confronted by student demands. To the South, a Committee on Racism is actively functioning on the demands of University of Oregon students. At Stanford, the Academic Council, faced by student unrest, has recently recommended, among other things, the doubling of its Black student enrollment by 1969-70. At Portland State, a presidential committee is at work to implement the chancellor's 3% proposal along lines designed to admit and assist more underprivileged students from the Albina district. The University of California may play football this fall without its substantial number of Black athletes. These are our closest major institutions -- can we rely on our geographical isolation to protect us for long from student confrontations? I do not think so....

Each year our student population increases in size and diversity. Even if Oregon State students read only the Gazette-Times and watch only a few news broadcasts on TV, they are certainly discovering that things are happening at colleges across the country -- and that students are making them happen. They are also discovering that colleges are being forced to face up to social responsibilities they have ignored in the past. Since institutions of higher education are traditionally conservative in their approach to internal functioning, it is not surprising that student demands have generally caught the college faculty and administration unprepared to cope with the confrontation. Generally it is only after administrators have become embroiled that the faculty have been called in to the situation -- often as a hastily assembled hoc committee to work on the specific symptom of unrest.

The Oregon State faculty in its increasing concern about the functioning of the University should, it seems to me, include in that concern not only matters related to academic policies but also matters related to Oregon State's role in the identification of human talent and the conserving and development of human resources. The faculty may have a little time to reinject itself into that area which college faculties have allowed to slip away to administrators and non-prestige clerking committees -- student welfare. The faculty should be concerned, among other things, about the adequacy of its advising, the value of its present orientation procedures, the causes and cost (both financial and human) of the deplorable 50% attrition, the reasons for and impact on students and college of the high rate of interschool transfers as well as its potential antecedent: requiring all students to declare a major before registering for a single college course, and the quality and quantity of the counseling and other assistance programs available to students.

Would it not be wiser to anticipate the problems with which students are likely to confront us and the means for coping with these problems rather than to wait until a confrontation pits one group against another over some symptom of general student
dissatisfaction? The relatively minor action of the Senate's agreeing to admit students to its meetings (student initiated) and the Senate's passage of the S-U grading policy (student supported) did much to give OSU students a feeling of faculty responsiveness to student welfare. I would propose that the faculty act promptly on measures designed to indicate a more permanent meaningful concern for student welfare.

I suggest, as a beginning, that (1) the Faculty Senate initiate an investigation of the feasibility of establishing a campus ombudsman, with direct access to the president and the Council of Deans, to handle student complaints and (2) the Faculty Senate should, as soon as practicable, create a Committee on Human Resources which would seek out present and potential sources of student dissatisfaction, supervise research on the effectiveness of current practices and procedures, and report its findings, with recommendations, to the responsible committees and appropriate administrative personnel.

There are often five, six or seven committees or administrators responsible for different parts of a program (such as the New Student Program) or a special group of students (such as foreign students). This decentralization assures that few creative proposals for modification or restructuring of a total program will evolve and when a proposal is generated in one part of the system, there is no logical central body or administrator to pick up on the proposal and guide it over the institutional hurdles to acceptance and implementation.

This Committee on Human Resources as well as the ombudsman would fill some of the gaps which now exist between the student personnel and academic areas and between students, faculty and administrators. As the university has grown, the specialization of functions has become accentuated and responsibilities have become compartmentalized. The student is split into pieces for efficient handling: the Registrar processes him as a grade point average, Student Health as a medical case, the Counseling Center as a client, the Dean of Men (or Women) as an offender, the Memorial Union as an activities participant, the Athletic Department as a spectator, the housing office as a tenant, etc., etc. Obviously, many student problems simply don't fall neatly into the administrative categories we have developed and too often problems appear in one area or another which are simply a result of the fractionating process itself.

The ombudsman would be available to handle dissatisfactions of complaints by individuals in any area and would bridge administrative lines and levels through access to whatever personnel have the authority to act where action seems appropriate. The Human Resources Committee could address itself to over-all student-related problems and potential problems which now too often are neglected through their containing components outside the jurisdiction of any single committee or administrative official.

Events are moving rapidly. The consequences of relying on the creaking institutional forms designed for an earlier era have meant violent disruption on many campuses. My proposals are certainly not presented as the solution for forestalling student related difficulties at OSU but rather to encourage the first small steps by the faculty toward adapting our bureaucratic structure to the new demands of an exploding student population and to generate discussion among the faculty on our current methods of handling almost 15,000 human beings who happen to be our students.

Charles Warnath
Psychology
Some Thoughts about Graduating with Honors at the University

It has been said that what is honored in a country grows there, and there is indeed psychological evidence to back up this view. Thus we should not take lightly what we decide to honor at this university since what we honor will determine the kinds of people who grow here.

Any suggestion that honors be given on grade point average should be rejected out of hand. First, grade point averages themselves are ridiculous. As any one with an elementary knowledge of mathematics knows, you do not multiply or divide nor even add or subtract numbers on an ordinal scale and grading scales are ordinal scales. An A is not worth twice as much as a C nor is the difference between an A and a B equal to that of the difference between a B and a C. It is ridiculous for a large university dedicated to science to devote a great deal of time pointing out the nature of mathematics to its students and then to spend thousands and thousands of dollars in time and effort devoted to operations based on such faulty assumptions and thus to inculcate in its students a dedication to such assumptions which no amount of classroom oratory can overcome.

A second objection is that to use any classroom measure as a device for honors rewards the student for being a good slave rather than for becoming an independent educated man. If the student seeks a broad interest in the university life -- its lectures, its plays, its discussions, its library -- he will be disadvantaged with respect to the student who devotes himself only to the material specified for him by his classroom instructors. If in the class he finds himself an original, more suitable way of learning class material, he may well be disadvantaged with respect to the student who concerns himself with class discipline, handing in certain required assignments and, in general, being a good boy but not necessarily learning efficiently or effectively. Furthermore, if in this same course he learns material which the instructor does not deem of great importance or which is irrelevant to the instructor's particular interest, he will be disadvantaged with respect to the student who ignores his own particular insights and interests, to model himself narrowly after his instructor -- his instructor's choice of topics and even his instructor's views on debatable topics. We should not seek to honor the student whose superior abilities to blind his own senses and to ignore inconsistencies enable him to follow slavishly the instructions, and to adopt obediently the thoughts of any other man set in authority; we should rather honor the person who has a good fund of knowledge of the best in our cultural heritage from the
humanities and from the sciences, who can integrate this knowledge meaningfully both within itself and with his own experiences, and who demonstrates such mastery by making creative use of this knowledge.

Therefore, I would suggest that the university develop a general screening exam testing broad knowledge in humanities and the sciences -- physical, biological and social -- which would be followed by some special test of competence devised for those selected from among this group, an honor's thesis or an original work or a creative performance. Those who perform well on these bases would merit honors at this university.

Such a program would take quite a bit of planning and work on the part of the faculty, but here we have a chance to free our students from the narrow robotization of the current pattern of training. Let's use this opportunity rather than adopt a process whose only virtue is to make the problem go away quickly.

Kermit J. Rohde
Professor of Psychology
September 24, 1968

The "OSU Faculty Forum Papers", a publication for the exchange of faculty opinions concerning university affairs, is published monthly through the office of the Dean of Faculty with the assistance of a faculty advisory committee. Guidelines for this publication were approved by the Faculty Senate on March 7, 1968 and appear in the March 15, 1968 edition of the Staff Newsletter. The guidelines contain directions for the preparation and submission of manuscripts. Papers intended for the November 1968 issue should be received by the Dean of Faculty by noon on Thursday, October 31.
Dear Dean Nicodemus:

We have read with a certain degree of apprehension the Staff Newsletter of October 18 in which there appeared, in uneasy juxtaposition with the Charter Day announcement, an exposition on a new permanent identification card for faculty. Our apprehension may stem in part from the projected images Oregon State University may acquire during its second hundred years, but our real concern arises from considerations far more serious than images, real or imaginary.

There is an obvious implication in the issuing of these cards that one's word is no longer valid in the various divisions of the university, and that only card-carrying faculty are to be considered as the genuine article. While the library card has its place, it is nothing less than idiotic to suppose that the creation of a credit-card-faculty will solve the various and sundry logistic problems in university organizations. Strict adherence to the use of such devices may well lead to ludicrous situations where bona fide faculty members are denied use of or access to campus services because they have misplaced, lost, or burned their "identity." One can't help but wonder, in fact, as to what sort of penalty will befall those who fail to pick up their card before November 1.

The words "Successful use of the card ... is predicated on the integrity and trust of both issuer and user," are meaningless. That the issuer (our 100-year-old university) finds it necessary to base its trust on our social security numbers speaks poorly for our integrity.

There is some small hope, perhaps, in that our credit cards will come equipped with a "self-destruct sticker." We don't know what a self-destruct sticker is, but as long as it disintegrates, or liquidates, or atomizes, or whatever else self-destruct stickers are supposed to do, we really don't care to know. Shades of Orwell and Mission Impossible! This would all be funny if it weren't for the alarming implications.

Sincerely,

W. P. Nagel

G. W. Krantz

October 28, 1968
FACULTY STATUS --- STUDENT RIGHTS

At first sight, these topics may appear unrelated. On reflection maybe this is not so. If we view the university of today, including ours, it becomes increasingly evident that unrest exists—faculty unrest and student unrest. In the sense of disruption of the academic process we may conclude that this institution is one of the "mild-mannered". Yet change is occurring in universities and there is no reason to believe that we will escape seeking change whether this be initiated by orderly or disorderly processes. Faculty and students alike demand more of a voice in academic policy. By policy I am not referring to the creation of daily rules to guide our operation. What is meant is a voice in deciding direction in long-range planning, in curricular matters and in all those things academic in nature, including teaching and research.

Oregon State University should not be found guilty of complacency in these areas. Real concern should be shown for the topic of this discourse, faculty status and student rights.

If our efforts are to be real it must mean faculty acceptance of responsibility and leadership in formulating policies leading to true academic freedom including matters of tenure and promotion. First, as a faculty we should decide what we want this university to be. What level of excellence and achievement do we desire? Once this is established, we need to ask ourselves how are we to achieve this? Paramount to answering these questions is the establishment of the status of the faculty in the process of academic change. To date, my inclination is to conclude that thus far we as a faculty have been too inclined to indulge ourselves in "daily administration" rather than to formulate long-range direction and policy. Certainly this is not to say that we do not need to satisfy ourselves that "daily administration" is consistent with the long-range plan and our academic freedom. When we as a faculty in consort with the administration and students have defined our goals then we as a faculty must act responsibly to achieve these goals.

* by "daily administration" is not meant only daily operation but also over concern with less important considerations.
What concrete moves might we then take? As a first step I would suggest the formation of long-range planning committees at the department, school and university level. These committees together with the faculties and administrators involved after a responsible self-evaluation, need to define what they hope to achieve and why and how they propose doing this. It is evident that this requires first a departmental initiative through open departmental meetings that by design permit frank discussion. I realize that some may state this has been done. I would quarrel with this at least in terms of the thoroughness suggested here. What needs to be emphasized is the importance for such studies to be initiated by faculty and students. This is particularly important if the result is a change in direction or emphasis. Getting down to the "nitty-gritty", suppose that a department decides that to move forward in the training of undergraduate and graduate students requires faculty in a new area of that department's discipline. How do you accomplish this? In an affluent situation it may be easy. If the department or school is less affluent then decisions have to be made that may in the extreme involve non-reappointments. Need I say more about the desirability of responsible faculty involvement? Choices have to be made.

In such deliberations we should not forget that an integral part of such deliberations is the third and equal part of the university triangle, the students. Certainly they have the right to express what they expect and deserve from their university experience, and to share in shaping its future. This should include active participation both in the initial discussions and the final decisions. Like the faculty, they share the obligation of responsible action. Not incidentally, they have the right to expect protection of their academic freedom from non-academic recriminations.

It is realized that this forum may be only a place to express views and as such may or may not result in action. Be that as it may, I would hope that this discussion might stimulate positive action. The only way it will is if this faculty and student body initiates concrete moves. The beginning most likely will have to start through departments or student organizations. Whether discussion continues depends on each accepting a responsible role with the belief that it is worth doing. One role of the administration is to convince all that the results will lead to a better university and a better understanding of faculty status and student rights in the process.

R. W. Newburgh  Nov. 11, 1968
Admittedly, the synthesis of idealism and medievalism which Dr. Rohde advances as a solution for the troubles of the honors program is appealing. It combines the flower of chivalry with flower power; the brazen ring of trumpets and nakers with the strumming of guitars; the strength of Gothic faith with the dissolution of a Gotterdammerung.

It is beautiful—but impractical.

It is based upon an unrealistic premise. It ignores the facts of modern life and society. It offers no practical alternatives. It is filled with wishful thinking, broad generality, and blanket condemnation which serves rather badly as a base upon which to develop a workable program.

Dr. Rohde apparently operates on the premise that there is such a thing as a "universal man." This is pure medievalism. It was true enough in the days of Erasmus and the Admirable Crichton, but it is generally accepted that the last "universal man"—who held within his mind a workable totality of human knowledge—was Gottfried Wilhelm von Leibnitz. Von Leibnitz died in 1716. Since then, human knowledge has grown exponentially and today the curve has turned asymptotic and has run right off the chart! No matter how nice it might be in principle to have an honors student capable of crossing disciplinary lines, the concept is impossible except in the most elementary form. A modern university, struggling madly to keep its students abreast of the flood of new techniques, publications, and discoveries is simply not designed to produce "universal men." The development of Admirable Crichton is neither useful nor a practical function no matter how fascinating the concept may be to certain types of educators.

Dr. Rohde ignores the fact that modern society has been forced to specialize because of this enormous increase in human knowledge. He denies, at least by implication, that students must specialize if they are to play any effective part in the development of civilization. He recoils from the thought; he calls it "narrowrobotization." Yet there is a distinct possibility that the only fair "honors program" must be "honor programs" specialized according to the disciplines involved.

Dr. Rohde would reject "out of hand" the GPA as one of the criteria upon which an honors program is based, but he offers no alternative. Admittedly, the GPA is an imperfect instrument, but it serves well enough to make the basic separation of the superior from the ordinary and, until something better is developed, it must remain. Certainly Dr. Rohde has no reason to confuse a numerical equivalent of ABCD with a numerical evaluation. I frankly doubt that anyone involved in education or grading ever thinks of a 4-point as double the value of a 2-point. The numerical equivalent is merely a convenience. The fault, if there is one, lies in the system—but, since the system is virtually universal and the convention is understood, there is no real reason to change it. And Dr. Rohde knows perfectly well that the separation of the "honors" from the "A" student involves an additional set of criteria that are considerably more demanding.
Of course, a complete individual personality profile of each student covering everything from academic proficiency to habits and traits of character would be a better method of basic evaluation. But it would be extraordinarily cumbersome, just as subjective, and just as dependent upon the prejudices of the evaluator as the present system. The only way to avoid subjectivity is to go to the objective roboticism of a computer. And this, rightly so, is anathema, for no computer can be programmed to recognize genius.

I feel that Dr. Rohde is attempting to return to the academic womb by this advocacy of "broad knowledge in humanities and sciences." Such a policy might produce breadth, but it would certainly lack depth, and the individual who tried to conform to it would inevitably know less and less about more and more, until eventually he knew nothing about everything.

This statement about breadth reminds me of the wise old owl to whom the forest creatures came for advice: A centipede limped up and said, "Sir, I have arthritis. My leg joints ache and since I have several hundred, the pain is unbearable. What shall I do?"

The owl eyed the centipede's swollen legs for a moment and then replied, "The answer is obvious. Since you cannot walk, you must learn to fly."

"But, sir, how am I to do this? I have no wings."

"Don't bother me with details," said the owl. "I'm an idea man."

Jesse F. Bone, D.V.M.
Professor, Veterinary Medicine
November 7, 1968
LET'S ELIMINATE THE "DROP-OUT"

It is time we stopped building Oregon State University into a Multiversity, composed of a great multitude of students, gathered in large classes taught by professors who, thereby, must remain almost entirely impersonal in their relations with students. The University should be restricted to those serious minded students who are well prepared and can, therefore, be reasonably expected to successfully pursue and complete the studies for a degree.

Approximately 27% of the students who enter OSU actually receive a degree here. Of the 3102 Freshmen who entered OSU in Fall 1967, only 2553 returned this fall. I believe it is a fair assumption, that this large attrition is due, in the main, to lack of adequate preparation or aptitude for University level studies.

But what about the many High School graduates who desire to continue their education but would be unable to meet the high entrance requirements that should be established for the University? For them, we must establish a system of Junior Colleges. These could be so organized that the "drop-out" would be almost eliminated. To this end, I suggest the following:

1. Junior Colleges should operate under the State System of Higher Education and offer a curriculum closely parallel to the Lower Division at the University. This will permit those students, who indicate aptitude for University level studies, to improve their grade level so that they can, eventually, be admitted to the University and earn a degree.

2. Vocational courses must also be offered. Not all Junior Colleges can, or should, offer training in the same vocations. With this Vocational option, the following advantages accrue:

   a. The student who, after a term or so, finds himself unsuited to complete studies for a degree, can, instead of dropping out of College, "DROP-IN" to a Vocational Course. In this way he avoids the stigma of being a "COLLEGE DROP-OUT".

   b. Upon completion of his Vocational Course, he will be awarded a "CERTIFICATE OF COMPLETION" by a "COLLEGE".
c. As he pursues his Vocational Training, he has the opportunity of enhancing his "overall" education by other available courses not directly related to his Vocation.

d. Although not earning a degree, he will be a "College Graduate". By virtue of this, he should experience an enhancement of prestige, that could considerably narrow the gap presently existing between the mechanic or technician and the professional man.

3. Student residency must be available at all Junior Colleges. This will permit the "DROP-IN" to transfer to a College where education in the Vocation of his choice is available.

J. A. Herrmann
Assistant Professor
Mathematics
November 18, 1968
The "OSU Faculty Forum Papers", a publication for the exchange of faculty opinions concerning university affairs, is published monthly through the office of the Dean of Faculty with the assistance of a faculty advisory committee. Guidelines for this publication were approved by the Faculty Senate on March 7, 1968 and appear in the March 15, 1968 edition of the Staff Newsletter. The guidelines contain the following directions for the preparation of manuscripts:

a. Must be authored by a faculty member eligible for election to the Senate according to the provisions of Section 2 of Article IV of the Bylaws.

b. Should be typed in a form which can be reproduced directly without the need of retyping or rearranging. Short papers of one or two pages may be typed with either single or double spacing to make best use of full pages. Longer papers must be single spaced. Other requirements:

(1) Use 8-1/2" x 11" plain white bond paper (sub. 20)
(2) Type on one side of page only
(3) Do not number or fold sheets
(4) Leave at least a 1-1/2" margin at the top of all pages.

c. Should not exceed a reasonable length. A six page limit is suggested, including displays such as tables or graphs. If this limit is exceeded, publications will require approval of the faculty advisory committee.

d. Should be signed (use black ink) and dated by the author at the end. The author's name and a subject, if appropriate, may be typed at the heading of the first page of the paper.

e. Manuscripts are to be submitted to the office of the Dean of Faculty. Receipt of each manuscript will be acknowledged. For each monthly publication, the deadline for the receipt of manuscripts shall be noon of the last full working day (Monday thru Friday) of the preceding month.

Papers intended for the January 1969 issue should be received by the Dean of Faculty by noon on Tuesday, December 31.
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