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.

DBN:dp
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