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,

[Signature]

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.

[Signature]

DEPT. OF
PHYSICS
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 participator, 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