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 processional 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 suit his students' needs. Although general guidelines 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 increase 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 textbooks so that students have to rely wholly on their lecture notes.
(c) Many textbooks 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 information. 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 student 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 effectiveness of hand-outs as a teaching device, a pilot study could be initiated. The excessive 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 discipline. 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

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 toadying 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
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 vocation 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, discussioncentered 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 denouncement 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.