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Dear President MacVicar:

We are pleased to submit for your consideration the report of the President's Commission on University Goals. This report is the results of over a year's intensive study of the total University from which we have formulated a statement of goals, missions and recommendations for the University. The text and appendices of the report constitute the supporting discussion for these goals, missions and recommendations.

We have not been able to give detailed consideration to every facet of the University, but have directed our efforts to those matters which we believed deserved our attention. We hope the study may be continued by the proposed President's Planning Commission.

We submit our report with the belief that we have examined a number of significant issues. We do not claim to offer final solutions, but rather hope that the issues will be discussed, debated, and refined with a view toward a more adequate formulation.

Emery N. Castle
Head, Department of Agricultural Economics

C. Warren Hovland
Chairman, Department of Religious Studies
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On February 20, 1969, President James H. Jensen announced the appointment of the Commission on University Goals. The charge to the Commission is stated below:

To assist Oregon State University in the development of a clearer definition and understanding of its purposes or goals, the President has invited three faculty members, Drs. Emery N. Castle, C. Warren Hovland and James G. Knudsen, to serve as members of a President's Commission on University Goals. In order to carry out its primary responsibility of assisting the institution to develop recommendations for long range planning, the Commission will be expected to study and evaluate existing organizational structures and methods of operation, present and emerging programs to determine how effectively they serve the purposes of the University. The Commission will be responsible directly to the President and it will be free to seek information and opinions from any office or individual in the University.

In the process of collecting and evaluating information about the University's programs, a part of the Commission's attention will be directed to preparing for the 1970 institutional accreditation by the Northwest Association. The Commission also will be encouraged to use additional sources outside of the University to assist in evaluations and long range planning.

The assignment of these tasks to the Commission will in no way relieve the administration, the faculty or the students of their proper and continuing share of responsibility for the development and evaluation of programs. To be effective, the Commission will require the
cooperative effort of all administrative persons and units of the
University as well as of many individual groups and members of
the faculty and of the student body.

The three faculty members listed above have accepted appointments
to the Commission and will be relieved from other duties in order
to devote half-time to the Commission. These appointments are for
at least one year. The Commission is being established with the
intent that it will function on a continuing basis but with the possibility
of rotation of membership. Moreover, the initial structure of the
Commission is not necessarily permanent.

The procedure of operation followed by the Commission was to:

1. Involve all segments of the University community, to the greatest
   extent possible, in evaluating the operation of the University.
   Questionnaires were sent to administrative units, faculty, students,
   and alumni. Samples of the questionnaires may be found in the
   appendices to this report. In addition, the Commission interviewed
   all administrative officers with the rank of Dean and above and met
   with Departments upon request. Other opportunities were provided
   for faculty and student input, including a faculty-student conference
   organized to discuss "University Goals."

2. Study the literature on Higher Education with particular reference
to reports on similar undertakings at other universities.

3. Synthesize the above information with particular reference to the
future role and mission of Oregon State University. The Commission
has been in complete agreement from the outset that goals and missions
cannot be divorced completely from the means of accomplishment and
has studied both. Our findings and recommendations reflect this
orientation.
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This preface explains the general format of the report and defines certain terms which provide part of the conceptual base upon which the report rests. The problems discussed herein are inherently complex; their solution should not be made more difficult by ambiguous expression.

Following this preface will be found a Statement of University Goals. Next, there is an identification of five missions for Oregon State University. There is then found a compilation of all of the recommendations of the report. The Goals, Missions, and Recommendations represent the end product of the work of the Commission. They are placed in a prominent place so they can be easily accessible to the reader.

We then present the supporting data and reasoning which form the basis for the report itself. Chapter I deals with the underlying assumptions and gives detailed treatments to missions and priorities. Chapter II deals, in some depth, with governance and decision-making. Chapter III treats planning and evaluation, while Chapter IV is concerned with University organization. Chapter V deals with the organization and objectives of individual Schools. Several technical appendices are then presented. These form the factual base for many of the conclusions and recommendations; they also provide raw material for others who wish to investigate these subjects in greater depth.
A. DEFINITIONS

Throughout this report certain terms are used repeatedly. There are also terms which have different shades of meaning in both popular and technical usage. We have chosen to use the terms as they are defined below, hoping that a degree of arbitrariness can be forgiven if greater precision in communication is achieved.

Goals. We use the term "goals" in the same sense as Hughes.\(^1\) A "goal" is a statement of purpose and is potentially a motivating force. A viable goal is one which integrates the goals of the organization with the individual goals of the people who comprise the organization. In the case of the academic community, it is necessary to define the term "community" in order to know which individual goals are appropriate for consideration. A goal, then, is a statement of purpose which integrates the aspirations of groups and individuals. The Commission believes this was also the intent of President Jensen when he appointed the Commission; otherwise the Commission would not have been given authority to study the structure and operation of the University. Goals may be at various levels of generality. Gross utilizes the following in his study of universities as organizations: output goals, adaptation goals, management goals, motivation goals, and positional goals.\(^2\) We have used the term "goals" to apply only to those pertaining to output and adaptation. In the report we utilize the term "missions." These terms, together with our recommendations, cover the areas implied by management, motivation, and positional goals. Objectives apply more specifically to operating units and are not treated extensively in this report.

---


The extent to which an academic community can articulate and pursue common goals is a test of whether a "university" exists, as contrasted to a "multi-versity." In the case of the "multi-versity," individual units within the organization might very well have goals, but no overriding common purpose exists to make the entire organization a single unit in an operational, as contrasted to an organizational, sense.

**Missions.** This term has become quite common in the literature and language dealing with public institutions. In this report, it will be used to describe a university-wide orientation that provides a focus for common efforts. It is more operational than a "goal," but at a higher level of generality than an objective. Schools may have missions that are derived from, and consistent with, those of the University.

**Objectives.** An "objective" is the translation of "goal(s)" in terms of a definite target. A goal may be stated in sufficiently general terms so that judging attainment is quite difficult. An objective, however, is of a more specific and operational nature. Herein, of course, lies a danger. In the process of converting a goal into an objective, important ingredients may be omitted. For example, the goal of "education" might be translated into the "objective" of teaching so many credit hours of classes. A particular objective may be consistent with a goal, but there may also be other objectives which are also consistent with the same goal. The selection of objectives and the measurement of their accomplishment may be a matter of crucial importance in the control of the public sector generally, and higher education in particular, as we contemplate the future. As used in this report, objectives will usually apply to a particular unit within the University.

At numerous places in the report, "guidelines" are presented. As used in the report, guidelines represent the Commission's suggestion as
to the direction of, or framework for, a particular activity or development. The guidelines are not necessarily exhaustive and have less status than do goals, missions, objectives, and recommendations.

The Commission has placed its statements on goals, missions, and recommendations at the beginning of the report so that the reader may easily determine the principal findings of the Commission. The Commission strongly recommends that every reader read the entire report. Only if this is done will the reasoning and the background underlying our statement of goals, missions, and recommendations be understood. We believe this background will be very useful in the debate and discussion that will inevitably result from our recommendations.
B. GOALS FOR OREGON STATE UNIVERSITY

The basic goal: to create a more adequate academic community for the intellectual and humane development of the men and women who comprise this academic community. The University should be a place to think freely and to think well, hence, it must provide the freedom to think, to learn, to relate, to experiment, and to develop standards of criticism and standards of excellence.

1. Output Goals
   
a. Teaching and Learning

   1) To develop in students an understanding and appreciation of scholarship, scientific research, and creative endeavor.
   2) To assist the student to develop his intellect to the maximum, as well as to develop his physical, social, moral, and esthetic potentialities.
   3) To confront the student with the experiences that will create an awareness of the relevant social, political, technological, and moral issues, and to provide him with the attitudes and skills which will enable him to evaluate consequences of decisions about these issues.
   4) To encourage the development of a life-long love of learning and the enjoyment of the pleasures of the life of the mind.
   5) To assist students to develop objectivity about themselves and their beliefs, and hence to examine these beliefs critically.
   6) To encourage the student to take responsibility for his own education: to learn his own learning process, to learn what he needs to learn, and how to communicate with other people.
7) To enlarge his horizons by exposing him to the great ideas and the great minds in all cultures and to avoid provincialism.
8) To provide the student with the skills, attitudes, contacts, and experiences which will maximize the likelihood of his making an effective contribution toward the development of a more humane and democratic society and permit him to pursue a useful career in this context.

b. **Research and Creative Activity**

1) To encourage those activities that extend the frontiers of knowledge and which provide outlets for the creativity of faculty and students.
2) To encourage the use of research results in the solution of social, economic, and environmental problems.
3) To encourage the communication of research methods and findings in the classroom.
4) To encourage the exploration of the consequences stemming from the application of new knowledge and technology.

c. **Extension Education and Service**

1) To further the concept of education as a life-long process by encouragement of the continued intellectual and professional development of the individual citizen.
2) To assist groups of citizens to use the resources of the university for the solution of common problems.
3) To provide cultural leadership through university-sponsored programs in the arts, public lectures by distinguished persons, and to serve as a center for the preservation of the cultural heritage.
2. Adaptation Goals

1) To provide appropriate procedures whereby the planning and evaluation of the University may proceed on a continuous basis.

2) To provide for the periodic reappraisal of goals, missions, and objectives of the University and its component parts.

3) To provide for a continuous two-way flow of information between the University and the larger community.

4) To educate, to his utmost capacity, every student who meets the entrance requirements, but to also encourage the admission of students with high potential in terms of the specific strength and emphasis of this University.

5) To recognize the special need of minority and disadvantaged students in this state and provide adequate funding and special assistance to them.

6) To give attention to the needs of this Region and the State of Oregon without neglecting national and international obligations and responsibilities.
**C. MISSIONS FOR OREGON STATE UNIVERSITY**

1. **Natural Resources and Environmental Quality.**

   Oregon State University has a special responsibility to bring its educational resources to bear in assisting man to live in harmony with his environment. Increased pressure will be placed on the natural environment of the Pacific Northwest by the needs of a changing human population and the technological means in existence at any point in time. Oregon State University has a tremendous potential for bringing its traditional strengths to focus on this problem. Accomplishments in this area to date, and existing educational and research programs, are indeed impressive. Yet, the emphasis has been on characteristics of the natural environment, while man and his institutions, as they impinge on natural resources management, have been neglected. The need for a more complete view establishes an opportunity for which Oregon State University is uniquely qualified.

2. **Economic Development.**

   Oregon State University should make explicit her special responsibility to bring her educational resources to bear on the enhancement of the economic growth of the State and the Region. The Commission recognizes it is fashionable to treat economic growth as an enemy of environmental quality. It would be foolish to deny specific instances of conflict do exist. This is due, in part, to a particular kind of economic growth; a real need exists to design the kind of economic system that will automatically yield the level of environmental quality that is desired. The problems of Oregon require more adequate social services. These services are not likely to be provided in the face of a stable or declining income base. The enhancement of economic growth is a worthy objective of an institution with a technological and scientific base of excellence.
3. **Human Resource Development.**

Oregon State University has a special responsibility for the education of those people who must adapt to the rapid technological change of this State and Nation. In particular, those groups and geographic areas that have borne a disproportionate share of the cost of technological change should receive special attention. The rural areas of Oregon, with pressing group problems, provide an example. The original land-grant universit thrust was an extension of the concept of making higher education available to all who could benefit. This concept needs to be re-interpreted in light of modern conditions. Access to the research, instruction and extension resources of the University must be guaranteed to all who can benefit regardless of geography, economic class, or social status.

4. **General Education.**

Oregon State University should assume a special responsibility for the general education of all of her students. There is a greater need than at any time in the history of this Nation for reasonable people to understand their common problems. In this context, we reject the concept of the multi-versity and endorse the concept of the university. The technically and professionally educated person needs to understand the social, the political, the cultural. Liberal arts students and students in the classic areas of science can benefit greatly from the insights of those in the professional fields.

We live in a world where people are interdependent in many ways. We also live in a world where many desired ends can be obtained only by group action. Conflict between and among groups are inevitable. War between nations is but one manifestation of our failure to solve conflicts by peaceful means; internal violence is another. Any domestic policy issue carries within it the threat of violence. The kind of change
brought about by scientific and technological progress inevitably brings about new groupings of people and new policy issues. Anticipation of these consequences should be attempted and research, education, and service efforts should be focused accordingly.

5. **Scholarship and Creative Activity.**

In common with all educational institutions, Oregon State University has a responsibility to add to the knowledge of mankind through scholarship, research, and creative activity. She has a special responsibility for those areas of study where additional knowledge is needed for the accomplishment of those missions identified earlier. All Schools on campus have a shared responsibility for the accomplishment of this mission.

THE ABOVE MISSIONS ARE INTERDEPENDENT
THE ORDER OF LISTING HAS NO PRIORITY IMPLICATIONS
D. RECOMMENDATIONS FOR OREGON STATE UNIVERSITY

GENERAL RECOMMENDATIONS

1. The Commission recommends the following high priority areas in the utilization of resources:
   a. The establishment of an adequate General Education program.
   b. The strengthening of the library resources consistent with support given to libraries of comparable universities.
   c. The establishment of a Center for the performing arts, as well as for public meetings held on the University campus.
   d. Strengthening the administrative support of the Office of the President. We recommend the following priorities in the use of this administrative support:
      1) a Dean of Undergraduate Studies
      2) a Vice President for Extension Education and Service
      3) elected Dean of Faculty
      4) innovative fund budget (I, C.)

2. The Commission recommends the following administrative positions:
   a. Vice President for Academic Affairs
   b. Vice President for Administration and Business Affairs
   c. Vice President for Extension Education and Service
   d. Vice President for Research and Advanced Study
   e. Vice President for Student Affairs
   f. Vice President for University Relations (IV, F.)

3. The Commission recommends the establishment of clear guidelines of authority and responsibility for students, faculty, and administration. (II, B.)
4. The Commission recommends the adoption of its definition of the roles of Commissions, Councils, and Committees because any coherent organizational structure will depend on clarity with respect to these roles. (II. C.)

5. The Commission recommends the establishment of a President's Cabinet for coordination of policy formulation and resolution of conflicts. The Cabinet would include representatives from the students, faculty, and administration. (II. C.)

6. The Commission recommends the creation within the President's Cabinet of an Emergency Campus Disturbance Committee which would consist of faculty, students, and administrators. The committee could be called into immediate action as advisor to the President in the event of a campus disturbance. (II. C.)

7. The Commission recommends support for the concept of personalizing and unifying the educational experience of the total university community. Interdisciplinary seminars, lectures, concerts, convocations, movies, and theatre are techniques which help bring this about. (I. B.)

8. The Commission recommends comprehensive reviews of administration and administrative units. The work performance and planning of divisions and departments should be reviewed every five years and Schools should engage in comprehensive review and planning at least every ten years. Such review should be made by a team composed of members from on and off-campus. (III. B.)

9. The Commission recommends that when a fixed budget has been established the institution should refuse to accept students in excess of the fixed student-teacher ratio. (III. A.)
10. The Commission recommends that on a designated day each month, a Vice President report the program, problems, and plans for his area to the entire faculty. This would mean each Vice President would report to the faculty twice a year. (III. B.)

ACADEMIC AFFAIRS

11. The Commission recommends that:
   a. The Council of Deans assume responsibility for formulating and articulating their position on matters of academic policy.
   b. The Council of Deans assume responsibility for (1) monitoring the progress of the University in the accomplishment of its missions (2) assess the adequacy of resources available for this purpose and (3) develop and promote new programs relative to University missions. (II. C.)

12. The Commission recommends that the Summer Term be continued as a unique session because this provides for experimentation, innovative programs and wider use of outstanding visiting professors. It is further recommended that the Summer Term administration establish and make use of a planning council, inform all faculty of summer term potential, and encourage the use of the Summer Term to improve the efficiency of graduate student programming. (IV. G.)

13. The Commission recommends the development of a General Education Program under the direction of a Dean of Undergraduate Studies and a Council on Undergraduate Studies. (I. B.)

14. The Commission recommends the establishment of a Dean of Undergraduate Studies to have responsibility for the development of the General Education program and to strengthen undergraduate programs generally. (I.B.)
15. The Commission recommends increased use of 5 hour courses and that Schools and Departments replace 2 and 3 hour courses with 5 hour courses wherever possible. (I.B.)

16. The Commission recommends increased flexibility in formal degree requirements so that a student of unusual ability in consultation with the Director of the Honors Program and the Dean of his School be permitted to design his undergraduate program to better meet his individual needs and interests. (I.B.)

17. The Commission recommends the support and expansion of innovative cross-disciplinary programs throughout the University by allocating a percentage of the instructional budget for this purpose and by exploring other sources of funding such as the Innovative Fund from the Ford Foundation. (I.B.)

18. The Commission recommends that undergraduate students be made aware of the nature of research and scholarly activity by:
   a. the development of formalized courses in General Education Programs on the nature of research and scholarly activity,
   b. providing opportunity for involvement in research through undergraduate research projects or working with graduate students on graduate research projects. (I.B.)

19. The Commission recommends that the Council on Undergraduate Studies re-evaluate the existing Honors Program in the context of the General Education program. The Honors Program should be fully budgeted and have a full-time Director or be discontinued. (IV.6)

20. The Commission recommends increased use of S-U grading by increasing the number of such courses that a student may take per term.
Consideration of the elimination of D and F grades from the students' transcripts should be explored. (III. B.)

21. The Commission recommends that all courses in physical education and health be graded on an S-U basis except those taken by majors in Health or Physical Education. (V. K.)

22. The Commission recommends that each academic department assume the responsibility for instruction, research, and extension education. (IV. D.)

23. The Commission recommends that the Vice President for Academic Affairs give high priority to the development of a statement clearly setting forth the procedures for promotion and tenure decisions which will be followed by each School and the University. (III. B.)

24. The Commission recommends that excellence in performance of instruction, research, and extension education be rewarded on a comparable basis with respect to rank, promotion, salary, and status. (I. B.)

25. The Commission recommends that procurement of new faculty should be made in terms of developing strengths or for providing support for new direction of effort consistent with long-range plans. (I. B.)

26. The Commission recommends the recruitment of a Professor of Higher Education to be located in the School of Education who would provide leadership for:
   a. the College and University Teaching Program
   b. the establishment of a center for research on the improvement of teaching
c. the encouragement of faculty in research on the improvement of teaching and teaching innovation. (I. B.)

27. The Commission recommends that the Council of Deans establish committees within the Council to have responsibility for the essential missions of the University. (See MISSIONS II. C.)

28. The Commission recommends the establishment of an elected Dean of Faculty in a staff position to represent the faculty to the President and to the Vice President for Academic Affairs. He shall be the presiding officer of the Faculty Senate and serve as ombudsman for the faculty. (IV. 6.)

29. The Commission recommends that because the Office of Vice President for Academic Affairs is so broad and involves so many responsibilities that there be established a minimum of two new supporting positions. (IV. B.)

30. The Commission recommends the Faculty Senate make major academic policy its principle concern. It further recommends that the Faculty Senate be made more effective by defining the scope of its operation more carefully and assigning its Executive Committee more specific responsibilities. The Commission is convinced of the importance of a viable effectual Faculty Senate. (II. C.)

31. The Commission recommends that assignments to University, School, and Department Commissions, Councils, and Committees be limited to a total of three per faculty member. (II. C.)

32. The Commission recommends that the Vice President for Academic
Affairs explore the feasibility of using such titles as distinguished professor, research professor, artist-in-residence, as a means of recognition of outstanding accomplishment. (I.B.)

33. The Commission recommends that the Council for Special Opportunities develop a statement of University objectives with respect to Minority Affairs and related enrollment issues. A corresponding University program and budget support should also be developed. (IV.G.)

34. The Commission recommends that the Council for Special Opportunities appoint a committee to make an in-depth study to determine whether the present curricula available to women are adequate. Special attention should also be given to women who have had their families and wish to continue their education either at the Baccalaureate or post-Baccalaureate level. (IV.G.)

ADMINISTRATION AND BUSINESS AFFAIRS

35. The Commission recommends that the Vice President for Administration and Business Affairs be the Chairman ex officio of the Administrative Council. The Administrative Council should consist of the Vice Presidents, the Deans of Schools, and the Directors of the various service units. (IV.6.)

36. The Commission recommends the establishment of a President's Planning Commission to insure that academic planning, facility planning, and financial administration are carried on in a coordinated fashion. It should be composed of students, faculty, administration, and a full-time Director of Planning. The Planning Commission should monitor the progress made in implementing the recommendations made by the Commission on University Goals. (III.A.)

37. The Commission recommends that study of school structure be on a continuing basis by the President's Planning Commission and that appropriate
changes in subject matter alignment by Schools and Departments be made when conditions and situations indicate. (III.A.)

38. The Commission recommends against making cost-benefit ratios the determinative factor in academic planning. This and related techniques should be used with great caution and with thorough knowledge of the possible pitfalls. (IV.H.)

39. The Commission recommends that budget for support personnel, supplies, equipment, and out-of-state travel be increased to improve the morale and efficiency of the faculty. (IV.H.)

EXTENSION EDUCATION AND SERVICE

40. The Commission recommends that work through the Division of Continuing Education and the Cooperative Extension Service be merged and placed under the administration of a Vice President for Extension Education and Service who is directly responsible to the President. The Commission further recommends that extension programs be administered through Schools and Departments parallel to the administration of research and instruction. The confering of academic rank and academic approval is the responsibility of subject matter departments. (IV.K.)

41. The Commission recommends the formation of a Council on Extension Education and Service. The Council should be composed of the Vice President for Extension Education and Service, the Director of Federal Cooperative Extension, the Director of Continuing Extension, and faculty representatives from the several academic Schools. It further recommends that an Extension faculty be established which is analogous to the Graduate Faculty. (IV.K.)
42. The Commission recommends that immediate study be given to ways the new extension education and service programs could benefit on-campus instruction and research programs as well as encourage the involvement of both undergraduate and graduate students in extension programs. Graduate and undergraduate students could become "extension aides" and assist experienced extension workers in both urban and rural areas.

RESEARCH AND ADVANCED STUDY

43. The Commission recommends that the Dean of the Graduate School report administratively to the Vice President for Research and Advanced Study. The Graduate Dean will remain ex officio Chairman of the Graduate Council. (IV. I.)

44. The Commission recommends the continued development of graduate education at Oregon State University building upon existing strength and in such a manner that undergraduate and graduate education are mutually supportive. The Commission further recommends the continued development and encouragement of research and scholarly activity on the part of the faculty so that both the graduate and undergraduate program will benefit. (I. B.)

45. The Commission recommends that the University terminate those parts of graduate programs that are no longer tenable in terms of low enrollments, obsolescence, and poor equipment. (I. B.)

46. The Commission recommends that every graduate program and graduate thesis meet the requirements and standards of the students' Graduate Committee and, in addition, have the approval of either a graduate faculty or a subject matter Department before it is recommended to the Graduate Council for approval. (IV. H.)
47. The Commission recommends that both fundamental and mission-oriented research be encouraged. The main criteria for encouragement should be the quality of the research. (I.B.)

48. The Commission recommends that the Research Council clarify the terms "Institute" and "Center" and establish criteria for the formation of such organizations consistent with the goals and long range plans of the University. (I.B.)

49. The Commission recommends that the Vice President for Research and Advanced Study or an assistant appointed by him, act as coordinator of Centers, Institutes, and institutional research programs. The person designated for this position should also be a member of the Research Council. (IV.I.)

STUDENT AFFAIRS

50. The Commission recommends a study to be done under the Office of the Vice President for Student Affairs of the adequacy and impact of the extra-curricular program. There should be recognition of the need for a wide variety of activities, providing opportunity for all segments of the student body and keeping the educational objectives of the extra-curricular program consistent with the goal of total development of the student. (I.B.)

51. The Commission recommends that funds be provided for ASOSU to conduct and publish a course and instructor evaluation. (III.B.)

52. The Commission recommends the establishment of a Council on the Extra-Curricular University. The Council would have as its responsibility the formulation of policy for all extra-curricular activities. It
would be chaired by the Vice President for Student Affairs and would consist of students, faculty and ex officio administrators. (IV. J.)

53. The Commission recommends a greater involvement of students generally in policy formulation within the University. Specifically, the Commission recommends:
   a. The President and first Vice President of ASOSU should be members of the President's Cabinet.
   b. Four students should be members of the President's Planning Commission.
   c. At least two students be members of each of the Council's advisory to the Vice Presidents.
   d. That Departments and Schools explore ways by which students may bring their unique information and viewpoints to bear on the formulation of policies at the Department and School level. (II. C.)

54. The Commission recommends that the Vice President for Student Affairs consider the appointment of an ombudsman for students. (IV. 6.)

UNIVERSITY RELATIONS

55. The Commission recommends that a Board of Visitors be established for the University. Such a Board would be advisory to the President and should seek to gain support for the University with the legislature and the various publics. The Commission further recommends the establishment of a comparable group for each school on campus. (II. B.)

56. The Commission recommends that inter-collegiate athletics be evaluated primarily in terms of its contribution to University relations
rather than in terms of the accomplishment of educational objectives. The administration of the program should reflect this recommendation. (I.B.)

57. The Commission recommends the formation of a Council on University Relations. The Council would consist of the Vice President for University Relations, Directors of various University relations units, students, and faculty. (IV.L.)

58. The Commission recommends the greater involvement of alumni in University affairs. Further, it is recommended that the Vice President for University Relations and Vice President for Extension Education and Service work together to develop a program of alumni involvement, support, and education. Such a program should involve not only public relations aspects, but continuing education programs as well. (III.B.)

SCHOOL STRUCTURE

59. The Commission recommends that the School of Humanities and Social Science should be encouraged to plan for its own development in full parity with all other Schools in the University. The Commission believes the School can play an unique role at Oregon State University by working together with scientific and professional Schools in achieving a viable synthesis of the scientific and liberal arts culture. We further recommend that the School:

a. develop a General Education program to prepare students for contemporary society,

b. interact with the School of Science and the professional Schools on problems of the human aspects associated with scientific and technological development, and

c. develop graduate programs in certain areas. (V.A.)
50. The Commission recommends that the work in theatre now in the Department of Speech Communication be organized into a Drama Department. In addition to its teaching responsibilities, its objective would be the promotion of this activity on the University campus and within the community. (V.A.)

61. The Commission recommends that the School of Agriculture consider alternative names that would more adequately describe its mission in administering agricultural production, natural resource management, and community development programs. Its traditional ties with the School of Science should be maintained through joint appointments with the Agricultural Experiment Station. The possibility of similar joint appointments with the School of Humanities and Social Sciences should be explored as broader social-economic problems are investigated. (V.C.)

62. The Commission recommends that the School of Agriculture give serious consideration to the emergence and development of those programs that are different from traditional agriculture by making appropriate administrative recognition for the coordination of instruction, research, and extension of these areas and for maintaining liaison with appropriate governmental agencies. (V.C.)

53. The Commission recommends that the School of Home Economics consider alternative names that would reflect its mission relative to human resource development. (V.H.)

54. The Commission recommends that a School of Oceanography be formed from the present Department of Oceanography. The School would offer only graduate degrees. It is recommended that the work in fisheries now located in Oceanography, be moved to the Department of Fisheries and Wildlife
or that the fisheries work be coordinated by means of joint appointments between the new School of Oceanography and the School of Agriculture. (V. I.)

65. The Commission recommends that the Department of Physical Education and Department of Health Education become Departments, or a Division in the School of Education. As units in the School of Education, they will serve the role of providing curricular programs in professional education for those students who wish to teach physical education and health in the schools, community colleges, and universities. The Commission recommends that the Department of Recreation become a part of the re-oriented School of Home Economics. (V. K.)

66. The Commission recommends that large and complex Schools such as Science, Agriculture, and Humanities and Social Sciences explore the possibility of grouping Departments by Divisions to simplify administration and to encourage interaction and communication among Departments with similar objectives. (IV. D.)

STATE SYSTEM OF HIGHER EDUCATION

67. The Commission recommends that the President ask the Chancellor's office to clarify and modernize curricular allocation guidelines within the State System of Higher Education. The Commission notes that graduate work in Humanities and Social Sciences at Oregon State University are denied on grounds of duplication. The School of Business and Technology is also limited in its development by the allocation system. Yet recently authorized programs elsewhere in the State System of Higher Education in the Environmental Sciences are duplicative of work in several Schools at Oregon State University. The Commission further notes the potential
for additional duplication elsewhere in the State System of Higher Education in the Engineering Sciences. The Commission believes the rigidity of this system is a major obstacle to Oregon State University realizing its potential contribution to the citizens of this State.
CHAPTER I

UNDERLYING ASSUMPTIONS:
GOALS, OBJECTIVES, MISSIONS, AND PRIORITIES

A. Underlying Assumption

I. The Nature of a University

A university is both a guardian of a tradition and a laboratory of social experimentation. It exists within a social context, and as an institution it both reflects and creates social pressures. The contemporary university is especially sensitive to the societal forces which create tensions on the autonomous character of the university.

In defining the university, one might characterize it as a community of scholars, both students and faculty, concerned with the achievement of a set of missions and goals. These goals include the unfettered search for truth and the creation of new knowledge, and the application of this knowledge to concrete social, economic, and political problems. More specifically, a university is a set of buildings, and a group of faculty, administrators, and students, with specified resources, working together on professional and general curriculum, involved with research grants, and extension activities. It includes a host of extra-curricular activities and communal rituals.

Ideally, a university is a place where the life of the mind is stimulated and encouraged, where learning is promoted, where the tools for inquiry and research are developed, where respect for truth is esteemed, and where standards of excellence are established and maintained. It can be a community of learners, both faculty and students, where the quality of relationships is marked by both breadth and depth, by mutual respect and courtesy, by a concern for the integrity and growth of all participants.
The university should be a place to think freely and to think well. Hence it must have an environment of freedom -- freedom to explore every kind of idea. The real enemies of the university are ignorance, sham, pretense, fear, superficiality, and superstition.

The traditional university was committed to the task of transmitting a high culture and of making men truly civilized. No society can function without transmitting certain knowledge to each succeeding generation, and because men seem to have an innate curiosity about themselves and the world around them, the society values the products of higher education. The traditional university conceived of its task as cultivating certain traits of intellectual qualities such as objectivity, rational inquiry, and intellectual candor. In addition, it believed that certain disciplines would create men and women of aesthetic and human sensibilities and refinement, who would be able to make critical and independent judgment.

American institutes of higher education reflect a melting pot of educational ideals. From the English tradition we have inherited Cardinal Newman's concepts of the small residential college, with its centralized core of human studies and the personal tutor-student relationship of learning. From Germany we have inherited the research-oriented, graduate concept of the university. Both of these traditions are in a sense eliteist, being restricted to a small percentage of the population. The contemporary American university has been influenced by populist notions. The Land-Grant University is the exemplar of the educational philosophy which seeks to democratize education, to provide higher education to all who are capable of profiting by it, and to become an important resource of new knowledge and

new technology for the society as well as a means of upward mobility for the individual.

Obviously, then, the American university exists in a framework of dynamic tension, and reflects not only its diverse origins and the tension between the autonomous and popular function, but reflects also the uneasiness of the contemporary society. It is an "Embattled University", literally and figuratively, because neither the society nor the university itself has been able to handle the problems generated by the knowledge explosion and technological change, or to establish the best working relationship between the society and the university. There is a crisis in authority and in value structure resulting from these changes. The complex problems of ecology, racial tensions, poverty amidst affluence, the decay of the cities, the gnawing problems of United States involvement in Southeast Asia, and inflation are frequently treated as issues which the university is called upon to solve. It finds itself ill-equipped to provide the kind of instant solutions that are requested of it by society.

On the other hand, members of the university are frequently most unhappy with the Establishment and its threat to certain basic values espoused by the academic communities. Hence the universities frequently maintain a critical stance vis-a-vis society. In a sense, perhaps one of the university's most important services to society is to act as critic of the society. But it can do this only when it has seriously engaged in self-criticism and explored its own dependent relationship to society.

That the university serves society is clear, but the nature and extent of this service is often unclear. Some may consider the role of university service to society as consisting of furnishing mindless technicians to serve the Establishment. However, it should be noted that the university works on pollution control and conservation research as well as defense-related
contracts, and sponsors Peace Corps training as well as ROTC. We would agree with the statement of a group of scholars at the University of Wisconsin: "The university is one of the institutions that has a major responsibility for the survival and improvement of life for civilized man." 1

2. Framework of this Study

The State of Oregon is a sparsely populated area for which a steady population growth is anticipated. It has been predicted that there will be a rapid rise in college age population until 1975, with a slower rate of growth after that date. Population growth is expected to be the most rapid in the western part of the State.

Oregon's natural resources dominate attitudes and activity. The State is noted for its unique natural beauty, and the natural resources have economic value for commercial purposes. The harvest of the forests and associated economic activity makes the greatest contribution of any industry to the economy of the State. Despite many acres of land in public ownership, and many acres that are arid, agriculture is the second largest industry of the State, followed by tourism. All of these industries are natural resource-oriented.

These natural resources undoubtedly have great impact on the attitudes of the people toward their environment. Oregonians surely are conscious of both the commercial and the aesthetic value of this natural environment. No Oregonian is likely to be isolated for long from basic considerations pertaining to his natural habitat.

Oregon is neither a rich nor a poor state, on a per capita basis. Per capita personal income in Oregon was $3,565 in 1969. The national average was $3,680, with Oregon ranking 22nd.

Oregon residents pay a smaller percentage of per capita income for taxes than do the residents of either Washington or California. On the other hand, per capita expenditures for education generally compare quite favorably with Washington and California. Per capita expenditures for higher education for the year 1966 were $68.90 in Oregon, $71.58 in Washington, and $55.45 in California.

The art and science of predicting university enrollments is indeed hazardous. One must consider not only the age distribution of the basic population, but many other factors as well. Some of these are (1) the availability and cost of other educational facilities, (2) economic conditions generally, (3) the supply and demand conditions prevailing for college and university trained people, and (4) policies of the university with respect to entry and exit from the university.

Oregon is expected to have a steady growth in population, with a rapid growth in the 18-29 age group until 1975. At the same time there has been a rapid growth in enrollment at the community colleges, as well as at other public institutions of higher learning in the State. This trend is expected to continue. The 1970's may be characterized by significant national economic problems, including unemployment and inflation. At the same time, it is expected the Nation and the State will have need for and will be able to compensate educated people if they are prepared to help accomplish the changing social objectives.

The Office of Institutional Research at Oregon State University has made projections and estimates of enrollment in 1985 as follows:
1968 (Actual) .......... 14,500
1969 (Actual) .......... 15,244
1975 (Estimated) ...... 19,300
1980 (Estimated) ...... 20,800
1985 (Estimated) ...... 21,700

The assumptions made by the Office of Institutional Research seem reasonable to the Commission. We accept their projections as a guide. We recognize, however, that the policies considered by this report can well influence the outcome.  

In recent years Oregon State University has not only experienced increased growth with respect to student enrollment, it has grown and changed in other respects as well. Research expenditures increased from approximately 4 million dollars annually in 1960 to about 14 million dollars annually at the present time. While total enrollment has increased, it has not grown proportionately among the Schools.

Diversity, as well as size, must be considered when one considers the important characteristics of the University. There are ten Schools which offer undergraduate degrees, as well as a Graduate School. An extensive research program exists which encompasses mission-oriented as well as fundamentally-motivated research. Continuing Education, in addition to the Cooperative Extension Service, is active on campus. Often the professional Schools have little in common, even though all professional Schools are dependent upon Science and Humanities and Social Sciences for basic instruction.

As long as resources available to the University increase more rapidly than demands, increased enrollment with considerable diversity may not create severe problems. However, this has not been the case at Oregon

1/ See Footnote, Chapter III-3.
State University. In the face of demands for new programs, resources have not even kept pace with enrollment increases. It is not clear that all of the programs and proposals being advanced in the recent past are consistent with one another or with the larger mission of the University. Basic to these questions, of course, are the goals of the University, as well as the adequacy of the decision-making process of the University.

Against this backdrop, President James Jensen appointed this Commission in February of 1969. The Statement of Charge and the procedure followed by the Commission are given in the Foreword.

3. The Unique Features of Oregon State University

In defining the goals and objectives of Oregon State University, and means of accomplishing them, the Commission attempted to identify present strengths and weaknesses as well as unique features upon which a sound future course could be established.

At the outset, several distinctive features of the University are enumerated:

1) Oregon State University is the only state-supported institution in Oregon providing professional education in Agriculture, Engineering, Home Economics, Forestry, and Pharmacy.

2) It is fortunate to have a large, broad-based, reputable School of Science active in both the basic and applied fields, with a close interaction with related disciplines in other Schools.

3) Research programs, Institutes, and Centers have evolved which are directly related to the needs of the State. These have been organized and fostered through the efforts of dedicated individuals who conceive an idea and bring about its
fruition by encouraging cooperative participation of other faculty members. The Nuclear Science and Engineering Institute, and the Environmental Health Sciences Center are typical examples. This kind of dedication can provide a sound basis by which the University may undertake meaningful programs directed at the major social problems of the State and the Nation.

4) There is well-recognized Cooperative Extension Service through which the Institution provides valuable service to the State in extending knowledge. While the Extension Service has been largely concerned with the agricultural and rural community, it has developed methods which should be applicable to the extension of the whole spectrum of knowledge available in the University community.

5) There is an on-going, well-established Graduate School which offers advanced degrees in many fields of Science and the professional Schools. Opportunity for interdisciplinary work is available through flexible procedures developed by the Graduate School. Numerous interdisciplinary and cross-department programs have been established.

6) Oregon State University is unique in having operated under an allocation system for nearly forty years, by which degree programs in Humanities and Social Sciences have been restricted. This has prevented the full development of the School of Humanities and Social Sciences on a par with other Schools. It has not only hindered the broad-based development of the Arts and Sciences as a basic ingredient of a true university, but has been detrimental as well to the contribution that the professional Schools could make to the State.
Oregon State University is probably the only University in the Nation, of comparable size and history, that has a relatively underdeveloped School of Humanities and Social Sciences, with no graduate work and virtually no research activity.
B. Goals and Missions

1. A New Interpretation of the Land-Grant University

The Land-Grant experiment must be ranked as one of the more remarkable innovations in American education. The impact of the innovation has not been confined to the United States; attempts are being made to implement the concept in other countries under varying cultural, social, and economic conditions.

The Land-Grant Universities in the United States have been dedicated to the utilitarian nature of knowledge. They have adopted specific goals and set about creating and disseminating knowledge to achieve specific ends. They were established to give particular attention to the higher education needs of a particular class in society. This particular resident instruction function, combined with mission-oriented research and an off-campus extension program, provided the distinguishing characteristics of the Land-Grant University.

These characteristics mean little, however, if sight is lost of the original concept, or if society has so changed that there no longer exists a need for this type of educational orientation. As one looks around the United States and compares Land-Grant Universities with other large public universities, one may logically ask whether there is any real difference. The Land-Grant Universities usually have a complete range of curricular offerings. They often have research underway which is only remotely related to "agriculture and the mechanic arts". Furthermore, non-Land-Grant public Universities frequently have substantial off-campus educational programs.
In an excellent article, Martin Trow writes of the autonomous and popular functions of the university. Certainly American Land-Grant Universities were dedicated to the popular function; yet today they, in common with other public universities, also give emphasis to the autonomous functions. As Trow indicates, a tension always exists between the two functions. Yet, one cannot accept the land-grant concept and deny the validity of the popular function. Even so, students, faculty, and administrators of existing Land-Grant Universities would resist any attempt to divest them of their autonomous functions.

It is apparent, then, that both concepts of education are embraced by all of the large public universities. Does this mean the land-grant concept has become so universal that it no longer has meaning when applied to a particular institution or a particular group of institutions? The Commission rejects this point of view. In the paragraphs that follow, we set forth our rationale.

When the land-grant concept came into being, and subsequently acquired

---

1/ Trow, Martin. "Reflections on the Transition from Mass to Universal Higher Education." Daedalus, Winter 1970. According to Trow, the autonomous functions include (1) the transmission of high culture, the cultivation of aesthetic sensibilities, broad human sympathies, and the capacity for critical and independent judgment; (2) creation of new knowledge by "pure" scholarship and basic scientific research; and (3) the selection, formation, and certification of elite groups. He classifies the popular function into two broad categories: (1) to provide places for as many students as can be encouraged to continue their education beyond high school, and (2) the provision of useful knowledge and service to nearly every group and institution that wants it (pp. 2-4).

2/ To a considerable extent, the same thing might be said about many large private universities. Numerous writers have questioned the usefulness of the public-private classification. Exploration of this point would not be germane to this report.
flesh and muscle, our Nation was predominantly rural and agrarian. Even so, this Nation was on the way to becoming a dominant power, and subsequently a highly urban society. To make this rapid transition, the Nation required an efficient agriculture, an able and literate working group, and a developing technology that would improve the performance of the agricultural and industrial sectors of the society.

That the Land-Grant Universities, by the performance of the popular functions, served the young and growing Nation has been well documented. Agriculture has indeed become more efficient. In fact, no other nation can match this performance, nor does history record a comparable record. The resources thus freed have been diverted to the production of other goods and services. Improvement in productivity also occurred in industry.

Those people who were able and willing to manage and use the new technology shared in the benefits of this progress. Research and educational programs designed to accomplish these ends have contributed to, and have been associated with, such progress to an extent that the need for the continuation of these programs is now being questioned.

The character of Oregon State University faithfully reflected these trends and problems. Her Schools of Agriculture, Home Economics, Engineering, and Forestry had this type of orientation. In addition, the impact of these trends on the Schools of Science and Education is discernable.

As is true of all human progress, the solution of one problem or one set of problems created others. To identify existing problems does not necessarily signify failure of past policies. The cost of food has declined, the welfare of farmers and the working classes generally has improved, the amount and quality of social services has increased, and we have added to the stockpile of human knowledge.
Yet, these successes have resulted in the emergence of new and different obstacles to human progress and welfare.

Such abundance as we have created has not benefited all parts of society to the same extent; we still have poverty and malnutrition. Despite our ability to manage our natural resources for greater production of food, fiber, and timber, we have concerns about environmental problems. Even though our per capita production of goods and services has increased, we have limited resources to do all of the things we wish to do; school budgets fail, and people raise questions about whether a given improvement in environmental quality can be afforded. Our transportation and communication improvements have brought people closer together to the extent they are separated by space and time, but people have not yet learned to live in harmony.

To the extent that Oregon State University wishes to re-dedicate herself to the land-grant philosophy, she should focus on the removal of existing and emerging obstacles to human progress and welfare. As progress is made in eliminating ignorance and in bringing about more informed judgments and decisions on these obstacles, new obstacles and problems will appear. Oregon State University should be so organized that these can be identified and efforts redirected. There should be explicit recognition of the fact that institutions often have a built-in resistance to change, and that conscious effort must be made to meet or remove this resistance.  

As Oregon State University enters its second century, the Commission sees opportunity for service with a different focus. We recommend a continuation of the land-grant philosophy of the popular functions of the university

---

of service to the people, and involvement with them in their problems. We recognize that the acceptance of such a philosophy requires constant evaluation of the relevance of University operation and its missions. As indicated, we anticipate change, but we believe these problems are of sufficient magnitude and depth they justify a special commitment of effort and, therefore, recommend the following missions for Oregon State University:

**Natural Resources and Environmental Quality.** Oregon State University has a special responsibility to bring its educational resources to bear in assisting Man in his need to live in harmony with his environment. Increased pressure will be placed on the natural environment of the Pacific Northwest by the needs of a changing human population and the technological means in existence at any point in time. Oregon State University has a tremendous potential in bringing its traditional strengths to focus on this problem. Accomplishments in this area to date, and existing educational and research programs, are indeed impressive. Yet the emphasis has been on characteristics of the natural environment, while Man and his institutions, as they impinge on natural resource management, have been neglected. The need for a more complete view establishes an opportunity for which Oregon State University is uniquely qualified.

The Schools of Forestry, Agriculture, Engineering, Science, Humanities and Social Sciences, and the new School of Oceanography have a special responsibility for monitoring the total effort of the University in the accomplishment of this mission.

**Economic Development.** Oregon State University should make explicit her special responsibility to bring her educational resources to bear on the enhancement of the economic growth of the State and the Region. The Commission recognizes it is fashionable to treat economic growth as an enemy of environmental quality. It would be foolish to deny specific instances of
conflict do exist. This is due, in part, to a particular kind of economic growth; a real need exists to design the kind of economic system that will automatically yield the level of environmental quality that is desired. The problems of Oregon require more adequate level of social services. These services are not likely to be provided in the face of a stable or declining income base. The enhancement of economic growth is a worthy objective of an institution with a technological and scientific base of excellence.

The Schools of Business and Technology, Engineering, Agriculture, Forestry, Pharmacy, and Home Economics should accept a special responsibility for this mission. They should seek the active involvement and cooperation of Science, Humanities and Social Sciences, and the new School of Oceanography.

Human Resource Development. Oregon State University has a special responsibility for the education of those people who must adapt to the rapid technological change of this State and Nation. In particular, those groups and geographic areas that have borne a disproportionate share of the cost of technological change should receive special attention. The rural areas of Oregon, with pressing group problems, provide an example. The original Land-Grant University thrust was an extension of the concept of making higher education available to all who could benefit. This concept needs to be re-interpreted, in light of modern conditions. Access to the research, instruction, and extension resources of the University must be guaranteed to all who can benefit, regardless of geography, economic class, or social status.

The Schools of Humanities and Social Sciences, Education, Home Economics, and Agriculture should accept a special responsibility for this mission. They should seek the active cooperation and involvement of the Schools of Forestry, Business and Technology, and Engineering.
General Education. Oregon State University should assume a special responsibility for the general education of all of her students. There is a greater need than at any time in the history of this Nation for reasonable people to understand their common problems. In this context, we reject the concept of the multi-versity, and endorse the concept of the university. The technically and professionally educated person needs to understand the social, the political, the cultural. Liberal arts students, and students in the classic areas of science, can benefit greatly from the insights of those in the professional fields.

We live in a world where people are interdependent in many ways. We also live in a world where many desired ends can be obtained only by group action. Conflict between and among groups is inevitable. War between nations is but one manifestation of our failure to solve conflicts by peaceful means; internal violence is another. Any domestic policy issue carries within it the threat of violence. The kind of change brought about by scientific and technological progress inevitably brings about new groupings of people and new policy issues. Anticipation of these consequences should be attempted, and research, education, and service efforts should be focused accordingly.

Scholarship and Creative Activity. In common with all educational institutions, Oregon State University has a responsibility to add to the knowledge of mankind through scholarship, research, and creative activity. She has a special responsibility for those areas of study where additional knowledge is needed for the accomplishment of those missions identified earlier. All Schools on campus have a shared responsibility for the accomplishment and the monitoring of this mission.

The great danger of the assumption of popular "missions", as outlined above, is that the University, or parts of the University, will become a political instrument or a tool of vested interests within the society. The
Commission believes this danger should be recognized squarely, and dialogue within the University on the subject should be encouraged. It is obvious that focus on the kinds of problems outlined above will require consideration of many controversial issues. The following observations are offered to assist in stimulating dialogue and the formation of guidelines for such involvement:

a. A university may provide inputs essential to the solution of a social problem, but does not ordinarily "solve" a social problem directly. For example, a university concerned about the level of food production may educate agriculturalists, conduct plant and animal breeding research, and carry an educational program to farmers. As a university, it will not try to solve a food shortage by agricultural production on the university farm.

b. A university, as a university, will not take positions on controversial public issues except as these may relate directly to the missions, responsibilities, and governance of the university itself. Observance of this guideline has two beneficial effects. First, it frees the individual student and scholar to express himself or investigate those issues he believes relevant, in the absence of pressure resulting from an official position of the University. Second, it strengthens the University in its unceasing battle to avoid being captured by any political group.

c. The assumption of a mission orientation enhances the need for standards of scholarly excellence and scientific objectivity. The very importance of the issues lend immediate significance to research findings and educational efforts.

In general, the guiding principle is one of providing inputs to the society
in the form of better informed and more discerning people, or in the form of new knowledge. This is contrasted to the University assuming direct responsibility for the solution of, or the implementation of the solution of a problem.

The University community should be aware of, and indicate its acceptance of, the new commitment. Otherwise, it will be unprepared for the consequences which will inevitably result. Just as the early County Extension Agents were often misunderstood, 'so too will there be misunderstandings of particular findings and programs related to current social problems.

2. Undergraduate Education

Quality undergraduate education should be one of the primary goals of this institution. The quality of both graduate programs and research are eventually dependent on the quality of the undergraduate program. The legislature and the people of Oregon are increasingly sensitive to the adequacy of our undergraduate programs.

Oregon State University has a particular responsibility to provide equal educational opportunity for all students from both rural and urban areas. This mission should be articulated with the community colleges and the remainder of the State System of Higher Education. As high school preparation improves, it becomes important to upgrade the quality of undergraduate instruction. This quality is dependent on adequate funding, but more especially on the character of undergraduate teaching. The Commission believes that undergraduates should be exposed to the best instructors available, and should not be automatically assigned to teaching assistants. Enrico Fermi, Linus Pauling, and George Wald all insisted on teaching Freshman undergraduates, even after they had established outstanding scientific reputations in their respective fields.
While being committed to the education of every student who meets the entrance requirements, the University should encourage the admission of students with high potential, especially where Oregon State University has strong programs. As an institution dedicated to human betterment, it has a responsibility to help each student discover and develop his potentialities. This would include his intellectual and aesthetic development, his social and moral development, and his professional development.

The primary goal of undergraduate instruction is to develop the intellectual potential of each student. It is to enlarge his intellectual horizons and to develop his skills in rational inquiry, to develop an appreciation of the method of scholarship or scientific research and/or creative endeavor. But is also to develop the student's physical, social, moral, and aesthetic potentialities. A good undergraduate education should provide all students with those experiences, both in and out of the classroom, which help an individual develop objectivity about himself and his beliefs, and hence, to examine these beliefs critically.

Intellectually, the University is responsible for developing and maintaining standards of excellence in scholarship. This involves an understanding of the means of discovering new knowledge, the ability to locate necessary information, and the skills in oral and written communication. The University's program of undergraduate instruction should include experience in critical and logical thinking, and exposure to rigorous standards of rational inquiry, as well as models of excellence in this area. The Commission believes that library resources should be much more fully developed.

---

1/ Dr. James Killian, Chairman of MIT Corp., says, "The purpose of teaching in the modern University is not merely to fill the student's mind with known facts, theories, and modes of thought; it is also to stimulate him to teach himself to learn by teaching others, to think creatively, to want to seek answers to questions as yet unexplored, and to learn the arts of doing so."
and all Departments should encourage students to use library resources.

In a scientific age such as ours, all students should be required to understand the nature of scientific investigation, the objectives and limitations of scientific inquiry. This should include at least one year of laboratory science. The Commission believes that a course in scientific research, its methodology, procedures, potentiality, and relation to society, should be developed for the non-specialist, and be a part of the General Education program.

The student should be made to understand how research extends the frontiers of knowledge, and should be encouraged to explore the application of research to the solution of scientific, social, economic, and environmental problems. The results of research should be communicated in the classroom, thus bringing the material presented up-to-date, and showing the relevance of these findings. It should be noted that research is not confined to the traditional sciences alone, but is engaged in by the Humanities and Social Sciences as well. The Commission recommends that wherever possible, undergraduate student aides be engaged in assisting in research projects under the direction of the faculty.

In addition to traditional scholarship and scientific research, the undergraduate should be provided the opportunity to engage in some creative endeavor. This could include work in the visual arts, music, theatre, dance, speech, and writing. Wherever possible the student should have actual experience in the processes of creation, rather than the simply academic courses or courses in appreciation. The University itself should provide an environment conducive to aesthetic experience, not only in the classrooms, but in its housing and in its extra-curricular activities.

It is a further responsibility of the University to develop the critical
facilities of individuals which enable them to make discriminating judgments and to recognize biases within themselves and in others. Students should learn to read all material with a critical eye, and to be aware of the real and perceived power of all large social institutions, including the mass media. In addition, quality undergraduate instruction would enable the student to evaluate critically his own educational experience. He should be encouraged to take responsibility for his own learning processes, and to learn what he needs to learn.

One part of the responsibility to the larger society is to provide an atmosphere conducive to the social and moral disciplines which help the student understand the nature of social processes, group behavior, and the social and political developments of society. Hopefully, the University graduate will have become sensitive to his responsibilities as a citizen, and will have those experiences in his University education which will make him an informed and active participant in the larger society.

The professional Schools, Agriculture, Business and Technology, Education, Engineering, Forestry, Home Economics, and Pharmacy, all have particular and distinct roles in undergraduate education. They accept the responsibility of education for professional careers. This frequently involves cooperation with accrediting agencies in determining the content of undergraduate programs. In order to avoid narrow specialization, the Commission recommends a greater use of interdisciplinary courses, and the use of electives in courses outside the professional area.

a. General Education. The Commission recommends the establishment of an experimental General Education program under the direction of a Dean of Undergraduate Education and a Council on Undergraduate Studies. The Commission is aware there is current dissatisfaction with the present arrangement which puts
the burden of General Education on elective courses in Science and Humanities and Social Sciences. Experience with General Education programs in universities across the nation indicate:

1) The program must have adequate funding and be under a Dean who has budget and FTE.

2) There is a tendency to reduce the specific course requirements, and to provide greater freedom of elective courses within programs.

3) Instead of broad surveys like History of Western Civilization, some institutions are recommending more specific topics like 19th Century Intellectual History to meet this requirement. This provides the opportunity for students to be exposed to in-depth studies of a topic with a professor who is working with his specialty.

4) That no one course or School can provide General Education for all students, and that some General Education is currently done in many courses in the professional Schools. Individual Departments in all Schools should be encouraged to design courses which would be interdisciplinary in character, and sufficiently general to attract students from all Schools.

The Commission believes all students should take work in at least four of the following areas:

1) Western and Eastern Civilization, including Anthropology, History, Philosophy, Religious Studies.

2) Fine Arts, including History and Appreciation of Art, Music, and Theatre.
3) Social and Behavioral Science, including Psychology, Sociology, Economics, Political Science.

4) Humanities, including Language, Literature, Philosophy.

5) Physical and/or Biological Science with laboratory experience, and including the History and Philosophy of Science.

6) Technology, including courses such as "World Urbanization", "Industrial Automation", and the "Information Technology Revolution".

All students should include work in Areas 5 and/or 6, as well as elections from Areas 1, 2, 3, and/or 4.

It should be the intention of the General Education program to be as interdisciplinary and perspectival as possible. The Council on Undergraduate Studies might explore some of the following suggestions for new types of courses and groupings:

1) A course that would essentially be an inventory of men and concepts which have been seminal in modern thought. Among the men who would be studied would be Darwin, Einstein, Freud, and Marx. Among the concepts to be explored would be evolution, indeterminancy, the atomic bomb, genetic code, probability, cognition, culture, personality, alienation, the dialectic, and historical determinism (Ohio State).

\[1\]

\[1\] The Commission studied the programs at Ohio State, Southern Methodist University, University of Utah, and Yale University.
2) A course in the study of Utopias, using both historical illustrations and contemporary Utopian thought.

3) A course which is designed to develop analytic and interpretive skills, using especially the resources of logic, linguistics, and semantics.

4) A course in social change and adaptation which would analyze the phenomena of change and its impact on societal structure and thought processes.

5) The quest for personal ethics -- man and man's relationship to mass society, and expressions of this quest in religious and symbolic expressions.

6) A course which would explore the nature of fact, theory, convention, verification, and explanation.

7) A course examining the physical and biological basis of human life, which would focus on ecology, evolution, and genetics.

8) One could suggest such further titles as "The Arts in Modern Society", "The Woman in Modern Society", and "The Knowledge Explosion".

Oregon State University provides numerous unique advantages for undergraduate education. In terms of contemporary problems, ecology, pollution, rural poverty, nutrition, population control, and general environmental studies provide examples. There are numerous opportunities for multi-disciplinary research. An undergraduate should be exposed not only through the Honors Program, but through experimental courses which cross disciplines, to encounter and work on
such problems. This could indeed add relevance to their education. A further unique feature of this Institution is the opportunity for undergraduates to work with the program in extension and the Experiment Stations. New ways should be explored to use student aides in these programs.

b. Recommendations. The Commission believes there needs to be much more innovative experimental programs throughout the University. It recommends that the University explore resources in the area such as the Innovative Fund from the Ford Foundation. In any event, the University's own innovative fund should be established, with a budget of 1% of the annual instructional budget as a target. Examples of the new types of courses that might be introduced include Math and Computer Science for the non-specialist, Science and Technology for the non-specialist, and interdisciplinary courses in Humanities, Science, Social Science, and the professional Schools such as Engineering and Human Values.

The Commission recommends the appointment of a Dean of Undergraduate Studies. One of his specific duties would be to assist in the development of General Education courses and to review the adequacy of existing undergraduate curricula. He should be a consultant to the Curriculum Committee and should be Chairman of a new Council on Undergraduate Studies. The Commission believes that attention should be given to those courses which allow the student to explore in some depth the nature of different disciplines, and methods of research and potentials of the field. Such offerings might be developed by a Committee or Council with representatives from the separate Schools. Such courses should be designed for non-specialists.
It is a particular responsibility of this University to create in its students an awareness of the common heritage and common problems of mankind. Therefore, undergraduate instruction should enlarge students' horizons by exposing them to the great ideas and the great minds in all cultures, and thus avoid the provincial attitude. It is an appreciation for this unity of mankind which distinguishes the truly educated person, and permits the technically trained person to apply his knowledge to relevant issues. The Commission believes that a major goal is to confront the student with experiences so that relevant social, political, technological, and moral issues of our time can be recognized, and help to provide him with the attitudes and skills which will enable him to evaluate the consequences of decisions concerning these issues.

Undergraduate instruction is a means by which students are inducted into the larger society. Hence, the Commission believes that the University should help provide the student with the skills, attitudes, contacts, and experiences which will maximize the likelihood of his making an effective contribution toward the development of a more humane and democratic society, and permit him to pursue a useful career in this context.

The Commission recommends increased flexibility in formal degree requirements. Departments and Deans should be encouraged to work with their advisors in making individual student programs more flexible. A student of unusual ability, in consultation with the Director of the Honors Program and the Dean of his School, should be permitted to design his undergraduate program to better his individual needs and interests.
The proliferation of courses and the tendency of students to carry 5 or 6 courses in one term is detrimental to in-depth scholarship. Therefore, we recommend increased use of 5-hour courses, and that Schools and Departments replace 2- and 3-hour courses with 5-hour courses wherever possible.

3. Research and Graduate Study

Oregon State University is deeply involved in research activity and graduate programs devoted to advanced training of students to the Ph. D. level. In this report, graduate study and research are discussed together, because much of the research on the campus forms the basis of graduate study and contributes significantly to the instructional and educational program of the University at all levels.

Any consideration of research and graduate study, and the ensuing recommendations, must be within the framework of the role that this activity will play in support of the total educational program of the University. The graduate and research program must be a high quality, integrated part of the University, which does not detract from the quality of other activities, but on the contrary supports these activities in terms of ensuring their continued quality.

The Commission supports a commitment to a strong program of graduate education and research, and believes that this must continue to be one of the major goals of the Institution.1/ The Commission believes this must be

1/"Oregon State University is committed to a strong program of graduate education and research as well as to undergraduate education, and is fully cognizant of the responsibilities of a modern University in teaching, research, and public service." Quotation from the Self Study Report of Oregon State University to the Commission on Higher Schools, Northwest Association of Secondary and Higher Schools, Corvallis, Oregon, February 1970.
the case, even though undergraduate education will constitute a significant activity of the University well into the foreseeable future.

In research, Oregon State University has a particular responsibility:

1) To learn more about the human resources of the State of Oregon. What are the social conditions that affect the development of human resources? What are the implications of these social changes to the problems of the University and other public agencies?

2) To better understand the natural environment, with particular reference to the State of Oregon.

3) To apply science and technology to enhance the orderly economic growth of the State.

4) To develop knowledge that will contribute to the solution of problems of nutrition and population pressure around the world.

5) To contribute to the knowledge and creative thought of the sciences and liberal arts.

It is fashionable at the present time to blame emphasis on graduate study and research as the reason for the deterioration of undergraduate teaching.\(^1\) There is no doubt that certain tensions or conflicts arise

\(^1\) In responding to questions concerning emphasis on graduate research and extension activities, students' attitudes are approximately as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Attitude</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Don't know</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Detrimental</td>
<td>1-8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>About right</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Too weak</td>
<td>10-20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Too heavy</td>
<td>5-7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No response</td>
<td>5-20%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

These results repudiate the prevalent notion that students believe that graduate study and research are detrimental to undergraduate study.
between undergraduate education and graduate programs. The Commission fully realizes the existence of potential conflict, but in recognizing this, it believes that such conflicts or tensions can be a constructive element in furthering the over-all future development of the University.

Therefore, the Commission recommends:

1) The continued development of graduate education at Oregon State University, building upon existing strength and in such a manner that undergraduate and graduate education are mutually supportive.

2) The continued development and encouragement of research and scholarly activity on the part of the faculty, so that both the graduate and undergraduate program will benefit.

The recommendation for continued development of graduate study and research at Oregon State University is based upon the following guidelines:

1) There is no doubt, despite current anxiety in certain areas, that the Nation's demand for people holding graduate degrees will continue to grow as priorities of the country shift to more concern for internal problems. There will be a need for well-educated individuals, and it is the responsibility of the University to provide them to education, government, and industry.

2) The University has well-established areas of basic science. Research and graduate work in the basic sciences contributes to the total fund of man's scientific knowledge, and undergirds the research in the professional Schools which have root disciplines in the basic sciences. The growth of research and graduate work in the basic sciences must not be permitted, however, to hinder the services that must be provided to the professional Schools.
3) There has been considerable development of graduate study and research in the applied sciences of Agriculture, Marine Science, Forestry, and Engineering. These activities encompass the professional Schools unique to Oregon State University. It is the responsibility of the University to provide the advanced education in these fields. Likewise, the results of research in these areas, in addition to contributing to knowledge, are directly applicable in the development of the State's resources.

4) The University has an emerging School of Humanities and Social Sciences with only a minor activity in research and graduate study. The University can make a significant contribution to education and the State by the prudent development of programs in the Humanities and Social Sciences within the over-all continued development of research and graduate study in the University as a whole.

a. Establishment of New Programs and Evaluation of Existing Programs.

The University should adopt a sense of modesty and careful selectivity in offering new areas of graduate study and research. The University should terminate parts of graduate programs that are no longer tenable in terms of low enrollment, obsolescence, and poor equipment.

The following guidelines are suggested in the evaluation of proposed graduate and research programs:

1) Projected enrollment
2) New courses required
3) New faculty required
4) Cost of the program
5) Uniqueness of the program and its compatibility with the goals of the University

6) Library resources required

7) The Nation's need for graduates of the program, and an evaluation of their probable contribution to society

8) The nature of the research to be conducted, with respect to its possible contribution to new knowledge and/or its relevance in present-day society

New programs should not be initiated merely because money is available for their support. Neither can the University afford the luxury of establishing new programs on the basis of the request by a few interested faculty members simply because the request is unchallenged and infringes upon no one else's rights or prerogatives. Reorganizations should not be undertaken just for the purpose of providing the framework by which a particular graduate and research program can be funded by an outside source. 1/

The quest for outside sponsorship of research should be based upon policies and planning which insure that the programs are compatible with the goals of the Institution. Such a quest should emanate from the strengths of the Institution in attempting to establish programs which will be mutually beneficial to the University, and will ultimately become supported by the State as an on-going program if, indeed, it serves a role in the

1/ As a consequence of neglect of specific criteria in establishing programs, changes have been brought by faculty pressure, administrative recognition, current trends in research (often over by the time we get into the act), status seeking among institutions, federal dollars, and student pressures. We therefore find ourselves in a "rat race" with other universities, vying for federal dollars, capable students at all levels, faculty, and a position of eminence.
total educational program.

Existing graduate education and research programs should periodically come under the same scrutiny to which new programs are subjected, and be continued or terminated, using similar criteria.

In the encouragement of a strong research and graduate effort, it is essential that each faculty member conduct the research in which he is interested and has the competence to conduct in a scholarly fashion. Implicit in this is freedom of publication and other communication. Both fundamental and mission-oriented research should be encouraged. The main criterion for its encouragement should be the quality of the research. A proper balance between fundamental and mission-oriented research will improve career opportunities for graduate students.

If the University is to have a proper concern and perspective with the major problems of society, it must necessarily become engaged in projects of a broad interdisciplinary nature, in which faculty can make contributions in their area of competence.

b. The Role of the Faculty. The key ingredient in the educational enterprise is the quality of the faculty. The faculty involved in graduate study and research educate students to a high level of specialization for careers in education, industry, and government, develop and enhance their own particular professional competence, and discover and/or apply new knowledge and report it through publication in the proper media.

Procurement of new faculty should be made in terms of developing strengths or providing support for new direction of
effort consistent with long-range plans. Likewise, every new faculty appointment should be evaluated not only for its contribution to a sound undergraduate program, but for its potential contribution to the graduate and research effort. This philosophy should prevail even in Departments where, as yet, there is no graduate work and research.

Scholarly activity of all forms should be encouraged. Research should improve the quality of the undergraduate program, because the faculty doing the research will be exposed to the latest developments in their discipline.

Care in faculty recruitment, promotion, and tenure should be the mechanism by which the University strengthens the research and graduate effort in a direction consistent with University goals.

With respect to rank, promotion, and salary matters, the Commission recognizes that instruction, research, and services are accepted functions of the University. Excellence in the performance of these functions should be rewarded on a comparable basis. Excellence in instruction should be on a par with excellence in research and service activities.

c. **The Role of Students.** Graduate study can serve two different objectives for students:

1) It constitutes specialized study to acquire a competence helpful to the individual in industry, business, or government.

---

1/ The special competence of an individual in extension education and service is an alternative or additional consideration.
2) It constitutes specialized study to acquire a competence helpful to the individual in an academic position. This objective should develop competence in teaching along with competence in the specialty area.

Graduate study and research has traditionally been single disciplinary. The Commission notes with approval a tendency in certain areas on campus to examine this tradition and design programs that have greater flexibility, while retaining subject matter depth. These programs not only may be superior from an educational standpoint, but may also improve career opportunities.

Many graduate students receive financial support by way of graduate research assistantships and graduate teaching assistantships.

The graduate research assistant spends a portion of his time participating in research under the direction of a major professor. It is through this activity, and through seminars and research methods courses, that the student learns to do research, learns the scientific method, learns to be critical, and learns to conduct independent study. Every effort should be made to develop the research competence in the student in addition to enhancing his background in his subject matter field.

The graduate teaching assistant is generally assigned specific teaching duties. If a student's ultimate goal is to follow an academic career, he should spend some time as a teaching assistant. The position of the graduate teaching assistant in teaching should be considered analogous to the position of the graduate research assistant in research. He must necessarily be supervised and
guided by those who are acknowledged as effective teachers. Every effort should be made to develop teaching competence in the student. This competence will be needed by the student himself in his future career, but it will upgrade the overall effectiveness of teaching at the University. Just as a research assistant should work under the direction of a good researcher, a teaching assistant should be under the direction of a good teacher.

It is important to define the role of the undergraduates within the framework of graduate study and research. The graduate and research program should be supportive of the total mission of the University, and wherever possible it should involve undergraduate students.

It would be desirable if undergraduate students were made aware of the nature of research and scholarly activity through the development of formalized courses under the General Education program, and provided with the opportunity for involvement in research through undergraduate research projects, or through working with graduate students on graduate research projects.

There is an apparent gap between undergraduate students and graduate students brought about by several factors, one of the most important of which is the lack of various organized intellectual activities in which both may participate. Often the only graduate students with whom undergraduates have contact are graduate teaching assistants. Graduate work and research may be made more supportive of the undergraduate program by bringing graduate and undergraduate students together in a variety of intellectual activities in which each group can make a
unique contribution. Some suggestions include:

1) Joint exploration of graduates and undergraduates of common educational objectives.

2) Using graduate students as advisors.

3) Combined graduate-undergraduate seminars.

4) Involvement of undergraduates in graduate research.

d. The Role of Departments, Institutes, Centers. The academic Department is the subject matter unit generally composed of a group of faculty with similar goals, aspirations, background, and education, who have a mutual respect for each other as professional peers or colleagues. The Department is, therefore, the center of professional activity at the undergraduate and, more specifically, at the graduate level.

As research problems become more complex, and technology develops, many Departments have faculty who have common professional goals with faculty in other Departments. Those with common interests may be brought together through the formation of an Institute or a Center. The advantages of such informal organizations are:

1) They provide a mechanism by which faculty with similar interests may communicate through seminars and common research projects.

2) They constitute a core of strength by which the research efforts in a particular field may be enhanced.

1/ Ambiguity in the use of the terms "Institute" and "Center" is noted. It is recommended the Research Council explore this problem.
3) They provide a mechanism by which graduate students may develop flexible graduate programs and there can be more efficient development and presentation of graduate courses.

4) Institutes, Centers, and other multi-disciplinary units, while mainly devoted to the coordination of research at Oregon State University, may also be used to coordinate graduate and undergraduate instruction and extension education.

Institutes or Centers may be organized around a specific discipline, or may be interdisciplinary with a broad program orientation. The latter permits faculty of different discipline areas to cooperate in the investigation of complex social problems. The need for utilizing the talents of the University faculty will undoubtedly increase, and better mechanisms to cross Department and School boundaries will be needed.

It is recommended that both disciplinary and interdisciplinary organizations among faculty be encouraged as a means of strengthening research and graduate training efforts. Such organizations may range from informal to formal, depending upon the problems under consideration. The following guidelines are offered for the formation of such organizations:

1) They should come under the same scrutiny as do new graduate programs.

2) They should be organized upon the volition of the faculty who are competent to do the work.

3) They should be consistent with the goals and long-range plans of the University.
4) Issues of duplication and overlap should be considered carefully.

5) Every effort should be made to ensure maximum student involvement.

6) The organization should be discontinued when it has accomplished its objectives or ceases to play a meaningful role in the total program of the University.

e. The Role of Humanities and Social Sciences. One major overriding conclusion stands out from the people whom the Commission interviewed, and from the material gathered. The conclusion is that Oregon State University has been badly handicapped in the past, and will be even more severely handicapped in the future, if the Humanities and Social Sciences on this campus continue to be prevented from full development.

The most dominant theme, repeated again and again in responses to questionnaires and in interviews with people in the several professional Schools, was that the development and impact of their Schools could be enhanced only if the Humanities and Social Sciences on this campus were permitted to develop more fully.

The extension of the land-grant philosophy of service to all of the people of the State, on and off the campus, requires involvement with the burning issues of our times. These issues include (1) environmental quality, (2) rural and urban poverty, (3) community development, (4) human resource development, as well as the traditional problems of (5) the use and conservation of our land, ocean, and other natural resources, and (6) economic development of our State. The solution to these
problems can be met only in part by the application of science and technology. Furthermore, effective application of science and technology to any of these problems must be accompanied by knowledge of economic, social, and cultural conditions. If we are to meet our responsibilities as a Land-Grant University in today's world, and especially under the conditions we expect to prevail in the future, we should not be restricted with respect to the tools of implementation. No other major Land-Grant University operates under similar restrictions.

The allocation system among the Universities, as conceived and administered by the State System of Higher Education, should be interpreted in the light of modern conditions. There is little in the current situation to warrant changing the policy with respect to the duplication of professional Schools among the various campuses. At the same time, there is no merit in the continuation of this policy regarding the basic arts and sciences on which all professional Schools depend. Such a policy had serious costs, but perhaps could be tolerated in a society that was mainly concerned with quantity of production and physical and natural phenomena. In the future, such a policy will doom the University to increasing irrelevance. Students recognize this, and do not hesitate to express their concern on this score. At the present time, about 2,000 undergraduates are majoring in the Humanities and Social Sciences. This constitutes about 17% of the total undergraduate student body.

The issue of cost is of immediate concern. A definitive answer is difficult, but the broad outline of such development is clear. However, the cost would undoubtedly be much less than might be first anticipated, for the following reasons:
1) The Humanities and Social Sciences are not high cost fields, compared with the Environmental Sciences programs which have been recently authorized elsewhere in the State System.

2) There is considerable complementarity between graduate instruction and research on the one hand, and undergraduate instruction on the other. The studies that have been made on this campus and elsewhere certainly do not support the popular notion that graduate education and research are the great enemies of undergraduate education that they are alleged to be.

3) Any realistic estimate of cost must take into account the cost of education elsewhere in the State System of Higher Education. One should ascertain whether expansion elsewhere would be less costly than at Oregon State University, and by how much. The cost of education in the School of Humanities and Social Sciences is, of course, much less than for the School of Science and for most of the professional Schools. 1/

---

1/ Direct instructional costs of the Schools were reported as follows in the Self Study report of Oregon State University to the Commission on Higher Schools, Northwest Association of Secondary and Higher Schools, February 1970.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School</th>
<th>Dollars per Student Credit Hour</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Agriculture</td>
<td>$36.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engineering</td>
<td>30.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forestry</td>
<td>36.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Home Economics</td>
<td>22.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pharmacy</td>
<td>34.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical Education</td>
<td>20.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business and Technology</td>
<td>14.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>17.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Humanities and Social Sciences</td>
<td>11.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Science</td>
<td>18.15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The cost of development of the Humanities and Social Sciences must be fully evaluated in terms of faculty, facilities, and most importantly, library resources.

While at the outset graduate work may be established in certain areas only, this should not hinder creative and scholarly activity in other areas. Indeed, there may be some areas in the Humanities where creative endeavors of the faculty may proceed rapidly without graduate programs.

Along with development of graduate work in Humanities and Social Sciences, the role of the School in providing service courses to the remainder of the University must be reaffirmed and enhanced.

f. Research on Instructional Methods. The Commission recommends the encouragement of genuine experimentation in this field, and the establishment of a Center for Research on the Improvement of Teaching, headed by a Professor of Higher Education. It would be his responsibility to develop and promote research on the improvement of teaching, and to give leadership to the College and University Teaching Program. 1/

---

1/ "In conclusion, education is in the early stages of a revolution in instruction which will be more or less complete by the turn of the century. The shape of the major changes will be primarily characterized by individualization of instruction leading to sophisticated systems of adaptive education. Two concomitants of the revolution which seriously concern college faculty and administrators are the need for the new fundamental concepts of student appraisal, and for adaptation to increasing heterogeneity among college students." Mitzel, H. E., "The Impending Instruction Revolution." Journal of Engineering Education, March 1970, pp. 749-754.
Many faculty express an interest in teaching as opposed to research. Those individuals whose major activity is teaching should be some of the most effective teachers on the campus, as measured by the knowledge of their field and the effectiveness by which they interact with students to present the material. They should be involved in research on instructional methods, and be aware of modern development in the field. Every effort should be made to disseminate results of research on instructional methods through seminars, conferences, and publication in the open literature. 1/

4. Extension Education and Service

Every University needs to be aware that it does not exist apart from the larger society of which it is a part. A University is an instrument of society. A Land-Grant University, in particular, should not lose sight of this fact.

The above should not be interpreted to mean, of course, that the University should be responsive to every public request or whim. Nor does it

---

1/ "What, then, are the real aims of our revolutionaries on the campuses? Although nobody, including themselves, can give an answer with any degree of assurance, in my optimistic moments I dream that I know. I dream that outside, in the country, they will succeed in putting a stop to the devastation of irreplaceable natural resources and beauty; in putting an end to the pollution of rivers and lakes by heat and sewage; in eliminating the degradation of our atmosphere by noxious exhaust fumes and noise; in creating crime-free, beautiful cities which lend dignity to the lives of their inhabitants. Inside, on the campuses, I dream that the revolution amounts to a clamor for the infusion of creativity in all directions, and on all levels of academic life. Even though I believe that each of these demands is non-negotiable, I have chosen but one of them as my theme: the demand for creativity in teaching and learning."

mean it should abandon the unique role of the University when playing such a role becomes unpopular. Rather, it suggests an awareness of the organic state of society, and a willingness to assume responsibility for behavior as a part of that whole.

The terminology for the area of education described in this section is not well developed, nor commonly accepted. Two main areas of activity need to be distinguished. One area pertains to the teaching and learning of non-resident students not regularly enrolled at Oregon State University. The main focus of the effort is education, as such. Such education may range from the pragmatic to the aesthetic. A second area of activity may properly be called "service". In this case, academic people are called upon to apply their knowledge and expertise to the solution of a problem existing in society.

Generally speaking, the Commission believes that service work by the University should be confined to those situations where (1) it directly enhances education or research, or (2) the problem is of considerable social importance, and the talent for solution is available only in the University. We recognize that Oregon State University is being called upon increasingly to service many groups, including State government. In some instances this service represents a real opportunity for assisting in the solution of an important social problem or to educate key people; too frequently it engages talented people on problems that have little educational or social payoff. The resources of the University are seldom augmented for the purpose of assisting in these tasks.

We note, also, another type of service which the University renders regularly. This involves leaves by faculty members to spend time away from the University in some type of public service work. To the extent
that such leaves broaden the faculty member's perspective and better acquaints him with problems in his field, his educational and research activities will be improved. If such leaves can be accommodated without undue disruption of on-going teaching and research programs, they should be encouraged.

In the hope of stimulating others to develop a more consistent terminology, we use the term "Extension Education and Service" to describe the range of activities which take the University to people who are not regularly enrolled students at Oregon State University.

Oregon State University is extremely fortunate to have a Cooperative Extension Service with a long and distinguished history in the State. The University has also had an active program of cooperation with the Division of Continuing Education. Given the combination of programs and disciplines on-campus, it appears the University is qualified to have a unique and valuable program of service and extended education. The objectives of such a program should be:

1) To provide the citizens of the State an opportunity to draw on the resources of the University for illumination of individual and group potential.

2) To provide to the citizens of the State continuing access to new knowledge in the sciences, the arts, and the professions related to their life work and to a richer life generally.

3) To provide access to the resources of the University for those groups who face public problems that require collective action for solution.

4) To provide an effective mechanism through which the University can draw information from the society around it. This information
can be used as a guide to relevance in the classroom and the research laboratory, and for the design of educational programs generally, both on- and off-campus.

Whatever success the Cooperative Extension Service and the Division of Continuing Education has had in communicating with people off-campus, they have not been successful in bringing about understanding of their mission, organization, and potential on-campus. The Commission believes there is an urgent need for this arm of the University to be understood throughout the campus and, in turn, for it to be used to enhance operations in the remainder of the University.

Our study of this situation leads us to recommend the following:

1) Work through the Division of Continuing Education and the Cooperative Extension Service should be merged and placed under the administration of an office directly responsible to the President of the University.

2) This recognized function should have access to every School and Department on campus, as needs and resources indicate.

3) Extension Education and Service programs should be administered through Schools and Departments in a manner parallel to the administration of research and instruction. We note with concern the lack of subject matter depth in many non-resident education and service programs.

4) A subject matter specialist in Extension Education and Service should continue to have academic rank and receive academic approval from his subject matter Department within the University.

5) Immediate study should be given to ways the new consolidated
Extension Education and Service program could benefit teaching and research programs on campus and encourage the involvement of both graduate and undergraduate students.

The flow of information through the new program should be a two-way flow. The program could become an important vehicle for improved understanding between the University and the community generally. We do not believe the University should be dominated by the vagaries of public opinion. We do believe the current demand for "relevance", the cry for research to be better oriented to the solution of important problems, can be better served if systematic provision is made for information feedback from the larger society to the University.

We visualize many unique opportunities arising from such an organization. For example, graduate and undergraduate students could become "extension aides" and assist experienced extension workers in both rural and urban areas. More extensive use of night schools and other relatively less structured devices can permit considerable innovation and experimentation. Extension education has the unique opportunity of being able to utilize those formal techniques that aid real learning, but of discarding that part of formalism which is empty or impedes learning.

The role of the extension worker becomes a most demanding one. He will need to command the respect of his disciplinary peers. His function will be to interpret the latest knowledge in his discipline or subject matter field to people away from the University. In addition, he should be able to draw on his extension education experience to illuminate classroom instruction and pose new and exciting hypotheses to the researcher.

The Commission suggests that a Committee of the Council of Deans be formed to consider consulting by faculty. The Committee should take into
consideration the individual traditions of, and diversity among, the various Schools, the expanded extension education and service function of the University, and the fact that both 12 and 9 month appointments exist with Oregon State University faculty.

5. **The Extra-Curricular University.** The extra-curricular University is described as all activities, other than those of a formal academic nature, that emanate from the University, which may aid in the development of the human potential of the University student. Such a concept embraces social activities, living group experiences, skill activities, student government and group decision-making, athletics, band, chorus, theatre, (when these activities are not for academic credit), convocations, lectures, and may include work experience.

It is apparent that the extra-curricular University is necessary, if one accepts the broad view of education and human development. The extra-curricular University is a most significant enterprise, whether measured in student impact, student time, or resources devoted to its operation. It has become apparent to the Commission that the University devotes less effort to the systematic study of this phase of its operation than warranted by the significance of the operation. The Commission is generally well pleased by the extra-curricular University at Oregon State University. However, the Commission believes that a systematic study of this area of activity would be helpful in identifying possible areas that need to be strengthened, as well as bringing the importance of this area to the attention of the faculty.

The person of college and university age is normally in a state of quest for self-understanding. Knowledge of self may come from either individual or group experiences. The extra-curricular University should provide for both types of experiences. Those activities which result in a sense of community or a better understanding of the need for, and requirements of, a viable
community are most legitimate parts of the extra-curricular University. The physical, emotional, and intellectual development of the individual are highly interrelated. It is appropriate that a university provide for physical activities ranging from dance to athletics.

These considerations become particularly important in the contemporary scene. There are many forces in existence currently which are tending to detract from traditional group experiences. The trend toward apartment living, both on the part of married and non-married students, changes the living experience of the college or university student in a most profound way. Divergent value systems exist which require widely varied activities of individuals and groups.¹

1) The extra-curricular University should provide for a wide variety of activities of both an individual and group nature. These activities should be developed in close consultation with students, and should be of such a nature that the participant can evaluate the degree of his accomplishments.

2) The extra-curricular University should provide opportunity for participation by all segments of the student body. In

¹ In response to the question "What is your view of extra-curricular activities at OSU?" the following response was obtained:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Meaningful</td>
<td>41.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inadequate</td>
<td>15.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Too time-consuming</td>
<td>14.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>17.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No response</td>
<td>11.6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

When students were asked to indicate why they chose to enter OSU, athletics was at the bottom of the items listed, by a wide margin. The list included excellence of professional Schools, proximity, cost, relative advice, athletics, reputation for academic programs, a friendly campus, and given a scholarship. (See Appendix on results from student questionnaire.)
providing services to the student body, its pluralistic character should be recognized.

3) Educational goals should be kept firmly in mind when objectives of extra-curricular programs are formulated, and when evaluation of these programs is made. The number of athletic contests won, the quality of a theatre performance, or the efficiency of work accomplished are desirable objectives of a program only if they are the best route to the accomplishment of an educational goal.

There are numerous group activities which serve a combination educational and public relations function. Musical and theatre groups, as well as athletics, provide examples. There are two broad avenues by which such programs may contribute to the accomplishment of educational objectives. The most obvious is the developmental effect on the participants themselves. Another possible benefit is the contribution such an activity may make to the creation of a feeling of community on the part of spectators. Viewed in this context, an athletic program should provide for widespread participation. In contrast to intramural and recreational sports, intercollegiate athletics provide for only limited participation. Furthermore, there has been considerable debate as to whether the impact on the individual participant is, on balance, beneficial.

Given the resources available to the Commission, the contribution of intercollegiate athletics to the creation of a sense of community among spectators was impossible to determine. It is not clear that the benefits derived in this respect, if any, can be achieved only in this way. Nevertheless, it is apparent that athletic events have, and are, fulfilling some social need, or they would not be supported to the extent they have been and are being supported.
We conclude that the principal benefit of intercollegiate athletics to the University community is a means of communicating with the general public. Accordingly, it is logical to evaluate the program primarily in terms of its contribution to University relations rather than in terms of the accomplishment of educational objectives. The administration of the program should reflect this fact.

6. Integration of All Educational Activities. We frequently think of the University as a series of individual units, each with its own goals and procedural operation. Especially with the knowledge explosion and the increasing fragmentation of knowledge, the University frequently lacks a unity. The individual student frequently sees little relationship between his several classes in scattered parts of the campus, the research activity, the graduate programs, and the Continuing Education work of the University. With increased size there is lack of personal relation and communication. We become a "multi-versity" rather than a university. The Commission therefore recommends support for the concept of personalizing and unifying the educational experience of the total University community. To do this requires

1) The re-dedication of each unit to relate as closely and effectively as possible to the other units. This may be done by newsletter, by social activity, by special invitations to intradisciplinary seminars and colloquium.

2) Because all educational activities center in the person, an effort should be made to foster a new concern for the person whose home is Oregon State University, by seeking new ways to become once again the "friendly campus", where a cooperative, concerned attitude, rather than a competitive, indifferent attitude, characterizes our relationship.

3) The recognition that extra-curricular activities are an essential
part of the total educational experience, and the climate of the University suggests that much greater support be given to lectures, concerts, convocations, movies, and theatre activities which "bring us together" as a unified community.

The Commission's recommendation on the total involvement of the University in instruction, research, and service functions, and the integration of the total educational program of the University raises questions relative to the assignment of faculty to specific tasks, and the reward system established for these tasks.  

In order to maintain suitable integration of the total educational program, it is desirable that faculty be involved in teaching, service, and research activity. It is unrealistic, however, to expect a single individual to be outstanding in all three areas. Therefore, it might be expected that the activity of faculty members might cover a wide spectrum (teaching, research, or service), the majority in two activities, in both of which they are successful, and a few in all three activities.

It is possible a few faculty may be recruited for full-time research, in which their only instructional activity would consist of directing graduate students. It is similarly possible that a few faculty would be recruited for their outstanding teaching ability, and their assignment will be only undergraduate and graduate teaching.

It has been the practice to recruit faculty on the basis of their research ability, and then assign heavy teaching loads so that they cannot carry on

1/ Many faculty commented on the questionnaire concerning the lack of any stated reward system, and many felt that effective teaching played a secondary role with respect to research in the recognition and reward of faculty performance.
research, even though they are "expected to do research", and are often evaluated on the basis of research production.

The Commission suggests that the matter of assignment of tasks and the recognition and reward criteria be clarified. Hence, each Department should prepare a statement describing its appointment, promotion, and tenure policy.

It is recommended that the Vice President for Academic Affairs explore the use of such titles as Distinguished Professor, Senior Professor, Research Professor, Artist-In-Residence, as a means of recognition of outstanding academic accomplishment.

Elsewhere in this report the Commission recommends the formation of three faculties: a Graduate Faculty, a General Education Faculty, and an Extension Education Faculty.

The Graduate Faculty now exists, and is appointed by the Graduate Council through well-developed procedures. It is recommended that the proposed Council of Undergraduate Studies and Council on Extension Education and Service formulate criteria for the appointments of their respective faculties in order to recognize outstanding accomplishment in these areas. It is anticipated that some individuals will not be appointed to any of the above three faculties. It is possible that an individual may be a member of two faculties, but only a most versatile person would be a member of all three faculties.
C. Priorities

The Commission is aware that members of the University community expect a statement of priorities in curriculum development, new programs, and resource allocation to be issued by the Commission. Such an expectation is understandable. Goals and objectives are formulated for the purpose of guiding our efforts and activities.

It would seem that priorities would involve nothing more than a statement of relative importance of the different goals, but things are not quite so simple. A brief discussion of the nature of priorities and their determination is appropriate, prior to the making of specific priority recommendations.

In any statement of priorities it is important to make explicit the assumptions on which the priorities rest. There are two elements in the determination of priorities. One assumption pertains to the desired objectives; the other assumption concerns the resources and techniques available for accomplishment. Priorities are general statements, but individual situations may differ. An illustration may be helpful. Assume two desirable objectives, A and B, and two situations, One and Two:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Situation One</th>
<th>Situation Two</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>50 units of A, or</td>
<td>30 units of A, or</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25 units of B</td>
<td>50 units of B</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In Situation One, a sacrifice of 2 units of Objective A is required to obtain 1 unit of Objective B. In Situation Two, 3/5 unit of Objective A must be sacrificed to obtain 1 unit of Objective B. A statement of priorities must be interpreted to account for the complexity that exists in practice. For example, Situation One might be used to illustrate the general situation at Oregon State University, while Situation Two might describe the situation in a particular School or Department. Or, Situation One might describe conditions
existing today, while Situation Two might describe what would exist five or ten years from the present.

Unless this type of complexity is recognized, priority statements can be misleading and even dangerous. In a complex institution such as a university, they should not be viewed as a substitute for a decision process that provides for the continuous evaluation of missions, objectives, and available resources. Priority statements should always be evaluated frequently to reflect changed conditions.

The point of the above is that we must recognize the dynamic nature of our society when we set priorities. The setting of priorities signifies a dissatisfaction with decision processes. Such processes should take new information into account with the passage of time, and continually readjust to this new information.

Later in the report, the Commission treats the decision process of the University in some detail, and makes recommendations for its improvement. Until such improvements are established, and until conditions affecting priorities change significantly, there is merit in the establishment of priorities. Furthermore, as a check on the efficiency of the decision process, periodic consideration of priorities will be highly desirable.

For the guidance of the University, the following high-priority areas for the utilization of additional resources are identified. The order of listing has no particular significance.¹/

¹/ Cost estimates should be made as soon as possible for implementing these priorities. These estimates should allow for variation in both scope and adequacy. Some of the above items require capital outlay; others require a current operating budget. As a result, they may not be direct substitutes in the budgeting process.
1) The establishment of an adequate General Education program at Oregon State University.

2) The strengthening of the library resources of the University, consistent with support given libraries at comparable universities.  

3) The establishment of a Center for the performing arts, as well as for public meetings held on the University campus in the performance of its Extension Education program.

4) Provision of such additional resources as needed by the Office of the President and central administration, to cope with the short-run operating demands as well as for longer-run planning and evaluation. We suggest the following priorities in the use of this support:

   a) Dean of Undergraduate Studies
   b) Vice President for Extension Education and Service
   c) Elected Dean of Faculty
   d) Innovative Fund Budget.

---

1/ See Appendix on Library Support.
CHAPTER II

GOVERNANCE AND DECISION-MAKING

A. The Functions

The university is a part of society and has numerous interconnections with that society. It has the problem of identification and possible response to these external stimuli. At the same time, the campus has traditionally been considered a "community" which implies a degree of self-containment and self-determination. Even if the typical large university campus were completely self-contained, governance and decision-making would be highly complex.

In such a setting it is most important to specify rather clearly the objectives of decision-making. As used here, decision-making becomes a means of achieving the output goals identified earlier in the report. It will not be efficient unless allowance is made for the positive effect of participation on motivation, as well as its negative effect in terms of time and resources required.

There is merit in distinguishing, in principle and practice, among policy determination, policy execution, and policy interpretation. We are accustomed to a rather strict division of responsibilities among the legislative, executive, and judicial branches of government. No such strict division is likely to be accomplished on a university campus, and would probably be undesirable even if it could be accomplished. Even so, it is important that the separate functions be recognized and provided for, even if they are combined, or overlap at some point.

Policy formulation in a university can be separated into at least two parts. Long-range planning is a part of the policy process. This topic,
together with evaluation, is discussed in the next section. There are also shorter range decisions that have policy implications. It is these decisions that occur as an integral part of the educational process that are discussed in this section of the report.

The administrative or executive function consists of the implementation of policies. Policy is frequently made as a part of implementation, but when this occurs, it is desirable that there be recognition of this fact.

Explicit recognition has not been given to the performance of the judicial function on most university campuses. Traditionally, administrators made the necessary rulings as a part of their regular duties. More recently, cases have arisen which have been unprecedented, or where there has been an unwillingness to accept rulings dispensed in the regular manner. As a consequence, there has been a recognition that the judicial function may need to be provided for in a special way.
B. The Participants

1. The Outside Community

The Commission recognizes the University cannot exist in isolation from the "larger" or "outside" community, and that the outside community has a legitimate role in policy formulation for the University. Nevertheless, it is appropriate that guidelines be established; the larger community should state in broad terms what it believes the guidelines of the University to be. They should assess the adequacy of the resources available to accomplish these objectives, and take steps to augment the resources available. Yet the specific formulation of policy, goals, and educational objectives should be left with the University community.

At the same time, the Commission believes there is much to be gained by a more systematic involvement of people outside the University with the problems of the University. The practice followed in Oregon tends to isolate the universities from direct political contact. The single State Board of Higher Education and the Office of the Chancellor isolates the individual institutions from outside influence to a greater extent than would be the case if each institution had a separate Board. The nature of Oregon State University is such that personnel from some of the Schools have frequent and in-depth contact with the people of the State. Even so, there is no outside group that has the responsibility for viewing the operation of the total University.

The Commission recommends the establishment of a Board of Visitors that would be advisory to the President. The Board would be advisory and advocative in view of the statutory authority of the State Board of Higher Education. Membership on the Board should go to those who are willing to devote time to the undertaking, and have the capacity to contribute to the quality of the institution internally and to explain its mission externally.
The Board should have periodic meetings on campus (perhaps 3 to 5 times yearly), to become familiar with programs, problems, and long-range plans. Emphasis should be given by the Board of Visitors to problems which are anticipatory in nature.

Community colleges are assuming an increasingly significant role in the post-high school education, and Oregon State University can expect an increasing number of transfer students coming from the community colleges. This development, therefore, implies that good working relationships with the community colleges should be established.

For many students, the intermediate step of attending a community college is a necessary transitional experience before attending a university. The matter of advising and counseling at the high school level becomes one of utmost importance. The student must be aware that attendance at the community college is not to be considered as inferior to attendance at the university, but is an open-ended experience by which he can prepare himself more adequately for a successful career at the university.

In the matter of course offerings at the community college, close coordination and relationship with the universities can develop arrangements whereby students can transfer to the university with a minimum loss of course credit.

It is also possible that the university may work closely with community colleges in advising students intending to enroll in the professional schools. Advisors in the professional schools may work with several students in the community colleges in developing academic programs which will more nearly suit their needs when they transfer to the university.
2. The Inside Community

Recently much emphasis has been placed on the relative role of students, faculty, and administrators in academic governance and decision-making. The Commission recommends the establishment of clear guidelines of authority and responsibility for each group. The Commission is aware that the Student-Faculty Council on Academic Affairs has taken leadership in the development of a statement on the rights and responsibilities of each of the above groups. The Commission is pleased this is occurring, and looks forward to the development of an acceptable statement. The following observations are made about each, to lay a foundation for further recommendation and discussion.

a. Students. Students are the principal reason for the existence of the University. As clients of the educational process, they have a right to express themselves on any aspect of the University about which they have information or opinion. By the nature of their position, they acquire certain information first-hand which may not be available to any other segment of the academic community. As a consequence, students are able to make a meaningful input into the academic process. The nature of the involvement should be clear, so that false expectations and disappointments can be avoided. In general, we believe students should be advisory to other groups in the establishment of academic policy. 1/

1/ In response to the question "Do you feel there are adequate channels for students to voice their opinions?", the following replies were given on the student questionnaire:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No response</td>
<td>2.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>44.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>35.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No opinion</td>
<td>17.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
b. Faculty. The faculty constitutes the largest single group with an on-going interest in the University. The Commission recognizes the primacy of the faculty in the formulation of academic policy. The faculty also have a responsibility for the implementation of academic policies in the University, as they are officers of the University.

c. The Administration. Members of the Administration execute, as well as participate in, the formulation of academic policy. It is because of the recognition of both roles that academic people are ordinarily selected for administrative positions. Administrators should keep both roles in mind, and communicate the distinction to all concerned parties generally, as well as in particular cases.

It is the belief of the Commission that the functions of decision-making are not concentrated or specialized with one group. All participate in more than one function, with the emphasis varying with the class of the participant.
C. The Structure

In the material which follows, recommendations are set forth with respect to the appropriate role in University governance of different participants. In addition, appropriate bodies and institutional devices are discussed. Our recommendations for structural organization are based on the following roles for Commissions, Councils, and Committees:

**Commissions:** These are groups appointed by the President of the University to undertake a responsibility that is University-wide in scope and impact. The Commission on Human Rights and Responsibilities and the Commission on University Goals provide examples. It is anticipated that at any point in time there will be a limited number of Commissions. Commissions may be either standing or ad hoc.

**Councils:** Councils will exist for the purpose of formulating policy for the entire University, or for some University-wide function that is the principal responsibility of a Vice President or Executive Dean. The Councils that now exist fit these criteria well. Examples are: Council of Deans, Administrative Council, and Research Council. Council membership will be determined by position or by appointment. Additional Councils should be created so that every Vice President and Executive Dean will have a policy group to which he can turn for advice.

In the case of the Councils advisory to the respective Vice Presidents, the Commission believes they should be primarily policy-making bodies rather than administrative, except for the Administrative Council. The Administrative Council would be chaired by the Vice President for Administration and Business Affairs. The Commission recommends that the appropriate Vice President be ex officio chairman of his advisory council, but that
Council members other than ex officio members elect a Vice Chairman. The Chairman and Vice Chairman should assume joint responsibility for the formation of the agenda. Ex officio members of Councils, other than the Vice President, shall be without vote.

The Executive Committee of the Faculty Senate will appoint other than ex officio Council members. Selections will be made from nominations submitted by Schools, by other faculty, as well as from lists of volunteers.

Elsewhere in this report student participation is treated in general terms, as well as in special instances. The Commission has the following general recommendations regarding student representation:

a. That the President and First Vice President of ASOSU be members of the President's Cabinet (Chapter II-11).

b. That four students be members of the President's Planning Commission. These students would be appointed by the President (Chapter III).

c. That at least two students be members of each of the Councils advisory to Vice Presidents. Students would be appointed by the Executive Committee of the Faculty Senate, from nominations of Schools and Departments.

Committees. Committees will exist at all levels within the administrative structure. The Commission on University Goals recognizes that the Committee on Committees provides a valuable service in clarifying the role and responsibilities of the various Committees on campus. University Committees may
be appointed by administrative officers, by the Faculty Senate, and by Councils.

There is recognition by the Commission that many faculty and students wish to have formal means by which their opinions may be expressed and made a matter of record. The Student and Faculty Senates are constituted for this purpose. We endorse the existence of these bodies, and hope they will continue. We also recognize the legitimacy of formal administrative channels of Department Chairman or Head, Academic or School Dean, and President. We believe a few relatively simple institutional devices would improve the functioning of the present system.

Additional Councils should be formed dealing with extension education and service, University relations, special problems, undergraduate education, and the extra-curricular University. These Councils should be advisory to the Vice President for Extension Education and Service, University Relations, Academic Affairs, Dean of Undergraduate Studies, and the Vice President for Student Affairs, respectively. These are described elsewhere in this report. The present Council on Curriculum and Academic Policy would be discontinued. Academic policy planning will be the responsibility of the President's Planning Commission. The Council on Undergraduate Studies will consider problems of academic policy. A Curriculum Committee should be created to perform needed curricular coordination on campus. This would be a Faculty Senate Committee, and would need to maintain close contact with the Council on Undergraduate Studies and the Graduate Council.

1. The Council of Deans

The Council of Deans should study, formulate, and take positions on matters of academic policy. The Council is encouraged to initiate, as well as react to, academic policy matters recommended by others. The
Chairman of the Council of Deans should be the Academic Vice President.

Committees on missions within the Council of Deans should be organized to monitor the performance of the University, to assess the adequacy of resources, and to develop and promote new programs relative to the five missions of the University recommended earlier. These Committees should be chaired by an Executive Vice President who, in his role as Chairman, will assume responsibility for all functions of the University. Committees on missions would include the following:

a. **Natural Resources and Environmental Quality.** The Schools of Forestry, Agriculture, Engineering, Science, Humanities and Social Science, and the new School of Oceanography will have a responsibility for the furtherance of this mission.

b. **Economic Development.** The Schools of Business and Technology, Engineering, Agriculture, Forestry, Pharmacy, and Home Economics should accept a special responsibility for this mission. They should seek the active involvement and cooperation of the Schools of Science, Humanities and Social Sciences, and the new School of Oceanography.

c. **Human Resource Development.** The Schools of Humanities and Social Sciences, Education, Home Economics, and Agriculture should accept a special responsibility for this mission. They should seek the active cooperation and involvement of Forestry, Business and Technology, and Engineering.

d. **General Education.** The Schools of Humanities and Social Sciences and Science should accept a special responsibility for the accomplishment of this mission. They should seek the active cooperation and involvement of all professional Schools.
2. The President's Cabinet.

There should be a formal mechanism which will coordinate the policy positions of students, faculty, and members of the Administration. The Commission therefore recommends the formation of a President's Cabinet. The Cabinet would be composed of:

a. The President
b. All Vice Presidents
c. Dean of Faculty
d. President and First Vice President of ASOSU
e. One Academic Dean elected by the Council of Deans
f. One faculty or student member appointed by the President
g. Vice Chairman of the Faculty Senate
h. An Executive Vice President or Provost, if such a position is created.

The Cabinet can be used by the President in a variety of ways, and could be used for policy guidance and advice on emergency situations or more regular policy matters. We also recommend a Policy Coordinating Committee within the Cabinet, chaired by the Vice President for Academic Affairs, and including the Vice President for Student Affairs, Dean of Faculty, and the President of ASOSU. This Committee would have the following responsibilities:

a. To identify conflicts in academic policy recommended by:
   1) The Faculty Senate
   2) The Student Senate
   3) The Council of Deans
b. To seek a consensus among these groups by various devices, including joint committees and referral of actions back to the originating bodies.

c. When a consensus cannot be reached, to:

1) Clearly indicate the differing positions of faculty, students, and administration for the guidance of the President.

2) Isolate policy alternatives for the guidance of the President.

3) If requested to do so by the President or the President's Cabinet, make policy recommendations.

The Commission also recommends the creation within the Cabinet of an Emergency Campus Disturbance Committee, which would consist of faculty, students, and administrators. The Committee could be called into immediate action as advisor to the President in the event of a campus disturbance. The Committee should establish procedure in advance of emergencies.

The Commission suggests further that a special Administrative Assistant to the Cabinet be assigned the task of keeping up-to-date a policy catalog and calendar for the entire University. The calendar would need to be designed by one who understands the decision process of the University. Properly maintained, it would prevent items from being "lost" in the bureaucracy of the University, and would permit anyone to quickly ascertain the current status of any policy issue. The calendar should be public information.

3. The Office of the President.

The President of the University has the final responsibility and
authority for the operation of the University, subject to the Chancellor and the State Board of Higher Education. As a consequence, he must be accorded considerable flexibility in dealing with both short- and long-range problems. The Commission believes the President should rely, to a great extent, upon recognized procedures and channels for the establishment of basic policy. When special emergencies arise, he must be free to seek advice from a variety of sources, to take such action as he believes appropriate for the welfare of the University. Accordingly, the President should encourage the identification of felt grievances, take measures to provide relief from an apparent injustice, and then insist that any underlying policy issue be given a prompt and thorough treatment by recognized procedures.

4. **Principal Policy-Making Bodies.**

It is the opinion of the Commission that two of the principal policy-making bodies on campus are considerably less effective than they should be. We have reference to the Council of Deans and the Faculty Senate. The following comments are offered in the hope they will provide for the more effective functioning of each. Earlier recommendations have been made which should strengthen the Council of Deans.

a. **Council of Deans.** We visualize this Council as:

1) The principal representative of the Administration in the formulation of academic policy.
2) The administrative group monitoring the performance of the University relative to the accomplishment of its appropriate missions.

The agenda of the Council of Deans should be developed in advance, and the membership of the Council should be involved in the formulation of the agenda. The President or the Vice President for Academic Affairs should have the privilege of
asking for the position of the Council on any institutional policy issue. Any member of the Council should have the privilege of requesting items to be included on the agenda. In case of question as to what should be on the agenda, a majority vote would be necessary for a matter to be considered. We recommend that the Council of Deans be chaired by the Vice President for Academic Affairs. The Administrative Council should be used for administrative purposes. Administrative matters pertaining to academic affairs should be handled within the Administrative Council. If necessary, the Academic Deans who are members of the Administrative Council could form a sub-group to consider problems of academic administration. This arrangement would free the Council of Deans for issues of major academic policy.

b. The Faculty Senate. The Faculty Senate at Oregon State University has acquired considerably more stature in recent years. Concern exists in the minds of some people as to whether the Senate is always effective, and whether it should assume jurisdiction over all of the items it does. The questionnaire circulated to the faculty by the Goals Commission yielded some interesting results in this connection. The following tabular material is taken from that questionnaire. For example, about half of those responding believed the Senate should be involved in academic programs, general personnel policies, and new programs. Only 20 percent thought the Senate should be involved in individual personnel
## Faculty Senate Involvement

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Academic Programs</th>
<th>General Personnel Policies</th>
<th>Individual Personnel Cases</th>
<th>Curricular Changes</th>
<th>New Programs</th>
<th>Budget &amp; Fin. Matters</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Now involved</td>
<td>19.2</td>
<td>14.0</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>21.2</td>
<td>20.5</td>
<td>3.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Now involved and should be</td>
<td>44.8</td>
<td>29.8</td>
<td>10.5</td>
<td>45.3</td>
<td>44.3</td>
<td>7.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Should be involved</td>
<td>51.0</td>
<td>47.0</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>52.2</td>
<td>15.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not now and should not be involved</td>
<td>49.0</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>80.0</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>47.8</td>
<td>84.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
cases, and only 15 percent believed there should be Senate involvement in budget and financial matters. Department faculty fared much better with respect to who should participate in decision-making. 1/

The Commission is convinced of the importance of a viable, effective Faculty Senate. The following guidelines are for the purpose of making the Senate more effective, and enhancing confidence in its operation.

1) The Faculty Senate should organize to permit greater selectivity with respect to the issues that are debated on the floor of the Senate, or it should exercise greater selectivity with respect to the scope of its jurisdiction. The volume of material considered by the Senate has increased greatly in recent years. Senate meetings are longer and more frequent. The Senate concerns itself with more than broad issues of academic policy. Unless the Senate discovers some way of exercising greater self-discipline in this respect, its influence will decline. In particular, the Commission believes it is inappropriate for the Senate to assume a judicial function, except as the Reviews and Appeals Committee is a Faculty Senate committee. The President's Commission on Human Rights and Responsibilities also performs a judicial function.

2) The Executive Committee of the Senate should exercise greater control over items brought before the full Senate. Generally, a Committee should not be permitted to request Senate action on a policy issue until the Executive

---

1/ For a complete analysis of faculty opinion as to who is and who should be involved in various decisions, see Appendix.
Committee is satisfied the Committee has given the matter proper and thorough study.

3) The issue of structural organization is dealt with in detail later in the report. However, the Commission believes it would be more consistent with the philosophy of the Senate, and Oregon State University generally, if the presiding officer of the Senate were elected by that body. The President and the Vice President for Academic Affairs should be ex officio members of the Faculty Senate. If the Executive Committee of the Faculty Senate appoints various Councils, the Senate may wish to consider making corresponding Vice Presidents ex officio members of the Senate without vote.

5. Student-Faculty Involvement in Decision-Making

The Commission did not make a thorough study of student government. Under any circumstances, sweeping recommendations would be inappropriate, because the Commission consists entirely of members of the faculty. Even so, certain observations are appropriate. As indicated earlier, the role that students have in policy formulation should be clearly specified so that they do not participate under false expectations regarding the extent of their influence. Further, we believe there is real merit in having students involved at various levels of decision-making. Involvement at the University-wide level may consist of addressing some of the more important policy issues, but it is here that progress may be the most difficult to observe, and consequent frustration the greatest. At the other extreme, involvement at the Department or student organizational level may provide a better opportunity to observe the relationship of participatory input to a changed educational program. We urge administrative units at every level to consider how their operation might benefit from the insights and information that can be provided by students.
The Commission is impressed by the time and effort that is required by faculty and students to participate effectively in the decision processes of the University. This is time that cannot be used for study, teaching, or learning of academic subjects and disciplines. Even so, we believe broad involvement and participation enhances motivation and creates a confidence in the personnel and the processes of the University which is necessary for an intellectual atmosphere. At the same time, if faculty and students expect to participate in this way, they should be prepared to pay the cost in terms of time and effort. The same standards of rigor and scholarship should apply to University governance as apply to disciplinary and subject matter endeavors. In order to minimize the burden, the following suggestions are offered:

a. When faculty are hired at Oregon State University, the issue of participation should be discussed. The faculty member's responsibilities in this respect should be made clear to him, as well as his teaching, research, and extension activities.

b. A genuine effort should be made to obtain broad participation in faculty and student committees. The present method of obtaining volunteers should be supplemented with nominations made through formal administrative channels.

c. A faculty member should not hesitate to utilize his Department Head or Chairman as his agent, if he believes his scholarly work will suffer from committee work. Department Chairmen, Department Heads, and Deans have a legitimate interest in the committee load of faculty members, and may be requested by a faculty member to intervene on their behalf. The Commission recommends that assignments to University, School, and Department Commissions, Councils, and Committees be limited to a total of three per faculty member.
6. Schools

The Commission is impressed by the diversity of traditions and practices with respect to decision-making that exists among the Schools. We believe it would be inappropriate for the Commission to suggest in detail how every School should make decisions. Nevertheless, we believe policy, planning, administrative, and judicial functions should be provided for in every School, and the way they are provided for should be clearly understood.

The greatest diversity among Schools exists regarding the relative reliance placed on faculty and administrators with respect to policy and long-range planning. We assume that all Schools rely upon regular administrative channels for the execution of policy. The President's Commission on Human Rights and Responsibilities is in the process of establishing judicial procedures in cooperation with the Schools.

We strongly recommend that every School establish a group responsible for long-range planning, which reports directly to the Dean of that School. We believe it should be left to the discretion of that School as to the composition and method of constituting the long-range planning group. However, we believe it would be desirable to have faculty and administrators represented. If students are not a part of the group, they should be informed as to the issues being considered by the planning group, and invited to make such inputs as they believe to be appropriate.

With respect to School organization and decision-making, special attention should be called to the tri-responsibility of every School. Our concept of a Land-Grant University for the future has little validity unless these responsibilities are accepted throughout the University. We believe every Academic Dean should establish appropriate channels for the discharge of these responsibilities. If his resources and the scope of his
program do not warrant an administrator for each function, he should per-
sonally exert the needed leadership so that his School has a viable program
in all three respects.

7. Departments.

Departments also vary greatly with respect to size, function, and tra-
dition. It is recognized that some Schools prefer to operate through Divi-
sions rather than Departments.\footnote{See Chapter IV.} In any case, it appears that some ad-
ministrative units below that of the School are needed in every School.
The unit, whether Division or Department, is the primary unit with respect
to the most important decisions made in the University. Examples are:
faculty appointments, promotion, tenure, budget making, and fund alloca-
tion.

Departments or Divisions should also have agreed-upon procedures
for decision-making. We believe much could be gained by the organization
of seminars to permit Department Chairmen and Heads to exchange infor-
mation on procedures they follow, and to invite outside experts to appear
before them. Departments should be able to explain to those outside the
Department the procedures followed when important decisions are made.
Again, the Commission does not recommend a uniform format for all units
at this level, but we do believe certain functions should be provided for in
an understandable manner.

The following chart is presented to show the integration of administra-
tion, policy, planning, and judicial decisions for the total University.
CHAPTER III

PLANNING AND EVALUATION

All education should develop a spirit of self-criticism and self-renewal. Institutions also require constant self-criticism and forward planning. Industries normally devote a portion of their total budget to research and development. The Commission believes that Oregon State University planning and evaluation should be a continual process and not merely an event. As an organization, the University needs to continually raise the question of adaptation to changing conditions and to review the adequacy of its performance. The setting of goals is a dynamic process and is useless unless accompanied by constant evaluation and planning activities.

A. President's Planning Commission

The Commission recommends the creation of the President's Planning Commission which shall consist of all Vice Presidents, and a Director of Planning. The President shall also appoint four students, four faculty, and three academic Deans. Students will serve one year with possibility of reappointment. Faculty and Deans will serve three-year terms. The chairman shall be a Vice President designated by the President. It is further recommended that the Director of Planning be a full-time position and that the functions of the Office of Institutional Research become a part of the activities of the President's Planning Commission.
The Goals Commission recommends that the Planning Commission appoint sub-committees who would be responsible for the following areas:

a. **Academic Priorities.**
   This would include determination of the establishment of new programs, review of existing programs, recommendations for coordination and consolidation of old programs, establishment of new Schools or units, and reorganizational recommendations. It is assumed that the Commission would work closely with the Curriculum Committee.

b. **Building Priorities.**
   The Commission should assume the responsibility for the determination of decisions regarding the order of construction of new buildings and facilities. This must be done in close coordination and consultation with the question of academic planning. No decisions should be made on the construction of new buildings without thorough discussion of the implications of such construction for the total educational program of the University. Faculty and students should be consulted before such decisions are finalized.

c. **Campus Planning.**
   Questions regarding the development of a total campus plan extending over a period of many years should be carefully considered. Questions of esthetics are as important as cost and efficiency in setting the environment for the academic community. Greater consideration must be given to the environmental factor even at the cost of convenience in terms of parking and efficiency.

1/ The Commission recommends that the present Facilities, Planning, and Use Committee be made responsible for the assignment of space and equipment, and implementation of certain policies of the Committee on Scheduling. It would become essentially the Facilities Use Committee.
Continued Goal Analysis and Evaluation.

The Planning Commission should continue the work of the Goals Commission. One of its first tasks should be the monitoring of the progress made in implementing the recommendations of the Commission on University Goals. This should be followed by periodic review of University accomplishment and definition of new missions and goals. The Commission should also supervise the regular review of Schools and administrative units described later in this chapter.

Enrollment Limitations.

One of the basic questions confronting the future of the University is the determination of its optimum size. The President's Planning Commission should give immediate attention to the question of enrollment limitations. It will have to confront the issue of the extent of the autonomy of Oregon State University in determining the size and the nature of its student body. Every effort should be made to confront the following issues:

1) The correlation between budget allocation and enrollment. The Commission recommends that when a fixed budget has been established the institution should refuse to accept students in excess of the fixed student-teacher ratio.

2) Every attempt should be made to increase the quality of the student body. Exploration of the question of raising

---

1/ See charts of Projected Enrollment furnished by the Office of Institutional Research. Although these are the latest available long-range forecasts, they have been nullified by action of the 1969 legislative session to limit enrollment of non-resident and graduate students. On the basis of these new restrictions, the predicted enrollment for Fall Term is 15,248. The figures after 1970 will be affected by these restrictions.
PROJECTED ENROLLMENT
by
DISCIPLINE DISTRIBUTION
1975 1980 1985

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Business &amp; Technology</td>
<td>11644</td>
<td>11644</td>
<td>11456</td>
<td>11519</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agriculture</td>
<td>11173</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>1173</td>
<td>1738</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Home Economics</td>
<td>11351</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>13038</td>
<td>1423</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Humanities &amp; Social Sciences</td>
<td>4340</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>4160</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>416</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>3860</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>3088</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>2387</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engineering</td>
<td>193</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>2912</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>1519</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forestry</td>
<td>193</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>2268</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>1738</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pharmacy</td>
<td>1718</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>2228</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>416</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Science</td>
<td>959</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>3007</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>434</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Science Education</td>
<td>3088</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>3860</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>3088</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agriculture &amp; Business &amp; Technology</td>
<td>11644</td>
<td>11644</td>
<td>11456</td>
<td>11519</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agriculture &amp; Business &amp; Technology</td>
<td>11644</td>
<td>11644</td>
<td>11456</td>
<td>11519</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(UNCLASSIFIED)

PROJECTED ENROLLMENT by LEVEL OF DISTRIBUTION OREGON STATE UNIVERSITY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>YEAR</th>
<th>GRADUATE DIVISION</th>
<th>UPPER DIVISION</th>
<th>LOWER DIVISION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1968 (ACT.)</td>
<td>46% 6960</td>
<td>39% 8299</td>
<td>46% 8736</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1975</td>
<td>13.5% 19,300</td>
<td>18% 3474</td>
<td>18% 3952</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1980</td>
<td>43% 20,800</td>
<td>39% 8112</td>
<td>42% 8789</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1985</td>
<td>42% 21,700</td>
<td>39.7% 8571</td>
<td>40.5% 8789</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
high school GPA entrance requirements and other selective procedures should be made. Additional effort should be expended on high school recruitment of honor students.

3) Graduate enrollment will inevitably continue to rise as America moves into a post-Baccalaureate society. With Community Colleges increasingly taking the responsibility of the two years of the undergraduate program, the University will tend to concentrate on upper division and graduate work. However, the Commission is concerned that this not result in a diminution of the quality of the undergraduate program.

4) Out-of-state, foreign student, and minority student representations are essential for the health of the University and for the educational experience of the students.¹/

School planning committees should be formed whose recommendations would be forwarded to the President's Planning Commission. The University suffers from a lack of overall academic planning and from a lack of correlation between the development of various academic programs. The work of the Goal's Commission has demonstrated the need to encourage individual Schools and Departments in their planning and to coordinate the total University's plans for the future.

¹/ The student questionnaire revealed that seven times as many students wanted more minority students, three times as many wanted more foreign students, and four times as many wanted more out-of-state students than those who wished to have these groups have less representation in the student body.
B. Evaluation of Performance

1. Evaluation of Students

One of the major tasks of the University is the establishment and maintenance of standards of excellence. It is a responsibility of faculty to make evaluative judgments of the performance of students and to establish clear and objective requirements for each assignment and for the course as a whole. On the other hand, the grade has frequently become the object of the educational endeavor to the detriment of learning. Many educational institutions are re-examining the grading system and are experimenting with alternative ways of evaluation. On the student questionnaire, Oregon State University students indicated their desire for more emphasis on learning and less emphasis on the grade, both by the instructor and the University. Over ten percent of the students indicated that the pressure for grades and the emphasis in securing a degree was one of the major problems that interfered with the learning process. The Commission recommends increased use of Pass-Fail grading by increasing the number of such courses that a student may take. The option of electing a grade or a pass-fail should be the student's privilege. In the student's major field, grades should continue to be used to measure accomplishment (including determination of Senior Honors) and to provide a basis for recommendation for employment. Consideration of the elimination of D and F grades from the student’s transcript should be explored. Students would thus be encouraged to explore more areas without fear of failing and thus also to accept greater responsibility for their own education.

The Commission suggests increasing the use of evaluation devices which will also assist the student in synthesis and integration of his academic experience. These might include the use of a senior project,
a senior thesis, or a senior comprehensive exam, whichever is most appropriate for the particular student.

The question of degree requirements is currently being explored in terms of the reduction of the total number of hours required for graduation. The reduction of English, Hygiene, and Physical Education requirements should allow for greater flexibility and more electives. The Commission suggests the continued study by the new Council of Undergraduate Studies of the lowering of hours required in various programs to bring the University in line with requirements at other institutions.

2. Evaluation of Faculty

a. by students

There is an increasing demand on the part of students to participate in the evaluation of faculty teaching performance. Students are competent to indicate whether or not the material is being presented in an effective, interesting way and whether faculty are prepared for their courses, and whether or not they are interested in students and in communicating the material. They may not be competent to judge whether the material itself is appropriate or essential for an understanding of the discipline.

In order for such evaluations to be made on a total university basis, and to give student opinion about both courses and instructors, the Commission recommends that the University provide the funds to ASOSU to conduct and publish a publication of student evaluation of courses and instructors. This would assure more adequate cooperation from Departments and Schools, and improve the quality of evaluation. The initiative should be taken by the University itself, because the Commission
believes this will improve the quality of undergraduate instruction.

b. by peers

Faculty are also evaluated by their peers in connection with recommendations for promotion and tenure. The Commission recognizes there is a great variance in the different Schools and Departments as to criteria for promotion and tenure. Different traditions, different missions, and different responsibilities may account for some of the variations in procedures. Even so, the Commission feels there exists more variations than can be justified. The Commission, therefore, recommends that the Vice President for Academic Affairs should give high priority to the development of a statement clearly setting forth procedures which will be followed within each School and for the entire University. He should involve both faculty and administration in the preparation of the statement including the Faculty Senate Committee on Faculty Status. In particular, the issue of shared responsibility between faculty and administration should be clearly stated. Individual faculty members should be informed at the time of their employment as to the specific procedures employed in their School.

c. by administration

It is recognized that the final decision about promotion and tenure rests in the administrative officers. However, when administrative officers make judgments contrary to the recommendations of the faculty, the basis for their decisions should

1/ For faculty opinion regarding promotion and tenure practices, see the report on Faculty Questionnaire in the Appendix.
be clearly and specifically indicated. Such contrary judgments should be done only infrequently and in close consultation with the faculty concerned.

The administration is encouraged to examine more carefully the nature of faculty turnover. An independent survey made by a group of interested students is attached in the Appendix. Although the data is limited, it indicates some problems of which the administration should become aware.

3. Evaluation of Administration and Administrative Units

It is recommended that a definite review procedure be adhered to by the University. Comprehensive reviews and planning should be done by every Department every five years. Every School should engage in a similar activity at least every ten years. In the event of an unfavorable review, a follow-up shall be required within five years. The administration, as well as the work performance of the respective units, should be reviewed and evaluated in terms of the unit's stated objectives. Every five or ten years as recommended above, a review team of at least five people should be appointed to review the operation of a unit. An example of a review team would be:

a. two off-campus members,

b. one from the University at large,

c. one member from the faculty of the unit being reviewed (elected by the faculty of that unit),

d. one member will be appointed by the administrator of the unit being reviewed and may be from within or outside the unit being reviewed.

The first three members should be appointed by the administrator of the next highest administrative level. A more informal review may be
conducted by administrators using a form similar to the one found in the Appendix entitled "Rating the Department Chairman."

Greater relevance should be placed upon the fact that people rather than positions are tenured. When a unit is reviewed, the administration of that unit should also be reviewed. This would provide a convenient time for administrative change if this is appropriate. While there are exceptions, academic administrators usually make their greatest contribution to a unit in ten years or less. The Commission sees considerable merit in people moving between teaching and research to academic administration. We do not believe a decision to be an administrator is irreversible. While we recognize this may be a sacrifice in terms of subject matter specialization, for time spent in administration, the academic administrator often returns to teaching with a broader perspective.

If this type of administrative and subject matter reviews were to be accompanied by the present method of selecting administrators, it is expected that administrators would reflect the faculty viewpoint as well as traditional administrative considerations. Some of the suspicion of administration by faculty should diminish under these circumstances.

4. Evaluation of the Total University

While some functions of evaluation will properly be performed by The President's Planning Commission, both external and internal evaluation of the total University should be a regular and periodic procedure. On a designated regular day each month, a Vice President should report the program, problems, and plans for his area to the entire faculty. This would mean each Vice President would report to the faculty twice a year. It is hoped that these reports would be presented with suitable audiovisual aids to illustrate the presentation. While
individual Schools have evaluations by professional accrediting agencies, the Commission believes the Board of Visitors might strengthen the self-evaluation procedure. If such a Board of Visitors becomes aware of deficiencies, they could make valuable inputs to both Schools and the University. Such evaluation might focus on gaining support for the institution by segments of the larger community and also aid in interpreting the work of the institution to both taxpayers and legislators.

The Commission believes that the alumni should be brought into closer working relationship with the University by development of a more adequate program of involvement, support, and education. The Vice President for University Relations and the Vice President for Extension Education and Service should work with the Director of Alumni Relations and University Development Officer to develop such a program. It should involve educational as well as University Relations activities. A faculty-student committee to work with the above administrators might make valuable inputs to such a program.
CHAPTER IV

THE ORGANIZATION OF THE UNIVERSITY

A. The Need For a Sense of Community

In its study of the University the Commission was made acutely aware of the tremendous complexity of the University with its wide spectrum of academic offerings, research activities and service programs. To state that there is a need for all elements to feel a sense of community is simple - to accomplish this sense of community is difficult.  

The sense of community implies a number of things:

1. An understanding and a dedication to the overall goals of the University,
2. The constructive involvement of the various elements of the University in contributing to the decision-making process,
3. The participation of all administrative units in all three of the major activities of the University, instruction, research, and service,
4. The support by all segments of the University of programs, new or existing, which benefit the University as a whole and lead to accomplishment of goals and objectives.

1/ "I don't like to see universities torn by dissension among students, faculty, administration and trustees. In this swiftly changing society, academic institutions are going to have difficulty surviving as coherent communities, and the difficulty will be magnified if they are expending their best energies in civil war.

The community that enjoys internal coherence and morale is in a position to defend and preserve its autonomy and to shape its future. The noncommunity will be shaped to a greater degree by outside forces." Gardner, John W., "No Easy Victories", Harper and Row, New York, 1968.
B. The Need for Organizational Structure

The accomplishment of goals and the operation of the University as a community implies the need for an organizational structure with definite lines of authority, responsibility, and decision-making. It is the organizational structure which administratively integrates instruction, research, service, and extra-curricular education into a single operating unit.

About one-half of the faculty who responded to the Commission's questionnaire believed the present organizational structure of the University was satisfactory and would operate if people were dedicated to making it operate.

The Commission believes that the University is presently under-administered for its size and the number of programs offered. Therefore, a moderate increase in the number of administrative personnel is recommended in addition to changing the designation and function of some of the administrative offices of the University. The recommended administrative officers of the University are listed in the accompanying table indicating that three new positions are added.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>New Title</th>
<th>Existing Title</th>
<th>Change in Function</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>President</td>
<td>President</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vice President for Administration and Business Affairs</td>
<td>Dean of Administration</td>
<td>Minor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vice President for Academic Affairs</td>
<td>Dean of Faculty</td>
<td>Major</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dean of Undergraduate Studies</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elected Dean of Faculty *</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vice President for Research and Advanced Studies</td>
<td>Dean of Research</td>
<td>Major</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dean of Graduate School</td>
<td>Dean of Graduate School</td>
<td>Minor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vice President for Extension Education and Service</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>New Position</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Director of Cooperative Extension</td>
<td>Director of Cooperative Extension</td>
<td>Minor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Director of Continuing Education</td>
<td>Director of Continuing Education</td>
<td>Minor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vice President for Student Affairs</td>
<td>Dean of Students</td>
<td>Minor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vice President for University Relations</td>
<td>Director of University Relations</td>
<td>Major</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Not in the line organization.
C. Basic Organizational Units

While organizational changes follow an overall plan, the plan is not intended to represent a static model. In fact, the hope is that all organizational structures include provision for change.

Organizational charts should be evaluated in terms of functions and not individuals. In some instances, two or more functions may be performed by one person. In the organizational charts shown in this report, the solid lines are lines of responsibility. The broken lines are lines of coordination and communication.

It can be said that the University is composed of four major organizational categories. One broad category includes academic units such as Schools and Departments. A second broad category is made up of support units including the Computer Center, Library, and Physical Plant. Into a separate category fall the facilitative academic programs such as the Honors Program, and the Water Resources Research Institute. Student-oriented units, including student government, living groups, and student movements, comprise a fourth group.
D. The Department as the Basic Academic Organizational Unit

1. Undergraduate Education

The department is the basic academic administrative unit involved in graduate and undergraduate instruction. Departments administer curricular programs and it is not uncommon for a single department to offer several undergraduate curricula as well as graduate curricula. In addition, instruction, research and service activities are conducted at the department level.

The quality of the University is determined by the quality of its departments. In turn, the quality of the Department is determined by the manner the talents of the faculty are mobilized to accomplish the aims and goals of the Department. Historically, the success of academic programs is traceable to motivation at the departmental level.

It is at the departmental level where segments of the student's academic life are pulled together. These include setting of graduation requirements, instruction, advising, membership in discipline-oriented student organizations, and student participation on departmental committees.

It is the Commission's belief that students can make their greatest contribution to academic policy by participation at the departmental level.

2. Research

The department is the basic administrative unit where most of the disciplinary (and sometimes multi-disciplinary) research is accomplished at the University. The Department is the organization within
which many faculty carry on scholarly activity supported and encouraged by their colleagues in the Department. It is the place where the major professor works with his graduate students.

3. Extension Education and Service

If, as recommended, a University-wide Extension Education and Service Program is established, the Department should develop its own extension education program. At present, only a few Departments, those who work through the Federal Cooperative Extension, are now heavily involved in such activities. If, as recommended by the Commission, there is established a University-wide extension-education program, then the goals of each Department should be to develop and encourage its own extension-education activities within the framework of the University-wide extension service. Departments should assume authority and responsibility for the administration and quality of their extension program and should be held equally responsible for the quality of their teaching, research and extension programs.

4. Advantages and Disadvantages of Departments

The departmental organization possesses advantages and disadvantages of which one must be aware if this type of organization is to flourish on the campus and contribute to the overall objectives of the Institution.

a. The major advantages of the Department are:

1) They provide the organization for high quality professional work in a discipline.

2) They can be composed of faculty whose goals and objectives are similar and who have mutual respect for each other professionally.
3) They are most closely associated with graduate and undergraduate students and the place where student needs and desires can be most sympathetically considered.

4) They are reasonably autonomous.

b. Their main disadvantages are:

1) They tend to become island entities with little or no communication with other departments even within the same School.

2) Their strong emphasis upon professional aspects of their discipline often causes them to ignore the quality of service courses which they provide to students outside their field.

3) They are the only administrative unit that can originate and develop new courses. While these are generally developed for their own students, it often happens that many departments offer very similar courses. Such duplication is wasteful and inefficient.

4) Frequently, certain segments of the faculty may have goals and objectives different from other groups in the Department. The rigidity of departmental structure makes it difficult to cope with such problems.

5) Departments are the major barriers to the development of interdisciplinary courses and interdisciplinary research.

1/ "Nowhere can the operation of vested interests be more clearly seen than in the functioning of university departments. The average department holds on like grim death to its piece of intellectual terrain. It teaches its neophytes a jealous devotion to the boundaries of the field. It assesses the significance of intellectual questions by the extent to which they can be answered without going outside the sacred territory. Such vested interests effectively block most efforts to reform undergraduate instruction." Gardner, J.W., "No Easy Victories", Harper and Row, New York, 1968.
The above disadvantages are frequently the basis of criticism of the departmental organization because they constitute major barriers to interschool and interdepartmental programs. To the contrary, it should be noted that many Departments at Oregon State University have been highly successful in fostering, cooperating with and participating in multi- and interdisciplinary activities. Frequently, the strongest departments are the leaders and are most receptive to interdepartmental cooperation. Nevertheless, many respondents to the faculty questionnaire cited the need for more adequate mechanisms for interdepartmental cooperation particularly in the undergraduate educational program.

5. Recommendations

The Department constitutes one of the basic strengths of the institution in providing a base for quality in subject matter areas and as the major point of contact for a majority of the students at the University. The Commission, therefore, recommends the continued existence of Departments as the basic organizational unit for most Schools in the University, and that each Department accept responsibility for instruction, research, and extension education. Some Schools, however, may find that the organization of Divisions in addition to or in place of Departments may enhance the effective accomplishment of their overall missions and goals.  

1/ Divisions may be organized and operate in several ways. One way is for a Division to function similar to a traditional department with both educational and financial management responsibilities. Secondly, a Division may be an informal organization of a group of Departments in a School, the missions of which are related. This informal organization functions to further the accomplishment of the common goals while financial and budget matters remain with the individual Departments. In a third arrangement, Divisions may be organized in a School and their function will only be educational responsibility while budget and financial matters are handled completely by the Dean's office. It is realized that
In order to eliminate or at least reduce some of the disadvantages enumerated above, the Commission offers the following guidelines for Department organization and operation:

a. The academic Department should be made up of faculty with similar goals and objectives who have mutual professional respect for each other.

b. The teaching of service courses to students other than majors of the Department should be an accepted responsibility and those faculty involved in teaching service courses in an effective manner should be recognized. It would be desirable if teaching of service courses were not a full-time activity of any faculty. In Departments with heavy service course loads, a division of the faculty may occur between those interested in the more general and/or more applied aspects of the discipline. It is suggested that both groups of faculty may exist in a Department and be mutually supportive. Any other arrangement will lead to a widening of the gap between the two groups and the ultimate formation of separate Departments.

Footnote continued from IV-8

certain Schools may be so constituted that the organization of Divisions may be desirable and advantageous. The Commission's recommendation for the continued existence of academic departments does not and should not preclude Schools from considering organization of Divisions of various types if they wish, and if their mission can be more effectively accomplished by such an organization.

In this report, we have classified Assistant and Associate Dean by functions. However, some Schools, particularly Agriculture, Science, and Humanities and Social Science, may wish to consider the formation of Divisions that would involve collections of Departments which have closely related subject matter objectives. In this case, the Division does not substitute for the Department. In this arrangement, an Associate or Assistant Dean could be head of a Division and would assume responsibility for the instructional, research and service missions of that Division.
c. The Department should be willing to participate in interdisciplinary courses where such courses can make use of special competence in the Department and the courses would constitute a contribution to the educational program of the University.

d. The Department should be administered by one who is well recognized in the subject matter field. He should have the authority and responsibility for the administration of his Department, basing his decisions upon information obtained in consultation with his faculty or with appropriate committees of his faculty. Each Department should have at least a curriculum committee, a personnel committee, and a long range planning committee.

e. Scholarly and service activities should be acknowledged responsibilities of the Departments. It is recognized that available resources will affect the amount that can be accomplished in this area. However, some scholarly activity and service work can and should exist in all Departments.

f. It is recommended that faculty of Departments be encouraged to participate in Institutes, Centers, and other informal organizations whereby they can communicate with other faculty of similar objectives.
E. The Schools

At Oregon State University a School is (with some exceptions) composed of Departments with more or less similar objectives. The Departments generally have some common elements in their curricula. Often the difference between curricula are only the professional content peculiar to each Department. There are Schools at the University which are quite diversified, however. These include the Schools of Agriculture, Science, and Humanities and Social Science.

The Commission recommends:

a. That the School\(^1\) be maintained as the organizational unit encompassing a number of academic Departments. In another section, the Commission provides recommendations with respect to specific Schools on the campus.

b. That every School and Department make provision for all three functions of the University—resident instruction, research, and extension education. Instruction, research, and extension education should be administered by and conducted within Departments and be under the general administration of the School. In the context of the above recommendation, the organization of the School should be approximately as shown in the accompanying chart. It should be kept in mind that this is a functional chart and in some cases more than one function may be performed by one individual depending on the work load.

---

\(^1\) The Commission has been unable to ascertain any particular national pattern with respect to the use of the terms School and College. Consequently, we are not recommending a change from the present system and refer to Schools in this report. However, we have no objections to the use of the term College for all or part of the administrative units that are now called Schools. If any unit wishes to change its labeling, it is encouraged to raise the issue with the President's Planning Commission.
Chart showing suggested functional organization of Schools and Departments.
(The other three Vice Presidents are not shown because they provide broad support to the three functions of instruction, research and service.)
c. That the Dean of a School have the authority and the responsibility for the administration of the School in the conduct of its several responsibilities. The Dean will make decisions after consultation with his Assistant or Associate Deans, his Department Administrators, and whatever standing or ad hoc committees are appropriate. It is suggested that a long range planning committee, a curriculum committee and a graduate committee be among the several School committees that the Dean may organize.

d. That there should be sufficient curricular autonomy for the Schools so that a University Curriculum Committee would review only procedures, necessary coordination, resolution of jurisdictional problems and resolution of duplication. The Schools should have autonomy in setting the scholastic standards for graduates from their curricula over and above minimum criteria set by the University. Schools also should have autonomy to develop viable programs in research and service. It is the responsibility of the Council of Deans, chaired by the Vice President for Academic Affairs, to insure that all programs are coordinated and consistent with the goals of the University.
F. The Executive Office

The President is responsible to the State Board of Higher Education through the Chancellor. The President exercises leadership in the intellectual and educational program of Oregon State University, having initiative in shaping and maintaining its educational policy. He is responsible for the coordination of the various administrative units of the institution, for the formulation and administration of the budget, for the development and maintenance of the Physical Plant, and for keeping the entire program of the institution in harmony with the program and objectives of the State System of Higher Education. He defines the scope of authority of faculty councils, committees, and officers of the institution and is the authorized channel of communication between the faculty and the Chancellor and the Board.

As chief executive officer of the University, he is a member of the Chancellor's executive staff and is an advisor to the Chancellor in matters of inter-institutional administration.

It is recognized that the President will need special assistants for various purposes. There is no attempt to identify these here as every President needs flexibility. The organization which he chooses should reflect his own style of administration. There are tremendous demands made on the President of a university. He should have an organization that will function even if he is involved with matters of pressing need for an extended period of time. Accordingly, he could designate one of the Vice Presidents as Executive Vice President or he could establish a special position of Provost. The Provost or Executive Vice President should be selected by and serve at the pleasure of the President.
It should be understood that this person would be in charge in the event of the President's absence. Because the Commission believes in an administrative structure with focal points of responsibility and authority, we believe the President will be well advised to give each of his Vice Presidents certain responsibility and authority.

The Commission recommends that the office of the President consist of the following officers:

1. Vice President for Academic Affairs
2. Vice President for Administration and Business Affairs
3. Vice President for Research and Advanced Study
4. Vice President for Extension Education and Service
5. Vice President for Student Affairs
6. Vice President for University Relations

The accompanying organization chart shows the various officers and their areas of responsibility.
G. Academic Affairs

The Vice President for Academic Affairs is the principal academic officer of the University under the President. He provides leadership to the faculty and its regularly constituted groups in the development of educational objectives and policies. The Deans of Schools and administrators of all special or interdisciplinary instructional programs are responsible to the Vice President for Academic Affairs on all academic matters. He has the privilege of attending meetings of all faculties and of all faculty councils and committees, especially those concerned with academic affairs.

He advises the academic Deans and Directors and their faculties in the planning, development, and evaluation of School curricula and policies. He works closely with councils and committees of the Faculty Senate which are concerned with the coordination and approval of instructional programs and academic policies affecting academic units of the University or the other institutions in the State System of Higher Education.

The Vice President for Academic Affairs advises the President on all recommendations from the Deans and Directors for faculty appointments, faculty promotions, tenure, and salaries. He participates in broad budget planning and in the allocation of resources to support existing and future academic programs. He has responsibility for the resident instruction budget of the University.

The responsibilities of the Office of Academic Affairs are so broad that the Vice President for Academic Affairs will have a need for a number of supporting positions. At a minimum, the Commission recommends the establishment of two new positions in addition to those recommended below.
The Office of the Vice President for Academic Affairs has administrative authority for Undergraduate Instruction, Library, The Honors Program, International Education, The Summer Term, and Academic Advising and Counseling. The Commission recommends the establishment of two new offices:

1. Dean of Undergraduate Studies -- reporting administratively to the Vice President for Academic Affairs;
2. Elected Dean of Faculty

The Commission also recommends the creation of a Council for Undergraduate Studies composed of faculty representatives from the Schools and appointed by the Faculty Senate from a slate of nominees suggested by the Schools. The Council will also include student members.

The Commission also recommends the formation of a Council for Special Opportunities of which the Vice President for Academic Affairs will be Chairman.

1. Dean of Undergraduate Studies

The Dean of Undergraduate Studies will be concerned with undergraduate instruction at the University as it relates to the General Education program and with academic advising and counseling. The position is at the level of the position of Dean of the Graduate School. The areas of responsibility of the Dean of Undergraduate Studies will be:

a. Supervision of the General Education Program. The Dean will be Chairman of the Council of Undergraduate Studies. Initially, the Council should be charged with the task of developing a meaningful, flexible General Education Program. The Council should certify faculty and courses in the General Education Program analogous to certification of Graduate Faculty and courses by the Graduate Council. The Dean of Undergraduate
Studies should be provided with the necessary budget so that general education courses may be developed and offered under the General Education Program.

b. The Dean of Undergraduate Studies is responsible for the quality of the service course teaching at the University. This involves such considerations as:

1) the role of Teaching Assistants;
2) promotion and tenure of service course faculty;
3) encouragement of faculty for service course teaching;
4) encouragement of activities that will allow lower student-teacher ratios.

c. The Dean of Undergraduate Studies should be concerned with the quality of undergraduate teaching and, therefore, should through appropriate committees encourage and stimulate good teaching and research in instructional methods. He should be available for consultation with the Vice President for Academic Affairs on all personnel actions that impinge upon undergraduate instruction.

d. The Dean of Undergraduate Studies should be concerned with academic advising and counseling of undergraduate students. He will establish methods and procedures by which the quality of counseling and advising in the University may be assured. He should coordinate the activities of the Head Advisors of the Schools. Of students responding to the questionnaire relative to academic advising, 10% rated it excellent, 30% rated it good, 32% rated it fair, 23% rated it poor, while 5% did not respond. It is significant that 55% of the students rated advising as fair to poor.
Relative to academic counseling and advising the Commission offers the following guidelines:

1) The student needs to relate to a small basic instructional unit.

2) Teaching load and advising at the University are not necessarily proportional. Advising and counseling should be divided more equitably among all faculty of the University. A special FTE allocation may be allotted to those Departments where the advising load is heavy relative to undergraduate teaching load.

3) It may be possible for seniors and graduate students to assist in advising, thereby providing some interaction between graduate and upper division students with lower division students.

4) Advising and counseling should be an organized activity in the Freshman and Sophomore years. Beyond that level, students should have the responsibility of developing their own programs within the limits that they must meet graduation requirements of the University, School, and Department. Upperclassmen should, of course, continue to have an advisor available to them.

5) New faculty should know that advising is an integral part of their teaching responsibility.

2. Dean of Faculty

The Commission recommends the establishment of an elected Dean of Faculty to serve in a staff position rather than a line position to represent the faculty to the President and to the Vice President for Academic Affairs.
The following position description is suggested for the Dean of Faculty:

a. The position should be a non-renewable five-year appointment with election by the Faculty Senate.

b. The candidates for election shall be determined by a special search committee which will consider internal candidates. The search committee shall consist of members which are elected by the Faculty Senate and by the faculty at large. The conduct of the election shall be the responsibility of the Executive Committee of the Faculty Senate. Before an individual agrees to become a candidate for the Dean of Faculty position, he must make suitable arrangements with his academic Department.  

c. The Dean of Faculty shall be presiding officer of the Faculty Senate.

d. He shall be the presiding officer of the Senate Executive Committee.

e. He shall have direct access to the President.

f. He shall serve as ombudsman for the faculty.

---

1/ The Commission recognizes that the recommendation to establish an elected Dean of Faculty carries with it a concern relative to the role of the President in this process. The matter is sensitive in that an individual elected as Dean of Faculty may not meet the approval of or have the acceptance of the President. It is, therefore, suggested that when the search committee has completed its search it will submit a list of nominees to the President of the University which will include no more than six names. The President of the University may challenge as many as two of the names submitted. A challenge by the President will eliminate a person from further consideration for the position. This should be done before the names of the nominees are made public. The Commission realizes that this places certain authority with the President. The elected Dean of Faculty must have the confidence of the faculty but to be effective there must be mutual trust and understanding between him and the President.
g. He shall not be a part of the line organization with respect to faculty personnel matters. However, he will upon request concern himself with individual personnel cases.

h. He will concern himself generally with matters of faculty welfare and morale.

i. The Vice Chairman of the Faculty Senate may assume the duties of the Dean of Faculty in the event of the latter's absence or inability to serve.

3. The Library

The Commission recommends that the Library should be given more adequate support than it is now receiving. We recognize this will result in altering the allocations to other units on campus. However, it is our belief the Library is so fundamental to the University that greater support is justified even at the expense of the operation of the other units. Data are presented in the appendix which permit comparisons with other universities.

4. The Honors Program

The Commission is concerned about the Honors Program. An effective Honors Program requires an adequate commitment and must be supported in order to function properly. The Commission sees no firm commitment to the Honors Program at Oregon State University at the present time.

An effective Honors Program can provide a unique educational opportunity for outstanding students. It is, however, no substitute for a stimulating educational experience for those scholarly students who may not qualify for the Honors Program.
The Commission recommends that the Council on Undergraduate Studies re-evaluate the existing Honors Program in the context of the General Education program. The Honors Program should be fully budgeted and have a full time Director or be discontinued.

5. The Summer Term

The Summer Term at Oregon State University is not a part of the formal academic year program. In the past, both here and at other Universities, there have been arguments put forward to make the summer session part of the formal academic program, i.e., making it a fourth quarter of the program. Several institutions have attempted this arrangement (under the four quarter system or the trimester system) and have abandoned it.

The Commission believes that for the present, there is merit to operating the Summer Session as a unique session rather than as a part of the regular academic year. This operation provides opportunity for experimentation, innovative programs, and the wider use of outstanding visiting professors. The Commission offers the following guidelines for the program:

a. A Summer Term Planning Council should be established of which the Director is the Chairman. This Council will be concerned with Summer Term planning and budgeting policies.

b. Faculty in all Schools should be made aware of Summer Term opportunities and urged to submit proposals for unique educational programs which they could offer. Proposals for such programs should be considered by the Summer Term Planning Council.

c. Consideration should be given to the encouragement of Summer Term graduate programs in fields other than Education to assist
students to complete graduate degree requirements.

d. Instructors and courses offered in subject matter fields for which academic credit is given toward the requirements of a degree must meet the approval of the subject matter Department Head and the School Dean.

6. Council for Special Opportunities

The University has a special set of opportunities today. In a dynamic society the nature of these will be constantly changing, but it is important that some agency be set up that gives them attention as they arise. The Commission recommends that a Council for Special Opportunities be created which can assign ad hoc committees to deal with issues as they occur. If necessary such committees may become permanent committees but this device would permit examination of issues and a decision as to the best procedures.

Four areas which deserve attention at Oregon State University and which the Commission regards as crucial are:

a. Minority Affairs, Three percent Programs, and Related Enrollment Issues

This involves basic decisions on character, quality, and distribution of minorities in student body and faculty. It involves funding for programs and basic hard decisions on priorities and use of resources.

The Commission recommends that the Council for Special Opportunities develop a statement of objectives with respect to Minority Affairs and related enrollment issues. A corresponding university program and budget support should also be developed.
The current program for Minority Affairs is forced to operate on a minuscule budget. The Faculty Senate, urging the establishment of the Minority Affairs program, advised it to seek students not normally admissible and then to provide academic support with special tutoring and counseling services. However, funding has been on a shoestring budget and contributions to the program have been minimal. Two academic positions are budgeted for this office and 75 students are to be enrolled in the Fall of 1970.

b. International Education

The Commission notes that Oregon State University has had a long history of involvement in international education. We believe it is appropriate that Oregon State University have an Office of International Education to better reflect contemporary developments in this field. The Director of International Education should be a full time position.

This involves not only decisions regarding admission to both undergraduate and graduate programs but exchange programs, foreign study, research, and extension programs for both students and staff. The educational advantages of the presence of foreign students on our campus should be obvious, especially in the light of our somewhat isolated geographical position and the restricted cultural experience of many of our students.

The Commission believes it is appropriate that the Director of International Education report administratively to the Vice President for Academic Affairs with the recognition that he needs to relate closely to the Vice President for Student Affairs. Present administrative lines of authority and responsibility appear to be appropriate.
The Commission notes some difficulty with the present operation of this office. The Office of International Education should attempt to work through existing academic and service units on campus to meet the special needs of foreign students. The Office of International Education should not attempt to offer academic programs, even of a remedial nature, to foreign students. This will dilute the resources of the Office of International Education and divert attention from foreign student counseling and providing leadership in developing special programs having an international dimension which should be the primary objectives of the office.

The Vice President for Academic Affairs should form a review panel to assess the program and the potential for International Education at Oregon State University. A carefully constituted panel could bring to Oregon State University the benefit of the experience from other universities that are recognized as having outstanding programs in this respect.

c. The Special Needs of Women
It would be unfortunate when great attention is being given to the role of women in our society if Oregon State University should fail to give special attention to them on our campus. We have often erroneously assumed that the women on campus have the same professional interests and goals as the men. A study by the Educational Testing Service of a sample of 10% of our undergraduate women last Spring Term reveals that 43% prefer a life centering on a home and family while only seven percent prefer a professional life. They also indicate that their most important source of job satisfaction is "to work with people rather than
things" and "to be helpful to others and useful to society" (60%). Fifty-four percent indicated they preferred becoming a housewife with one or more children while only one percent preferred to become a married career woman without children or an unmarried career woman. 1/

The Commission recommends an in-depth study to determine whether the typical curriculum available to women is adequate. Special attention should also be given to women who have had their families and wish to continue their education either at the Baccalaureate or post-Baccalaureate level. The Commission recommends further that the Council for Special Opportunities appoint a committee for this purpose.

1/ Additional information concerning the study is available from the Office of the Dean of Students which furnished the Commission with this material.
H. Administration and Business Affairs

The Vice President for Administration and Business Affairs has the responsibility for general administrative and financial management of the institution including coordination of the various institutional service units. He is Chairman of the Administrative Council and has the privilege of attending meetings of faculty, councils and committees.

As a member of the President's Planning Commission he assumes special responsibility for planning with the city and other community agencies to insure the most effective realization of common purposes. He advises with the President in apportioning funds and in formulation and administration of the budget. In carrying out this responsibility he consults with the other Vice Presidents to insure the coordination of the educational and financial aspects of the institution.

The Vice President for Administration and Business Affairs will be closely associated with budgeting, resource allocation and priorities as well as the day-to-day financial operation of the University.

1. Budgeting and Resource Allocation

The Commission recognizes the necessity of close coordination between academic planning and financial planning, and recommends that every new program be considered from the standpoint of its cost. New programs should not be recommended until their cost has been estimated and their impact upon the resources of the University evaluated. With relatively fixed resources, the approval of a new program means the readjustment of priorities and a termination or reduction of support of existing programs.
This calls for a continual evaluation of programs along with a continual evaluation of priorities. The Commission recommends that careful study be given to present trends of making cost analysis and cost-benefit ratios the determining factor in academic planning. The intangible contribution of many programs is difficult to measure and costs alone vary considerably across the spectrum of disciplines represented at the University. Such factors as uniqueness of the program, consistency with University objectives; success in meeting stated goals, enrollment trends, needs of the State are but a few of the many factors to consider above and beyond cost analysis.

It is evident that most, if not all, programs at the University suffer from subminimal support in terms of support personnel and supplies and equipment. Out-of-state travel is also very restricted. The Commission recommends that support personnel, supplies, equipment, and out-of-state travel be carefully analyzed in budget preparation to make more effective the morale and efficiency of the faculty.

Numerous questions have been directed to the Commission concerning the budgeting process and resource allocation. The Commission recognizes some, if perhaps not all, of complexities of this process. We recognize that it is a continuous process and the nature of the decisions are different from decisions related to broad policy formulation.

1/ Over 80% of the faculty responding to the questionnaire believed the so-called "boot strap" program has become almost a way of life at the University. They believed a thorough evaluation of all programs was necessary so that new programs could be considered more intelligently and their impact evaluated.

2/ On the questionnaire to the faculty frequent mention was made concerning the inadequacy of secretarial help, technician help, supplies and equipment budget. Many respondents indicated that their own professional contribution to the University and to their field would be greatly enhanced if these budget items were increased.
Consequently, we recognize that participation cannot be as broadly based and that responsibility must be fixed in a most precise manner.

We assume that the various supportive student service and academic units will make requests for funds to higher administration. We assume further that the President and his Vice Presidents will coordinate and decide among these requests. We do not presume to advise the President's office as to how he should organize his office to make these broad allocative decisions. We assume that he would rely heavily upon the Vice President for Administration and Business Affairs. Once these broad allocative decisions are made, however, we recommend that the respective Vice Presidents be responsible for the budgets in their various areas. For example, the Vice President for Academic Affairs should have responsibility for the instructional budget, and the Vice President for Research and Advanced Study should have responsibility for the institutional research budget, if any.

In the matter of formulating budgets, the Departments and Schools should prepare budgets indicating their needs consistent with standards relative to types of programs, number of budgeted personnel, number of major students, and total number of student credit hours taught. Programs should continually be justified in terms of the missions of the University.

New programs should be budgeted consistent with criteria used for budgeting existing programs except that initially special items of a non-recurring nature may have to be considered. Acceptance of new programs by the University will carry with it the acceptance of the budget and the commitment to support the program.
The Commission notes with concern the lack of knowledge among the faculty generally of the budget making process and of financial management. Academic Deans and Department Chairmen have a responsibility to inform the faculty of their respective units concerning the budget for their units. The Commission suggests that the Vice President for Administration and Business Affairs give thought to the preparation of annual or semi-annual reports on the financial health of the University. These could be presented at meetings of the Faculty Senate and/or general faculty called for this purpose.
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I. Research and Advanced Study

The Vice President for Research and Advanced Study coordinates efforts of the various research organizations of the University, including research institutes, Agricultural Experiment Station, Engineering Experiment Station, and Research Centers. He advises the President regarding the general progress of the institution's research program and works with the Dean of the Graduate School to insure maximum opportunity for the integration of graduate instruction and research. He coordinates administration of the grant and contract operations with the Vice President for Administration and Business Affairs to facilitate the work of the research personnel and to insure compliance with the regulations of granting agencies. With the advice of the Research Council, he recommends allocation of NSF institutional grant funds and other general research funds and provides encouragement and assistance to faculty members in the development of research programs, research areas, and grant applications.

1. Research

The administration of research is the responsibility of the Vice President for Research and Advanced Study who will be ex officio chairman of the Research Council. The Research Council should be composed of faculty representatives from the various Schools appointed by the Executive Committee of the Faculty Senate from a slate of volunteers and of nominees from the various Schools. Schools having active graduate and research programs should have an Assistant or Associate Dean for Research and Graduate Study as an ex officio member of the School Graduate Committee. The Graduate School should also have a representative on the Research Council. This mechanism will insure the participation of Schools and Departments in the overall research effort of the University.
The Commission also recommends that the Vice President for Research and Advanced Study or an Assistant designated by him act as coordinator of Centers, Institutes, and Institutional Research programs. The person designated in this position should also be a member of the Research Council. It will be the purpose of this activity to assist in the organization of faculty groups interested in emphasizing a certain area of research. The formation of Institutes, Centers, or Graduate Faculties should not occur on a haphazard, unplanned basis. On the contrary, they must be carefully planned and organized to assure that the maximum results will accrue for the effort involved. Duplication of effort in research must be avoided.

New programs undertaken by newly established Centers and Institutes must be carefully evaluated in the context of University missions, including educational merit.

2. **Advanced Study**

Advanced study includes those educational activities directed to the specialized education of individuals at post Baccalaureate levels. The major portion of this education will be devoted to training Masters and Doctoral level students although post doctoral work, extension education graduate courses, workshops, and seminars will also constitute advanced study. Training of Masters and Doctoral students will consist of both course work and research and it is essential that the total research program of the University be closely allied with the training of graduate students.

It is recognized that Departments have played a strong role in graduate programming. This contribution should not be eliminated or weakened by any reorganization. It is recommended, therefore, that
every graduate program and graduate thesis meet the requirements and standards of the students' graduate committee and, in addition, have the approval of either a graduate faculty or a subject matter department before it is recommended to the Graduate Council for approval.

It is suggested that disciplinary faculty groups may be formed where the discipline encompasses advanced studies in several Departments. A Genetics Faculty is now in existence operating through the Genetics Institute. Graduate Faculties of Botany, Economics and Ecology are possibilities. For example, a Graduate Faculty of Economics would be composed of faculty from Departments of Economics, Agricultural Economics, Forest Management, Home Management, Business, and Economic Geography.

There is no doubt that interdisciplinary and multi-disciplinary research will become more common. The need for insuring the quality of advanced study and research in these cases should be the responsibility of coordinating committees, and Boards of Directors of Institutes and Centers. Normally, a student involved in a multidisciplinary program will be enrolled in a subject matter Department which will have final authority for admission and approval of such students. The multidisciplinary groups, however, may provide the mechanism by which a student may develop a program better suited to his own particular needs.

3. The Dean of the Graduate School

It is recommended that the Dean of the Graduate School report administratively to the Vice President for Research and Advanced Study. The Graduate Dean would remain ex officio Chairman of the Graduate Council which would consist of representatives of the Graduate Faculty of the University. The present method of appointments to the Graduate
Faculty would continue. It has been developed through considerable thought and discussion by the Graduate Council.

The Graduate Council will formulate policies relating to graduate work. The Dean of the Graduate School will be responsible for graduate admissions, record keeping and maintenance of standards and procedures relative to graduate work. He should be responsible for the overall development of graduate work and advanced study and should work closely with Departments and groups which are developing new graduate programs. He should encourage the various school graduate committees to be active in planning and developing graduate work in their Schools. As at present, the Graduate School through the Graduate Council will continue to approve and certify graduate courses and Graduate Faculty.
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J. Student Affairs and Extra Curricular Education

The Vice President for Student Affairs is responsible for the coordination of the student personnel program and exercises overall responsibility for the administration of student service units. The role played in coordination activities will be one of guidance with reasonable responsibility assumed by the students themselves. His responsibility also includes the general supervision of the extra-curricular university.\(^1\)

The Commission recommends the formation of a Council -- the Council for the Extra-curricular University and Student Services of which the Vice President will be Chairman. The Council will establish policies on matters of student affairs and extra-curricular education and will be composed of student and faculty members. The faculty members will be appointed by the Executive Committee of the Faculty Senate from a slate of nominees provided by the several Schools.\(^2\)

The Commission recognizes that the Director of the Memorial Union and his Board, together with the Student Activities Committee, have historically assumed responsibility for the development of many extra-curricular activities. We believe they will continue to have an important role in this respect. To this end the Director of the Memorial Union

\(^1\) Of 3,700 students responding to the student questionnaire, 61% had participated in extra-curricular activities, 34% had not participated, and four percent did not respond. Forty-two percent found their extra-curricular activities meaningful, 16% found them inadequate, 15% found them too time consuming, 14% had other reactions and 13% did not respond.

\(^2\) The new Council would replace the existing student personnel services council. The Vice President for Student Affairs should, of course, be free to hold staff meetings at any time with his principal administrators to consider matters of administration.
should be an ex officio non-voting member of the Council for the Extra-Curricular University and Student Services. We believe the time has come for the planning for both student activities and services to be a University-wide responsibility.

The Commission believes that student involvement in affairs of the University will result in generally improved communication between students and faculty and students and administrators. The nature of student involvement can take various forms. Oregon State University has been progressive in including students on many University committees. Further involvement at the Departmental and School level has been accomplished by some Schools and Departments either through Student Committees or Student-Faculty Committees.

The Commission urges that student involvement be encouraged at the School and Department level where students' views concerning courses and programs can be considered most effectively.

The attached organization chart recommends the formation of Department and School student organizations where these do not now exist. Such organizations provide a focal point for students in similar disciplines and encourages a sense of professionalism. These organizations should receive the moral support of the faculty and faculty members should act as advisors to student groups. However, the faculty should act in an advisory, supportive role only and each organization should be responsible for its own affairs and working out any problems that arise.

At the School level, a student council made up of Presidents of various student organizations in the School may consult with the Dean
or work through a faculty advisor on matters relative to School activities. The School Council should have representation on the Student Senate on ASOSU.

On matters relative to student activities not directly involving student organizations and ASOSU, Schools should provide an Academic Counseling Service but should be prepared to refer students' personal problems to more the professional counseling, guidance and health facilities of the University.

The effectiveness of all programs involving students can be greatly enhanced by faculty participation and interest. In particular, faculty should be aware of the major student organizations and their objectives.
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K. Extension Education and Service

The Commission recommends that a new Vice President for Extension Education and Service be appointed to coordinate all extension and service activities.

Extension education and service should be a commitment of the entire University and recognition of this commitment should be sought of the Legislature of the State. This new effort should draw on the total strength of the University and where appropriate make use of the techniques which have developed from work in Agriculture, Home Economics and Forestry.

It is essential that the extension education and service function be developed and operated through subject matter Departments in the same manner as resident instruction and research. It is through this mechanism that it is possible to focus the best disciplinary knowledge on the major problems of society. Only in this way can the unique and particular contribution of Oregon State University be realized.

The Vice President would be Chairman of the new Council on Extension Education and Service composed of a representative from each School with the Director of Federal Cooperative Extension, and the Director of Continuing Education as non-voting ex officio members. Faculty members of the Council will be appointed by the Executive Committee of the Faculty Senate from slates of volunteers and nominees provided by the appropriate Schools.

It is recommended that an Extension Education Faculty be established which is comparable to the Graduate Faculty and the General Education
Faculty. The criteria for appointment to this Faculty would be such that outstanding performance in the field and subject matter competence would be recognized. It should be clear that a person meeting these qualifications will have a need to participate in research or scholarly activity and can make a contribution to the University instructional program.

It is desirable that resident students on the campus be involved in the Extension Education and Service activity, particularly the extension activity by which the students may become familiar with the major problems of society.
L. University Relations

The Vice President for University Relations is responsible for the effective coordination of all University public relations units and all institutional units having direct relationships with the public.

The Commission recommends the formation of a Council on University Relations. Members of this Council will consist of administrators, faculty, and students. Administrative Heads of public relations units will be ex officio non-voting members. The faculty members will be appointed by the Executive Committee of the Senate from volunteers and nominees provided by the various Schools.

Public relations constitutes an important activity of the University in communicating with its various publics. The spectrum of public relations ranges from intercollegiate athletics to University development and public information.

Several of the units under the purview of the Vice President for University Relations are non-profit corporations in the State of Oregon and as such operate on a self-supporting basis and have full control of their budgets and the funds which constitute their income. As such they can operate quite independently from the general academic operation of the University. While this independent mode of operation may or may not be deemed undesirable, the contribution of the unit to the goals of the University are of prime consideration.

The Commission suggests that the establishment and continued operation of all public relations units should be based on the following guidelines:
The activity should be of sufficient importance that programs at the University would be jeopardized if the unit did not exist.

The activity should make a contribution to the education of a substantial number of students through:

1) providing professional faculty in an area of competence,
2) enhancement of support for the University which results in improved educational programs.

The activity should result in publication of information and newsworthy material in a professional manner so that activities of the entire University are brought to the attention of appropriate publics.

Personnel involved in public relations who have academic appointments in subject matter Departments should have the approval of the Department Head and the Dean of the School concerned.

In a previous section, the Commission recommended the formation of a Board of Visitors for Oregon State University. The Vice President for University Relations would work with this Board.

The Commission notes with concern the lack of balance of publicity releases on University activities and, therefore, strongly urges the establishment of a university public information program which will reflect the work of the entire University. The Vice President for University Relations should give high priority to the establishment of this program.
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CHAPTER V

THE SCHOOLS

The Commission's major effort was devoted to a study of the total University. We therefore did not study the individual Schools in detail, as we believe this is more appropriately done by the Schools themselves or by outside professional groups. In the pages that follow we offer our evaluation of, the opportunities for, and in some cases recommendations for the reorganization of the existing Schools on the campus. This is done within the context of our study of the total University.

The Commission considered many possible alignments of the various Departments in the University into Schools or Colleges having different orientations and objectives from the present Schools.

The Commission received and considered a number of proposals that would have the effect of creating smaller Schools. This would increase the number of academic Deans responsible to the President and the Vice Presidents. The Commission believed that the number of academic Deans should be kept at a reasonable number not appreciably more than at present.

There were also some suggestions for the combining of Schools into Colleges; the College being made up of individual Schools, each with its own Dean responsible to a Vice President of the College. One effect of this would be to add another administrative layer between the School Deans and the President. The Commission believed that this was undesirable, and that the academic Deans needed the channels to the President and Vice Presidents which they have now. Likewise, Institutes and Centers could be organized to accomplish some of the functions that would be accomplished by grouping Schools into Colleges.
Even though wide disciplinary involvement and new approaches are suggested, past organizational forms will not necessarily become unworkable. An acceptance of a broader point of view may give an existing organizational unit a fresh outlook. A method of operation found to be effective for a given purpose may be most helpful as operation for the accomplishment of different objectives is considered.

We believe that all Schools need to improve their planning, and put objectives into sharper focus. Some Schools need to re-evaluate their role and relate it more directly to the missions of the University.

The Commission recognizes the need, for the professional Schools especially, to become associated with various industries and professions in the discharge of their resident and non-resident educational work and research. Yet this involvement should never proceed to the point where the professional Schools are not free to examine the social issues pertaining to the practice and performance of industries and professions. The University has a responsibility to provide education and research for industries and professions; it also has a responsibility to serve as social critic and evaluator. All Schools in the University must recognize this dual responsibility.
A. The School of Humanities and Social Sciences

At the present time this School suffers from dual objectives which are not always mutually reinforcing. The traditional role of this school was to provide service courses to students majoring in other Schools on campus. With the authority to grant degrees, Departments naturally aspired to greater academic excellence, research, and graduate work. The evidence is overwhelming that other Schools on campus are being handicapped in the accomplishment of their objectives by the lack of development of Humanities and Social Sciences.

The School should be encouraged to plan for its own development, in full parity with the School of Science and the professional Schools. This would mean, at a minimum, graduate programs in certain areas, greater interaction with the professional Schools on problems of mutual concern, and increased attention to problems of general education to prepare people for the contemporary society. To meet this challenge we offer the following:

1) The creation of a new position in the Office of the Vice President for Academic Affairs that would carry the title of Dean of Undergraduate Studies. This office would have responsibility for all general education courses on campus, and would have control of all FTE used for that purpose. General education thus becomes a University responsibility. While the School of Humanities and Social Sciences would contribute resources to the General Education program, the School would be freed to concentrate its leadership on development of its own academic programs.

2) The School has important contributions to make to the general education of all students. This includes an understanding and
appreciation of Man, his history, his nature, his values, and his behavior, together with his cultural and social achievements. Scholarly and creative activity will be needed in all of these areas if the School is to make a significant contribution to the entire University.

3) The School of Humanities and Social Sciences should identify its potential contribution to the accomplishment of the University missions specified earlier. It should then determine priorities and their recommendations to higher administration should reflect these priorities. The Commission does not believe resources will be available to Oregon State University in the immediate future to permit the simultaneous development of all areas of the School.

4) The School should seek formal arrangements with other units of the University to build spheres of strength. Participation in the research and graduate programs in Education, Home Economics, and other Schools should be sought, formalized, and officially approved.

As indicated above, the development of Humanities and Social Sciences is crucial to the accomplishment of the missions of most of the professional Schools on campus.

The Commission considered the possibility of a combined School of Arts and Sciences, to be formed from the combination of the present Schools of Science and of Humanities and Social Sciences. No persuasive arguments could be put forth for such a combination. The Commission believes that if the University is committed to strengthening the School of Humanities and Social Sciences, it can be strengthened as a School in its own right just as easily as if it were part of a School of Arts and Sciences. Furthermore,
the Commission believes that the School can play a unique role at Oregon State University, along with the scientific and professional Schools, in accomplishing a viable synthesis of the scientific and liberal arts cultures.

Likewise, many multidisciplinary research programs at the University will require the participation of the School of Humanities and Social Sciences. The School can also play a significant role in extended and continuing education.

The Commission believes that the role played by the Humanities in the investigation of multidisciplinary societal problems may be just as significant as the role played by the Social Sciences. The aesthetic, artistic, and humanistic aspects of the environment in which Man works and lives will be of prime importance in the future.

If the University is committed to building a strong Humanities program, the following suggestions are offered:

1) Top priority should be given to obtaining a Center for the performing arts which can be used for lectures and convocations, conferences, and art displays. Such a Center would have the added benefit of giving campus visitors the privilege of observing current trends in the artistic world. The Commission strongly supports this Center, and suggests that every avenue of support, public and private, be investigated.

2) Certain Humanities, especially in the Arts, are expensive in terms of student/teacher ratio. This must be fully recognized if the University is committed to supporting and strengthening these fields.
3) Theatre and drama is now associated with the Department of Speech Communication. While drama is a form of communication, it is more oriented toward artistic interpretation. The Commission recommends that the theatre and drama be organized into a Drama Department. In addition to its teaching responsibility, its objective would be the promotion of theatre and drama on the University campus and within the community.

Virtually every professional School requires some Humanities and Social Sciences courses in its program. Therefore, the School of Humanities and Social Sciences carries a rather significant service course load. This service course load should be a recognized responsibility of the School, and those teachers who effectively carry out service course teaching duties should be suitably recognized.
B. The School of Science

Oregon State University has a well-established School of Science. It is the largest School in the University, in terms of both undergraduate and graduate enrollment. There are several strong Departments which have attracted and retained outstanding scholars. The School has assumed the responsibility of fundamental research and instruction in the basic sciences. The Commission recognizes the tremendous contribution of the School of Science in this respect. This contribution is exceedingly relevant to University Mission number 5, identified earlier.

The Commission also recognizes that the School has spawned many new programs which ultimately became viable in their own right. Oceanography and Atmospheric Sciences are examples. The arrangement of joint appointments between several Departments and the Agricultural Experiment Station should be continued. This arrangement can constitute a fruitful source of fundamental research problems.

The School of Science is a source of strength for many areas of accomplishment and emphasis on campus. It has performed a dual role most successfully in the past. It has developed considerable scholarly excellence in its own right, as well as strong supporting programs for many of the professional Schools through both research and teaching. The Commission believes the School of Science will continue to undergird the work of the other Schools, and recommends a continuation of those traditional policies which have worked to the benefit of the School as well as the University.

The Commission believes the School of Science can contribute in a significant way to all of the University missions identified earlier. Particular responsibility should be assumed by this School for general
education and the advancement of knowledge fundamental to the accomplishment of the broad missions of the University.

The Commission is concerned about the comments relative to adequacy of basic science service courses for students in the professional Schools. We believe the School should give a high priority to consideration of this concern. Relative to this, the Commission suggests the following:

1) Maintain channels of communication between the professional Schools and the Departments involved. The curriculum committees in the professional School should have representation from the School of Science. The professional Schools should take the initiative in this regard.

2) The professional Schools should outline in detail their needs, relative to basic science courses in their curricula.

3) The School of Science should give consideration to identifying qualified individuals in the professional Schools who would be willing to teach recitation sections in basic science courses.

The School is diversified. It offers instruction and conducts research in the Mathematical Sciences, the Physical Sciences, the Biological Sciences, and the Earth Sciences.

The Commission gave considerable thought and study to many possible reorganizations of the School of Science. Several specific proposals were received. One proposal was for the formation of a School of Mathematical Sciences, to be composed of Departments of Pure Mathematics, Applied Mathematics, Statistics, and Computer Science. Another was for
the formation of a School of Oceanography. On the basis of its study, the Commission offers the following recommendations relative to the School of Science:

1) That the existing Department of Oceanography be formed into a School of Oceanography, headed by an academic Dean.

2) That for the present, the remaining units in the School of Science remain organized as a School. The Commission believes that it is premature to recommend the formation of additional Schools from the School of Science, until the School itself has had an opportunity to examine its structure relative to the Physical Sciences, Biological Sciences, and Earth Sciences, as well as the Mathematical Sciences.

3) That, in accordance with the above, the School embark on a self study to examine the missions identified for it by the Commission, and develop the organizational implications. This study should be undertaken without delay.
C. The School of Agriculture

The name of the School of Agriculture does not reflect its breadth or the role it plays and can play in the accomplishment of the missions of the University. It is one of the most diversified Schools in the University, with work ranging from agricultural production to basic biological research to natural resource management. Several Departments within the School reflect this same diversity.

The School must maintain its traditional role as a School of Agriculture. In addition, the School has the capability and precedent to focus on many emerging natural resource and community development problems. The School should assume responsibilities in three main areas:

1) Traditional agricultural research, education, and extension for the agriculture of the State.

2) Natural resource management and environmental quality. Certain Departments now have this as their main focus; almost all contribute in some fashion.

3) Community and rural development. The School of Agriculture should assume particular responsibility for the assistance of rural areas, as those areas have borne heavily of the cost of the agricultural revolution in the State and the Nation.

The School should engage in central planning to bring these missions into focus.

Its traditional ties with certain Departments in the School of Science should be maintained through the joint appointments between the School
of Science and the Agricultural Experiment Station. The possibility of similar joint appointments with the School of Humanities and Social Sciences should be explored as broader socio-economic problems are investigated.

The School has a strong and growing Department of Fisheries and Wildlife. Work in fisheries is expanding elsewhere on the campus, and the possibility exists for a School of Fisheries and Wildlife. For the present, the Commission does not recommend the formation of such a School. However, it recommends that the Department of Fisheries and Wildlife become the focal point of all fisheries and wildlife activities on the campus, and that cross-Department and cross-School projects be operated under an Institute organization or by means of joint appointments.

The School of Agriculture should give serious consideration to the emergence and development of areas that are different from traditional agriculture, by making appropriate administrative recognition for the coordination of instruction, research, and extension, and for maintaining liaison with appropriate governmental agencies. The activities of the Department of Fisheries and Wildlife fall almost entirely in this category, but certain areas in other Departments qualify as well.
D. The School of Business and Technology

The Commission suggests a re-examination, under the Vice President for Academic Affairs, of the allocation restriction by the State Board which tends to limit the development of the School in its programs in Business Administration.

The Commission suggests that the School explore more systematically the area of societal changes under the impact of technology. This should be a fruitful area for interdisciplinary programs with Engineering, Economics, Sociology, Political Science, and Humanities. It should be noted that 30% of the students taught in Business Administration in 1968-69 were from other areas of the campus.

The School might also explore some of the ways such business practices as mass media advertising affect social ethics, family life, and life styles in America. The incentive system affecting American business, relative to environmental quality and the quality of life, as well as the contribution of business to the Gross National Product, should be examined. This could provide excellent material for the General Education program as well as interdisciplinary studies with Forestry, Agriculture, Oceanography, and Science. It might well give more attention to qualitative aspects of economic growth.

Increasing use of quantitative techniques in business, industry, and government creates an opportunity for the School of Business and Technology to take advantage of strength in the Schools of Science and Engineering. The Commission notes with approval that the School of Business and Technology has moved in this direction, and that the proposed Ph. D. in management science is consistent with this thrust. The increased use of these same techniques in public agencies creates an opportunity for
study as to their applicability in both the public and private arena.

The State of Oregon is characterized by many small businesses, oriented largely to service industries and natural resources. Yet massive economic forces will inevitably change the structure of the industry of the State. The impact of these trends on the survival of small businesses and on the markets for capital and entrepreneurship appear to be subjects worthy of focus by the School of Business and Technology. We hope that thought will be given to ways these fundamental problems can be investigated in research and examined in the classroom.

The relation of the Business Education program with the School of Education has not been completely satisfactory, and the Commission suggests the Vice President for Academic Affairs explore with both Schools ways of strengthening these programs.
E. The School of Education

The School of Education is in a strategic position to influence the entire educational climate of the State. By effectively educating our future teachers and administrators, it can also make a great impact on future generations of Oregon State University students.

The School's major area of responsibility, in terms of the mission at Oregon State University, is the cultivation and preservation of human resources. The Commission therefore supports the proposed development of a curriculum which emphasizes the Foundations of Education. This approach proposes to explore in some depth the historical, psychological, philosophic, and social aspects of education. Such an approach should assist the student in developing competence and understanding, especially in logic, reasoning, and communication skills. This should be combined with an understanding of the social, political, and historical issues in education, as well as the area of human value and human potentiality. Hopefully such an approach would replace some of the present dissatisfaction among students with the emphasis on methods courses.

A second major need is to strengthen the competence of prospective teachers in subject matter fields. Many of our prospective teachers leave the University without genuine competence in their subject matter area.

The Commission is concerned about the failure in communication and organization between subject area Departments and the School of Education. This is especially notable in some areas of the Social Sciences and some of the professional Schools. The Commission urges that the Vice President for Academic Affairs give high priority to the strengthening of these relationships and the coordination of these programs.
The School of Education has unrealized potential not available to other Schools of Education in the State. It is hoped that the following high-potential areas will be given priority in the future development of its programs:

1) **Elementary Guidance.** Here there is an important relationship that can be established with the nursery school program in the School of Home Economics, the Departments of Psychology and Sociology, and the Counseling Center.

2) **Vocational Education.** This is an area which has high potential for Oregon State University, and has strong support from the State Department of Education because of expanding technical and vocational programs in the community colleges.

3) **Educational Administration.** The development of community colleges has increased the need for trained administrators, and the shortage of qualified persons should make this an important development area.

4) **Special Problems and Opportunities.** Work with the disadvantaged, including minorities, ghetto residents, migrant workers, the aged, and other groups who have been bypassed due to technological changes in the society. Research programs can be supported in these areas, and Oregon State University has unique resources to assist in such development.

One of the major weaknesses of the School is in its graduate program. The Commission suggests a review of this area, with a view to establishment of a Center for genuine research and development programs on basic educational problems.
The School is inadequately housed, and high priority is recommended for new facilities.

The School, together with the School of Home Economics, is in a strong position to examine the role of women in society. The Commission believes that the School can utilize its reorganization into divisions in developing a viable graduate program.

We are asking the School of Education to assume the responsibility for the administration of the programs in Physical and Health Education.
F. The School of Engineering

The School of Engineering offers the only accredited curricula in Engineering in the State. The School is strongly oriented to undergraduate teaching -- over the years about 90% of the enrollment has been in the undergraduate programs. Enrollments have followed national trends. Despite the relative isolation of Oregon industrially, the Engineering programs enjoy a good reputation among employers in education, government, and industry.

The School offers 4-year terminal programs in Engineering Technology as well as the professionally-oriented programs leading to the first professional degree and advanced degrees in Engineering.

Responding to technological change, and recognizing that some of its graduates were "overtrained", the School developed the Engineering Technology program. The program is apparently accomplishing its objectives. The most recent of these programs to be offered is in Nuclear Engineering Technology. The Commission believes these programs represent a viable synthesis between a vocational, highly technically-oriented emphasis and a professional emphasis.

The School has been responsive to national studies on goals in Engineering Education. Several Departments have initiated long-range planning, and the School should undertake long-range planning to integrate these activities.

The School has an opportunity to contribute significantly to the missions identified for the University, particularly the environmental mission, the economic development mission, the general education mission, and the scholarly activity mission.
Research is conducted at a modest level, and is both fundamental and mission-oriented. Research support is almost wholly from sources external to the University. Significant research and training programs in environmental engineering produce highly trained personnel, and also contribute to technological development in this area. Good working relationships have developed with other Schools, with particular emphasis on multidisciplinary programs.

Engineering curricula are criticized for their lack of elective opportunity. There are problems in getting an adequate number of courses in four years, but there is hesitancy in moving to a 5-year program. Many students elect to spread their program over more than four years. The Commission sees no objection to this.

The curriculum requires 27 hours of Humanities and Social Sciences. This is meant to provide the engineering student with some breadth and depth in the Humanities and Social Sciences. Difficulties exist under present scheduling methods and course availability. It is the Commission's hope that the development of a General Education program will provide not only the engineering student, but all students, the insight, judgment, and understanding which will be needed to live and work in the 21st century. The Engineering School should, with other Schools, assume the responsibility of offering courses in the General Education program.

The Service program includes a testing activity. This activity should be restricted to those projects for which no facilities exist elsewhere in the State. This program, like the seed testing program in Agriculture, would seem to have to be justified on its educational value or be transferred to some other agency.
Since 1950 the number of institutions in the Nation offering accredited engineering programs has increased by 50%, while the number of undergraduates has remained approximately constant. Many states have established new engineering schools beyond their ability to support them adequately. At the same time, the states must face up to the whole problem of post-high school technological education covering the spectrum from the two-year technician programs to the professional programs.

Oregon has not yet proliferated and duplicated technological education. As a result, it has the opportunity to develop an effective, coordinated program relative to the broad spectrum of technological education. The Engineering School has the opportunity to provide the leadership for this effort. The Commission therefore believes that the Office of the Chancellor should address this overall problem.
G. The School of Forestry

Dealing as it does with the area of natural resources and preparation of professionals for management of the State's greatest economic asset, the School of Forestry must continue to play an important role at Oregon State University.

The School's ideal of educating the man, the citizen, and the forester, assures a strong program in general education as well as education in technical areas. However, the curriculum is still weighted heavily in the technical area. The School of Forestry believes that its strength as a School depends on the "development of graduate programs and stronger faculty and research activities in several areas of the Humanities and Social Sciences". The School also desires to enter into closer and more effective working relationships with all Schools of the University, including Agriculture, Science, Business and Technology, and Education, as well as Humanities and Social Sciences.

The School's work in Continuing Education is especially important, since it serves one-fourth of the country's foresters, and is one of the Nation's most active programs. It is important that new technology and new educational techniques be kept in balance so that this healthy condition continues.

Ecology, recreation, and environmental studies will continue to be major concerns of the School, along with production, management, and forest products development. Increasingly the School will have to deal with the social issues related to use and disposition of the forest resources of the State and of the Region.
The School's Self-Learning Center has proven to be a valuable asset. The Commission recommends that every School explore ways in which similar Self-Learning Centers could be developed.

The Commission was pleased to note that a basic objective in the Forest Management unit's report included "an understanding of the cultural, biological, and physical environment" as one of the goals of Forestry Education, and that "service does not put the University in a position of servitude to any group".

Undoubtedly the School will continue to expand its strength in the undergraduate program, but indications are that graduate programs, which have increased five-fold during the past decade, will perhaps double or triple in the next ten years. This will require additional graduate staffing and funding.
The Commission notes recent changes in the basic pattern of living in the State and the Nation. The time spent on income-earning activity has declined in this country in recent decades. Attitudes toward work and "leisure" time are undergoing considerable change. The role of both "woman" and "man" will remain distinctive, but they are in the process of being re-defined. The School of Home Economics has an opportunity to establish for itself a mission related to improving and enriching the basic fabric of our national life -- the relationship of people in the most basic of social units.

New opportunities exist in human resource development from the standpoint of family, nutrition, clothing, and recreation. If this broadened mission is assumed by the School, the Commission recommends that consideration be given to alternate names which more accurately describe this mission.

The School is the major School of Home Economics in the State, and exerts regional leadership.

It has an opportunity to provide leadership in extending educational opportunities to all students, men and women alike, in the area of family living and family relationships.

There is need to strengthen Home Economics programs in the high schools to reflect new orientations, including human resources development.

The School should continue to establish and maintain relationships with other Schools of the University. Establishment of relationships
with the Schools of Science and Humanities and Social Sciences, comparable to that between Agriculture and Science, may prove advantageous.

In accordance with a broadened mission oriented toward human resource development, the Commission recommends that the Department of Recreation, now located in the Division of Physical Education, be transferred to the School of Home Economics. Possibilities for developing the Department of Recreation appear geared to human resource development, with appropriate attention being given to the use of leisure time.

Because leisure time activities impinge upon the forests, streams, and beaches of the State, it is urged that the Department of Recreation seek relationships with Forestry and Agriculture, in order to take full advantage of the natural resource orientation of these Schools.
I. The Proposed School of Oceanography

The Commission recommends that the Department of Oceanography be formed into a School of Oceanography, administered by its own Academic Dean. The Commission recognizes that the present Department of Oceanography in the School of Science has objectives somewhat different from the School of Science. It is mission-oriented, and meets the criteria for the establishment of new units (Section I. B. 3. a.). The Commission recommends that this School be formed as soon as administratively possible. In the formation of the School, the Commission offers the following recommendations:

1) That the activities of the School will remain essentially those of the present Department, with the exceptions noted below.

2) That the School continue to offer only graduate degrees in Oceanography.

3) That there is little need to form Departments in the School. The Commission encourages the formation of Divisions, which will have goals and objectives consistent with the School. In the event that Departments are formed, they must have goals and objectives consistent with the School of Oceanography, and should not duplicate work in other Schools of the University.

4) That the School seek cooperative arrangements with other Schools on the campus.

5) That the work in fisheries now located in Oceanography, and which properly should be in the Department of Fisheries and Wildlife, be moved to this Department, or that the faculty involved have joint appointments between the new School of Oceanography and the School of Agriculture. It is recommended that the School of Oceanography not be formed until
the matters relative to fisheries are settled.

The missions identified for Oceanography include the environmental mission and support of the economic development mission. The School has the opportunity to make a significant contribution to the State. It conducts a strong program devoted to marine research and the production of knowledge upon which the ultimate economic utilization of the oceans can be accomplished with minimal degradation of the environment.
J. The School of Pharmacy

Pharmacy has five separate Departments, each with its own academic objectives. Technological advances have changed the nature of the profession, and the School is trying to cope with these changes. At least two alternatives seem open. First, it could continue to develop technicians or para-pharmacists who could dispense prescriptions. Or secondly, it could be related to a medical research program and work closely in connection with a medical school, and focus attention on advanced study and research. This alternative would suggest a much closer relationship with the University of Oregon Medical School, and the need to carry on studies in a research hospital. Hospital pharmacists are increasingly needed. Pharmacists need more involvement with doctors, nurses, and patients. There is little opportunity in Corvallis for such experience.

About one-half of the 1400 to 1500 practicing pharmacists in the State of Oregon are graduates of Oregon State University School of Pharmacy. Enrollments probably will increase. In recent years Oregon State University has graduated only one-half of the pharmacists needed yearly in Oregon. To correct this situation is a high priority of the School.

The Commission regards the control by the State Board of Pharmacy as a limiting factor in the genuine academic program of the School. Research in the School is limited, although advances have been made. Students lack incentive for graduate work, partly because of the 5-year program, and because employment and earnings are good at the B.S. level and most students are from the West and married.

In developing the 5-year program, the School tended to add additional technical courses. Service courses from other Schools have not
been entirely satisfactory to the School of Pharmacy.

The Commission believes there are a number of critical questions facing this School. They include the following:

1) Should the School continue to be located on this campus, or would it be better served, and serve better, by being moved to Portland where it could be more closely associated with the Medical School?

2) Should the School tackle some of the critical social problems of our time, such as environmental health, drug distribution, drug abuse, and socialized pharmacy? If it is to do this, what auxiliary and interdisciplinary facilities will it need? What changes would be required in the present technical and highly specialized curriculum?

3) Can the School develop educationally, independently from the influence of the State Board of Pharmacy?

4) Is its current organizational structure adequate to do the kind of teaching, research, graduate study, and service it needs to do?
K. The Division of Physical Education

It is difficult to identify a central unifying objective for the Division. At present it appears that the Division has four objectives, which are not altogether in harmony with each other. These are:

1) It provides the opportunity for all students to participate in athletic and/or physical activities in order to maintain and enhance their physical well-being. In this respect it is closely allied to the extra-curricular program.

The Commission firmly believes that the total education of the student includes a responsibility for education relative to his physical well-being. Therefore, it endorses the philosophy:

... to influence the individual student to maintain an interest and a degree of physical efficiency or fitness to help him develop a wide range of interest in a large number of physical activities, along with sufficient skill in some activities so that he will want to play and enjoy them in his leisure time, and also to develop within each individual through experiences, precepts and examples of desirable patterns in human behavior and citizenship. Through the enjoyment of participation in physical education activities, the learning of new skills, the improved physiological functions which refresh the body and give the feeling of well-being, we believe we can give our men and women college students a valuable foundation for effective living in our culture of today.1/

The Commission recommends that all courses in Physical Education be graded on an S-U basis except those taken by majors in Health or Physical Education. The Commission

1/ From statement of philosophy of the Division of Physical Education.
believes that provision of staff support and facilities consistent with the needs of the student body is a high priority item.

In meeting this objective, the Commission suggests consideration be given to the possible combination of the Departments of Physical Education for Men and Physical Education for Women into a single Physical Education Department. Students should be guided into activity areas which more nearly fit their body type, and where they may have the best chance for successful accomplishment. Encouragement of participation should be given to all students, not just the participation of those who are the best.

2) The Division provides the professional education necessary for those who plan to teach Health and Physical Education in grade school, high school, community college, or university. In this activity, the Division is closely allied to the School of Education, since students going into public school teaching must also meet certification requirements of the State Department of Education. The Commission believes that this is an important activity, and appropriately reflects the missions of Oregon State University.

3) The Division provides education in professional recreation oriented toward Park Administration, Outdoor Recreation, and Outdoor Education. The emphasis in this program is in human resource development as related to leisure time, and recreational activities as they utilize the State's outdoor advantages. This activity relates more closely to the human and natural resource orientation of the Schools of Home Economics, Agriculture, and Forestry. The
Commission recommends the transfer of the Department of Recreation to the School of Home Economics (see Chapter V, Sec. H).

4) The Division is developing instructional and research efforts in the field of biomechanics, directed to professional training for individuals entering Health and related fields, but not directly involved in teaching per se. This activity is rooted strongly in the basic sciences, particularly microbiology and physiology. The efforts of the Division in this direction are most admirable in the recruitment of faculty and the initiation of several research projects. The Commission questions whether such a program should be developed at this time. Programs of this type should be closely allied with a Medical School in order to make use of certain courses it offers, and to provide medical competence as support in research programs.

The Commission believes that if the Division wishes to continue this area of activity, it do so on a scale consistent with the basic science and medical support available on the campus and in the Community.

If Recreation is transferred to the School of Home Economics, the Commission believes that the Division would make its greatest contribution to the University if the Departments of Physical Education and Health Education were to merge with the School of Education. In this organizational arrangement the Division would carry on Objectives (1) and (2) described previously and, consistent with basic science and medical support available, provide professional courses and conduct research in the fields of health and biomechanics.
The Commission recommendations are based upon considered judgment of the present status of the Division of Physical Education at Oregon State University.

If the Commission recommendations relative to the Division of Physical Education are not accepted, the Administration of Oregon State University should give immediate support to the elevation of the Division to School status, and accord it full priority with other academic units in the allocation of resources.
L. Natural Resource Management Oriented Departments in the University

Oregon State University has had a long history of involvement with natural resources management. Emphasis has been given to an understanding of the natural resources themselves. The Schools of Forestry, Engineering, and Agriculture have been much concerned with such matters. Certainly no other institution in the State has such a collection of expertise. There has been a lack of emphasis on Man and his institutions as these relate to natural resource management, although some such work is beginning to emerge. The Commission views this as a potential growth area if the University is to serve the recommended missions.

Departments that are engaged in the latter area of work -- Man and his institutions as these relate to natural resources management -- include Anthropology, Geography, Forest Management, Landscape Architecture, Agricultural Economics, Economics, and Recreation. The School of Business and Technology has also done some related work, and has further aspirations. The Commission further notes the Department of Fisheries and Wildlife emphasizes management, as does the Department of Range Management. The Environmental Health Sciences Center and the Air Resources Center have concerned themselves with some education and public service work in the management area.¹/

At the same time, there is beginning to develop considerable interest in community and rural area development on campus. Some of the units mentioned above are also involved in this undertaking. It is clear these are two different thrusts, although there is considerable overlap.

¹/ For an interesting proposal, see Appendix A.
As a consequence of the above development the Commission has reached the following conclusions:

1) Natural resource management will be a growth area on this campus requiring a relatively greater input from the Social Sciences and Humanities. However, we also foresee a continued absolute growth in Biology, Physical Science, and Engineering as these relate to natural resources.

2) Community development, with particular emphasis on rural areas, also has potential, requiring the type of input referred to above, and additional contributions from Sociology and Political Science.

3) The President's Planning Commission should give this matter continued study, and should try to devise organizational forms that will bring people working on related problems into closer communication. For example, the people in Horticulture concerned with landscape planning should be communicating closely with the people in Humanities and Social Sciences concerned with art and design. By the same token, people concerned with the benefits and risks involved in the application of agricultural chemicals should have the advantage of the latest intellectual developments in the subject matter area of Decision Theory Under Conditions of Uncertainty.

The Commission regrets it has had inadequate resources to develop definitive recommendations on this matter. The proposals that have been made, and the organizations now in existence, are inadequate relative to the generality of the two problems described. In the absence of a unifying concept, the Commission does not recommend the formation of a permanent organizational unit to address the two problem areas described above. We believe the possibility of temporary Institutes or Centers
should be explored, with due regard for the Institutes and Centers already in existence on campus.
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A SURVEY OF FACULTY ATTITUDES
AT OREGON STATE UNIVERSITY

The Commission on University Goals conducted a survey of faculty attitudes and opinions as part of its overall effort in collecting information for the formulation of a statement of goals for Oregon State University. The questionnaire used in the survey was sent to all faculty of the University with rank of instructor or higher.

A total of 340 questionnaires were returned representing a response of about 25% of the total questionnaires distributed. A certain amount of personal data was requested on each questionnaire; however, the response to this request was optional so information concerning the respondents is not complete. A summary of information relative to the respondents is given in the attached tables.

In summary, one might characterize the respondents as representative of all Schools at the University. They are approximately equally divided among Assistant, Associate, and Full Professor ranks; over 63% have tenure; about 60% received their degrees at institutions other than Oregon State University; over 62% have had experience at another University besides Oregon State University; 64% were on departmental committees, 41% were on School Committees and 37% were on University Committees.
### Responses by Schools

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School</th>
<th>No. of Responses</th>
<th>% of FTE of School</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>School of Agriculture (Including Agricultural Experiment Station)</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School of Business &amp; Technology</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School of Education</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School of Engineering</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School of Forestry (Including Forest Research Lab)</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School of Home Economics</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School of Pharmacy</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School of Science</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School of Humanities &amp; Social Sciences</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School of Physical Education</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Academic (Library, Cooperative Extension, ROTC, etc.)</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No indication</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>340</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Committee Membership

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Department Committee</th>
<th>School Committee</th>
<th>University Committee</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Response</td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Percent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>217</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Response</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>340</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Academic Rank of Respondents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No response</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instructor</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistant Professor</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate Professor</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professor</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>340</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Tenure Position

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tenures</th>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No response</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Have Tenure</td>
<td>213</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not have Tenure</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>340</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Employment at Other Institutions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No. of Institutions</th>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No other institution</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One other institution</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two other institutions</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Three other institutions</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Four other institutions</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Five other institutions</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Six other institutions</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No response</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>340</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Number of Degrees Received at Oregon State University

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No. of Degrees</th>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No degree</td>
<td>195</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One degree</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two degrees</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Three degrees</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No response</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>340</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
THE QUESTIONNAIRE

September 1969

TO ALL FACULTY MEMBERS:

As you are probably aware, last February 20, 1969, President Jensen appointed us to a Commission on University Goals. Our primary responsibility was "assisting the institution to develop recommendations for long-range planning." To discharge our responsibilities, it was stated, "the Commission will be expected to study and evaluate existing organizational structures and methods of operation, present and emerging programs, to determine how effectively they serve the purposes of the University." If such an endeavor is to be successful, it will require the thought and work of far more than three people. Anything less than a complete University effort will undoubtedly fail.

The purpose of the attached questionnaire is to permit any faculty member who wishes to do so to convey his thoughts to the Commission. A questionnaire has already been sent to all Schools, Departments, and other administrative units on Campus. Both students and faculty will have an opportunity to participate in the completion of these questionnaires and reports. However, the attached questionnaire has been designed specifically for the faculty.

When completing the questionnaire, please keep in mind that you are not obligated to answer any questions; therefore, feel free to eliminate those questions that you believe irrelevant or of no concern to you. By the same token, you are encouraged to submit any material you wish on subjects not covered by the questionnaire.

The questionnaire provides space for your name and other personal information. Your replies will be read and evaluated carefully, regardless of whether or not you record your name and the other information.

The questionnaire should be returned by, or before, November 1, 1969, to "Commission on University Goals, c/o the Library."

We appreciate the help you will give us.

Emery Castle - Extension 2941
Warren Hovland - Extension 2921
James Knudsen - Extension 3001

Attachment
FACULTY QUESTIONNAIRE

PRESIDENT’S COMMISSION ON UNIVERSITY GOALS

1. Do you believe the operation of Oregon State University suffers from the lack of a clear statement or understanding of its goals, missions, or objectives? Yes ___ No ___ Comment, if you wish:

Does the same answer apply to your School? Yes ___ No ___ If not, why not?

Does the answer given for your School also apply to your Department? Yes ___ No ___ If not, why not?

2. Do you believe Oregon State University provides a promising place for you to achieve your individual professional goals and objectives? Yes ___ No ___ We would appreciate a concise statement of why you answered as you did.

3. Do you believe your individual goals and objectives are in harmony or in conflict with those of the University, your School, and your Department? Please check the appropriate rectangle below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>My Goals</th>
<th>The Univ.</th>
<th>My School</th>
<th>My Dept.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>In harmony with</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>those of:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In conflict with:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In the event your goals and objectives are in conflict with one or more of the above units, you are invited to 1) specifically identify such conflicts, 2) give your recommendations as to how such conflicts might be resolved.

4. What could be done at Oregon State University to make you a more productive professional worker, both individually as well as a member of the total University community? (You may submit a separate statement if you wish).

5. Indicate by a circle whom you believe are now involved in decisions on matters relevant to your unit. Indicate by a square whom you believe should be involved. (More than one circle or square may be entered).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Involve-</th>
<th>State Board of Higher Ed.</th>
<th>President</th>
<th>Executive Dean</th>
<th>School Dean</th>
<th>Faculty Senate</th>
<th>Department Chairman</th>
<th>Department Faculty</th>
<th>Students</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ment</td>
<td>Academic Program</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>General Personnel Policies</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Individual Personnel Cases</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Curricular Changes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>New Programs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Budget &amp; Financial Matters</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
6. One of the major problems facing the University is the allocation of resources, with respect to the adoption of new programs and the review and continuation of existing programs. Under these circumstances, please check the alternative below that you believe would be the most desirable:

- Continue all existing programs and establish new programs on a "boot strap" basis. (SPECIFY PROGRAMS)

- Eliminate some existing programs and establish new ones which would be in keeping with the goals of the University and the needs of society. (SPECIFY PROGRAMS)

- Continue existing programs and establish no new programs. (COMMENTS)

- Eliminate some existing programs. Establish no new programs, and develop excellence in the remaining programs. (SPECIFY PROGRAMS)

7. Do you believe significant inadequacies exist in the decision-making framework at Oregon State University? Yes No If yes, what should be done to improve upon these inadequacies? Please be specific.

8. Do you believe significant difficulties exist at Oregon State University with the present organizational structure? Yes No If so, what are these difficulties? Please be specific.

9. What changes in organizational structure would you recommend at Oregon State University? (Please be as specific and as detailed as you wish. You need not confine yourself to organizational changes that would affect your administrative unit).

10. What criteria do you believe should be used to determine promotion and tenure at Oregon State University?

11. What criteria do you believe should be used for the granting of tenure and for promotion at Oregon State University?

12. What criteria should be used to judge the performance of:

- This University
- Your School
- Your Department

OPTIMAL

Your name:__________________________________________

Your Department:__________________________________________

Your Rank:__________________________________________

Do you have Tenure? Yes No

How many degrees have you earned at Oregon State University?____

As how many other universities have you been employed?____

Are you a member of: Yes No If yes, how many?

- Departmental Committees
- School Committees
- University Committees

September, 1969
ANALYSIS OF RESPONSES

Question 1

a) Do you believe the operation of Oregon State University suffers from the lack of a clear statement or understanding of its goals, missions, or objectives? Yes ___ No ___ Comment if you wish.

b) Does the same answer apply to your School? Yes ___ No ___ If not, why not?

c) Does the answer given for your School also apply to your Department? Yes ___ No ___ If not, why not?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>No Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) University suffers</td>
<td>147 (43)</td>
<td>143 (42)</td>
<td>50 (15)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) School suffers</td>
<td>147 (43)</td>
<td>141 (41)</td>
<td>52 (15)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Department suffers</td>
<td>145 (43)</td>
<td>137 (40)</td>
<td>58 (17)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Selected Comments

* This is best answered by individuals making decisions affecting the University. Precise expressions of goals and responsibilities should be of value. Goals would of necessity be somewhat general and not particularly restrictive on the individual faculty member.

* Aims and goals are quite general, but they are building blocks for each School to determine its goals.

* The Professional Schools have clear and reasonable objectives, many of which are being achieved with some distinction.

* Lack of communication among departments discourages unified goals or knowledge of them. Objectives that were once satisfactory should be re-examined.

* Present guidelines are good, but how these are interpreted and applied are not clear. It is not clear that there is relationship between problems and lack of goals. Is falling enrollment, inadequate budget, faculty morale, student unrest, lack of prestige, a function of goals? Will restatement of goals relieve these problems?
* Priorities must be established on the basis of objectives when funds are short, moving all directions at once is not efficient.

* With limited resources we must delineate how to use our capabilities to best meet our objectives. Without objectives we are lost.

* Goals statements must necessarily be broad and abstract in order to apply to a whole University. If specific in operation, we would spend more time arguing about it than would be useful.

* Salesmanship and public relations is an ever present challenge. It takes ingenuity.

* Guidelines, rights and responsibilities of faculty are helpful, but not sufficiently clear.

* The fact that Oregon State University has research and extension as well as teaching responsibilities is often overlooked by people outside the University. Teaching is an integral part of the University, but if research suffers from lack of support, teaching will also suffer.

* Goals must be stated in general terms of scholarship, pursuit of truth and excellence, teaching and research, the rest is up to the individual.

* Effectiveness is being diluted by attempting to be all things to all people. We should focus resources.

* It is difficult to assess our progress or lack of it with respect to stated goals.

* The University cannot be outstanding in every endeavor and should not be involved in all activities in all areas as it is at present. Funds are limited and spread too thin.

* There is need to emphasize by articulated goals and objectives the areas in which the University will concentrate. Lack of this results in an attempt to be all things to all men with inadequate resources.

* The University cannot do the job it should within the limitations designated by the allocation system. Barriers should be broken down.

* Major goal of any university is to accommodate needs, desires, and interests of students. This is not being done.

* Goals are printed, learned and preached but not adhered to. They are understood by administration, but not implemented by teachers.
I'm not sure a statement of goals is necessary. It is assumed that the University's chief product is knowledge. Need anything more be said? If everyone talked less, worked harder, and paid attention to his own business, there would be fewer problems.

Statement is clear. Failure to achieve goals probably due to lack of full understanding and full commitment.

Major problem is disagreement over limitation of goals. Not all members of University are willing to honor all parts of statement.

Clearer statement of University goals will lead to stronger, clearer goals for each School and Department and provide administrators at all levels with leverage to get the needed financial backing.

Many or most departments don't pay attention to training students to function in a democracy. Student contact with department staff is authoritarian.

We, as a Land Grant institution, having teaching, research, and extension as our mission. The question should be asked, are we revising and updating curricula to meet today's needs? Are research programs in step with needs? Are we serving the needs of today's students? Are we contributing to national needs?

I am not sure the University suffers, but there is always room for improvement from the communications standpoint.

Broad generalizations are fine for brochures, but specific statements, in my view, are essential if specific action is to be taken.

Conflicting statements on relative roles of research and graduate and undergraduate teaching. No apparent attempt to select schools, departments, or areas of strength to be built into nationally recognized excellence, rather than to uniform mediocrity.

Some goals are specified of which some are useful and some so general as to be useless. The greatest error is likely not in the statement but in their communication and motivation of staff, faculty, students, and administration to achieve them.

The University suffers particularly with reference to the major social and economic changes of the past 10 years. Our previous statements on objectives need to be clarified and made more meaningful under emerging situations.
The University is constantly under pressure to perform functions other than those it is meant to do. These pressures come from both within and without. A clear statement will define the issues.

Oregon State University wishes to become a real University. How can it do so without a strong program (graduate and undergraduate) in Humanities and Social Science.

The goals of any University is education and mind development.

Goals should be clarified before problems develop.

I think most faculty seriously want to "better" the university. The bigger we get, the less apt we are to know what our fellow faculty mean by "better." As we attempt to improve our communication we are finding out that we are not only failing to pull together, we are also pulling in different directions.

A clear statement of goals would be helpful, but the inference of your question related to understanding is more important. If the mission of goals and the University are understood, then there can be concurrence in everyone's efforts in carrying these out and the strength of common dedication to these purposes.

Despite stated goals, "education" at Oregon State seems to consist of imparting information to the largest number of students at the lowest cost, which is not education at all.

I believe we are caught in a conflict of goals. Demand for undergraduate education versus graduate programs versus community service. However much of this is a result of changing demands by the outside environment.

It seems to me that the University should enable its graduates to better cope with and understand the world around them. Too much shoving of facts down throats and not enough relating how this fact makes this part of the world understandable.

I think that to some extent, the University is negligent in its role as an independent critic of society and overemphasizes the provision of "service" to the state. I do think, however, that Oregon State is maturing in this respect.

Within the School, I understand the goals a little better. I have more discussions with persons within my school than I have with persons across the campus.
* Goals, missions, and objectives for our School are clearly stated discussion re-evaluation often by all involved.

* The School is a more homogeneous group than the University, therefore, more likely to have a unified policy and common goals. Nevertheless, departmental rivalry for money and prestige exists and some conflict over the exercise of power. These differences would not be resolved by re-statement of goals.

* The School being smaller, has more readily defined objectives or missions and in a School, objectives and missions are explicitly stated.

* The School is organized such that teaching and research are compatible and compliment each other. The objectives are well known and sufficient time is allotted for each activity.

* The scope of some Schools is so broad, they do not lend themselves to specifics and generalities have the fault of being too general and incapable of accurate definition. A clear statement of goals and missions of each department would be valuable.

* There is need to emphasize by articulated goals and objectives the areas in which Oregon State will concentrate as a University. Lack of this results in an attempt to be all things to all people with an inadequate resource base.

* There has always been considerable discussion of goals. It is not a neglected subject.

* There needs to be some sort of new employee indoctrination so everyone on the faculty starts with the same concept of the School's mission. There is lack of unanimity of feeling for what the School's purpose is.

* I believe School goals are understood. Execution in a manner fair to each department and individual leaves something to be desired.

* I have the impression that the important balance of education versus research is not well formulated at this time in our School.

* There is a singular lack of vision in the implementing studies of a cultural scope suitable for students who must live in the awesome future.

* There is confusion about its "service" to technologically-oriented students as opposed to development of broader programs in the Schools.
We appear to be hung up on the allocation system. Some faculty believe that we need to propose programs and make plans to do so. Yet these plans are always frustrated by the allocation system. We are encouraged to believe and plan for graduate study, but we get little encouragement in upper level administrative units.

In the School the faculty are involved and urged to participate more fully in the several functions or missions including resident instruction, undergraduate and graduate research, and service.

We know our missions and objectives in our School. We do not have enough money to materialize these missions and objectives, so we cannot reach goals.

School and department goals should not be vague. Departments are the administrative units that carry out School functions. Therefore, department goals are the action areas of School policy.

For departments as well as for the School we have a clear statement of goals, missions, and objectives, which is the level on which detailed statements of that kind are required.

I feel that our School has generally been quite responsive to the needs of its clientele as traditionally defined. I would suggest, however, that the "clientele" of the school needs to be conceptually defined much more broadly than it is at the present time.

We periodically discuss goals in the Department and this is helpful in the interchange of ideas. No statement of goals is agreed upon, other than broad concepts.

Our Department has made some effort to establish goals and objectives, and in part, has been successful in achieving some of those objectives. The definition of goals and objectives does not necessarily improve the contribution of the unit, however, it can contribute to the more orderly development of the unit.

We work continuously on goals in the Department.

Vague administration at times tends to put off decisions which give the impression that we lack direction. Great improvement could be obtained at times.

Conflict exists not so much from lack of goals as in disagreement as to how goals are to be achieved.
There has been no consideration of even short range goals or priorities in the four years I have been here; further few in the Department appear to be concerned with goals, other than personal status quo.

Frequent meetings have led to an understanding of Departmental goals.

Departments have to add a few nuts and bolts to the general aim of the University in order to keep their aim on target.

Our Department does have goals and objectives that it is pursuing, but these could be more sharply defined at the moment.

We have clearly stated goals, but the programs suffer due to lack of staff unity and individuals interested in their own gains and not concerned with other staff and students.

As a Department we need to relate actual day to day operation policies to our objectives. Again, however, these statements must not be restricting in only aiming for efficiency or effectiveness, but rather freedom of inquiry and innovation which may be the antithesis of efficiency.

The smaller the unit the more important an awareness of goals becomes. Large heterogeneous units should be open to divergent goals.

I think that the goals, missions, and objectives are fairly well outlined in the Department but I think it would be good to have a general understanding and agreement among the present departmental faculty. Also these goals should be revised from time to time, say every five or six years.

Within our small Department there is a more or less continual evaluation of goals since really few people are involved.

We have a smaller group and can talk together freely. We may not all agree on a line of action, but all will support the project once a decision is made.

My department is torn between trying to train for graduate school and trying to train for life problems on a broader perspective. The schism is not resolved, result badly botched up job of teaching.

As a still smaller unit, the department tends to have a greater common feeling and understanding of its objective. As the smallest administrative unit in the University hierarchy the Department needs specific understanding of its goals which necessarily will deviate from those of
the School, and the University at large providing a degree of autonomy and uniqueness in most cases.

* I believe the Head and the members of the Department are sincerely attempting to teach the students, perform some research and carry on public service within the scope of their abilities and the time available.

* Our Department has a clearly stated Development plan, which we are following with respect to staff acquisitions, equipment procurement, space allocation, and programs of instruction and research.

* I believe we have recently addressed ourselves to the appropriate goals, missions, and objectives and have come to some basic agreements...
In general most of the faculty responding to this question felt that the University provided the environment and a promising place to achieve individual goals and objectives. Many responded that if the environment had not been such they would have not stayed at Oregon State University. Comments on this question, however, pointed out several advantages and limitations at the University which could help the individuals attain their professional goals to a greater extent. Many commented that the attainment of their own professional goals and objectives was dependent primarily upon their own initiative and ability and were in no position to blame the University for failure to achieve professional goals. Some of the advantages and limitations pointed out, however, were as follows:

Selected Comments

* In some cases, the pursuit of excellence by intellectual inquiry seems to have lowest priority compared to recording grades, committee work, and administration of people.

* I am provided a great deal of flexibility in my teaching and research work to develop professionally. Thus far, encouragement in terms of financial and administrative support has been excellent. If I do not develop professionally, the fault is mine.

* There is a spirit of cooperation on the campus.

* Limitation of heavy teaching load, lack of research library, and lack of inspiration and challenge of graduate students.

---

ANALYSIS OF RESPONSES

| Do you believe Oregon State University provides a promising place for you to achieve your individual professional goals and objectives? |
|---|---|---|
| Yes | No | No Response |
| 256 (75) | 65 (19) | 19 (6) |

In general most of the faculty responding to this question felt that the University provided the environment and a promising place to achieve individual goals and objectives. Many responded that if the environment had not been such they would have not stayed at Oregon State University. Comments on this question, however, pointed out several advantages and limitations at the University which could help the individuals attain their professional goals to a greater extent. Many commented that the attainment of their own professional goals and objectives was dependent primarily upon their own initiative and ability and were in no position to blame the University for failure to achieve professional goals. Some of the advantages and limitations pointed out, however, were as follows:

Selected Comments

* In some cases, the pursuit of excellence by intellectual inquiry seems to have lowest priority compared to recording grades, committee work, and administration of people.

* I am provided a great deal of flexibility in my teaching and research work to develop professionally. Thus far, encouragement in terms of financial and administrative support has been excellent. If I do not develop professionally, the fault is mine.

* There is a spirit of cooperation on the campus.

* Limitation of heavy teaching load, lack of research library, and lack of inspiration and challenge of graduate students.
* Lack of financial support to Humanities and Social Sciences.

* Lack of financial support for research and a small number of (not outstanding) graduate students. There is mutual cooperation and stimulation.

* The potential of Research Centers and Institutes is not being fully utilized.

* Teaching loads are too great and vocational education, across the board, is over-emphasized.

* Major limitation is financial resources. On the positive side, there is congenial, close professional relationships and minimum of administrative supervision.

* The opportunity is available if one seeks it.

* Dearth of research, professional contacts, self analysis, continued education and acceptance into the mainstream of University activities are limitations -- emphasis on the routine is depressive.

* Basically, the environment is congenial and there is lots to be done, but we are hampered by lack of money, facilities, and manpower.

* Too much emphasis is placed on faculty degrees and too little on faculty knowledge and ability.

* Limitation due to being assigned numerous responsibilities including committee assignments and heavy advising loads.

* Looking at the present University goals, the University can hardly be a promising environment for students or faculty.

* There is confidence in the University administration but lack of confidence in the State Board and Legislature.

* The University is limited by too much faculty concern about politics and too little commitment to student, intellectual, social, and professional concerns.

* We are limited by mass education, large classes, and a Joe-college atmosphere.
The University has the resources, talents and personnel to accomplish anything. The potential exists but the promise is unclear. Coordination of disciplines and a clear sense of criterion are lacking, but great potential and human resources is present. Leadership is needed to bind us with common purposes.

There is too much concern with political organization at every level of the University -- too many meetings, too much discussion, too many questionnaires, too much paperwork, too many artificial problems raised.

There is lack of research and scholarly work. The environment is sterile but the potential is here.

Beyond the departmental level, communication breaks down and there are many top-heavy insulating committees.

There is no mechanism for expression in the Department and School. This is a repressive, anti-intellectual environment. Major problems are nepotism and lack of communication.

There are presently too many constraints and barriers to innovation. We need organizational changes.

As an institution just becoming a University it offers the hope of building a very good University.

It does not bother me that objectives are ill-defined. There is nothing wrong with conflicting ideas of what should be done as long as everyone is tolerant of different opinions. I can still achieve my personal goals within this existing framework.

Lack of a really stimulating intellectual community, especially in the Humanities and Social Sciences; and there is a great lack of intellectual stimulation which would enhance scholarly work in the Humanities and Social Sciences.

An employee has the responsibility of adjusting his goals to those of the Institution. The Institution certainly cannot adjust to the employee goals.

There is a problem not with quantity and substance but with quality and the impractical aesthetic things in life. The University should be a fertile ground for blending the two.
I am interested in research but I am limited not by administration attitudes but by the conflicts of teaching and class preparation. My range of subjects forces me to neglect my areas of greatest interest and I am unable to cover the rest adequately.

I have been on the campus for a relatively short time and seem to be confronted with extreme rigidity on the part of faculty members when I try to cross Departments and School lines. With so many resources it is a shame to keep them locked up.
ANALYSIS OF RESPONSES

Question 3

Do you believe your individual goals are in harmony or in conflict with those of the University, your School and your Department? In the event your goals and objectives are in conflict with one or more of the above units, you are invited to 1) specifically identify such conflicts, 2) give your recommendations as to how such conflicts might be resolved.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>University</th>
<th>School</th>
<th>Department</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>In Harmony</td>
<td>245 (72)</td>
<td>217 (64)</td>
<td>251 (74)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In Conflict</td>
<td>41 (12)</td>
<td>52 (15 )</td>
<td>52 (15)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Response</td>
<td>54 (16)</td>
<td>71 (21 )</td>
<td>37 (11)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A majority of respondents (64% to 74%) indicated no conflict with the University, School or Department. The problems pointed out in the various comments were conflict between "education" and "training," lack of recognition of good teaching and advising, lack of recognition of low student/teacher ratio requirements in certain courses, conflict between graduate and undergraduate teaching, difficulty in undertaking interdisciplinary activities at the undergraduate level.

Selected Comments

* I feel that the objective of the School is to serve a clientele which is much narrower than I would prefer to see served. This is obviously a value judgment, but I think it does respond to the question. Nevertheless, I feel that the School and the University have an obligation to do considerably more work on society's problems than they have done in the past.

* There seems to be a philosophical conflict, I'm not sure how it can be resolved. I do not feel that I am being constrained by the School by working in those areas which I feel have been neglected. On the other hand, this does not resolve the conflict of goals.

* Regardless of dollar support a university must first be concerned with education and not training. We must educate people to think and to learn and not just to do. Goals such as good teaching and good
counselling and advising seem to have second rate acceptance. It also does not appear possible for a person to be a good undergraduate teacher and a productive researcher at the same time.

* We should seek intellectual stimulation through academic diversity and not just try to maintain the status quo.

* The conflicts are not with the goals but how to achieve the goals themselves, resulting primarily from personal ideology and differences between administrators and faculty.

* There has not been adequate support for expanding enrollments in the Humanities and Social Sciences and appears to be little understanding of the need for such education.

* The conflict arises in the concept of Humanities education. Different courses require different techniques. We need small lower division classes in the Humanities and research should be encouraged at all levels.

* More secretarial help and graduate assistants are needed. Much time is spent on non-essentials and little time is spent on essentials.

* The aims of the University seem to be inconsistent with helping students learn to live with one another and themselves.

* The professional schools should take a significant role in contributing to the general education of the student.

* In the service area the clientele served is probably much too narrow and needs to be broadened to encompass many more segments (particularly the underprivileged) of society. Conflicts arise in the allocation of space and facilities. Statements of needs seem to fall on deaf ears. I would suggest a decentralization of decisions on priorities. There is little peer group decision making. Faculty recruitment should reflect the needs and demands of students with respect to courses.

* More opportunity is needed for research to resolve some conflicts.

* There is a conflict over the philosophy of service to the university. To what extent does the faculty commit extra time to perform service to the university.

* No recognition is given for support for graduate education or reduction of teaching loads at the graduate level.
Lack of communication and apathy and lack of clear definition of responsibilities and authority give rise to conflicts.

Promotion and tenure are based too much on national and international prominence rather than competence in research and teaching on the campus.

The resolution of all conflicts might result in a dull conformity.

Conflicts arise with people who wish to interact with others in their departments to develop strong graduate training programs and undergraduate programs which cross departmental boundaries. Present structure and provincialism of departments works counter to the development of new programs to meet emerging needs. This might be solved through more vigorous administrative leadership or through increased faculty involvement in achieving goals and in establishing goals and priorities.

There is a continuous conflict with the operations of the Business Office. Their procedures and goals appear to be opposed to progress. They are rigid, antiquated, inconsistent, difficult to communicate with.

The University needs to chart a course of total academic and social statesmanship. We are neglecting Oregon's growth and expansion. The University must be contemporary and treat this State and the Northwest problems as opportunities. It must attract top quality students, have advanced study and graduate students, out-of-state students and foreign students.

Much of the conflict arises from the fact that the University really knows what its goals are.

There is need for much more personal growth, freedom of choice for the students and development of human effectiveness than is presently possible here.

Certain areas are not covered and many areas are duplicated. This should not be permitted.

The University should be an umbrella to cover a catholic multiplicity of endeavors. Promotions and rewards should be awarded on the basis of excellence in performance, but that performance may be instruction, research, extension, administration, advising, counseling, University and public service. Research should not blatantly be a quest for funds because one loses in freedom of inquiry and instead does research that will sell.
The conflict might be resolved by opening lines of communication which define objectives of the administration and the role the faculty can play in fulfilling the goals. The University could be more of a University if its Humanities program were strengthened.

The University must become a leading voice for progressive ideals and moral leadership in the State.
Selected Comments

* I am more concerned about the responsiveness of the University and the School than I am about any constraints imposed on my professional development. By responsiveness, I mean the ability and willingness to serve as an independent critic, as well as to provide society with the traditional services which are supplied by universities.

* More, and up-to-date facilities would greatly increase productivity. Few of us can afford to attend out-of-state professional meetings regularly and therefore tend not to go regularly since very little Department and School support can be counted on. Also, teaching loads tend to direct one's attentions away from productivity in the professional field.

* Support research programs financially and stop begging for funds from Federal Agencies.

* Professionalism must be more firmly established but maintain aspects such as supplies, domains of authority. Locations and capabilities of administrative functions are not documented and defined.

* Encouragement and interest on the part of the University in professional activities.

* Reduce administrative committees the faculty must serve on.

* Build a library.

* Higher quality faculty.

* Lighten class loads.
* Mixing of faculty from different disciplines and greater concern for professionalism.

* More time for research and drastic increase in support for library.

* Change the concept of one class hour for every hour of credit. It is unnecessarily restrictive and enslaving to both the faculty and students.

* Make education more relevant. The University should not be a weed-out place for industry or a limbo to keep the students out of military service or off the labor market. Education is an end in itself.

* Up-date facilities, faculty. Adopt innovative new teaching techniques.

* Reduce paperwork and multitude of committee work. Allow for more direct student contact.

* We need in-service training for college teachers.

* Give the faculty an opportunity to perform meaningfully.

* Pay specific attention to developing communication patterns and decision making mechanisms. The School should become an open organization rather than a closed one.

* Establish a consistent set of criteria to be placed on teaching and research functions.

* Recognize teaching proficiency as a professional accomplishment and allow time for research as well.

* Capitalize on the strengths of the individual faculty members and continue to keep faculty in positions where they will be most productive and competent.

* Provide more inter-departmental planning for teaching and research.

* Free faculty from leg work, provide laboratory support, secretarial support and library help.

* It is a mistake to expand into more and more departments when not enough funds to maintain present ones are available.

* Break down barriers between departments, make more split appointments, make clear the goals and objectives of the departments.
* Tenure should not mean guaranteed life-time employment.

* Simply a bit of encouragement and recognition. Positive encouragement from superiors is few and far between. Many administrators need courses in good management.

* Provide support facilities consistent with what you want the faculty to do.

* Provide an opportunity for people with similar interests to work together.

* A scarcity of travel funds has fostered provincialism at Oregon State University.

* Nothing is necessary but students, books, and an atmosphere that encourages the search for knowledge and, as far as possible, wisdom.

* Fewer, more productive staff meetings; more non-professional manpower assistance.

* Create cooperative attitude between faculty and departments.

* Improve communications at all levels.

* "Community of scholars" should be broadly interpreted to include students. To this end, there should be a reduced emphasis on grades and credits.

* All existing programs need to be carefully and thoroughly evaluated.

* The response time for needed programs and curricular changes is too great to meet the needs of a changing world. Fix meaningful social goals worthy of an institution of enlightenment. Change decision-making framework. Provide better channels of communication.

* Recognize that the productivity of each individual cannot be judged by the same production guidelines.

* With the proliferation of Community Colleges and State colleges, it will become increasingly necessary for the University to establish itself as a true university. Much effort should go into the development of areas of excellence, and faculty can be productive if they can fit into these programs.

* Modify the handling of financial matters to provide a unified university-wide system and reduce the waste in time and effort for faculty members and administrative personnel and permit them to be more productive in their professional pursuits.
* It is good to have a democracy but requires a great deal of time and the willingness to work on committees. However, I think we have gone too far in the use of committees. Many decisions can and should be made by administrators at all levels. If committees are to be useful, we must recognize that each person's time is then spent in some administrative effort and this should be recognized accordingly.

* The best that any university can do is to provide a high calibre faculty with the funds and freedom to pursue their academic interests.

* Less emphasis on day-to-day production; more emphasis on long-range development.

* Others should respect the opinions of professional people in other areas. There should be more faith by more people that people in their own field are professional enough to do what is best for their department.

* An important need is a more flexible approach to the learning process and ways of meeting requirements. In many cases a course is required where a qualifying examination would be more appropriate. Apparently there is no convenient way to pay for the administration of exams without courses.
Indicate by a circle who you believe are now involved in decisions on matters relevant to your unit. Indicate by a square who you believe should be involved.

Of the 340 Questionnaires returned, 42 did not respond to this question. The remaining 298 were analyzed to obtain a spectrum of attitudes of the faculty toward the decision-making process. Many faculty (including those responding to the question) expressed lack of knowledge of the decision-making process as it presently occurs. Since the question also was asked concerning who should be involved in decision-making, it was believed that the response to this part of the question was more meaningful as an indication of faculty attitudes toward the decision role of various segments of the campus.

The response to this question is shown in the following table. The results are based on 298 Questionnaires. The numbers indicate percentages based on this number.

The results of the table are plotted on the following eight bar charts for each unit considered. The black portions of the bars give a profile of the attitudes toward involvement (or non-involvement) in decision-making.

A qualitative interpretation of the results may be made by indicating degree of involvement in the decision-making process. As one moves up the hierarchy of administrative levels a particular decision may be reversed or vetoed. In essence, the State Board of Higher Education is the final authority in the decision-making chain. However, lower levels of the administrative hierarchy may have the experience and competence so that they can and should exert a major influence in a particular decision.
IN INVOLVEMENT IN DECISION MAKING
(BASED UPON 298 REPLIES)

☐ -PERCENT INDICATING THAT THE UNIT IS NOW INVOLVED (NOT RELIABLE BECAUSE OF LACK OF KNOWLEDGE OF DECISION-MAKING PROCESS).

☐ -PERCENT INDICATING THAT THE UNIT SHOULD BE INVOLVED (THOUGHT TO BE A RELIABLE INDICATION OF FACULTY ATTITUDE TOWARD INVOLVEMENT IN DECISION-MAKING PROCESS).

B -PERCENT INDICATING UNIT IS NOT AND SHOULD NOT BE INVOLVED (THOUGHT TO BE RELIABLE INDICATION OF WHO SHOULD NOT BE INVOLVED.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>INVOLVEMENT BY</th>
<th>STATE BOARD OF HIGHER ED.</th>
<th>EXECUTIVE DEAN</th>
<th>SCHOOL DEAN</th>
<th>FACULTY SENATE</th>
<th>DEPT. CHAIRMAN</th>
<th>DEPT. FACULTY</th>
<th>STUDENTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ACADEMIC</td>
<td>B-50.7</td>
<td>B-53.1</td>
<td>B-63.5</td>
<td>B-21.8</td>
<td>B-49.1</td>
<td>B-72.6</td>
<td>B-67.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PROGRAM</td>
<td>25.2</td>
<td>28.6</td>
<td>18.8</td>
<td>47.0</td>
<td>31.6</td>
<td>48.7</td>
<td>58.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GENERAL</td>
<td>B-51.4</td>
<td>B-38.6</td>
<td>B-38.6</td>
<td>B-21.8</td>
<td>B-52.6</td>
<td>B-23.2</td>
<td>B-37.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PERSONNEL</td>
<td>B-47.4</td>
<td>B-55.4</td>
<td>B-55.8</td>
<td>B-71.6</td>
<td>B-29.9</td>
<td>B-65.5</td>
<td>B-37.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POLICIES</td>
<td>B-27.9</td>
<td>B-38.3</td>
<td>B-35.6</td>
<td>B-47.4</td>
<td>B-33.3</td>
<td>B-46.7</td>
<td>B-46.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INDIVIDUAL</td>
<td>B-90.7</td>
<td>B-65.5</td>
<td>B-54.8</td>
<td>B-21.5</td>
<td>B-80.0</td>
<td>B-13.8</td>
<td>B-45.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PERSONNEL</td>
<td>B-8.4</td>
<td>B-30.9</td>
<td>B-39.6</td>
<td>B-73.6</td>
<td>B-10.5</td>
<td>B-78.6</td>
<td>B-31.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CASES</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>21.5</td>
<td>25.9</td>
<td>47.4</td>
<td>15.1</td>
<td>58.1</td>
<td>42.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CURRICULAR</td>
<td>B-62.5</td>
<td>B-69.2</td>
<td>B-71.9</td>
<td>B-27.2</td>
<td>B-50.0</td>
<td>B-21.5</td>
<td>B-16.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHANGES</td>
<td>B-15.6</td>
<td>B-17.8</td>
<td>B-13.8</td>
<td>B-44.0</td>
<td>B-28.6</td>
<td>B-49.7</td>
<td>B-59.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEWS</td>
<td>B-44.7</td>
<td>B-41.0</td>
<td>B-53.1</td>
<td>B-19.2</td>
<td>B-47.7</td>
<td>B-20.5</td>
<td>B-19.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PROGRAMS</td>
<td>B-50.4</td>
<td>B-53.1</td>
<td>B-41.0</td>
<td>B-74.6</td>
<td>B-44.7</td>
<td>B-70.2</td>
<td>B-63.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BUDGET &amp;</td>
<td>B-27.9</td>
<td>B-34.9</td>
<td>B-25.2</td>
<td>B-52.6</td>
<td>B-31.9</td>
<td>B-51.7</td>
<td>B-48.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FINANCIAL</td>
<td>76.3</td>
<td>66.5</td>
<td>55.4</td>
<td>80.3</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>68.9</td>
<td>25.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MATTERS</td>
<td>50.1</td>
<td>46.4</td>
<td>40.0</td>
<td>56.1</td>
<td>12.8</td>
<td>36.1</td>
<td>39.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A-34 Question 5
STUDENTS

ACADEMIC PROGRAM
GENERAL PERSONNEL POLICIES
INDIVIDUAL PERSONNEL CASES
CURRICULAR CHANGES
NEW PROGRAMS
BUDGET & FINANCIAL MATTERS

NOW INVOLVED
NOW INVOLVED & SHOULD BE INVOLVED
SHOULD BE INVOLVED
NOT NOW & SHOULD NOT BE INVOLVED
DEPARTMENT FACULTY

ACADEMIC PROGRAM
GENERAL PERSONNEL POLICIES
INDIVIDUAL PERSONNEL CASES
CURRICULAR CHANGES
NEW PROGRAMS
BUDGET & FINANCIAL MATTERS

NOW INVOLVED
NOW INVOLVED & SHOULD BE INVOLVED
SHOULD BE INVOLVED
NOT NOW & SHOULD NOT BE INVOLVED
NOW INVOLVED

A. DEPARTMENT CHAIRMEN

1. ACADEMIC PROGRAM
2. GENERAL PERSONNEL POLICIES
3. INDIVIDUAL PERSONNEL CASES
4. CURRICULAR CHANGES
5. NEW PROGRAMS
6. BUDGET & FINANCIAL MATTERS

NOW INVOLVED & SHOULD BE INVOLVED

SHOULDN'T BE INVOLVED

NOT NOW & SHOULD NOT BE INVOLVED
SCHOOL DEAN

ACADEMIC PROGRAM
GENERAL PERSONNEL POLICIES
INDIVIDUAL PERSONNEL CASES
CURRICULAR CHANGES
NEW PROGRAMS
BUDGET & FINANCIAL MATTERS

NOW INVOLVED
NOW INVOLVED
SHOULD BE INVOLVED
NOT NOW & SHOULD NOT BE INVOLVED
FACULTY SENATE

ACADEMIC PROGRAM
GENERAL PERSONNEL POLICIES
INDIVIDUAL PERSONNEL CASES
CURRICULAR CHANGES
NEW PROGRAMS
BUDGET & FINANCIAL MATTERS

- NOW INVOLVED
- NOW INVOLVED
- SHOULD BE INVOLVED
- NOT NOW & SHOULD NOT BE INVOLVED
NOW INVOLVED | NOW INVOLVED & SHOULD BE INVOLVED | SHOULD BE INVOLVED | NOT NOW & SHOULD NOT BE INVOLVED
---|---|---|---

ACADEMIC PROGRAM
GENERAL PERSONNEL POLICIES
INDIVIDUAL PERSONNEL CASES
CURRICULAR CHANGES
NEW PROGRAMS
BUDGET & FINANCIAL MATTERS
Therefore, on the basis of the responses indicated by the square (□) symbols in the above table the following qualitative scale is developed as an indication of faculty attitudes on what should be the involvement of various segments on the campus:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Percentage Range</th>
<th>Number Rating</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0 to 10%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 to 20%</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 to 30%</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 to 40%</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40 to 50%</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greater than 50%</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

On this basis, the data were interpreted according to the following table:

**INVolvement IN DECISION MAKING**

(BASED ON 258 REPLIES)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>INVOLVEMENT DECISION</th>
<th>BY</th>
<th>HIGHER ED</th>
<th>EXECUTIVE DEAN</th>
<th>SCHOOL DEAN</th>
<th>FACULTY SENATE</th>
<th>DEPT. CHAIRMAN</th>
<th>DEPT. FACULTY</th>
<th>STUDENTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ACADEMIC PROGRAM</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GENERAL PERSONNEL POLICIES</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INDIVIDUAL PERSONNEL CASES</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CURRICULAR CHANGES</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEW PROGRAMS</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BUDGET &amp; FINANCIAL MATTERS</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5 = Involved
0 = Not Involved
Selected Comments

* Students should be involved on a discussion but not a decision basis. A distinction between the Office of Executive Dean and President are unknown to me.

* School Deans should have strong concentration of power with weak overall administration which would allow individual schools to grow at different rates in different directions.

* In general, many decisions on policy are made on the administrative level without consultation of the faculty -- decisions which determine policy of the unit for many years.

* I think there is a remarkable involvement of all concerned.

* Student participation is desirable to the extent that their ideas appear to reflect the present without reacting very far into the past or future. Their ideas tend to shake loose the complacency of an established pattern or system and revive the thoughts of the future developments and problems.

* In reality there are degrees of involvement and meaning. My thought is that we have too much involvement by too many on many questions these days.

* I hope that at some point in this study of University goals there will be an opportunity for the faculty who wish to form cross campus study groups to study some of these topics related to curriculum development on a broader basis. Groups of 16 drawn at random from those interested might really ferment some meaningful changes in order to make what is being done more effective. I realize the honors program is designated in this way for the superior student, but we need more graduates who will be taxpayers and elected representatives in the State Legislature and local government groups who control funds, who have experience and break away from the traditional so that in the future they will influence others to view education as a more significant force in society.

* As to student participation, it should be accomplished by giving ear to legitimate complaints. I strongly feel that first responsibility is serving the need of the undergraduate.

* Too many policies are handed down from the Executive Office without faculty being aware that such are being considered. Someone has to eventually make a decision. This is the responsibility of the administrators. However, there should be better lines of communication and seeking of consultation and the development of policy items by the faculty who will be effected by these rather than the administration making the arbitrary decisions.
ANALYSIS OF RESPONSES

Question 6

One of the major problems facing the University is allocation of resources, with respect to the adoption of new programs and the review and continuation of existing programs. Under these circumstances, please check the alternative below that you believe would be the most desirable:

a) Continue all existing programs and establish new programs on a "boot strap" basis. (Specify Programs)

b) Eliminate some existing programs and establish new ones which would be in keeping with the goals of the University and the needs of society. (Specify Programs)

c) Continue existing programs and establish no new programs. (Comments)

d) Eliminate some existing programs. Establish no new programs, and develop excellence in the remaining programs. (Specify programs)

Well over 80% of those responding favored alternative (b) wherein all existing as well as new programs must be evaluated and priorities set in accordance with the stated goals of the institution. Many believed that the "boot strap" operation had been a way of life too long at the University and this constituted deficit spending of human and physical resources. They believed that this stemmed from a general reluctance to present viable new programs.

Several considerations emerge which require thoughtful consideration.

- Rather than eliminating programs consider consolidation and re-orientation.

- Establish flexibility for changing needs. Rigid commitment to today's needs may mean obsolescence in tomorrow's environment.

- Develop unique and novel programs using the strengths of the University as a basis.

- Provide for continuous evaluation of programs through an appropriate body.
Selected Comments

* I would encourage the following:  
  a) creation of a viable University Extension Service, or substantial reorganization of the Cooperative Extension Service, in order to serve new audiences and respond to new needs,  
  b) give some consideration to the formation of a Research Institute, perhaps on the form of Stanford Research Institute, which would draw on the expertise of the university for those research projects which can be identified with specific beneficiaries. The basic idea here would be to identify the "service" function as being a legitimate objective of the university, but to make the form in which this objective is obtained highly visible and substantially separate from the "quest for truth" function of the university.

* This procedure (boot strap) has long been established.

* Develop a school of Earth or Atmospheric Sciences or a school of Oceanography. Develop Ph. D. programs in certain areas of Humanities and Social Science. At first, develop interschool task forces and institutes even to attack interdisciplinary problems, such as human problems, over population, city core problems, pollution. Such groups should be funded or allowed to receive funds so as to make real contribution.

* This watered down (boot strap) approach makes everyone look bad except the administrators. It has resulted in the present deterioration of the quality of teaching. I would suggest a continuous reviewing of existing programs and vigorous pursuit of new programs. Bootstrapping may easily eliminate desirable programs.

* Establishment of programs should be determined by demand. We are here to serve the people of Oregon.

* New programs will flourish if given a start and if they prove their excellence. We need a strengthening of most of our existing programs.

* Establishment of graduate programs need not necessarily be on a bootstrap basis. It just may require adjustments and priorities. If a program is worthwhile, it should be funded. If it is old or new and worthless it should be eliminated. The notion of money is secondary in the decision of whether the program should or should not be operational.

* There should be reduction of duplication of effort between Schools and in Schools.
Almost everything we have done is a bootstrap operation.

The State of Oregon must be prepared to move forward in the support of viable new programs if they are to continue to have high quality educational institutions. We are victims of a syndrome in that we are afraid to present viable new programs to the State on their own strength. We have already bootstrapped too many programs and many of our understaffing problems stem from this.

Establish minority student programs involving major experimentation in admission and recruitment of significant Oregon minority groups.

Honors program could be served by students enrolling in challenging graduate level series.

There should be a special council of the Faculty Senate that would conduct a continuous evaluation of on-going programs of the University.

Require better English proficiency of all students. Require broader Humanities and Social Science training for students in the Technologies. Require more Science and Technology in Liberal Arts students. Eliminate necessity to elect a major immediately upon entrance. Permit a one or two year searching experience first.

A major attempt should be made to develop excellence by whatever means necessary in some, if not all, programs that support the overall goals. Through regular review it should be possible to delete those programs which are outdated and have little student support and it should be possible to consolidate some programs and/or courses where there might be duplication.

No university can excel in all its programs. Schools and Departments of a university develop an outstanding program which is recognized nationwide. New programs to fulfill society's needs should be established, if possible. It seems that an efficient relevant organization should evaluate programs and eliminate them continuously. I would suggest eliminating programs not directly concerned with academics. Eliminate small departments and most courses where enrollments are regularly low. Faculty is not always honest about the need for new programs.

Relevancy of programs should be approved by a vote of Faculty Senate after review and recommendation of a Senate committee appointed for that purpose.
Urban studies, regional economic planning, economics of human resource development are important courses. Needs of society are continually changing. We must review existing programs and encourage new ones to meet the needs. Possibly rather than eliminating programs, a new focus could be taken. Perhaps intercollegiate athletics should be reviewed and isolated from the university. Skills courses are out of place in a university setting. This is more than a valley community college.

Do not try to compete with the University of Oregon in Humanities and Arts. Try to develop something unique at Oregon State based upon its strength in the Science and professional schools.

More outside review should be used to help individuals evaluate their effectiveness in departmental efforts. Small departments with less than five faculty should be merged. Relocate departments into more meaningful combinations.

How has the emphasis of budgetary support and curricula been evaluated over the years so that it is more clearly parallel with students desires.

De-emphasis of extra-mural athletics and emphasis on intra-mural athletics. Emphasize problems of man in both his social and physical environment.

Any top institution should have some "risk capital" to experiment with new programs. There is need to reach the appropriating bodies and budgeting officials and to get them to understand this.

University requirements in general need to be revised, particularly in English, Chemistry and Science. The Honors program seriously needs strengthening. It is very important to implement the concept of the interdisciplinary approach in university education.

Consolidation might be a better alternative than to eliminate. I refer, particularly, to curriculum and course consolidation. Many instances occur where departments, school and inter-school consolidation should take place, but vested interests change very, very slowly. After consolidation we can well strengthen the program.

As admission pressures slowly grow, restrict size of student body while raising admission standards. Plan for moderate excellence.

Some means should be developed to build flexibility into the allocation of resources. As a member of a young and growing department I feel that the present system is stifling to any kind of growth.
* There is always a tendency to continue programs regardless of whether they have accomplished their mission or goals or continue to do so.

* New good programs will contribute to the University. The University should not start programs just to have new programs, however. There is a point where a size is a handicap. Pressure for growth from existing programs will be great. Some programs need to develop excellence.

* Unless funded and definite need is established, all existing programs should be justified by review. New programs should satisfy a unique need not now being satisfied.

* What are needed are standards of funding and priorities which the University will accept and agree to with respect to establishment of new programs. We are less and less able to support new programs without watering down further established areas. No new programs should be inaugurated before making certain that Library resources can support them. The institution needs fewer programs in which it can develop excellence.
ANALYSIS OF RESPONSES

Question 7

Do you believe significant inadequacies exist in the decision-making framework at Oregon State University? Yes ___ No ___ If yes, what should be done to improve upon these inadequacies? Please be specific.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>No Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>174</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Selected Comments

* Decisions should be made by a Dean who gathers around him the best instructors, researchers and scholars. Consultation and advice should be sought freely. Department Heads can administer effectively and efficiently. Communication needs to exist between the lower and higher echelons. Faculty should always have its say or contribution before decisions are made.

* More decisions should be made by faculties, fewer by administration and faculty should include a broader based faculty. No faculty member should be on more than one committee.

* Greater autonomy in the use of funds should be housed in the individual Schools.

* Most current problems can be related to the ability of the faculty to involve themselves in major decisions of the University. By ability I mean both willingness and organization of the faculty and also the attitudes of the administrators to permit and encourage faculty decision-making. This is an evolutionary process and I believe the faculty has considerable obligation to assume a larger and responsible role in the decision-making process. In other words, more faculty involvement and more honesty and openness at all levels of the University. The existing structures are satisfactory, but perform at their maximum by enlightened and inspiring dynamic leadership. Some regrouping and changing of present organization of schools might be in order.

* The State allocation system inhibits its initiative since local decisions are often avoided, altered and stopped because of the allocation system.
Promotion and tenure should be the decision of membership both inside and outside the department.

Let there be a real debate, first of all, of the role of the University. Let there be honest consultation and straight from the shoulder communication between the administration and the faculty. Let us tell the truth about our present condition.

Students should be involved in providing information for promotion and tenure and faculty should be involved in evaluation of administrators. At the department level, all faculty should be more directly involved in departmental policy on future goals and programs, appointments, budgets, promotion and tenure. At the presidential level, greater use could be made of Academic Deans. While faculty should be involved in these activities, they should not administer. They should give the charge to the administrator and hold them responsible. Decisions by committee is ridiculous.

Communication is appalling. In four years of teaching I don't know where the real centers of decision-making are. The faculty should be kept informed of the decision-making procedures, processes and status of each. There are many areas which are now diffused and responsibility without authority exists. All decisions should reflect the total aims and objectives of the University.

Committee responsibilities are not clear.

Decision-making in the School and Department apparently do not allow for dissent among the faculty. The faculty appear to have little true voice in the School decisions since committees are appointed, not elected. It is difficult to find out who really makes the decisions and seldom does the administrators and faculty make direct, honest statements about decisions being made. The true rationale behind a decision should be given.

Too much authority rests with the Faculty Senate. The educational program is their primary responsibility and there should be some other division of responsibility and authority for other matters.

There is too much reliance on committees. Committees tend to be fickle, easily stampeded, anonymous and not responsible for their actions. Committees should recommend, not decide.

Establish a democratic framework rather than the military chain of command now in existence.
Establish a thorough going democracy out of the pleas of so many, or use a democratic process to elect men to be responsible for this and that. Give them the authority to do so, and then fire them if they fail, to be replaced by someone else who can do the job. The problem is obviously that we speak democracy but we don't practice it.

Inadequacies exist in the decision-making framework probably at the individual staff member level. He should be responsible for his activity, his productivity and general contribution. If everyone does his part, the administrative function becomes primarily that of assisting in the attainment of individual goals and hence should be more productive for all concerned. Until the total faculty is improved academically, it is simply not strong enough to improve the situation at the University.

The decision-making power on general academic policies should be in the hands of a strong, fairly-apportioned Faculty Senate.

The inadequacies are, in particular, in permitting people who have no expertise in specific fields to function or attempt to function as judges of the efficiency and operation of those fields. I refer specifically to committees who step beyond their prescribed advisory functions and attempt to exert administrative functions without taking responsibility for their acts. Committee and administrative details are left in the hands of a committee with no real authority.

We suffer greatly from a tradition of major decisions being made at the top and our present tendency is for faculty and students to be a bit disgruntled and to rubber stamp most things.

Make the School decision-makers subject to the rules, and reviewed by School faculty at regular intervals.

An effective leader listens to his subordinates viewpoints and makes his own decisions and takes the responsibility for the outcome.

Initiate office of ombudsman. Invest more authority in the existing administrative structure and less in committee-appointed chores. Abolish the Faculty-Senate.

My opinion is that most administrators are so involved in details that they frequently can't see the forest because of the trees. Greater use of administrative assistants would seem to be one way to help this situation. Better communication between levels is needed. Administrators should regard this as a primary responsibility.
Strengthen the power of the Faculty Senate. Strengthen the power of the faculty by School meetings. Make Deans responsible to the faculty.

At present the Faculty-Senate seems to be dominated by people who love to talk, but who are not truly representative of staff members. All Senate members should not have the right to vote on all program change recommendations. They do not know about the problems of the Schools.

The decision-making execution in the area of interdisciplinary programs often leaves much to be desired.

A statement of mission, aims, and goals would provide a strong foundation for the basis of decision within the existing framework.
ANALYSIS OF RESPONSES

Question 8

Do you believe significant difficulties exist at Oregon State University with the present organizational structure? Yes ____ No ____ If so, what are these difficulties? Please be specific.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>No Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>149 (44)</td>
<td>132 (39)</td>
<td>59 (17)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Selected Comments

* The traditional alignment of academic programs and departments does not fit today's need. We need re-alignment in keeping with realities of contemporary social needs and demands.

* The organization at higher levels must be responsive and flexible in order to have progress and high morale. More cooperation is needed among departments and programs, especially in teaching programs and development.

* Reduce the size of the academic senate to about one-quarter of its present size and put on well recognized, outstanding faculty.

* Administration is looked upon as a mandate to over-run and over-ride the faculty. A down-graded faculty is a resentful one.

* The academic deans have too much power. The faculty cannot get to them and the administration won't because of tradition. Administration makes final decisions regardless of faculty desires. We need better lines of communication between administration and faculty.

* We need a reorganization of some schools into smaller groups wherein the departments have close, professional relationships.

* The present format is satisfactory but there should be an Executive Dean to coordinate extension for the whole University and we need a better arrangement to coordinate our international programs.
Intercollegiate sports should be isolated from all University functions. There should be improvements in purchasing to avoid delays.

The trend toward administration by committee is much too pronounced. Responsibility, authority and accountability must be co-equal and co-extensive for good administration to be possible.

The Dean of Faculty's position is ill-defined.

The Faculty Senate is too cumbersome. We should consider adopting a Federal system -- a system with one representative from each department and a chamber of nominating boards in each department. The Senate appears now to be long on authority and short on responsibility.

The present administrative alignment into schools and departments tends to make meaningful interdisciplinary relevant research almost impossible. A restructuring of the research effort seems needed so that the task force approach addressed to problems can be organized. Funding should be done from block funds if they become available. The scientists, social scientists and engineers must learn one another's methods and language. There is almost no organizational structure for directing and managing contemporary research projects.

The Athletic Department should be put directly under the control of the Faculty Senate.

A structure is needed to provide two-way contact with the citizens of the State to share resources of knowledge and learn of real needs.

The major organizational difficulty that I foresee is the relationship between Departments and other forms of administrative units including Institutes and Centers. Departments are discipline-oriented. Institutes and Centers are problem-oriented. Perhaps some combination of the two is a viable situation, but considerable attention should be given to addressing this question.

It is sometimes difficult to know, or to find out, who will make what decision. This gives the impression of buck passing, sometimes in the form of referring decisions to committees. It is also difficult to ascertain where the Faculty Senate's authority and responsibility ends and the Administration's begins. As for the Senate, I believe it has a tendency to be long on authority and short on responsibility. I am suspicious of articulate professors, particularly young ones, who organize caucus to push through questionable legislation.
What changes in organizational structure would you recommend at Oregon State University? (Please be as specific and as detailed as you wish. You need not confine yourself to organizational changes that would affect your administrative unit.)

Selected Comments

* Any answer is surely incomplete. I would suggest that consideration be given to the formation of, for example, a faculty of economics, a faculty of biology, a faculty of engineering, etc. These faculties might serve as substitutes to the current departments. Centers or Institutes, then, as broad, problem-oriented organizations, might serve to bridge the gap between disciplines. In this respect, I am implying, that organization along two lines, discipline and problem-orientation, would be consistent and complimentary over time.

* Create a new school of Mathematical Science and perhaps split the School of Science into a School of Physical Science and a School of Biological Science. The extension programs should be divorced from the University and handled on a DCE basis. Athletics should be de-emphasized and ROTC courses should not have academic stature.

* Designate terms for Chairmans and Deans. Dean of Faculty should represent the faculty to the administration. Democratic decision-making at the departmental level is necessary. We also need to develop some means of promoting inter-departmental and interdisciplinary communication.

* Institutes and Centers should exist in physical structure and not on paper only because the latter drastically reduces the resources of the University.

* Create a strong Graduate School in Humanities and Social Science.

* Why is Oceanography not a School?

* Organizational structure, as such, is rarely a deterrent to effective operation. Of greater importance is the quality of the individual faculty and capabilities of the administration and service units. If everyone
does his job with a commonness of purpose and direction, the existing organization should be entirely satisfactory. There needs to be some separation of responsibilities so that one man has only one boss-- the one who pays him. Establish University-wide faculties for people in a discipline on a voluntary basis and with essentially no control of personnel or budget to conduct course offerings and offer degrees outside departments. These should not be administrative units competing with established programs.

* Committees should be a part of every staff member's duties. Assignments should not be entirely on a voluntary or requested basis but should be in line with the individual's training and expertise. Unqualified persons should not sit on Faculty committees.

* We need an ombudsman type administrator to mediate some of the current student problems.

* Whatever is necessary to sensitize administrators that subordinates need to know.

* De-emphasize the belief that excellent academicians make excellent administrators.

* Encourage greater cross-department and cross-school academic development by participation of faculty in new programs. The present structure leads to provinciality.

* Reorganize with efficiency in mind. The delegation of power, authority and charges so as not to waste thousands of man-hours and energy and time.

* We need a vice-president to help the President.

* Four or five Vice Presidents with clear-cut authority and definition of areas of responsibilities. Eliminate departments as such and establish administrative units with common interests.

* Individual schools should be responsible for admission, retention and graduation requirements for their schools. Abolish University requirements.

* Review and consolidation of departments to form fewer but more effective administrative units.

* External evaluation of all departments.
A merit system approach to management to key organizational units, thus Deans and Department Heads should be subject to removal from above or below if their performance is not satisfactory. Consolidation of small departments wherever practical to eliminate duplication in administration staff. Develop stronger administrative control of Centers and Institutes so that "empire builders" do not proceed to the disadvantage of departments and schools.

* For one thing, a means of interdisciplinary working together concerning programs, curricular revisions, new projects, and some rotation plan to involve people from other departments.

* Suggest that responsibilities and service of Oregon State University be considered in a broad sense under several functions. Resident instruction, education, post graduate and undergraduate research, extension education, all activities that take education to people off campus as well as short courses, continuing education, etc. that may be held on campus. Suggest that all Schools, Departments and faculty reorganize or recognize a responsibility of themselves and their unit to perform all of these functions in varying degrees, depending upon their funding and priority of mission. Would suggest that the research, extension, and service function be coordinated at the School and Department level in all Schools and to round out top administrative level at a Dean of Extension along with Dean of Research and a Dean of Faculty.


Note: The following response to Question 9 is one of the most detailed received. The response is given in total.

* In my opinion, the term "DEAN" is more closely associated with the academic process than with the administrative process. To improve communications and to clarify duties, I would recommend that the titles for some positions be changed and responsibilities be shifted accordingly. Here are some thoughts on the subject:
UNIVERSITY ADMINISTRATION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>New Title</th>
<th>Present Title</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>President</td>
<td>Same</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provost</td>
<td>Dean of Administration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vice President for Academic Affairs</td>
<td>Dean of Faculty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vice President for Business Affairs</td>
<td>Director of Business Affairs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vice President for Development and Research</td>
<td>Dean of Research</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vice President for Student Affairs</td>
<td>Dean of Students</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Under these officers would be:

Dean (s) of Men/women/students, etc.
Registrar
Director of Admissions
Treasurer
Budget Director
Etc.

(The above would be permanent appointments with or without courtesy academic rank)

UNIVERSITY FACULTY

There is much confusion and uncertainty of who is in charge under present system. I feel the need of one policy and suggest that the following be considered.

1. **Dean of Faculty**
   a. Permanent appointment made by the administration. Appointment to be made after a University Faculty screening committee had made a search and presented not less than three acceptable candidates.

   or
b. Elected by the faculty to serve a term of five years. A nominations committee would select a slate of candidates and faculty would vote. The administration would select from the top two or three candidates. The Dean of Faculty would serve a maximum of two terms. No "outside" candidates would be considered.

2. **Dean of School**
   
a. Permanent appointment made by administration. Appointment made after School Faculty screening committee had made a search and presented not less than three acceptable candidates.

   or

b. Elected by the faculty of the school to serve a term of five years, or a maximum of two terms. A nominations committee would select a slate of candidates, faculty would vote, and administration would select from top two or three candidates. Outside candidates would not be considered.

3. **Department Heads or Chairmen**
   
a. Department Heads - Permanent appointment made by the Administration. Appointment made by Dean of School after Department had screened candidates and presented not less than three acceptable candidates.

   or

b. Elected by the faculty of the Department to serve for a term of five years, or a maximum of two terms. Each faculty member would vote for one or more colleagues whom he thought to be qualified to do the job. Dean of School would select from top two or three candidates. Outside candidates would not be considered.

It is important that people work together. Professional competence, ability to direct others, and academic freedom (or loss of) are often confused by both administrator and faculty. The faculty must expect that some toes will be stepped on if the administrator is to be effective in the conduct of his position. The administrator must expect that most of the academic matters will be settled by the faculty,
and that he must work with, not against the faculty, in such matters as curriculum, appointment and termination, rank and title, promotion and tenure, and departmental business procedures.

In the final analysis, machinery must exist whereby an incompetent administrator can be replaced in a fair and just manner, without the presence of popular trends and political forces, and popularity contests.

I feel strongly that one, and only one, policy should apply to appointment and termination of school and department administrators. I am opposed to the gossip which accompanies elections.
A list of various criteria mentioned by respondents follows:

- Commitment to teaching
- Research and writing
- Personal relationships
- Longevity
- Committee service
- Threats to leave
- Politics
- Productivity and Achievement
- Research
- Publication
- Popularity
- Professional attainment
- Ability to draw research money
- Make the right contacts
- Work accomplished
- Time on job
- Research performance
- Degrees
- Openings created by death or retirement
- Tenacity
- Subject matter taught

Selected Comments

* A systematic professional faculty review and recommendation of all matters affecting faculty status. In short, professional criteria developed by professionals in each field.

* I am not sure that the stated ones are the real ones. I have tenure but no one told me why. In fact, I have tried to figure out how I am evaluated with little meaningful results. How many people on campus know why they did or did not get their raise? Was last year's work good, bad, average and in what respect?

* I have reason to believe that there are no clear-cut policies in most Schools. Policy varies from School to School.

* Research productivity, holding of advanced degrees, and occasionally teaching performance, personal friendliness, cooperativeness with higher-ups, informal estimates of competence.

* For academic and administrative personnel, promotion and tenure is based on job performance, length of time in position, assuming more and difficult responsibilities, the ability to accept more responsibility which not everyone can or wants to do.
In our department promotion is determined without any real criteria that are stated or followed. This is unfortunate. A tenure staff committee makes tenure recommendation, but the chairman does not follow the criteria set up by the Department and Committee.

The criteria seems to be a deep, dark secret. I would like to know if it is teaching evaluation by student, faculty and administrators, if it is research publications as well as quality research. Some research that has been published hardly deserves the space it took to publish it, much less the money and time it took to do it.

Professional performance, personal preference of supervisor and/or Department Heads and Deans. Within our School I have no reason to believe that the guidelines set forth by the School are not in good use. Final decisions are based on the judgment of the appropriate administrative professional personnel. An individual's assignment is important and judgment on productivity as they pertain to promotion and tenure consideration must take this into consideration.

Just about any you want to mention and with great variation. This may not be bad, in fact, insistence on too much uniformity and conformity may be worse than the present pattern. I would be on record as saying that "publish and perish" may be misleading and other more personal readings must be included.

"Publish" or "perish" is a hackneyed phrase but, unfortunately, describes promotion and tenure policies for too many individuals at Oregon State. I won't argue that this curse effects every individual, but I do know that certain Departments have lost excellent teachers because of this criteria. The quality of teaching and service work are important in promotion and tenure decisions and need to be more systematically concerned in all cases.

Excellence in performance, be it either in administration, instruction, research, extension, or public relations.

As far as I am aware, no stated policies or guidelines exist. Some guidelines have been developed by ad hoc committees charged with advising on promotion and tenure, but these do not extend beyond the Department lines or even beyond the lines of the ad hoc committee.

In Schools and Departments where the procedures are known to me, I believe main criteria is productivity and research and next in importance is teaching ability. However, I feel there is still too much weight given to the University and community service and longevity. The main problem with using research productivity as a criterion is that there is difficulty in assessing one's intangible contribution to society. In other words, the tabulation of titles of papers is not enough.
ANALYSIS OF RESPONSES

Question 11

What criteria do you believe should be used for the granting of tenure and for promotion at Oregon State University?

Selected Comments

* Prediction of what an individual will do in the next twenty years. Minimum standards should be proficiency in teaching.

* Excellence in teaching or research or community service, but not mediocrity in all three. I would not expect anyone to be good in all three, but they should be outstanding in at least one of them.

* Excellence of performance in one or more of the following dependent upon unique strengths of the individual: instruction, research, administration, extension activities, university or public service, advising and counseling of students.

* Recognition of individual in his particular field by members within his department and members outside the university. Judgment should be based on quality and quantity of his contribution in teaching or research, such as teaching the staff members attract graduate students. Research: does staff member make a contribution which is recognized by persons in similar field?

* Development of criteria for use in granting tenure and promotion should be at department or school level. They should take into account, the assignment of duty to the individual, and recognize the necessity for developing an objective method for measuring such methods as teaching, service and professionalism. Measurement of research efforts through quality and quantity of publication.

* Progress of the university, whether it is through published research, program development, effective teaching, or any other way, promotion should be based on significant, rather than routine contributions. Neither promotion or tenure should be automatic for someone who merely does his job.

* Primarily for good performance of assigned duties, assuming that the assigned duties are furthering the achievement of the university goals.
This depends on the primary activity of the individual. If he's primarily in research, judge on research activities, teaching ability, and service, in that order. If he's primarily a teacher, judge on teaching ability, student opinion, research ability and service to the University.

Those activities which advance the quality of education at Oregon State University or in some way promote the institution, golfing at the Country Club excluded.

Each faculty member should be made clearly aware of his duties and responsibilities. Performance should then be judged by the faculty members, peers, both in his own department and in other departments. Deans should override the recommendations of department heads only in rare cases and only after full discussion with the department head and faculty member involved.

Professors should devote their classroom time to the subject they are supposed to teach. Good teaching ability, professional competence. This would disqualify persons who talk about Viet Nam in class. It would also provide tenure for persons of any political and/or activist inclination whatsoever, provided that they confine their activities to their own time and meet the other qualifications.

Each department should have its own clearly define and publically proclaimed criteria.

Teaching ability, general knowledge of subject area, research skill.

Scholarship and only scholarship. I recognize that some people would list good teaching here, but I have never understood how teaching, research and other professional activities could be separated from one another at university level.

Excellence of all aspects of scholarly endeavor with student plus colleague evaluation of teaching and external evaluation of research excellence.

Excellence in teaching if that is the task. Excellence in research if that is the task. Excellence in administration if that is the task. Excellence in a combination of tasks if that is the assignment.

The problem is not one of criteria, but the pressure that tenure puts on those making the decisions on promotion and tenure. How do you get rid of a non-productive or inactive staff member once he has tenure. This problem clouds how evaluators promote and give tenure. We have alot of deadwood that we don't seem to be able to get rid of.
* Production in area of responsibility, teaching, research, extension, administration, individual efforts toward self-improvement, constructive support regarding the goals of administrative unit.

* Achievement of a "level of professionalism" in teaching and research with an apparent recognition of the need for a "balance" of the two. Ability to administer to the functions of these elements effectively.

* Outstanding teaching record with at least a few good graduate students finishing successful projects and receiving Ph.D.'s within five years of original appointment. In some cases, it is impossible for a man to conduct graduate work. In these instances, other contributions in addition to teaching might serve to qualify a man for promotion and tenure.

* Teaching, sincerity and willingness to do more than minimum endeavor, research and publications. However, I do not feel that research and publications should be the overriding consideration. This can be overemphasized to the detriment of those who may excel in teaching. The excellent teacher should be promoted.

* Excellence in teaching, emphasis upon this over research and publication, excellence in research secondary to teaching, promotion based on merit either in research or teaching without regard to a quota system. If a man excels in teaching, he should not be punished for a lack in research and publishing and if he excels in research, he should not be punished for a lack in teaching. Some individuals are excellent teachers while others are excellent for research workers, but not both.

* Teaching ability based on course content reviews by students, department chairmen and the teacher's own peers. Ability to carry on a meaningful research program which is of current importance and has future implications. Ability to intellectually communicate with students and peers.

* In the tremendous variety of programs at Oregon State University criteria MUST vary in different branches. More important that in any given jurisdiction, the criteria be clearly stated and equitably applied. It may be necessary to use different sets of criteria in the same School, depending upon the professional requirement of the area concerned. I do not believe a single set of criteria possible for History and English.
* Intensive study needed for this. However, excellence in instruction and excellence in professional disciplinary work should be weighted far more heavily than they are. At the present, standards appear to be historical rather than anticipatory in nature.

* Scholarly performance as evidenced by both teaching and research, service to public and University, service to Department and School. Evaluate criteria in relation to job assignment and not apply willy-nilly to all individuals.

* If an individual professor is appointed to do research on a 3/4 time basis, I would make the decision three-fourths dependent upon his research progress, results, and publications. I think the quality of teaching, research, and service work should all affect the promotion and tenure decision, but only in proportion to the commitment in the respective areas.
**ANALYSIS OF RESPONSES**

**Question 12**

What criteria should be used to judge the performance of:

a) The University  
b) Your School  
c) Your Department

**Selected Comments**

* Performance of its main product - students. Productivity of its staff. Its humane treatment of all persons - students, staff and patrons in the State. *(This latter criterion is not irrelevant).*

* The excellence of the faculty to attract outstanding students; to offer courses that are meaningful to them, and finally, providing motivation to students to seek excellence in their areas of professional activity.

* These criteria are infinite. The positive measure of each is the contribution in the past, present, or anticipated future to the people of the State of Oregon.

* The performance of our products after graduating or judged by how well they do. I really do not know how one goes about learning this. Are we really keeping up in a significant number of areas? *(compared with Universities of substantial reputations).*

* The achievements of its graduates. How it stands among other Land Grant universities. The accomplishments of its faculty. Its image as seen by the general public.

* Its ability to respond quickly to needs of students and residents of state. However, I would urge that we recognize the difference between needs and desires. Students desire may be short term and not good for the University.

* Ability of graduates to perform satisfactorily professionally and in society. Ability of graduates to handle academic work at other leading universities. Significant research by staff and graduates.
Awards and honors to staff and graduates. Performance of schools in national competitive exams. Faculty publications. Faculty leadership in international and national societies. Leadership of graduates in industry and government.

* Quality of entering and leaving students. Measures of innovation and change in programs of instruction and curriculums. Public (Oregon) satisfaction and pride in the University. Degree status of faculty.

* Some measure of whether we are producing whole human beings who have more than a technical training and skill, people who are sensitive to the social, political, environmental, and personal needs of other men; the principles of academic freedom for students and artistic life of the university; support for and position of the Library in university life; the general intellectual climate of opinion.

* Its impact "outside" - on the student, the region, the state, etc. - "internal criteria" are almost useless in true evaluation of the University.

* Evaluation of the graduate as a person whose general education has begun in the proper direction, and not as a finely trained technician. The latter is more the function of a trade school.

* Development of individuals as people and citizens; creativeness in research, art, teaching, or whatever; leaders in problem solving and understanding of many points of view.

* Development of course work and classes taught - evaluate acceptance for worthwhile content. Establishment of strong research units - interdepartment programs, grant applications and approvals, presentation of scholarly works.

* Should depend on its total contribution to our society.

* The achievement of moral values of its graduates. The performance of social service of its students and faculty members.

* Performance of its graduates and the contributions they make to the state, nation, and their families. Next should be the performance of the staff.

* Relevant programs that help young people to reach their highest potential and to make their best contribution to society. The contribution of the University to the improvement of the education of the people of the state; of the economy; and of the environment of the state.
The success of graduates professionally and as citizens. The contributions made toward material, social, environmental, and esthetic gains for the citizens of Oregon. This includes additions to the bank of knowledge that may be of value in the future.

Does its faculty hold to high standards of scholarship; does it challenge its students to change their mode of thinking and to face reality; does it take a moral course (as opposed to an expedient course) in all that it does?

The excellence of its graduates, the services provided to the state, the research contribution to the fields of knowledge housed at the University.

Are its research and teaching functions dealing with the real problems of the people and its students? Does the University function in effective ways to relate to those problems?

The intellectual achievement of its faculty and students, that is, the level to which they can and do think independently of degrees received, salaries commanded, or social position or acceptability. More particularly, the intellectual contributions they make and the love of learning that the faculty transmits or the student acquires.

The quality of the educational program offered. The number of students served. The effectiveness of teaching techniques, there are too many instructors either not trained or not interested in presenting their subjects so that the students get the maximum from the courses. Research program underway and accomplishments.

Balance in advanced degree programs (we do not have it), with some super-excellent areas, world-recognized. Balance does not mean equality in mediocrity, but it does mean we have all major areas of human endeavor covered with a viable, advanced degree program, with some major areas considered extraordinary.

Leadership of faculty and ex-students; teaching standards. Recognition of faculty for teaching, research, professional accomplishments, humaneness.

The general strength of all departments in the University. At this University, there are some weak areas. The most important task facing this University is the strengthening of the Arts, Humanities and Social Sciences. Another important factor in judging this University would be in its treatment of minority groups and its response to the constructive creative forces of its younger faculty and responsible students.
It is my opinion that the three units considered in this section should function in unity and harmony with each other so that the criteria used to judge one should be applicable in equal measure to the other two. Subdivision for administrative convenience need not color the purposes or objectives of any part of the organization. In all cases, criteria should involve the cultural contributions to the student who may be considered alone or as society as a whole. Breadth of knowledge and experience should overshadow narrow training and the requirements of each unit should serve as a system of checks and balances to achieve this purposefully. Similarly all three units should be judged by their research programs regardless of the semantic impasse of the terms basic and applied.

1) Its ability to maintain neutrality and a questioning environment on all current issues, 2) its tolerance of any activities which do not endanger life and property, 3) its ability to act decisively in situations where life and/or property are endangered, 4) the degree of satisfaction of its graduating students, 5) the extent of its communication directly with the public - not with specialists at other universities - of information which bears upon public problems.

This is equivalent to asking what should the goals be. A one-sentence criteria would be the efficient, enjoyable development of individuals capable of thoughtfully assaulting the challenges of the future. This type of criteria is, unfortunately, quite unmeasurable. In addition, it is essentially intangible and unattainable. Thus we can only proceed toward it. The means of measuring progress is to establish some short range, tangible goals consistent with current needs and understanding and then measure our progress against them and periodically re-evaluate the short-range goals.

How well it meets students' academic needs, their personal needs, professional and social needs, understanding of themselves, their culture, the role of a democratic society and its citizens. Research and professional preparation must not be overlooked. What are our "products" doing and how do they do it after they leave the University?

The ability to provide resources to the community to meet the educational needs of those making use of its resources - for example - providing for the full-time student - for the graduate student, for the working student - for those who want adult education courses for self-enrichment; for those in industry who want special training for their personnel ... etc... (higher education to produce the "well-rounded personality."
Scholarship (as judged by peer evaluation, here and elsewhere) and teaching (as judged by peer and student evaluation) I feel are of equal weight. Service to other kinds as a secondary category.

Overall rating of the University, of which it is a part. Quality and productivity of faculty, administrative effectiveness, salary levels and support, productivity of its research program, acceptance and performance of its graduates, accreditation by appropriate professional societies, its statements of objectives and mission, ranking by its peer groups on a nationwide basis.

The quality of our product. Are our graduates well educated? Is our research meaningful and relevant? Are we keeping up with the needs of society?

Quality of graduating students; contributions of faculty to general public good; quality and significance of research results. (Many research papers are technically excellent, but have little relevancy to the public good or even to the technical field of interest.)

Development of character, integrity, intellectual excellence in the students; awareness of needs of society as well as of individual needs.

The extent to which the schools actively support the development and improvement of departmental functions.

Primarily by the quality (not quantity so much) of its graduates. Their ability and willingness to think independently, act responsibly, and distinguish themselves in their chosen fields of endeavor.

Administrative convenience need not color the purposes or objectives of any part of the organization. In all cases criteria should involve the cultural contributions to the student who may be considered alone or as society as a whole. Breadth of knowledge and experience should overshadow narrow training and the requirements of each unit should serve as a system of checks and balances to achieve this purposefully.

Alumni rating, employer rating, student rating. By majors only.

Any evaluation must be in keeping with stated objectives, i.e., To what degree has Oregon State University achieved her goals? Provide professionals for jobs, public service, research results, etc.

Does the department produce first rate graduates? Does it help other departments in their functioning?
Question 12

* Turnover of personnel. Publication and support. Mechanism for decision-making. General morale of Department.

* Ability of graduates to perform satisfactorily, professionally and in society. Ability of graduates to handle academic work at other leading universities. Significant research by staff and graduates. Awards and honors to staff and graduates. Performance of schools in national competitive exams. Faculty publications. Faculty leadership in international and national societies. Leadership of graduates in industry and government.

* 1) Quality of students; 2) innovation and untemporary character of programs; 3) research in progress; 4) esteem of faculty members in their respective societies.

* Effectiveness in: 1) educating and training students, 2) solving problems, 3) developing new knowledge.

* Do we adequately provide service and resources required to support the programs and objectives of the University?

* The excellence of the faculty to attract outstanding students; to offer courses that are meaningful to them, and finally, providing motivation to students to seek excellence in their areas of professional activity.

* Ability to attract and keep good students (graduate as well as undergraduate) and faculty.

* Meeting needs of students. Advancing knowledge through research.

* Since my department is mainly a service department, using performance of graduates will not be adequate. Expressed satisfaction of students with course offerings and course content. Interest students and staff express in course offerings.

* Whether it is fulfilling its role in the School and the University and how its graduates are serving, succeeding, and competing.

* Follow-up reactions of students -- are they happy with their education 6 months, 18 months, 5 years, etc. after graduation? Were they prepared adequately to work in their chosen field, etc..

* Is it a productive part of the school and University. Is it accomplishing its purpose? What are reactions from without the department.
1) Excellence of its staff and graduate students, 2) performance of its graduates, 3) special recognitions to staff and students, 4) vigor of its resident and non-resident teaching programs, 5) attitudes of its students, 6) evidences of state leadership in its field, 7) monetary and non-monetary support from outside groups, 8) reputation at other schools.

How well it meets the goals that it ought to have. Specifically in 3 areas: 1) research and graduate student training, 2) undergraduate majors, 3) service courses.

The quality of the life of the individual graduate. The contribution to the quality of life of our society and mankind in general. Contribution to the fund of knowledge by which men may live "quality" lives. Evidence that the University graduates will live continuously enduring lives based on acceptance of continuously evolving truths.

Devotion to excellence in undergraduate writing would be a unique contribution to the universities of this state.

Democratic policy making.

Quality standards of instruction; success of graduates; harmonious faculty-student relationship; public image. With all of these, a growth in knowledge of and solutions for the problems of modern society.

Whether or not it has given its graduates what they came here to get in the opinion of the graduate himself, and his employer.

Quality and productivity of faculty, salary levels and benefits, physical facilities and budget, effectiveness of teaching efforts, productivity of research program, performance of graduates, professional attitudes and activities, acceptance by other professional departments, goals aimed at achievement of excellence rather than breadth.
1) Excellence of its staff and graduate students, 2) performance of its graduates, 3) special recognitions to staff and students, 4) vigor of its resident and non-resident teaching programs, 5) attitudes of its students, 6) evidences of state leadership in its field, 7) monetary and non-monetary support from outside groups, 8) reputation at other schools.

How well it meets the goals that it ought to have. Specifically in 3 areas: 1) research and graduate student training, 2) undergraduate majors, 3) service courses.

The quality of the life of the individual graduate. The contribution to the quality of life of our society and mankind in general. Contribution to the fund of knowledge by which men may live "quality" lives. Evidence that the University graduates will live continuously enduring lives based on acceptance of continuously enduring lives based on acceptance of continuously evolving truths.

Devotion to excellence in undergraduate writing would be a unique contribution to the universities of this state.

Democratic policy making.

Quality standards of instruction; success of graduates; harmonious faculty-student relationship; public image. With all of these, a growth in knowledge of and solutions for the problems of modern society.

Whether or not it has given its graduates what they came here to get in the opinion of the graduate himself, and his employer.

Quality and productivity of faculty, salary levels and benefits, physical facilities and budget, effectiveness of teaching efforts, productivity of research program, performance of graduates, professional attitudes and activities, acceptance by other professional departments, goals aimed at achievement of excellence rather than breadth.
Communications from Individual Faculty Members

In the course of conducting the survey of faculty attitudes, the Commission received letters from individual faculty members which in its judgment merited publication in total. These are published here. Permission to publish these documents has been given by the authors and the Commission extends its appreciation to them for the time and thought spent on behalf of the Commission.
It seems to me that the present governmental structure of Oregon State University should be changed in order to strengthen the University and facilitate the development and administration of its educational programs. Under the present structure, a number of deans and other high officials each carry out and/or oversee various functions of the University and are directly responsible to the President of the University. For example, the Dean of Faculty oversees (roughly) essentially all of the academic functions of the University and the Dean of Administration oversees (roughly) a variety of administrative and business functions of the University and both are directly responsible to the President.

It seems to me that there are some serious, inherent deficiencies in this structure (which are quite independent of the persons involved.) To begin with, the President cannot (and should not) closely supervise or involve himself with the specific problems and affairs confronting his immediate subordinates, as the present structure suggests or may require. He can (and/or should) only concern himself with the most general leadership, policies and decisions. His time is almost wholly taken with his responsibilities as representative of the University to the State Board of Higher Education, the Legislature and other governmental agencies, and the public. He has little or no time to oversee, coordinate, or adjudicate differences between his subordinates let alone involve himself with the details of operating the University. Now these difficulties can be and, I think, are dealt with by simply delegating authority to the subordinate officials and except for rare cases leaving all “second” level policy decisions to these officials. But it is precisely here, as I see it, that the fundamental deficiency of the present structure is to be found.

With essentially separate, independent offices and deans (etc.) attempting to deal with various functions or aspects of the university and each reporting directly to the president, as is now the case, development, coordination, and administration of policy are difficult at best and impossible at worst. Moreover, in many cases it is difficult or impossible to distinguish and separate the various functions or aspects of the University. Thus, if one office has responsibility for such a function an important aspect of it may be ignored and decisions concerning the matter may be made from a partial viewpoint. As a possible example of this consider registration. Should it fall under the Dean of Administration, the Dean of Faculty, or the Dean of Students? Who decided, and on what basis was the decision made, to initiate computer registration at a stage which did not allow students a choice of instructors or meeting times? If more than one office has a stake in a given function the problem of coordination and ultimately of primacy arises.
Of course, if he is available, the President might be called upon to decide such an issue and assign prime responsibility. But, again, this would distract him from his primary tasks. Finally, with co-equal offices under the President, especially, an independent, separate office of Dean of Administration, we intensify the universal problem, threat, or temptation to subordinate the educational goals of the University to the administration of them. All too often and quite understandably the administrative tail ends up wagging the educational dog. This happens for two related reasons. First, the chief administrative (business) officer, as controller of the purse usually, either makes or greatly influences all university, including academic, decisions and policies. Second, such an officer normally tends to make these decisions on "administrative" rather than "academic" grounds. The prospect of administrative efficiency and cost-effectiveness often takes precedence over educational considerations and ideals. Perhaps, though I do not know, this was the case with computer registration (which I support, ultimately). It seems to me that with a separate, co-equal Dean of Administration, this common problem and temptation is exacerbated. Moreover, if he becomes a dominant figure, then the problem is all the more present. If he remains an equal and actively seeks to cooperate and consult with his peers, the problem still remains. For what if he disagrees on a point? Here, again, only the President, if available, could resolve such a problem.

Allow me to quote from the recent Study of Education at Stanford which reflects the concern I am trying to express:

> The primacy of academic considerations would be enhanced by removing the Provost from his present primus inter pares status as one of four vice-presidents and elevating him to a position in which all other officers of administration are subordinate to him and the President. (Vol. X, p. 24)

In sum, the very nature of the present structure in which several officials and offices has essentially equal, independent status and report independently to the President greatly encumbers the processes of policy formation, implementation, and review as well as the general operation of the University, and it greatly increases the risk of subordinating educational goals and principles to administrative ones.

To remedy this situation, I wish to suggest for your consideration that an office of University Vice-President be created. This officer would be the chief operations officer of the University and directly responsible to the President. He would oversee the administration of the President's general educational policies and decisions and he would oversee all or almost all of the offices and officials who now are responsible directly and only to the President, e.g., the Dean of Faculty and the Dean of Administration. He would coordinate, delegate, and adjudicate all functions and matters dealt with by these officials. He would set "lower level" policies subject to the review of the President.
I am in agreement, then, with the Stanford study in so far as it proposes the creation of a single office directly and immediately responsible to the President of the University. But I disagree with regard to the function of this office. They propose that the Provost be the President's deputy and like him not an operations officer. They suggest that the operation of the University fall under the purview of several Vice-Presidents. My essential point, however, is that there should be a single chief operations officer of the University and that delegation of this responsibility to a group of essentially independent officials is seriously inadequate. Of course, it might be useful to provide the President with a deputy who would not involve himself in the operation of the University, but this would (should) be an additional and different position from that of the Vice-President, as I propose it.

It should be clear from what I have said that the Vice-President should have, above all else, the qualifications, ideals, and principles of an academic or educational official and view administration as an important, demanding but subordinate function. I would suggest further that since the Vice-President is to work intimately with and be immediately responsible to the President, he be appointed by the President. But since he holds the highest academic office (other than the President) and must, therefore, be responsive to the faculty, I also suggest that his appointment require confirmation by the Faculty Senate (by majority vote) and be subject to termination by a 2/3 vote of the Faculty Senate, which is (should be) the chief policy-making or review body besides the President of the University.

Lastly, let me make it perfectly clear that the basis and purpose of these remarks and suggestions concern only the offices and structure in question and not their holders, past or present. If I am not mistaken, these officials would be in general agreement with many if not all of my criticisms.

I wish to thank Professor Ronald Clarke who was kind enough to correct what was intended merely as a draft of this letter and to submit it to the Goals Commission when an emergency prevented me from doing so. His interest and help should not be taken as an endorsement of any of the views expressed, however.

Sincerely yours,

/s/

Robert D. Dale
Department of Philosophy
Commission on University Goals  
c/o the Library  
Oregon State University  

Dear Sirs:

Most students on the OSU campus have been denied some of the courses which they wanted to take, simply because the course was previously filled by other students. I believe this is an educational tragedy and OSU's most serious academic fault.

Our attitude is poor. Departments limit enrollments in each of their courses in anticipation of turning students away. They seem only too happy to tell students that a course is closed—except of course to majors, for whom they always seem to be able to find room. We should be encouraging each student to gain the broad background which marks an educated man. Instead, we deny him many interesting courses outside his major field and succeed only in graduating competent technicians.

As a predental advisor this fall I was able to see this problem first hand. Although the predental program is basically a three year science curriculum, these students have 54 hours of electives. I encouraged them to map out a tentative three year program which would allow them to slip into another major if they became disenchanted with a dental career, and which would broaden their interests by including a diverse set of liberal arts sequences. It was fun, because the students were receptive and planned interesting programs which gave them a well rounded education. I was content, because I felt each student had a program which would teach him the finer things in life so that he would know how to profitably spend his free time and his potentially large salary. My contentment was short lived. Most of my eager freshmen returned completely depressed, closed out of the interesting liberal arts sequences I had encouraged them to take. It took OSU less than a week to break the spirit of these freshmen, and mine too.

Although closing students out of courses seems to be a way of life at OSU, many schools have solved this problem. With a little effort, so could we. Here are some suggestions for solving this and related problems.

I can see two reasons why a department might be forced to limit enrollment in a course. First, there might be a lack of funds to hire enough teachers to staff courses of reasonable size. However, turning students away has not been a successful method of demonstrating need and attracting the necessary money. In fact, it is precisely the opposite tack which has proved successful. The
departments which sometimes crowd their courses have been in the best position to demonstrate need and secure the proper funds. I believe that departments which deny students certain courses will have to change their attitude if they expect to improve the situation.

Let me point out that there are very successful ways of running large liberal arts courses. Twice a week one has a large lecture with two or three hundred students. Once a week there is a discussion section with about fifteen students. The wives of many graduate students are well educated and would be qualified to lead such discussion sections. These discussion leaders assign and grade papers, and grade the exams, so that the lecturer has a reasonable course load. The most valuable courses which I took as an undergraduate were taught in this way.

The second reason why a department might be forced to limit enrollment is that they learn too late that a course will be particularly popular. This brings us to the related problem of student registration. We try to register 13,000 students in a mad rush just a few days before classes are to begin with repeatably poor results. Computers, although useful work-saving devices, are not going to solve this problem. Preregistration is the answer. In the Fall, students should be planning their winter program. This would allow enough time to do the job properly. Fall programs should have been planned in the Spring. This would give us the entire summer to set up the courses, assign rooms, allot FTE equitably, and perhaps hire a few additional teachers for the more popular courses. It would also give the legislature some time to think about the impending consequences of underfunding.

Carrying this idea one step further, perhaps in the Spring, students should plan their course of study for all three quarters of the next year. This would allow them to put a little more continuity into their program and give them an idea of where they are headed. Planning one quarter at a time leads to a fragmented program and broken course sequences. Under this plan, which has been found successful at other universities, the school has the entire summer to plan constructively for the coming year and to get the necessary paperwork out of the way. Fall registration is used for those students who find it necessary to change some of their courses.

Registering freshmen could be even easier. Most incoming freshmen have no preference for a particular set of courses. However, once they had decided on a curriculum they are disappointed about being closed out of a course no matter how arbitrary the choice was in the beginning. One solution is to have all incoming freshmen take the same set of courses. The curriculum could be designed to introduce the new student to the diverse possibilities of a university major. In this way, he would not be committed to a specific major until his sophomore year, when he is better able to choose. I would suggest the following courses and credit hours:
Science with lab. 4
Language 3
Writing 1 quarter and a 2 quarter General Psychology course 3
Art History or Music Appreciation 3
Math 3
PE 1

TOTAL 17 hours

Any freshman would be free to alter this curriculum, and could do so during the normal fall registration. Since registration is such a problem, and since most incoming freshmen do not know what courses to take anyway, I think this is a sound solution. A less ambitious proposal would be to have each school plan a curriculum for their freshmen.

Carrying this idea one step further, each department could plan a curriculum for their students through all four years. Any student would be completely free to deviate from the program, but it could be used to guide him in his planning. By suggesting an entire program including "electives" the department could encourage the student to take sequences leading to a well rounded education. Setting up such a program could guarantee a place for the student in each course and avoid scheduling conflicts.

Departmental planning of a well rounded program might serve to solve a related problem. Majors are not given enough free hours to plan a balanced program. If a department tried to plan an ideal schedule, it might be convinced of the need to streamline its own courses in order to give the student the education he deserves.

Let me summarize my points. OSU should encourage each student to gain a broad education so that he can enjoy all facets of life as well as earn a living. As things now stand, we make this goal impossible for the student, because we limit enrollment in popular courses and because we allow few course hours outside the major. I suggest that major departments streamline their courses, and set up recommended course schedules which broaden the students' outlook on life. Preregistration should be used so that the school has enough time to respond to scheduling problems. Four year programs for each student should replace fragmented quarter by quarter planning. Let us concentrate on educating the whole man.

Sincerely yours,

W. Curtis Johnson
Assistant Professor
Biochemistry & Biophysics
Dr. Emery Castle
Chairman, Commission on
University Goals
Department of Agriculture Economics

Dear Emery:

First, let me thank you for the willingness of your committee to meet with this department. Probably one thing that did emerge is the general feeling that the faculty of this university has not involved itself as much as it should have in long-range university planning. This, I hope, will be initiated through your commission.

I am taking the liberty of communicating some thoughts to you via this letter rather than the questionnaire which I only partially completed.

In the past and to some degree at present too much of the direction of this university has been determined by outside financial support. I say this fully cognizant that I have personally benefited and maybe this adds credibility. Let me try to point out what I mean. Suppose a university member or several members are able to generate research and training funds in a particular area. One result is that new faculty are hired on "soft money". Soon two things emerge. One is the realization that if good people are to be hired sources of "hard money" are needed. So either existing departments are cajoled into hiring this staff that already exists or new teaching programs are developed. This may be good or bad but the important thing is that the faculty didn't develop the long range plans but the plan may have been imposed upon them. What this has meant in the humanities and social sciences as well as in the sciences is that growth may be less planned in terms of an orderly process of development of the whole university. Please be assured that I don't necessarily feel that the directions thus far are wrong but only that in my way of thinking the lack of careful deliberation by the whole faculty is not good.

Our most important function is the training of undergraduates and graduates who will be able to cope with problems and a world we can not readily visualize. It is this problem that we as a faculty need to take stock of and develop long-range plans for. We must ask ourselves what we are doing not only for the average student but also for the exceptional or disenfranchised. Then we need to be willing to commit resources to achieve some pre-determined goal. It seems to me the Council on Curriculum Policy, the Graduate Council and other bodies ought to be spending time toward this end. I feel that, at present, we are too concerned about administration and the administration than we are about real
long-range policy. Questions one might envisage are such things as: Do we want an honors program?; Should we permit more student experimentation in regard to curricula?; What about a more general first two years of study?; Should some professional schools think more of a longer period of training, (i.e. What is so magic about four years)?

I hope these comments may be of some use and certainly if any member of this department can be of more service be assured we are at least ready and willing.

Cordially,

/s/

R. W. Newburgh
President's Commission on University Goals
Oregon State University
Corvallis, Oregon 97331

Gentlemen:

Rather than complete the faculty questionnaire I accept the Commission's invitation to respond in an individual way. As you suggest, several of the questions presented are of little personal concern or are matters about which I have limited knowledge. Others I have considered and do wish to comment on.

It is apparent that OSU, as most universities, does not enjoy a clear and operational statement of goals. The guidelines do not guide, and the veto power of the OSBHE and the legislature makes boldness in considering marked departures from these guidelines a somewhat speculative exercise.

If the Commission does prepare a statement of goals I suggest that the possible uses of such a statement should guide the statement's content. I feel goals should indicate priorities, and that the present guidelines do not. All directions and employments of University resources are possible under the guidelines, and all are of equal importance. The University does not suffer from lack of a philosophical statement of purpose, but it does from a statement of what are the priorities for the use of its resources and energies. In the absence of a clear and widely-known expression, the subtle and usually obscure political processes of the University set operating priorities. I believe it is the relative obscurity of the process of assigning priorities that stimulates faculty and student dissatisfaction and suspicion and not the priorities themselves. My suggestion is, simply, if guidelines cannot be used for planning and guiding major priority decisions, we are better off without them. The completely political nature of choice would then be recognized and accommodated.

The questionnaire also asks opinions regarding internal resource allocation, organization, and decision making structure. I believe these are closely related. There are two types of organization in question. One is the University wide organization for planning, coordination, and possibly evaluation of all academic activities of the University, and the other is the arrangement of the units of the University. In my opinion the major organizational weakness is found in the absence of clear organizational responsibility for planning, coordination of program and resources, and evaluation of existing programs. A well staffed office of an academic vice-president and/or provost is an orthodox organizational approach to planning and coordination, and it might work here.
One disadvantage in planning at OSU is the budgeting process, or processes. Budgets come from above, or in response to specific requests, often on an ad hoc basis. The several resource categories of faculty, support, and facilities are considered separately and decided internally in a shadowy process. I doubt if over a dozen people in the University know who makes final budgetary decisions and even fewer know what criteria are used in these decisions. If meaningful University goals are to be sought operationally, the budgetary process must be more open and based on allocation criteria consistent with these goals. Coordination of budget resources with accepted program goals is a necessity, and I believe some system of "asking" budgets is also necessary and possible within the present method of legislative and board budgeting policy. Budgeting is perhaps the key planning device in any organization. At Oregon State University budgeting does not assist in planning and any relationship to program is obscure. * (See addition on page 4)

The questionnaire mentions a series of alternative approaches to fitting resources to program. Without a clearer, more systematic budgeting process and without a central agency for planning and coordination, options limiting or abolishing old programs in order to enhance other existing programs or new programs have little realism. I personally favor limiting programs or abolishing some to develop quality in others, but I have observed the extreme difficulty in making even modest steps in this direction. People do not willingly phase out themselves or their discipline nor do they happily request a reduced level of activity and aspiration.

I believe universities could benefit from industrial and even military practices in reviewing operations and output. We often discuss quality, but we have limited ability to define quality and we have no central organization to review programs for quality. Whenever a lack of quality is publicly noted by those directly involved, it is usually for strategic reasons of obtaining more resources. Seldom is attention called to poor academic quality in order to support removal of the guilty program.

An academic vice-president could be charged with an academic quality control responsibility. Recognizing that inspection of diverse academic programs to evaluate quality is a difficult and highly subjective task, I believe it would be rewarding to try. Leaving quality determination to direct participants and outside agencies (accrediting agencies, departments of education, etc.) is somewhat irresponsible and non-conducive to internal planning and resource allocation.

I do not believe that the arrangement of the University's sub-units is as important to meeting goals of the University as is the lack of an effective planning, coordination, and evaluating agency, yet the arrangement can have considerable bearing on how the University actually performs in meeting its goals. Below are several points which I think might be considered in making actual organization more effective.
1. Organization should follow purpose, and not the reverse. One of the problems in colleges of arts and sciences is that they just happened and not in response to a clear purpose or mission.

2. Organizations can be faculty-oriented or student-oriented. Most professional schools are more student-oriented than arts and sciences colleges.

3. The larger and more complex the organization, the more decision making must be left with sub-units.

4. Organizations can be discipline-oriented or mission-oriented. Discipline-oriented units are usually faculty-oriented.

5. Strong departments are consistent with strong graduate education, strong schools are consistent with undergraduate emphasis.

6. A great barrier to innovation is the strong department. It may innovate internally, but broader innovation is usually subject to formal or informal veto by departments.

7. There is no need that any continuing association of persons with similar professional interests also be an administrative organization. We should resist excessive narrowness regarding professional identity through creation of administrative entities.

8. Organizational change should not be used to resolve political or personal differences.

My personal bias is toward some more schools or colleges and fewer departments with the use of "faculties" to replace departments. Colleges would be the smallest administrative units. A College of Human Resources with no departments but faculties in education, in family life, in sociology, etc., is, I think, reasonable. Difficulties would be encountered in faculty evaluation for promotion and tenure, but I understand that problems occasionally arise under the present organization. The present arrangement is biased toward research and against teaching. On reflection, faculties might have the same role in faculty evaluation as departments now do, but some faculties could have a broader disciplinary base than is now seen in departments. For example, a large faculty in biology would have wider professional interests than the present biology-based departments do.

I regret that the neatness of your questionnaire was replaced by this rambling communication. Thank you for the opportunity to comment.
Best wishes in your important assignment.

Very truly yours,

K. D. Patterson
Professor of Economics

KDP: jeb

† (Addition to fifth paragraph)

Since these remarks were written, the Chancellor's Office has initiated an approach to biennial budgeting which may serve as a framework for correction of what I consider serious budgeting weaknesses.
For some time, I have been disturbed by the fact that at this and other Land Grant Universities there has been no functional device for relating the development and extension of new technology to the anticipated social and environmental consequences. Results of our work in one field sometimes have created problems in another for which we do not have answers or programs to develop them. The recently established environmental health sciences center can be a step in this direction, but leaves the question of social consequences still unresolved.

As a beginning, I would propose the creation of a "Council on Consequences" to which a scientist might come to communicate his concern about serious implications stemming from his work. It would be the function of such a council to appraise the situation from an inter-disciplinary view and to seek the appropriate persons to involve in a task force on the subject if deemed desirable. There are some specific cases at hand that would merit attention.

Such a council would necessarily require membership from Schools other than Agriculture, and could serve the needs of other Schools—though most of the new technology that I am thinking of relates to agriculture and forestry.

I am not proposing that the development of new technology be suspended, but that a better companion effort be generated.

Very truly yours,

/s/

Jean W. Scheel
Assistant Director
At a time when the School of Humanities and Social Sciences is seeking to find its identity and its role in the University as a whole, I would like to propose that we establish a continuing Institute where all of the specialized schools in the university would be represented, but with perhaps a somewhat larger delegation from those disciplines in the Humanities and Social Sciences that are uniquely concerned with man.

The general intent of this group would be to try to determine with as much wisdom as possible those traits in man which we would like most to have realized and how technology comes to bear both creatively and obstructively on such realization. The Institute should have some financial means of sustaining itself and should be able to draw on specialists other than those in the immediate group. The Institute should also bear some responsibility for seminars and teaching to the general student body. One could begin small, but perhaps it could be eventually developed into an operation analogous to the Center for the Study of Democratic Institutions.

The problems discussed would range from speculation on the nature and potentialities of man to water pollution, population concentration and control, architectural aesthetics, labor relations, educational innovation, race relations, zoning for wilderness areas, etc. We might thereby mitigate some of the dilemmas that have occurred elsewhere - notably in our neighbor state to the south.

The reports of the Institute's studies could be regularly published and it could make specific recommendations to the Oregon Legislature and perhaps to Washington and Idaho as well. This appears potentially to be a unique way of relating the significance of the Humanities and Social Sciences, with their concern for value and perspectives, to the specialized technologies, and vice versa. It also seems to me a most appropriate undertaking for a Land Grant University with its human, technological, and regional concerns.

/s/
Nicholas J. Yonker
Associate Professor
Dept. of Religious Studies
APPENDIX B

TABULATED RESULTS

from

STUDENT QUESTIONNAIRE

by

PRESIDENT'S COMMISSION ON UNIVERSITY GOALS
### Student Questionnaire

**President's Commission on University Goals**

The President's Commission on University Goals was appointed to assist the University in the development of a clearer definition and understanding of its purposes and goals. In order to provide an opportunity for student input into the study and to aid in its task, the Commission is conducting a survey of student attitudes. On the basis of the survey it hopes to suggest changes through which the University may provide more adequate programs and opportunities for students.

Questions 1 through 28 require only a check in the appropriate box. Opportunity to provide additional comments and recommendations is provided in questions 29 through 37. Feel free to omit any question.

**These questionnaires must be returned at the time your class schedules are distributed from 7 to 10 p.m. Wednesday, January 7, 1970.**

Your cooperation is respectfully requested.

#### School
- Agriculture (01)
- Business & Technology (02)
- Education (03)
- Engineering (04)
- Forestry (05)
- Home Economics (06)
- Pharmacy (07)
- Science (08)
- Graduate School (09)
- Humanities and Social Science (10)
- Physical Education (12)

#### Department
- (3, 4, 5)

#### Class
- Freshman (1)
- Sophomore (2)
- Junior (3)
- Senior (4)
- Graduate Student (5)
- Resident (6)
- Nonresident (7)
- Transfer Student (8)
- Foreign Student (9)

#### Cumulative GPA
- (10, 11, 12)

### 1. If you are an undergraduate, are you planning to do graduate work?
- Yes (1)
- No (2)

### 2. In the past term how many of your classes were:
- Large lectures only (over 300)
- Large lectures with smaller discussion groups
- Medium sized lectures - discussions
- Seminars
- Reading and Conference or Independent work

### 3. Is the scholarly focus of your major departments?
- Poor (1)
- Fair (2)
- Good (3)
- Excellent (4)

### 4. Why did you choose to enter OSU? Rate only three factors in order of importance, with No. 1 being most important.
- Excellence of Professional Schools (1)
- Proximity (2)
- Cost (3)
- Relative's advice (4)
- Athletics (5)
- Reputation for academic programs (6)
- A friendly campus (7)
- Given a scholarship (8)
- Other (9)

### 5. Should there be some university-wide requirement to provide a genuine liberal education for all students?
- Yes (1)
- No (2)

What should it be?

---

**Stu**: Student

**Pres**: President's Commission on University Goals

**Stud**: Student's questionnaire

**Class**: Class schedule

**Gpa**: Cumulative Grade Point Average

---

**Table**: Questionnaire with options for responses and comments.
6. Have you sought academic advising at OSU? (24)
   - Yes (1)
   - No (2)

7. How would you characterize faculty interest in undergraduates? (25)
   - Poor (1)
   - Fair (2)
   - Good (3)
   - Excellent (4)

8. How has OSU contributed to your education most significantly? Rate only three factors in order of importance, with No. 1 being most important.
   - Increased my interest in major field (1)
   - Given me practical and technical skills (2)
   - Aided my critical thinking ability (3)
   - Increased my aesthetic sensitivity (4)
   - Aided my understanding of scientific method (5)
   - Developed my creative thinking (6)
   - Developed my competence in one or more fields (7)
   - Other (specify) (8)

9. Which of the following do you believe are most important in your education?
   - Courses which stress basic principles (29)
   - Courses with strong practical emphasis (30)
   - Courses concerned with political-social issues (31)
   - Courses which develop critical thinking (32)
   - Courses which enrich my personal life (33)
   - Courses which broaden my intellectual horizons (34)

10. Is the University's emphasis on graduate programs:
    - Too heavy (1)
    - Too weak (2)
    - About right (3)
    - Detrimental to undergraduate education (4)
    - Don't know (5)

11. Have you participated in extra-curricular activities at OSU? (36)
    - Yes (1)
    - No (2)

12. Is the University's emphasis on research programs:
    - Too heavy (1)
    - Too weak (2)
    - About right (3)
    - Detrimental to undergraduate education (4)
    - Don't know (5)

13. Is the University's emphasis on extension and continuing education:
    - Too heavy (1)
    - Too weak (2)
    - About right (3)
    - Detrimental to undergraduate education (4)
    - Don't know (5)

14. Do you feel there are adequate channels for students to voice their opinions? (43)
    - Yes (1)
    - No (2)
    - No Opinion (3)

15. Do you feel the Administration is adequately sensitive to student opinion? (44)
    - Yes (1)
    - No (2)
    - No Opinion (3)

16. How do you think students should be involved in determining the goals of the University?
    - Through serving on Faculty-Student University committees (45)
    - Through serving on departmental Faculty-Student committees (46)
    - Through student government (47)
    - Other (specify) (48)

17. How do you feel the University should be related to the social, economic, technological and political issues of our times? (i.e. Pollution, Poverty, Discrimination) (49)
    - Concerned, but objective and detached (1)
    - Not involved (2)
    - Active, involved participant (3)
    - Some combination of above (4)
    - Other (specify) (5)

18. Which of the following factors are most important in stimulating your intellectual life? Rate only three factors in order of importance with No. 1 being most important.
    - Library (1)
    - Book Store (2)
    - Stimulating professor (3)
    - Lecture Series (4)
    - Social life (5)
    - Independent reading (6)
    - Seminars (7)
    - Other students (8)
    - Other (specify) (9)
19. Has your academic advising at OSU been:
(53)
- Poor (1)
- Fair (2)
- Good (3)
- Excellent (4)

How could it be improved?

20. What is your view of extra-curricular activities at OSU?
(54)
- Meaningful
- Inadequate
- Too time consuming
- Other (specify)

21. Which of the following factors present the most serious problems in your education? Check those which apply.
(55)
- Advising
- Registration
- Housing
- Lack of stimulating academic atmosphere
- Inadequate instruction
- Inadequate facilities
- No serious problems
- Too heavy academic schedules

22. Education at OSU would be improved by changing the "mix" in which ways?
(56)
- Increasing ratio of faculty to students (1)
- Decreasing ratio of faculty to students (2)
- Increasing number of minority students (3)
- Decreasing number of minority students (4)
- Increasing the number of foreign students (5)
- Decreasing the number of foreign students (6)
- Increasing the number of out-of-state students (7)
- Decreasing the number of out-of-state students (8)
- Other (specify)

23. Would you say your total experience at OSU has been:
(57)
- Very positive (1)
- Positive (2)
- Mediocre (3)
- Poor (4)

24. Which description best suits your view of OSU?
(58)
- A large state university with adequate number and quality of programs to meet most students' needs (1)
- A technological and scientific institution (2)
- A quality graduate and professional institution (3)
- A good undergraduate institution with broad programs in liberal education (4)
- An institution with strong emphasis on professional schools and limited emphasis on programs in Humanities & Social Sciences (5)

25. If you had a younger brother or sister, would you advise them to attend OSU?
(59)
- Yes (1)
- No (2)
- No Opinion (3)

Why

26. Do you believe the use of audio-visual media such as charts, slides, sound tapes, motion pictures and/or video tape should be:
(60)
- Increased (1)
- No Change (2)
- Decreased (3)

27. Do you believe self-instruction and programmed learning using the above audio-visual media (see question 26) should be:
(61)
- Increased (1)
- No Change (2)
- Decreased (3)

28. Was your education prior to coming to OSU adequate preparation for your course of study?
(62)
- Yes (1)
- No (2)
- No Opinion (3)

Elaborate
29. What has been the single most important factor in your educational experience at OSU?

30. In achieving your personal educational goals what changes would you suggest for the improvement of the curriculum?

31. What do you think are the major problems facing students?

32. How do you characterize:
   a. A good course
   b. A good professor
   c. A good university

33. What can be done to encourage better teaching at OSU?

34. What role should Humanities and Social Sciences play in this institution?

35. If you had another quarter at OSU to freely choose, in what departments would you elect courses?

36. What factor, or factors, do you feel are needed to make OSU an institution of greater excellence in the future?

37. If you have additional thoughts you wish to give to the Commission, please use the following space.

(Any further comments or suggestions which you might have may be sent directly to the Commission on University Goals, c/o Library)
### Responses by Schools

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School</th>
<th>Number Enrolled</th>
<th>Number of Responses</th>
<th>% of Response from school</th>
<th>% of Total Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Agriculture</td>
<td>1152</td>
<td>280</td>
<td>24.2</td>
<td>7.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business and Technology</td>
<td>1594</td>
<td>271</td>
<td>17.0</td>
<td>7.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>2453</td>
<td>632</td>
<td>25.4</td>
<td>17.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engineering</td>
<td>1991</td>
<td>482</td>
<td>24.2</td>
<td>13.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forestry</td>
<td>436</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>38.9</td>
<td>3.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Home Economics</td>
<td>894</td>
<td>205</td>
<td>23.0</td>
<td>5.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pharmacy</td>
<td>457</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>21.9</td>
<td>3.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Science</td>
<td>2801</td>
<td>591</td>
<td>21.1</td>
<td>16.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Humanities and Social Science</td>
<td>2370</td>
<td>542</td>
<td>22.9</td>
<td>14.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical Education</td>
<td>Not Avail</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>Not Avail</td>
<td>1.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate</td>
<td>1770</td>
<td>396</td>
<td>22.4</td>
<td>10.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>3694</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Responses by Class

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Class</th>
<th>Number Enrolled</th>
<th>Number of Responses</th>
<th>% of Response from school</th>
<th>% of Total Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Freshman</td>
<td>4361</td>
<td>816</td>
<td>18.7</td>
<td>22.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sophomore</td>
<td>2869</td>
<td>719</td>
<td>25.9</td>
<td>19.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Junior</td>
<td>2625</td>
<td>769</td>
<td>29.2</td>
<td>20.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior</td>
<td>2589</td>
<td>785</td>
<td>30.3</td>
<td>21.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate</td>
<td>2100</td>
<td>550</td>
<td>26.2</td>
<td>14.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td></td>
<td>55</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>3694</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Response by Resident Status

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Resident Status</th>
<th>Number of Responses</th>
<th>% of Total Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Resident</td>
<td>1982</td>
<td>53.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Resident</td>
<td>543</td>
<td>14.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Response</td>
<td>1169</td>
<td>31.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transfer</td>
<td>403</td>
<td>10.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foreign</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>2.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### ANALYSIS OF RESPONSE

**Question 1**

If you are an undergraduate, are you planning to do graduate work?
- **Yes**
- **No**
- **No response**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Count (Percentage)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No response</td>
<td>710 (19)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>1621 (43)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>1363 (38)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>3694</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### QUESTION 1: PLANNING FOR GRADUATE WORK

- **No response**
- **Yes**
- **No**
**ANALYSIS OF RESPONSES**

**Question 2**

In the past term **how many** of your classes were:

a) Large lectures only (over 100)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Class Type</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>1810</td>
<td>(49.0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1064</td>
<td>(28.8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>545</td>
<td>(14.7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>199</td>
<td>(05.4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>(01.5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>(00.4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>(00.2)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

b) Large lectures with smaller discussion groups

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Class Type</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0 Large</td>
<td>2170</td>
<td>(58.8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Large</td>
<td>1050</td>
<td>(28.4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Large</td>
<td>357</td>
<td>(09.7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Large</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>(02.2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Large</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>(00.7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Large</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>(00.2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Large</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>(00.2)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

c) Medium sized lectures-discussions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Class Type</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0 Medium</td>
<td>771</td>
<td>(20.9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Medium</td>
<td>853</td>
<td>(23.1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Medium</td>
<td>780</td>
<td>(21.1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Medium</td>
<td>663</td>
<td>(17.9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Medium</td>
<td>425</td>
<td>(11.5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Medium</td>
<td>177</td>
<td>(04.8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Medium</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>(00.7)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

d) Seminars

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Class Type</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0 Seminar</td>
<td>2964</td>
<td>(80.2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Seminar</td>
<td>582</td>
<td>(15.8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Seminar</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>(02.8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Seminar</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>(00.9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Seminar</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>(00.2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Seminar</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>(00.1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Seminar</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>(00.0)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

e) Reading and Conference or independent work

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Class Type</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0 Read/Conf</td>
<td>3223</td>
<td>(87.2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Read/Conf</td>
<td>360</td>
<td>(09.7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Read/Conf</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>(01.9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Read/Conf</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>(00.8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Read/Conf</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>(00.3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Read/Conf</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>(00.03)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Read/Conf</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>(00.02)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**ANALYSIS OF RESPONSES**

**Question 3**

Is the scholarly focus of your major department:
- Poor
- Fair
- Good
- Excellent
- No Response

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>How could it be improved?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Poor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fair</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Excellent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Response</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**QUESTION 3: SCHOLARLY FOCUS OF DEPARTMENT**

- Poor
- Fair
- Good
- Excellent
- No Response

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>10</th>
<th>20</th>
<th>30</th>
<th>40</th>
<th>50%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
# ANALYSIS OF RESPONSES

**Question 4**

Why did you choose to enter OSU? Rate only three factors in order of importance, with No. 1 being the most important.

- Excellence of Professional Schools
- Proximity
- Cost
- Relative's advice
- Athletics
- Reputation for academic programs
- A friendly campus
- Given a scholarship
- Other

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rated No. 1</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>0</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>12</th>
<th>-</th>
<th>Res</th>
<th>Nres</th>
<th>TR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No Response</td>
<td>82 (02.2)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Excellence</td>
<td>979 (26.5)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>228</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>303</td>
<td>538</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proximity</td>
<td>656 (17.8)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>225</td>
<td>404</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost</td>
<td>318 (08.6)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>195</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relative</td>
<td>193 (05.2)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Athletics</td>
<td>29 (00.8)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reputation</td>
<td>558 (15.1)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>158</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>172</td>
<td>286</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friendly</td>
<td>161 (04.4)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scholarship</td>
<td>185 (05.0)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>533 (14.4)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>159</td>
<td>256</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>3694</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></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## ANALYSIS OF RESPONSES

### Question 4

#### Rated No. 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>0</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>12</th>
<th>-</th>
<th>Res</th>
<th>Nres</th>
<th>TR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No Response</td>
<td>312 (08.5)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Excellence</td>
<td>383 (10.4)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>199</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>45</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proximity</td>
<td>710 (19.2)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>211</td>
<td>462</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost</td>
<td>693 (18.8)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>228</td>
<td>422</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relative</td>
<td>252 (06.8)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Athletics</td>
<td>46 (01.3)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reputation</td>
<td>596 (16.1)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>311</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friendly</td>
<td>323 (08.8)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scholarship</td>
<td>190 (05.1)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>189 (05.1)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>3694</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></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Rated No. 3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>0</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>12</th>
<th>-</th>
<th>Res</th>
<th>Nres</th>
<th>TR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No Response</td>
<td>628 (17.0)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>236</td>
<td>265</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Excellence</td>
<td>241 (06.5)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proximity</td>
<td>551 (14.9)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>176</td>
<td>328</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost</td>
<td>584 (15.8)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>162</td>
<td>385</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relative</td>
<td>267 (07.1)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>155</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Athletics</td>
<td>66 (01.8)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reputation</td>
<td>415 (11.3)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>214</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friendly</td>
<td>532 (14.4)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>272</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scholarship</td>
<td>132 (03.6)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>278 (07.5)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>3694</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></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
QUESTION 4: REASONS FOR CHOOSING OREGON STATE UNIVERSITY

- EXCELLENT PROFESSIONAL SCHOOLS
- REPUTATION FOR ACADEMIC PROGRAMS
- PROXIMITY
- OTHER
- COST
- FRIENDLY CAMPUS
- NO RESPONSE
- RELATIVE'S ADVICE
- GIVEN SCHOLARSHIP
- ATHLETICS

POINT RATING
FIRST CHOICE = 3 POINTS
SECOND CHOICE = 2 POINTS
THIRD CHOICE = 1 POINT

RELATIVES ADVICE
GIVEN SCHOLARSHIP
ATHLETICS

10 20 30 40 50 60 70 80 90 100 110 POINTS
QUESTION 5 UNIVERSITY-WIDE REQUIREMENT FOR LIBERAL EDUCATION

No response: 147
Yes: 240
No: 429

Question 5

Should there be some university-wide requirement to provide a genuine liberal education for all students?

Yes
No

What should it be?

Total 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 12
No Response 470 (12.7) 0 37 45 86 45 13 36 8 58 64 73 5
Yes 1381 (37.4) 1 79 88 238 159 32 77 46 213 183 246 19
No 1843 (49.9) 2 164 138 308 278 72 92 69 320 149 223 28

Total 3694

F S J S G
No Response 147 88 75 68 85
Yes 240 257 307 312 249
No 429 374 387 405 216

QUESTION 5: UNIVERSITY-WIDE REQUIREMENT FOR LIBERAL EDUCATION

No Response

Yes

No
## ANALYSIS OF RESPONSES

### Question 6

Have you sought academic advising at OSU?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>2747 (74.3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>800 (21.6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Response</td>
<td>147 (04.0)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total 3694

### QUESTION 6: SOUGHT ACADEMIC ADVISING AT OSU

- **No Response**: 147 (04.0)
- **Yes**: 2747 (74.3)
- **No**: 800 (21.6)

![Bar chart showing response distribution for Question 6]
### ANALYSIS OF RESPONSES

#### Question 7

How would you characterize faculty interest in undergraduates?
- **Poor**
- **Fair**
- **Good**
- **Excellent**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>0</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>12</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No Response</td>
<td>260 (07.0)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>575 (15.5)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>1448 (30.2)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>281</td>
<td>196</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>252</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>229</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good</td>
<td>1207 (32.7)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>172</td>
<td>182</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>159</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>176</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Excellent</td>
<td>204 (05.5)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>3694</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Response</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>148</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>64</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>337</td>
<td>324</td>
<td>316</td>
<td>299</td>
<td>156</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good</td>
<td>270</td>
<td>224</td>
<td>248</td>
<td>297</td>
<td>155</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Excellent</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>27</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### QUESTION 7: FACULTY INTEREST IN UNDERGRADUATES

- **No Response**
- **Poor**
- **Fair**
- **Good**
- **Excellent**

![Bar chart showing the distribution of responses](image)
### Question 8

How has OSU contributed to your education most significantly? Rate only three factors in order of importance, with No. 1 being most important.

- Increased my interest in major field
- Given me professional and technical skills
- Increased my aesthetic sensitivity
- Aided my critical thinking ability
- Given me understanding of scientific method
- Developed my creative thinking
- Developed my competence in one or more fields
- Other (specify) ______

### Question 8: University Significant Contribution to Education

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Interest in Major</th>
<th>Critical Thinking</th>
<th>Competence</th>
<th>Technical Skills</th>
<th>No Response</th>
<th>Creative Thinking</th>
<th>Aesthetic Sensitivity</th>
<th>Scientific Method</th>
<th>Other</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Point Rating**
- First Choice - 3 Points
- Second Choice - 2 Points
- Third Choice - 1 Point

10 20 30 40 50 60 70 80 90 100 110 120 130 140 Points
### ANALYSIS OF RESPONSES

**Question 8**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rated #1</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>0</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>12</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No Response</td>
<td>317 (8.6)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interest</td>
<td>1113 (30.1)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>238</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>141</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>169</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tech Skill</td>
<td>521 (14.1)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sensitivity</td>
<td>195 (5.3)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crit. Think</td>
<td>531 (14.4)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scientific</td>
<td>141 (3.8)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creative</td>
<td>180 (4.9)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Competence</td>
<td>472 (12.8)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>224 (6.0)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>3694</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>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>F</th>
<th>S</th>
<th>J</th>
<th>S</th>
<th>G</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No Response</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interest</td>
<td>257</td>
<td>224</td>
<td>261</td>
<td>224</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tech Skill</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>171</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sensitivity</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crit. Think</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>114</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scientific</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creative</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Competence</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### QUESTION 8

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>0</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>12</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No Response</td>
<td>518</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interest</td>
<td>548</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tech Skill</td>
<td>509</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sensitivity</td>
<td>238</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crit. Think</td>
<td>679</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scientific</td>
<td>259</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creative</td>
<td>334</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Competence</td>
<td>545</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>3694</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>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>S</th>
<th>J</th>
<th>S</th>
<th>G</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No Response</td>
<td>178</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interest</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tech Skill</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>108</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sensitivity</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crit. Think</td>
<td>163</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scientific</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creative</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Competence</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>106</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Question 8

#### ANALYSIS OF RESPONSES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rated #3</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>0</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>12</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No Response</td>
<td>789</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>152</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interest</td>
<td>464</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tech. Skill</td>
<td>361</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sensitivity</td>
<td>240</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crit. Think</td>
<td>503</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scientific</td>
<td>292</td>
<td>7.9</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creative</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>10.8</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Competence</td>
<td>534</td>
<td>14.5</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>3694</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>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>F</th>
<th>S</th>
<th>J</th>
<th>S</th>
<th>G</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No Response</td>
<td>225</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>143</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>116</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interest</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tech. Skill</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sensitivity</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crit. Think</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scientific</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creative</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Competence</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Selected Comments

Note: The results of the "other" category had 4 main areas where students were most interested.

Negative attitudes:

* CSU science courses tend to stifle creative thinking
* helped me grow a bit stubborn because of the unrealistic attitudes of administration
* very little study required, disillusionment, development of apathetic attitude
* helped me realize this is a very poor academic community

Social Relationships:

* taught me to work with people who have different technical and philosophical ideas
* has helped me become aware of the world around us in word, thought, and action
* given me opportunity to interact with many different people
* I've become more aware of people and life in all respects and the college experience has contributed to this

Self awareness and development:

* aided my maturity-learning to accept responsibility, being away from family, etc., broadened my base for decision-making
* given me the ability to think more for myself
* helped me how to learn on my own and where to find information

Academics:

* helped me realize the importance of college education and the role college plays in our society
* awards degree to aid in locating a job
* given me an opportunity to work in my major field

* taught me that a degree is an important symbol in the eyes of the employer
### ANALYSIS OF RESPONSES

**Question 9**

Which of the following do you believe are most important in your education?

- Courses which stress basic principles
- Courses with strong practical emphasis
- Courses concerned with political-social issues
- Courses which develop critical thinking
- Courses which enrich my personal life
- Courses which broaden my intellectual horizons

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>0</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>12</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Basic Princ.</td>
<td>913</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>162</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>143</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Practical</td>
<td>1617</td>
<td>165</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>298</td>
<td>252</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>243</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>32</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Political</td>
<td>394</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crit. Think</td>
<td>1277</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>196</td>
<td>153</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>208</td>
<td>174</td>
<td>211</td>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal</td>
<td>854</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>203</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>176</td>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intellect</td>
<td>1476</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>273</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>251</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>292</td>
<td>16</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>F</th>
<th>S</th>
<th>J</th>
<th>S</th>
<th>G</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Basic Princ.</td>
<td>186</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>174</td>
<td>199</td>
<td>200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Practical</td>
<td>341</td>
<td>314</td>
<td>387</td>
<td>368</td>
<td>190</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Political</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crit. Think</td>
<td>246</td>
<td>223</td>
<td>251</td>
<td>294</td>
<td>243</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal</td>
<td>249</td>
<td>177</td>
<td>176</td>
<td>168</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intellect</td>
<td>374</td>
<td>304</td>
<td>310</td>
<td>304</td>
<td>166</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### QUESTION 9: COURSES MOST IMPORTANT TO EDUCATION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>Basic Principle</th>
<th>Practical Courses</th>
<th>Political-Social Issues</th>
<th>Develop Critical Thinking</th>
<th>Enrich Personal Life</th>
<th>Broaden Intellectual Horizon</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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**ANALYSIS OF RESPONSES**

**Question 10**

Is the University's emphasis on graduate programs:

- [ ] Too heavy
- [ ] Too weak
- [ ] About right
- [ ] Detrimental to undergraduate education
- [ ] Don't know

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>0</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>12</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No Response</td>
<td>210 (5.6)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Too Heavy</td>
<td>173 (4.6)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Too Weak</td>
<td>378 (10.5)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>About Right</td>
<td>876 (23.7)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>153</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Detrimental</td>
<td>209 (5.6)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don't Know</td>
<td>1848 (50.0)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>153</td>
<td>377</td>
<td>240</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>272</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>316</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>F</th>
<th>S</th>
<th>J</th>
<th>S</th>
<th>G</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No Response</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Too Heavy</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Too Weak</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>About Right</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>167</td>
<td>215</td>
<td>225</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Detrimental</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don't Know</td>
<td>541</td>
<td>417</td>
<td>406</td>
<td>323</td>
<td>137</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
QUESTION 10: UNIVERSITY EMPHASIS ON GRADUATE PROGRAMS

- NO RESPONSE
- TOO HEAVY
- TOO WEAK
- ABOUT RIGHT
- DETRIMENTAL TO UNDERGRADUATE

DON'T KNOW
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### ANALYSIS OF RESPONSES

**Question 11**

Have you participated in extra-curricular activities at OSU?

- **Yes**
- **No**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No Response</td>
<td>151</td>
<td>4.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>2266</td>
<td>61.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>1277</td>
<td>34.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>3694</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**QUESTION II: PARTICIPATED IN EXTRA-CURRICULAR ACTIVITIES**

- **No Response**
- **Yes**
- **No**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No Response</td>
<td>151</td>
<td>4.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>2266</td>
<td>61.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>1277</td>
<td>34.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>3694</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Chart:**

- **No Response**
- **Yes**
- **No**
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**ANALYSIS OF RESPONSES**

**Question 12**

Is the University's emphasis on research programs:

- Too heavy
- Too weak
- About right
- Detrimental to undergraduate education
- Don't know

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>0</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>12</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Too heavy</td>
<td>293</td>
<td>7.9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Too weak</td>
<td>343</td>
<td>9.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>About right</td>
<td>886</td>
<td>24.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Detrimental</td>
<td>303</td>
<td>8.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don't know</td>
<td>1803</td>
<td>48.8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Response</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>F</th>
<th>S</th>
<th>J</th>
<th>S</th>
<th>G</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Too heavy</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Too weak</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>About right</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>171</td>
<td>178</td>
<td>214</td>
<td>182</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Detrimental</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don't know</td>
<td>556</td>
<td>392</td>
<td>375</td>
<td>315</td>
<td>144</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
QUESTION 12: UNIVERSITY EMPHASIS ON RESEARCH PROGRAMS

- NO RESPONSE
- TOO HEAVY
- TOO WEAK
- ABOUT RIGHT
- DETRIMENTAL TO UNDERGRADUATE
- DON'T KNOW
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**ANALYSIS OF RESPONSES**

**Question 13**

Is the University's emphasis on extension and continuing education:

- Too heavy
- Too weak
- About right
- Detrimental to undergraduate education
- Don't know

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>0</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>12</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No Response</td>
<td>173</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Too heavy</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Too weak</td>
<td>667</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>About right</td>
<td>1019</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>190</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Detrimental</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don't know</td>
<td>1728</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>291</td>
<td>236</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>314</td>
<td>185</td>
<td>233</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>F</th>
<th>S</th>
<th>J</th>
<th>S</th>
<th>G</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No Response</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Too heavy</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Too weak</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>164</td>
<td>205</td>
<td>103</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>About right</td>
<td>201</td>
<td>187</td>
<td>232</td>
<td>240</td>
<td>145</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Detrimental</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don't know</td>
<td>477</td>
<td>354</td>
<td>316</td>
<td>301</td>
<td>258</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
QUESTION 13: UNIVERSITY EMPHASIS ON EXTENSION

- NO RESPONSE
- TOO HEAVY
- TOO WEAK
- ABOUT RIGHT
- DETRIMENTAL TO UNDERGRADUATE
- DON'T KNOW
Do you feel there are adequate channels for students to voice their opinions?

- Yes
- No
- No opinion

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>S</th>
<th>J</th>
<th>S</th>
<th>G</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No Response</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>1638</td>
<td>396</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>327</td>
<td>340</td>
<td>254</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>1292</td>
<td>214</td>
<td>271</td>
<td>308</td>
<td>327</td>
<td>154</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No opinion</td>
<td>660</td>
<td>178</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>120</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Question 14: Adequate Channels to Voice Opinions**

- **No Response**
- **Yes**
- **No**
- **No Opinion**

**Analysis of Responses**

- Total respondents: 5000
- Percentages: Yes (44.3%), No (35.0%), No opinion (17.9%)

---

To view the percentages, please refer to the bar chart provided in the document.
**ANALYSIS OF RESPONSES**

**Question 15**

Do you feel the Administration is adequately sensitive to student opinion?

- [ ] Yes
- [ ] No
- [ ] No opinion

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>S</th>
<th>J</th>
<th>S</th>
<th>G</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No Response</td>
<td>151</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>1170</td>
<td>267</td>
<td>216</td>
<td>236</td>
<td>243</td>
<td>191</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>1599</td>
<td>278</td>
<td>337</td>
<td>367</td>
<td>404</td>
<td>190</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No opinion</td>
<td>774</td>
<td>229</td>
<td>159</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>144</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>3694</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**QUESTION 15: ADMINISTRATION IS ADEQUATELY SENSITIVE**

- **No Response**
- **Yes**
- **No**
- **No Opinion**
How do you think students should be involved in determining the goals of the University?

- Through serving on Faculty-Student University Committees
- Through serving on departmental Faculty-Student Committees
- Through student government
- Other (specify) ________________________________

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>S</th>
<th>J</th>
<th>S</th>
<th>G</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>University</td>
<td>1602</td>
<td>352</td>
<td>312</td>
<td>334</td>
<td>341</td>
<td>243</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Departmental</td>
<td>1900</td>
<td>327</td>
<td>364</td>
<td>399</td>
<td>467</td>
<td>321</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Government</td>
<td>1036</td>
<td>292</td>
<td>210</td>
<td>193</td>
<td>192</td>
<td>133</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>273</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>4811</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Selected Comments

* The whole university should be run on an administration-faculty-student basis.

* Students can only help determine goals as a part of society.

* Through good personal relationships with the faculty.

* University presidential advisory committee composed of students.

* Representatives to Board of Higher Education.

* To meeting similar to the one with the Legislative Interim Committee.

* Personal communication.

* By being students who wish to learn rather than complain.

* By being allowed to choose and carry out more individualized programs.

* Total polls for all and for all involved.

* Through taking some of the power from the Oregon State Board of Education and giving it to the University.

* Departmental evaluation forms.

* Freedom to select 75% of graduation requirements.

* By being heard and understood

* Students should run and organize sports, debates, MU activities.

* Those committees have no power, given them the power.
Question 17

How do you feel the University should be related to the social, economic, technological and political issues of our times? (i.e., Pollution, Poverty, Discrimination)

- Concerned, but objective and detached
- Not involved
- Active, involved participant
- Some combination of above
- Other (specify)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>S</th>
<th>J</th>
<th>S</th>
<th>G</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No Response</td>
<td>157 (4.3)</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concerned</td>
<td>588 (16.0)</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>131</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uninvolved</td>
<td>63 (1.7)</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Active</td>
<td>1654 (44.7)</td>
<td>340</td>
<td>321</td>
<td>354</td>
<td>389</td>
<td>232</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Combination</td>
<td>1127 (30.5)</td>
<td>290</td>
<td>225</td>
<td>240</td>
<td>225</td>
<td>132</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>105 (2.9)</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>3600</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Question 17: Relation of University to Contemporary Issues**

- **No Response**
- **Concerned**
- **Uninvolved**
- **Active**
- **Combination**
- **Other**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>10</th>
<th>20</th>
<th>30</th>
<th>40</th>
<th>50 %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
Selected Comments

* Objective research.

* It should be actively involved and a source of ideas, but not economically involved.

* Should provide means for positive exchange. All power to the people.

* Those areas of education which is necessary for human survival.

* Each individual can involve himself, the University is here to provide an education for the individual.

* Objectively involved.

* Involved but not active detriment of others.

* The University cannot be detached much longer!

* To assist where possible and to voice the young people's opinions.

* Involved at least enough to present the many facets of such issues intelligently.

* Being a science oriented institution, OSU should be a major source of focus of pollution, poverty, etc.

* Properly prepare people to the above issues.

* Get to all the students.

* Use University facilities and resources to research solutions.

* Academically only.

* It is the individual's responsibility to involve himself where he feels concerned.
**Question 18**

Which of the following factors are most important in stimulating your intellectual life? Rate only three factors in order of importance with No. 1 being most important.

- Library
- Book Store
- Stimulating professors
- Lecture series
- Social life
- Independent reading
- Seminars
- Other students
- Other (specify)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rated #1</th>
<th>Rated #2</th>
<th>Rated #3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No Response</td>
<td>106 (2.9)</td>
<td>No Response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Library</td>
<td>173 (4.7)</td>
<td>Library</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Book Store</td>
<td>33 (.9)</td>
<td>Book Store</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professors</td>
<td>2142 (58.0)</td>
<td>Professors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lectures</td>
<td>146 (4.0)</td>
<td>Lectures</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social life</td>
<td>126 (3.4)</td>
<td>Social Life</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reading</td>
<td>333 (9.0)</td>
<td>Reading</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seminars</td>
<td>119 (3.2)</td>
<td>Seminars</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students</td>
<td>422 (11.4)</td>
<td>Students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>94 (2.5)</td>
<td>Other</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>3694</strong></td>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
QUESTION 18: FACTORS STIMULATING INTELLECTUAL LIFE

- Professors
- Other Students
- Independent Reading
- Lecture Series
- Library
- Seminars
- Social Life
- No Response
- Other
- Book Store

POINT RATING
- First Choice - 3 Points
- Second Choice - 2 Points
- Third Choice - 1 Point

10 20 30 40 50 60 70 80 90 100 110 180 190 200 210 220 POINTS
Selected Comments

* Independent research.

* Honest sincere people (profs, students, etc.) who like their work and want to do it.

* Course content of certain courses.

* My personal goals.

* Personal involvement, practical work.

* Practical work—labs, etc.

* Good profs always bring the best out of people, thus stimulate students to intellectual competence.

* Actually working in areas that I've had lectures and classes in, eg. nursery class—nursery school.

* Well read men who help focus my effort by demonstrating the value to reading certain works of importance.

* Discussion of common interest topics in class or out.

* Outside work.

* Work study job.

* Own interest development.

* Meeting different people and listening to their views.
ANALYSIS OF RESPONSES

Question 19

Has your academic advising at OSU been:

- Poor
- Fair
- Good
- Excellent

How could it be improved?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>F</th>
<th>S</th>
<th>J</th>
<th>S</th>
<th>G</th>
<th>TR</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No Response</td>
<td>182</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>841</td>
<td>177</td>
<td>192</td>
<td>193</td>
<td>199</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>1174</td>
<td>288</td>
<td>240</td>
<td>243</td>
<td>253</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>108</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good</td>
<td>1117</td>
<td>228</td>
<td>195</td>
<td>232</td>
<td>221</td>
<td>228</td>
<td>152</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Excellent</td>
<td>380</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>3694</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

QUESTION 19: ACADEMIC ADVISING

- **No Response**
- **Poor**
- **Fair**
- **Good**
- **Excellent**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>10</th>
<th>20</th>
<th>30</th>
<th>40</th>
<th>50</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>No Response</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Poor</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Fair</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Good</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Excellent</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Selected Comments

* By having each advisor better informed about other areas than his specific department.

* By having more advisors so each advisor has more time for each student.

* They should be better informed as to the field you want to go into and be trained to answer questions and problems you might have.

* Obtain professional advisors, not profs on their own time outside of class.

* Be the advisor of a particular class in your major each term, then get a new advisor each term.

* Advisors should be better prepared.

* Make appointments and take more time to really discuss the choices and problems.

* Be more helpful to unsure students instead of shoving them into a straight jacket program.

* Advisors knowing more about courses and student's needs.

* Get a feedback program from students concerning advice offered in past--to see how successful it turned out to be.

* Add "care"!

* More up to date, better communication. It's frustrating when you don't know an answer--and moreso when your advisor doesn't know and helpless when he can't find out.

* The advisors should be more informed as to University requirements and school requirements. Many do not know.

* With more concern.

* Advisor helping more than just providing signature thinking that's enough.
* Fewer advisees per advisor or advisor specialists.
* More personal contact and concern.
* Requirements, classes should be made consistent and each advisor made aware of them.
* By changing advisors if allowed.
* Having profs in their offices more.
* Grad school faculty needs to agree on requirements for grad students.
**ANALYSIS OF RESPONSES**

**Question 20**

What is your view of extra-curricular activities at OSU?

- [ ] Meaningful
- [ ] Inadequate
- [ ] Too time consuming
- [ ] Other (please specify)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>0</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>12</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Meaningful</td>
<td>1537</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>296</td>
<td>212</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>223</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>189</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inadequate</td>
<td>581</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Too time Con.</td>
<td>539</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>646</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Response</td>
<td>391</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>3694</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>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>F</th>
<th>S</th>
<th>J</th>
<th>S</th>
<th>G</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Meaningful</td>
<td>370</td>
<td>344</td>
<td>337</td>
<td>298</td>
<td>171</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inadequate</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Too Time Con.</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>157</td>
<td>111</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

No Response
Selected Comments

* More concerts and more visitations by men prominent in science and arts.

* One-sided (social rather than intellectual).

* Not open enough for all students.

* Involves mostly "upperclassmen".

* Too Greek-Fraternities and Sororities exercise too much influence.

* Overdone in the area of sports.

* Students as a whole should not be taxed for activities of a few.

* Costs too much.

* Meaningful but time consuming.

* Too time consuming--but, they can increase one's enjoyment while at OSU.

* Don't have time to join.
Which of the following factors present the most serious problems in your education? Check those which apply.

- Advising
- Registration
- Housing
- Lack of stimulating academic atmosphere
- Inadequate instruction
- Inadequate facilities
- No serious problems
- Too heavy academic schedules

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>S</th>
<th>J</th>
<th>S</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>Tr</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Advising</td>
<td>769</td>
<td>181</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>173</td>
<td>178</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Registration</td>
<td>753</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>185</td>
<td>166</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing</td>
<td>456</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of Stimuli</td>
<td>1143</td>
<td>265</td>
<td>225</td>
<td>244</td>
<td>275</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instruction</td>
<td>1156</td>
<td>206</td>
<td>228</td>
<td>259</td>
<td>303</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facilities</td>
<td>631</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>147</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Problems</td>
<td>782</td>
<td>198</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>143</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>158</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schedules</td>
<td>564</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>6254</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
QUESTION 21: SERIOUS PROBLEMS IN EDUCATION

- Advising
- Registration
- Housing
- Lack of stimuli
- Instruction
- Facilities
- No problems
- Heavy academic schedules
Education at OSU would be improved by changing the "mix" in which ways?

- Increasing ratio of faculty to students
- Decreasing ratio of faculty to students
- Decreasing number of minority students
- Increasing number of minority students
- Increasing the number of foreign students
- Decreasing the number of foreign students
- Decreasing the number of out-of-state students
- Increasing the number of out-of-state students
- Other (specify)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>0</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>12</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No Response</td>
<td>888</td>
<td>24.0</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inc. Ratio</td>
<td>2619</td>
<td>70.9</td>
<td>189</td>
<td>190</td>
<td>483</td>
<td>330</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>435</td>
<td>240</td>
<td>404</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dec. Ratio</td>
<td>187</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Response</td>
<td>2155</td>
<td>58.3</td>
<td>172</td>
<td>175</td>
<td>349</td>
<td>310</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>349</td>
<td>247</td>
<td>255</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inc. Minority</td>
<td>1336</td>
<td>36.2</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>255</td>
<td>141</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>207</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>273</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dec. Minority</td>
<td>203</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Response</td>
<td>2319</td>
<td>62.7</td>
<td>172</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>386</td>
<td>313</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>377</td>
<td>267</td>
<td>303</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inc. Foreign</td>
<td>1048</td>
<td>28.4</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>199</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>157</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>210</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dec. Foreign</td>
<td>327</td>
<td>8.9</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Response</td>
<td>2214</td>
<td>59.9</td>
<td>173</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>377</td>
<td>313</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>345</td>
<td>258</td>
<td>304</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inc. Outstate</td>
<td>1190</td>
<td>32.2</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>205</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>201</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>209</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dec. Outstate</td>
<td>290</td>
<td>7.9</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>359</td>
<td>9.7</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### ANALYSIS OF RESPONSES

#### Question 22

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>F</th>
<th>S</th>
<th>J</th>
<th>S</th>
<th>G</th>
<th>-</th>
<th>Res</th>
<th>Nres</th>
<th>Tr</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>No Response</strong></td>
<td>215</td>
<td>143</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>155</td>
<td>191</td>
<td>306</td>
<td>425</td>
<td>157</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Inc. Ratio</strong></td>
<td>565</td>
<td>537</td>
<td>563</td>
<td>594</td>
<td>332</td>
<td>802</td>
<td>1463</td>
<td>354</td>
<td>291</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Dec. Ratio</strong></td>
<td>36</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>No Response</strong></td>
<td>483</td>
<td>398</td>
<td>453</td>
<td>435</td>
<td>349</td>
<td>754</td>
<td>1122</td>
<td>279</td>
<td>226</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Inc. Minority</strong></td>
<td>283</td>
<td>288</td>
<td>271</td>
<td>301</td>
<td>178</td>
<td>354</td>
<td>741</td>
<td>241</td>
<td>163</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Dec. Minority</strong></td>
<td>50</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>No Response</strong></td>
<td>500</td>
<td>430</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>475</td>
<td>374</td>
<td>799</td>
<td>1205</td>
<td>315</td>
<td>245</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Inc. Foreign</strong></td>
<td>262</td>
<td>232</td>
<td>197</td>
<td>222</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>274</td>
<td>580</td>
<td>194</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Dec. Foreign</strong></td>
<td>54</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>197</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>No Response</strong></td>
<td>490</td>
<td>411</td>
<td>455</td>
<td>454</td>
<td>360</td>
<td>762</td>
<td>1190</td>
<td>262</td>
<td>230</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Inc. Outstate</strong></td>
<td>263</td>
<td>247</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>259</td>
<td>164</td>
<td>309</td>
<td>609</td>
<td>272</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Dec. Outstate</strong></td>
<td>63</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>183</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Other</strong></td>
<td>57</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>189</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
QUESTION 22: IMPROVEMENT OF STUDENT "MIX"

**FACULTY TO STUDENTS**
- Increase
- Decrease
- No response

**MINORITY STUDENTS**
- Increase
- Decrease
- No response

**FOREIGN STUDENTS**
- Increase
- Decrease
- No response

**OUT-OF-STATE STUDENTS**
- Increase
- Decrease
- No response

**OTHER**
- 10
- 20
- 30
- 60
- 70 %
Selected Comments

* Increasing involvement with industry.
* Decreasing number of graduate students teaching.
* Higher requirements for T A's.
* Increase ratio of education to students.
* Increase quality not quantity.
* Less instate discrimination.
* More classes and subjects.
* Make deals with other states to reduce out-of-state tuition.
* Increase academic entrance requirements for all except minority students.
* Move all research off campus as it does not "mix" well.
* Develop creative programs as a complement to lecture and learning courses.
* More controversial speakers.
* Increase number of controversial professors.
* Making the university a student organization rather than an administrative and research institution.
**ANALYSIS OF RESPONSES**

**Question 23**

Would you say your total experience at OSU has been:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Very positive</th>
<th>Positive</th>
<th>Mediocre</th>
<th>Poor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>No Response</strong></td>
<td>147 (3.9)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Very Positive</strong></td>
<td>466 (12.6)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Positive</strong></td>
<td>2099 (57.5)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>167</td>
<td>145</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mediocre</strong></td>
<td>861 (23.2)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Poor</strong></td>
<td>121 (3.3)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>F</th>
<th>S</th>
<th>J</th>
<th>S</th>
<th>G</th>
<th>-</th>
<th>Res</th>
<th>NRes</th>
<th>Tr</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Response</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Positive</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positive</td>
<td>399</td>
<td>430</td>
<td>431</td>
<td>473</td>
<td>340</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>224</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mediocre</td>
<td>235</td>
<td>169</td>
<td>184</td>
<td>172</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
QUESTION 24: VIEW OF OREGON STATE UNIVERSITY

| NO RESPONSE |
| ADEQUATE NUMBER AND QUALITY OF PROGRAMS |
| TECHNOLOGICAL INSTITUTION |
| QUALITY GRADUATE INSTITUTION |
| GOOD UNDERGRADUATE INSTITUTION |
| STRONG EMPHASIS ON PROFESSIONAL SCHOOLS |

10 20 30 40 %
## ANALYSIS OF RESPONSES

Question 25

If you had a younger brother or sister, would you advise them to attend OSU?

- Yes
- No
- No opinion

Why ____________________________

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No Response</td>
<td>231</td>
<td>(6.3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>1819</td>
<td>(49.2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>777</td>
<td>(21.0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Opinion</td>
<td>867</td>
<td>(23.5)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Selected Comments

Most frequent answer -- depends on their field of interest.

Second most frequent answer -- it is their decision.

Those who said yes, gave the following reasons:

* More study, less riots.
* Excellent education at OSU.
* Fine education -- morally and socially.
* It's a good place to grow up and if you're education oriented, it's a good atmosphere in which to get education.
* No riots, or demonstrations, or disruptions.
* Campus policies help studying and proper development.
* It's a place where one may really study if he desires.
* Variety of experiences here.
* It's an all-around university.
* Because OSU needs changes and I think he's a good person to help out.

Those who said no, gave the following reasons:

* Better and more relevant schools in California.
* Would recommend a more progressive institution.
* Too conservative to "educate" a person.
* OSU doesn't recognize the creative person.
* PSU means no dorms, less cost, and equal education.
* Poor academic climate.
* Academic program too structured.
* OSU lacks quality instruction and academic environment.
* Many say OSU is too technically minded.
* Too large, not enough personal help.
* Inadequate staff and out-of-date facilities.
## Question 26

Do you believe the use of audio-visual media such as charts, slides, sound tapes, motion pictures, and/or video tape should be:

- [ ] Increased
- [ ] No Change
- [ ] Decreased

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>0</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>12</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No Response</td>
<td>384 (10.4)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increased</td>
<td>2417 (65.4)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>196</td>
<td>174</td>
<td>446</td>
<td>319</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>139</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>378</td>
<td>235</td>
<td>334</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Change</td>
<td>759 (20.5)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>111</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decreased</td>
<td>134 (3.6)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>F</th>
<th>S</th>
<th>J</th>
<th>S</th>
<th>G</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No Response</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increased</td>
<td>537</td>
<td>470</td>
<td>509</td>
<td>535</td>
<td>337</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Change</td>
<td>168</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>166</td>
<td>162</td>
<td>94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decreased</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**ANALYSIS OF RESPONSES**

**Question 27**

Do you believe self-instruction and programmed learning using the above audio-visual media (see question 26) should be:

- Increased
- No Change
- Decreased

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>0</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>12</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No Response</td>
<td>576 (15.6)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increased</td>
<td>1527 (41.3)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>285</td>
<td>186</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>249</td>
<td>193</td>
<td>205</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Change</td>
<td>1036 (28.0)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>161</td>
<td>165</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decreased</td>
<td>596 (15.1)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>.98</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>F</th>
<th>S</th>
<th>J</th>
<th>S</th>
<th>G</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No Response</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>123</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increased</td>
<td>278</td>
<td>295</td>
<td>325</td>
<td>350</td>
<td>266</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Change</td>
<td>260</td>
<td>209</td>
<td>211</td>
<td>221</td>
<td>118</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decreased</td>
<td>141</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**QUESTION 27: USE OF SELF-INSTRUCTION & PROGRAMMED LEARNING**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>10</th>
<th>20</th>
<th>30</th>
<th>40</th>
<th>50 %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>INCREASE</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>DECREASE</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>NO CHANGE</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>NO RESPONSE</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**ANALYSIS OF RESPONSES**

**Question 28**

Was your education prior to coming to OSU adequate preparation for your course of study?

- [ ] Yes
- [ ] No
- [ ] No opinion

Elaborate

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>0</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>12</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No Response</td>
<td>187</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>2386</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>167</td>
<td>152</td>
<td>404</td>
<td>307</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>397</td>
<td>315</td>
<td>316</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>999</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>149</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Opinion</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>F</th>
<th>S</th>
<th>J</th>
<th>S</th>
<th>G</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No Response</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>465</td>
<td>454</td>
<td>491</td>
<td>510</td>
<td>436</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>287</td>
<td>202</td>
<td>214</td>
<td>214</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Opinion</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Selected Comments

* Changing high schools often made adjustment to college easy.
* Those who went to Junior College before coming here felt that it helped in the change from high school to college.
* Inadequate math for engineering career.
* Most schools are lacking in math and science.
* Not enough demand in high school to study.
* High school did not challenge me enough.
* Those who didn't know what field they would pursue when in college found their general high school background inadequate.
* I took the most difficult classes in my field that my high school had to offer and so I was prepared.
* I tried to prepare for what was coming. Living in Corvallis where there is a "University Atmosphere" helps.
* High school courses do not deal in depth; they're too general.
* I knew what to prepare for due to work experience.
* My high school had college prep courses which really helped.
* Many felt that their freshman year of college was a repeat of high school.

QUESTION 28: ADEQUATE EDUCATION PRIOR TO ATTENDING OSU

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NO RESPONSE</th>
<th>YES</th>
<th>NO</th>
<th>NO OPINION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

10 20 30

60%
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Question 29

What has been the single most important factor in your educational experience at OSU?

There were a total of 858 responses.

Selected Comments

* 225 (26.2) felt that good instructors who were personable, interesting, and concerned, and advisors who helped to plan the curriculum were the most important.

* 193 (22.5) said self awareness-experience: The university life in general has developed the life of many students in many ways. Being aware of oneself and experiencing different things through learning. As one student said of the single most important factor of the educational experience at OSU; "The challenges made to me, my way of life communicated through professors, students, written material, and my own thoughts." Another student made the observation that "studying for a grade is the great faculty-student delusion." A third said "realization that education is an on-going process that should continue until death. The world continues to change and so must man."

* 174 (20.3) felt that student interaction and human relationships were important. They want to meet a variety of different people, learning to accept or reject, or be tolerant of them.

* 90 (10.5) responded with research-courses. Much of the importance here lies in the way material was presented in class. Research was a strong category and emphasis on direct experience courses as opposed to theory ones were frequently mentioned.

* 46 (5.4) had negative comments. These ranged from the experiences of extremely poor instructors to the gripe about taxes ahead of education, to conservative elements in the school.
* 39 (4.5) felt that living in residence halls or in Greek houses caused experiences of interaction, togetherness, and empathy.

* 34 (3.9) fell in the category intellectual expansion. This includes learning skills in research, studying. A search for new ideas.

* 17 (2.0) students responded that they liked the extracurricular and social events.

* 16 (1.9) were concerned about grades.

* 11 (1.3) liked the friendly environment.

* 8 (0.9) felt that marriage had played a very important part.

* 5 (0.6) were most aware of the facilities including speakers and equipment.
ANALYSIS OF RESPONSES

Question 30

In achieving your personal educational goals what changes would you suggest for the improvement of the curriculum?

There were a total of 824 responses.

Selected Comments

* 324 (39.4) students felt that there are too many requirements. In addition, they feel that many of the requirements are worthless. They would like to have time to pursue personal interest courses. Suggestions were 1) minimizing requirements and/or 2) extending programs to five years.

* 111 (13.5) students were unsatisfied with their programs of study. They are limited to general courses for the first two years. In their Junior year, they finally get a taste of their major and if it is unpleasant there are a lot of problems involved in changing majors at that late date. They would like to see more method courses in the earlier years of study.

* 89 (10.8) wanted advisors who are informed about requirements. Perhaps a counseling staff should be formed for all students, instead of assigning professors to be advisors. Many students are upset at paying high prices for an education and then getting stuck with TA's and graduate assistants who have a very limited knowledge of the subject. Many students also put in a request for teachers who speak "english". Many of the foreign teachers are hard to understand.

* 89 (10.8) saw a need for the addition of classes in most of the schools on campus. In many cases they stated actual schools that needed enlarging. (Of interest -- 41 said H and SS).

* 82 (10.0) liked the ideas of smaller classes, independent study, and availability of individual help.
* 38 (4.6) were unhappy with registration. Their complaints ranged from lack of choice in time and professor, to a need for preregistration, as well as a need for more sections of most classes.

* 29 (3.5) felt that the emphasis should be changed from grades to learning.

* 23 (2.8) felt that the curriculum is adequate as it is now.

* 15 (1.8) preferred seminars and colloquias to lectures.

* 6 (0.7) felt that there should be creativity in learning processes.

* 6 (0.7) felt that TV lectures wanted elimination.

* 5 (0.6) wanted to see more evening and summer courses offered.

* 5 (0.6) wanted to see more extra-curricular activities.

* 1 (0.1) saw a need for more TV and radio lectures.

* 1 (0.1) saw a need for more exchange programs.
**ANALYSIS OF RESPONSES**

**Question 31**

What do you think are the major problems facing students?

There were a total of 1185 responses.

**Selected Comments**

* 167 (14.1) responded personal adjustment to the university as a whole, new environment, self-discipline, and new discoveries.

* 133 (11.2) thought it was the faculty-student relationship. This includes instructors, administrators, advisors, various other university personnel. Here successful interaction, communication, and concern is lacking.

* 120 (10.1) said the pressure of grades; emphasis placed on grades and on degree rather than learning.

* 108 (9.1) felt there was a lack of adequate knowledgeable instructors and adequate presentation in the subject matter areas.

* 97 (8.2) were bogged under by financial problems.

* 72 (6.1) said classes which are not relevant, interesting. They also feel a need for more classes in particular areas.

* 63 (5.3) students are concerned about the world problems. They are bothered by the isolated university community, and relating their college lives with society's problems.

* 48 (4.0) said the fear of the draft was interfering with their education.

* 42 (3.5) said there is a lack of definite goals. "Where am I going?" "What am I doing here?"

* 41 (3.5) saw a lack of motivation for college students, therefore, there is apathy or lack of interest in the university.
40 (3.4) were unhappy with the mechanics of registration as well as not being able to get wanted classes.

39 (3.3) said the university is too crowded which leads to impersonalization.

34 (2.9) were having problems in managing their time.

30 (2.5) said it is a difficult decision to choose a major, especially for an incoming freshman.

23 (1.9) are dismayed at the required courses they must take to fulfill requirements. Courses that are not relevant to them or their major. They resent the strict curriculum requirements.

20 (1.7) had trouble keeping a reasonable balance between social activities and their academic studies.

19 (1.6) said there was rough competition in college.

16 (1.3) found it difficult to find a job during college and after.

15 (1.3) said there were pressures from home to go to school and get good grades.

15 (1.3) feel there are too many decisions to be made.

14 (1.2) felt that classroom, equipment, and social facilities are inadequate.

13 (1.1) say there is inadequate counseling and counselors.

9 (0.8) say students have a lack of voice in university matters.

7 (0.6) felt OSU is too conservative.
ANALYSIS OF RESPONSES

Question 32a
How do you characterize a good course.
There were a total of 1076 responses.

Selected Comments

* 209 (19.4) want a course that they enjoy, that holds their attention, one that they are willing to attend at 8:00 a.m.

* 191 (17.7) want a class that makes the student want to do additional work on his own, it should be professionally interesting, and taught slightly above the student's level of understanding.

* 149 (13.8) feel that it is important that the professor be interesting, dedicated, knowledgeable, willing to help the students, and must deliver the material in an interesting, and organized manner.

* 111 (10.3) feel that classes should be relevant to today's environment.

* 105 (9.7) want courses that are relevant to their major field of study.

* 85 (7.9) want classes that actually teach them something. Where they remember the material months and years later, not just long enough for the test.

* 62 (5.8) want discussion classes with a lot of interaction between the students and the instructor.

* 44 (4.1) felt that visual aids, guest speakers, and versatility in class presentation is important.

* 35 (3.3) feel that a good text is very important.

* 34 (3.2) feel that classes must be small.

* 22 (2.0) want the class taught on their level of understanding.
* 18 (1.7) want classes that teach them what they were supposed to have learned. That is, the course should follow its outline set up in the catalog and in the outline set up by the professor.

* 7 (0.7) want nothing but concise facts with a great deal of memorization.

* 4 (0.4) feel that the other students in the class must be interested in the subject.
ANALYSIS OF RESPONSES

Question 32b

How do you characterize a good professor?

There were a total of 1447 responses.

Selected Comments

* 366 (25.2) felt a good professor is one who is concerned about the student as an individual and is willing to take time to talk to him about problems.

* 284 (19.6) said the professor should show enthusiasm in his presentation, thus stimulating the students. Overall, a professor who can capture the interest of his students through effective presentation.

* 149 (10.2) said one who knows the material well.

* 124 (8.5) said one who is sincerely interested in his subject matter. One student defines a good professor as one who has "actual interest in his field, an ability to project to his students the excitement of it and an urge to keep learning more about it."

* 75 (5.2) said a prepared professor who presents material in an organized manner.

* 66 (4.6) said the professor should be human. This includes friendship, sensitivity, acceptance of criticism, willingness to admit a mistake, dedication.

* 58 (4.0) said he should communicate ideas to the students in subject matter and personal discussions.

* 58 (4.0) said he should be broadminded, one who adapts to his particular class, and welcomes different viewpoints. One student says this of a good professor, "willing to constantly re-examine lecture material and course emphasis in light of changing student needs."
* 45 (3. 1) wanted one who is current in his lecture material, i.e. he doesn't use notes which are 5 years old. As one student says: "a good professor makes an honest effort to keep abreast with change in his subject."

* 44 (3. 1) felt that the instructor should be an honest and fair person in testing, grading, etc.

* 39 (2. 7) said the professor should present the material in a way that motivates the student to think creatively, critically, and to go beyond the requirements of the course.

* 34 (2. 4) thought humor added to the informal, personal atmosphere.

* 34 (2. 4) answered that he should give lectures which cover course material and yet are relevant to society and student's needs. A professor who emphasizes the importance of the course for the individual in today's society.

* 32 (2. 2) said the professor should allow open discussion in class.

* 18 (1. 3) responded by saying a professor should consider the students on their own level. One who does not look down upon the student, but instead respects his part in the classroom.

* 11 (0. 8) want the professor to present material in a challenging manner.

* 10 (0. 7) said the professor should be available during his office hours or after class to discuss problems, concepts. One who can be approached.
QUESTION 23: TOTAL EXPERIENCE AT OREGON STATE UNIVERSITY

- NO RESPONSE
- VERY POSITIVE
- POSITIVE
- MEDIocre
- POOR

10 20 30 50 60 %
## ANALYSIS OF RESPONSES

### Question 24

Which description best suits your view of OSU?

- [ ] A large state university with adequate number and quality of programs to meet most students' needs
- [ ] A technological and scientific institution
- [ ] A quality graduate and professional institution
- [ ] A good undergraduate institution with broad programs in liberal education
- [ ] An institution with strong emphasis on professional schools and limited emphasis on programs in Humanities and Social Sciences

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>0</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>12</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No Response</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>(4.1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adequate</td>
<td>1152</td>
<td>(31.2)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>239</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>190</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technological</td>
<td>617</td>
<td>(16.7)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality Grad.</td>
<td>169</td>
<td>(4.5)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undergrad.</td>
<td>141</td>
<td>(3.8)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional</td>
<td>1465</td>
<td>(39.7)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>225</td>
<td>199</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>186</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>354</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>F</th>
<th>S</th>
<th>J</th>
<th>S</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Adequate</td>
<td>324</td>
<td>225</td>
<td>220</td>
<td>223</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technological</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>139</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality Grad.</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undergrad.</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional</td>
<td>273</td>
<td>305</td>
<td>327</td>
<td>352</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
How do you characterize a good university?
There were a total of 1018 responses.

Selected Comments

* 202 (19.8) felt that good professors, good courses, and good facilities were important.

* 193 (18.9) felt there should be a balance between professional courses and courses that are relevant to today's environment.

* 188 (18.4) felt it should provide programs for all students. This includes providing programs for all the different students already here and also providing programs to bring different students to this university. They want to see many minority groups represented.

* 105 (10.3) thought the school should be concerned with each individual's goals.

* 73 (7.2) thought there should be a great deal of interaction between students, faculty, and administration.

* 54 (5.3) said the university should teach the students to think and allow them to think.

* 53 (5.2) wanted to see versatility in all aspects of the university.

* 42 (4.1) felt that a university should provide adequate training for the student's profession.

* 36 (3.6) thought the university should have a high academic rating.

* 32 (3.2) wanted the university to be small, intimate, friendly.
* 19 (1.9) felt that there should be interested and involved students on campus.

* 15 (1.5) felt that the university should emphasize research.

* 6 (0.6) saw a need for a good counseling service.
ANALYSIS OF RESPONSES

Question 33

What can be done to encourage better teaching at OSU?
There were a total of 762 responses.

Selected Comments

* 159 (20.9) felt teacher evaluation by students was the answer to many of the student's complaints. It included a variety of evaluations from rating forms, to grades of A-F, through reviews by departments on quality of instruction. There were also opinions on publications of results of the teacher evaluations. Most thought that the teacher evaluation by students should be emphasized greatly through making them known to the student body, and as a determining factor for firing ineffective professors.

* 116 (15.2) said that an increase in salaries and better facilities at OSU were needed. The students who answered this category felt that teachers were greatly underpaid. Salary increases and better facilities might attract better instructors.

* 102 (13.4) said that the policy of publish or perish should be abolished. Students feel that too much emphasis is placed on publication and perhaps not enough on teaching. The insurance of tenure may keep poor instructors. One student says "promotion should be on the basis of teaching ability rather than longevity or literary production."

* 87 (11.4) said to eliminate old, incompetent, ineffective instructors. "Old" does not reveal age but the attitude of the instructor, and his dated lectures. There should be more careful hiring of professors who are better in teaching and relating to the students.

* 69 (9.1) Two thoughts are incorporated here. There should be smaller classes for better student teacher relationships and more faculty should be hired so that the classes are smaller and teaching may be more effective.
67 (8.8) said that in addition to the need for eliminating tenure is the importance of stressing teaching rather than research. Students feel that often too much time is spent on research and therefore teaching of the subject matter fails. Also, there is a suggestion that the poor instructors do research while the good teachers teach exclusively. A combination of both is poor.

46 (6.0) said there is a need for more successful student-teacher relations. An instructor who cares about the student's needs is a better teacher.

22 (2.9) felt that there should be methods of teaching courses for all professors that are teaching. Along the line is a suggestion made by a student that professors who teach methods courses actually experience teaching that grade level.

21 (2.8) said there should be less restrictions placed on instructors and their teaching.

20 (2.6) felt that instructors that have done an excellent teaching job should be rewarded cash or some type of recognition.

20 (2.6) said there should not be teaching assistants and secondly, teaching assistants lack preparation due to time and the skills needed in instruction. Some of the skills deal with speaking ability, and specific techniques.

10 (1.3) saw a need for better course and curriculum development.

9 (1.2) saw a need for materials that are relevant and practical to the student.

8 (1.0) said grades should be eliminated as there is too much stress on them now.

6 (0.8) said there is a need for more visual aids.
ANALYSIS OF RESPONSES

What role should Humanities and Social Sciences play in this institution?

There were a total of 756 responses.

Selected Comments

* 285 (37.7) felt that it should be the same as any school on campus. It should play an equal part in each student's education.

* 106 (14.0) felt that it should play a major part.

* 100 (13.2) felt the department should be involved in community affairs and problems. It should expand in the research area. It should make all students aware of life, teach them how to think in terms of society's needs.

* 73 (9.7) thought it should play a very minor part or no part at all. Perhaps a supplementary part to the scientific schools.

* 65 (8.6) felt it should be an integral part of every undergraduate's program of study.

* 56 (7.4) thought it should concentrate on offering the best program possible to those who want it. It should not be required but elective.

* 40 (5.3) felt that it should continue playing the same part it is now.

* 31 (4.1) thought it should provide a background for those who want it and feel it would strengthen them in their major field.
If you had another quarter at OSU to freely choose, in what departments would you elect courses?

There were a total of 2216 responses.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Department</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Humanities and Social Sciences</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anthropology</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>1.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Architecture</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>0.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Art</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>6.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economics</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>1.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English (WR, LIT)</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>4.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geography</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>1.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>History</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>3.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Journalism</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>0.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Language</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>1.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Music</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>2.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philosophy</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>2.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Political Science</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>1.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychology</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>5.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religion</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>3.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sociology</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>3.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speech</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>1.98</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<p>| Science                        |       |            |
| Biochemistry and Biophysics    | 9     | 0.41       |
| Botany                         | 23    | 1.03       |
| Chemistry                      | 33    | 1.48       |
| Computer                       | 17    | 0.76       |
| Geology                        | 25    | 1.12       |
| Math and Statistics            | 91    | 4.11       |
| Biology                        | 41    | 1.85       |
| Oceanography                   | 48    | 2.17       |
| Physics                        | 19    | 0.85       |
| Zoology                        | 34    | 1.53       |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Field</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Average</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Agriculture</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>(2.40)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Animal Science</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>(0.90)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farm Crops</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>(0.63)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fisheries and Wildlife</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>(1.62)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Food Technology</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>(0.36)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Horticulture</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>(0.41)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Range Management</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>(0.14)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soils</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>(0.04)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Veterinary Medicine</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>(0.18)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business and Technology</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>(3.75)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secretarial Science</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>(0.10)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>(3.07)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engineering</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>(1.62)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agricultural</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>(0.14)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chemical</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>(0.04)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Civil</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>(0.27)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electrical</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>(0.49)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Industrial</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>(0.18)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mechanical</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>(0.27)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Production Tech.</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>(0.45)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forestry</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>(1.94)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Home Economics</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>(2.98)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clothing</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>(0.49)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family Life</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>(0.72)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foods</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>(0.27)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pharmacy</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>(0.41)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical Ed. and Recreation</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>(3.03)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ROTC</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>(0.14)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Question 36

What factor or factors do you feel are needed to make OSU an institution of greater excellence in the future?

There were a total of 783 responses.

Selected Comments

* 171 (21.8) said more and better professors are needed. More professors are needed so that classes will be less crowded and more personal student-teacher relationships can develop. Better professors are the ones who are relevant to the times, current in material, dedicated to teaching rather than extra-curricular material.

* 77 (9.8) feel there is a need for more Humanities and Social Sciences courses and less technological courses. Several enlightening comments by students reflect the need for social, relevant education.

* 56 (7.2) feel there should be more communication between students, instructors, and administration. One student writes that the factors needed to make OSU an institution of greater excellence is "a responsive administration and faculty, capable of rapid change, willing to take or share the initiative in exploration of new avenues of communication with the students."

* 55 (7.0) said more facilities are needed and outdated ones should be replaced. They especially see a need for a larger library.

* 48 (6.1) want a broader range of courses; relevant courses; less stringent curriculum without required courses.

* 46 (5.9) feel the university should be aware of the changing needs of the students and should gear education to meet those needs.

* 46 (5.9) want a more flexible, liberal university. Flexibility, change with the times, and less stringent rules are emphasized.
44 (5.6) say that improvement in the university takes money, whether it is in the hiring of more and better instructors or the increase in facilities.

43 (5.5) A large number of students reflect the need for the university to take an active role in social changes and problems. Several students respond on this topic: "OSU is so technically minded that the people, faculty, and students try to shut themselves off from the social revolution that is occurring in the U.S. OSU people are afraid to fully open their minds and openly confront the problem at hand"; "emphasis on the realities of life and the application of scientific thought to human and technological problems to advance knowledge on both fronts"; "OSU must become deeply concerned with and actually involved in the environmental problems facing Oregon and the nation today. We are well equipped to do this, but seem to lack real commitment."

30 (3.8) say that the size of the university has a hidden meaning. There is a need for more personalization and quality instruction.

26 (3.4) say there should be a greater emphasis on the graduate program with quality in the research program.

22 (2.8) want to broaden the minority students program with more minority and foreign students. One student attributes an intellectual isolation of OSU due to a negligible number of blacks and other ethnic groups.

21 (2.7) say that grades do not emphasize learning. More pass-fail courses should be offered.

19 (2.4) say that higher academic standards in entrance examinations for students and selection of professors should be enforced.

18 (2.3) say there should be less emphasis on athletics, more on education.

14 (1.8) say there is a need for students to be heard. They should have a greater say in university matters.

13 (1.7) want a restructuring or elimination of the tenure system. Concern on this topic is due to the dismissal of good instructors who have not published and retention of poor, outdated teachers.
* 11 (1.4) want a new system of registration -- one with less hassle and choice of professor.

* 7 (0.9) want a better staff at OSU including persons other than instructors and administrators. These deal with personnel in offices.

* 7 (0.9) more extracurricular activities are needed at OSU.

* 5 (0.6) want a better school of education -- encompassing instructors and courses.

* 4 (0.5) want OSU to be more conservative.
ANALYSIS OF RESPONSES

Selected Comments

* Question 24 is unfairly loaded. As I see it, OSU is an average undergraduate university with moderately strong engineering and agriculture programs, and a graduate program which, although it tries to improve in reputation, is still second rate, partly as a result of lack of fund, partly because of administrative inertia, and largely because of its location in what must be described as a rather unimposing area.

* Concerning question 30: OSU (Dept. of Business and Technology) offered two excellent courses on the U.S. legal system in the BA 411-412 series. The series was cut so that now only 412 remains. This was a crime! These two courses were some of the most enlightening and informative I have ever taken. They offered information most persons are dangerously without. An understanding of our legal system should be a part of everyone's education at OSU. Far more important than hygiene! I would like to see BA 411 reinstated, perhaps made a university requirement.

* A student-faculty group (consisting of people from each academic department) should be set up. This group would meet once every two weeks in the MU, to hear gripes from the students. If by a vote of the group the gripe is legitimate they would advise the president to some action on the matter.

* The university should provide more, modern, housing (non-profit) or upgrade requirements for private housing adjacent to campus.

* I believe that instruction practices in physics and math are the worst anywhere. A thorough revamping of these departments should be in order.
Anytime an institution conceived by the majority and supported by
the majority falls prey to the minority and I don't care what minority
it is--remember that the rising sun and swastika were once
minorities--then I for one am going to unlimber my gattling guns.

1. Do away with professional athletics
2. Student parking on north side of campus
3. American Instructors
4. More electives
5. Reasonable married student housing

Learn from the experiences of other colleges and universities in
other states and correct as many deficiencies as possible to prevent
some of the destructive incidents that have occurred.

I feel there is a real need for a social center for graduate students
and foreign students. Graduate students particularly could gain
much by having the opportunity to meet and interact on an informal
basis.

The true learning process takes place when the student interacts
with others who have different backgrounds and ideas. Encourage
more student discussion of major topics of today. INVOLVEMENT.

This university is too conservative. It should loosen its hold on the
old traditions and live in the present.

OSU has got to get more minority students and lower class whites
and develop a tutorial program even at the risk of becoming a
Cornell. The pledge to the flag says "with liberty and justice
to all." The university I feel must be the vanguard of this move-
ment and lead society.

Lack of gym facilities for graduate students. Swimming pool should
be open all day except for team practices and matches. Great need
for squash and hand-ball courts. Students should have more say
in MU activities.

There should be a more satisfactory, more convenient way to
conduct registration. How ridiculous to hold classes before students
know if they will be in it. It is a real inconvenience to come at
night to pick up class schedules. It is a hardship on those of us
who have families and are commuters.
A good book which I feel deals well with this and offers excellent thoughts is *Education and Ecstasy* by George B. Leonard. He has a lot of valuable things to say.

This university should try its hardest to involve the student in the world he will meet after graduation and not just place books and classes before him. College should be a preparation for life and not just a career niche. It should provide every opportunity to present speakers, and media on controversial and current topics including both sides be they anti-American, anti-religious, etc.

Let the administration support and encourage the free university concept. It stimulates thought.

Raise the 2.0 probationary GPA.

As an undergraduate, my viewpoint was very narrow, but after serving in the Navy for 5 years and returning for further education, I feel that student unrest is due to students wanting something better but not having the experience to know what or how to change the system. This may require submission of various alternatives to them so they know what is available or possible. This questionnaire should be used more often.

I have suggested more or greater communication with the students, but I feel the school must always demand responsibility from students. Do not knuckle under to irresponsible demands but do listen and do hear when responsible students speak.

Take more pressure off the students by relaxing the importance of grades. A grade of D is unsatisfactory, but not failing so why not make below 1.50 probation. Too many instructors give D's and say well, it is not failing, when it might as well be.

Some revision of the grading system. A re-definition of letter grades or a new type of grading system; one S-U course per term is not enough.

I realize money is always a problem, but many buildings such as the Men's Gym are really archaic and should be renewed.

Registration -- students deserve at least one chance to get the professor they want.
Stop trying to control students, they must sooner or later make decisions and accept the consequences. Start trying to design rules and regulations where the student can follow rational alternatives.

I am an out-of-state student and the tuition is ridiculous. I don't understand. It keeps going up and it's forcing many out. Is that the purpose? To get rid of out-of-staters? I'd think that you'd want a good cross-section of this country to be represented.

Most students at OSU seem to have common backgrounds. I think college students would very much benefit from contact with people of other cultures, American and otherwise.

Received A.B. from Univ. of Washington and M.S. from Portland State. Teaching quality is no better in these schools. No wonder students rebel when so few professors try to improve their teaching methods.

The administration must be more open-minded and liberal about so many things. There is so much red tape involved in just voting on an amendment to a constitution that it is ridiculous. A lot of rules need to be modified and done away with in reference to the girls living groups, co-ed living, etc. Also, radical speakers need to be brought onto this campus if the student body wants to. I feel the reins are just too tight and that OSU is almost archaic in this sense.

Since there are so many students, each one different, I feel that it must be realized that there is always going to be a minority really willing to learn and that what is offered is ample for a start.

There needs to be more room in the university for the true teacher who has only a little research responsibility. Eliminate the publish or perish idea.

Administration is a service. It should be restructured so that there is not a mixing of the mechanical functions of a university and job of policy making and philosophical development. That latter job should lie more with the academic personnel.

A good research scientist should not be forced into administrative work if he wants to move on to jobs of more recognition, responsibility, and pay. Positions should be available that make use of his research abilities and knowledge.
* If everything was an S-U course, there would be less pressure on the students and they could learn because it is good to learn.

* I would like to see everyone have the opportunity to preregister the two weeks before dead week for the next term. Then classes could be created to take care of conflicts in scheduling. Especially in the field of H and SS. I would like to see a new building made composed of simple classrooms to hold the overflow of students in any area of that field.

* I think the university should quit hiring and firing professors on the basis of how much they contribute to publications and RESEARCH. Most of these professors don't give two hoots about their students. The really good instructors are told to leave—many such as Mr. Frank Harper are the ones who help the students the most. The student was Mr. Harper's first interest and I learned much more from him than I have in any other class.

* I believe that the course load is entirely too heavy. OSU offers semester hours for quarter courses. Less emphasis should be placed on cramming and more on independent study. You should not have to be required to take so many hours of this or that.

* I know it is trivial, but can you please arrange to get more left-handed desks.

* I would like to suggest driver training for those foreign students, and others who haven't learned how to drive yet.

* Let BA and BS, MA and MS, holders teach. Let the Ph. D.'s play with their test tubes.

* You may find it interesting to know that in 2 1/2 years here, I have had only two really stimulating teachers. It becomes more interesting when you know that they are both only instructors.

* At registration please get a lot of extra, qualified help at the registrars office and station at the coliseum.

* How about pre-registration? I've gone to classes which were scheduled to meet despite the disruption caused by registration and the profs have not shown up. Books cannot be purchased, since I have no idea what professor I'll have.
I have gone to Portland State and find myself comparing a lot. The most important difference is that Portland State contains professors of wide variety—both liberals and conservatives. Their teachers are involved with the students—much more respect is evident thus deeper interest and involvement. OSU lacks the variety of professors who relate themselves with students—they are unconcerned.

The math department for the lower division courses is terrible.

Only courses in major should be graded. All others should be S-U.

Government is too powerful. Our lives are controlled by the draft. Jobs are controlled by amount of money the government sends out. I question whether out-of-state students should have to pay more than in-state. Maybe Oregon State people could go out of state if other institutions had lower tuitions. I hope to see some evidence that this survey had an effect. Thank you.

I don't believe in student protest when it reaches a point where other student's education is interrupted.

Better music facilities should be made available for students.

I feel a more comprehensive study should be made into the textbooks used in some of the undergraduate studies.

I think OSU is overpopulated. It creates impersonal feelings between professors and students. Secondly, computer registration needs to be straightened out.

This school needs more real instructors instead of a crowd of experts who cannot communicate with anyone but themselves. The practice of sticking Ph. D. 's into classes to "teach", and really fail is a failure of the school.

More professors, smaller classes.

All in all—it's a pretty darn good university.

Work out computer registration soon!

Let us have a choice in our professors at registration.
* The campus is not the place for an emotional explosion. Good thought patterns are difficult to develop and require an atmosphere of self-discipline and peace.

* The problems facing society must inevitably be solved by both engineers and H and SS people. The first to provide the practical means or avenue of approach to solve the problem and the second group to provide the means to get the people to accept or demand that the problem be solved or that the solution be implemented. These groups need more and better understanding between them. I personally feel that this is the largest problem facing our university.

* Something I've sensed since I've been here. The professors who do research and write books and who are boring, monotonous, or uninteresting in the classroom seem to enjoy higher esteem in the eyes of the administration and faculty than those teachers who are controversial, imaginative, and honest about how they feel. What is more important in a university, to do research and give second hand effort to teaching or vice versa. The teachers have that decision to make. How they decide will affect the atmosphere at OSU and the excellence of instruction.

* More duplicating facilities for use by students.

* Eliminate TV classes. If all we wanted was watch TV, it could be watched at home for nothing.

* Engineering -- either more choice or change into a 6 year program, with more liberal program and some choice.

* An institution of higher learning should be a place where the student is what is important. He should not take a back seat to research, federal grants, and public images. This university should be for the STUDENT and not for the professor or researcher.

* Please publish the results of this survey.

* Do not bend backward just because other schools are. There is such a thing as majority rights.

* A good system of maintaining correct phone numbers, social security numbers, addresses.
* Please improve the mathematics department. Please provide an informal study area of large size, similar to commons, but mostly for study.

* Maybe some open hearings could be held, i.e. similar to Legislative Task Force on Education?

* Humanize the program, emphasize teaching and experimentation, increase student choice and planning-power.

* Registration is a mess! Write to Michigan State University for suggestions.

* I believe that it is time the university got on with informing, teaching, and instructing, etc. This is the place for it. I don't feel that it should turn into an "example or demonstration" for every problem. I'm very much in agreement with the idea of the well-informed, concerned citizen, but the university structure itself should not become so entangled as to stop functioning at its most effective level.

* Please hire TEACHERS! Some graduate students show more interest and enthusiasm than many professors and should be encouraged to stay on and teach.

* Listen to the students who care. Give professors more of a chance. Open your minds to the music of life and move.

* Less emphasis should be placed on declaration of major.

* Why not tell students why and how certain decisions are really made. For example: Why tenure? How decided? Why publish-research? How are administrators and faculty evaluated? How much money is available? Why was it spent on this or that?

* I feel like I have wasted my time taking courses that are required but that will in no way enhance my ability to excell in my major area now that I am about to enter the field.

* Eliminate or reduce to an honest level, the testing fee for challenging of course. It doesn't cost $15 to administer the test for a 3 hour course.

* More seating space at the library to study.
* Why can't it be arranged to open adequate sections for the classes?

* Being an out-of-state student, I feel that we need more of them. Lowering the number of them just lowers the opportunities for people to get to know different kinds of people, different ways, etc. I think it is hurting people.

* Improve quality of humanity classes and get some competent math teachers.

* I think there are far too many faculty members who stay on after completing graduate school here. It is too imbred a university. Positions should be filled by out-of-state people as well to bring in fresh views and ideas.

* A student evaluation of individual classes and professors should be initiated.

* A faculty register is very important and much needed.

* In many areas of study, women students are not allowed to join departmental clubs and honor societies. They are therefore denied an opportunity to further themselves in their areas by meeting the 'right' people.

* I feel that in general students are getting the raw end of the deal on the grading system at this institution. If you are going to compare students by their GPA, then why do you convert from a numerical grade to a letter grade, then turn around and convert back to a numerical GPA? Why not use a 4.00 system entirely. If a student gets a B+ in the present system is it the same as a B-?

* I do not like computer registration -- can't choose professor.

* OSU policy and students are too conservative. Art department is pitiful.

* You are doing O.K., but look a little more for help. Seek out the people in the local community.

* The methods of dishing out finals is outdated. There is no point in making the good students rehash material they have shown they already know.
Try to improve the level of student competition in the major field--this improves intelligence and ability in both the academic and professional levels.

The main reason I came to college was to learn and prepare myself for the field I am interested in. I feel that the university puts too much emphasis on grades and on covering so much material in a term and not enough emphasis on teaching and preparing students for their chosen career.

If large-group lectures in the humanities cannot be eliminated, at least provide small discussion groups, lab sessions, to coordinate more student participation in the courses.

OSU could well be expanded in three ways. 1. more emphasis on liberal arts, with more courses and areas. 2. the introduction of more terminal 2 year vocational-technical curricula. 3. expansion of the graduate school, mainly in liberal arts, but also in the science and professions.

The university is a place where education is supposed to be taking place. Research has a place, but educating should be first. Allow the student a serious chance to evaluate all professors and the department should use this information.

A university encouraging a student to think and create ideas, and discuss his ideas reasonably with others is a university of progress.

I would like to see the number of students at OSU remain the same while the number of instructors increases. I would not mind paying a little more for smaller classes and more personal attention from instructors.

More use of advisors as advisors and less use of unconcerned professors as advisors would improve the program. Use only those professors who willingly volunteer to advise. Too many students are neglected by an advisor with other interests.

I don't like lecture classes with 350 students in them. I am not motivated in such a class to study or participate. Registration should be before vacations and schedules picked up after vacations.

You haven't asked about ROTC. I'm in it and hope to see it persist.
No homework should be required because if a person has the intelligence to pass without why should he have to do it. It is his education and his life and he should be able to study as he chooses. It is his grade. Midterms are enough to test a person's knowledge of the material.

Teachers on the college level are not gods. They should be required to be taught how to teach the same as high school teachers.

I have seen institutions of higher learning in other states practically exclude undergraduate education in favor of graduate work. In my opinion Oregon cannot now afford to do this. Undergraduate education is virtually unavailable except at the 2 universities.

I think OSU's liberal arts requirements in the engineering and professional schools are about right. I think that their graduates need to have an awareness of what is going on in society and should be good citizens. But there is a limit to the amount of time and money that a student can spend learning it. The scientific and technical fields are expanding so rapidly that it takes a vast amount of time and study just to be momentarily competent in one's field--let alone in everybody else's field. I happen to like liberal arts, but I don't want them shoved down my throat compliments of the liberal arts majors. I'm a heck of a lot better in their field than they are in mine.

How about a more efficient registrars office at the start of the term. There is an awfully long line that usually causes you to miss classes, etc., in order to straighten out the computer's program.

Tenure of faculty can be as bad as it is good when it is granted essentially on a life-time basis. There are those who receive it and then abuse it be retiring on the job and serving only themselves. That is why a periodic review by a qualified committee would be useful.

All schools have drawbacks and in time with enough people concerned maybe some day an education will be what it should be.

Advisors should be easily accessible to students. They should be on the campus more often than 1 or 2 days every other week.

Reduce restrictions on foreign students admission.
I find it objectionable when professors use class time to project their satirical views. If they want to express themselves they should do it on their own time not on mine.

Are you another Commission? Have you read the Report of the President's Commission on Violence in America? Truth; facts; cause and effect; everyone agrees. Because this Report was true, nobody has acted on it and no one can or will act on it. By distributing this questionnaire, you will reinforce the foolish view of most students that their views have some effect. Fine; this reinforcement may justify the costs associated with printing this questionnaire. But have you also fooled yourselves into thinking that you as individuals can influence the course of this institution? If so, may I suggest that you are even less well "educated" (in the best sense) than I?

I, as a chemistry major, was required to take first year German. The reason for this requirement is that some original articles are not translated into English. I feel that the present course in German here at OSU should be changed and orientated more toward this goal. I am presently required to spend a large amount of time learning to properly pronounce each word so that I can properly speak the language. I feel that a section in German should be established that would be orientated to a greater extent toward reading and writing.

I feel students could benefit from a 3-day career carnival in the fall quarter such as offered regularly by Michigan State University, where representatives from industry set up displays and are available to discuss their company--providing an opportunity for students to be exposed to possible future employers.

Please consider the failings in the grading system. Today, students don't worry about how much they learn. They worry instead, about how to get an "A". Also, the usual 4 year curriculums should be extended to about 6 years. This will help promote absorption of knowledge without cramming, because a longer, less hectic, time period is utilized.

I think it would be great if a student could take a course without worrying about prerequisites.

The health institutions are very poor and should be developed with pharmacy and some medical students getting involved to help make up shortages.
* Why not make OSU the first university to develop an effective means for evaluating a teacher's performance. This might eventually allow a system of recognition of merit which might be applied to his professional performance file, and possibly replace some required research publications.

* A more published schedule of available recreation facilities open to students not connected to the PE departments and/or not living on campus.

* A closer relationship with community colleges for major programs. L. B. C. C. in Albany could lighten the Freshman and Sophomore classes if the courses were the same. This would relieve more instructors at OSU to have smaller classes for better teaching and learning.

* Education in America can serve a critical function in the very near future. If we choose to do so we can provide most students the opportunity and necessary help to develop constructive, critical, innovative thought. Democracy is not a practicable form of government unless the people are able to form their own judgment as well as having the freedom to do so. Advertising and militarism are very grave threats unless the people are able to sort facts and myths.

* Students at OSU would greatly benefit if a great emphasis were placed on recruiting more foreign students, minority groups, and out-of-state students.

* Either provide enough classes for those who enroll or close up shop. I'm tired of closed classes and am tempted to speak out against OSU because of it.

* I think the S-U system of grading is a great idea. The worry over grades is enough to make me hysterical after every test.

* I do not understand why I can only transfer 93 credits from Lower Columbia College. The only reason I have been able to get from anybody is that it does not offer a 4 year degree. That is one hell of a good reason to make me go to school another quarter so I can have enough credits to graduate.

* Students need to do more independent study -- they are allowed to become lazy in large classes with multiple choice tests.
* If grades must be emphasized, something better than midterms and finals should be measure of the amount learned. I think written papers are a little better -- although dishonesty does interfere with this type measure. Perhaps the answer is in de-emphasis of grades. Scholarships and other grade important factors could be awarded on basis of recommendation or evaluation by professors of students.

* Please consider using entrance exams or high school GPA as a limiting factor rather than large tuition increases. The university is surely not helping itself by permitting only those economically fit to enter.

* The mathematics department needs to start over from the beginning. Do not use foreign students for TA's and replace some of the undergraduate books.

* More emphasis on a broad education -- less on professional training.

* The university must never give up its dignity for the students, yet the faculty must never become so wrapped up in narrow minds as to not expand and broaden.

* Tell the people what OREGON STATE is really like -- it is a professional school that is very weak in liberal arts. Out-of-state students would not make the mistake of coming to the wrong school.

* I would like to see a department of Computer Science developed at OSU. This university has a growing and very dynamic computer center that is not being used in the most efficient manner. Since various departments are just developing courses as they see fit, they are not being coordinated in a manner which is in the best interests of the student.

* Before entering college I had high hopes of gaining the knowledge necessary to pursue my ambitions, but I find that all I am achieving is a degree on a piece of paper. In whole, I am disappointed with higher education.

* I feel that the time a student spends studying on his own is far more important than the time spent in a lecture.

* I've enjoyed every minute at OSU. Such a friendly, scholarly campus.
* Graduate students should be better prepared to teach classes than they are.

* Despite the problems at OSU, the student should realize that one gets out of something what one puts into it! With the proper attitude and peace of mind, one can get a good education at OSU.

* I would like to see the present grading system replaced by a system that forces all students to perform at a given level with no penalty, social or otherwise, for taking more than normal time to acquire required skills or insight.

* The practice of requiring students to join a school as Freshman and even Sophomores is entirely unnecessary -- most of these students are unsure and will eventually change their minds anyway.

* There should be more 1 credit hour classes that can be taken by non-majors.

* De-emphasize the authoritarian aspect of the university and give the individual the freedom and authority to govern his own learning process which must grow from the individual student and not be imposed from without.

* I have only been here a term but have found a great deal of apathy on the part of students and professors as to current issues of the day. Maybe this could be improved with more seminar groups offered dealing with current issues.

* I am not against the study of science and technology only the emphasis it now has on industry which is destroying a world. If we can change the emphasis to survival with everyone working towards it, OSU could lead the nation in solving the problems that are so urgently needed.

* Some of the pre-requisites and the actual content of some required classes could use some investigation and revision. Orientation and introduction courses aren't much use after the first few weeks.

* "Search" courses as at U of O sound very interesting and would provide opportunity to enrich or explore. Perhaps limited pass-fail hours should be offered to underclassmen to provide opportunity to examine unfamiliar areas. There are very few speakers who come to this campus. Maybe more faculty members who are qualified would present lectures on controversial subjects for general student body.
Why is a place that is supposed to be a continuous source of new ideas and insights so conservative about how it goes about trying to educate people.

OSU is a hard university for it points out very clearly whom college was meant for.

The registrar's office needs more fast, efficient help during registration periods, to reduce long waiting lines wasting everybody's time.

I have had three TV lectures so far: Biology, Psychology and General Hygiene. In Biology especially I have had a great deal of trouble because of the TV lectures. The lecturer has no idea at all if his listeners are understanding him or not--there is no chance for questions. The recitation is only offered every other week and Biology is not discussed. Instead the population problem is talked about so you can't ask questions there. In a large lecture room at least the professor can tell if he is being understood or not by the general reaction of the students.

A realistic form of complaints receiving systems should be employed to insure quick response to student's desires and needs. Instructors should not have the right of sudden death decisions over students. A teacher instruction system should be maintained by the university.

I am dumbfounded as to the support the school gives the Art Department. The budget allotted is shameful. The department might as well not be in existence.

The faculty should be able to review tenure of the deans just as students should be able to evaluate the quality of classroom instructors. The Deans as well as the President of this university seem to have built their own little ivory towers. The athletic department should be investigated too.

Good Luck! You've got a good start here.

Good Luck!

Thank you for the opportunity to fill this questionnaire out.
This questionnaire was an excellent idea!

I don't think too much of your questionnaire. It was poorly structured and in several places very unclear as well as repetitious.

Student questionnaires are a good idea.

This is a good idea, having this questionnaire, but it can be rendered useless if the commission fails to heed the words of the students themselves. If you can put any of the ideas of anyone into action more power to you, and you will have my praise.

I have not even been aware of the President's Commission on University Goals and until now was not even aware anyone gave a damn about what students think concerning the above well selected questions. There are many more such important questions. How about making the commission more readily available to us. I for one am quite willing to devote some of my time to improving our university.

It seems to me that the administration and faculty look for ways to make their life easier instead of ways to help the students. Students are the only reason the advisors and the faculty are here, but they don't seem to realize it.

The standard of this institution could be raised to a higher level by bringing more competent and qualified teachers and with more federal grants so that this quality of the world would be improved.
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Questionnaire to Administrative Units

In addition to faculty and student questionnaires, a questionnaire was developed for use by administrative units on campus. Each administrative unit was sent two questionnaires. Both the principal administrator and the long-range planning committee of the unit were invited to complete and return the questionnaire. Academic schools and departments, as well as all service units received questionnaires.

Assurances were given that the administrative questionnaires would be treated confidentially. As a result, the replies are not given here, as they are for the faculty and student questionnaires which can be summarized without revealing the identity of the respondent. There are, however, some generalizations that can be drawn from the completed questionnaires received from administrative units:

1. About half of the units responding have statements setting forth their aspirations, goals, and plans.
2. A significant percentage of the units responding, 48 percent, indicated they believed they have a considerable influence in the determination of the missions and objectives of their reporting units.
3. Approximately 40 percent of the reporting units believed that a realistic planning period for their reporting unit was less than 5 years while about 50 percent believed a realistic planning period was between 5 and 10 years. Thus, 90 percent believed that 10 years or less was a realistic planning period for their units.
Approximately 70 percent of the reporting units believed that research adds to on-campus instruction. A slightly smaller percentage, 68 percent, believed that public service adds to on-campus instruction.
QUESTIONS FOR SCHOOLS, DEPARTMENTS, AND OTHER REPORTING UNITS, FROM THE PRESIDENT'S COMMISSION ON UNIVERSITY GOALS

Respondents are encouraged to read the entire questionnaire before answering any questions. Reporting units should not be constrained by the space available on the questionnaire. Any or all answers may be submitted on separate sheets.

This report was prepared by:

Unit reported on:

In what capacity are you reporting?

____ Chief administrator of reporting unit
____ Member, policy or planning group of reporting unit
____ Other (specify)

1. In 1959 Oregon State University developed a statement of aims and objectives (see last page of questionnaire). Do you find these statements to be (you may check more than one answer):
   A. Highly relevant to your operation
   B. Relevant, but too general to be useful
   C. Inconsistent with your objectives
   D. Other (please feel free to criticize, supplement, or amend):

   In 1964 a set of guidelines were developed for Oregon State University. These may be found on pages 5 and 6 of the 1961-69 Faculty Handbook. Do you find these guidelines to be (you may check more than one answer):
   A. Highly relevant to your operation
   B. Relevant, but too general to be useful
   C. Inconsistent with your objectives
   D. Other (please feel free to criticize, supplement, or amend):

2. Does your reporting unit have a statement that pertains to your aspirations, goals, or plans? If so please attach.

3. In determining the mission or objectives of your reporting unit, which of the following do you believe to most accurately describe the prevailing situation:
   A. Decision made elsewhere in the State System of Higher Education and given to your unit
   B. Decision made in the University and given to your unit
   C. Deliberate decision made by your unit
   D. A combination of the above, with "A" dominant
   E. A combination of the above, with "B" dominant
   F. A combination of the above, with "C" dominant
   G. Other (please specify):

4. In determining the mission or objectives of your reporting unit, what do you believe to be the most important influence?
   A. The needs and interests of students
   B. The needs and interests of the "larger" community. (If this is chosen, please specify the nature of the larger community you serve.)
   C. The needs and interests of the faculty
   D. Other (please specify):

5. To what extent do you believe the goals and objectives of your reporting unit can be realized through curricular design?

6. Has your reporting unit recently engaged in long-range planning? If so, how much time was devoted to this undertaking? If so, who participated in the effort?

   What is a reasonable planning period for your reporting unit?
   A. Less than five years
   B. 5-10 years
   C. 10-15 years
   D. More than 15 years

7. If your reporting unit has engaged in long-range planning in recent years, to what extent have you realized your expectations? If you have not realized your expectations, why not?

8. Has your School or Department recently had anyone from outside the University review the operation of part or all of your reporting unit? Who was the individual or agency? Was this review required? If so, by whom? When was the review conducted?

   Please indicate, to the best of your judgment, the criteria used by the reviewer (please rank):
   A. Student need
   B. Professional competence
   C. Social relevance or need
   D. Other (please specify):

   How did your unit respond to the outside review? Please be specific.

9. Do you know of summary statements of the goals or missions of your professional area? If so, please list:

   [Consultant's comments]
10. Please list one or more significant references which you have found to be especially helpful in relating the professional area represented by your reporting unit to the changing needs of our society. (Please give specific bibliographic references, but do not cite more than five.)

11. What service(s) do you provide other units of the University?

12. What does your reporting unit expect from other units in the University?

13. How do you reconcile the demands or requirements made on you by other units of the University with your major curriculum?

14. Which of the following most accurately describes who makes the final decision within your reporting unit on major policy issues?
   - A. Administrative personnel
   - B. Consensus of full faculty
   - C. Majority of full faculty
   - D. Other (if you distinguish between junior and senior faculty, please specify criteria)

15. Does your Department or School maintain records of graduates? If yes, what information is recorded?

16. Have you solicited opinions of post-graduates with respect to the adequacy of their training, in view of their occupational choice? Do their responses affect your curriculum?

17. Do you believe research adds to, detracts from, or is neutral with respect to on-campus instruction?
   Please cite specific evidence in support of your answer. Consider, but do not necessarily limit yourself to, such factors as utilization of the same personnel for more than one function, separate funding, and organization.

18. Do you believe public service adds to, detracts from, or is neutral with respect to on-campus instruction?
   Please cite specific evidence in support of your answer. Consider, but do not necessarily limit yourself to, such factors as utilization of the same personnel for more than one function, separate funding, and organization.

19. What criteria should be used to judge what public service functions are appropriate for the University to assume?

20. Please supply the following information:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Budgeted FTE</th>
<th>Actual FTE Use</th>
<th>Ideal FTE Allocation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Percent</td>
<td>Number</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instruction</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service (include extension and off-campus instruction)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1/ "Ideal" FTE is that amount of FTE which, if available on demand in the present situation, would permit you to achieve an ideal or optimum performance of your reporting unit. Please list total, not additional FTE.
21. Does your reporting unit have a program of evaluating teaching effectiveness? If yes, please supply criteria and method of applying criteria to such evaluations. What other considerations are important in evaluating faculty?

22. Does your reporting unit have a problem in evaluating faculty on joint appointments? If so, what is the problem and how are you meeting it?

23. What factors do you consider important in evaluating the contribution of your unit to the purpose of the University?

24. What do you consider to be the major growth or emerging area in your professional area? Does your School or Department plan to participate in these areas? If so, which ones?

25. What changes in organization would you recommend that would better permit your unit (School or Department) to flourish? (Please be specific; you may attach documentation and as much detail as you wish.)

26. Describe organizational models that are operational at other institutions that might be used at Oregon State. (You may attach documentation if you wish.)

27. Apart from organization, in what way(s) can you conceive of your unit relating more effectively to the total University or to parts of the University?

28. How should the University develop during the next ten years to best enhance the development of your reporting unit?

29. Have you projected the growth of your undergraduate and graduate programs for the next five years? Next ten years? If so, have you estimated the requirements of this growth with respect to:
   - A. Space
   - B. Faculty
   - C. Equipment
   - D. Materials and supplies
   - E. Support (clerical and technicians)

30. What are the main limiting factors at the present time in your operation? (Please rank in order of importance.)
   - A. Number of faculty
   - B. Quality of faculty
   - C. Number of students
   - D. Quality of students
   - E. Space
   - F. Equipment
   - G. Support (technical and secretarial)
   - H. Other (including administration, State Board, etc.)

31. What do you consider to be the limitations to the full development of Oregon State University?

32. Do you believe enrollment should be limited in the University? If so, on what basis should it be limited? Do you have special criteria for admission of students to your unit? If so, please specify.

33. Does your reporting unit have a graduate program? What do you believe the relationship of graduates to undergraduates instruction within the same reporting unit to be?
   - A. Mutually beneficial
   - B. Mutually exclusive or independent
   - C. Injuious to undergraduate instruction
   - D. Injurious to graduate instruction
   - E. Other (specify)

34. Do you believe there should be essential or core educational experiences for all graduates of this institution? If yes, please describe.

35. Please give what you believe to be the major educational weaknesses of our present undergraduate program.

36. Do you have criteria for the evaluation of the success of your program or unit? (Examples might be the number of students admitted to graduate school, enrollment, usefulness to community, etc.) If yes, please describe such criteria.

37. If there are areas not covered in this questionnaire which would help the Commission understand and interpret the goals of your unit, we invite you to provide whatever information you wish, or indicate that you would like to have us discuss this with your unit.

38. Briefly describe the process by which the answers to this questionnaire were developed.
THE AIM OF OREGON STATE UNIVERSITY

The aim of Oregon State University is to provide both opportunity and inspiration for gaining knowledge and for developing attitudes and abilities which contribute to living in a democratic society. This aim requires the development of the individual and of society, as well as the development and conservation of resources through instruction, research, and extension.

The aim is to be achieved by promoting:

I. The pursuit of truth and the advancement of knowledge.

II. The well-being of the individual to the extent of his capacity through improvement of intellectual, physical, economic, social, aesthetic, and ethical attainments.

III. The growth of social institutions responsible to the needs of the people.

IV. The improvement of government through encouragement of an informed and actively participating citizenry.

V. The development of business and the professions through improvement of personnel, facilities, techniques, and services.

VI. The conservation of natural resources through improved production, processing, marketing, and utilization.

The furtherance of this aim requires the individual and combined efforts of a competent staff working freely and cooperatively under conditions conducive to its attainment.
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ALUMNI QUESTIONNAIRE

In order to give alumni the opportunity to provide information to the Commission on University Goals, the accompanying questionnaire was included in the Winter 1970 issue of the Oregon Stater. One hundred responses were received of the 13,500 questionnaires that were distributed. The data were insufficient, hence no tabulation of responses was made. The Commission appreciates the efforts of those alumni who responded.
PRESIDENT'S COMMISSION ON UNIVERSITY GOALS QUESTIONNAIRE

The President's Commission on University Goals was appointed to assist the University in the development of a clearer definition and understanding of its purposes and goals. A survey of faculty and student views on the subject is being conducted. The commission also hopes to learn the views of alumni, parents, past faculty and others interested in OSU. Therefore, you are invited to respond to the following questionnaire and mail it to the Alumni Office on the campus. Use additional sheets of paper if they are needed for your comments. Other readers of the Oregon Stater also may wish to offer their views.

Name ..............................................................................; Class ..........; Major .......................................................;

Present Hometown and State ......................................................; Hometown and State When at OSU ...........................................

1. During the time you attended OSU, the best feature of the institution (school) was:

2. The worst features:

3. If you had a son or daughter, would you advise them to attend OSU? Why?

4. What was your single most important educational experience at OSU?

5. What do you feel is the most significant change in the university since you left the campus? Is this a change which benefits the students?

6. Given the time, what one additional educational opportunity would you like to have had at OSU?

7. What do you believe is needed to make OSU an institution of greater excellence in the future?

8. Do you feel your educational experience adequately prepared you for your present profession or activity? (If not, please indicate how it could have been more adequate.)

9. If you have additional thoughts you wish to give the Commission, please use the following space or an additional sheet.

Mail to: OSU Alumni Association
MU 104
Corvallis, Ore. 97331
APPENDIX E

A STUDENT SURVEY OF FACULTY TERMINATING
EMPLOYMENT AT OREGON STATE UNIVERSITY, JUNE 1970
Dear Faculty Member:

We are members of a group of students interested in OSU. We are trying to find out what attitudes and opinions exist in the faculty and student body concerning instruction and functioning at OSU.

This questionnaire was constructed in order to measure these factors. The questionnaire has two sections: 1) evaluation of your experiences as a teacher; and 2) evaluation of your experiences as a faculty member. In each section there are two types of questions, rating and philosophical. The philosophical questions have lettered responses, and there is no intention to rate any of these responses as desirable or undesirable. In addition, there are some questions at the answer any of these questions.

This is the first form of this questionnaire, consequently some of the questions may seem vague or biased to you. Please feel free to clarify any of your responses, change the wording of the questions, or point out any bias. Some areas may be neglected or overemphasized; please point out these areas. Your help and cooperation is greatly appreciated.

The questionnaire is being distributed to all people who are leaving OSU this year. Next year, the rest of the faculty and students will be surveyed on these topics. When you have finished the questionnaire, please mail it in the enclosed envelope by Friday, June 5.

Thank you very much,

Tom Hamilton
Jr. Science

Jim Ostlind
Sr. H&SS
Evaluation of their own experiences:

1. How would you rate communication with
   a. the members of your department,
   1) very poor
   2) poor
   3) fair
   4) good
   5) very good
   b. your department head
   1) very poor
   2) poor
   3) fair
   4) good
   5) very good
   c. your dean
   1) very poor
   2) poor
   3) fair
   4) good
   5) very good

2. How would you rate cooperation from
   a. the members of your department
   1) very poor
   2) poor
   3) fair
   4) good
   5) very good
   b. your department head
   1) very poor
   2) poor
   3) fair
   4) good
   5) very good
   c. your dean
   1) very poor
   2) poor
   3) fair
   4) good
   5) very good

3. How would you rate your experiences?
   1) very frustrating
   2) frustrating
   3) fair
   4) satisfying
   5) very satisfying

4. How would you rate the availability of resources you need for your work?
   1) very inadequate
   2) inadequate
   3) fair
   4) adequate
   5) very adequate

5. In the role of teacher, how do you perceive yourself?
   a. as an expert in your field and primary source of knowledge for the student. By relating your own wisdom and experience you lead the student to an understanding of the subject matter.
   b. as a motivator, the student's duty is to use any source to advance himself intellectually. You only encourage him in this endeavor and make him aware of the sources available.
   c. other (please specify)

6. How would you rate your freedom to function academically as you see fit.
   1) much pressure to conform
   2) some pressure to conform
   3) no pressure or encouragement
   4) some encouragement to do things your own way
   5) much encouragement to do things your own way

7. How would you rate the academic competence of your department?
   1) very poor, many faculty aren't aware of or don't understand many of the new innovations in the field.
   2) poor, not as good as most depts. at other institutions.
   3) No better, no worse than most depts. at other institutions.
   4) better than most depts. at other institutions.
   5) excellent, nationally known as excellent in the field.

8. How would you rate the importance of method vs. subject matter competence in teaching.
   a. subject matter competence very important; the effect of method is negligible.
   b. subject matter competence is important, but method of presentation is a factor.
   c. subject matter competence and method of presentation are of equal importance.
   d. method of presentation is important, but subject matter competence is a factor.
   e. method of presentation is very important; the effect of subject matter competence is negligible.

9. What is the role of the university in society?
   a. the university should remain aloof from society and engage in strictly teaching and research.
   b. the university should remain aloof from social and political issues but should work on the technical problems of society (such as field burning).
   c. the university should be actively involved in solving social and technical problems but should not become involved in politics.
d. The university should be actively involved in solving social and technical problems and become involved in politics only to the extent necessary for the solution of the social and technical problems.
e. The university should be actively involved in all phases of society, including politics.

10. How would you rate the availability of time for research?
   1) very inadequate
   2) inadequate
   3) fair
   4) adequate
   5) very adequate

11. How would you rate the availability of time for teaching and class preparation?
   1) very inadequate
   2) inadequate
   3) fair
   4) adequate
   5) very adequate

12. Did you have the opportunity to teach the courses you wanted?
   1) no opportunity
   2) some opportunity
   3) satisfactory opportunity

Evaluation of Students

13. How would you rate preparation in the high schools for college-level work?
   1) very inadequate
   2) inadequate
   3) fair
   4) adequate
   5) very adequate

14. How much do most students participate in the learning process?
   1) very passive, don't do much in the way of class work
   2) passive, memorization of text and notes
   3) neutral, willing to try to learn, but not enthusiastic
   4) active, curious and interested in learning
   5) very active, seeking knowledge and doing studies beyond course requirements

15. In comparison to other institutions you have attended or taught at, how would you rate the intellectual capabilities of OSU students?
   1) much less intelligent
   2) less intelligent
   3) equal
   4) more intelligent
   5) much more intelligent

16. How capable are OSU students of pursuing their own education?
   1) completely incapable
   2) students are capable of learning some things on their own, but most concepts require explanation
   3) capable, but need the professor's help
   4) professors are mostly unnecessary, but they are needed to provide insights and knowledge the students would have a hard time finding on their own
   5) professors are there only to offer suggestions (students capable of learning completely on their own)

17. To what extent does the professor affect student involvement in the learning process?
   1) not at all
   2) not very much
   3) some
   4) quite a bit
   5) totally dependent on the professor

18. How much do students appreciate a professor's efforts to be a good teacher?
   1) not at all
   2) some
   3) moderate
   4) quite a bit
   5) very much

19. Is there adequate communication between students and professors?
   1) very inadequate
   2) inadequate
   3) fair
   4) adequate
   5) very adequate

20. Are students aware of the problems professors face in their role as a faculty member?
   1) not at all
   2) some
   3) moderate
   4) appreciative
   5) very appreciative

21. Are students more concerned about learning or the grade?
   1) entirely grade
   2) grade but some learning
   3) equally
   4) learning but some grade
   5) entirely learning
22. Why are you leaving? Please check all applicable responses.

1) personal
2) retirement
3) better pay at some other institution
4) better academic position at some other institution
5) failure to be promoted
6) limited length of contract
7) do not like the policies of the university
8) do not like the policies of the school
9) do not like the policies of the department
10) do not like the attitudes of the community
11) lack of communication
12) other (please specify)
13) other (please specify)

School ________________________________
Department ________________________________

Is the climate at OSU more
more conservative
less conservative
more liberal
less liberal
than your own viewpoint?

What is your academic position?
___ professor
___ associate professor
___ assistant professor
___ instructor

How many years have you taught?
___ 1-5
___ 6-10
___ 11-15
___ 16-20
___ 21 +

How many institutions have you been associated with other than OSU? ________________________________
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ag.</th>
<th>Sci.</th>
<th>Eng.</th>
<th>Home Ec</th>
<th>B &amp; T</th>
<th>H &amp; S</th>
<th>Ed.</th>
<th>Unknown</th>
<th>Total Responses Averaged</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4 responses</td>
<td>6 responses</td>
<td>3 responses</td>
<td>2 responses</td>
<td>6 responses</td>
<td>6 responses</td>
<td>1 response</td>
<td>1 response</td>
<td>20 responses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.50</td>
<td>4.60</td>
<td>4.33</td>
<td>3.50</td>
<td>2.83</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.75</td>
<td>3.17</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>3.33</td>
<td>2.56</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.50</td>
<td>1.83</td>
<td>2.50</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>2.40</td>
<td>2.17</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>4.75</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>4.67</td>
<td>3.50</td>
<td>3.17</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>3.50</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>2.83</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>4.33</td>
<td>2.17</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>2.83</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>4.75</td>
<td>3.20</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>3.50</td>
<td>3.83</td>
<td>2.33</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>3.67</td>
<td>4.50</td>
<td>2.50</td>
<td>4.17</td>
<td>1.67</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.50</td>
<td>1.58</td>
<td>1.50</td>
<td>1.75</td>
<td>1.58</td>
<td>1.67</td>
<td>b(2)</td>
<td>a+b (1.5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>4.75</td>
<td>3.33</td>
<td>3.67</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>3.17</td>
<td>2.50</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>4.33</td>
<td>3.83</td>
<td>3.67</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>3.17</td>
<td>2.33</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>2.38</td>
<td>3.17</td>
<td>2.67</td>
<td>2.50</td>
<td>2.67</td>
<td>2.50</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>3.83</td>
<td>3.67</td>
<td>3.50</td>
<td>3.80</td>
<td>3.67</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>N. R.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>3.33</td>
<td>2.53</td>
<td>2.50</td>
<td>1.50</td>
<td>2.25</td>
<td>1.67</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>3.67</td>
<td>3.50</td>
<td>3.67</td>
<td>2.50</td>
<td>4.17</td>
<td>2.83</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>2.67</td>
<td>2.67</td>
<td>2.33</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>2.17</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>3.33</td>
<td>2.83</td>
<td>2.50</td>
<td>3.66</td>
<td>2.83</td>
<td>2.92</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>3.50</td>
<td>2.58</td>
<td>2.63</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>3.67</td>
<td>3.50</td>
<td>N. R.</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>2.40</td>
<td>2.67</td>
<td>2.50</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>2.75</td>
<td>N. R.</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>2.67</td>
<td>2.17</td>
<td>2.33</td>
<td>2.50</td>
<td>3.17</td>
<td>2.83</td>
<td>N. R.</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>4.50</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>3.67</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>4.17</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>4.67</td>
<td>3.67</td>
<td>3.33</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>4.33</td>
<td>3.75</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>2.67</td>
<td>4.33</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>3.50</td>
<td>2.17</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>2.33</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>1.50</td>
<td>1.50</td>
<td>2.50</td>
<td>1.67</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>2.50</td>
<td>1.70</td>
<td>1.33</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>2.60</td>
<td>2.33</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
QUESTION NO. 22: REASONS FOR LEAVING

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>111</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>111</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>111</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>111</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
<td>1111</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX F

Sample Questionnaire

"Rate the Department Chairman"

* Chairman or Head?? --Either will work-- A Chairman who behaves as though he is a Head--or a Head who behaves as though he is a Chairman. (Heads roll, Chairmen rotate)
Please check the answer which you believe most accurately describes the current situation. You may check more than one answer.

1. The Department Chairman
   - is inaccessible to faculty
   - is highly accessible
   - is hard to see, but about what you would expect given an operation of this size.
   - other (specify)
   **COMMENTS:**

2. The Department Chairman
   - does not delegate administrative chores as he should
   - should pay greater personal attention to administrative detail
   - delegates about the right amount of administrative detail
   - other (specify)
   **COMMENTS:**

3. The Department Chairman
   - spends too much time recruiting
   - spends too much time teaching and researching
   - spends too much time making speeches
   - spends too much time off-campus
   - spends too much time working for others on campus
   - other (specify)
   **COMMENTS:**

4. The Department Chairman
   - is too autocratic
   - is too democratic
   - is indecisive
   - makes too many snap judgments
   - insists on faculty participation to about the right amount in policy formulation and decision making
   - other (specify)
   **COMMENTS:**

5. The Department Chairman
   - should spend more time in long-run planning for the department
   - should spend more time raising funds for the department
   - should spend more time keeping abreast of his field of academic specialization
   - as far as I can tell, he does a pretty good job of allocating his time
   - other (specify)
   **COMMENTS:**

6. This Department
   - should spend more time in group planning
   - has about the right amount, but the wrong kind, of committee work and group planning
   - has too much committee work and group planning
   - has about the right amount and the right kind of committee work
   - other (specify)
   **COMMENTS:**

7. If I could change the decision-structure of this Department, I would:
   - make it more democratic
   - centralize decision-making
   - have fewer committees
   - have different committees
   - have committees with different functions
   - other (specify)
   **COMMENTS:**
8. The Department Chairman and his wife
   ___ provide about the right amount and kind of
   ___ should be more active
   ___ should be less active
   ___ other (specify)
   COMMENTS:

9. As compared with other departments on this campus
   as a place to do professional work, this department
   ___ be among the top 10 percent
   ___ be among the bottom 25 percent
   ___ other
   COMMENTS:

10. As compared to other similar Departments in the
    United States as a place to do professional work,
    this department would
    ___ be among the top 10 percent
    ___ be among the bottom 25 percent
    ___ other
    COMMENTS:

11. The Department Chairman should
    ___ spend more time working with individual
    faculty on their teaching and research
    ___ supervises faculty too closely
    ___ provides about the right amount of guidance
    ___ other (specify)
    COMMENTS:

12. We should have
    ___ more full faculty meetings
    ___ fewer full faculty meetings
    ___ different kinds of full faculty meetings
    (please specify)
    ___ other (specify)
    COMMENTS:

13. What would you most like to have changed about
    this Department? (You may include the Depart-
    ment Chairman as a variable).

14. Our Department Chairman could be more effective if
    he would
    COMMENTS:
APPENDIX G

STATISTICAL INFORMATION ON LIBRARY
The Commission recommends that high priority be given to Library support. The Library is one of the key factors in developing quality and strength in the programs of the University. In providing Library support, the needs of existing programs should receive highest priority. Library planning must be carried on in close cooperation with the proposed Presidents Planning Commission.

As new programs are planned, the needs for these programs in terms of Library resources should be evaluated well in advance of the time of initiation of the program so that acquisition of these resources can take place on a systematic basis.

A comparison of OSU Library with national standards for university libraries made possible by a recent study of some fifty university libraries in the United States and Canada, which are members of the Association of American Universities, and prepared for the Association of Research Libraries recently, indicates the OSU Library is below the "range low" in most comparisons and in the first quartile in a few. An attached chart will indicate this comparison graphically.

The study is attached as Table E, and from it is extracted information to prepare Table A. The basis for the decision to select the universities listed was on enrollment, because that seemed to be the only criteria against which one could measure what seemed reasonably realistic. Oregon State University is listed as the last university on the list and the information provided is available from a number of sources.

It is noted that the median university library as of 1967/68 had a budget of nearly $2,500,000, while at the same time Oregon State University had a budget of under $1,000,000. The median size of universities was not too far from the size of Oregon State University, since their student body numbered just over 16,000, while ours was around 13,000. Another key figure, is that while we were spending $27.98 per student for books, periodicals and binding...
the median figure for the universities in the study was $46.61. For total library expenditures as a median, these libraries were spending $128.07, while our total library expenditures came to $73.95 per student.

In addition to the study referred to above, Appendix C has some library facts and figures for Oregon State University dating back to 1961. Appendix D lists figures taken from the major study without referring to any specific universities. It is compiled from the median figures based on the study in Appendix E.
TABLE A
1967-1968

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>UNIVERSITY</th>
<th>AVERAGE ENROLLMENT</th>
<th>TOTAL FACULTY</th>
<th>LIBRARY EXPEND. BKS.</th>
<th>BINDINGS - TOTAL</th>
<th>PER CAPITA LIB. EXPENDITURES - TOTAL</th>
<th>VOLS. PER STAFF MEMBERS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cornell</td>
<td>4,083,695</td>
<td>14,470</td>
<td>1,560</td>
<td>1,467,023</td>
<td>147,096</td>
<td>310.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northwestern</td>
<td>1,885,185</td>
<td>16,031</td>
<td>919</td>
<td>634,508</td>
<td>103,368</td>
<td>152.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Syracuse</td>
<td>1,612,221</td>
<td>16,646</td>
<td>1,200</td>
<td>696,537</td>
<td>58,844</td>
<td>103.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alabama Univ.</td>
<td>1,161,641</td>
<td>17,016</td>
<td>600</td>
<td>561,045</td>
<td>50,230</td>
<td>79.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colorado</td>
<td>1,874,036</td>
<td>17,107</td>
<td>979</td>
<td>792,922</td>
<td>68,981</td>
<td>119.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Florida</td>
<td>1,700,444</td>
<td>16,393</td>
<td>1,801</td>
<td>580,349</td>
<td>56,478</td>
<td>109.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iowa Univ.</td>
<td>1,816,717</td>
<td>16,903</td>
<td>1,692</td>
<td>846,648</td>
<td>74,705</td>
<td>119.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kansas Univ.</td>
<td>1,419,399</td>
<td>15,833</td>
<td>960</td>
<td>678,677</td>
<td>35,614</td>
<td>105.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kentucky Univ.</td>
<td>1,449,764</td>
<td>13,597</td>
<td>1,033</td>
<td>670,878</td>
<td>50,272</td>
<td>122.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missouri Univ.</td>
<td>1,500,000</td>
<td>18,140</td>
<td>1,200</td>
<td>810,000</td>
<td>70,000</td>
<td>99.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Columbia campus)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N. Carolina</td>
<td>1,804,678</td>
<td>15,591</td>
<td>1,127</td>
<td>824,065</td>
<td>92,166</td>
<td>134.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oklahoma</td>
<td>1,065,368</td>
<td>16,980</td>
<td>492</td>
<td>592,125</td>
<td>34,295</td>
<td>82.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oregon State</td>
<td>800,844</td>
<td>13,176</td>
<td>1,352</td>
<td>368,677</td>
<td>30,486</td>
<td>73.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iowa State *</td>
<td>842,720</td>
<td>15,777</td>
<td>910</td>
<td>370,272</td>
<td>55,726</td>
<td>50.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wash. State</td>
<td>1,072,404</td>
<td>9,914</td>
<td>1,911</td>
<td>490,918</td>
<td>37,177</td>
<td>98.16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Please note - this figure increased 57% in the four year period.

() Professional staff
The only information available, subsequent to that in Appendix A was derived from Annual Reports received from Librarians of the institutions listed below. The only 1968/69 annual reports do not give the same information as Appendix A, so only reliable figures are used - no other information is extrapolated from them.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>University</th>
<th>Library Expenditures - Books and periodicals (excludes binding)</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>U. of Arizona</td>
<td>$ 580,977</td>
<td>(State funds $450,000)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(Increase of 67,781 over 67/68)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U. of Calif. (Davis)</td>
<td></td>
<td>(Added 89,120 vols)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U. of Colorado (Boulder only)</td>
<td>720,768</td>
<td>(State funds $533,918)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(Added 69,809 vols)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cornell (Central libraries)</td>
<td>1,042,361</td>
<td>(Added 126,295 vols)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iowa State Univ. (Ames)</td>
<td>550,783</td>
<td>(State funds $405,700)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U. of Kansas (Lawrence)</td>
<td>683,615</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Louisiana State (Baton Rouge)</td>
<td>418,365</td>
<td>(State funds $329,552)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U. of New Mexico</td>
<td>492,340</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U. of North Carolina</td>
<td>758,177</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U. of Oklahoma</td>
<td>614,760</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oregon State University</td>
<td>328,796</td>
<td>(State funds $287,658)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### TABLE C

**LIBRARY FACTS AND FIGURES**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>61/62</th>
<th>62/63</th>
<th>63/64</th>
<th>64/65</th>
<th>65/66</th>
<th>66/67</th>
<th>67/68</th>
<th>68/69</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Lib. FTE</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prof.</td>
<td>26.38</td>
<td>26.38</td>
<td>26.38</td>
<td>26.38</td>
<td>28.17</td>
<td>28.67</td>
<td>33.10</td>
<td>33.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C.S.</td>
<td>21.85</td>
<td>24.00</td>
<td>26.60</td>
<td>32.00</td>
<td>39.00</td>
<td>43.00</td>
<td>42.00</td>
<td>45.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student (equiv)</td>
<td>26.74</td>
<td>29.73</td>
<td>30.90</td>
<td>31.98</td>
<td>35.23</td>
<td>35.68</td>
<td>38.07</td>
<td>37.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Student Wages</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Request</td>
<td>45,600</td>
<td>45,600</td>
<td>59,500</td>
<td>60,548</td>
<td>88,766</td>
<td>98,092</td>
<td>103,600</td>
<td>108,750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Budget</td>
<td>30,100</td>
<td>39,254</td>
<td>58,079</td>
<td>40,710</td>
<td>40,930</td>
<td>45,918</td>
<td>75,139</td>
<td>53,487</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exp.</td>
<td>47,410</td>
<td>56,363</td>
<td>60,668</td>
<td>64,353</td>
<td>77,806</td>
<td>82,750</td>
<td>96,678</td>
<td>105,006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Operating Hours</strong></td>
<td>89</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>99.5</td>
<td>99.5</td>
<td>101.5</td>
<td>101.5</td>
<td>101.5</td>
<td>101.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Circulation</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cent. desk</td>
<td>159,404</td>
<td>164,709</td>
<td>148,197</td>
<td>148,091</td>
<td>171,469</td>
<td>179,389</td>
<td>198,888</td>
<td>205,816</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Res. Book Room</td>
<td>121,706</td>
<td>130,461</td>
<td>130,918</td>
<td>137,911</td>
<td>166,918</td>
<td>134,533</td>
<td>150,945</td>
<td>157,539</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Room Pickup</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>374,666</td>
<td>506,786</td>
<td>554,443</td>
<td>572,180</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>281,110</td>
<td>295,170</td>
<td>276,118</td>
<td>288,002</td>
<td>718,053</td>
<td>820,658</td>
<td>904,276</td>
<td>935,335</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Enrollment</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vols. at end of fiscal year</td>
<td>10,920</td>
<td>11,211</td>
<td>11,445</td>
<td>12,818</td>
<td>13,612</td>
<td>14,737</td>
<td>15,791</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net vols. added</td>
<td>18,415</td>
<td>19,536</td>
<td>26,109</td>
<td>26,465</td>
<td>27,277</td>
<td>29,582</td>
<td>32,082</td>
<td>28,461</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Beginning this fiscal year, funds from unfilled C.S. positions could not be transferred to supplement student wages.

** Beginning "dead week," Winter Term 69/70 - Reserve Book Room opened an additional 14 hours for total of 115 hrs. in Reserve Book Room only.
TABLE C continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>61/62</th>
<th>62/63</th>
<th>63/64</th>
<th>64/65</th>
<th>65/66</th>
<th>66/67</th>
<th>67/68</th>
<th>68/69</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Budget</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Requested</td>
<td>481,055</td>
<td>530,191</td>
<td>615,735</td>
<td>654,061</td>
<td>753,447</td>
<td>838,609</td>
<td>1,179,633</td>
<td>1,349,747</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allocated</td>
<td>443,755</td>
<td>480,588</td>
<td>580,669</td>
<td>598,906</td>
<td>683,414</td>
<td>716,767</td>
<td>871,768</td>
<td>932,041</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expended</td>
<td>480,815</td>
<td>531,306</td>
<td>638,737</td>
<td>682,575</td>
<td>745,996</td>
<td>800,494</td>
<td>974,321</td>
<td>1,064,518</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Books &amp; Binding</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Requested</td>
<td>(a) 156,971</td>
<td>(a) 174,412</td>
<td>(a) 200,574</td>
<td>(a) 230,660</td>
<td>(a) 272,179</td>
<td>321,171</td>
<td>457,151</td>
<td>580,651</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allocated</td>
<td>122,452</td>
<td>134,520</td>
<td>170,031</td>
<td>180,031</td>
<td>215,995</td>
<td>233,635</td>
<td>288,113</td>
<td>282,276</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Added funds</td>
<td>University</td>
<td>30,912</td>
<td>69,444</td>
<td>34,571</td>
<td>28,300</td>
<td>58,846</td>
<td>6,077</td>
<td>31,776</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Misc. Accounts</td>
<td>8,980</td>
<td>2,199</td>
<td>800</td>
<td>1,600</td>
<td>4,450</td>
<td>3,650</td>
<td>7,737</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fed. funds</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>17,443</td>
<td>35,324</td>
<td>41,138</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expended</td>
<td>138,706</td>
<td>166,536</td>
<td>227,297</td>
<td>235,741</td>
<td>247,961</td>
<td>296,924</td>
<td>368,617</td>
<td>369,311</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Unit costs (excluding gifts and exchange)**

<p>| | | | | | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>OSU</td>
<td>8.51</td>
<td>8.88</td>
<td>9.22</td>
<td>9.42</td>
<td>9.31</td>
<td>9.56</td>
<td>12.08</td>
<td>11.78</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**New serial titles added by purchase** (a)

|               | 262 | 450 | 358 | 312 | 472 | 515 | 612 | 594 |

**Serials and binding expenditures**

|               | 77,003 | 92,699 | (b) 177,780 | 126,676 | 130,126 | 151,366 | 185,324 | 212,863 |

**Serials without binding**

|               | 61,231 | 74,675 | 107,733 | 108,649 | 113,714 | 137,236 | 158,516 | 181,280 |

(a) W. H. Carlson, former Director indicated that he did not ask but based budget request on an estimated percent of increase over previous year expected from inflation and rising costs. Figures are based on his memoranda to the President.

(b) Includes $25,071 for back-sats.
### TABLE D

**STANDARDS FOR UNIVERSITY LIBRARIES**

Fifty university libraries in the United States & Canada (Study by Association of American Universities and Association of Research Libraries) compared to Oregon State University.

- OSU Library is below the range **LOW** in most comparisons and in the first quartile in a few.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Median size of universities studied</strong></th>
<th>OSU</th>
<th>Oregon State University</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>15,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Median figure for student for books, periodicals and binding</strong></th>
<th>OSU</th>
<th>Oregon State University</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$46.61</td>
<td>$27.98</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Total library expenditures per student (median)</strong></th>
<th>OSU</th>
<th>Oregon State University</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$123.07</td>
<td>$73.95</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Relationship of total library expenditures to total University expenditures (median)</strong></th>
<th>OSU</th>
<th>Oregon State University</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3.6%</td>
<td>2.32%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Volumes (net added - (median))</strong></th>
<th>OSU</th>
<th>Oregon State University</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>75,652</td>
<td>29,647</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Volumes per student (median)</strong></th>
<th>OSU</th>
<th>Oregon State University</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>83.56</td>
<td>42.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>No. of current periodicals (median)</strong></th>
<th>OSU</th>
<th>Oregon State University</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11,050</td>
<td>5,608</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>No. seats per student (median)</strong></th>
<th>OSU</th>
<th>Oregon State University</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3,000</td>
<td>1,650</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Hours of service (median)</strong></th>
<th>OSU</th>
<th>Oregon State University</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>100</td>
<td>101</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Research Book Room only now open 115 hours*
### TABLE 1

**FINANCES: TOTAL LIBRARY BUDGET, 1968-69; AVERAGE ANNUAL EXPENDITURES, 1965-68**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>OSU LIBRARY</th>
<th>No. of Lib.</th>
<th>Total Amount</th>
<th>Average</th>
<th>Range Low</th>
<th>First Quartile</th>
<th>Median</th>
<th>Third Quartile</th>
<th>Range High</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>932,041</strong></td>
<td>50</td>
<td>147,464,633</td>
<td>2,940,250</td>
<td>970,835</td>
<td>1,198,337</td>
<td>2,539,161</td>
<td>3,770,971</td>
<td>8,500,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>974,321</strong></td>
<td>50</td>
<td>141,258,035</td>
<td>2,523,179</td>
<td>1,213,743</td>
<td>1,272,075</td>
<td>2,452,536</td>
<td>3,547,627</td>
<td>8,343,593</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>800,844</strong></td>
<td>50</td>
<td>122,078,147</td>
<td>2,441,523</td>
<td>1,035,368</td>
<td>1,500,000</td>
<td>2,023,594</td>
<td>2,932,465</td>
<td>7,605,550</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### TABLE 2

**RELATIONSHIP OF TOTAL LIBRARY EXPENDITURES TO TOTAL UNIVERSITY EXPENDITURES FOR GENERAL AND EDUCATIONAL PURPOSES, 1967-68**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No. of Lib.</th>
<th>Total Amount</th>
<th>Average</th>
<th>Range Low</th>
<th>First Quartile</th>
<th>Median</th>
<th>Third Quartile</th>
<th>Range High</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>974,321</strong></td>
<td>50</td>
<td>141,258,035</td>
<td>2,523,179</td>
<td>1,213,743</td>
<td>1,272,075</td>
<td>2,452,536</td>
<td>3,547,627</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>38,867,949</strong></td>
<td>50</td>
<td>4,019,632,084</td>
<td>80,362,641</td>
<td>18,140,016</td>
<td>50,652,000</td>
<td>66,402,520</td>
<td>118,044,250</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### TABLE 3

**RELATIONSHIP OF TOTAL LIBRARY EXPENDITURES TO SALARIES AND WAGES; BOOKS, PERIODICALS AND BINDING; GENERAL EXPENSES, 1967-68**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No. of Lib.</th>
<th>Total Amount</th>
<th>Average</th>
<th>Range Low</th>
<th>First Quartile</th>
<th>Median</th>
<th>Third Quartile</th>
<th>Range High</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>974,321</strong></td>
<td>50</td>
<td>141,258,035</td>
<td>2,523,179</td>
<td>1,213,743</td>
<td>1,272,075</td>
<td>2,452,536</td>
<td>3,547,627</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>564,483</strong></td>
<td>50</td>
<td>80,832,234</td>
<td>1,616,645</td>
<td>681,019</td>
<td>973,685</td>
<td>1,300,033</td>
<td>1,589,410</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>587,283</strong></td>
<td>50</td>
<td>47,685,600</td>
<td>957,141</td>
<td>391,241</td>
<td>600,933</td>
<td>835,357</td>
<td>1,230,112</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>389,617</strong></td>
<td>50</td>
<td>80,832,234</td>
<td>1,616,645</td>
<td>681,019</td>
<td>973,685</td>
<td>1,300,033</td>
<td>1,589,410</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>41,221</strong></td>
<td>50</td>
<td>10,149,072</td>
<td>202,931</td>
<td>52,295</td>
<td>95,425</td>
<td>149,103</td>
<td>213,363</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>47</strong></td>
<td>50</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>13.3</td>
<td>23.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### TABLE 4

**Student Per Capita Expenditures for Books, Periodicals, and Binding, and for Total Library Expenditures**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>OSU Library</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No. of Libs</td>
<td>Total Amount</td>
<td>Average</td>
<td>Range Low</td>
<td>First Quartile</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Enrollment (FTE)</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>594,740</td>
<td>19,805</td>
<td>4,710</td>
<td>11,840</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Library Expenditures</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>1,145,935</td>
<td>1,133,740</td>
<td>1,727,075</td>
<td>2,422,938</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Per capita, total library expenditures</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>142.01</td>
<td>54.77</td>
<td>99.34</td>
<td>125.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expenditures for books, periodicals, binding</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>47,853,800</td>
<td>953,710</td>
<td>291,241</td>
<td>600,920</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Per capita for books, periodicals, binding</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>9,894</td>
<td>20.39</td>
<td>36.40</td>
<td>46.88</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### TABLE 5

**Resources: Volumes, Volumes Added, Current Periodicals, and Microforms**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>No. of Libs</th>
<th>Total Amount</th>
<th>Average</th>
<th>Range Low</th>
<th>First Quartile</th>
<th>Median</th>
<th>Third Quartile</th>
<th>Range High</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Volumes, June 30, 1968</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>99,459,415</td>
<td>1,980,158</td>
<td>890,660</td>
<td>1,164,142</td>
<td>1,430,684</td>
<td>2,105,723</td>
<td>7,920,357</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gross No. of vols added (3 year average)</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>99,459,415</td>
<td>1,980,158</td>
<td>890,660</td>
<td>1,164,142</td>
<td>1,430,684</td>
<td>2,105,723</td>
<td>7,920,357</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net No. of vols. added (3 year average)</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>99,459,415</td>
<td>1,980,158</td>
<td>890,660</td>
<td>1,164,142</td>
<td>1,430,684</td>
<td>2,105,723</td>
<td>7,920,357</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current Periodicals received</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>692,513</td>
<td>14,735</td>
<td>5,640</td>
<td>9,100</td>
<td>11,020</td>
<td>14,049</td>
<td>30,055</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. of microforms</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>15,937,577</td>
<td>339,523</td>
<td>7,641</td>
<td>160,922</td>
<td>340,123</td>
<td>435,495</td>
<td>924,754</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Microfilm reels</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>1,182,513</td>
<td>27,921</td>
<td>2,525</td>
<td>13,747</td>
<td>23,160</td>
<td>41,012</td>
<td>91,756</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Microfiche, microcards, microprint</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>13,853,569</td>
<td>318,155</td>
<td>5,169</td>
<td>170,686</td>
<td>326,914</td>
<td>439,006</td>
<td>907,233</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### TABLE 6

**Relationship of Enrollment to Number of Volumes and to Number of Current Journals**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>No. of Libs</th>
<th>Total Amount</th>
<th>Average</th>
<th>Range Low</th>
<th>First Quartile</th>
<th>Median</th>
<th>Third Quartile</th>
<th>Range High</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Enrollment</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>994,740</td>
<td>19,805</td>
<td>4,710</td>
<td>11,840</td>
<td>16,775</td>
<td>28,369</td>
<td>48,235</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vols. No. of vols.</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>99,459,415</td>
<td>1,980,158</td>
<td>890,660</td>
<td>1,164,142</td>
<td>1,430,684</td>
<td>2,105,723</td>
<td>7,920,357</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vols. per student</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>99,459,415</td>
<td>1,980,158</td>
<td>890,660</td>
<td>1,164,142</td>
<td>1,430,684</td>
<td>2,105,723</td>
<td>7,920,357</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. of current periodicals</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>692,513</td>
<td>14,735</td>
<td>5,640</td>
<td>9,100</td>
<td>11,020</td>
<td>14,049</td>
<td>30,055</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Periodicals per student</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>15,937,577</td>
<td>339,523</td>
<td>7,641</td>
<td>160,922</td>
<td>340,123</td>
<td>435,495</td>
<td>924,754</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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### TABLE 7
**PERSONNEL**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>No. of Labs</th>
<th>Total Amount</th>
<th>Average</th>
<th>Range Low</th>
<th>First Quartile</th>
<th>Median</th>
<th>Third Quartile</th>
<th>Range High</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Professional staff</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>4,439</td>
<td>88.8</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>227</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nonprofessional staff</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>7,681</td>
<td>153.6</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>199</td>
<td>426</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total staff</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>12,120</td>
<td>242.4</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>154</td>
<td>184.5</td>
<td>297</td>
<td>653</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent professional</td>
<td>72%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hourly wages</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>8,680,305</td>
<td>136.332</td>
<td>29,164</td>
<td>72,068</td>
<td>113,000</td>
<td>192,331</td>
<td>446,633</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work hours/week professionals</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>1,922</td>
<td>38.44</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>37.5</td>
<td>39.0</td>
<td>40.0</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work hours/week clerical</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>1,694</td>
<td>39.08</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>37.5</td>
<td>40.0</td>
<td>40.0</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### TABLE 8
**RELATIONSHIP OF TOTAL STAFF AND PROFESSIONAL STAFF TO ENROLLMENT**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>No. of Labs</th>
<th>Total Amount</th>
<th>Average</th>
<th>Range Low</th>
<th>First Quartile</th>
<th>Median</th>
<th>Third Quartile</th>
<th>Range High</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Enrollment</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>994,740</td>
<td>19,895</td>
<td>4,719</td>
<td>11,480</td>
<td>16,775</td>
<td>29,369</td>
<td>45,255</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional staff</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>4,439</td>
<td>88.8</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>227</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enrollment/professional staff</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>12,120</td>
<td>242.4</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>154</td>
<td>184.5</td>
<td>297</td>
<td>653</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total staff</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>12,120</td>
<td>242.4</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>154</td>
<td>184.5</td>
<td>297</td>
<td>653</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enrollment/total staff</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>82.07</td>
<td>18.45</td>
<td>40.03</td>
<td>40.0</td>
<td>40.0</td>
<td>40.0</td>
<td>40.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### TABLE 9
**RELATIONSHIP OF NUMBER OF SEATS FOR READERS TO TOTAL ENROLLMENT**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>No. of Labs</th>
<th>Total Amount</th>
<th>Average</th>
<th>Range Low</th>
<th>First Quartile</th>
<th>Median</th>
<th>Third Quartile</th>
<th>Range High</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Enrollment</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>994,740</td>
<td>19,895</td>
<td>4,719</td>
<td>11,480</td>
<td>16,775</td>
<td>29,369</td>
<td>45,255</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enrollment</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>950,745</td>
<td>20,138</td>
<td>4,719</td>
<td>12,570</td>
<td>16,903</td>
<td>28,510</td>
<td>45,255</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of seats</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>3,308</td>
<td>935</td>
<td>2,576</td>
<td>3,000</td>
<td>4,391</td>
<td>7,808</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seat/enrollment (percent)</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students per seat</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>6.09</td>
<td>1.60</td>
<td>3.84</td>
<td>8.15</td>
<td>8.41</td>
<td>20.65</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### TABLE 10

**RELATIONSHIP OF THE AREA OF SHELVING FOR BOOKS TO THE TOTAL VOLUMES HELD IN THE LIBRARY**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LIBRARY</th>
<th>No. of Libs.</th>
<th>Total Amount</th>
<th>Average</th>
<th>Range Low</th>
<th>First Quartile</th>
<th>Median</th>
<th>Third Quartile</th>
<th>Range High</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Csu</td>
<td>564,295</td>
<td>90,459,415</td>
<td>1,380,148</td>
<td>990,868</td>
<td>1,164,142</td>
<td>1,456,684</td>
<td>2,103,727</td>
<td>7,920,397</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42,076</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>5,609,485</td>
<td>151,612</td>
<td>24,070</td>
<td>82,278</td>
<td>121,522</td>
<td>215,729</td>
<td>523,095</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.41</td>
<td>37</td>
<td></td>
<td>13.25</td>
<td>7.42</td>
<td>9.70</td>
<td>13.70</td>
<td>16.81</td>
<td>49.93</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### TABLE 11

**RELATIONSHIP OF AREA ASSIGNED TO STAFF TO THE TOTAL AREA OF THE LIBRARY, AND NUMBER OF SQUARE FEET PER STAFF MEMBER**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Staff area</th>
<th>No. of librs</th>
<th>Total Amount</th>
<th>Average</th>
<th>Range Low</th>
<th>First Quartile</th>
<th>Median</th>
<th>Third Quartile</th>
<th>Range High</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Csu</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>1,144,728</td>
<td>33,671</td>
<td>8,800</td>
<td>18,310</td>
<td>20,325</td>
<td>44,191</td>
<td>91,257</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8,343</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>800</td>
<td>245.38</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>162</td>
<td>185</td>
<td>293</td>
<td>553</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>137.22</td>
<td>34</td>
<td></td>
<td>22.72</td>
<td>97.21</td>
<td>146.63</td>
<td>179.76</td>
<td>325.76</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### TABLE 12

**SPACE: AIR-CONDITIONED AND CARPETED**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>No. of Libs</th>
<th>Total Amount</th>
<th>Average</th>
<th>Range Low</th>
<th>First Quartile</th>
<th>Median</th>
<th>Third Quartile</th>
<th>Range High</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Air-conditioned space</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>8,345,673</td>
<td>238,432</td>
<td>29,732</td>
<td>125,250</td>
<td>209,000</td>
<td>310,060</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carpeted area</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>820,513</td>
<td>22,138</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>8,234</td>
<td>10,478</td>
<td>15,389</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### TABLE 13

**CIRCULATION AND PUBLIC SERVICE**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Service</th>
<th>No. of Lbs</th>
<th>Total Amount</th>
<th>Average</th>
<th>Range Low</th>
<th>First Quartile</th>
<th>Median</th>
<th>Third Quartile</th>
<th>Range High</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Recorded general circulation</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>24,150,249</td>
<td>561,641</td>
<td>127,733</td>
<td>234,630</td>
<td>464,153</td>
<td>697,013</td>
<td>2,365,029</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recorded reserve circulation</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>8,402,120</td>
<td>211,555</td>
<td>15,369</td>
<td>59,714</td>
<td>160,360</td>
<td>312,628</td>
<td>812,880</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recorded general and reserve circulation</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>35,369,015</td>
<td>825,498</td>
<td>193,043</td>
<td>592,269</td>
<td>760,779</td>
<td>1,150,180</td>
<td>2,517,981</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. of hours open per week</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>4,377.25</td>
<td>97.55</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>121.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### TABLE 14
**STUDENT PER CAPITA CIRCULATION—SUMMARY**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No. of Libs.</th>
<th>Total Amount</th>
<th>Average</th>
<th>Range Low</th>
<th>First Quartile</th>
<th>Median</th>
<th>Third Quartile</th>
<th>Range High</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>OSU LIBRARY</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13,176</td>
<td>994,740</td>
<td>19,894</td>
<td>4.719</td>
<td>11,840</td>
<td>16,775</td>
<td>20,369</td>
<td>48,235</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>198,888</td>
<td>834,596</td>
<td>19,414</td>
<td>4.719</td>
<td>8,511</td>
<td>16,303</td>
<td>22,631</td>
<td>48,205</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15,09%</td>
<td>24,130,349</td>
<td>561,841</td>
<td>127,723</td>
<td>251,038</td>
<td>464,133</td>
<td>697,013</td>
<td>2,392,019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>345,176</td>
<td>197,499</td>
<td>19,514</td>
<td>4.719</td>
<td>30,063</td>
<td>16,953</td>
<td>28,310</td>
<td>45,235</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>349,183</td>
<td>38,366,615</td>
<td>852,458</td>
<td>193,043</td>
<td>508,289</td>
<td>760,079</td>
<td>1,150,456</td>
<td>2,517,055</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26.55</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### TABLE 15
**SUMMARY DATA ON LAW LIBRARIES**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No. of Libs.</th>
<th>Total Amount</th>
<th>Average</th>
<th>Range Low</th>
<th>First Quartile</th>
<th>Median</th>
<th>Third Quartile</th>
<th>Range High</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>NOT APPLICABLE</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enrollment (FTE)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>17,248</td>
<td>574.93</td>
<td>296</td>
<td>363</td>
<td>501</td>
<td>607</td>
<td>1,707</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty (FTE)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>944.88</td>
<td>31.50</td>
<td>13.0</td>
<td>21.0</td>
<td>27.15</td>
<td>40.0</td>
<td>72.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vols.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>6,156,804</td>
<td>205,290</td>
<td>53,273</td>
<td>97,578</td>
<td>161,570</td>
<td>202,300</td>
<td>1,102,235</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vols. per student</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>357.07</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>33.5</td>
<td>410</td>
<td>843</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current journals</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>54,106</td>
<td>1,800.53</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>520</td>
<td>996</td>
<td>2,500</td>
<td>7,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vols. per student</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>3.14</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>10.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional staff</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>188.45</td>
<td>6.28</td>
<td>1.75</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>21.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nonprofessional staff</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>228.10</td>
<td>8.94</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>5.73</td>
<td>13.00</td>
<td>33.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total staff</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>486.53</td>
<td>13.22</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>7.00</td>
<td>11.33</td>
<td>20.00</td>
<td>56.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students per staff member</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>31.75</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>111</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expenditures for books</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>2,179,245</td>
<td>72,642</td>
<td>27,000</td>
<td>45,235</td>
<td>75,099</td>
<td>91,906</td>
<td>153,509</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Book expenditures per student</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>128.35</td>
<td>42.40</td>
<td>20.40</td>
<td>96.42</td>
<td>115.53</td>
<td>171.74</td>
<td>314.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salary expenditures</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>1,310,581</td>
<td>104,053</td>
<td>25,198</td>
<td>41,763</td>
<td>68,130</td>
<td>156,111</td>
<td>352,566</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salary expenditures per student</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>182.03</td>
<td>60.16</td>
<td>90.01</td>
<td>137.31</td>
<td>232.17</td>
<td>418.59</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hours of opening per week</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>2,852.25</td>
<td>98.23</td>
<td>67.00</td>
<td>89.73</td>
<td>98.00</td>
<td>104.73</td>
<td>163.50</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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STUDENT RECOMMENDATIONS

During the year that the Commission conducted its study, a group of students organized, on a voluntary basis, to conduct their own study of University goals. They met with the Commission occasionally for discussions but formulated their own plans, procedure and report. The accompanying report was prepared and submitted by the group. The Commission extends its appreciation to these students for their time, effort, and sincere concern for the University.
APPENDIX H
STUDENT RECOMMENDATIONS

We would like to thank the Goals Commission for this opportunity to express our ideas on education. We have observed them in operation and feel that their's is an important contribution to education at Oregon State University.

CURRICULUM

The purpose of the university is to serve men, either individually or in society. Among its more obvious contributions is the training of men in special skills and services for use in society. Beyond this, however, it has an obligation to educate people to think for themselves. It is increasingly ill-equipped to fulfill this second obligation. The curriculum and course structure tend to discourage independent research and individualized instruction. The curricula, especially in many of the more technical fields place very little emphasis in education or the practice of citizenship other than professional training. As a result, many of the graduates of these disciplines are poorly prepared to cope with problems outside of their field. An alternative would be to place more emphasis on the Humanities and Social Sciences or interdisciplinary instruction. These disciplines are a preparation for life and effective citizenship.

At present, many courses of study demand an immediate decision on the part of an entering freshman as to what he wants to do for the rest of his college career. Often, he is ill-equipped to make this decision. He has few facts and almost no experience as to the range of fields, their
content, or their opportunities. To rectify this situation, we recommend:

a. A declaration of major not be required until, at the earliest, the beginning of the sophomore year.

b. All departments should offer one-term, five-credit courses for non-majors explaining what the field is about (goals, methods, basic premises and ideas, historical development of main ideas, how this field relates to other disciplines and fits into the world of present day experiences).

c. One "Life" course, similar to Man and His World should be available. Its purposes should be to help students see a possibly broader view of the world than the one they have seen before entering the university, and provide preparation and experience for responsible citizenship.

d. Restructuring courses and curricula to allow for more individual initiative and independent research on the part of the students.

RESOURCES

In many areas, the university faces problems caused by a lack of adequate resources to meet its obligations as an institution of higher learning. At present, large enrollment courses tend to subsidize small enrollment classes. As a result, the senior in a highly specialized class gets the resources he needs at the expense of the freshman in a general course. Inexpensive expansion of the resource base and better utilization of existing resources could be achieved by:

a. Using team teaching in introductory or survey courses. Because these courses cover a diverse field of topics, more effective use of available talent could be made by the use of team teaching.
Such teams could be comprised of the specialists in the department or even by interdisciplinary in nature, and would serve to introduce lower-division students to their future upper-division teachers.

b. Using non-paid upper division students as discussion leaders in lower-division courses. Use of these students in "Man and His World" seems to be successful judging from the comments of some of the participants. Recompention in the form of academic credit would be an incentive for students to volunteer to lead such groups. Best of all, students taking these classes would benefit from experiences other than straight lecture at very little extra cost to the department.

c. Encourage the expansion of the role of community colleges. Such institutions, when of equal academic quality, can take some of the burden off of the resources of the university. The students also benefit because the community colleges have curricula in fields not carried by the university. Thus, the students who are not sure of which course of study to follow will have a broader range to choose from.

**GRADING SYSTEM INNOVATIONS**

The purpose and spirit of education is corrupted by its heavy emphasis on traditional and formal means of evaluation, which inordinately rewards competition, conformity and standardization, and restricts flexibility, relevance and innovation. The true purpose of education, as we see it, is the pursuit of learning, leading to a lifelong process of discovery. Of primary concern in this endeavor is the development of the student's ability and skills so that meaningful knowledge is continuously
acquired. The present system of grading constrains the realization of these goals. It subverts the educational process into "schooling" and into the frenzied pursuit of grades, fosters a preoccupation with the accumulation of credit hours, and makes gamesmanship and the acquisition of a degree the final goal of learning. We recommend:

a. Courses evaluated on a Satisfactory- Unsatisfactory basis can help relieve this problem.

1) Liberalization of academic rules should be encouraged to allow students to take more courses on an S-U basis.

2) Departments and instructors should be encouraged to offer more courses on an S-U basis.

b. Active experimentation with new methods of evaluation. Some departments may discover new methods of evaluation better suited to the needs of the learning process.

c. More effective utilization of examinations as an integral part of the learning process. This entails placing greater emphasis on the educational benefits of examinations rather than on their value in "rating" student performance.

d. A serious attempt to divest ourselves of the belief that education takes place only within the classrooms of this university and is completed when a student receives his baccalaureate degree.

EVALUATION OF INSTRUCTION

Instruction of students is one of the oldest functions of the university; indeed, the land-grant institution was originally established to serve this purpose. "The ultimate criterion of good teaching is education. The teacher whose students make good progress toward educational goals is an effective teacher regardless of how he looks or what techniques he
uses. 1/ The university has a large number of policy statements saying in effect, teaching is to be emphasized as the primary role of the faculty member. In order to carry out these policies, we recommend that:

a. A formalized student evaluation of instruction be instituted.

   Education is a communication process, and as in all forms of communication, feedback is necessary for it to be effective. Student evaluations are a good form of feedback in education. In addition, such evaluations would be valuable to all segments of the academic community.

CAMPUS COMMUNICATION

Many problems on this campus are caused or aggravated by inadequate communication within the university community, which gives rise to rumor, misinformation and misunderstanding. For example, some actions of the administration and faculty seem arbitrary to students, possibly because of inadequate communication. To remedy this situation, we recommend:

a. More effective use of the Barometer be made. This could be accomplished by increasing its resource support, enlarging it to five issues a week, and by encouraging all segments of the university to use the Barometer to give added exposure to all information relevant to the academic community.

b. The role of campus radio be enlarged. In the age of instant communications, the printed word is often too slow in coming. The campus radio could be made more effective if it broadcast on the AM band, rather than FM.

c. More emphasis be placed on informal, less rigid means of communication.

communication rather than the formalized handbooks, pamphlets, brochures and directives which are now generally used. Students seem to be more receptive to less rigid forms of communication.

MEETING STUDENT NEEDS AND PROBLEMS

Oregon State University is a well organized and articulated bureaucratic institution. Students approaching the complex campus bureaucracy, regardless of its competency, in order to seek resolution of personal and educational problems experience confusion, anxiety and frustration because they are not adequately prepared to deal with this kind of organization. The counseling, advising and general information services provided by the university are increasingly less capable of helping the student deal with this situation and find solutions to his problems. We recommend:

a. Improved and expanded referral services within the campus and community. This might include the creation of a "directory of services."

b. Energetic support of the campus Counseling Center. A substantial increase in resources, staff, and improved and more centrally located facilities is absolutely essential if this vital university service is to adequately meet the needs of students. (Note: see Counseling Center, Year End Report 1968-69 for more detailed information and recommendations.)

STUDENT PARTICIPATION IN UNIVERSITY AFFAIRS

Students at Oregon State University are genuinely concerned with aiding the university to realize its goals in the pursuit of learning.
They have many valuable and constructive ideas to contribute to this endeavor. A sincere openness and receptiveness on the part of the administration and faculty to student proposals can contribute significantly to a unified campus community and a sense of common purpose among its members. We therefore suggest:

a. Student officio and ex officio responsive representatives on significant and appropriate university committees and councils.
b. Strengthened, meaningful and responsible student body government. No government can be meaningful and responsible unless it is given matters to be responsible about.

CONCLUSION

Again, we would like to thank the Goals Commission for the invitation to contribute recommendations to their report. We sincerely believe that they have made a most valuable contribution to education at Oregon State University. Through the period in which our own ideas were forming, we have observed the need for a permanent and continuing Goals Commission involving all members of the academic community. We feel the existence of such a commission is made necessary, to a great extent, by the dynamic quality of higher education and the society it serves.

Respectfully submitted,

Jim Ostlind
Senior, Political Science

Tom Hamilton
Junior, Science Education

Contributors: Dan Bergsvik, John Erickson, Paul Hinkly, Steve Morton, Dave Passmore