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1. The aim of this thesis is to appraise the Oregon Board of Higher Curricula as an agency for curricular control. The 1932 reorganization of Oregon higher education, adopted by the State Board of Higher Education on the basis of the recommendations of the Federal Survey of 1930, appears to provide a useful, though admittedly an imperfect, criterion for evaluating the work of the Board of Higher Curricula.

2. The Survey of Oregon higher education, conducted under the auspices of the United States Office of Education, was enjoined by the law of 1929 establishing the State Board of Higher Education. The Survey Commission recommended a plan of reorganization designed to be suited to the state's needs and tax-paying ability. The recommendations were thoroughly analyzed by the Board of Higher Education in respect to advantages and disadvantages. Those recommendations that were adopted by the
Board represent the combined judgment of a disinterested commission of educational specialists and a lay board responsible to the state as a whole. The recommendations that were adopted thus bear a double stamp of approval in respect to suitability to the Oregon situation.

3. The Board of Higher Curricula was for twenty years (1909-1929) legally in supreme control of the curricular scope of the University of Oregon and Oregon State College. The Board functioned, however, under certain acknowledged limitations. In matters other than curricular each institution was controlled by its own board of regents. Under the Board of Higher Curricula the two institutions, while duplicating considerable areas of work, occupied fields that in very major respects were differentiated.

4. Without regard to the procedures or details of the work of the Board of Higher Curricula, attention has been centered on the product of its work; namely, the curricular program of the two institutions as developed by the year 1929, when the Board of Higher Curricula was abolished.

5. "Major" work, representing courses in a field or subject leading to degrees, and "service" work, representing nonmajor basic or supplementary courses in a field or subject taken by students majoring in another field, are terms that figured conspicuously in the rulings of the Board of
Higher Curricula. Under the 1932 plan of reorganization the same terms have continued in use.

6. The curricular program of the two institutions as it had been developed by 1929 under the Board of Higher Curricula has been compared, in terms of major and service work, with the reorganized plan of 1932. A special chart (Chart D) has been prepared to facilitate comparison between the former and the reorganized program. Comparison has been made of the number of major and service departments that were carried over from the former to the reorganized curricular plan in relation to the number of departments having a changed status under the new plan. It appears that survival greatly outweighed change, and that a large proportion of the former curricular plan of the Board of Higher Curricula has been carried over into the future program of Oregon higher education.
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This thesis is a brief inquiry into the effectiveness of the Board of Higher Curricula through its twenty years of service. It is recognized, of course, that by 1929, when the Board of Higher Curricula and the separate University, State College, and normal school boards of regents were merged into one Board of Higher Education, the conditions in Oregon and in Oregon higher education had become very different from what they were in 1909, when the Board of Higher Curricula was established. The merging of the separate boards is evidence of a demand for unified and more efficient control of the higher educational program of the state.

Grateful acknowledgement is made of the encouragement and criticism that have been given by Dr. R. J. Clinton. Appreciation is also expressed to Mr. Charles D. Byrne, secretary of the Oregon State Board of Higher Education, in whose custody are placed the records of the Board of Higher Curricula, for the assistance given by his office in verifying facts regarding the work of the Board.
While the development of the best possible educational program with the funds available is a perennial problem even in states that maintain a single state institution of higher education, the problem is one of special difficulty in those states, like Oregon, that have established both a state university and a land-grant institution. Oregon's two largest institutions of higher education have been in existence for approximately two generations—the State College since 1868, the University since 1876. Both institutions until well into the present century were predominantly devoted to liberal arts. The earliest professional schools to be established were law (1884), medicine (1887), music (1902), and education (1910) at the University (19); and agriculture, commerce, engineering, and home economics (all in 1908) at the State College. (17) In connection with the organization of professional schools, as well as with other aspects of growth and development at the two institutions, questions arose regarding scope and future
policy in respect to duplication and differentiation. The two institutions were serving the same state, and both were dependent on the state for support, but they were under separate governing boards, and no agency existed for coordination between the institutions. In 1909 the State legislature established the State Board of Higher Curricula, assigning to it full authority over curricular matters for the two institutions, particularly "to determine what courses, if any, shall not be duplicated in the higher educational institutions of Oregon, and to determine and define the courses of study and departments to be offered by each such institution." (15) This was the sole function assigned to the Board of Higher Curricula; the separate boards of regents were left in full charge of their respective institutions in all matters other than curricular.

The work of the Board of Higher Curricula extended over a period of twenty years until 1929, when all state-supported institutions of higher learning were placed under a single board. The former boards of regents of the University, State College, and Normal Schools were at that time abolished, along with the Board of Higher Curricula, and their functions transferred to the State Board of
Higher Education. The law creating the new board provided that the work of the several institutions should be reorganized on the basis of a survey to be instituted under the direction of the board and conducted by a nationally recognized, impartial authority. The reorganization was to have as its objective "a program of higher educational development adapted to the needs of the State, taking into consideration its population, resources and tax-paying ability." (15) The new program, adopted in 1932, thus represents the combined judgment of a disinterested professional survey commission and of a lay board responsible to the state as a whole. It has been described as "one of the most drastic reorganizations of a state-supported system of higher education ever undertaken." (3) It appears to provide a useful, even though imperfect, criterion by which the work of the Board of Higher Curricula may be evaluated. It may be assumed that such curricular rulings of the Board of Higher Curricula as have survived the reorganization represent, in some measure at least, positive contributions of the former curricular board. The aim of this paper is to appraise the Board of Higher Curricula as an agency for curricular control. The first step in such appraisal is to
review briefly the 1932 reorganization of the Oregon higher educational program.

II

THE 1932 REORGANIZATION OF OREGON HIGHER EDUCATION

The survey required by the law of 1929 was conducted in 1930 by a commission of educational specialists under the auspices of the United States Office of Education. The commission was headed by Dr. Arthur J. Klein, Chief of the Division of Collegiate and Professional Education in the United States Office of Education. The other members of the commission proper were Dr. F. J. Kelly, President of the University of Idaho, and Dr. George A. Works, Professor of Higher Education at the University of Chicago. The report of the Survey Commission was issued in the spring of 1931. (4)

The Oregon Survey ranks high among the surveys of higher education that have been conducted in this country. It is included among the thirty outstanding surveys of higher education that were selected by a group of twenty-eight men most experienced in the higher-educational survey.
field. (2) Among the eleven outstanding statewide surveys selected by these men, the Oregon Survey is tied for first place with the California (Carnegie) and the Texas surveys. (2) In a group of fifty surveys ranked in respect to the number of specific recommendations carried out, the Oregon survey stood twenty-fourth. In this ranking all recommendations, primary as well as secondary, were treated as of the same value, though the fact that some were of far more importance than others was recognized. (2) It is notable that in the case of the Oregon Survey recommendations, the major recommendations, as will be indicated below, were for the most part adopted.

Beginning in April, 1931, when the Survey Report was first received, the State Board of Higher Education conducted a systematic, detailed study of the recommendations made. The presidents of the institutions were immediately requested to present briefs setting forth their views regarding the Survey recommendations; other briefs and counter briefs were subsequently called for or accepted by the Board dealing with various aspects of the Survey proposals. Many alternative proposals for unification and coordination were tentatively considered by the Board.
Under the leadership of the Board's executive secretary,* facts and figures pertaining to different phases of the educational program were assembled by committees of faculty members representing both institutions, the data jointly authenticated, specific Survey recommendations then jointly examined, and reports filed showing what the situation would be in each field if the Survey recommendations were adopted. Joint alternative proposals were invited, and in lieu of these each institutional group was permitted to file a separate alternative proposal. Within the Board itself a number of special committees, notably one on curricula, engaged in various studies, both independently and in cooperation with the institutions. By the time a plan of reorganization was finally agreed upon by the Board, the situation and the possibilities appear to have been pretty thoroughly studied. All the objections that any one had to offer to the Survey recommendations had been discussed. Alternative proposals had been advanced and analyzed. The decision of the Board, embodied in the report of its Committee on Curricula as

* Dr. E. E. Lindsay, formerly professor of education at the University of Pittsburgh. Dr. Lindsay was one of the special assistants serving on the Oregon Survey staff.
approved on March 7, 1932, was to adopt "in practically all essentials" the Survey recommendations.

The biennial report of the State Board of Higher Education for 1931-1932 contained the following statement of the Board's point of view in respect to its new program:

In this plan of reorganization the Board followed the specific recommendations of the Survey Commission in practically all essentials. This is particularly true in the allocation of major curricula. Back of the Commission's recommendations were fundamental principles of education, definitely stated, that in general are in harmony with the recommendations of similar surveys and the opinion of educational authorities generally. These principles, roughly summarized, were developed in the Survey Report somewhat as follows: On the campus of the land-grant college are centered the natural sciences and their applications, those curricula and disciplines that depend primarily on the laws of the material universe. On the campus of the university are centered the humanities and social sciences, those curricula and disciplines dealing with human beings and the principles governing their actions. This natural grouping suggests for one campus engineering, agriculture, forestry, home economics and allied subjects; and for the other campus architecture, music, painting, sculpture, social science, law, journalism and business administration. On whatever campus a professional school is located, the sciences basic to it are located. Thus the schools of agriculture, engineering, forestry, home economics and the like require foundations in mathematics and the biological and physical sciences. Since these professional schools are located at Corvallis, strong departments in the various sciences must be maintained on that campus. If strong science departments are maintained also at Eugene in order to have there a typical and complete college of arts and sciences, there must be extensive duplication in the sciences between the institutions.
In like manner, the schools of business administration, journalism, and law at Eugene require strong departments of economics, political science, and sociology. If strong departments in these social sciences are maintained also at Corvallis in order to care for a school of commerce, there must then be extensive duplication. Similar conditions govern through practically the entire list of vocations and professions. Therefore, if extensive duplication is to be avoided, the basic sciences and arts upon the advanced levels must be divided between the two campuses along the same lines as the professional schools that rest upon them. Preparation for teaching any subject is necessarily centered where the subject itself is located.

The Survey recommendations may be classified into two groups: (1) primary recommendations, and (2) secondary recommendations. The first group is composed of the six "fundamental recommendations" given on page 49 of the Survey Report (see Chart A). The second group is composed of various other recommendations, some of them having to do with curricula, and others with administration. The secondary recommendations were in some instances either not adopted by the Board or adopted in modified form. Examples of modifications made by the Board include premedical work, physical education, and certain proposed joint curricula. In the case of the primary recommendations, however, the Board adopted the Survey program in nearly all respects, as shown in outline in Chart B, taken from the 1933-34
reference to the relations among the six agencies that constitute the educational factors in the situation, the commission has adopted six guiding principles that it believes are self-evident and in harmony with the purposes of the law creating the department of higher education:

First, certain functions having to do with this enterprise as a whole must be performed through a central office rather than from any of the campuses. For example, all relationships with high schools and high-school students, such as educational guidance conferences and all advertising of higher education.

Second, past rulings of the board of higher curricula should not be binding for the future. These rulings were made to harmonize the interests of competing institutions, limited as they were by separate legislative appropriations. The new set-up contemplates a different theory of operation, and the future development should not be hampered by past rulings. In meeting its responsibilities the board should not be influenced by the arguments of priority in the field, or institutional interest. Only the arguments of efficiency, economy, and better State service should weigh in the decisions of the future.

Third, the assignment of functions to the several campuses should be determined by major services required by the State, with provision for flexibility among all the details so that changes from year to year can easily be made in the light of the shifting educational needs of the State and interests of the students.

Fourth, distribution of functions should be on the basis of life careers. The career motive is dominant in higher education. This does not mean that all higher education courses are vocational or professional, but rather that some time before the completion of higher educational study almost all students feel impelled to prepare for some career.

Fifth, the assignment of functions to the several campuses on the career basis must have regard for the fact that the best preparation for a career calls for wide cultural training also and that the function of any institution of higher learning, especially a State institution, is first to fit its students to be good neighbors, friends, and citizens, and then to provide specialized education needed to prepare them for occupational careers.

Sixth, the dominant factor in determining the assignment of functions among the several units is the influence such assignment will have upon the ultimate future development of the unified system. Not for next year nor the next few years is the State now building, but for the next 25 and the next 100 years. What arrangement will assure ultimately the greatest educational service capable of being administered most efficiently at the least cost, is the all-important question. If this arrangement calls for a departure from the typical American organization of education, the State should not hesitate at such departure.

The statement that follows refers primarily to undergraduate college instruction, but the principles are applicable to a considerable degree to the assignment of professional schools to the institutions and to emphasis upon graduate instruction.

The commission recommends the following assignment of major functions to the various institutions:

1. The training of teachers for the elementary schools should be done at the three normal schools.

2. Unspecialized freshman and sophomore work (hereafter referred to as lower division work) in all the arts and sciences should be available on essentially identical terms at Eugene and Corvallis. The purpose of this lower division work shall be to afford the broad, general education needed by men and women without respect to the careers they will follow, and to provide service courses needed in the many professional curricula.

3. A great school of science should be developed at Corvallis based upon lower division work that may be pursued at either the university or the Oregon State College. This school of science should provide curricula leading to undergraduate and graduate degrees in the various sciences, including botany, zoology, geology, chemistry, physics, astronomy, and mathematics and statistics.

4. A great school of art, literature, and social sciences should be developed at Eugene, based upon the lower division work that may be pursued at either the Oregon State College or the university. This school of the arts, literature, and social sciences should provide curricula leading to undergraduate and graduate degrees in the various arts, literatures, and social sciences, including art, English language and literature, the foreign languages and literatures, speech, history, economics, political science, sociology, and psychology.

5. The professional schools resting essentially upon the natural sciences should be located at Corvallis. These include engineering, agriculture, forestry, mines, women's careers in the realm of foods, and teacher training in the sciences and their applications. Because of the presence of facilities for it, pharmacy should be continued at Corvallis, at least temporarily.

6. The professional schools resting essentially upon the arts, literatures, and social sciences should be located at Eugene or at Portland. These include architecture, music, law, medicine, public health, nursing, social service, journalism, business administration (including commerce), teacher training in the arts, literatures, and social sciences and their application.

Each of these points will be discussed briefly. Points that can not be presented in sufficient detail within the compass of this chapter are discussed at length by the chapters that follow.
FUNDAMENTAL CURRICULAR ALLOCATIONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recommended</th>
<th>Adopted</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>By Federal Survey Commission</strong>&lt;br&gt;<strong>May 13, 1931</strong>&lt;br&gt;(Survey Report, pp. 276-277)</td>
<td><strong>By State Board of Higher Education</strong>&lt;br&gt;<strong>March 7, 1932</strong>&lt;br&gt;(Curricula Committee Report)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**ELEMENTARY TEACHER TRAINING**
- At Normal Schools
  - "1. Training of teachers for the elementary schools should be done at the three Normal schools."
- At Eugene and Corvallis
  - "2. Unspecialized freshman and sophomore work referred to as lower division work in all the arts and sciences should be available on essentially identical terms."
- At Corvallis
  - "3. A great School of Science should be developed at Corvallis based upon lower division work that may be pursued at either the University or State College."

**LIBERAL ARTS AND SCIENCES**
- At Eugene
  - "4. A great School of Arts, Literature and Social Sciences should be developed at Eugene, based on lower division courses that may be pursued at either the State College or the University."
- At Corvallis
  - "5. The professional schools based essentially on the natural sciences should be located at Corvallis. Teacher training in the sciences and their applications."

**PROFESSIONAL SCHOOLS**
- At Eugene
  - "6. The professional schools resting essentially upon the arts, literatures, and social sciences should be located at Eugene. Teacher training in the arts, literatures and social sciences and their applications."
- At Portland
  - "The professional schools include... medicine..."

**Oregon Normal School**
- Southern Oregon Normal School
- Eastern Oregon Normal School
- Lower Division
  - "Lower division work to be offered on both of the major campuses."
- School of Science
  - "Upper division and graduate work in pure science... centralized in a School of Science to be located at Corvallis."
- College of Arts and Letters
  - "Upper division, graduate and professional work in this field [literature, language and arts], to be given only at Eugene."
- College of Social Science
  - "School of Social Science at the University... that upper division and graduate work be limited to the unit at the University."
- School of Agriculture
- School of Engineering
- School of Forestry
- School of Home Economics
- School of Pharmacy
- Secretarial Training
- School of Education
- School of Business Administration
- School of Fine Arts
- School of Journalism (April 30, 1932)
- School of Law
- School of Physical Education
- School of Education
- School of Medicine
  - "The continuance of the Medical School to be located at Portland."


(From Biennial Report 1933-1934, Oregon State Board of Higher Education, page 16.)
biennial report of the Board. In the same biennial report
the President of the Board, in his letter of transmittal
addressed to the Governor of Oregon, said:

The program that has been in operation during the
past two and a half years...is in all essentials the
program of the Survey Commission. While future read-
justments no doubt will need to be made in matters
of detail, as a result of experience and further study,
it is the Board's conviction that the fundamental al-
locations of function are sound, educationally and
economically, and should be maintained. With a popu-
lation of less than a million people and an assessed
valuation of approximately nine hundred million dol-
ars, Oregon cannot support separate institutions
each complete in itself according to the traditions
of the more populous and wealthy states; rather, each
institution must occupy a distinctive field as a part
of the state system, all the institutions together
constituting a complete unity of curricular offerings
and other functions required to meet the higher edu-
cational needs of the state. (9)

Having in mind the use of the present curricular struc-
ture of the Oregon State System of Higher Education as a
criterion in appraising the work of the former Board of
Higher Curricula, it is to be noted that those Survey rec-
ommendations that the Board adopted, after analytical
study of their advantages and disadvantages, bear a double
stamp of approval in respect to their suitability to the
Oregon situation.
III

THE BOARD OF HIGHER CURRICULA

The Board of Higher Curricula, established by the Oregon legislature in 1909, was composed of five members serving for five-year terms, one member being replaced each year. Presidents of the Board during the period of its work were Dr. J. R. Wilson, educator, who served from 1909 to 1915, and Dr. C. J. Smith, physician and surgeon, who served from 1915 to time of the abolition of the Board in 1929. Mr. Joseph E. Hedges was secretary of the Board during the entire twenty years of its existence. Aspects of the work of the Board have been presented by Leonard (6), Veit (20), and others (1, 5, 21). In the present paper no attempt is made to give the history of the Board's work, details of its membership, or a description of its methods, except as these are incidentally involved in the appraisal of the Board as an agency for curricular control.

Capen, reporting on the survey of the University of Oregon that he made in 1915 under the auspices of the United States Bureau of Education, declared that it was
no part of his province as an investigator "to estimate the wisdom of the decisions of the Board of Higher Curricula."

(1) His attitude toward the Board and its work, however, is in some measure indicated by the following statement:

"Through the action of its unique 'Board of Higher Curricula,' each of the state-supported higher institutions of Oregon is assigned to its own special territory. This regulation is negative rather than positive, prohibitory rather than prophetic. While preventing the University and Agricultural College respectively from undertaking some activities which have seemed in the past to be the natural outgrowths of their several lines of work,...it has only in the most general way outlined the future sphere of each."

(1)

Zook, who in 1922, while Specialist in Higher Education in the United States Bureau of Education, investigated the colleges and universities of Oregon, both publicly and privately supported, reported to the Oregon State Superintendent of Public Instruction (J. A. Churchill), as follows:

"Considering the fact that in Oregon as much, if not more, has been done through the Board of Higher Curricula toward the elimination of undesirable duplication between the two institutions, it is difficult to see how it would be possible to reduce the state expenditures for higher education without eliminating, or very seriously crippling, activities that are vital to the prosperity and welfare of the state."  (21)

Leonard, whose 1923 monograph on the coordination of
state institutions of higher education has been called "the best single reference to the work of this type of board" (5), evaluated the work of the Oregon Board of Higher Curricula as follows:

In Defining Policies and Curricula:

a. Duplications in engineering have been eliminated by direct action of the board.

b. Duplications in journalism, liberal arts and education have developed since the board undertook its work. Duplications in commerce are now more serious than before the board was created.*

In Bringing About Harmonious and Cooperative Relations Among Institutions:

a. Through the efforts of the board the relations between the two institutions—the university and the agricultural college—have improved. Open hostility has given way to "armed neutrality." Although not susceptible to proof, this is the opinion of all with whom conferences were held. The stage of cooperation and good will has not been attained.

b. The board has given no consideration to the relations among institutions in the training of teachers. One reason is that the work of the normal school does not come under the purview of the board, and another that the work of the board, under law, is limited exclusively to considering duplications of curricula. (6)

Leonard's general appraisal of the work of the board is expressed in the following statement:

The Oregon board of higher curricula has been in existence for about thirteen years. Its activities have been limited to considering problems of duplications of curricula. Its chief constructive act was in centering all instruction in engineering in

* See Appendix.
one institution, thereby eliminating the conflict and waste which had been going on for years. During the life of the board, however, duplications of sufficient import to constitute serious problems have developed in the work of the university and the state college in commerce and journalism and are in process of development in the liberal arts and in education. (6)

Veit, who considered the work of the Board through its full twenty years of existence (see Appendix), summarized its accomplishments as follows:

The work of this Board has been of value to the institutions concerned and to the state at large in that standards of education have been raised to an accepted level. This was largely brought about by the first definite action of the Board in requiring that standards be raised at the Oregon Agricultural College in order that engineering be kept on the same high level it had been at the University of Oregon.

It has led to harmonious action in that different heads of departments of the two schools have discussed problems of duplications in their respective departments preparatory to placing them before the Board, which led to agreements satisfactory to both institutions, and which resulted in efficiency and economy in the departments concerned.

The personnel of the board has at all times been composed of honest, upright men, sincere in their interest in the progress of education in the state and their personal integrity cannot be questioned. Yet there has been a doubt as to whether each one, because of training and experience, was competent to understand clearly the needs, scope and functions of the two institutions of higher learning.

During the time (1909-1929) the Board of Higher Curricula was in existence, duplications arose in
various departments as commerce, journalism, liberal arts, physical education, and music. Since the board had no funds and no special power or means to enforce its orders, it cannot be held accountable for the unwarranted and wasteful duplications which arose. (20)

The Oregon Survey Commission of 1930, while it declared that "past rulings of the Board of Higher Curricula should not be binding for the future," (4) apparently recognized that the Board had accomplished important constructive results. The Survey Report contains no formal appraisal of the Board or its work, but in the following statement commends the degree of differentiation between the two institutions that had been developed:

The character of the University and of the Oregon State College as reflected in their spirit and educational offerings are not identical. The circumstances of their founding, their histories and the work of the State Board of Higher Curricula have all tended to produce institutions that in very major respects are different, have different objectives and characters, and use different means for accomplishing their purposes. Each is devoted to large areas of educational endeavor that are peculiarly its own and within which it has no competition from the other State institution. ... Naturally, the points of clashing cause irritation and bulk large in the consciousness of the institutions and of the State. Yet, essentially the University's major attention is given to the humanities and the social sciences and to their applications in various professions, while the major activities of the Oregon State College are directed to the sciences and their technical application in a wide range of occupations. (4)
IV

PLAN OF APPRAISAL

A complete appraisal of the Board of Higher Curricula as an agency for curricular control would involve a sifting of many details. In respect to the Board itself a number of factors would require careful attention. The powers of the Board were limited by the lack of funds, aside from the expenses of the board members, who devoted time to the work as a public service in addition to their private occupations; by the lack of disinterested assistance; by the lack of provision for the assembling of impartial data; by the lack of contact with the institutions; and by the lack of an executive officer to enforce the orders of the Board. In evaluating the achievements of the Board due account must be taken of these several limitations on its functioning. Then, too, the Board of Higher Curricula was merely one factor in a rather complex scheme in which other factors—the two institutions and their constituencies, as well as the state as a whole—also played a part. On only a few occasions did the Board of Higher Curricula engage actively in the study of curricular problems of the
institutions, these occasions being when acute controversies arose. Even in those instances when the Board held hearings, considered the briefs of the institutions, and in some cases consulted outside opinion, it would be difficult to segregate just what the Board itself actually contributed to the solution. It may be questioned whether any study that might be attempted, however carefully planned and carried out, would yield results very satisfactory in showing just what achievements may be separately ascribed to the Board of Higher Curricula and what to the institutions themselves, their respective regents, presidents, and faculties. It is realized that the present attempt at appraisal of the Board is essentially an appraisal of the whole rather loose structure of which it was a part.

In this structure, however, the Board of Higher Curricula was supreme in curricular matters; it legally had "the power of life and death" over all course offerings at the two institutions. To ascribe to the Board of Higher Curricula the credit for constructive results to which other agencies undoubtedly contributed may be as reasonable as to ascribe greatness to a man even though it is
realized that time and circumstance in part conditioned his achievements.

The present appraisal for the most part ignores the processes followed by the Board of Higher Curricula and directs attention to the product. The net result of the various allocations and prohibitions that had been made by the Board of Higher Curricula is to be found in the actual curricular programs of the University and the State College as they existed in 1929 when the Board was abolished. At that time at each institution certain curricula existed that had been specifically assigned by the Board as major work at that institution; in addition, certain other curricula existed on which the Board had never taken specific action, but which— to some extent, perhaps, on the assumption that "what the sovereign does not forbid, he commands"—were regarded as fully approved even though not formally assigned. Examples of major work definitely allocated are fine arts, journalism, and commerce (higher) at the University; and engineering, mining, and commerce (leading to the bachelor's degree) at the State College. (The Board as late as 1925 declared that higher commerce as assigned to the University and commerce leading to the bachelor's degree
as assigned to the State College were "sufficiently differentiated", (7) though these curricula were on several occasions the subject of controversy.) Examples of curricula never directly allocated, though in practice recognized as within the province of one or the other institution, are agriculture, forestry, and pharmacy at the State College; and letters, science, and law at the University.

An outline of the curricular programs as they were developed at the time of the termination of the work of the Board of Higher Curricula is supplied by the joint statement contained in the catalogs of the University and the State College during the years just preceding 1932, when the new curricular program of the State Board of Higher Education was inaugurated. The joint statement (see Chart C) first appeared in the catalogs for the academic year 1928-29, as an aspect of the various efforts at cooperation that were made during the last year or two before the establishment of the new Board of Higher Education. (16, 18) The joint catalog statement was in part a result of a series of joint meetings of the boards of regents of the two institutions, under the leadership of Governor Patterson, at which matters of common concern
The University of Oregon

Degree and Program

I. THE COLLEGE OF LITERATURE, SCIENCE AND THE ARTS (B.A., B.S., degrees)

(A) Degree Granting Departments:

The Division of Biology, composed of the major departments of Animal Biology including Physiology, and Plant Biology including Botany; the major departments of Chemistry, Economics, English (English), German, French, English, Spanish English, French and Fizeau Production, Library Training, Education, German, Languages (German, Norwegian, Russian), Polish, Greek History, Latin, Mathematics, Military Science, Philosophy, Physics, Psychology, and English, Spanish, Italian, French.

(B) Service Department:

Humanities; no major work and no professional training is given in this department and no degrees are granted.

II. THE PROFESSIONAL SCHOOLS

1. The School of Architecture and Allied Arts (B.Arch., and M.Arch. degrees; also B.A. and B.S. degrees through the Graduate School).

Major work in Architecture, Drawing and Painting, Sculpture, and Visual Arts.

2. The School of Business Administration (B.B.A., B.A., B.S., M.B.A. degrees). Professional training in Accounting, Finance, Foreign Trade, Marketing, Advertising, Transportation, Personnel Management, and Production; and combination courses in Law and Business Administration. The Graduate division of the school offers the only graduate work in Business Administration given in the state of Oregon.

3. The School of Education (B.S. Education, B.A., and also B.A., M.S., and Ph.D. degrees through the Graduate School).

Secondary and higher education careers in Teaching, Administration, and Supervision; Educational Psychology; and Atypical Children; Educational History; Sociological, and Mental Values.

4. The School of Journalism (B.A., and B.S. in Journalism; also B.A., B.S.; and M.A. and M.S. degrees through the Graduate School).

Commercial and mass media careers in Advertising and Publishing in newspapers (metropolitan and rural), magazines, and class and trade papers; advertising, printing.

5. The School of Law (LL.B., J.D. degrees)

6. The School of Medicine (M.B., M.D., Ph.D. degrees through the Graduate School).

7. The School of Music (B.M., B.A.; B.S.; and M.A., M.S., M.F.A. degrees through the Graduate School).

Major courses in the history, theory, composition, and literature of music; teaching of music; public school music; and music education; and professional training in piano, organ, voice, stringed instruments, and other instruments of the orchestra and band.

8. The School of Nursing Education (B.S. and B.A. degrees for the professional and teachers training courses, and M.A. and M.S. degrees through the Graduate School).

Training in the practical aspects of Nursing Education for Women, Athletics, and the Health Service.


Training for social work and public health nursing.

III. THE GRADUATE SCHOOL (M.A., M.S., M.P.A., Ph.D. degrees)

Majors in all of the degree-granting departments of the College of Literature, Science, and the Arts, and in several of the professional schools.

IV. RESEARCH

The Research Committee; the Bureau of Student Research; the Bureau of Education Research; the departments of the Graduate School; research and investigations by the faculty and students of the university.

V. THE EXTENSION DIVISION (B.S., B.A. degrees and M.A., M.S. degrees through the Graduate School).

Adult education in the liberal arts and professional fields offered to the University in major lines of work leading to a degree, but not in the service departments; visual instruction and social welfare departments.

OreGon State Agricultural College

Corvallis

1. DEGREE GRANTING SCHOOLS AND DEPARTMENTS.

1. The School of Agriculture (B.S. and M.S. degrees).


2. The Department of Chemical Engineering (B.S. and M.S. degrees).

A major curriculum in Chemical Engineering including application of chemistry in the industries: Graduate study and research.

3. The School of Commerce (B.S. degree; M.S. degree in Agricultural Economics and Rural Sociology).


4. The School of Engineering and Mechanical Arts (B.S. and M.S. degrees).


5. The School of Forestry (B.S. and M.S. degrees).


6. The School of Home Economics (B.S. and M.S. degrees).

General and professional major curricula in Home Economics including Clothing and Textiles and Related Arts, Food and Nutrition, Home Economics Extension, Household Economics.

7. The Department of Military Science and Tactics (B.S. degree).

A major curriculum in Reserve Officers Training Corps including Engineering, Field Artillery, Infantry. Commission in United States Army.

8. The School of Mines (B.S. and M.S. degrees)

A major curriculum in Mining Engineering including Geology and Metallurgy. Graduate study and research.

9. The School of Pharmacy (Ph.B., B.S., and M.S. degrees.

A major curriculum in Pharmacy including Pharmaceutical Technology, Pharmaceutical Analysis, and Pharmaceutical Chemistry.

10. The School of Vocational Education (B.S. and M.S. degrees).

A major curriculum in Vocational Education including administration, supervision and teaching of agriculture, economics, home economics, industrial arts; vocational counseling and guidance. Graduate study and research.

II. SCHOOL OF BASIC ARTS AND SCIENCES & OTHER SERVICE DEPARTMENTS.

In these departments no major work is offered and no degree is granted.

1. The School of Basic Arts and Sciences: Nuclear, Terrestrial, and Atmospheric Sciences, Chemistry, Botany and Plant Physiology, Chemistry, English Language and Literature, Mathematics, English Language, Humanities, Mathematics, Modern Languages (French, German, Spanish), Physics, Sociology.


III. RESEARCH AND EXPERIMENTATION

The Agricultural Experiment Station: the Engineering Experiment Station; graduate study and research in all degree-granting divisions of the College, except that in Commerce graduate study is limited to Agricultural Economics and Rural Sociology.

IV. EXTENSION SERVICE

Adult extension work by lectures, demonstrations, conferences, extension schools, correspondence, radio, television, and all other means. Activities in the work of county agricultural agents, home demonstration agents, and specialists in various fields supervised cooperatively by the Federal, State, and county agencies. Extension work through levy and club clubs, projects, correspondence and other methods. Extension work is limited to the special fields assigned the College.
were discussed and certain procedures mutually agreed upon.

V. "MAJOR" AND "SERVICE" WORK

For an understanding of the joint statement (Chart C), and particularly for the purpose of comparing the 1929 curricular program with the new program inaugurated in 1932, it is desirable to define the terms "major" and "service" as applied to departments and courses. The curricular problem of the Board of Higher Curricula appears to have centered in these two terms. In the earlier years the Board was particularly concerned with the allocation of major work. In the later years, after the programs of both institutions had greatly expanded, the Board repeatedly attempted to define service departments. (7)

The first orders of the Board of Higher Curricula consisted in assignments of departments to one or the other institution. On April 28, 1910, for example, it was ruled that "The departments of mechanical engineering and mining engineering shall be confined to the State Agricultural College." It was similarly ruled that "The school of
education, as such, shall be confined to the University of Oregon..." And a blanket ruling was laid down as follows: "No new school, department, or course may be established in either the State Agricultural College or the University of Oregon until the plan of such school, department, or course shall have been submitted to this Board and have received its approval." (7) In these early orders the term "school," "department," or "course" obviously signifies major work leading to degrees.

In "confining" departments to one or the other institution, however, the Board took cognizance of the needs of students for instruction in certain subjects even though they were majoring in other fields. In a series of rulings on February 7, 1914, for example, the Board assigned architecture, music, economics and political science, and higher commerce to the University, but made certain exceptions, such as, "The State Agricultural College may continue instruction in music as now offered as an accessory only to the regular courses of that institution,...but no degrees shall be conferred in music by said Agricultural College." In respect to economics and political science, a similar exception was made: "The State Agricultural College shall
not be required to discontinue such elementary and applied courses in these subjects as are essential to the general training of the students. Such training naturally embraces subjects underlying all good citizenship, as well as those which supplement the various technical courses of the Agricultural College." (7) The Board later designated such nonmajor courses as "service" courses. On September 19, 1917, the Board authorized a proposed group of studies in household arts at the University "as a service course only" (7).

Under the Survey recommendations the service needs of the institutions were to be provided through lower-division offerings. When the State Board of Higher Education adopted its program of reorganization, however, it used the term "lower division and service" to describe those departments not authorized to offer major work. (12,13) Hence, in the comparisons that will be made between the Board of Higher Curricula program of curricula and the new program adopted by the State Board of Higher Education it is possible to retain the term "service," as well as "major" as applicable to a particular department.
VI
FORMER CURRICULAR PROGRAM COMPARED WITH REORGANIZED PLAN

As will be observed from Chart C, the University in 1929 contained a college of literature, science, and the arts, with seventeen major departments and one service department, together with ten major professional schools. The State College contained ten major professional schools or departments, a non-degree-granting school of basic arts and sciences, and certain "other departments." The degree of difference in the curricular programs of the two institutions shown side by side in Chart C illustrates the fact, referred to in the Survey Report, as already quoted, that each institution was "devoted to large areas of educational endeavor...peculiarly its own."

In analyzing the two programs, however, the Survey Commission found a larger amount of duplication between the two institutions than might appear from a merely general comparison such as Chart C permits. Duplication at the lower-division level was regarded by the Commission as ordinarily not expensive and hence unobjectionable (4); it was recognized as indispensable, in fact, in the field...
of the liberal arts and sciences, which the Commission recommended should be developed at the lower-division level on an essentially parallel basis at both the University and the State College. (See Chart B.) At the upper-division level the Commission found duplications that it sought to decrease, if not to eliminate, in the following fields: social sciences, natural sciences, humanities, mathematics and engineering, journalism, home economics, arts and music, and health and physical education. (4) That these fields of duplication were noted is mentioned in connection with Chart C to avoid overemphasis on the degree of differentiation that had been achieved between the two institutions. No attempt is made in this paper to determine the extent to which upper-division duplication has been decreased in the new program.

Accepting Chart C as an official presentation of the curricular program of the University and the State College as developed by 1929 under the Board of Higher Curricula, it is now possible to make a direct comparison with the new program adopted by the Board of Higher Education in 1932. The main points of the new program in relation to the Survey recommendations have already been presented in
Chart B. In the present paper a detailed review of the new program does not appear necessary, although in the Bibliography are included the titles of official publications in which the program is fully described. (8, 9, 10, 12, 13, 14, 17, 19) For the new program details are given in Chart D that are equivalent to those for the former program as given in Chart C. The purpose of Chart D is to show in a general way what happened to the former program when the new plan was put into effect.

The left-hand column of Chart D is based directly on Chart C. For the University the various major departments and schools and the one service department are listed item for item as they appear in Chart C. For the State College in a few cases a breakdown by Departments has been found desirable in order to facilitate comparison of the former and the new programs. Certain State College schools were affected in the 1932 reorganization, not in their entirety but by departments. Thus the major in landscape architecture in the school of agriculture was transferred to the University; this major has therefore been listed in Chart D as a special item. Four biology majors (bacteriology, botany, entomology, and zoology, as shown in Chart C),
## Chart D

### COMPARISON OF FORMER CURRICULAR PROGRAM WITH 1932 REORGANIZED PLAN

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Major Departments</th>
<th>Changes made in inaugurating new plan of reorganization 1932-36</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Continued</td>
<td>Raised to major</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Board of Higher Curricula 1929</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>UNIVERSITY</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Major Departments</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Animal Biology (Zoology)</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plant Biology (Botany)</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chemistry</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economics</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geology</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germanic Languages</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greek</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>History</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latin</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mathematics</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Military Science</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philosophy</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physics</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Political Science</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychology</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Romance Languages</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Architecture and Allied Arts</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business Administration</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Journalism</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Law</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medicine</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Music</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical Education</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sociology</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Work</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>STATE COLLEGE</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Major Departments</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agriculture</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Agriculture</em></td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Botany</em></td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Biology</em></td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Economics</em></td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Geology</em></td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>History</em></td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Landscape Architecture</em></td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Law</em></td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Lever Science</em></td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Motor Science</em></td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Philosophy</em></td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Physics</em></td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Political Science</em></td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Public Speaking</em></td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Secretarial Training</em></td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Social Science</em></td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Zoology</em></td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Service Departments</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychology</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Art and Architecture</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>History</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mathematics</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Modern Languages</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physics</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Speaking (Speech)</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Industrial Journalism</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Library Practice</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Music</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical Education (Men, Women)</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* See explanation in text.
were offered in the school of agriculture, although the
departments themselves were service departments for the
entire institution and were administered under the school
of basic arts and sciences. These departments were trans-
ferred in 1932 into the new school of science. In order
to show this transfer in Chart D the four majors are listed
under agriculture but omitted under service departments.
While all the major work in the former school of commerce
at the State College, excepting the secretarial work, was
logged to the University, it is necessary to insert
the component departments of the school of commerce as
they existed in 1932, in order to show clearly what took
place in the 1932 reorganization.

The State College majors marked in Chart D with an
asterisk require brief explanation. The four biology ma-
jors, referred to under agriculture, involved a specified
minimum of agriculture in addition to the biology; and
similarly the social-science majors required a specified
minimum of commerce proper (finance and administration and
secretarial work) in addition to the economics and soci-
ology or political science. (16) None of these majors,
moreover, reached to the graduate level, except in the case
of agricultural economics and rural sociology, which by ruling of the Board of Higher Curricula had been assigned to the State College. In the 1932 reorganization, agricultural economics was incorporated in the school of agriculture, though this is not shown in Chart D.

With these explanations, then, the left-hand column of Chart D may be stated as representing the former curricular plan developed under the Board of Higher Curricula.

The remaining columns of Chart D show what happened to the former program in the reorganization. The period of reorganization has been extended to include 1932-35 in order to take into account two actions of the State Board of Higher Education that have altered the status of certain elements of the new program as at first organized. Secretarial science, defined in 1932 as a "minor applicable as an elective toward a degree in a school of the student's choice," was made a major curriculum in 1933. (17) The Portland school of social work, discontinued in 1932 as a separate organization, was partly preserved by the transfer of the nursing work to the medical school, and in 1935 a division of social work in Portland was authorized under the college of social science. (11) These changes have
been incorporated in Chart D as part of the reorganization plan.

The columns in Chart D under the general heading 'Changes made in inaugurating new plan of reorganization 1932-35' show clearly which major or service departments of the former plan were continued unchanged under the new plan, which service departments were raised to major status, which major departments were reduced to service status, and which departments were transferred or discontinued. The changes that took place, in terms of major and service status, as shown in the respective columns in Chart D, may be summarized as follows:

Departments unchanged:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Department</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>University</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State College</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>43</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Service departments raised to major:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Department</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>State College</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Major departments reduced to service:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Department</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>University</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State College</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>13</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
As this comparison is made in terms simply of changes in major or service status, these summary figures count as "unchanged" those departments that continued as major departments in the institution, even though administrative transfers within the institution were made, as in the case of social work, or though major accretions were transferred from the other campus, as in the case of biology at the State College and business administration at the University. To complete the total of changes, in terms of major or service status, however, the transfer of the landscape architecture major must be added:

Department transferred (not counted in foregoing):

From State College to University - - - 1

The method here employed for comparing the former curricular program with the new plan under the reorganization does not warrant the computing of percentages, or other attempt at precise mathematical determination. The comparisons that are possible in Chart D, however, show clearly what took place, in terms of major and service departments, when the new plan replaced the old. Our specific interest is to note to what extent the curricular plan of the Board of Higher Curricula, as it was developed by
1929, may have carried over into the new curricular plan. The data given above may be stated in condensed form as follows:

Departments unchanged - - - - - - - - - - - - - - 43
Departments changed - - - - - - - - - - - - - - 17

Without claim of undue significance for these un-weighted figures, significance probably attaches to the fact that forty-three departments survived the reorganization without change in status so far as major or service character is concerned. From the standpoint of economy and efficiency significance may likewise attach to the fact that for seventeen departments the reorganization brought change of status. The chief interest for the present study, however, is found in evidence of the extent to which the Board of Higher Curricula program survived the reorganization. Ever since 1932 the University and the State College have been keenly aware of the changes that were made. In so far as comparison of major and service status, before and after the reorganization, reveals the extent of change, it appears that survival greatly outweighed change, and that a large proportion of the former curricular program developed under the Board of Higher Curricula has been carried over into the future program of Oregon higher education.
VII
SUMMARY

1. The aim of this paper is to appraise the Oregon Board of Higher Curricula as an agency for curricular control. The 1932 reorganization of Oregon higher education, adopted by the State Board of Higher Education on the basis of the recommendations of the Federal Survey of 1930, appears to provide a useful, though admittedly an imperfect, criterion for evaluating the work of the Board of Higher Curricula.

2. The Survey of Oregon higher education, conducted under the auspices of the United States Office of Education, was enjoined by the law of 1929 establishing the State Board of Higher Education. The Survey Commission recommended a plan of reorganization designed to be suited to the state's needs and tax-paying ability. The recommendations were thoroughly analyzed by the Board of Higher Education in respect to advantages and disadvantages. Those recommendations that were adopted by the Board represent the combined judgment of a disinterested commission of educational specialists and a lay board responsible to the state.
as a whole. The recommendations that were adopted thus bear a double stamp of approval in respect to suitability to the Oregon situation.

3. The Board of Higher Curricula was for twenty years (1909-1929) legally in supreme control of the curricular scope of the University of Oregon and Oregon State College. The Board functioned, however, under certain acknowledged limitations. In matters other than curricular each institution was controlled by its own board of regents. Under the Board of Higher Curricula the two institutions, while duplicating considerable areas of work, occupied fields that in very major respects were differentiated.

4. Without regard to the procedures or details of the work of the Board of Higher Curricula, attention has been centered on the product of its work; namely, the curricular program of the two institutions as developed by the year 1929, when the Board of Higher Curricula was abolished.

5. "Major" work, representing courses in a field or subject leading to degrees, and "service" work, representing nonmajor basic or supplementary courses in a field or subject taken by students majoring in another field, are terms that figured conspicuously in the rulings of the
Board of Higher Curricula. Under the 1932 plan of reorganization, the same terms have continued in use.

6. The curricular program of the two institutions as it had been developed by 1929 under the Board of Higher Curricula has been compared, in terms of major and service work, with the reorganized plan of 1932. Comparison has been made of the number of major and service departments that were carried over from the former to the reorganized curricular plan in relation to the number of departments having a changed status under the new plan. It appears that survival greatly outweighed change, and that a large proportion of the former curricular plan of the Board of Higher Curricula has been carried over into the future program of Oregon higher education.

2. Eells, Walter Crosby. Surveys of American higher education. Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching. 1937. (The thirty outstanding surveys mentioned on page 5 of the text are listed on pages 220-221. The eleven outstanding state surveys are listed on page 221. The ranking of the Oregon Survey is shown in the table on pages 183-186; the limitations of the ranking method are discussed on pages 189-191.)


7. Oregon Board of Higher Curricula. Minutes, 1909-1929. (Unpublished. In custody of Secretary, State Board of Higher Education, Eugene, Oregon.) (The phrase quoted on page 21 of the text is from the minutes of July 15, 1925. The rulings quoted on pages 23-25 of the text are contained in the minutes for April 28, 1910.)


11. Oregon State Board of Higher Education. Minutes, 1935. (Unpublished. In custody of Secretary, State Board of Higher Education, Eugene, Oregon.) (The authorization to reestablish social work is recorded in the minutes for July 22, 1935.)


15. Oregon Code 1930. Compiled under the supervision of the Supreme Court of Oregon. Bobbs-Merrill Company. 1930. (The excerpt on page 3 of the text is condensed from the statement of the purpose of the Board of Higher Curricula, Volume 4, 35-4601. The excerpt on page 4 of the text regarding the higher educational program is from Volume 4, 35-4509.)


17. Oregon State College. Catalog 1938-39. Oregon State System of Higher Education Bulletin, No. 70. April 1938. (The dates of establishment of professional schools mentioned on page 2 in the text are given on page 52. The change in status for secretarial science mentioned on page 51 of the text is stated on page 366.)


20. Veit, Mathilde. The Oregon State Board of Higher Curricula. A sequence of its actions relating to the University of Oregon and the Oregon Agricultural College. A thesis presented to the faculty of the graduate school of the University of Oregon in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of master of arts. August 1929. ( Mimeographed.) (The excerpts on pages 16-17 of the text are from pages 60-61 of the thesis.)

APPENDIX

Two writers, Leonard (6) and Veit (20), have dealt in detail with the Board of Higher Curricula. Of the two studies, the former, as indicated in the quotation from Klein and Smittle (5) on page 15, is especially competent. It is not within the province of this paper to evaluate or criticise these studies. In the interest of accuracy, however, place has been made through this appendix to record the following corrections: 1. A note on a quotation used by both Leonard and Veit. 2. A note regarding a statement made by Leonard. 3. A note regarding a statement made by Veit. The making of these corrections does not imply that these are the only errors to be found, as the two studies have been read for the information they contain, rather than with a view to test their accuracy.

1. A Note on a Quotation Used by Leonard and Veit

Leonard, in describing commerce at Oregon State College as it existed in 1909, writes as follows (page 99):

"The agricultural college maintained a school of commerce granting the B.S. degree. As in the field of engineering, students were admitted upon completing two years of high school work. The aim of the school was "to do for the business man what the trade
school does for the mechanic." Two groups of courses were offered—business management and office employment. Both courses contained considerable technical work of secondary character such as office practice, accounting, penmanship and commercial arithmetic. A minor place was accorded to economics and political science. No graduate work was provided. A two year secondary course in stenography and bookkeeping was offered for graduates of elementary schools.

This statement by Leonard occurs in the Veit thesis verbatim. It is not enclosed in quotation marks. Veit's footnote reference is to "Catalog, O. A. C. 1909." The Catalog for 1909-10 does not, however, contain the statement made by Leonard and repeated by Veit. It does contain the complete sentence of which Leonard, without indication of omission, quotes only a part. The full sentence as contained on page 90 in the 1909-10 State College Catalog (as well as in preceding and subsequent catalogs) is as follows:

"Its aim is to do for the business man what the trade school does for the mechanic, what the school of engineering does for the engineer, or what the school of law does for the lawyer."

The underlined portion of this sentence, omitted by both Leonard and Veit, obviously modifies the trade-school emphasis. The context in the College Catalog, in fact, is explicit in stating that the school aimed to offer business training such as was then being developed in "the most progressive colleges and universities."
ii. A Note on a Statement Made by Leonard

Leonard (page 185) makes the following statement:

"There is no case on record where the Oregon board has declined a request from either institution for a new department of instruction or curriculum."

Both the following incidents, however, are matters of record in the minutes of the Board of Higher Curricula, under the dates indicated:

a. Denial to State College of a Proposed Major in Architecture, 1913:-- "On motion it was ordered that the courses be approved and the petition allowed, except those under subdivision vi in Architecture, as to which it was ordered, that in view of the questions that are yet to be determined by the Board, the Board does not deem it advisable that the Oregon Agricultural College should extend its courses in Architecture at this time. Therefore the Board does not approve of the extension of the Course in Architecture." (Minutes, April 26, 1913.)

b. Denial to University of Proposed Courses in Stenography, Typewriting, and Stenotypy, 1919:--"... It was on motion ordered that all the requests be granted except that as to the course in Commerce, including Stenography, Typewriting, and Stenotypy, made by...the University of Oregon, which as requested was denied." (Minutes, May 17, 1919.)

iii. A Note on a Statement Made by Veit

Veit chronicles the organization at the State College of the Division of Service Departments under a dean, then authorization by the Board of Higher Curricula in 1922 to
change the name to "School of Basic Arts and Sciences," the State College having declared that the purpose of the change was "purely for administrative efficiency." Veit then (page 40) says:

"In spite of these declarations not to change the general purpose or character of the work, the change of name prepared the way for a change of emphasis in these departments. From 'service courses' they were changed to 'basic departments' which might or might not be used as service courses. Shortly afterwards a dean was appointed for the School of Basic Arts and Sciences, who performed functions very similar to those devolving on the dean of a Liberal Arts College in a State University."

This passage is strikingly like the following which was contained in a University of Oregon Brief to the Board of Higher Curricula, filed under date of April 27, 1925:

"...Nevertheless, the change of name prepared the way for a change of emphasis in these departments. They were no longer simply service courses, but basic departments, which might or might not be used as service courses. Shortly afterwards a dean was appointed for the School of Basic Arts and Sciences, who performs functions very similar to those devolving on the dean of a liberal arts college in a state university." (University Brief, April 27, 1925, page 3.)

It will be noted that Veit has paralleled, partly quoted, the University brief. In order to correct an error in the quoted portion, the following facts, easily verifiable by consulting the State College catalog for 1919-20, are called to attention:
a. Dr. M. Ellwood Smith came to Oregon State College in 1919 as Dean of the Service Departments.

b. When the name of the division was changed in 1922 to School of Basic Arts and Sciences, Dean Smith's title automatically became Dean of the School of Basic Arts and Sciences. He continued in this capacity down to the time of the 1932 reorganization.

It is apparent that the appointment of a dean did not occur "shortly afterwards" but had preceded the change in name by several years. In a State College brief dated May 18, 1925, this error was corrected by the State College. Apparently Veit followed the University brief only and overlooked the correction.