

JOURNAL OF THE UNIVERSITY SENATE
The University of Oklahoma

Regular Session, January 26, 1970--4:10 p. m.

The University Senate was called to order by Dr. Duane Roller, Chairman.

<u>Present:</u>	Abell, Creed	Hall, Rufus	Parker, Jack F.
	Alley, John N.	Harden, Darrell	Potter, Emma
	Babb, S. E., Jr.	Henderson, George	Roller, Duane
	Bowen, Willis H.	Heller, Ben L.	Root, Paul
	Christian, Sherrill	Hopla, Cluff	Smith, Thomas
	Ciereszko, Leon	Johnson, B. Connor	Springer, C. E.
	Deckert, Gordon	Kitts, David	Weiss, A. Kurt
	Doerr, Arthur	Lancaster, John	White, Raymond R.
	Elconin, Victor	Norton, Spencer	Zelby, Leon
	Foote, B. L.	Olkinetzky, Sam	
 <u>Absent:</u>	 Bruce, John B.	 Lynn, Thomas	 Snow, James B., Jr.
	Enis, Thomas	Parr, Arnold	Tolson, Melvin
	Hilbert, Richard	Pray, Joseph	Williams, G. Rainey
	Hollomon, J. H.	Shepherd, Gene	Wolf, Stewart
	Kendall, J. L.	Smouse, A. D.	

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

The Journal of the University Senate for the regular meeting on November 24, 1969, was approved.

ACTION BY THE PRESIDENT

President Hollomon's letter of November 25, 1969, to the Chairman of the University Senate concerning the work of the Chapter Study Committee:

"This is to acknowledge receipt of the Senate action concerning the report of the Senate Ad Hoc Committee on University Policy, as published in the Journal for October 27.

"I would like to express my appreciation to the Ad Hoc Committee and to the many Chapter Study Committees, for the immense amount of effort they have put into their studies. I certainly intend to--in the words of the Senate Resolution-- 'pay careful attention to these views. '

"The full report of the Study Committee on Chapters VIII and X has been published in the Journal of the Senate. I would appreciate it if you could provide me with copies of the full reports of the other Chapter Study Committees. Such Faculty Studies are of great value to the Administration."

ACTIONS OF ADMINISTRATIVE OFFICERS AND DEANS CONCERNING
REQUESTED ANNUAL REPORTS TO RESPECTIVE FACULTIES

Vice President McCarter on December 11, 1969, wrote to the Chairman of the University Senate as follows:

"At the last meeting of the Deans Council, the

University Senate's request that each Dean make an annual report to the faculty of his college. Some of the Deans have tried to comply with the request but all of them expressed uncertainty and confusion as to what the Senate expected of such reports and also the propriety of the Senate's directing such a request of the Deans.

"The Deans requested me as Chairman to convey to the Senate the consensus of the Council that more specific information or guidelines for the report are needed and that the request was not made through proper channels."

Dean Riggs sent the following memorandum on November 17, 1969, to the Chairman of the University Senate:

"At the first meeting of the faculty of the Graduate College of this academic year (10/28/69), I presented an oral report summarizing the activities of the College during the past year. Since the Graduate Dean has no budget, except for operating his office, this report did not include details of finance. I did mention the general picture of federal support for graduate students.

"A written report is in preparation."

Dr. Roy Trout, Assistant Dean of the College of Continuing Education, wrote to the Chairman of the University Senate as follows on December 1, 1969:

"The annual report of the College of Continuing Education was distributed to our faculty at the Spring Faculty Meeting on May 6, 1969. A copy of this report is attached for your information."

Dr. McAnally, Director of University Libraries, sent the following report to the Chairman of the University Senate on January 6, 1970:

"Enclosed is a mimeographed copy of the annual report on the University Libraries for the 1968/69 academic year. You might want to file this with the Secretary of the Senate for record purposes.

"Distribution of mimeographed copies of the report was very late this year for various reasons. However, we have made public distribution of these reports annually since 1951/52.

"Copies go to offices of administration including all deans and department heads, to members of the faculty Council on University Libraries, and to all members of the Library staff. For external relations purpose a copy is sent to all donors to the library. The larger state newspapers also receive copies. Also, reports are exchanged with ca. 125 other university libraries.

"I believe that this fulfills the intent of the Senate in such matters."

UNIVERSITY SENATE REACTION TO VICE PRESIDENT McCARTER'S
MEMORANDUM REGARDING REPORTS FROM THE DEANS

Calling attention particularly to the second paragraph of Vice President McCarter's memorandum to the Chairman of the University Senate on December 11, 1969, on this subject (see page 2 of this Journal), Dr. Doerr made the following motion:

"Whereas the University Senate is deeply concerned with the academic and fiscal affairs of the University and has made a request of Deans and other administrative officials to provide their constituencies with annual reports, the members of the University Senate are at a loss to understand the statement from Dr. McCarter of December 11, 1969, to the Chairman of the University Senate to the effect that, 'The Deans requested me as Chairman to convey to the Senate the consensus of the Council that more specific information or guidelines for the report are needed and that the request was not made through proper channels.'

"The University Senate clearly has the prerogative to make a request for such reports. Since many Deans and other administrative officials have failed to comply with the University Senate's second request for such reports, and since the Deans Council has failed to enunciate valid reasons for failing to comply with the University Senate request, I move that all Deans and other administrative officials who were requested to supply written annual reports to their constituencies and who failed to do so by today's date, be censured by the University Senate."

The motion was seconded and was discussed at some length. Because the voice vote was indeterminable, the question was put to a vote by show hands. The motion was defeated by the close vote of 13 for and 14 against the proposed censure.

Dr. Smith then moved that the Chairman of the University Senate request an appropriate Committee of the Senate to investigate this problem involving the Deans and to report to the University Senate at the next meeting. This motion was seconded, and with no further discussion, was approved in a voice vote without opposition.

CHANGE IN AUDIT ENROLLMENT PROCEDURES

On July 14, 1969, Dr. Robert Bailey of the Admissions Office recommended a revision in the audit enrollment procedures. (See page 8 of the Journal of the University Senate for September 29, 1969, and page 3 of the Journal of the University Senate for October 27, 1969).

Senate Action:

Report of the University Senate Committee on Courses and Curricula:

"We have polled the University departments and colleges for comments on Dr. Robert Bailey's proposed revised statement on 'Enrollment as an Auditor.' While many respondents had reservations about portions of the revised statement, the dominant sentiment was to approve it. Therefore, we recommend that the attached revised statement on 'Enrollment as an Auditor' be approved."

George Henderson, Chairman Gordon Deckert
B. L. Foote, Chairman

ENROLLMENT AS AN AUDITOR ✓
Revised Statement

Enrollment as an Auditor is permitted in all courses subject to the approval of the instructor in the course and the dean of the college in which the course is offered. Enrollment as an Auditor may be completed only between the first day of classes and the last day permitted for late enrollment for credit in any semester or term.

A change of enrollment from Audit to credit may be made provided the change is made not later than the end of the second week of classes of a semester or the first week of classes of a summer term, and provided the instructor and appropriate dean approve. A change of enrollment from credit to Audit may be made provided the change is made not later than the end of the fourth week of classes of a semester or the second week of classes of a summer term, and provided the instructor and appropriate dean approve. At his discretion an instructor may assign a final grade of W (withdrawn passing) at the end of a semester or term to a student enrolled in his class as an Auditor in the event the student has not performed according to the instructor's requirements for an Auditor.

Enrollment as an Auditor is indicated on the student's permanent academic record void of credit hours with the final mark of AU (identified as Audit), subject to the same posting regulations governing the entry of a credit enrollment. Fees for enrollment as an Auditor are the same as fees for enrollment for credit. An Auditor only may withdraw only during the fee refund period. Fee refunds for withdrawing from an Audit only enrollment are the same as for withdrawing from a credit enrollment, but the withdrawal will be processed as a cancellation so that no entry of the enrollment will appear on the student's permanent academic record.

The motion was seconded. After a brief discussion, primarily concerning the four-week deadline for changing the enrollment from credit to Audit, the revised stated was accepted by the University Senate in a voice without opposition.

STUDY OF BUDGETARY PROPOSALS. ✓

In connection with the action taken by the University Senate at its November, 1969, meeting (see page 11 of the University Senate Journal for November 24, 1969), Vice President Nordby wrote as follows on December 9, 1969, to the Chairman of the University Senate:

"My attention was drawn to an item in the minutes of the University Senate relative to budgetary proposals. I'm sure you realize that what you are referring to is something written for discussion purposes. It was neither a "letter" nor circulated by my office. If committees were appointed to examine every piece of paper generated in my office, I could keep the Senate busy for some time to come.

"I think such matters are first appropriately studied by the Budget Council, for I think this type of activity is what the Council was established to do.

"The information you refer to was discussed with the vice president and deans and now is relatively dormant. What I'm trying to say is why don't you save your energies until you have a concrete proposal to work with as well as a thorough review of the facts before reacting. It will be some time before such a proposal is made because the Budget Council has not been able to review budget modification suggestions as yet. In fact, they may not be able to do this until January at the earliest."

Copies of the Vice President's "draft" memorandum of October 23, 1969, have been furnished by the Secretary of the University Senate to the members of the University Senate Committee on University Organization, Budget, and Publications. Dr. Jack Parker, Chairman of that Committee, reported that this matter is still under study by his group.

Senate Action:

Dr. Doerr, in making reference to the November 24, 1969, communication from Vice President Nordby made the following motion:

"That the University Senate advise Vice President Nordby that the Senate is capable of making an independent judgment of matters which do and should concern it and that it considers the advice set forth in Vice President Nordby's letter of December 9, 1969, to the Chairman of the University Senate to be patronizing and intemperate."

The motion was seconded and approved in a voice vote without opposition.

INNOVATIVE UNIVERSITY CALENDAR, 1971-72 ✓

As directed by the University Senate (see pages 9 and 10 of the University Senate Journal for November 24, 1969), the University Senate Committee on University Organization, Budget, and Publications has been studying various innovations in the University calendar.

Dr. Jack Parker, Committee Chairman, reported on the results of a recent mail-questionnaire survey of the faculty. He analyzed faculty reaction to the four calendars suggested. The major problems in scheduling the academic calendar appeared to be the following: (1) fall semester registration and start of classes, (2) the extended break between the fall and spring semesters if the fall semester ends before Christmas, (3) dates for final examinations for the fall semester, and (4) second semester opening to coincide with dates at other colleges for the benefit of transfer students.

Dr. Parker distributed at this meeting for the first time copies of the following proposed innovative University calendar for the 1971-72 academic year:

CALENDAR: 1971-72

1971

First Semester

August 30
August 31
September 1
September 6

-Monday, Registration, 8-12 noon and 1-5 p. m.
-Tuesday, Registration, 8-12 noon and 1-5 p. m.
-Wednesday, Classwork begins, 7:30 a. m.
-Monday, Labor Day

- November 23 -Tuesday, Thanksgiving vacation begins, 11:59 p. m.
- November 29 -Monday, Classwork resumes, 7:30 a. m.
- December 14 -Tuesday, Last day of classes, 11:59 p. m.
- December 15 -Wednesday, Stop day, preparation for examinations
- December 16-18 -Thursday--Saturday, examinations
- December 20-22 -Monday--Wednesday, examinations
- December 22 -Wednesday, First Semester closes, 11:59 p. m.

1972

Second Semester

- January 20 -Thursday, Registration, 8-12 noon and 1-5 p. m.
- January 21 -Friday, Registration, 8-12 noon and 1-5 p. m.
- January 24 -Monday, Classwork begins, 7:30 a. m.
- March 18 -Saturday, Spring vacation begins 12 noon
- March 27 -Monday, Classwork resumes, 7:30 a. m.
- May 13 -Saturday, Last day of classes, 12 noon
- May 15-20 -Monday--Saturday, examinations
- May 24 -Wednesday, Annual Commencement, 7:30 p. m.

1972

Summer Session

- June 1 -Thursday, Registration, 8-12 noon and 1-5 p. m.
- June 2 -Friday, Registration, 8-12 noon and 1-5 p. m.
- June 5 -Monday, Classwork begins
- July 4 -Tuesday, Independence day holiday
- July 31 -Monday, Examinations
- August 1-2 -Tuesday--Wednesday, examinations
- August 6 -Sunday, Summer Commencement, 7:30 p. m.

Senate Action:

Dr. Parker moved approval of the proposed calendar. The motion was seconded and discussed at some length. In a voice vote with some opposition, the 1971-72 university calendar was approved.

STUDY COMMITTEE REPORT
CHAPTER IV, THE FUTURE OF THE UNIVERSITY

Dr. Doerr, Chairman of the Ad Hoc Committee, reported that the Study Committee Report concerning Chapter IV, THE FUTURE OF THE UNIVERSITY, the Graduate College, did not reach him in time for appropriate consideration by the Ad Hoc Committee and subsequent report to the University Senate at this meeting. (See pages 11-13 of this Journal and pages 5-7 of the Agenda for this meeting for complete text of the Report).

CHANGES IN THE BY-LAWS OF THE UNIVERSITY SENATE

On November 24, 1969, Dr. Roller, Chairman of the University Senate, outlined proposed changes in the By-Laws of the University Senate (see page 11 of the University Senate Journal for November 24, 1969). The text of the changes appeared on page 8 of the Agenda for the January 26, 1970, meeting of the University Senate.

By accepting Dr. Tom Smith's motion without further discussion after seconding, the University Senate approved without opposition the following changes in its By-Laws:

A. OFFICERS:

1. The Officers of the Senate shall consist of a Chairman, a Chairman-Elect, and a Secretary.
2. The Chairman-Elect and the Secretary shall be elected by ballot and at a meeting of the Senate in May. If either office is vacated, a replacement shall be elected at the next meeting of the Senate.
3. The Chairman-Elect will succeed to the office of Chairman whenever it is vacated or when his own successor is elected. Normally, the Chairman's tenure of Office will be from May to the following May.
4. For Officers elected between May 1 and January 31, the term of office will be until the following May. For officers elected between February 1 and April 30, the term of office will be until the second May following.
5. A Chairman-Elect will remain a member ex officio of the Senate, even though his term as a Senator may expire, until his terms as Chairman-Elect and Chairman expire.

B. MEETINGS:

1. The Senate shall meet regularly on the last Monday of each month of the regular school year, except December, and on call of the Chairman, the Vice-Chairman, or on petition, presented to the Secretary signed by five members.
2. Meetings of the Senate are regularly open to attendance by all members of the University Community and representatives of the Press. However, the Senate may go into executive session by a majority vote of the members present.
3. A person not a member of the Senate may speak only by invitation or permission of the Senate. Requests from non-members to speak shall be addressed to the Chairman in writing. The Chairman will present such requests to the Senate for action.

PROPOSAL TO STUDY THE AVAILABILITY OF ACADEMIC MATERIALS

On November 25, 1969, President Hollomon forwarded to the Chairman of the University Senate a copy of a bill recently adopted by the Student Congress calling for the creation of a joint University Senate-Student Association Committee to study the availability of academic materials. Copies of the bill were forwarded to the University Senate Committee on Student and Public Relations. Dr. Alley, Committee Chairman, reported on his recent informal conversations with various student leaders concerned. Apparently, the issue concerns the availability of pencils, papers, and textbooks at the bookstore. Dr. Alley will confer with the author of the Student Congress bill in question, as well as other individuals. A formal Committee report will be presented later.

GRADUATE ASSISTANT MEMBERSHIP ON THE UNIVERSITY SENATE

The Chairman of the University Senate received the following letter dated January 7, 1970, from Mr. Michael I. [Name obscured]

"In order to establish better communications and to upgrade the position of graduate assistants at the University of Oklahoma, the Association of Graduate Assistants formally requests that two graduate assistants, chosen through consultation with the A. G. A., be appointed to the Faculty Senate, with full privileges and responsibilities. Active participation by graduate assistants in the policy decisions of the University will, we feel, help solve our problems amicably and responsibly. To that end we are also requesting representation on the President's Faculty Advisory Council and the Graduate Council."

This matter has been referred to the Committee on the Senate Charter for study and comment.

S-U GRADES IN SPECIFIC COURSES

On January 3, 1970, Dean Riggs of the Graduate College submitted the following request to the Chairman of the University Senate:

"The question of whether 'S-U' grades must or may be given in certain courses needs to be clarified. Therefore, I am asking the Senate for an opinion in the cases of the following courses:

226, 296, 490
 Chemistry 426
 Electrical Engineering 299, 295
 Engineering 299, 295
 Engineering Physics 228, 401
 Industrial Engineering 301, 401, 402
 Library Science 401
 Physics 401
 Psychology 295
 Speech (and Drama) 337
 Speech 450

This matter was referred to the Committee on Academic Standards, which has not ~~had~~ sufficient time to study the question. The appropriate Committee report will follow later.

VACANCY ON ATHLETICS COUNCIL

The Chairman of the University Senate has received a request for nominations to fill the vacancy on the Athletics Council created by the death of the ~~late~~ Professor C. M. Stookey. The University Senate Committee on Committees has not had an opportunity to consider the matter for a report at this meeting. Nominations will be presented at the next meeting of the University Senate.

TIAA-CREF PARTICIPATION IN UNIVERSITY RETIREMENT PROGRAM

On December 4, 1969, Dr. Zelby requested Senate consideration of a study of possible TIAA-CREF participation in the University Retirement Program. This matter was last studied by the University Senate at its meeting on May 27, 1968, (see pages 4-5, University Senate Journal for May 27, 1968). Dr. Zelby moved that the Senate Committee on University Organization, Budget, and Publications study again the desirability and feasibility of TIAA-CREF participation in the University Retirement Program. The motion was seconded and approved without

RESOLUTION AGAINST THE VIET NAM WAR ✓

During the preceding week, Dr. Ben Heller mailed individually to members of the University Senate copies of an explanatory letter and his proposed resolution against United States participation in the Viet Nam war. (See page 11 of the University Senate Journal for November 24, 1969).

After offering some prefatory remarks concerning the resolution, Dr. Ben Heller moved the University Senate adopt the following resolution:

"Whereas a crisis of conscience, initiated by the youth of our college campuses, has swept across the land in an agony of deep concern about our massive military presence in Viet Nam, and

"Whereas the Viet Nam war is not only irrelevant to our national interests but actually impairs the pursuit of our national and international programs, and

"Whereas our effectiveness as teachers in the pursuit and distribution of knowledge is sorely compromised by the drain of blood and treasure in an unjust war and the consequent disordered value judgment concerning our nation's true priorities,

"Be it resolved that the University Senate, acting in its own behalf, express its unalterable opposition to the war in Viet Nam and petitions the President and the Congress of the United States to withdraw all American forces from Viet Nam on a systematic, accelerated schedule and to reorder our national priorities with the advent of peace."

The motion was seconded. Dr. Babb then moved that this question be tabled. The tabling motion was defeated by a 11 to 15 vote. The ensuing lengthy and heated discussion covered both sides of the issue.

Some speakers objected on the basis of alleged irrelevance of voting on such a resolution in the University Senate, some of the language of the resolution--particularly, the words "unalterable opposition"--and the propriety of having the individual members of the Senate speak for their constituents on such a controversial issue. Supporters of the resolution made equally impassioned pleas on the basis of alleged immorality of the conflict, diversion of national resources from more pressing and local problems, and an attempt to resolve in some way the crisis of conscience facing the nation, in general, and the academic community, in particular.

The consensus of the University Senate was that the resolution should be put to a "roll call" vote. The members of the University Senate voted as follows:

Abell: For
Alley: For
Babb: Against
Bowen: For
Bruce: Absent
Christian: For
Ciereszko: Against
Deckert: For
Doerr: Against
Elconin: For
Enis: Absent
Foote: Against
Hall: Against
Harden: Against
Henderson: For
Heller: For
Hilbert: Absent
Hollomon: Absent
Hopla: For
Johnson: For
Kendall: Absent

Kitts: For
Lancaster: For
Lynn: Absent
Norton: Against
Olkinetzky: Against
Parker: Against
Parr: Absent
Potter: Against
Pray: Absent
Roller: Abstained as Chairman
Root: Against
Shepherd: Absent
Smith: For
Smouse: Absent
Snow: Absent
Springer: Against
Tolson: Absent
Weiss: Against
White: Against
Williams: Absent
Wolf: Absent
Zelby: Against

The resolution was defeated in a count of 13 affirmative and 15 negative votes.

ADJOURNMENT

The University Senate adjourned at 5:37 p.m. The next regular session will be held on Monday, February 23, 1970, in Room 165 of the Student Union. Items for the Agenda should reach the Office of the Secretary by Wednesday, February 11, 1970.

Anthony S. Lis, Secretary

An Evaluation of Chapter IV of THE FUTURE OF THE UNIVERSITY

A Report to the University Senate
by
Its Designated Committee

The Committee to examine and evaluate Chapter IV of THE FUTURE OF THE UNIVERSITY consisted of Drs. P. N. Kaul-Pharmacy, F. H. Miller-Law, C. M. Stookey-Fine Arts, and the following members of the Graduate Council: J. H. Abbott, B. D. Gooch, E. D. Jacobson, A. J. Kondonassis, W. E. Livesay, R. E. Olson, J. W. Renner, E. L. Rice, and R. A. Terry, Dean Riggs, Crim, and Francis also participated in the discussions.

The committee met on May 1, 1969, from 15:00 to 18:00 and from 19:00 to 23:00. All members had read Chapter IV and were prepared to discuss it. The recommendations are as follows:

1. In order to achieve and maintain a high, uniform standard of graduate education at the University of Oklahoma, the committee vigorously supports the concept of a strong, centralized Graduate College at the University.
2. The qualitative and quantitative development of the overall graduate program of this University should be a major and persistent factor in shaping faculty and administrative policy pertaining to all major areas of University activity, e. g., faculty recruitment, student recruitment, budgeting, fund raising, curriculum, development of new programs, construction, publicity, etc.
3. We believe that growth of the Graduate College at a rate more rapid than that of the undergraduate colleges is inevitable and desirable, but that graduate enrollment should not be increased by design without careful planning and without commensurate increases in budgeting for graduate programs.
4. The faculties of the various departments and colleges with graduate programs should be constantly aware of those criteria of greatest importance to the recruitment of the best graduate students.
5. We question the actuality of a common function for graduate and graduate professional programs (e. g., there is and probably always will be a fundamental difference between the purpose of a program leading to the Ph. D. degree in the area of humanities and those leading to a M. D. or a J. D. degree).
6. The Graduate Faculty should be in constant pursuit of the highest standards of quality for the University and it should exert a consistent and positive force for such quality. The Graduate Dean should be the chief "standards officer" for the University.
7. The chief purpose of the Graduate College is the development of scholarship which includes "in depth" study. Increasing the marketability of the student is an incidental purpose.

8. Control of graduate and graduate professional education does rest with the departments and professional colleges, but control of the former basically rests with the overall Graduate Faculty.
9. This University should not develop a planned program to attempt to retain our undergraduate students as graduates; rather we should develop sufficient quality in our graduate programs that will continually attract top students from other institutions in an informal "in kind" exchange.
10. The University should make a concerted, thoughtful effort to develop a recruiting program designed to attract graduate students from all socio-economic backgrounds, especially minority and deprived groups. This should not be done by lowering standards for admission to or progression within the Graduate College but by the development of remedial and supplementary programs that would precede full admission.
11. Although a faculty should always be aware of the importance of involving graduate students in "real problems of significance" (see p. 64), true scholarship and creativity can be stifled by overemphasis on channeling the thinking of creative students. Furthermore, the ultimate significance of research is often extremely difficult to recognize or predict.
12. Faculty members with a significant involvement in the graduate program should have a teaching load which does not exceed six hours.
13. The University should develop an acceptable system for giving teaching-load credit for the supervision of graduate students involved in independent research.
14. Graduate students serving the University in the capacity of teachers or laboratory assistants should have junior faculty status and be treated accordingly by the senior faculty.
15. The "graduate assistantship" as it now exists at the University of Oklahoma should be restructured and subdivided into different categories of junior faculty status.
16. To foster the development of the graduate program, faculty recruitment should proceed through a planned effort to achieve the proper balance between established scholars and promising new Ph. D. 's.
17. Centralized special research facilities, including both space and equipment, supplemental to those now existing, should be developed at this University.
18. We concur with the idea of easier integration of programs where such integration is needed and is academically sound. In developing interdisciplinary programs constant emphasis must be placed on maintenance of standards as well as an awareness that the basic differences in the goals of graduate and professional programs can preclude some types of integration.
19. Greater effort should be made to develop meaningful involvement of graduate and professional students in "in service" activities, provided that such activities be commensurate with the goals of the specific graduate

program. Graduate programs should not become mission-oriented. Over-emphasis on "in service" programs could destroy the graduate program. Mission orientation often opposes academic freedom.

20. In general we concur with the DIRECTIONS FOR DISCIPLINES (pp. 67-71) but we believe that the development of the many new programs suggested or implied should be expedited only after there is reasonable assurance that (1) the new programs fit the overall plan for expansion of the overall graduate program, (2) there is real need and adequate demand for the program, (3) adequate money is available to establish a strong program, and (4) its adoption will not dilute other important programs already in existence. There is great need to strengthen most of the existing programs which should, in general, take precedence over the establishment of new programs.

Some specific comments on DIRECTION FOR DISCIPLINES are:

- a. The pharmaceutical sciences should be specifically included in Life Sciences and Medicine.
 - b. We question the development of a program in Marine Engineering and Marine Biology unless the University's financial base is greatly enlarged.
 - c. Emphasis on strengthening the program in Mathematics is enthusiastically supported.
 - d. The directions for disciplines of Social Sciences and Humanities, and Art, Language, and Communication are highly commendable and should be expedited in light of the admonition above (see 20); however, very careful thought should be given to the appropriateness of relocating existing departments to new and different colleges and programs before such relocation is attempted.
21. We support the "continuum concept" (p. 71) assuming that it does not imply duplication of courses in various areas of the University and that it incorporates the requirements of "outside" professional organizations (e. g. accrediting agencies).
22. We are not sure that we understand the statement, "It should be possible for the graduate student to change from one professional curriculum to another at a minimum cost in time and effort." The "in depth" nature of graduate studies virtually precludes easy interchange as does the specialization of professional studies.
23. Much greater effort should be made by all departments with doctoral programs to provide teaching experience under regular guidance and evaluation for those students who are going to become college teachers.
24. Graduate programs should be continually reconsidered and evaluated with the goal of constant improvement of quality and, where academically feasible, increased flexibility to permit and encourage interdisciplinary programs.
25. We concur with the concept of bona fide graduate programs beyond that leading to the J. D. degree in Law as a part of the development of a Law center.

