

JOURNAL OF THE UNIVERSITY SENATE

The University of Oklahoma

Norman

Regular Session -- September 21, 1970 -- 4:10 p. m.

The University Senate was called to order by Dr. Cluff Hopla, Chairman.

<u>Present:</u>	Babb, Stanley E., Jr.	Harden, Darrell	Parker, Jack
	Bowen, Willis H.	Henderson, George	Parr, Arnold
	Burwell, James	Hopla, Cluff	Potter, Emma
	David, Paul	Johnson, B. Connor	Root, Paul
	Enis, Thomas	Kendall, J. L.	Shepherd, Gene
	Frueh, Forrest	Lancaster, John H.	Smouse, A.D.
	Gregory, Helen	Levy, David	Taylor, K. L.
	Grunder, J. Richard	Marshall, Geoffrey	Weinheimer, A.J.
	Hall, Rufus	Mohler, Ronald R.	Weiss, A. Kurt
	Hansen, Robert	Nuttall, Edmund	Zelby, Leon

<u>Absent:</u>	Abell, Creed	Lynn, Thomas N., Jr.	Tolson, Melvin
	Deckert, Gordon	Norton, Spencer	
	Hilbert, Richard E.	Snow, James B., Jr.	

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

The Journal of the University Senate for the special meeting on July 27, 1970, was approved.

SCHEDULE OF 1970-71 UNIVERSITY SENATE MEETINGS

The University Senate will meet in regular session on the following Mondays during the current academic year at 4:10 p. m. in Room 165 of the Student Union:

- (1) September 21, 1970
- (2) October 26, 1970
- (3) November 30, 1970
- (4) January 25, 1971
- (5) February 22, 1971
- (6) March 29, 1971
- (7) April 26, 1971
- (8) May 17, 1971

ACTIONS TAKEN BY PRESIDENT J. HERBERT HOLLOMON

ROTC. On May 28, 1970, President Hollomon acknowledged receipt of Senate action concerning the ROTC program. (See pages 2-4 of the University Senate Journal for April 27, 1970.) This matter was referred to Dr. McCarter, Vice President Burr, and the Student Association for recommendation. President Hollomon further stated that he would keep the Senate informed about any action taken.

Proposed Student Code. In acknowledging receipt of the Senate action concerning the proposed Student Code (see page 14 of the University Senate Journal for the regular session on May 25, 1970), President Hollomon wrote as follows to the Secretary of the University Senate on June 4, 1970: "Since the student government has not yet acted on this proposed Code, I plan to hold the Senate action until I hear from that body."

X Student Representation on the Search Committee. On August 18, 1970, President Hollomon informed the University Senate that he had approved and transmitted to the University Regents the University Senate recommendation that the student representation on the proposed Search Committee for a New President be increased. (See pages 8-10 of the University Senate Journal for the special session on July 27, 1970.)

X Faculty Parking Fee. On July 13, 1970, President Hollomon acknowledged receipt of the Senate action concerning the Faculty Parking Fee. (See page 12 of the University Senate Journal for the regular session on May 25, 1970.) He reported that this matter has been referred to Vice President Kennedy for a recommendation and added that he would keep the Senate informed of any action taken.

X Proposed Research and Public Service Council. On July 13, 1970, President Hollomon acknowledged receipt of Senate action concerning the proposed Research and Public Service Council. (See pages 9 and 10 of the University Senate Journal for the regular session on May 25, 1970.) He added that this matter had been referred to Dr. McCarter, Vice President Riggs, and the Student Association and that he would keep the University Senate informed of any action taken.

X Proposed University Constitution. In acknowledging receipt of Senate action taken concerning the proposed University Constitution (see page 4 of the University Senate Journal for the regular session on May 25, 1970), President Hollomon wrote as follows to the Secretary of the University Senate on May 28, 1970:

"In accordance with the announced procedure for approval, this action of the Senate has been forwarded to the Chairman of the Constitution Drafting Committee. After receiving the positions of the Student Association and the Administration (as defined in the Constitution), the Drafting Committee will prepare a recommendation to the University Regents."

FACULTY NOMINATIONS: Search Committee for the New President

In accordance with the authority granted by the University Senate on July 27, 1970, the Joint University Senate Nominating Committee (consisting of both the Executive Committee and the Committee on Committees) submitted to the University Board of Regents on July 29, 1970, the following faculty nominations for membership on the Search Committee for the new President: (See pages 8-10, University Senate Journal, for the special session on July 27, 1970.)

Medical School:

Deckert, Gordon
Jacobson, Eugene

Johnson, Connor B.
Williams, Gordon Rainey

Norman Campus:

Andrews, Mildred
 Christian, Sherril D.
 Gibbens, Daniel G.
 Harden, Darrell
 Henderson, George
 Hilbert, Richard
 Herrick, Ted P.
 Hopla, Cluff E.

Jacobs, Paul D.
 Keown, William H.
 Male, Roy R.
 Parker, Jack F.
 Rassmussen, Maurice L.
 Suggs, Charles C.
 Whinery, Leo H.
 Merrill, Kenneth

ANNUAL REPORTS TO THE FACULTIES OF THE VARIOUS COLLEGES 7 + Rame
W. H. H.

The Secretary of the University Senate has received from the Dean of the College of Business Administration a copy of his 1969-70 report to the faculty. (See pages 1 and 2 of the University Senate Journal for February 23, 1970.)

ANNUAL REPORT -- UNIVERSITY EXTENSION COUNCIL

The Secretary of the University Senate has received a number of copies of the 15th Annual Report to the University Senate from the Extension Council of the University for the year, 1969-70. Interested faculty members may obtain individual copies from the Senate Secretary.

ELECTION OF NEW SENATOR: College of Arts and Sciences

On September 1, 1970, Dr. Rufus Hall, Assistant Dean of the College of Arts and Sciences, reported to the Secretary of the University Senate that Dr. Edmund C. Nuttall (Speech) had been elected by the faculty of that College to serve the remainder of the 1968-71 term on the University Senate of Dr. Lebn S. Ciereszko (Chemistry), who is on leave during the current academic year.

RESIGNATION OF SENATOR: Medical Center

On September 16, 1970, Dr. John P. Colmore (Medical Center) submitted his resignation as a representative of the Medical Center to the University Senate, in view of his recent appointment as the Interim Executive Vice President for Medical Center Affairs. Dr. Colmore has been requested to arrange for the election of a replacement for the three-year term, 1970-73.

COMMENTS BY ACTING PRESIDENT PETE KYLE McCARTER

Dr. McCarter, Acting President of the University, appeared before the Senate to make remarks appropriate at the start of the new academic year, in accordance with University Senate tradition. In view of his detailed remarks to the General Faculty at the meeting on September 10, 1970, (see pages 11-14 of this Journal), Dr. McCarter mentioned only these three items of particular interest and concern to the University Senate:

- (1) His approval and appointment of the ROTC Advisory Committee as recommended by the University Senate on April 27, 1970.

- (2) His interest in early Senate action concerning revised tenure regulations.
- (3) His forthcoming recommendations for enlarging the membership of the Faculty Committee on Oversight and Evaluation of the Administrative Structure of the University.

COMMENTS BY ACTING PROVOST CARL D. RIGGS

The Executive Committee of the University Senate also extended an invitation to Dr. Carl D. Riggs, Acting Provost of the University, to appear before the Senate for any appropriate remarks. In addressing the University Senate, Dr. Riggs reiterated his preference for having the Senate nominate three faculty members for every University Council vacancy to permit more equitable assignment of faculty members. He also requested renewed Senate attention and consideration in the matter of improving the basic academic programs of this University.

AMENDMENT OF UNIVERSITY SENATE BY-LAWS: Chairmanship of University Senate Committee on Committees

Background Information: On July 27, 1970, the University Senate tabled until the first meeting of the new academic year the proposal of the Senate Executive Committee to change the University Senate By-Laws as follows: (See page 3 of the University Senate Journal for the special meeting on July 27, 1970.)

"That the Chairman-Elect of the University Senate shall function as the Chairman of the University Senate Committee on Committees during his tenure as Chairman-Elect."

Senate Action. Dr. Hall moved that this question be removed from the table and the amendment to the By-Laws be approved. Without further discussion, the Senate approved without opposition this change in its By-laws.

X UNIVERSITY RETIREMENT PROGRAM

Background Information. Throughout the 1969-70 academic year, the University Senate considered the question of changes in the University Retirement Program, particularly a proposed participation in the national TIAA-CREF organization. (See page 8 of the University Senate Journal for January 26, 1970; pages 1 and 3 of the Agenda and page 4 of the Journal for the University Senate meeting on March 30, 1970; pages 1-3 of the Agenda for the University Senate meeting on April 27, 1970; and page 11 of the University Senate Journal for May 25, 1970.)

Senate Action. Dr. Jack Parker, Chairman of the University Senate Committee on University Organization, Budget, and Publications, moved approval of his Committee's recommendation that the University Retirement Program include participation in TIAA-CREF. He referred to the pertinent remarks made by University Vice President Kennedy at the September 10, 1970, meeting of the University General Faculty. He also introduced Dr. Donald Childress (Department of Finance), who studied this matter in great detail as consultant to both the Senate Committee and a University administration committee. Dr. Childress outlined the need, the desirability, and the advantages of TIAA-CREF affiliation in the University Retirement Program. He agreed to prepare a summary of 4-5 pages of the 50-page

detailed report for distribution to the General Faculty. A TIAA-CREF representative met with the Senate Committee and will be scheduled to meet later with the General Faculty at a special meeting in the future. The University Board of Regents is scheduled to consider this question at its next meeting on October 8, 1970. Final action would have to be taken at that time if the recommended program is to be put into effect on January 1, 1971. Dr. Parker added that his Committee had read the voluminous report and had concurred in its favorable recommendation. The consensus of the University Senate was that a Senate approval at this time would have to be contingent upon favorable action by both the Regents on October 8, 1970, and the General Faculty at a subsequent special meeting.

In a voice vote without opposition, the Senate approved the Senate Committee's recommendation.

REPLACEMENT NOMINATIONS FOR VACANCIES ON UNIVERSITY COUNCILS

Dr. Rufus Hall, Chairman of the University Senate Committee on Committees, moved approval of the following faculty nominations for replacements on the specified University Councils:

Council on Planning and Development:

To fill the vacancy created by the resignation of William H. Keown (1969-72):

Gene Bavinger (Fine Arts)
Jonathan Spurgeon (History)

Council on Research and Public Service:

While Edwin Klehr is on sabbatical leave during the 1970-71 academic year:

Paul Root (Engineering)

The Senate approved, without opposition, the above faculty nominations.

REPLACEMENTS FOR FACULTY ADVISORY COMMITTEE TO THE PRESIDENT

Dr. Darrell Harden moved approval of the recommendation of the University Senate Executive Committee that the following faculty members be elected to two-year (1970-72) terms on the Faculty Advisory Committee to the President to replace Professors Crim, Hobbs, E. Rice, Scheffer, Unger, and Zelby upon the expiration of their initial, one-year terms: (See page 4 of the University Senate Journal for October 27, 1969.)

Elconin, Victor (English)
Herrick, Ted (Accounting)
Lee, Cecil (Art)
Morris, Virginia (Physical Education)
Rasmussen, Maurice (Aero. and Mech. Engineering)
Sutherland, Patrick (Geology)

The Senate approved the motion without opposition.

NOMINATIONS: STANDING COMMITTEES OF THE UNIVERSITY SENATE, 1970-71

Dr. Hall, Chairman of the University Senate Committee on Committees, moved acceptance of the following nominations for membership on the various University Senate standing committees for the academic year, 1970-71:

ACADEMIC STANDARDS

Stanley Babb
Willis Bowen
Creed Abell
Ken Taylor
Paul Root
Tom Love

TEACHING AND RESEARCH

Edmund C. Nuttall
A. D. Smouse
John Colmore
Ronald Mohler
William Livezey

COURSES AND CURRICULA

George Henderson
Gordon Deckert
Arnold Parr
Robert Hansen
Mary C. Zahasky

UNIVERSITY ORGANIZATION,
BUDGET, AND PUBLICATION

Jack Parker
Melvin Tolson
Leon Zelby
James Snow
A. J. Weinheimer
Sarah Crim

FACULTY PERSONNEL

Spencer Norton
Thomas Lynn
Emma Potter
Gene Shepherd
David Levy
Paul David

COMMITTEE ON COMMITTEES

Rufus G. Hall
Richard Hilbert
Jack Kendall
Helen Gregory
Forrest Frueh
James Burwell

STUDENT AND PUBLIC RELATIONS

Kurt Weiss
Thomas Enis
J. Richard Grunder
Geoffrey Marshall
Dorothy Truex

EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

Cluff Hopla
Rufus G. Hall
Connor Johnson
Darrell Harden
John Lancaster

JOURNAL COMMITTEE

Cluff Hopla
Rufus G. Hall
Arnold Parr

The Senate approved all nominations without opposition.

UNIVERSITY SENATE RESOLUTION CONCERNING THE PRESIDENTIAL SEARCH
COMMITTEE

Dr. John Lancaster moved approval of the Senate Executive Committee's recommendation to accept the following resolution presented by Professors Feaver, Lee, Maehl, and Ruggiers on September 11, 1970:

"The recent resignation of President Hollomon has left little time or opportunity for members of the University community to discuss with one another the qualities they hope to see in a successor or to convey these opinions to members of the Presidential Search Committee.

"In order to facilitate that discussion and expression of viewpoints, BE IT RESOLVED THAT we respectfully request that members of the Presidential Search Committee arrange a procedure to meet as informally as possible with all interested faculty and discuss the criteria for the selection of the new President."

Dr. Hopla, Chairman of the Presidential Search Committee, commented that he had already appointed twelve leaders to head informal discussion groups to draw up sets of criteria for the selection of the new President and that other groups will be added as may be warranted in the future.

In a voice vote without opposition, the Senate approved the resolution.

PROPER APPELLATION OF MEMBERS OF THE GENERAL FACULTY

Calling attention to the lack of uniformity in the forms used in addressing faculty members on the campus, Dr. Leon Zelby proposed the following University Senate Resolution to standardize usage:

Whereas the title "Doctor" generally implies a terminal academic degree (Ph. D.), although it is used sometimes to denote a member of a profession (e. g. medical), and

Whereas in some areas of academic endeavor Ph. D. is not required as a terminal degree, and

Whereas the title "Professor" denotes an academic rank

Be it therefore resolved that the proper appellation of the members of the General Faculty be "Professor."

After some discussion primarily concerning the propriety of such Senate consideration and action, the proposed resolution was defeated in a voice vote by a majority of the University Senate.

PROPOSED STUDENT CODE

Background information. At the special session of the University Senate on May 20, 1970, copies of the proposed new Student Code were distributed to members of the Senate. At the regular session on May 25, 1970 (see Page 14 of the University Senate Journal for May 25, 1970), the revised student code was approved by the University Senate. (See also page 1 of this Journal concerning action taken by President Hollomon in this matter.)

Senate Action. Mr. David Butler of the Student Association appeared before the University Senate to explain the changes that had been made in the Student Code by the Student Association in response to criticisms and suggestions from various sources. He stated that the major revisions were primarily in the organization of the document, with only a few minor changes in the content. Mr. Bill Moffitt, President of the Student Association, reported that copies of the revised Code were being distributed to members of the University Senate Executive Committee with the request that the University Senate approve the revised Student Code. Various members of the Student Association expressed some urgency on their part to have the Student Code presented at the next meeting of the Regents on October 8, 1970.

The University Senate was reluctant to approve the revised Code without further consideration and study of specific changes in the Code as approved previously by the University Senate. Dr. Shepherd moved that the University Senate Executive Committee be authorized to review and approve the proposed, revised Student Code if, in its opinion, the changes recommended do not change the substance (as defined by the Executive Committee) of the Code approved previously. In a voice vote that included one dissenting vote, the University Senate approved the motion to authorize the Executive Committee to take action.

ELECTION OF GENERAL FACULTY REPRESENTATIVES TO THE UNIVERSITY SENATE

Voting by written ballot, 486 members of the General Faculty of the University elected the following representatives to the University Senate for the three-year term, 1970-73:

Crim, Sarah (Home Ec)
 Livezey, William (History)
 Love, Tom (Aero. and Mech. Engr.)
 Truex, Dorothy (Education)
 Zahasky, Mary C. (Med. Center)

(For the complete roster of the University Senate, 1970-71, please see page 10 of this Journal.)

ADJOURNMENT

The University Senate adjourned at 5:25 p. m. The next regular session will be held on Monday, October 26, 1970. Items for the Agenda should reach the Secretary by Wednesday, October 14, 1970.

Anthony S. Lis
Secretary

MEMBERS OF THE UNIVERSITY SENATE: 1970-71

<u>Name:</u>	<u>Representing:</u>	<u>Term:</u>
Abell, Creed	School of Medicine	1969-72
Babb, Stanley E., Jr. ✓	Arts and Sciences	1968-71
Bowen, Willis H. ✓	Arts and Sciences	1968-71
* Burwell, James	Arts and Sciences	1970-73
* Crim, Sarah	General Faculty	1970-73
* David, Paul ✓	Arts and Sciences	1970-71
Deckert, Gordon C.	School of Medicine	1969-72
Enis, Thomas	Law	1969-72
* Frueh, Forrest	Business Administration	1970-73
* Gregory, Helen	College of Fine Arts (dance)	1970-73
* Grunder, J. Richard	College of Pharmacy	1970-73
Hall, Rufus	Arts and Sciences	1969-72
* Hansen, Robert	School of Dentistry	1970-72
Harden, Darrell ✓	Engineering	1968-71
Henderson, George ✓	General Faculty	1968-71
Hilbert, Richard E. ✓	Graduate College	1968-71
Hopla, Cluff E.	General Faculty	1969-72
Johnson, B. Connor	School of Medicine	1969-72
Kendall, J. L. ✓	Arts and Sciences	1968-71
Lancaster, John H. ✓	Arts and Sciences	1968-71
* Levy, David	Arts and Sciences	1970-73
* Livezey, William	General Faculty	1970-73
* Love, Tom	General Faculty	1970-73
Lynn, Thomas N., Jr.	School of Medicine	1969-72
* Marshall, Geoffrey	Arts and Sciences	1970-73
* Mohler, Ronald R.	Engineering	1970-73
Norton, Spencer	Fine Arts	1969-72
* Nuttall, Edmund ✓	Arts and Sciences	1970-71
Parker, Jack E. ✓	Education	1968-71
Parr, Arnold ✓	Business Administration	1969-71
Potter, Emma	School of Nursing	1969-72
Root, Paul	Engineering	1969-72
Shepherd, Gene D.	Education	1969-72
Smouse, A. D.	Education	1969-72
Snow, James B., Jr.	School of Medicine	1969-72
* Taylor, K. L.	Arts and Sciences	1970-73
Tolson, Melvin B. ✓	Arts and Sciences	1968-71
* Truex, Dorothy	General Faculty	1970-73
* Weinheimer, A. J.	Arts and Sciences	1970-73
Weiss, A. Kurt	School of Medicine	1969-72
* Zahasky, Mary	General Faculty	1970-73
Zelby, Leon	Engineering	1969-72

* New Member

Note: The Medical Center is to elect a replacement for Dr. John Colmore (1970-73) who resigned his Senate post recently.

Excerpts -- Dr. McCarter's Remarks
to the General Faculty on September 10, 1970

SEVEN GOALS FOR ACADEMIC YEAR 70-71

1. As far as I have the authority and influence, I insist that all of us enter upon a positive, affirmative effort to recruit into the University, into the faculty, into the administrative staff, into the classified staff, a substantial number of qualified people from minority races. I find myself surprised that in 1970 at the University of Oklahoma anybody even would need to bring the subject up. But it does need to be brought up. We have not gone so far this way as we should. We do need to correct ourselves. Therefore, I call on deans, chairmen, directors, and Committees A to devote special attention to this matter, as vacancies occur or as they are declared through the academic and administrative areas during this year.

2. We now have the advantage of a lull or a period of calm to get into the question of academic organization and decide what we really do think about it. In recent years we have not really dug into this question. If I may use as shorthand references to the two administrations under which I have served as the Cross system and the Hollomon system, I have been unable to find, and I have studied this matter a great deal, any essential, basic difference between the two in these questions of academic organization. In both administrations the definition of a college was practically the same. Definitions of departments in both administrations were practically the same. The relationship of department to college was defined in practically identical ways in both administrations. Yet, the faculty accepted one and rejected the other. I think we need to ask why. The conspicuous difference in the mechanism is the recent provision for the position of vice provost. Dr. Hollomon and I acted precipitously and without proper consultation on this matter last spring. The faculty reacted negatively and quite emotionally. Communication of viewpoints was poor. I think we now have time to talk about it. I have, therefore, asked the Committee on Oversight and Evaluation to take the initiative and get into this subject. I think it must be brought later to the University Senate in order to get larger consideration. I see no reason why this shouldn't get under way at once so that when the next president gets here he quickly will be able to determine the faculty's position on this matter. I'm not trying to lead you to one position or the other; I'm simply saying I think definitions ought to be made and standards ought to be reached.

3. It is time in the administration of the University, and especially in the academic administration, that we begin to consider more and more proper delegation of administrative authority than we have had. This is partly a factor of size. We are getting too big to operate effectively without more delegation for various reasons. To some extent the system has been responsible for this weakness. To some extent people have been responsible for it. It has been too easy to pass the buck, to receive the buck, and to hand it off. There has been an erroneous assumption that everything, down to rather small details, has to be run in the final analysis out of the president's office. We must develop a system of delegation through which people at the various stages in the administrative structure will be able to make decisions with the confidence that the general administration will back up those decisions. This has much to do with budget administration, and that's another subject that we need to get into, but not here.

4. The question of override payments is a subject that we need to do something about immediately. We have now reached a condition that we cannot live with. We have something that's doing a great deal of good to a very few people and a great deal of harm to the entire University. It has become almost impossible to defend this system to legislators, who are very sensitive to it. It has become impossible to defend it to Regents, both State Regents and University Regents. And it is not possible to defend it to myself. Therefore, I am asking the Budget Council to make this question a major order of business this fall. I think the Council should search the issue in more depth, consult with Vice President Katzenbach, whose policies and system have a very important bearing on this question, consult with Vice President Dean and ask him what the legislature is asking him about it, and seek the advice of Vice President White. Arrangements should be made I think for any interested college dean, any department chairman, or any member of the faculty to express his views to the Budget Council during this study. An ideal system would allow these earnings to go back into the budget of the department or college to pay for released time and allow for expansion of staff and services. I know that is ideal. My second choice would be to place a rational limit on the amount of income that may be earned by individuals in excess of the salary base.

5. This topic also concerns salaries, faculty salaries especially. During the past two or three years we have followed a system of computing allocations from the budget for increments to faculty salaries; that is, we have found out what percentage we could apply to the base each year and arrived at the amount of increase in that way. Then that percentage became an average increase for the faculty. In other words, we have been working out salary increases on the average percentage and we have so been stating this method to the faculty. It has seemed to me that this has some flaws, one of which is that it leads to misunderstandings and disappointments on the part of individual faculty members. When we say that the average increase is such and such percentage, anybody who gets more than that percentage is elated, and anybody who gets less than that percentage is disappointed. When one looks at the entire range of salaries to be considered from the newer people in the lower ranks to the senior people in the higher ranks with higher salaries and make comparisons, this is what happens: people in higher ranks, higher salary brackets, practically all of whom merit good increases, get them but, because of the size of the salary, the percentage is smaller than the average. So even if the intention is to recognize his merit the recipient is disappointed. You can't give people in the lower salary brackets a reasonable increase and meet these averages unless you give the people in the higher salary brackets less than average. That's just the way it works out. I think this has caused an occasional morale problem. The problem is fictitious, but it becomes real in individual cases, and I have already asked Vice President Nordby and his staff to see what they can do, with the help of all mathematicians they can bring in, to devise a better system that would be more satisfactory to the faculty. I don't think it will mean any better salaries. I think it will mean more satisfactory understanding of salary increases.

6. I hope to get something done this year about the function of certain administrative bodies. Most of our faculty organizations are organized and their work is clearly defined and they go about it well. By that I mean college faculties and the various standing committees in departments, in the colleges, and in the University.

There is one body, however, whose function has not been clearly defined for many years and may not be definable by its own membership, and that is the Deans' Council. The Deans' Council has been working for some months through a committee of its own in trying to define its role. I would like to see that worked out this fall. Acting Provost Riggs will be presiding over that council. We all know what a dean does in his office I think, but we need a better understanding of what deans do when they get together. I think really that's important. Last year (turning to another body, which may not be organized well enough to be called a body) many of the chairmen of departments and the directors of schools began meeting on their own volition and eventually asked President Hollomon to meet with them. He took me along, I think, to that first meeting. Later, on his proposal, the deans were brought into one or two of those meetings. I thought that the last meeting between the president and the department chairmen was an interesting and productive meeting. And, if the department chairmen want to do it, I'd like to see something of that sort continued. At the same time it would be well to have records kept as to what is agreed to and what commitments are made, because that meeting lasted all day and there were many, many differences of opinion as to who said what and what he meant by it two or three months later, when we began to get into the budget.

All I'm doing here, I guess, is talking about communications. I would not like to see so many bodies formally organized that they begin to get in one another's way or begin to get on parallel tracks without each knowing what the other is doing; but, if that can be avoided and communication can be maintained, it should be all to the good.

7. We need more effective liaison than we have had between the Norman campus and the Medical Center campus. I think that whatever liaison is effected there will depend very largely on the faculty and particularly, when we talk about the Norman campus, the faculty in certain science areas. This liaison depends on the willingness of the faculty to get together and to work together. I'm going to appoint some liaison committees with this specific mission quite soon. But I should very much like, for the faculty not only to be cooperative but to be active in this kind of thing.

Now we are going to turn from more specific things to some generalizations. I don't think what I have here is very good but it's the best I could do in the time I had.

This is the University of Oklahoma. It is my earnest conviction that this institution occupies a place in the regard of the citizenry of this state that no other institution occupies. This is not to say that everybody's proud of us or that everybody even likes us. I think a very considerable number of very important people are proud of us, and many of those who are not exactly proud of us do at least wish us well. There are many who disapprove of us. They have various reasons. Some have reasons of conviction. Some have reasons of personal disappointment of one kind or another. Some have specious reasons. Some have slanderous reasons. You wouldn't believe how many reds there are on this faculty, and some people have no reasons at all that they can express. They just don't like us. But on balance I think we have in the state around us I think we have a very large reservoir of good will. But that's a commodity that we can't get too much of. For our own good as professional people and especially for the good of the University.

I'm sorry to have to tell you that in the view of a great many people who are watching us the University now stands in disarray. I ask you to consider earnestly and thoughtfully the degree to which this may be true of the faculty. We all agree, I suppose, that a university is a place that is not afraid of dissent and is not afraid of disagreement. But please let's not confuse dissent with dissension, and let's not confuse disagreement with divisiveness and petty carping. I'm afraid we've been guilty of some of that kind of confusion. We've been tearing our own fabric. We've been wounding ourselves, and we have lesions to attend to. Now fortunately they're the kind of lesions I think can be quickly healed. I ask you to do a very simple thing. Let's get back together. Take a colleague to lunch. If you don't think he's worth that much, buy him a cup of coffee and find out. See how long you can discuss the University without falling into gossip. Every campus has its gossip, but this place has been riddled with it, and believe me, that's hurting us in Lawton and Broken Bow and especially in Oklahoma City.

This morning the regents appointed a search committee to help them select a president. Now there will be a lot of discussion on what kind of person he--I think I have to say he or she--ought to be, and there will be a lot of argument over credentials and qualifications. Then we'll get to the stage of rumors as to who has the inside track, and most of that will be based on more conviction than knowledge. But before we get into all that, I want to get you to think about another question that closely concerns all of us and that's this: once this person is found, what makes you think he'll take the job? After all, being a university president is not a very attractive line of work these days. Of all the vacant presidencies, what makes this one all that attractive? Fortunately, we may have time to make it more attractive than it is now. We need to zero in on the whole university, not just the faculty--students, administration, the alumni, all their support. We need to zero in on some big good abstractions. Things like stability, unity, harmony. Now whether we get there and get there in time to make it attractive to a president depends very greatly on the willingness of the faculty to work for the university. So I make a very personal plea to you. Please, for Pete's sake, do it.