

ChangeechangeAnge

The first step in this process is in the making. An experimental program through the College of Education is being built within the framework of educational training. Though still a long way from reality, it is the first step in testing the small college idea.

Another step in the interdisciplinary approach is taking shape in the new human relations program headed by Dr. George Henderson, Goldman professor of human relations. Henderson is spending this year developing an academic program in this discipline.

The term academic program has new meaning now, however, and Henderson will be drawing on the experience of faculty members from a number of different areas. He will be bringing in well known speakers from outside the University, and he will provide opportunity for field work in human relations—something outside the purely academic world.

In architecture the first step has been taken to broaden horizons of professional development. A new director has been hired who will be a dean of environmental design and architecture.

The new college is envisioned as being served by three academic units: architecture, social sciences and humanities, and the physical sciences and engineering.

At the Medical Center the long hoped for program in dentistry is in its beginning stages. A dean has been hired, and a small amount of equipment is being purchased so that at least the academic program can be initiated soon with the practicum phase still in the future.

While a law center has been agreed upon in theory and structural organization, the new physical facility for the center is still in the design phase, and the search continues for a dean.

Generally throughout the University there is a new air of participation. Authority has been somewhat decentralized through the vice presidents. While the president must make multiple hard core decisions regarding the University, he is less involved in the day to day minutiae that too often consume the energies of high ranking officials.

Committees are the order of the day. Nearly every area has advisory committees, and in addition there are committees of faculty, students and public leaders considering the myriad questions facing the University today.

For some, committees have proliferated beyond a serviceable means. They feel that committees exist just to give people a feeling of participation and that actually decisions are cut and dried before the committee is even appointed. But by and large committee participation is widespread, and most of the groups are reasonably active, meeting as often and as effectively as their diverse membership will allow.

Students particularly are serving on more and more committees. In addition, they are sought out by faculty members and administrators and asked their opinions on issues. There is still an overriding tendency for the same students to offer the same opinions and serve on all the committees month after month with little new blood. This, however, is a universal failing of leadership. In every community of people the same names tend to pop up again and again in government and committee work. The same is true at the University.

After one stumbling attempt, the students finally passed their constitution last year and got it approved by the administration and the Regents. It goes into effect in earnest this year, and its effectiveness cannot be measured until the end of the school year. Many of the same old faces show up in the student government picture again, which indicates to some that only the titles have changed but not the methods of operation.

The University constitution is in limbo right now. The committee's initial attempt to get it accepted by

chaNgechanGechangE

the faculty failed. A large bloc of faculty members protested the speed with which the committee attempted to run the constitution through, and so it has waited through the summer for action this fall. When and if it is passed, that will mark the second phase in the new constitutional reform at the University.

One of the key proposals in the plan was for a flat fee system to replace the present credit hour concept. A plan was drawn up in the spring and presented to the State Regents for Higher Education. Under the plan students would have paid a flat fee for a range of course hours. Its proponents maintained that it would make money for the University and provide a method of freeing students from the confines of the credit hour.

In July the state regents tore the proposal apart and refused to implement any part of it. Their experts maintained that the plan, rather than making money for the institution, stood a high probability of losing money and did nothing to get rid of the credit hour problem since a student's graduation depended on the number of credit hours completed.

Officials were upset at the failure of the flat fee system, and at the July meeting of the OU Board of Regents, board president John Houchin, Bartlesville, stated coldly that whether it were a flat fee or a credit hour fee, the University will have to have a fee increase.

Budgetarily the University is in a tough position. There was a small increase in funds from the Legislature this year, but it did not amount to even a cost of living increase. Departments throughout the University are feeling the squeeze in not being able to fill vacant positions, not being able to increase present salaries appreciably and not being able to purchase needed supplies and equipment. The outlook for fiscal 1970-71 is a little better, but that is agonizing months away.

Many of the changes within the University during the past months have been housekeeping chores: getting offices re-located in more convenient places, centralizing scattered departments, coordinating all the University's grant and contract efforts under one umbrella, and so forth.

But perhaps the greatest change anywhere in the University has been among the students. The Uni-

versity has dropped its strict in loco parentis policy to provide more freedom, more expectation of adult attitudes among the students.

The hated compulsory housing regulation has been relaxed somewhat to exempt seniors and all students over 21. Niceties are being added in the housing areas to make them more attractive to students.

The administrative structure in the University community has been changed drastically to decentralize it and bring programs to the students rather than the other way around.

Physically, the University has changed, of course. An alumnus who has been away from the campus for ten years might not recognize great chunks of it. But you expect that kind of change.

The change that is less readily apparent is what really counts, and there will be more of it as the presidency of J. Herbert Hollomon continues. It has not been easy. Not all the ideas have been good ones. Even the good ones have not always been accepted wholeheartedly by all concerned. But change is coming. It is here, and it will continue. Even the changes will change, for that is part of "The Future of the University:"

In a world of change and uncertainty, the University of Oklahoma should shape its goals in terms of human values by a continuous and impartial process for planning and restating its purposes through concrete action. Every major position taken in this report should be reviewed at least every five years.