Ferrari Named Vice President of Resource Planning Office

The creation of the Office of Resource Planning was announced by President Moore March 1. The new vice president of that office will be Dr. Michael Ferrari.

In a move to provide more efficient and economical planning of the University's resources, President Moore announced March 1 the creation of an office of resource planning and named Dr. Michael R. Ferrari vice president for the new area.

The assignment will be the third for the 32-year-old management and organization specialist since coming to Bowling Green. He was appointed coordinator of budgeting and planning in August, 1971 and last summer was named acting provost for the current academic year.

In making the announcement, Dr. Moore said, "In the years immediately ahead universities will face no more complex task (nor one more challenging) than that of intelligent, economical, creative planning for the use of its resources. In particular, the state university—charged as it is with a sense of accountability to the general public, to its clientele, and to the units of state government—has an obligation to give high priority to the planning function.

"It is clear that the financial and organizational constraints facing higher education in the '70's call for a more effective and efficient utilization of the human, technical, and space resources of the University if the institution hopes to achieve its multiple objectives.

"Resource planning must be done on an integrated, systems approach basis and provide administrators and councils with more sophisticated information systems. Quality education at the lowest possible cost to the student and to the state in the years ahead will be difficult under any circumstances—impossible without careful planning. Rationalized systems must be developed to plan effectively for academic program development and evaluation, reallocation of resources in a period of static enrollments and somewhat lessened state financial support. Above all, concerted efforts must be taken to provide a catalyst for qualitative growth, and these efforts will be increasingly dependent on the development of an effective resource planning team.

"Currently, Bowling Green State University has a number of individuals who work in the resource planning area; however, their organizational relationships and efforts are largely fragmented and on occasion duplicative. Thus, the results of their work do not converge on decision-making. Bringing these individuals together into a new organizational format with vice presidential leadership would provide a significant step forward in generating short and long range plans that maximize the use of available human and financial resources. Although many institutions do have vice presidents for planning, few have yet built an integrated total resource planning team as proposed here and as found in many industrial organizations.

"Functional relationships would be established within the team and among the major University offices, especially the President, Provost and Vice Presidents. Chief responsibility for budget preparation will rest with the new resource planning unit.

"The Resource Planning Office would be funded immediately by transferring salaries and appropriate operating budget monies from existing organizational units. In fact, once the team were organized and occupied some shared space there would be at least a 10 per cent reduction in operating costs due to efficiency and the use of less secretarial support staff, etc.

"There will be no planned growth in the size of the team now or in the future beyond the current authorized reconfiguration. The actual budget would be worked out once a final decision is made as to who will be part of the team."
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Report from the President

President Moore Suggests Changes in University Governance

Beginning June 1 University personnel involved in different aspects of planning will become part of the new office of resource planning. The areas most affected will be the offices of the provost and vice president for operations. To be included in the resource planning office are several persons now serving as chairmen of major committees or councils which deal with finance, space assignment, equal employment opportunities, academic information, computational services and academic development and evaluation.

University governance, and the role of student, faculty, and staff were analyzed by the president in a message to the Faculty Senate on Feb. 14.

The past decade—and the most recent few years particularly—have brought much study, debate, and reform in university governance throughout the country. Scores of institutions have modified or even completely discarded old forms of governance. The general thrust of these efforts has been to soften so-called authoritarian patterns and to broaden participation to include students, non-academic staff, and sometimes trustees and alumni, in day-to-day decision-making processes.

At Bowling Green we are perhaps fortunate that we have proceeded cautiously. I say “fortunate,” because the national higher education community is just now beginning to receive some feedback on the effects of the attempt to broaden the basis of participation through the establishment of university-wide senates or assemblies with extensive powers. It’s not all favorable.

As a result of adopting a governance model based upon the university as a political unit—which it clearly is not—some institutions are finding that they have become so involved in the process of governance that the central purpose of the university—to educate students—is in danger of being neglected. Responsible management often loses something in participatory involvement overkill. Gradually it is being acknowledged that university-wide senates or assemblies with broad powers are less well-equipped to deal with decision making than are those persons—administrators as well as advisory groups—with a close and continuing relationship to a particular operation. Students, even more than faculty, are frustrated by their inability to represent a constituency. Excessive emphasis on the relative strength of representation of each participating group has often led to an adversary relationship between faculty, students, and staff.

Clearly we are an organization faced with critical problems which will test the institution’s resiliency and adaptability for change as we now enter a period of stable growth. Experience elsewhere has shown that when resources are scarce there is a natural tendency for university faculty and administrators to act conservatively and to avoid new ventures which may include an element of risk for some segments of the university community. A governance structure which calls for the same matters to be debated by first one group and then reviewed by another (perhaps even ratified by a third) is obviously costly not only in terms of staff time and energies but perhaps more importantly in terms of paralysis of the mechanisms for change.

Public pressure for “accountability” under these circumstances is understandable. Here in Ohio the concern is perhaps best illustrated by provisions written into the appropriation law for 1971-73 which prevent erosion of the authority of university boards of trustees. The intent of these provisions is to strengthen and preserve the autonomy of the universities. We all know that unresponsiveness or self-serving management in the individual university can lead only toward increased regulation of university affairs by state government and a concomitant loss of institutional style.

In the wake of debate on recent governance recommendations at Bowling Green and elsewhere, a fear of excessive structure has been clearly evident. I share the apprehension; in a convocation to the faculty in April of 1971, I observed:

“...We endanger the governmental process at our institutions when we obfuscate the real issues with interminable wrangling over minor procedural matters, when the agenda of our major council meetings deal with trivia while we are undecided which of the countless committees on our campus has jurisdiction to deal with truly essential issues.

“The real questions hinge on our talent for self-governance in matters of priority. The question is one not of institutional preservation, but of institutional integrity. Our institutions potentially can suffer seriously from governing boards or legislatures which reduce the money available to higher education or from lurid events which become more and more hostile to their academic neighbors or from students who perceive college officials as culprits who by design or default fail to solve society’s problems. We could indeed be injured by unfair attention from the public media. But any one or all of these outside interests are probably not as serious in the long run as the danger from within—the danger of inadequate or self-seeking governance through slow and steady erosion of our ability to decide important issues and make significant changes.

“It is an appropriate time for us now to take stock of where we are, what we have accomplished, and how we can get on with the task of improving our university decision-making structure where this is necessary.

First, let’s look at the history of recent events. A President’s Advisory Council task force convened during the summer of 1970 under the chairmanship of Professor Bernard Rabin. This task force suggested two governance models, the first of which (Model A) was spelled out in some detail. Model A provided for 1) a broadly representative “community council” which would serve as a “communication center, a problem-solving group, and a policy-forming institution”; 2) the creation of a Student Affairs Council; 3) the replacement of Student Council with a more functional and realistic organization; 4) the appointment of faculty and student representatives to all University-wide budgetary and financial committees; 5) faculty and student involvement in working directly with the Board of Trustees; and 6) a clarification of the rights and responsibilities of undergraduate and graduate student representatives in their respective departments. Recommendations two through five have been implemented, and number six is achieved in some departments. Only a sketchy outline was presented for Model B, but it would have provided for a radically different form of governance—the elimination of separate (current) faculty and student bodies and the creation of a University Senate.
to which all councils and standing committees would be subordinate.

A second group, the Charter Commission, convened during the summer of 1971 under the chairmanship of Vice Provost George Herman in response to a charge from the President's Advisory Council to propose a model University Charter incorporating the Rabin committee's "Model B." The Charter Commission subsequently proposed elimination of the present Faculty Senate and creation of a number of University councils whose actions would be subject to review by a broadly representative University Assembly.

In the spring of 1972 five special Senate committees reviewed the Charter Commission report and developed detailed critiques of the recommendations. These were extensively reviewed and debated by the Senate Executive Committee, and in October, 1972, the S.E.C. indicated that it had "no inclination to bring the present Charter Commission Report to the Faculty Senate for adoption."

Concurrent with discussion of the Charter Commission report a new student body organization constitution was adopted by the student body (February, 1972) no doubt in response to a charge from the Faculty Senate detailed critiques of the recommendations. These were a broadly representative University Assembly.

Perhaps most important of all developments has been a slow and steady addition of broader representation — including both faculty and students and to some extent non-faculty staff — on decision-making bodies of the University. The Budget Council was reorganized twice in 1971-72, each time bringing additional faculty and student representatives into membership. During the present year a sub-council, which includes seven undergraduate students and two graduate students, has been established to review the needs of departments and programs currently receiving general fee support and to make recommendations to the Budget Council regarding 1973-74 general fee allocations.

The Academic Council includes three students. A Student Affairs Council with appropriate constituent representation was established. Students serve on continuing committees (such as Athletics) and ad hoc bodies (such as the Provost Search Committee). Several of our academic departments have improved their procedures for making departmental decisions and widening the base of input. Now our challenge seems to be not so much that of broadening the basis of participation; sustaining the interest of these new partners in decision-making is now our problem.

In short, we have made considerable progress toward goals of more broadly-based decision-making — though not necessarily cleaner, neater charts and hopefully not more elaborate super structures of government.

Prevailing thought naturally on the subject of university governance now appears to be shifting. For example, I sense a general unease about establishing an Assembly which has power of review over all council policy legislation. Superior judgment simply does not necessarily reside in a large, unicameral body, and the wisest decisions are usually made by those who continuously work closely with and therefore understand the complexities of the several major policy areas of a university.

Faculty feel a real need for a body of their own to express special concerns on matters such as benefits, salaries and working conditions. (Preserving the essential faculty character of the Senate would not, of course, prohibit inclusion of selected student and administration members for the purpose of effective communication.) There is a rather strong likelihood that any university which eliminates from its governance structure a clean-cut faculty organization invites the creation of a new one to fill the void in no time at all. Moreover, there is beginning to be an awareness that redundant involvement in university governance (reexamination of the same issue by several committees) brings some peril to the institution in that valuable energy and resources and time of faculty are pulled away from the crucial purpose — namely, teaching, research, counseling with students — and diverted into the decision-making areas of the institution which are oftentimes no longer served by the introduction of additional individuals.

I believe that the existence of a Faculty Senate is important in the life of an institution. I feel that it should not be evaluated entirely in terms of what it appears to "accomplish," or what may appear to be its degree of efficiency and dispatch. The mere fact of its existence is clearly important to the on-going life of the university. Moreover, it is the kind of a body which is available to respond to issues and crises, even though they take place infrequently.

Certainly there are many ways in which the Faculty Senate can continue to work with effectiveness at Bowling Green. There are ways in which it might enlarge the scope of its constituency by adding students and perhaps other non-faculty personnel as well, as long as widening the membership does not in essence really dilute the essential character of the Senate, which is the faculty voice. This does not mean that the administrative organization of the University resides in the Senate, but it does mean that the Faculty Senate is such an essential voice in the life of the University that it probably ought not to be seriously altered.

Now the question which teases me is: where do we go from here? Clearly, the existing structure should be updated and made current. Whatever we do must enhance our capacity for responsive action. We should see if some solution is readily at hand which can gain acceptance by the bulk of our University community. We now have wide involvement at critical levels where recommendations are generated, where issues are explored, and the data appropriate to those issues are examined. That is where broad involvement should take place frequently.

Students who once saw "participation in decision-making" as their prime goal now express far greater interest in seeing changes occur and innovations achieved. Between the lines of their comments is an uncomfortable acknowledgment that as we add new layers of "participatory democracy" we seem to facilitate our ability only to discuss, not necessarily to decide—unless what we decide is just to do nothing. Moreover, we simply cannot risk the crippling effects from lapses of time when critical decisions need to be made. As I see it, these are some of the things which now need to be done:

1. The Senate Executive Committee or the Committee on Committees needs to make a thorough review of the present committee structure and its relation to other official University bodies.

2. A committee (with representation from the Council of Chairmen, the college policy councils, and the deans) should be appointed to review department and college governance; specifically, the powers, duties, and provisions for the selection, tenure, evaluation of department chairmen and deans, issues left untouched by the Charter Commission as something to be dealt with later. Organization and administration at the department and college levels are the most critical areas which impinge on quality and serve of leadership, organizational adaptability, and responsiveness to demonstrated need for change. The emergence on our campus last year of a Council of Chairmen illustrates the importance of this aspect of University organization.

3. The President's Advisory Council should be replaced with a President's Panel, much in accordance with the recommendations of the Charter Commission. This recommendation is one on which there seems to be
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widely agreed, and it could be implemented now, apart from other recommendations of the Commission.

4. The Vice Presidents for Operations and Public Services should be asked to establish advisory councils similar to those requested in the Charter Commission report.

5. A coordinating committee, to work in conjunction with the President, should be established to consolidate the several efforts working on the whole question of university decision-making and governance as the various undertakings mentioned above begin to conclude their work. There should be representation on the committee from the Board of Trustees so that the governance structure is consistent with and supportive of the provisions of the Trustees’ by-laws.

6. I have asked the Student Affairs Council to review the possibility of appointing an ombudsman.

7. I hope that the Faculty Senate will reexamine its rules and regulations and address itself to the issue of permanently institutionalizing the role of the students in the Senate. As you know, this is presently a "gray area," inasmuch as students must be "elected" and "confirmed" annually.

Finally, I would like to compliment the members of both the Task Force on University Governance and the Charter Commission for the contribution they have made by focusing our attention on critical issues of governance. As a result of their reports, we now enjoy greatly expanded involvement of students and others in defined areas such as academic affairs, budgeting, student affairs.

I met regularly with the Senate Executive Committee, the Student Body Organization officers, and Cabinet, and I find that all of these bodies have provided a vehicle for communication which has been highly valuable both from my point of view and theirs. Our sensitivity to the need for effective decision-making on this campus has been sharpened by the work of the Task Force and the Commission. Committees appointed by SBO and the Senate have explored the various governance proposals and have given a great deal of insightful analysis.

My conclusion is that the gains of the past few years can be consolidated by overhauling rather than replacing the Faculty Charter. Let us begin at that point and consider further adjustments as seem appropriate in the years ahead.

Board of Trustees News

At its March 1 meeting the Board of Trustees approved a Master Plan for Graduate Education, passed a resolution thanking the citizens of Fostoria and Fremont for their support of academic centers in their communities, considered construction of a new warehouse, and approved an Ice Arena repair project.

MASTER PLAN FOR GRADUATE EDUCATION

The Board approved the master plan for graduate education which features implementation of at least four new doctoral programs by 1980 in addition to the eight currently accredited programs. There are 11 academic areas aspiring to offer doctorate level work.

Bowling Green has fewer masters and doctoral programs than other schools in the state, Dr. Charles Leone, dean of the graduate school and vice provost for research and graduate studies, said. He added that Bowling Green's five doctoral-producing programs had graduated 150 students, which indicated that existing programs are successful.

The master plan forecasts enrollment objectives for graduate students to 1980 and are within the maximum of 1,800 students allowed to Bowling Green in the 1971 Ohio Master Plan.

Also two or three Specialist (intermediate degree) programs will be added to the six now available. Five new programs will be added to the existing 33 master's programs.

Because of the new College of Health and Community Services, several master's programs are expected to be added. If a new College of Communication is created, other master's programs will be necessary.

The master plan will now be forwarded to the Board of Regents for final approval.

CAMPUS SAFETY INCLUDES NEW LIGHTS

An allocation of $12,775 from appropriate auxiliary and local capital improvement funds was approved for the addition of campus lighting.

The additional lighting proposal comes from the recent national concern for campus safety. Although the crime rate at the University has dropped substantially, surveys of campus lighting have been made and some areas identified where more lighting might deter crimes of personal violence. Twenty such areas have been marked for additional lighting.

Paralleling the lighting factor for campus safety, other measures are being implemented by the University. New locks and re-keying in some dormitories and sorority houses, and a proposed "Operation Identification" are part of recent efforts to provide more personal safety on campus.

WAREHOUSE TO BE BUILT

Construction of a new 25,000 square feet warehouse was tentatively approved by the Board. The warehouse would be built at the cost of $250,000 with a note being issued against the available $565,000 of 1954 Dormitory Surplus Fund. The Board will approve final plans after further study of the architect's design of the warehouse.

Present warehouse facilities include leasing of 16,466 square feet of a city-owned facility. The city has notified the University that the lease will expire and not be renewed as of June 30, 1974. Another 3,060 square feet is privately owned and the University has been notified that the property is for sale.

After studying several alternatives the Trustees’ Finance Committee and University officials concluded that the building of a new warehouse would be the most appropriate solution to the problem.

ICE ARENA REPAIR APPROVED

Approval was given by the Trustees to proceed with plans to repair the faulty ice conditions in the main and curling sheets of the Ice Arena. The problem, principally heaving of the ice, has existed for more than a year.

While repairs are being made the Arena will have to be closed for a longer than usual time either in late spring or the summer. However, it is not known how long the construction will take and when the Arena will be back in operation.

ACADEMIC CENTERS CLOSED; TWO CITIES COMMENDED

In a special resolution the citizens of Fremont and Fostoria were commended for their support of more than a decade in the operation of the University's academic centers in each of the cities.

The centers are to be closed this year because of decreasing enrollment and lack of financial support from the state. The University will continue offering upper division and graduate extension courses which are offered in communities where there is sufficient interest.

The cities' public school systems provided facilities without charge for classroom instruction, support of boards of education, community libraries, Branch Advisory Committees, and community resident support.
In 1971 the State Board of Regents adopted a policy statement that "all academic centers will be phased out not later than September 1973."

Governor Gilligan's proposed allocations to state-assisted universities did not include financial support for academic centers for the next biennium.

RECOMMENDATIONS LISTED FOR REDEFINITION OF BACCALAUREATE

Board members heard the report from the committee which studied the redefinition of the baccalaureate degree. Headed by Dr. John Holmes, department of business, the report proposed several innovations in the present method of earning the baccalaureate degree.

The report encouraged high school students to enroll in University courses. Students would be advised and could receive credit for courses taken while they were in high school. A special council made up of secondary school administrators and University personnel would oversee this early admissions area.

The report also suggested that the quarterly 18-credit hour maximum for undergraduate students be lifted. Students would be encouraged to attend summer sessions and undergraduates would be credited with five hundred level courses taken if the student desired to apply these courses to a graduate degree.

In addition the committee suggested allowing credit for off-campus professional experiences, the establishment of an Associate Degree, and the creation of a general education curriculum committee which would oversee course requirements in the general education area.

INTRODUCTORY STUDIES ANALYZED

The introductory studies report was presented by Dr. George Horton, assistant dean of the College of Education. The report recommended the adoption of a curricular pattern of correlated studies for all University freshmen which would be relevant to goal orientation while utilizing basic curricula of the present disciplines offered to students.

The committee emphasized the need for introductory teaching to remain professional but to also become more personal. Teacher reward methods were suggested as an aid to this goal.

Summer pre-registration should place greater emphasis on academic advisement and student-faculty interaction, while fall orientation should offer the opportunity to the new student to have questions answered that evolved during the summer period. Resident advisors should be better trained, according to the report, to aid students in academic advising since faculty advisers can not always be readily available.

The creation of a Coordinator of Freshman Programs office was recommended. Through this office the review of the freshman curriculum and experience could be studied and continually upgraded.

Finally the committee suggested that the cost of the present freshman year be computed and compared with costs in other years for better planning purposes.

FALL ENROLLMENT GOOD

Bowling Green's freshman enrollment picture next fall is a good one, Dr. Michael Ferrari, acting-provost, told the Trustees.

The Admission's Office began deferring applications from prospective freshman students on Feb. 7. More than 6,000 applications have been processed and most students have been notified of their status in next fall's incoming class, which will number approximately 3,200.

Because of the University's new admission's policy, which accepts applications on a first-served basis rather than attempting to create a balance of men and women students, it appears that about 60 per cent of next fall's class will be women.

However, Dr. Ferrari said there would be no great shift in the overall enrollment mix of the University. Based on preliminary enrollment figures, a three per cent shift seems likely.

Faculty Senate Highlights

The University budget, grade review policy, and an amendment to the Faculty Charter highlighted Faculty Senate's Feb. 6 meeting.

PRESIDENT DISCUSSES 1973-74 BUDGET

It is hoped that Bowling Green's budget for the 1973-74 year will be $36,458,000—the amount the Board of Regents has recommended to the administration. The current operating budget for the University is $34,233,000.

However, Governor Gilligan's recommended budget to the legislature for Bowling Green is only $34,750,000. Should a three per cent increase in instructional fees be approved, then the suggested amount for Bowling Green would be $35,040,000.

The Regent's figure of $36,458,000 assumes no loss in enrollment, the same enrollment mix, no increase in the $50 general fee and the continuing legality of the out-of-state surcharge. Fees currently provide approximately $12 million in revenues while state appropriations amount to about $16 million of the University's budget. The remainder comes from other sources.

Goals outlined by the president included strengthening the inter-university council, getting special legislation to assist the University with mandated civil service salary increases, and getting standby legislation, to allow the University to adjust instructional fees if the out-of-state surcharge should be ruled illegal.

The president also stated that approximately $800,000 was needed in addition to the normal budget increase to allow the University to regain first or second place in Ohio for faculty salaries.

GRADE REVIEW POLICY CHANGED

Policy for the reviewing of a grade was set by the Senate. The new grade review procedure will allow for greater flexibility in changing grades.

The current grade review policy states that a grade can be changed only when a "mechanical error" is made in computing or processing the grade and then permission of the academic dean is required.

The new grade review policy is as follows:

1. Each department will establish its own procedure and will identify a tenured faculty member and a similar alternate to implement that procedure. The name of the persons and a description of the procedure will be filed annually with the respective dean and be made known to the students. Students will try to resolve the academic grade with the instructor before appealing at the department level.

2. Each undergraduate college and independent school will establish an academic arbitration board of at least two faculty members and one student which will serve to hear appeals from students who are not satisfied that
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the resolution of the appeal at the department level is fair. The department procedure will be followed first in all cases.

- 3. The department and college procedures will consider all of the facts in the case. If at either level the facts are deemed to support a grade change, moral suasion may be brought to bear on the faculty member. If, on the other hand, either committee regards the findings as not supporting a grade change, that decision should be transmitted unequivocally to the student. However, this committee reaffirms that the responsibility and authority for determining grades rest with the faculty member who assigned the grade.

- 4. The grade will be changed by a letter to the college from the instructor and either the department or college committee. The procedure must be started by the end of the fifth week of the quarter following the issuance of the grade, with the exception of the Spring quarter, which must be appealed by the end of the fifth week of the Fall quarter. All actions for grade changes must be completed by the end of the next quarter, except for the Spring quarter, when action must be completed by the end of the following Fall quarter.

SENATE DISMISSAL CLARIFIED

Article XII, By Law 5 of the Faculty Charter was amended to read: “Any Senate member, excepting the President of the University, not on official University leave absent from three scheduled Senate meetings, whether with an alternate or not, in one academic year shall be deemed to have vacated his/her office. He/she shall not be eligible for appointment to fill any Senate vacancy for a period of one academic year.”

Grants and Scholarships Received

During the first two months of 1973 the University received more than $445,000 in grants and contracts. That figure is nearly double the amount received during the same period in 1972.

The University received $11,311.63 in public service grants, and $61,735 in privately and federally-sponsored research grants.

In other areas, Bowling Green was awarded $46,008 for sponsored institutes and workshops, $199,669 for government student aid, $20,000 in salary grants and $6,000 in equipment grants.

Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, $29,027 for “Urban Fertility” projects under the direction of Dr. Arthur Neal and Dr. Theodore Groat.

Also from HEW $16,708 for “Lateral Dominance and Lateral Word Recognition” project under the direction of Dr. Walter McKeever.

HEW, $3,249 for student personnel under the direction of Robert McKay.

Johns-Manville Corporation, $10,827 for industrial education under the direction of Dr. Robert Swanson.

Milwaukee Health Department, $30,800 for biology under the direction of Dr. William Jackson.

National Science Foundation, $6,000 for chemistry under the direction of Dr. Paul Endres.

Northwest Ohio ETV Foundation, $6,231 for WBGU-TV under the direction of Dr. Duane Tucker.

Ohio Instructional Grant, $196,420 for financial aid under the direction of Dr. Beryl Smith.

Ohio Medical College at Toledo, grant for work-study under the direction of Robert McKay.

National Aeronautics and Space Administration, $33,200 for “The Genetic Material in Space” project under the direction of Dr. Irwin Oster.

State of Ohio Department of Education, $72,500 for public service project under the direction of Dr. Marvin Bowman.

World Health Organization, $1,000 for biology under the direction of Dr. William Jackson.

Employment Opportunities

For job description for faculty and staff positions contact the Office of Equal Opportunity, 238 Adm. Bldg. Check the posting of bulletins from Personnel Services for classified positions.

STAFF POSITIONS

Staff physician: Must be graduate of approved medical school and hold M.D. degree — must be licensed to practice in Ohio or be able to obtain an Ohio license.

FACULTY POSITIONS FOR 1973-1974

Part-time instructor in sociology: Master’s degree required. Contact Chairperson, department of sociology.

Asst. football coach and instructor in health and physical education: Master’s degree required. Experience and qualifications in the areas of physical education, athletics and football coaching. Contact Donald Nehlen, head football coach.

Asst. professor of quantitative analysis and control: Ph. D. in statistics or related area such as operations research or econometrics. Contact Dr. Robert Patton, department of quantitative analysis and control.

Assoc. to full professor in geography: All specializations considered. Contact Dr. Joseph Buford, chairman, department of geography.

Instructor of quantitative analysis and control, three positions: Undergraduate major in accounting or the equivalent at the master’s level; MBA or MS/MA in accounting. CPA certificate preferred but not essential. Contact Dr. Timothy Ross, department of quantitative analysis and control.

Assoc. professor or professor (term appointment one or two years): Teach graduate and/or undergraduate level sociology courses. Ph. D. and some experience required. Contact Chairperson, department of sociology.

Art Education: Teacher with experience to teach art education courses and capable of expanding art education programs, and supervising graduate assistants and teaching fellows. Terminal degree preferred with significant teaching experience. Contact Ronald Coleman, director, School of Art.
One or two Asst. professorships in popular culture: Teaching undergraduate and graduate courses in popular culture. Ph. D. in American Studies, English, the media, history; no experience required. Contact Ray Browne, director, Center for the Study of Popular Culture.

Full or Assoc. professorship and the possibility of the chairmanship in the department of physics: Must have experience in innovative teaching and sponsored research. Contact D.W. Bowman, chairman, department of physics.

Systems ecologist/quantitative biologist: Ph. D. with broad training in ecology and experience in quantitative biology. Contact Dr. Stephen Vessey, department of biology.

Positions (8) in the 1973 Little College component of the Modular Achievement Program, fall quarter 1973 only: A.B.D. or Ph. D. Teaching, advising, curriculum planning part of duties. Contact Dr. Neil Browne, department of economics or Dr. Douglas Daye, department of philosophy.

Announcements and Reports

Dr. Moore Testifies to State Finance Committee

On March 7 President Moore testified before the Finance Committee of the Ohio House of Representatives concerning the passage of House Bill #86 which would directly affect higher education and its future in Ohio.

President Moore made four recommendations to the committee for changes in the bill and pledged not to recommend any increase in instructional fees for Bowling Green students next year.

1. The Regents' request for instructional subsidies should be substituted for those which are now a reflection of the executive budget. For Bowling Green, this would mean an addition of approximately $600,000 in the first year of the biennium (1973-1975), and $1.2 million during the second year.

2. The state should increase the appropriation for developmental instruction from $2.5 to $3 million and that this money be allocated to the universities on the basis of program costs.

3. The state should include in the category of special appropriations an additional $100,000 to support Bowling Green's experimental, model program in the time-shortened baccalaureate (the same amount presently recommended for the independent study experiment at Ohio University).

4. There should be a commitment on the part of the legislature to include universities in a special appropriations bill to meet extra costs imposed on them at some later time within the legislative session should a civil service pay raise bill be passed.

Finally President Moore also suggested that the legislature grant standby permission for instructional fees to be increased in the event of and commensurate with the loss of income from any possible ruling which would make illegal the current out-of-state surcharge.

Should House Bill #86 pass without the above suggested changes President Moore said that the University would suffer severe cutbacks in essential services, in student employment, and in attention to needs of minority group students. It would also halt some of the developmental programs on campus and would be forced to increase student charges.

Budget Council Concerned With 1973-74 Budget

The proposed budget for the 1973-74 academic year has highlighted recent Budget Council meetings. Council decided that national inflation and program priorities would determine budget allocations.

BUDGETS PLANNED

For planning purposes Council approved in January that the same expenditure levels for 1972-73 be assumed for 1973-74. At its Feb. 28 meeting Council moved that it should be assumed that the amount available to the University would be equal to the income it would receive by virtue of Gov. Gilligan's proposed three per cent increase in subsidies plus a three per cent increase in instructional fees.

The five major organizational areas (Board of Trustees, President, Provost, Vice President for Operations, and Vice President for Public Services) were to release budgets that reflected the program priorities within their respective areas. These budgets will help initiate the 1973-74 budget development.

Council also decided that the percentage allocated for salary increases, not already mandated, would be left up to the head of each unit. The three percent increase, due to inflation, as outlined in Gov. Gilligan's budget recommendations for higher education, would be used in pricing goods and services, while five percent would be used for contract salary increases.

Appropriations for the budget are based upon summer and fall full-time-equivalent (FTE) student enrollment in courses classified according to certain categories. Expenditures models per student for each of the classifications have been developed by the Board of Regents. These models provide for a three percent increase per student because of the rate of inflation in the nation's economy.

THREE AREAS FILE BUDGETS

The first three recommended budgets filed with Budget Council were budgets from Dr. Michael Ferrari, acting-provost; J. Claude Scheuerman, vice president for operations, and James Hof, vice president for public services. The recommended budgets totaled $669,384 in new monies for the 1973-74 academic year.

The Provost's area had a priorities request of $410,000 in new monies for the academic area. The priorities request included increased faculty and staff, a central equipment pool, new doctoral program support for mathematics, history, and sociology, new summer school and increased support for the Student Development Program.

The area of operations had a $220,000 priorities request for new monies. The bulk of the requested new monies would be used for the heating plant operations. The cost of heating operations have increased because the University is converting from coal fuel to oil and gas fuel in a move to lower air pollution.

The public services area made a priorities request for $39,384 in new monies for the 1973-74 year.

Dr. Joseph Balogh, acting Dean of the College of Health and Community Services, now has his office located in Room 231 of the Administration Building. His new telephone number is 372-2915.
Winter Quarter Enrollment Up Compared to Same Time Last Year

Enrollment for the 1973 winter quarter at Bowling Green was slightly more than the same quarter a year ago, according to figures released by Glenn Van Wormer, dean of registration and records.

The main campus enrollment of 15,056 this winter is up 413 from winter quarter of 1972, and a larger part of that rise is due to a four per cent increase in the number of women students on the main campus. While male enrollment rose only one per cent (up 93 students, from 14,643 in 1972 to 15,056 in 1973), the number of women rose by 320, from 7,167 in 1972 to 7,487 in 1973.

Enrollment at the Firelands Campus for winter quarter is 805 students, down 42 from last year's 847, and enrollment at the academic centers in Fostoria and Fremont and at Northwest Tech is also down, with 292 students as compared to last year's 498.

Final Examination Times Are Not To Be Changed

Final examinations are to be given according to those times listed in the final examination schedule. According to policy, times may be changed only after written approval is obtained from the Provost's office. Requests for variance should be in writing, giving reasons for the requested exception, and be approved by the department chairman and the dean concerned.

Students are not bound to take their final examinations at any time other than that listed on the schedule. Even if a final exam has been officially changed a student may still appear and be given a final examination in any course at the hour and date listed for his course in the final week schedule.

This policy was approved by Faculty Senate Dec. 1, 1970. The exam schedule is designed to provide an orderly examination plan and to protect all students from compression of examinations into an unfavorable testing arrangement.

Faculty Awards Increased, Nominating Process Revamped

The procedure for the selection of faculty members for the Distinguished Teaching Awards has been changed and the number of recipients increased from three to six. The six divisions under the new system include social sciences, natural sciences, fine arts, humanities, education, and business. Each of the six award winners will receive $500. Previously only one teaching award per college was selected. Winners will be announced at the first faculty meeting of the 1973-1974 academic year.

Nominations for distinguished teachers will come from various sources. Every department's honorary or club may nominate a teacher. Students, faculty, and staff may submit nominations. Nominations also will be open during the first week of spring quarter.

After nominations are in, the student-comprised Academic Affairs Board of the Student Body Organization will set up a committee with one representative from each of the six divisions to review the nominations. Professor-course evaluations, class visits, and student comments will be considered in evaluating the teacher.

The awards were established by the Bowling Green Parents Club four years ago and are presently funded by the club.

Graduation Exercises Scheduled for March 17

Winter graduation exercises will be held at 10:15 a.m., Saturday, March 17 in the Ballroom of the University Union. Faculty remarks will be given by Dr. Michael Ferrari, acting-Provost and newly-named Vice President of Resource Planning.

Degree breakdown includes 430 undergraduate degrees, 73 master's, six special education, and seven doctorate degrees.
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