MAY 25 DEADLINE

OREGON STATE SYSTEM OF HIGHER EDUCATION
OFFICE OF ACADEMIC AFFAIRS
P.O. Box 3175
EUGENE, OREGON 97403

OFFICE OF THE VICE CHANCELLOR

May 20, 1970

To: Institutional Executives
President Robert D. Clark
Dean Charles N. Holman
President Winston D. Purvine
President Averno M. Rempel
President Leonard W. Rice
President James K. Sours
Dean Louis G. Terkla
President Gregory B. Wolfe
President Roy A. Young

Gentlemen:

As you know, the board's office has been asked by the board's committee on academic affairs to make an analysis of institutional experience with recent episodes of student unrest. We have been asked to provide the committee and the board (at the June 9 meeting of the board) with a report of this analysis, providing therein a response to the following questions:

- Were board policies relating to institutional governance, with particular reference to the student role therein (adopted December 1968), as outlined immediately below, breached by students, nonstudents, or faculty, during recent episodes of unrest?

  Institutional rules and regulations governing student participation and conduct should reflect the institutions' obligation to:
  .....
  4. Preserve and protect the right to assemble peaceably, and the right to petition authorities. But resort to violence, physical abuse of persons, or threats of such abuse, destruction of property, or overt interference with the operation of the institutions is contrary to the spirit and freedom of the academic community and should be dealt with by appropriate institutional and/or legal sanctions...

- What action was taken by the institution or civil authorities in those instances in which board policies were breached? Does the action appear to have been appropriate to the infraction and adequate to the needs of the occasion?

- Based upon experience with the aforementioned episodes, does it appear that present board and institutional policies, city ordinances, and state and federal laws are adequate to deal with such problems in the future? If not, what modification or elaboration of these policies, ordinances, or laws seems indicated?

Our task in making this analysis is made difficult by the fact that:

UNIVERSITY OF OREGON
RECEIVED
MAY 21 1970
OFFICE OF PRESIDENT

- We are required to render a report by June 9, which gives us little time to explore these episodes in all their complexities, and little time to involve institutional representatives actively in the drafting of the report as we should like to do.

  The press of time requires that we bring together background information for the report by the quickest means consistent with securing accurate information. This appears to be by asking each institution to provide us with a written analysis of the critical episodes on their campus. For that purpose we have provided you with the attached outline of what we think would be helpful to us. If time allows, we shall seek confirmation from you later concerning the general line of the report we develop, insofar as it relates to the data you have supplied.

- As you will agree, the perception of what transpired in these episodes varies according to the vantage point of the viewer. Objectivity requires that some sense of this disparity of views of these events be understood by us in drafting the report. For without such parallax it would not be possible to see these episodes in more than a one-dimensional form.

  How to sample these disparate views in a meaningful way is a problem. One alternative would be to hold open hearings on each campus. But time will not permit. Moreover, in today's charged atmosphere it is not at all clear that an open hearing would do more than exacerbate an already difficult situation.

  What we are proposing therefore is that each institutional president invite a faculty representative (someone having status in the faculty - such for example as the president of the faculty senate) and a student who has some status among students (the student body president, for example) to respond to the same or at least some of the same kinds of questions we are asking the president to respond to. For that purpose we are supplying you with outlines which we ask you to kindly pass along to a faculty and student representative.

We would emphasize that it would be helpful to us if, with your response to the questions raised on the attached form, you would include copies of all pronouncements that the president or other member of his immediate staff has issued officially concerning each of the episodes, and to the extent possible, copies of the materials issued by faculty groups or by student groups in the nature of "demands," proposals, and the like. We shall have the newspapers searched for background on these episodes, as well.

Should you find the foregoing approach lacking in important respects, or should you feel that a more meaningful approach to securing the information we need is available, we would be most grateful if you would call us.

Let me emphasize that time is of the essence, for the board meets June 9. They have asked to have the report several days in advance which means we must mail it to them on or about June 2, two weeks from yesterday (Tuesday May 19). We must accumulate the background information, analyze it, write the report, get

it reproduced and bound, all in less than two weeks time. Therefore we are asking if you will please mail us the materials from your institution not later than Monday, May 25. We know how pressed you are, and dislike making such a request of you, but in view of the deadline fixed for us by the Chancellor and the board, we see little recourse.

Cordially yours,

Miles C. Romney
Vice Chancellor

MCR:me

cc: Chancellor Lieuallen
Mr. Collins