



President's Bulletin

University of Missouri

Volume 3, Number 3

Thursday, Sept. 14, 1972

TO: FACULTY
FROM: C. BRICE RATCHFORD, PRESIDENT

I am using this issue of the President's Bulletin to bring both returning and new faculty members up to date on the status of the University's continuing institutional reappraisal.

As many of you will recall, I announced the University's plans to undergo a thorough self-evaluation on January 15, 1971. For those of you new to the University, however, let me recap the highlights of our efforts since that time.

Background Information

Confronted with the need to find solutions to the financial problems before the University and with the need for quality and pertinence in all its programs, the institutional reappraisal was initiated in order to pinpoint major issues facing the University as well as their possible resolution. While all of the University's concerns could not be tackled, I invited the four campus chancellors, the deans of faculties, campus faculty leaders and my academic staff officers to re-examine the University in four important areas: (1) Mission (2) Program (3) Resources and (4) Organization and Governance.

The results of these discussions were summarized in Preface to Decision, which was distributed to the faculty of each campus a year ago. The purpose of this document was to establish areas of major concern to the University and from these issues select those which most urgently called for solutions.

In the early summer of 1971 I met with the University's Academic Planning Council--which includes the four campus chancellors and the vice presidents for administration, academic affairs, extension and research--to complete this task. The results of our work were submitted to the Board of Curators as an "Agenda for Action."

The agenda included 10 specific areas for study and investigation by members of the University community. However, recognizing that it was not realistic to undertake the 10 areas simultaneously, it was decided to begin work on the three areas considered to be of most crucial importance to the University's future:

- (1) Redefine the role and scope of each campus and the University-wide unit.
- (2) Begin assessment of all our academic programs to determine our strengths and weaknesses.
- (3) Develop an improved administrative structure for the University.

Evaluation Teams

As the first stage in the academic program reappraisal, last spring teams visited each of these areas: engineering, education, biological sciences, health sciences, mathematical sciences, physical

Is Your Address Right?

The University, in developing its mailing lists for this and other communications, uses the office and home addresses shown on the revised employees' Withholding Exemption Certificate (Form W-4). It is especially important that the office address list be maintained because it enables the University to avoid high U. S. Mail costs.

Please be sure that both these addresses are accurate on your Form W-4. If you have no campus address, enter "off campus" in the space provided for office addresses. Your cooperation is appreciated. Please note, however, that these mailing lists do not affect disposition of payroll checks, telephone directory entries, and other address files.

sciences, and psychology. Each team contained three to six appropriate authorities from outside the University and at least one member of each team held or recently held a significant administrative post in a major university.

Starting Sept. 3, the second series of program evaluations will begin. The schedule approved by the Academic Planning Council for evaluation of eight more academic areas follows:

<u>PROGRAM</u>	<u>DATE OF VISIT</u>	<u>REPORT DUE</u>
<u>English & Foreign Languages</u>	Sept. 3-8	Sept. 22
<u>Communication Arts-- Journalism, Speech, Radio-TV, Film</u>	Sept. 10-15	Sept. 29
<u>Social & Behavioral Sciences--Anthropology, Geography, Sociology</u>	Sept. 17-22	Oct. 6
<u>Business & Public Administration</u>	Oct. 8-13	Oct. 27
<u>Economics & Political Science</u>	Oct. 15-20	Nov. 3
<u>History & Philosophy</u>	Oct. 22-27	Nov. 10
<u>Fine Arts</u>	Oct. 29-Nov. 3	Nov. 17
<u>Music, Theatre, Art Musicology, Archeo- logy, Art History, Classical Studies</u>	Oct. 29-Nov. 3	Nov. 17

The evaluation teams were chosen by the Academic Planning Council from names of persons suggested by many quarters of the University. A Steering Committee has served as the coordinator and the main source of contact for the evaluation teams. Members of the Steering Committee are UMC Dean of Extension John F. McGowan, UMKC Provost Wesley J. Dale, UMR Dean of the Graduate School Robert H. McFarland, UMSL Interim Chancellor Everett Walters, and University Vice President for Academic Affairs Paul C. Nagel, chairman.

Before arriving at the University, each team member will have received program inventories from initial program evaluations completed during 1971-72, as well as general information about the University and its four campuses.

After its visit to the University, each team will prepare a report based on five major questions about the academic areas under study. Questions to be considered are:

1. In its present state, what appear to be the area's or program's strengths? What are the weaknesses? On which campuses are these to be found?

2. Hereafter should the University support this program or area? Among the many factors to be considered are: What is society's future interest in this program likely to be, and what are the prospective numbers of students who might wish to enroll in it?

3. What portion, if any, of the existing program should be continued? On which campuses and to what extent?

4. What portions, if any, of the existing program should be reduced or terminated? On which campuses and to what extent?

5. What new phases of this area or program should be established?

The reports, based on responses to these questions, are not for publication but are for internal working purposes. They will be distributed to campuses, and in turn to the various departments under study. Responses from the campuses will be sent within 30 days to the Academic Planning Council.

Role and Scope

After the program appraisals are completed, we will proceed immediately with the development of a final role and scope statement. We have already

prepared, with Board of Curator's approval, a background statement, entitled "The University of Missouri: Its Future." (President's Bulletin, Volume 2, Number 13; April 28, 1972.) This document is the philosophical segment of the final role and scope statement; the geographical assignment of programs has been deliberately deferred in order to take advantage of the program evaluations currently underway.

As with "The University of Missouri: Its Future," the final role and scope statement will be predicated on two fundamental assumptions: (1) the University of Missouri will be a comprehensive institution of higher learning, but no individual campus will be; and (2) each campus will have programs ranging from the freshman year to the doctorate in some areas.

MICROFILM CONSOLIDATES FOUR LIBRARY CATALOGS, TELETYPE SPEEDS INTER-CAMPUS BOOK LOANS

The University of Missouri has put into operation a microfilm card catalog system which creates one University library serving all four campuses.

Ever since the reorganization of the University to include four campuses in 1963, attempts have been made to extend the library resources of each campus to the other campuses. Through the Office of Intercampus Loan, students and faculty have been able to request their home campus library to borrow materials from the other libraries for their personal use. The daily courier service trucks, which carry all types of communications and equipment between campuses each week-day night, have made it possible to send and receive books within 24 hours. In 1970, in order to speed up communications between the campuses, teletype machines were purchased and installed in all four main libraries.

"In spite of these efforts, however," Dr. Edward Carroll, former director of libraries on the Columbia campus, said, "there has been a need for one catalog of the holdings of all four libraries. Clientele were shooting in the dark when they requested books from another library--there was no way of knowing whether or not the library actually held the needed material. Also, checking out and filling requests was a time consuming job for librarians."

It is my personal goal to have the final segment of the role and scope statement, including geographical assignment of programs, ready to be released for comment before the end of this calendar year. It is more important, however, that we be concerned with the quality of our assessments than with meeting any particular deadline.

I will use as official advisors the Intercampus Faculty Advisory Council, which consists of three elected faculty members from each campus, and a student advisory group consisting of two students from each campus. Of course, the Academic Planning Council will be my final advisors in developing a statement to go to the Board of Curators for their consideration and approval.

4 Million Cards Filmed

In 1971, Dr. Carroll presented a proposal to microfilm the main card catalogs for the four campus libraries. "It called for depositing all four microfilmed catalogs, along with reader-printers, in each library. The proposal was accepted, nearly four million cards were filmed, and the system is now in operation," he said.

This system has a number of advantages for the University, according to Dr. Carroll. "Considering the enormity of the undertaking--nearly four million cards plus four reader-printers--the initial costs and maintenance are reasonable because of the microfilming capabilities of the University Records Management Office. Also, it is possible now to avoid duplication of expensive, lesser-used materials," he said.

Another benefit of the project is that it provides an original copy of each card catalog. The original copies are stored in a vault in the Records Management Office. "In case of fire or damage to the public card catalogs, records can be reconstructed from the microfilm copies," he said.

Since the cards are all on microfilm and stored in cartridges, they occupy little space. It is less tiring to run these cartridges through a reader than to stand and go through full-size card files.

Time Saver

Dr. Carroll said the microfilmed catalogs should conserve librarian time. "The borrower can now affirm that the material he wants is held at a certain campus. He simply pushes a button on the reader-printer and the machine gives him a copy of the card with the call letters already on it. This card is then sent to the library or the call letters are transmitted via teletype. It is then a very simple matter for a clerk or student assistant to find out whether the book is available," Dr. Carroll explained. "Librarians who previously had to track down elusive references, check misspelled authors' names and verify hazy titles are now freed to do other things."

If the book is available for loan it is sent by courier service to the requesting library, which sub-loans the book to the scholar the morning after the request was made.

Mark Gromley, director of the library on the University's St. Louis campus, said the system has already been used extensively. He believes it will result in more use of other campus libraries than in the past.

Earl Randolph, director of the library on the Rolla campus, said that the microfilm card catalog has been a great help to them in cataloging new books. "If another library has already cataloged the book, we can simply record the necessary information from our microfilm copy of the card."

The new policy follows:

1. Effective immediately, any student or staff member from the University of Missouri may have access to materials in any of the four campus libraries.

2. The identification card or badge issued to a student or staff member by the University of Missouri will be honored when he wishes to borrow materials from any of the campuses.

3. All loans will be made in accordance with the library rules of the lending campus. The borrower will acquaint himself with those rules and abide by them.

4. Materials borrowed from any of the four campuses may be returned to the library of any of the other three. They will then be sent to the home library by courier. Borrowers may also return books by mail or in person.

5. Fines for overdue books and charges for lost books will be assessed according to the schedule of the lending library.

6. If a borrower fails to return an item, he will be contacted directly by the lending library. If he cannot be contacted or if he fails to respond, the information will be sent to the cashier on his home campus.

7. Each library assumes responsibility for following through on information regarding its delinquent students or staff members. Appropriate steps will be taken through the local business office to insure collection of fines or payment for lost books.