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I will begin by commenting on the Indian trip. The purpose of it was to explore the possibilities for exchange groups, both faculty and students, between the 286 institutions of the American Association of State Colleges and Universities and approximately 25 Indian universities. I was a member of one of two teams. Our team went from Delhi, over to Calcutta, to Madras, west to Bangolor and then back to Delhi. We were encouraged by the possibilities for an exchange. Our encouragement was greater at the end of our trip than it had been at the beginning. We felt that there might be some difficulties because of the American attitude toward the Bengalese situation. However, we found that no one really mentioned that while we were talking exchange. Everyone was quite polite to us and only after cocktails at night did discussions become somewhat heated although we, attempting to be American ambassadors of some skill, at least tried to talk in moderate terms.

In our report we are proposing several kinds of exchanges. There would be the usual one year exchange of professors from Indian universities to one of our campuses. There would be exchanges one term in length or semester in length for professors. There would be teams of professors coming for short periods to lecture in specialties. There would be professors from here going there. We had quite a few requests for lecturers in pedagogy. We would have student exchanges lasting in length from a term to two years, with most of them probably one year in length. We're also proposing exchanges amongst student groups in fields such as dance, music, drama and athletics. They are great lovers of Shakespeare we find out. They would like to have drama groups doing some Shakespeare over there as well as other kinds of drama. We also find there is a possibility of establishing or developing a new kind of master's degree in many fields in which a student would spend one year in the United States and
one year in India. This, of course, to be opened to both the Americans and the Indians.

There are three possible ways to finance such an exchange program. As most of you may remember, the U.S. sent millions and millions of tons of grain to India and in return the Indians are paying us back in rupees. Those rupees must be spent in India. They're called PL 480 funds and there are PL 480 funds in other currencies in other countries. Those funds at the present time are earning 5 million rupees a day in interest alone. These funds are not being spent. Our State Department has finally opened itself to suggestions and we will be making application for a sizeable amount of rupees to help finance these exchange programs. They will at least pay for the expenses in India. We are also asking the Indian universities to pay what they would pay an Indian professor to an American professor who teaches there. We are also asking some of the Indian universities to provide scholarship monies to American students as well as Indian students. American colleges and universities, on the other hand, would also provide scholarship funds and would pay, of course, for salaries of Indian professors who would come here. In some cases, they would be asked to make up the difference between an Indian salary and an American salary while an American is teaching in India.

Next week I will be going to Denver at which time we will try to sell our Association on our report and proposal. If they buy it, we will go to the State Department in our search for funds. If this program is successful, I think that Grand Valley State College should get in on the ground floor and perhaps should give some thought to developing an Eastern Studies Program to a greater degree than we have already because we may be able to get some
funds to do it.

You might ask the question why did you go to India? I suppose anyone who was called up on a Wednesday afternoon and asked if he wanted to go to India would be tempted to say yes. And I probably went because I was invited. My going also symbolizes something else I believe. It symbolizes GVSC's commitment to international studies and that's a strong commitment. It's a commitment made on several grounds, some of which I'd like to mention. First, our student body is largely a Michigan group. In that respect we are parochial, in so far as Michigan is parochial. I wouldn't say that Michigan is a backward state by any matter. Michigan has a great variety of life styles and culture styles. However, we still are one state and we are limited to a geographic area. I feel that it's in the student's best interests to have an opportunity for some education outside of the United States. I would like to make it possible for the student who is so inclined to go outside of this college, outside of the State of Michigan, for part of his education even though he remains affiliated with one of the GVSC colleges. I think that a nation that knows other nation's people will be better prepared in trade; in the use of ideas and techniques. I think one of the most important parts of the American genius has been the ability to adapt to and adopt other peoples ideas and I would like to see us continue that. The more exchange we have, the better chance we have of doing it. Finally, the chance for understanding people and the reality of understanding people perhaps will help the world to adjust to one of its new and greater problems; that is how do you handle aggression when you have such tremendous tools at your disposal to unleash it? That's not a new idea, but just because it isn't new doesn't mean that it's worn out!
At the present time, our college has programs in Britain, Latin America, France and Austria. We are planning programs in Italy, Japan and, hopefully, in India. These programs are in many fields; languages are not the only fields that are important. We are also concerned with education, art, humanities, social studies and, in some cases, even the natural sciences. I think that our commitment to international studies is an illustration of our faith in such a program when (1) money is tighter and devalued to a degree and (2) at a time when it seems to be in the U.S. popular to withdraw. It's politically popular now to withdraw. There is a kind of neo-isolationism abroad. I am proud of our Association of State Colleges and Universities as they are moving in just the opposite direction.

I'd like now to turn to the objectives set for Grand Valley State College. The first one was to establish identity for the existing two colleges - CAS and Thomas Jefferson College. We attempted to do this by appointing strong deans to both those colleges, and to develop an administrative structure within each college that was autonomous or separate from the structures of the other colleges. I would say that today these two colleges have taken on a new autonomous significance.

The second objective was to plan for a new college. Here in our midst is William James College. I am pleased and also somewhat amazed that Professor Cunningham and his task force were able to put an idea on paper and that it moved so rapidly from idea stage to implementation and the reality of the existence of William James College. It is really quite a miracle and even with the problems
any new college might have - some of which I am aware of and others that I'm sure I'm not aware of - I still think that William James College is here, that it is good that it is here, and that it will be here during the life of the Grand Valley State Colleges.

The third objective was to develop and refine a program for the disadvantaged. I think there has been some success in that. To identify the disadvantaged, and it is very difficult to do so, we've selected a family income of $6,000 or under. I'm sure that can be quarreled with, but we're using that as the guide. In 1969 we had 147 such students enrolled. In 1970 - 1971 we had 218 or a 48% increase. In 1971-1972 we have 345 enrolled or a 53% increase over the past year. In 1969-1970 the average aid was $912 per student..... today it is $1,300 per student. Of course costs have gone up, but not quite in the same proportion. The amount of the total financial aid that the college has provided, 1969-1970, was $476,000. That's state money, private money and federal money. In 1970-1971 it was $677,000.....and in 1971-1972 it's $981,000. We've also increased the staff in our disadvantaged program. We added two people last year, and again added two more this year.

The fourth objective was to establish a long range and short range planning group. Most of the effort last year went into reorganization of the colleges, a rather short range plan and immediately implemented. A task force was appointed to work out the reorganization and I think it was quite successful. A second task force was appointed to work out a planning procedure. Dr. Walkoe was appointed during the summer to initiate a long range plan and Dr. Kolenbrander, who is my assistant this year, was given the position of Director of Planning. I hope by the end of
this year we will have a document, a long range document, that will be significant and that will clarify where we are going and how fast we hope to get there. I would say in this objective four, long and short range planning has been moderately successful. Perhaps we tried to bite off more than we could chew in one year. Somethings were accomplished - not as much as we had hoped. I hope by the end of this year that that objective will be fully met.

The fifth was to improve and encourage the research climate on campus. Generally, in that respect, I would say we were not too successful if you looked at the amount of money that was expended. The administration worked hard in some areas. They did send out more information to faculty on funding available for research. We did, through the efforts of Dr. Ward primarily, receive the largest research grant in the history of the college in the Environmental Studies Institute award of $167,000. Look at the number of dollars spent on research last year - $7,500. That's not much! The year previous to that it was $21,000. If you look at those statistics I would say we were not too successful in that objective.

The sixth objective was to broaden our educational programs in areas that involve staff from all parts of GVSC. That, I think we did most significantly in our International Studies Program. This is really getting off the ground now and it involves all personnel. Off-campus study has been stepped up. The internships in business, the field study program in Thomas Jefferson College, the public service internships have all been expanded in the last year. Some of them are actually new. Finally, and perhaps most significantly, the educational television
station is underway. The concept of one was there and funds were raised and we are on our way. Last year was a year of working to raise the money and making the initial plans. This will be the year of building the station and appointing the staff. By next year we will be in operation.

The seventh objective was to find an academic vice president. We completely failed in that objective, but I don't think we failed to fulfill the function of a vice president. I must say that my philosophy of administration was altered somewhat. I felt that we had the people on our staff who could do the job. I became increasingly committed to a small central core of administrators, not a large central administration. Where administrative work needed to be done in the colleges, we should meet the need. Each college should have the administrators it needs but the central administration should not need a great increase in staff to meet an increasing enrollment. In line with changing times in higher education, I like people in central administration who are in effect coordinators and arbitrators. I like to find people who can do many different things. Who knows what kind of direction the central administration will have to give to the institution in a year from now. I like to find people in central administration who are flexible, who are not hemmed in by their titles, who can do jobs. People who, when one job is finished, can do another job. If a job isn't finished or if one man has given most of his creative energy to that job let another man come in who might have some creative ideas to take over and reassign the other individual. This, of course, can be rather difficult for a faculty member I realize. Sometimes things change rapidly and a person is doing one thing one year, and the next year doing something different. That can be confusing. Yet, despite that kind of confusion, I do think that it probably will make for more responsive, more creative administration in the long run. Next year, with the return of Mr. Loessin, who I hope by then has his PhD., we may have a full complement, including the people that are already
in central administration, in that area for the next several years.

Well, I do feel that there were some accomplishments last year as well as some failures. Much accomplishment is measured in the attitude of the members of the college community. I feel that less progress is made in a college when an adversary philosophy predominates. I am not so completely naive, psychologically, that I am unaware of man's need for some adversaries and that aggression is a real part of all of us. So when I make this statement, I'm talking about degrees. There will always be tensions; there will always be battles. Sometimes they can be helpful and healthy. I am just saying that when the psychology of the adversary relationship dominates a campus, then I think our creativity is in trouble. I believe that during the last year we saw a real willingness on the part of increased numbers of people.....both students, faculty and administrators....to really try to cooperate with one another; to try to arbitrate disputes in a mature and sensible way. Despite all the specific examples one can find to the contrary, I believe that there is a growing maturity in our college community; a health that grows out of a sense of professional accomplishment and a sense of responsibility and duty to the people with whom one comes into contact with. Though we fight our battles, and we will continue to do so, they can be fought in a field that is not devoid of mutual trust, respect and integrity. I sense that we have made some progress along these lines.

Now for the objectives of 1971-1972. First, I would like to see the development of a plan that provides education opportunities for all students who qualify for admission. Now, what does this mean? If we presuppose that the Grand Valley State Colleges will continue to grow quite rapidly according to the updated projections which call for 5,000 students next year and between 10
and 12,000 students by 1980 it also requires that enrollment projections for each of the existing colleges be set for the rest of this decade. If there should be a ceiling on each college, one should be set soon!! I am willing to hear any recommendation on the subject. The problem is particularly severe for CAS. In CAS are the School of Business and the School of Health Sciences. The enrollment demand in these two institutions may be substantial. If they are to be a part of the College of Arts and Sciences, it affects the enrollment projections of the College of Arts and Sciences. I don't think we can limit the Schools of Business and Health Science to a small enrollment. Therefore, if the College of Arts and Sciences, with two schools in them, sets an enrollment at 4,000, I can see them probably being overwhelmed by those two schools very soon. Now, what is the alternative? You can have a higher enrollment in CAS; these two schools can be separated from CAS; or two other colleges, one of Business and one of Health Science, can be established. Because of the expense in health studies, I would doubt whether the latter would be advisable. These are alternative and problems which we must face as a community. We must make our decisions and they will not be easy decisions and largely they will be decisions within the College of Arts and Sciences.

So far as Thomas Jefferson College and William James College are concerned, I don't think the problem is quite so severe yet. We must remember that the College of Arts and Sciences was the College for such a long time; they have different problems in this regard. I believe that we should establish a task force within the next few weeks to plan a new college or new colleges. I don't believe that we will need a new college by the fall of 1972, but I think perhaps
by fall of 1973 we should give serious thought to establishing a new college and therefore planning should begin. If we have a new college, what will be its philosophy? If we have two new colleges, what should be their philosophies? If CAS decides to limit its enrollment, what should we do? Should we add another institution to CAS if there continues to be a demand for that kind of education? Should we have a college without walls within the cities of Grand Rapids and Muskegon, particularly? Should we have our own community college or in essence a freshman college which would not have the admission standards as some of our other colleges? What about an educational television college? We will have ETV. How will we organize education on ETV? I'm hoping a task force will come up with some answers for us in this area.

The second objective.... I think we should make a conscious attempt to provide continuing education for people beyond the usual college age. The changes in technology, the knowledge explosion everywhere is forcing people back into the educational institutions. The stimuli with which we are bombarded in our society, I think tends to make people restless. In the 1980's there may be as many people beyond 22 years of age on the campus as there are 18 to 22 year olds. I think our major enrollment growth, if there is any in the decade of the 1980's, will come from this age group and we are prepared to meet it. I propose to appoint a task force within each college for each college to determine what role it should play in continuing education and I would like to include a member of the Student Services staff and the Admissions department as well on each of those task forces. The implication, of course, of women's liberation in such a program is evident and we may need to develop extensive child day care services which, I believe, Dr. Clock has been working on and
which I would encourage and I do hope that it can be soon rather than late.

The third objective is that I think that we must persist in our attempt to add minority people to our faculty and to increase the percentage of women on our faculty and administration. This must be done without sacrificing quality. Yet, the excuse too often used is that we can't find qualified people in these groups. First reports received from those who are in charge of recruitment for next year indicate they are finding qualified candidates from these two groups. The ideal situation will come, of course, when candidates are available and the recruitment policy will just naturally produce a balanced faculty and staff so far as race, sex and culture is concerned without having a kind of artificial quota system. I don't know any other way to do it than to emphasize the fact that our percentage of women on our faculty and staff is low (except on the secretarial staff) and that our percentage of minority people on our faculty is low. Now, if we all are conscious of that and work toward rectifying that situation, which I believe our society needs, then we shouldn't have too much trouble and we don't have to have demands and rigid guidelines. If we don't have rigid guidelines...we must still persist and we probably will have to pick some target numbers.

The next objective is that I would like to see us refine our systems of quality control and communication within each college and amongst the colleges. In some respects, this is an objective of consolidation after a year of sweeping changes. We have been moving rapidly in enrollment. We've re-organized ourselves. We are hopefully committed teachers. We have paid some attention to the quality of instructors, but I think that this would be a good year
in which to emphasize consideration of the quality of our instruction. We should probably review the methods of measurement of quality. What do we think is quality teaching? What do we as students think is quality teaching with quality instruction and how do we measure it? I would like to see each college present to me sometime during the course of this year their best thoughts on those matters. We should justify, each person should justify to himself and others, the concepts of good teaching. That doesn't necessarily mean you change them, but periodically it is for the best to justify what you're doing. I think that we should make each other justify ourselves from time to time, again in a spirit of cooperation and a spirit of trying, to improve things rather than destroy.

We should analyze the reorganization of last year to ascertain if it works. I don't think any of us want to dump the cluster college or group college idea at all. That's what we want. What about the structure; the structure for determining promotion and tenure; the structure for supervising faculty; the structure for communicating amongst the colleges; the structure that we have initiated to make decisions - are they working? What have we forgotten? What isn't doing well? These are the questions that are in my mind and I hope that you can help answer during the course of the year so that a reorganization can be readjusted. I'm not asking for sweeping changes - that's just what we've done. I'm asking for readjustment; the bugs taken out.

The next objective....I hope we can reach a decision on what we should do about graduate studies. There have been some people who have been quite eager to embark upon graduate studies. There have been others equally determined that this should remain an undergraduate college. This decision, of course,
is not ours alone to make. The State Legislature and the State Board of Education have strong feelings in these areas. But first I think, a task force should be appointed to ask the question: "Is there a need?" If there is a need, in what fields? Do we want to meet any of the existing needs if we determine there are some? If we decide we do, in what fields? If we decide that maybe it would be good for us to embark in some areas of graduate education, we must ask the question of can we prepare adequately to meet the needs in the fields we select? If we can't, let's forget it. Then finally, will the state support be forthcoming if we decide we want to go into these fields? These are not new questions on our campus. I think they are questions, at least the initial question, of whether we should be in graduate education or not. This is a question that really should be answered this year and answered not for all time, because who can answer for all time, but it should be answered for five years or perhaps more if the task force thinks so.

Next objective: We should plan for the most effective use of the educational television resource. Each college should give some thought as to how it would want to contribute to educational television. As we plan an ETV program, we must take into consideration the needs of the general public. That doesn't mean that this isn't going to be our television station and that we, as colleges, should take responsibility for using that resource and perhaps having most of the say in what happens in using the ETV as far as higher education is concerned. This year will largely be one of planning and appointments, but when we go on the air next fall, there should be a concept of how we as a college will use the media to offer higher education. There are still some political problems; problems relating to the development of a state system for educational television. As those become clarified, I will let you know. They may have some effect on us.
Next Objective: I would like to see us create a climate for personality growth. This relates a bit to what I said earlier. I think that our organization as an institution offers opportunity for creativity which can be important in the growth of human personality. We certainly aren't perfect. The fact that we have three different colleges, with three different philosophies, I believe does offer more opportunity for creativity in an undergraduate situation than many institutions in this country can provide. I believe that the student development emphasis of the Student Affairs Division is evidence of our desire to help individuals find their identity; what they like about themselves and what they don't like. Much of what we do here is aimed at helping the individual cope; cope with himself, the decisions he must make; cope with other people who directly or indirectly affect his life. Now, in this whole area of creating the climate for personality growth, I think there are some encouraging characteristics. None that we as an institution are responsible for, but ones that can help us fulfill our mission in this area as an institution. I think, for instance, there is more openness on the part of young people. There is more maturity in some areas. This may be an inadequate and homely illustration, but I'm thinking of the bomb scares we had the other day in the dormitories. That kind of pranksterism is less now than it was when I was in college. It wasn't popular when I was in college to have bomb scares, but all the other kinds of ridiculous types of pranksterism went on. There really is less of that on campus now I think than there was in the past which indicates to me a kind of maturity; a kind of readiness to deal with real problems in a serious manner. Subsequently, there is more thought given to important issues by people today in college in the average college age group. Probably the sexual attitudes of today may make for healthier sexual relationships than in
the past. I'm sure about that. I have some real questions about the sex practices of today but not being Dr. Kinsey, I'm not sure that all of my statistics and facts are correct. I think it's an important attitude. About three or four years ago I remember a blistering attack (I believe it was in Harper's or it might have been in the Atlantic) of the failure of the college community to recognize the seriousness of sexual adjustment and identity of the college age person. Perhaps we have failed in this area, but I sometimes think the general attitudes today on that score are healthier than the ones that I remember in my college days. I have some fears, however. I'm ready to admit that they're the result of my viewing from a distance the life of the younger generation without living in it.

Sometimes a healthy attitude toward materialism, which I think this generation has in general, goes too far. There is a disregard for property and a slovenliness develops. One thing again; a kind of homely illustration that may be meaningless is little things like littering, breaking chairs, cigarette butts on the floors and burned cushions. This is a kind of failure of respect for things. Sometimes this even gets carried over into a failure of respect for persons. I realize that a person is a very much more sacred object than a thing and yet people and things are attached. Some people are attached to things. There is a kind of slovenliness I think in the character of many today, based perhaps on rebellion or on individualism or whatever it is that disregards some of the strong feelings and rights of others in respect to property. I sometimes think that this is a sign of deeper lack of discipline; a discipline that may be needed if an individual is eventually to get everything together. That is at most, and at least, a personal discipline that may be necessary for
him to get along most constructively with people he must work with.

There is another thing that frightens me and that's the drug culture. I don't know all of its implications and I don't believe that many people who are involved deeply or even on the periphery do either. Certainly the laws and preachments don't do much to change it. All I can do or all any of us who are concerned can do is really mention the concern, see that the laws of the state are enforced when a violation is discovered - we all know that that is like 1/10 of 1% or less. The problem is not going to be solved that way. See, liquor my generation knows. We know much about its destructive power and we know the extent of the national problem it produces. We feel we can handle it and live with it with no long range serious consequences for society in general. We just feel more uneasy about the drugs and what they do to the personality. As I present this problem, I don't want to present it in a strongly judged mental way though I do feel a judgement against it. I present it knowing full well that there is not anything that any of us who are concerned about it can really do about it. It's just like everything that's very personal; just like everything that you do to relax or to fulfill. It's like some of us use liquor. It's personal like sex. There is really nothing that we can do and yet I would say as a 40 year old adult, I'm frightened about it. If someone, sometime, can do the research on marijuana and it can be fully proven that it's no more harmful than liquor; and that I know is the argument; let's legalize it. My mind on that subject is somewhat open. However, I am convinced from the statistics that I can find that the use of drugs is not just what this generation is going to do instead of using liquor - it just isn't in the bag that way, I don't think. So that's my fear and my concern.
This whole matter of growth of personality and these encouraging factors and these fears that I have have national implications which I wish to take a few moments to talk about. I am convinced the attitudes of the young in America are such that they can provide leadership for this nation. I think the general attitudinal thrust of the young people is correct. It can keep a nation great and we need some greatness. We need personalities to catalyze on all levels of society. For instance, the anti-war attitude of the young people has been significant in the development of our national policy and this attitude will continue to do so as they move into adulthood. But to have an anti-war attitude and yet in a very real and somewhat cynical world keep the capabilities of waging war is going to be an interesting test. The anti-materialistic attitude of many of the young is a real commentary on the over-materialistic attitude of our society from its inception. With anti-materialism will the next generation of this nation be capable of producing well and support medical facilities, education, good housing and creative leisure? Materialism and creation of wealth do, in some respects, go together. For instance, the young are not overly committed to the national - the idea of a national state. That's fine. Yet, in today's society in the world, will they be capable of being loyal to a nation because as a nation people can accomplish tasks that they would be unable to accomplish in other ways. It's these fine lines of taking the new thoughts and the new ideas and not getting carried away with them to such an extent that you lose other strengths that cannot be done by emotionally self-indulgent people and it can't be done by blown minds or disintegrated personalities. It can't be done by people who use their anger and rebellion improperly. A little anger and a little rebellion is essential.

Now I've expanded a local objective for this year into a national discussion.
But again I feel that we as one small college have a responsibility to help in the growth and development of the personalities of the people here so that we as a society, whether it's Grand Valley community, the State of Michigan, the mid-west, the United States or beyond are healthy people who can cope with this society and make it healthy.

The next objective and the last one: There are probably many more objectives, but this one I would like to tackle this year. It is the review of our whole athletic program. For several years we've been having pro and con arguments. I've heard praise of the Athletic Department, I've heard complaints about the athletic programs. I am aware that we have some people who, in what I would consider to be an old American tradition, are strong advocates of varsity athletics and others who feel that it is a waste of time and are truly devotees of Robert Hutchins, who I think is perhaps one of their great patron saints whether they know it or not. This year I would like to have a task force of students and faculty working with the Athletic Department to decide how extensive a program we want. Once a decision is made, we then have to fund what we want to adequately carry it out. The questions that will arise are: What improvement in facilities should we try for; how extensive should our intramural program be; how extensive should our varsity program be? Once we decide and say, let's finance it, how do we finance it: Private gifts - what can we count on; ticket sales - what can we count on; should there be a student fee or shouldn't there be a student fee; how much should the general fund carry? I would like some help in making these decisions and I think this is the year in which we should make a decision in that area.
In conclusion, I want to talk briefly about finance and salaries. Our budget situation this year is not critical at this particular time so far as operations are concerned. It is critical so far as capital funding is concerned. The State last year did not fund any new starts on the state college campuses. I doubt if any state college grew more than we did. So, if we're going to continue to take more students, which the State wants us to do, they have to be prepared to give us more facilities. The idea around Lansing about this college was; "well, we built them a big campus and they didn't get enough students to fill it." This is the year that that kind of idea or that image of us must change. Not all of our facilities, not all of the square feet that we have, are enclosed in quite the way we would like it. But we are not inadequate; we don't have an inadequate amount of closed space. This is not going to last very long according to our enrollment projections. We must make a big effort to get capital funds. In operating funds, one of the reasons why we are not hurting quite so much as some of the other schools is because of our enrollment growth. The State did plan for it and this has helped us. They see us as a growing, developing institution. None-the-less, they did cut, or have threatened to cut, 3% from our appropriation this year which will probably be a certainty soon. We can operate with that 3% cut without dipping into the kinds of funds we have provided for the faculty and students to conduct life on this campus as it should be or as they have planned for or as they have been given budgets for. We don't have to cut those budgets yet. We are cutting in areas of special projects - things that we would like to do. We'd like to put more money into the library, for instance, and it needs it but we are not going to be able to do that unless they restore the $140,000 cut. I'm not going to cry
wolf on budgets like many college administrators do constantly. We are not rich, we are not flush with money, but we've got enough to run a good institution. We would use more - we could always use more - but I realize that some of the special projects that people would like to embark upon to really do something creative may be limited, maybe not.

So far as faculty salaries are concerned, this is a very perplexing subject. I've been told that a few institutions in the last several weeks have gone ahead and paid their promised increases. I'd like to know that for sure. I just heard that when I came in today. If that's the case, we certainly aren't going to be the only one that doesn't do it. If, after the freeze is lifted, the inequities are not corrected, now when I talk about inequities, I'm defining them as our position vis-a-vis the other state institutions, then I will either recommend to our Board of Control that we go ahead and take our chances and make the increases or that we go to court - one or the other. That would be done at the December Board meeting of the Board of Control.

I will be very happy to have a committee of faculty members, members appointed by the All-College Senate, to advise me on this subject if they would so choose. I believe that there will be a committee of the AAUP appointed to advise the administration on faculty salary policy for the coming year and that too, I welcome. I would, as I think I've mentioned before, prefer to work closely within this faculty group regarding faculty compensation. My own view is that I would like the faculty to be compensated as high as they can be, and as much as they want. I've said to some faculty members when they asked my opinion on if they organized that I wish they would let me join them. If you do
present a demand, I'd say you can have it. Then, make sure you get it from Lansing. It's almost beyond administrative control. I do think if compensation becomes a problem in the state institutions, there has to be some other approach other than an institution by institution bargaining operation. Of course, if everyone does it, and the whole thing falls apart, I wouldn't blame the faculty for organizing at all. I would like to try another technique first. Finally, if internally we can't do it together and it becomes virtually impossible for institutions to come to an agreement between the faculty and the Board, then I would like to see all of education unite; administrators, faculty and everyone else, making a united approach to the source of funds - the legislature of the State of Michigan. That, in fact, is where is happens. I don't know what's going to come of it, but let's try to work together for awhile and see whether we can't find good solutions to the compensation situation. I think it's one of the major questions that will continually come up if the freeze is lifted. If the freeze isn't lifted, then we are going to have guidelines we'll have to follow and I'm sure we'll do our best to meet the maximum that the guidelines will allow. If the freeze is lifted, then I think that we, as a faculty and administration, should decide what percentage of the money that we get should go into faculty compensation and what percentage should go into other things. If we can decide upon that, if we can find something that we think is fair, we'll all agree to do it. Then, we'll present it to our Board.

I want to thank all of you for your cooperation in trying to make this a significant school. I suppose all of you have your ideas of where we are, how successful we've been. We're certainly not an institution of great note. I do feel that we are an institution that's making progress and making it a little differently than other schools. At a time when the economy has slowed down, when many schools
are fighting for enrollment, we have been fortunate enough to have the momentum of an increased budget and of a growing student body. At what point are we too big? I don't know. I do know that the State has determined that we should grow. I've said this before - it's repetitious - but I'll keep saying it: I think our task is to find out how we organize ourselves with a growing student body. How do we organize ourselves to keep a sense of community? How do we organize ourselves to allow students to be individuals rather than numbers? Michigan has enough great universities, so the student who likes that has the opportunity to go there. Let's continue to be something different. Even though we're required to take a lot of students, let's make sure that those students remain human beings and individuals and not caught up in an educational factory.

Thank you very much for coming and I hope you have a good year.