

UNO - FOUR YEARS AFTER MERGER

by

D. B. Varner

President, University of Nebraska

UNO LIBRARY
ARCHIVES

A statement presented to the Faculty and Staff of the
University of Nebraska at Omaha

April 13, 1972

Eppley Auditorium

We are approaching the fourth anniversary of that date when the Municipal University of Omaha became the University of Nebraska at Omaha. I was not a participant in that decision nor the events which led to the decision. Neither were many of you in this room today - perhaps most of you. Based on the observation of my 26 months, I can say with certainty that these have been hectic, eventful, and sometimes frustrating early years in this new partnership. Those experienced in this kind of undertaking assure me that such occurrences are always fraught with frustration, and this merger has suffered unusual pains because of at least two factors: (1) There was little advance planning and less general understanding prior to the merger, and (2) shortly after the merger had been achieved, one of the chief architects of the idea - Chancellor Clifford Hardin - resigned his position before he had an opportunity to provide the leadership of which he was so capable. For more than a year the leadership for the merger was, of necessity, in a tentative situation - and this, even under the most ideal arrangements, was destined to create difficulties. We must credit the talent and patience and good will of all those involved that so much was achieved during those difficult early months.

I am personally pleased to have this opportunity to meet with you today for the primary purpose of reviewing these four years. It seems appropriate to do so not

only in order to make an assessment of those first years after merger, but so that I may comment directly on some of the matters of concern to you and others on this campus about the operations of the University of Nebraska as a system. In the course of the comments I shall try to speak as candidly as I know how on some of the specific subjects which, I understand, are causes of anxiety with some on this campus.

Before turning to more specific topics, let me make two general observations. The first has to do with my personal background and experience - which relate quite directly to some of the concerns which exist on the UNO campus today.

In 1959 I moved from the stability and security of a vice presidency at Michigan State University to the chancellorship of a non-existent university on a non-existent campus. During the ensuing ten years I enjoyed the pleasures and endured the pains of creating a new institution. For better or for worse Oakland University was a satellite campus of Michigan State University - an institution with 104 years of history as a pioneer land-grant college, with a large graduate and professional school, and a distinguished football team. Michigan State University could be charged, in the judgment of many, with being paternalistic toward Oakland University. The new campus, in turn, could have been charged with brashness bordering on the bravado. No intercollegiate athletics, no fraternities or sororities - none of the usual adornments of the ivy laden campus. These views were loudly proclaimed. Oakland University sometimes assumed the posture of a precocious child in the academic community - oftentimes to the displeasure of the parent campus. For a full decade I lived in an environment of low-level hostility between sizable segments of the two campuses.

I was identified - both physically and emotionally - with the small campus, the satellite, the affiliate. You can fully appreciate the moments of anguish which were mine during those ten years.

It was from that environment that I came to my present position.

My purpose in recalling this background is to say to you very simply and very directly that I have a deeper feeling for the frustration of this campus in this system than most of you apparently believe to be possible. I have been there. I have lived through the moments of accommodation which were painfully necessary. I have wondered who really cared about the lonely satellite - who would divert attention from the admittedly pressing problems of the mother campus to those problems which were relatively just as pressing for the younger and smaller campus. They were just as real - more so because they were our problems.

In summary, I am neither unaware of your anxieties nor callous toward your genuine need for support and understanding. I came from a similar environment.

The second general observation has to do with the role and function of a system office.

Before accepting the invitation to come to my current position, I visited with some experienced and trusted friends who were serving as presidents of systems. I received a great deal of advice and warning - and it has all been borne out by my experience of 26 months. Without exception my counselors made it clear that the chief executive officer of a system will not be loved by the campus components - it simply is not in the cards. The very nature of the position makes it subject always to charges of favoritism, of arbitrary action, of meddling in campus affairs on the one hand and of

ignoring the campus on the other hand, of absentee landlordism, of duplicity, of lack of support for this or that campus, for always being at the other campuses - wherever they may be. In general, the position - by assumption - is Machiavellian in character. Let me assure you here today that those broad charges are indeed part and parcel of each campus in this system, although UNO - if my information is correct - may well be the system leader in this category at the moment. However, your lofty position is not unchallenged by the other campuses.

Like most members of the human race I would enjoy being loved by my fellow man. However, I do not have that as first on my list of personal priorities - otherwise I would not have accepted this assignment. What I do have as my highest personal priority is to do my job as President of the University of Nebraska to the very best of my ability - utilizing all the vigor and imagination and competence that I can muster and all the courage necessary. If, in the process, this earns the love and respect and admiration of my colleagues on the campuses, then that is a welcome bonus - and I shall be grateful.

What is the major role of my office? This is a fair question and I shall answer it.

My job is to provide the leadership, in every way possible, to help make the University of Nebraska - as a system - the finest educational enterprise which can be developed with the resources available.

This means that difficult decisions must be made - decisions which in many instances will be unpopular in some quarters. But at some point, at some time, by some one, those decisions must be made. That happens to be my job. With the best advice I can get, with careful consideration of the alternatives available and the

likely consequences of each of those alternatives, I shall make the decision in each case based on the single criterion of what best serves the goals of the total University and, through the University, the best interests of the State of Nebraska. From that point the matter rests with the judgment of the Board of Regents.

Enough of the general observations. Let us turn to some of the specific concerns which are of interest to you. I am told that there are deeply held feelings by many on this campus that UNO has not fared well - that it is a stepchild of the system. Other frequently reported charges are that the system office is merely an extension of the Lincoln campus - that no one there really cares about the development of UNO or about its role. I am told that in its most extreme form it is held by some that there is a kind of grand conspiracy designed to keep UNO from emerging, from developing, from becoming what it can and should become.

Let me be direct in responding to these concerns. I do so not in a spirit of defensiveness, but rather in the spirit of reviewing the facts as they exist from my vantage point. Admittedly I may view these facts with a bias. The one salient point which must be made is that neither I, nor my office, has communicated effectively with the UNO campus - and I propose that we begin today to close that communications gap. While I do not suggest that we can in this session discuss in depth all the grievances - real and imagined - which I am told currently exist on this campus, we can deal with some of the continuing and major concerns prevailing.

I. A Major Concern: The system staff is basically a UN-L staff and, therefore, has a built-in bias in favor of UN-L.

The Facts: The system staff has seven principal officers: the president, the assistant to the president for equal opportunity, the administrative assistant to the president, the executive vice president for administration, the executive vice president for academic affairs, the secretary to the Board of Regents, and the director of public affairs. These positions are currently held - or will be shortly - by these persons, listed with their previous educational affiliation:

President: D. B. Varner, Oakland University.

Assistant to the President for Equal Opportunity: Barbara Coffey,
University of Nebraska at Omaha.

Administrative Assistant to the President: Pete Boughn, University of
Nebraska Medical Center.

Executive Vice President for Administration: Howard Neville, Claremont
College.

Executive Vice President for Academic Affairs: Merk Hobson, University
of Nebraska - Lincoln.

Secretary to the Board of Regents: Ralph Bradley, University of Nebraska
at Omaha.

Director of Public Affairs: Anne Campbell, Lincoln Public Schools.

In addition to these principal officers, the Vice President for Graduate Education is Dr. Norman Cromwell from the Lincoln campus, selected by a University-Wide search committee; and Dr. G. Robert Ross, formerly from the Lincoln campus, is coordinating a special statewide project. It may be worth noting, in responding to this expressed concern, that of the six principal positions on my staff, five have been appointed during my tenure - two came from

UNO, one from the Medical Center, and two from outside the system. I believe that even the most critical observer will confess that the evidence hardly supports the charge.

It should be observed further that one of the most persistent and, in my judgment, legitimate concerns has been the physical location of the system office - located precisely where the former Chancellor of the Lincoln campus historically had his office. From my first day in this position the Regents have been dedicated to relocating this office off the Lincoln campus as soon as finances permitted. At last this is being accomplished. A new building to house the system staff and the Board of Regents is scheduled for occupancy in September of this year - off the Lincoln campus.

My Conclusion: There is no substance to the charge that the system staff is dominated by the UN-L personnel thereby carrying a built-in bias in favor of the Lincoln campus.

II. A Major Concern: All the promises - real and implied - that UNO would be substantially advantaged through the merger have proven to be empty promises.

The Facts: My response to this frequently heard assertion comes in several parts:

1) The enrollment at UNO in the last year prior to merger was 5,766 full-time equivalent students. In the fall of 1971 the enrollment was 8,750 full-time equivalent students. This represents a growth of 52% in four years.¹

2) The number of full-time equivalent faculty has grown from 267 in the fall of 1967 - the last full academic year prior to merger - to 449 in the fall of 1971, an increase of 68%.²

3) The campus contained, for all practical purposes, two buildings which were primarily academic at the time of the merger. Since the merger the Allwine Science Building has been completed, the Kayser building has been completed, a new Fine Arts building is nearing completion, funding for a new \$3.5 million classroom-office building was appropriated last week, and planning money for a major new library has been provided. There is a real possibility that this new library will be under construction within 15 months. Beyond this, \$1 million has been provided for land acquisition since the merger.

4) The student credit-hour load per full-time equivalent faculty member has moved from 348 in the fall of 1968 to 287 in the fall of 1971, a reduction of 17.5%.³ This was occurring at a time when teaching loads were increasing on the Lincoln campus and generally throughout higher education. While the student credit hour load per FTE faculty member at UNO was 287 in 1971, the comparable figure for UN-L was 253. As you know, the substantial graduate and professional programs at UN-L require a heavier input of teaching resources. It is quite clear that this teaching load will be reduced again in the fall of 1972 on the UNO campus, while it will grow again on the Lincoln campus.

5) A final bit of data on this subject. In the fall of 1967 the budget available in support of each full-time equivalent student was \$1,023 - the operating budget from all sources for education and general operating expenses. In the fall of 1972 this same figure will grow to \$1,347 per full-time equivalent student - an increase of 32% over the five-year period.⁴

My conclusion: Contrary to the suggestion that UNO has not benefited from the merger, this campus has achieved dramatic improvements in the level of support provided during those five years. This is all the more noteworthy when we

recognize that this was a period of relative austerity in higher education, both in Nebraska and nationally. Let me be sure that this conclusion is not misunderstood. There is no implied notion from my standpoint that UNO is adequately funded. My point is simply that progress has indeed been substantial during these years of merger.

III. A Major Concern: UNO is relatively disadvantaged by the system office when the budget requests are submitted and, hence, when they are finalized.

The Facts: The system office recommended to the Board of Regents in September, 1971, that a special operating budget supplement of \$100 per full-time equivalent student be recommended for UNO in an effort to improve the relative budget position of UNO. The Board unanimously approved this recommendation. It should be noted that this recommendation originated in the system office - not on the UNO campus. The final operating budget request approved by the Board of Regents called for an increase in general fund appropriations for UNO of 34.3%, while the increase requested for UN-L was 8.8%.⁵ I am persuaded that reasonable and informed people would agree that this did not represent budgetary discrimination against UNO.

The final action of the Legislature, after considering Governor Exon's recommendation, was reasonably parallel to the Regents' recommendation. It deviated only in further widening the gap between the increase for UNO compared to the increase for UN-L. The final figure gave a general fund increase of 31.4% for UNO compared to 3.5% for the Lincoln campus.⁶

The current appropriation comparison may be put another way. When consideration is given to new dollars appropriated for general operating purposes,

UNO received an increase of \$796,753, about ten times as great as UN-L's \$80,110.⁷

My Conclusion: The allegation that the system office is unconcerned about the relative budgetary support for UNO, or that UNO is chronically disadvantaged in budget treatment, or that the UNO budget "is made in Lincoln, therefore naturally short-changed," simply has no basis in fact. Those who persist in these charges are either uninformed or deliberately building a divisive issue. The real tragedy is that these persons have not bothered to examine the facts.

IV. A Major Concern: The UNO faculty is substantially disadvantaged in terms of compensation when compared with the UN-L faculty.

The Facts: From my earliest days in this position I have stated repeatedly that as a matter of policy the faculty of the University of Nebraska at Omaha should be paid salaries as nearly comparable to those paid at the Lincoln campus as possible, taking into account the qualifications, the experience, and the responsibilities of the persons involved. In the spirit of furthering this objective, I appointed an inter-campus committee to study the comparability of faculty salaries. This committee was established last May and has worked with some diligence to bring to me the best possible data on the inequities which currently exist. This campus was represented on the committee by Professor Camp in political science, Professor Hess in sociology, Professor Lane in English, and Professor Prestwich in marketing. The Lincoln campus representatives were Professor Dudek in psychology, Professor Gradwohl in law, Professor Roesler in economics, and Professor Voss in home economics. Vice President Neville

served as committee chairman.

The committee submitted its report to the Board of Regents last Saturday and I suspect most of you here are generally familiar with the findings. According to their report they confined their comparability measures to 1) the level of formal education (terminal vs. non-terminal degree) and 2) the number of years of full-time collegiate teaching experience. The raw data used in the study was verified by the deans of the appropriate colleges on the two campuses. The study was limited to those three colleges on each campus where there is direct comparability: the Colleges of Arts and Sciences, the Colleges of Business Administration, and the Colleges of Education. In order to simplify the comparison, any added responsibilities because of graduate level instruction were ignored. Admittedly these broad measures of comparability were somewhat crude, but the committee felt they were workable.

The committee submitted five findings, but the crucial part of the report is contained in Finding No. 1:

"1. There is no compelling evidence that there is a consistent pattern of salary differentials favoring either UNO or UN-L over the other campus. Rather, the study revealed a number of differentials, some of which favor segments of faculty on each campus. Further, the study indicated that within each campus there exist unexplained salary differentials between segments of the faculty."

This statement came as a surprise to me, as I suspect it did to you. I had concluded, based strictly on superficial evidence and rumors, that there was a fairly substantial salary differential between the two campuses. The

report points out that the Lincoln campus tends to be advantaged salarywise at the higher ranks and the Omaha campus advantaged at the lower ranks. Based on the framework used in this study where a position-by-position comparison of the full-time, 9-month faculty involved in these three colleges was used, it would require no more than \$20,000 to correct those inequities uncovered by this committee in the three colleges combined. It is interesting to observe also that this study covered approximately 84% of the total UNO full-time 9-month faculty and approximately 69% of the total UN-L 9-month full-time faculty.

The study does underscore the fact that there are intra-campus inequities but this comes as news to no one in the academic community here or elsewhere, and these inequities are a matter of local campus consideration.

My Conclusion: Based on the results of the study of this intercampus faculty committee, I can only conclude that the frequently stated and emotionally charged issue of gross inequities in salary treatment between the two faculties is not founded in fact. It would be my hope that each member of this faculty would secure a copy of the committee report and study it in some detail. I am quite certain that many members of the faculties both here and at Lincoln will quarrel with the methodology used in this study and with some of the definitions of terms. Even so, the plain and hard truth, based on the best evidence available, tells us in the words of the committee report that "there is no compelling evidence that there is a consistent pattern of salary differentials favoring either UNO or UN-L over the other campus."

- V. A Major Concern: The reorganization of the College of Engineering is but a forerunner of additional "stepchild" relationships between the Omaha and the Lincoln campuses.

The Facts: In order to intelligently discuss the reorganization of the College of Engineering, it is necessary to consider the context in which this decision has been made.

Let me remind you that my office has the responsibility for coordination where such coordination holds promise for improving the educational program, and that my office has the responsibility for making broad policy decisions which affect the educational well-being of the entire University. We are a new system and, as I indicated earlier, a system established with a minimum of pre-planning. In establishing this system the hope was that it would permit a more efficient and effective allocation of those resources available to serve the educational needs of Nebraska. It was in the light of this overriding responsibility that I spent the first 18 months trying to get some sense of program identification and organization. After this overview it was my conclusion that the University can serve its purposes more effectively by making certain program adjustments.

In October of last year I asked the Regents to authorize my office to take a look at four specific programs with the view of some rearrangement of administrative alignments and, in some cases, physical locations. The first of these was the Graduate School of Social Work, which has historically been an integral part of the Lincoln campus. With the merger in effect and with the Omaha campus clearly designated as the urban campus of the System, it seemed only

logical that the Graduate School of Social Work have this campus as its base of operations rather than the Lincoln campus. It was my recommendation that we physically move and administratively reassign the Graduate School of Social Work to the UNO campus. This decision was made, although it required a great show of educational statesmanship on the part of the faculty, the students, and the Director of that School to accept the decision gracefully. They agreed because it made better educational sense. That decision is now finalized. The Graduate School of Social Work will be a part of the University of Nebraska at Omaha.

A second area which called for another look was the School of Nursing which operates exclusively at the University of Nebraska Medical Center. Because there is a shortage of trained nurses and because there is a promising source of talent in the collegiate population, I proposed that we consider an extension of the nursing education program to the Lincoln campus with the hope that the clinical facilities of the several Lincoln hospitals could reinforce the the academic programs available on the campus. It was my recommendation that this extension of the program be offered at the earliest possible date but with the clear understanding that the Lincoln-based program would be administratively responsible to the Dean of Nursing on the Medical Center campus and would be considered a part of a unified School of Nursing of the University of Nebraska. This recommendation has been approved. The decision has been finalized, and the plans are under way.

The third area to be studied was the program in pharmacy, again historically located on the Lincoln campus. It was my judgment that pharmacy

is an integral part of the health care profession and that it made good sense to have the College of Pharmacy physically and administratively identified with the program in human medicine. It was my recommendation that this program be physically and administratively moved from the Lincoln campus and assigned to the Medical Center. This location was approved, the action was finalized, and the physical move will begin this fall. This decision was not viewed with cries of joy from either the faculty or the students in the pharmacy program, but they, too, accepted the decision gracefully because they believed it to be consistent with our efforts to allocate our resources wisely.

This brings us to the College of Engineering at UNO. There is much history which some of you know and which I shall not retrace today. I shall simply point out that the program in engineering education on the Lincoln campus, while substantial in size and in history, is still far from distinguished. The engineering program at UNO in its entirety has averaged fewer than 40 graduates annually over the course of the past five years. There are currently 14 full-time faculty members in the UNO College of Engineering, excluding the Engineering Technology program. None of the engineering programs at UNO are accredited.

From where I viewed the situation in engineering education within the System, these facts seemed clear:

1. The engineering education responsibility in this State falls to the University of Nebraska.
2. We do not now have even one distinguished program in engineering education.

3. The people of Nebraska will not support and probably should not support two major colleges of engineering.

4. Engineering enrollments are declining nationally, which strongly suggests that we should exercise a good deal of care to avoid overcommitting our internal resources to programs in engineering which are costly and for which there may not be sufficient student demand. These are dollars which could be available to strengthen other programs.

In view of these factors, and in keeping with my responsibility to make each dollar available work to its maximum, I recommended after a series of consultations with Dean Dennehy, Chancellor Blackwell and Dean Gaines from UNO, and Chancellor Magrath and Dean Hanna from UN-L that the two programs in engineering be consolidated administratively into a single College of Engineering located at Lincoln but serving both campuses, both communities, and the State. We have made it clear then, as we do now, that no student currently enrolled shall be disadvantaged. We have made it clear that no faculty member will be asked to physically move from Omaha to Lincoln. We have emphasized that a quality engineering education opportunity must be provided for students attending the Omaha campus. We have repeatedly underscored the fact that graduate engineering programs should be made available on this campus by the combined faculty to meet the engineering needs of this Greater Omaha community.

This recommendation has been approved and finalized, and we are moving toward its implementation.

Finally, let me point out that there has been no thought given to any further such consolidations or reassignments and none are under consideration.

My Conclusion: The decisions made in each of these four cases were made for sound educational and economic reasons. I am in total support of each of them even though in each case there was a notable lack of enthusiasm on the part of the persons involved in the programs. This is both understandable and inevitable, but again my responsibility is to recommend those actions which appear to be in the best interests of the students, the University, and the State of Nebraska. This I did and this I shall continue to do.

I have observed, interestingly, that the anguish expressed on the Omaha campus is at least matched on the Lincoln campus. There are recurrent rumors that the next programs to be moved from Lincoln to Omaha are Law and Dentistry. These rumors are totally unfounded, as are the rumors on this campus that Business Administration and Education are next in line for consolidation. While these kinds of rumors are great fun at cocktail parties, they have no basis in fact and I think it is fair to say that they contribute little to the growth and development of the University of Nebraska.

VI. A Major Concern: The Search Committee for the Chancellor of this campus was somehow controlled and manipulated by the System office.

The Facts: I am sure you know that for a combination of reasons we have faced the necessity in the past twelve months of seeking new Chancellors on each of the three campuses. In each case we established a search committee based on generally accepted procedures and in each case we have followed to the best of

our ability the recommendations made by these committees. You might be interested to know that the procedure followed has been essentially identical on each of the campuses.

The committee on the Lincoln campus consisted of five members of the faculty designated by the faculty itself, three members of the student body designated by the student government, three members of the administrative staff designated by the Council of Deans, a representative from the System office designated by the President, a representative of the Alumni Association, and a representative of the UNO and Medical Center campuses designated by those campuses.

The Medical Center committee consisted of five members of the faculty, two members of the staff, two private practitioners (the President of the Douglas County Medical Society and the President of the Nebraska State Medical Association), a student, a representative of the System office, and representatives from the Omaha and Lincoln campuses.

The committee at UNO was composed of five faculty members chosen by the faculty, three students chosen by the student government, three staff members designated by the Council of Deans and the Acting Chancellor, a representative of the System office, a representative of the alumni, a representative of the Regents Study Commission, and representatives from the Medical Center and the Lincoln campus.

The instructions to each committee were essentially the same. They were asked to submit no fewer than five nor more than ten names to the Board of Regents, names representing the most able persons whom they believed

might be available for the position. They were each advised of the procedure established by the Board of Regents some time ago that it would be preferred that the committees not engage in personal interviews. It is the judgment of the Board that interviews in many cases cause a likely prospect to withdraw rather than run the risk of personal embarrassment. Each committee was instructed that its function would be concluded when it submitted the list of nominees - the Board of Regents would make the determination from the list submitted. Further, each committee was given my personal assurance that if for any reason the choice could not be made from the list submitted, I would urge the Regents to return to the committee and ask for a supplemental list. This procedure has been followed with no exceptions.

One may argue, as many have, with the procedure adopted by the Board of Regents. There are obviously other methods followed by other universities. Yet this is a prerogative reserved for the Board of Regents and it is the judgment of the Board that this procedure has been effective for this institution - a judgment with which I concur. The procedure followed at UNO was in no way different from the procedure followed on the other campuses. From the first list submitted, three nominees seemed to have the qualities which all of us were seeking. In order, each of the three declined to give consideration to the position. It was the Regents' judgment and one which I shared, that we should ask the committee to reconvene and submit additional names. In response to a direct question from a member of the committee I did, for the first time in any of the three search procedures, offer the names of two possible candidates - one in Wisconsin and one in California. I did so reluctantly and

tried to make it clear that neither of those persons was a personal candidate. In fact, I had never met either of the gentlemen. I was simply passing on recommendations from persons whose judgment I trust. In making those suggestions I pointed out that there was a growing sense of urgency about getting this position filled since the budget-making season was approaching rapidly and since three of the six deanships were interim appointments.

I believe that most reasonable people would have shared my personal resentment at the rather strong implication from some members of the committee that I was trying to push a personal candidate on the committee - trying to manipulate the procedure. That allegation was unfounded, untrue, and unfair. The committee proceeded with its work and submitted an additional eight names, none of whom were suggested by me.

As you know, Dr. Ronald W. Roskens, Executive Vice President of Kent State University, was approved by the Board of Regents as the new Chancellor. For your information let me point out that none of the eight candidates on the list submitted received more votes than did Dr. Roskens, according to the report by Professor Camp. He seemed to be quite universally acceptable to the members of the committee based on the evidence which they were able to acquire. My own inquiries substantiated the judgment of the committee and I recommended Dr. Roskens to the Board of Regents. After a personal visit with the full Board, the Regents unanimously concurred. The position was offered to no other nominee. He was the first choice of those available from my standpoint and from the standpoint of the Board of Regents, and I am personally delighted that he had accepted the Chancellorship.

My Conclusions: The unfortunate and unhappy rumors about manipulation of the Search Committee for the UNO Chancellor simply are not true. The committee may not agree with the general guidelines established for their operation, but it must be recognized that the guidelines for the UNO Search Committee were the same as those prescribed for the Medical Center and the Lincoln Campus Search Committees. I do believe they are workable and that they have worked.

In this very candid and straightforward statement to you today I have attempted to do what perhaps should have been done months ago. I have tried to lay before you as honestly as I know how specific answers to specific rumors which have from time to time been brought to my attention. I am sure that others need to be addressed and they will be in the days and weeks which follow. I am equally sure that many answers are not satisfactory to some of you in this room. Yet these are the answers as I believe them to be. I have confidence in the fundamental fairness and integrity of the great majority of those of you assembled, and I urge you to work as diligently as have I to uncover the truth in response to rumor.

The record is abundantly clear that this campus, far from being neglected and ignored by the System office, has indeed fared extraordinarily well in the course of these past two years. I do not believe there is any evidence which any of you in this room can submit to substantiate the explicit or implicit allegation that UNO has been deliberately disadvantaged in its treatment - budgetary or otherwise.

I have elected to make this direct commentary on the concerns prevailing on this campus for two reasons.

First, it is imperative that facts be the basis for judgments rather than emotion and rumor.

Second, I am convinced that UNO is now poised for a major period of development as an urban university. On more occasions than I would want to recount, both within this State and outside this State, I have contended that the Omaha campus has an extraordinary opportunity to emerge as a model urban university.

The timing is right, the setting is right, and now with the relative budgetary advantage which UNO enjoys, we have an opportunity to move boldly to a new plateau of achievement on this campus.

There are many excellent teachers and scholars on this faculty. I have been especially impressed with the enthusiasm and the imagination and the quality of many of the young faculty members who have been assembled during these past two or three years.

The physical facilities are unfolding to permit breathing room for both man and vehicle.

I am totally convinced that the leadership in the Omaha community stands ready to be mobilized in support of this new era at UNO. There is growing evidence of a readiness to join hands in building distinction on this campus. The report of the Regents Commission involving more than 100 leading citizens of the community serves as evidence of the eagerness to help in the joining of the University and its constituency.

The five-year plan, even in its approximate form, points out some exciting areas for growth and development on this campus and it is my hope that you are

approaching with enthusiasm and imagination the refinement of this first approximation.

Beyond all these factors which point to a new era at UNO, let me underscore my personal enthusiasm for your new Chancellor. I did not know him until your committee came up with his name. I have made it my business to learn a great deal about him in these past few weeks. The qualities which stand out above all others, in my judgment, are that Ron Roskens brings to this campus a surprisingly broad base of administrative experience, a keen understanding of scholarship and of the educational process, a love for this part of the world, a professionalism which will serve the University well, and a lovely and gracious wife. Equally important are the personal qualities belonging to the man. From every bit of evidence I have been able to acquire - and this has been reinforced from numerous sources - he brings those invaluable and crucial qualities of enthusiasm, energy, imagination, courage, integrity, and aggressiveness. He knows what a university is about. He knows quality. He has been through a baptism under fire in terms of administrative frustrations and complications. He is extraordinarily experienced for his 39 years. I commend the committee for its having discovered Ron Roskens. I give you my unqualified commitment that he comes with my full confidence and my full support.

The mission which you face and I face - and the mission which Chancellor Roskens faces - is not to be concerned with the real or imagined grievances of yesterday, but rather to recognize the opportunity which is ours today, and to harness the unique potential belonging to this University in this community at this moment in history. To do this will require the best and most productive attitudes

and efforts of those able professionals on this faculty and staff. It is to this objective that Ronald Roskens has made a personal commitment, and it is this objective that I personally, publicly, and enthusiastically endorse.

I urge you - each of you - to join in this promising new era - this new beginning - for the University of Nebraska at Omaha. It promises great excitement.

FOOTNOTES

¹ Municipal University of Omaha, Enrollment Statistics First Semester 1967-68 As of September 25, 1967; and University of Nebraska at Omaha, Enrollment Statistics First Semester 1971-72 As of September 27, 1971. For both terms, full-time equivalent student is defined as either 15 undergraduate student credit hours or 12 graduate student credit hours.

² Data obtained from 1967-68 Municipal University of Omaha Budget, and 1971-72 University of Nebraska at Omaha Budget as revised. Full-time equivalent faculty is the sum of FTE, of those with academic rank or graduate assistant appointment, budgeted in teaching departments.

³ The student credit-hour load per full-time equivalent faculty member is simply total SCH for the fall term divided by budgeted faculty:

<u>Fall</u>	<u>Fall</u> <u>SCH</u>	<u>Fall Budgeted</u> <u>FTE Faculty</u>	<u>SCH Per</u> <u>FTE Faculty</u>
1968	109,439	314.68	347.8
1971	129,137	449.08	287.6

⁴ See Table: REGULAR SESSIONS EDUCATION AND GENERAL OPERATING EXPENDITURES OR BUDGET, UNO: 1967-68 and 1972-73^a

<u>Year</u>	<u>Expenditures</u> <u>or Budget</u>	<u>Fall FTE</u> <u>Students</u>	<u>Expenditures or</u> <u>Budget Per FTE Student</u>
1967-68	\$ 5,896,386 ^b	5,766	\$1,023
1972-73	12,224,008	9,074 ^c	1,347

^a "Regular Sessions Education and General Operating Expenditures or Budget" is defined as all Education and General programs minus the following: Extension and Public Service, Summer Sessions, Computer Center, Data Processing, Public Accounting Audit, and Special Legal Fees. The deletion of the latter four accounts in 1967-68 was necessary to allow comparison to 1972-73 where these activities were appropriated to University-Wide.

^b The 1967-68 OU fiscal year was only ten months due to entry into the University of Nebraska on July 1, 1968. Thus, the ten-month 1967-68 data have been capitalized by 0.833.

^c Estimated for Fall 1972.

Footnotes (continued)

⁵Final budget request for General Fund operating appropriations, for UNO and UN-L, for the 1972-73 fiscal year, compared to actual 1971-72 appropriations, was:

	<u>1971-72</u>	<u>1972-73</u>
UNO	\$ 5,449,376	\$ 7,319,713
UN-L ^a	28,271,089	30,760,675

^aThe UN-L data includes all programs in the UN-L organizational structure.

⁶Final appropriations from LB 1476, and the actual 1971-72 data, were:

	<u>1971-72</u>	<u>1972-73</u>
UNO	\$ 4,899,538	\$ 6,439,661
UN-L	27,033,253	27,984,922

NOTE: Computer Services, Legal Fees, and Public Accounting Audit were deducted from the 1971-72 data to make the comparison to actual 1972-73 appropriations.

⁷"New dollars" are available after formula continuation budget requirements are met. The UN-L data include all operations except the University of Nebraska School of Technical Agriculture (Curtis). The formula continuation requirements were:
 For Personal Services, 2-1/2% of the 1971-72 salary base, plus \$200 per 1.00 FTE, the total not to exceed \$600 for any one position on a 1.00 FTE basis
 For Nonpersonal Services, 3-1/2% of the 1971-72 base