

PLACE IN RETURN BOX to remove this checkout from your record.

TO AVOID FINES return on or before date due.

MAY BE RECALLED with earlier due date if requested.

DATE DUE	DATE DUE	DATE DUE
SEP 27 2006 AUG 06 2007		

Copyright by
JEFFERY ROTH FRUMKIN
1983

A STUDY OF THE DEVELOPMENT OF THE
STRUCTURE OF FACULTY PARTICIPATION
IN UNIVERSITY-LEVEL GOVERNANCE
AT MICHIGAN STATE UNIVERSITY

By

Jeffery Roth Frumkin

A DISSERTATION

Submitted to
Michigan State University
in partial fulfillment of the requirements
for the degree of

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

Department of College
and University Administration

1983

ABSTRACT

A STUDY OF THE DEVELOPMENT OF THE STRUCTURE OF FACULTY PARTICIPATION IN UNIVERSITY-LEVEL GOVERNANCE AT MICHIGAN STATE UNIVERSITY

By

Jeffery Roth Frumkin

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this study was to chronicle the development of the structure of faculty participation in university-level decision-making at Michigan State University. From this chronicling there developed a history of the structure of decision-making at the University and a guidepost to examine current and future governance structures.

Methodology

The researcher examined the Minutes of the Academic Senate, Academic Council and other documents from the period 1949 to 1977. In addition, open-ended interviews were conducted with 16 individuals identified as participants during this period. The list of interviewees includes three former Presidents.

Organization of the Study

The study is divided into eight chapters. Chapter 1 identifies and describes the area of study, the methodology, organization, limitations and definition of terms. Chapters 2 through 7 examines each of the six documents that identify the structure of faculty participation, beginning with 1955, and the five revision documents of 1961, 1968, 1971, 1975, and 1977. Each Chapter includes an analysis of the revision process and the events which impacted on the process. Chapter 8 presents a summary of the findings, the researcher's observations and recommendations for further study.

Findings

The first codified faculty organization at Michigan State University was established in 1955. This document (Bylaws) was revised in 1961, 1968, 1971, 1975, and 1977. Each revision, up to 1975, reflected an increase in the scope of faculty in the decision-making process. The 1975 revision marked a systemic change in the structure which decreased the number of participants and set limitations as to the scope of governance. The revisions that occurred between 1955 and 1971 were due the growth of the institution and the need of the faculty to be recognized as a distinct constituency. The 1971 revision reflected this faculty constituency need and recognition of the student constituency.

The five structural changes to the Bylaws did not

necessarily influence the decision-making process. What became apparent is that constituent participation needs are not necessarily satisfied by structure alone. The focus for current and future participants should not be on structure. Instead, the focus should be on the process of consensus building.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The author wishes to express his appreciation to the following individuals:

First, to Eldon R. Nonnamaker, my advisor and Committee Chairperson, whose guidance, not only in the development of this dissertation, but in my development as a professional and a human being cannot be measured. He has been both a teacher and a friend.

In this same regard, Louis F. Hekhuis, Committee Member, employer and friend, has contributed immeasurably to this study. He has also been instrumental in helping me recognize and develop the potentials that I have as a person. To no lesser extent, Richard Featherstone and Daniel Kruger, Committee Members and teachers, helped me to recognize what professionalism means, and would not let me produce at any level less than that of a professional.

Next, I wish to express my gratitude to the staff of the Archives at Michigan State University. Dr. Fredrick Honhart, Mr. Richard Harms and Ms. Mary Patten were instrumental in providing me with the primary source material upon

which this study is based. They also established an atmosphere within the Archives that enhances the researcher's desire to investigate an area to its fullest extent. In addition, I would like to acknowledge the skill and patience of Ms. Ruth Beechum. Ruth word processed this study and was always available and very helpful when additions and corrections became necessary.

I also wish to extend my deepest appreciation to my parents, in-laws, family and friends who understood the sacrifices I had to make and who made sacrifices themselves to accommodate my needs. In this vein, I must single out Ken Ebert, fellow doctoral candidate and friend, whose encouragement, empathy and sympathetic ear were invaluable.

And, of course, Mary, my wife. Her love, faith and tolerance was unshakable during this process. And, all three of these attributes were tested. She has been, and continues to be, the most important person in my life, and my best friend. To her I dedicate this dissertation, a labor of love to my love.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER	PAGE
1. INTRODUCTION	1
Introduction and Background	1
Statement of the Problem	7
Purpose of the Study	8
Importance of the Study	10
Methodology	11
Organization of the Study	13
Limitations	14
Definition of Terms	15
Notes	18
2. DEVELOPMENT OF THE FACULTY ORGANIZATION, 1955	20
Overview and Background	20
Structural Analysis	23
Article I: Composition of the Faculty	23
Article II: College Faculties	24
Article III: The Assembly	24
Article IV: The Academic Senate	25
Article V: The Academic Council	27
Analysis of Events	29
Notes	40
3. DEVELOPMENT OF "BYLAWS, 1961"	42
Overview and Background	42
Structural Analysis	46
Article I: Composition of the Faculty	46
Articles II and III: Department Organization	48
Article IV: College Organization	50
Article V: University Faculty Organization	52
Academic Council	52
Academic Senate	56
Committee Structure	58
Analysis of Events	63
Notes	76

CHAPTER	PAGE
4. DEVELOPMENT OF "BYLAWS, 1968"	80
Overview and Background	80
Structural Analysis	86
Article 1: The Faculty	86
Article 2: Department and School Organization	88
Article 3: College Organization	90
Article 4: University Organization	91
The President	91
Principal University Academic Officers	92
Academic Senate	93
Academic Council	94
Steering Committee	97
Committee on Committees	97
Article 5: Standing Committees	98
Articles 6 and 7: Other Committees	99
Article 8: Administrative Support	99
Article 9: Interpretation and Amendment	100
Analysis of Revision Process	101
Article 1	103
Articles 2 and 3	104
Article 4	104
Senate Rejection	105
Faculty Affairs Report	106
Council Debate	107
Analysis of Events	111
Notes	114
5. DEVELOPMENT OF "BYLAWS, 1971"	119
Overview and Background	119
Structural Analysis	128
Article 1: The Faculty	128
Articles 2 and 3: Department and School Organization/College Organization	129
Article 4: University Organization	131
Student Representation	132
Other Changes	134
Article 5: Standing Committees	135
Analysis of the Revision Reports	140
The Massey Report	141
The McKee Report	147
The Killingsworth Memorandum	154
Senate Rejection	160
The Taylor Report	161
Analysis of Events	166
Notes	170

CHAPTER	PAGE
6. DEVELOPMENT OF "BYLAWS, 1975"	176
Overview and Background	176
Analysis of the Ad Hoc Report and Bylaw Revision	183
The Manderscheid Report (Principles)	183
The Manderscheid Report (Recommendations)	190
Article 1: Definitions	198
Article 2: Governance in Schools, Colleges and Other Units	200
Article 3: University Academic Governance	201
Article 4: Standing Committees	204
Article 5: Other Committees	207
Analysis of Events	208
Notes	213
7. DEVELOPMENT OF "BYLAWS, 1978"	218
Overview and Background	218
Structural Analysis	224
UCAG Proposals	225
Student Council Proposals	226
Steering Committee Proposal	228
Analysis of Events	230
Notes	234
8. SUMMARY, OBSERVATIONS, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS	236
Summary	236
Observations and Conclusions	263
Recommendations	272
Notes	275
APPENDICES	
Appendix	
A. List of Interviewees and Topics of Discussion	276
B. Divisional Faculties, October 24, 1949	280
C. Statement to the MSU Academic Community, November 30, 1982	282
BIBLIOGRAPHY	283

LIST OF TABLES

TABLE		PAGE
1.	1941 College-level Governance Structure	238
2.	1950 College-level Governance Structure	240
3.	1956 University-level Governance Structure	244
4.	1961 University-level Governance Structure	247
5.	1968 University-level Governance Structure	251
6.	1971 University-level Governance Structure	256
7.	1977 University-level Governance Structure	261

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

Introduction and Background

The major task facing many, if not most, of the institutions of higher education in the United States today is the management of the institution in an era of financial recession. This situation has been labeled a "crisis" by many professionals in higher education.

John Millett, former President of Miami of Ohio University and presently with the Academy for Educational Development, Washington, D.C., wrote the following in 1978:

As of 1977-78 higher education in the United States has entered a period of profound crisis. There is reason to believe that at a minimum this period of crisis will extend throughout the decade of the 1980's, and one of the major issues of this unhappy era will be whether or not academic institutions will prove to be manageable under circumstances requiring substantial change in accustomed attitudes and modes of behavior.

The "crisis" being described by Millett first seemed to appear during the economic recession of 1973-74 that was caused in large measure by the oil embargo and its resultant "energy crisis". The economic turmoil of the 1970's,

coupled with the campus activism of the late 1960's and early 1970's, led to a general decline in the prestige that higher education had gained during the past fifty years.

Millett, in his article "Management of Academic Institutions in a Period of Change" (1978), gives the following broad-stroke overview to the evolution of higher education in the twentieth century:

...(there have been) four major discontinuities in American society in relation to higher education (in the 20th century). The first discontinuity occurred in October, 1929 when the Great Depression began...For some thirty years preceding 1929 there had been a steady but unspectacular expansion in higher education enrollment and in the development of graduate and professional education. Suddenly, in the decade of the 1930's the idea of a Brain Trust was born...Higher education gained a new stature in American society.²

The second period of discontinuity began with the advent of World War II in September, 1939... American Higher Education went to war: Went to war to help educate and train officers for the armed forces, (etc.)...For its wartime contribution, American higher education achieved a new peak in national prestige and national attention.³

The years from 1945 to 1973 marked yet another period of social discontinuity: years of almost uninterrupted economic growth of substantial proportions...years when America made new commitments to higher education...years when higher education was barely able to meet the demands for educational talent in a rapidly changing labor market.⁴

Since 1973 we have embarked upon a new period of discontinuity...costs of energy resources and of raw materials...protect our national environment...disgrace of Watergate...the end of a strong labor market demand for educated talent...⁵

As higher education expanded and grew in the first half of the twentieth century, the relationship between administration and faculty became more formalized. As described by Frederick Rudolph (1962), the nature of the American college and university had changed:

In responding to the problems of growth, the colleges and universities themselves were introducing new agencies of standardization. One of these was the whole apparatus that came to be known almost everywhere by the loose term 'the administration'. The growth of administration, the proliferation of administrators, was a response to enrollment increase and to demands for new services. It was a response also to the need to free research-minded scholars from the detailed but necessary work that went into management of an organized institution.⁶

During the post World War II era faculty found themselves interacting with the "administration" on a variety of levels. There was the Department Head, the Dean of the College, the Academic Vice President or Provost, the Registrar, the Dean of Admissions, etc. Decision-making in the institution had become compartmentalized and bureaucratized. As described by Professor Walter Adams, former President of Michigan State University (1969) and former President of the American Association of University Professors (1972), faculty believed that there had been a great loss of power by the faculty in institutional decision-making.

National organizations developed "positions" and "statements" in regard to faculty participation in institutional governance. In 1966, the American Association of University

Professors, passed its "Statement on Government and Colleges and Universities".⁷ In 1967, the American Association of Higher Education developed its "Faculty Participation in Academic Governance" statement.⁸ By the mid-1960's it had become clear that faculty expected to play a major role in the decision-making processes at American colleges and universities. During the decades of the 1950's, 1960's and 1970's, most institutions developed some type of formalized structure for faculty participation in institutional governance. These structures appear to be as varied and unique as the institution itself that developed them.

Henry L. Mason, Chairperson, Department of Political Science, Tulane University, developed a "Handbook of Principle and Practice" for institutional faculty governance structures.⁹ This handbook was designed to act as a reference point and/or guidepost for the development of faculty participation structures. On the subject of institutional diversity, Mason quotes Nicholas J. Demerith's work "Power, Presidents and Professors" (1967):

...there is no single or unique answer to the problems of appropriate faculty-administration relationships. There can be no prototype because the human elements cannot be equated from campus to campus. The size of the institution, the research emphasis, traditions and charter restrictions are further variables which oppose conformity.¹⁰

Millett takes the position that new demands are being placed on higher education administrators and that decision-making

structures are necessarily going to have to be altered:

Higher education needs two kinds of change to produce useful products recognized as such by society in a new period of social development, and to be more effective and efficient in its use of faculty and other resources employed in this educational output. By and large the higher education leadership in our colleges and universities is well aware of these needed changes. The problem is how to manage such change... The first task of leadership and of management is decision-making... We have complicated the governance structure and process within our colleges and universities by permitting consultation to become the authority to veto...

The current structure of faculty participation in collegiate governance is under serious question and review. The general structure of faculty participation in University-level governance was developed in the expansion and growth years of the 1950's and 1960's. The dilemma facing institutions today is how viable the current structures are and what impact can and should they have on the decision-making processes.

As with many institutions in the United States, this question of viability of faculty participation in university-level governance is of grave and current concern at Michigan State University.

For example, the Board of Trustees of Michigan State University voted seven to one in February 6, 1981 to declare a "State of Financial Exigency".¹² This action was taken as a "legal step" to allow extraordinary action to forestall

financial chaos due to severe budget recisions by the State of Michigan.¹³

Many of the actions taken by the central administration following this declaration were based upon the recommendations of a blue-ribbon "Select Committee" (see Definition of Terms). This "Select Committee" was formed by the Steering Committee of the Academic Council to provide a more effective means of adding faculty voice to this decision-making process.

The "Select Committee" was developed, in part, because the normal machinery of university-level governance was too cumbersome and time-consuming. Many administrators had stated as recently as September 1980 that the system of governance at Michigan State University was too slow and unresponsive to the type of decision-making that was necessary in this climate of financial crisis.

Dr. Gordon Thomas, Professor, College of Communication Arts and Secretary for Academic Governance, was quoted in the State News as follows:

Academic Council spends most of its time debating because it has no real decision-making authority ...When the process slows down, it reduces the Council's influence on decision-making even more ...I think administrators -- I know Mackey* has got a little frustrated by the slowness of the system.¹⁴

*President M. Cecil Mackey

In the same State News article, Dr. Clarence L. Winder, Provost, agreed with Dr. Thomas and said the following:

One of the important things about the governance system is that it must be timely.¹⁵

It is clear from these statements that the concern raised by John Millett in 1978 about the viability of governance systems was a crucial issue facing Michigan State University in February 1981. And, as recently as November 1982, the question still remained very active. In the "Statement to the MSU Academic Community", November 30, 1982, the faculty members of the Steering Committee of Academic Council stated, in part, that:

We believe that the academic governance system at MSU is an outstanding model and has performed well, even during the university crisis of the early 1980's. Some, however, judge the system to be inefficient and insufficiently responsive over the short term. It is, therefore, extremely important that everyone, including those critical of the system, take constructive action to increase the ability of academic governance to provide appropriate and timely responses to any and all issues requiring its attention.¹⁶

This "statement" has evolved into a call for a review of the current structure of the governance system at Michigan State University. When completed this review will be the sixth restructuring of the governance system since its inception in 1955.

Statement of the Problem

The question of the role of faculty in university-level decision-making at Michigan State University (governance) is

the focal point of this study. Since 1955 the structure of faculty participation in University-level governance has been altered or amended on five different occasions. These reorganizations have occurred in 1961, 1968, 1971, 1975 and 1978. As was stated in the Introduction and Background a sixth reorganization is under serious contemplation. This study examines the structural changes that have evolved in faculty participation in university-level governance at Michigan State University from its formal codification in 1955 up through the last major revision in 1978. This study also provides an analysis of the major factors that helped to shape and mold the outcome of each reorganization.

Purpose of the Study

An historical account of the development of faculty participation in university-level governance at Michigan State University serves two purposes. As the governance system attempts to deal effectively with the problems facing Michigan State University, and higher education in general for the remainder of this century, this study provides an insight into the developmental stages of faculty participation that will be useful as a benchmark and guidepost.

Second, an historical account of the development of faculty participation in university-level governance at Michigan State University adds to the general knowledge of not only the institution, but of higher education in general.

Frederick Rudolph, writing in his Preface to The American College and University: A History, states:

For some time now the general reader and the professional historian have had greater access to the history of almost any skirmish in the Civil War than they have had to the history of education in the United States... The universities themselves have not yet created the body of historical knowledge from which a multivolume and definitive work may be written... How and why and with what consequences have the American college and university developed as they have? This question is not, of course, the only one answered, but it is the first question we need to have answered.¹⁷

Finally, a forceful rationale for this study was written by John Brubacher in the Preface of his massive work, Higher Education in Transition:

History is occurring faster than it is being written. The first half of the twentieth century in particular has witnessed an almost frightening acceleration in the reform of higher education. If prognostications are correct, we stand at mid-century on the threshold of the greatest expansion of higher education we have ever known. Whatever magnitude the problems of higher education have reached in the past, they may well be dwarfed by those of the future. To meet these problems it seems... of the utmost importance to establish some overall historical perspective without delay. Like physicians, educators can hardly prescribe a therapy for the maladies of higher education unless they¹⁸ have a clinical record of their patient's past.

Madison Kuhn has chronicled The First One Hundred Years of Michigan State University. It is intended that this study also be a small chapter for the multi-volume "Second One Hundred Years" to be chronicled in future years.

Importance of the Study

Millett, in his essay, The Academic Community, wrote:

...I believe there is more general misunderstanding about the subject of internal organization than about any other aspect of the American college or university. Moreover, this misunderstanding is just as widespread¹⁹ inside our colleges and universities as outside.

If this is indeed true, and there is a plethora of studies in the 1960's and 1970's that verify Millett's assessment, then it becomes necessary for professionals in the study and management of higher education to examine this phenomena. A brief review of the literature indicates there have been a number of approaches to the examination of faculty participation in university-level governance. These studies include John Corson's Governance of Colleges and Universities (1960), Caleb Foote's and Henry Mayer's The Culture of the University (1971), Henry Mason's College and University Government (1972), the Carnegie Commission's Governance in Higher Education (1973), and John Millett's New Structures of Campus Power (1978).

Each of these studies has added to our knowledge concerning faculty participation. However, none of the above listed studies detail in a specifically defined pattern the evolutionary process which has occurred in faculty participation in university governance. Indeed, Millett's study specifically excluded examination of structure. He was only interested in process and consequence. These studies have

examined effectiveness of faculty participation, or have detailed comparisons and contrasts between different structures. None of these studies examined the step-by-step causes, and the resultant effects, of structural changes in a governance system. Thus, as Brubacher indicates, professionals in higher education cannot attempt to "cure" the problems facing the institution, qua institution, without some record of how it reached its present condition.

Methodology

The process of investigation in this study involved examination of primary sources and open-ended interviews with key participants involved in the structural development and changes of faculty participation in University-level governance from 1955 through 1978. The primary sources used in this study are as follows:

1. Minutes of the Academic Assembly, 1955-61.
2. Minutes of the Academic Council, 1955-78.
3. Minutes of the Academic Senate, 1955-78.
4. Minutes of the Faculty/Staff Meetings, 1949-55.
5. Minutes of the Administrative Group/Council of Deans, 1949-78.
6. Minutes (notes and reports) of the Committee on the Future of the University, 1959.
7. Presidential Papers, Presidents John A. Hannah, Walter A. Adams and Clifton R. Wharton, Jr.

8. Papers of the Office of Secretary for Academic Governance (formerly Secretary of the Faculty).
9. Faculty Facts publications. 1947-1981.*

The list of interviewees appears in Appendix A. The criteria for selection as an interviewee was based upon the individual's knowledge of events and factors effecting the structure of faculty participation in University-level governance. A primary criterion for knowledge was the interviewee's participation in the deliberations on a particular structure document. A secondary criterion was the individual's particular "office" or "position" occupied during a particular reorganization process. The final criterion for selection to be interviewed was availability and accessibility.

Also in Appendix A, an outline of the topic areas discussed by each interviewee is presented. Each interview was open-ended. Each interview was designed to discuss topic items for which the interviewee met the established criteria. Thus, no two interviews covered exactly the same topic material. However, each interviewee was asked the same initial question, as follows:

In your opinion, what is the role of faculty in university-level governance?

*All of the documents listed are on file in the Archives, Michigan State University Library.

The comments of each interviewee were recorded in long-hand by the interviewer. No mechanical reproduction of the interview was made.

Organization of the Study

This study is composed of eight chapters. The first chapter identifies the problem under study and the framework of the investigation. Chapter 2 consists of an overview description of Michigan State University, a brief historical account of faculty participation in university-level governance prior to ratification of the first structure document in 1955, and a description of the structure developed for faculty participation in university-level governance in 1955. This description is followed by an analysis of the events which helped to shape and mold the document.

Chapters 3 through 7 describe the structural changes that occurred with each revision document. Chapter 3 describes the 1961 revision; Chapter 4 describes the 1968 revision; Chapter 5 describes the 1971 revision; Chapter 6 describes the 1975 revision; and Chapter 7 describes the 1978 revision. As with Chapter 2, each of these chapters contains an analysis of the events which helped to shape and mold the respective reorganizations.

Finally, Chapter 8 is a summary of the analyses, and details the evolutionary process that occurred at Michigan State

University. The summary is concluded by a discussion of the future of faculty participation in university-level governance at Michigan State University.

Limitations

As with any attempt to study a social institution there is the problem of human perception. Any two individuals participating in or observing the same event may perceive the event, and the factors which caused the event, in totally different ways. In this study the problem of human perception is twofold. First, the recollections of the interviewees are necessarily biased based on the person's position in the institution, the person's stand on the particular issue, and time. Many of these events occurred over twenty years ago. Many of the individuals took the position that time has proven their particular position to be correct or incorrect. Time also has a way of clouding even the sharpest of memories. To the extent possible, the recorded outcomes have been the median from which each individual's recollections, and the collective set of recollections, have been analyzed.

Second, the written record is also subject to the frailties of human perception. Minutes in particular are subject to the perceptions of the recorder. In this study this problem is compounded by the fact that the examined written record was compiled by many individuals. Thus, where necessary,

documents have been juried for authenticity and meaning.

Finally, the study is limited by the background of the researcher. First, the researcher is not an experienced historiographer. And second, the researcher was an active participant in many of the events which helped to shape and mold the topic under study from the period 1970 to the present. The bias of the researcher must be taken into account in examining the analysis of this time period.

Definition of Terms

ASMSU: This is the Associated Students of Michigan State University. This organization was the representative body for all undergraduate students at the University. With the establishment of "Bylaws, 1971" (see Chapter 5), ASMSU was removed from direct representation of undergraduate students in the Academic Council. ASMSU maintained its status as the recognized student government for undergraduate students.

Basic College: This college was established in 1944. The purpose of this college was to provide for the so-called "general education" curricula. The college was developed under the leadership of Professor Floyd Reeves, University of Chicago. This college's name was later changed to University College.

COGS: This is the Council of Graduate Students. This organization, recognized in 1969, is responsible for representing all graduate and professional students at the University. COGS provides for direct representation for graduate students both to the Academic Council and the Graduate Council.

Committee on the Future: This was an Ad Hoc "blue-ribbon" type committee established by President John A. Hannah in his State of the University Address in January 1959. This committee was to draft a blueprint for the University as it entered the decade of the 1960's. The recommendations of this committee in regard to faculty participation led to several changes in the governance system in 1961.

Divisional Faculty: Prior to becoming a University in 1955, Michigan State College's major educational units were called divisions. This term is descriptive of the faculty that would meet with a divisional dean to discuss academic policy.

Junior Faculty: In the context of the composition of the faculty as described by Professor Madison Kuhn (see Chapter 2) this term is descriptive of the non-tenured instructional staff of Michigan State College.

Residential College: This term is descriptive of a concept

developed at Michigan State University during the 1960's whereby specialty colleges were developed to provide for concentrated study in a particular discipline. Furthermore, the colleges were to be physically located in one structure (a residence hall) which provided for close interaction between students and faculty. Michigan State University developed three such colleges: Justin Morrill (Liberal Arts), James Madison (Social Science), and Lyman Briggs (Natural Science).

Select Committee: This committee was developed to make recommendations to President M. Cecil Mackey in regard to programmatic rescissions necessitated by the severe financial crisis facing Michigan State University during the 1980-81 Academic Year.

Work-load: This term is used to describe the formula by which the time a faculty member is to devote to a particular activity is measured. A faculty member's time can include teaching, research, service, administration, etc. In the development of "Bylaws, 1968" the faculty established the principle that participation in the governance process should be used as a factor in determination of a faculty member's workload (see Chapter 4).

NOTES

Chapter 1

1. John Millett, Higher Education and the 1980's, (Academy for Educational Development, Washington, D.C.) January 1978, p. 1.
2. Ibid., p. 2.
3. Ibid., p. 3.
4. Ibid., p. 4.
5. Ibid., p. 5.
6. Frederick Rudolph, The American College and University: A History, [Vintage Books (Random House), New York] 1962, p. 434.
7. AAUP Bulletin, Volume 52, Number 4, December 1966, p. 375.
8. Arnold Weber, et. al.; Faculty Participation in Academic Governance, (American Association for Higher Education, Washington, D.C.) 1967.
9. Henry L. Mason, College and University Government: A Handbook of Principle and Practice, (Tulane University Press, New Orleans, Louisiana) 1972.
10. Ibid., p. 47.
11. Millett, p. 11.
12. Michigan State News, Volume 75, Number 24, February 9, 1981, p. 1.
13. Ibid.
14. Michigan State News, Volume 74, Welcome Week Edition, September 1980, p. 22.
15. Ibid.
16. "Statement on Academic Governance," November 30, 1982, unpublished. (See Appendix B.)
17. Rudolph, Preface.

18. John Brubacher, Higher Education in Transition, (Harper and Row, New York) 1958, Preface.
19. John Millett, New Structures of Campus Power, (Jossey-Bass Publishers, San Francisco) 1978, p. xii.

CHAPTER 2

DEVELOPMENT OF THE FACULTY ORGANIZATION, 1955

Overview and Background

Professor Madison Kuhn, the official historian for Michigan State University's centennial (1955) and the Secretary of the Faculties from 1968 until 1972, gave the following summarization in his book The First Hundred Years:

Michigan State on the eve of World War II was a university in fact, although in the eyes of the public, the students, and even the staff, it was no more than a overgrown and diversified college. When peace returned the concept had changed but little. It was only amid the growing size and prestige and maturity of the post-war years that a consciousness of university status developed.¹

The university-era for Michigan State began with the appointment of John A. Hannah as President in December 1940.² Hannah assumed the Presidency on July 1, 1941. One year after the beginning of Hannah's administration, the junior faculty (see Definition of Terms, Chapter 1) at Michigan State were given an equal status with the senior faculty in representation to Division (e.g. college) advisory committees. On June 4, 1942, the Divisional Faculties passed a set of recommendations that set up the first codified system for faculty participation.³

This document defined the faculty of the Division as any person above the rank of graduate assistant who had at least a one-year appointment and was involved in teaching, research or extension work. The Divisional Faculties were required to meet at least once per term, excluding the summer. The Dean of the Division was the presiding officer. Minutes of the meeting were taken and distributed to the President and other Division Deans.⁴

Each Division Faculty was allowed to set up its own structure of operation. Any proposal approved by a Divisional Faculty was clearly labeled as "advisory" and was "subject to approval by the college faculty and administrative officials" as constituted by the laws of the State of Michigan. It was made clear in the document, however, that it was "proper" for the Divisional Faculty to make recommendations on the areas of "curricular, instructions, examinations, grading, degree standards for promotion and standards for salary increases, etc".⁵

Finally, the 1942 document codified a structure of "Divisional Advisory Committees" that required representation at a minimum of one person each from the ranks of Professor, Associate Professor, Assistant Professor and Instructor. Research and extension personnel were also specifically included. Individuals were elected to Divisional Advisory Committees by secret ballot.⁶

Divisional Advisory Committees were not required to meet at any specified time. It appears that the Divisional Advisory Committee met at the pleasure of the Divisional Dean who "may consult with this committee on all matters of divisional policy".⁷ If the Dean, however, decided to meet with the Advisory Committee, he was normally required to discuss agenda items with the membership "at least 24 hours prior to the meeting". It was implied within the document that the Advisory Committee would meet regularly with the Dean.⁸

This policy was a reflection of the commitment the new president, John A. Hannah, had to upgrade the quality of academic instruction at Michigan State College. President Hannah (1980) wrote the following in regard to this:

If we were really going to make substantial progress in improving the faculty, we would have to recruit the brightest young people as soon as they finished their doctorates in the better graduate schools.⁹

Professor Kuhn added the following to the picture of the faculty at the college during the first ten years of the Hannah administration:

...As late as 1940 instructors composed two-fifths of the teaching staff; many of them had served for long periods and were viewed not as interns but rather as permanent members. A tenure system, introduced in 1942...not only encouraged talented instructors to remain but forced a careful selection of those who would be retained and promoted. By the 1950's instructors comprised less than a fourth of the staff, and were outnumbered by associate professors.¹⁰

During the 1940's and early 1950's Michigan State recruited new faculty from the so-called prestigious institutions

(Harvard, Yale, University of Michigan, University of Chicago, Stanford, etc.). These new faculty brought with them a sense of environment far different from that of East Lansing, Michigan; more urbane and cosmopolitan. The new faculty also brought with them a university perspective that was quite different than the "patriarchal" system to which many long-time faculty at Michigan State College had become accustomed.

Structural Analysis

In 1955 the State Board of Agriculture, the constitutionally prescribed governing board for Michigan State University (Michigan State became a University in name in 1955) approved the "Michigan State University Faculty Organization" document.¹¹ In analyzing the document, the first noticeable difference was the size of the document. The 1942 "Participation Document" is one single-spaced, typewritten page. The 1955 document required nine pages, also single-spaced and typewritten, to detail the structure of faculty participation at the University.

Article I: Composition of the Faculty

Article I described the composition of the faculty. The definition of the faculty was reflective of the change in the make-up of the faculty described previously by Professor Kuhn and others:

The faculty of Michigan State University shall be composed of all persons holding the rank of

Instructor, Assistant Professor, Associate Professor or Professor, except such persons as may be on a part-time or temporary appointment.¹²

Article I designated lecturers and visiting professors as "honorary faculty". Also, the article included the "principal administrative officer" of each major educational and research unit as members of the faculty.

Article II: College Faculties

Article II of the 1955 document absorbed the 1942 document in toto. The only difference in the wording was reflected in the necessity of referring to college and university faculty members as opposed to divisional and college faculty members.¹³

Article III: The Assembly

Beginning with Article III the new University-level structure was unveiled. Article III described "The Assembly"; Article IV described "The Academic Senate"; and Article V described "The Academic Council."

The Assembly was a body composed of the President, the administrative officers, the faculty and "other academic personnel on full-time appointment". The Assembly's sole function was to "serve as a means of communication between the administration and the academic personnel of the University".¹⁴

Article IV: The Academic Senate

The Academic Senate was composed of all tenured professors, associate professors and assistant professors. The Senate's composition also included the President, the Vice President on Academic Affairs, the Vice President for Off-Campus Education, the deans of several colleges, the Dean of the School of Advanced Graduate Studies, the Dean of University Services, the Dean of Students, and the Registrar. All of these individuals served as voting members of the Academic Senate.¹⁵

The President presided over the body. The President also had the power to select the Secretary of the Senate. The Senate was required to meet at least once per term and could be called into extra session by the President.¹⁶

The Senate could develop its own rules of procedures. In addition, the document mandated the establishment of an elected Steering Committee. The Steering Committee was charged with assisting the President in developing an agenda for the Senate meetings. The members of the Steering Committee automatically became members of the Academic Council.¹⁷

The Senate functions were described as follows:

The Academic Senate shall possess and exercise those rights and duties which are conferred by the Constitution and Statutes of the State of Michigan upon the faculty of Michigan State University or

which may have been or shall be delegated to it by authority of the State Board of Agriculture.¹⁸

In February 1956, the Senate adopted a series of "Rules of Order and Procedure". These rules provided for the definition of quorum as 40% of the total membership. The Senate was also established as preeminent over the Academic Council. Actions approved by the Council were transmitted to the Senate in the form of a "Report". The Senate had the authority of approving the Reports of the Academic Council. The Senate was limited to non-amendment of any Council Report on first presentation of a Report to the Senate. However, the Senate could refer the matter back to the Council. Upon second presentation, the Senate could amend the Report and send it on to the President without further consultation with the Council.¹⁹

Any matter brought to the Senate by the Steering Committee, or arising from the floor, had to be sent to the Academic Council for action. If the Academic Council acted favorably on the matter, the process described above was to be employed.

The document provided for voting to be by a show of hands, unless a secret ballot was called for by a majority of those present and voting. The Senate could also suspend its own rules of procedure by a two-thirds vote of the body.²⁰

Article V: The Academic Council

Article V described the Academic Council. This body was composed of the President, the Vice President for Academic Affairs, the Vice President for Off-Campus Education, the deans, the members of the Steering Committee of the Academic Senate, and two representatives from each college.²¹

To be eligible for the Academic Council as a college representative, the faculty member had to be a member of the Senate. In other words, only tenured faculty could serve on the Academic Council. College representatives to the Council were nominated by election. College faculty that were eligible to serve (i.e. tenured) on the Council were eligible to cast ballots.²²

Each eligible faculty was able to nominate two faculty members for the position of representative. There was an ascending scale for the number of nominees per college. In colleges with less than 100 voting faculty, six nominees were slated. If the eligible faculty numbered between 100 and 200, nine nominees were possible. Colleges with greater than 200 eligible faculty were allowed 12 nominees.²³

Once the college slate was assembled the eligible faculty were again able to vote. This time, however, eligible voters could only cast a ballot for one name. The names of the three top vote receivers were submitted to the

President. The President then selected one of the three to serve as the College Representative.* Each college was allowed two representatives. The term of office was two years and was staggered. In addition, each college representative became an ex-officio member of the College Advisory Committee.²⁴

The Academic Council was chaired by the President. The President selected the Secretary of the Council. The Council was to meet at least once per term, "and more often at the pleasure of the president".²⁵

The organization of the Academic Council provided for a nine-member Committee on Committees. Five of these nine members came from the Steering Committee of the Senate. The other four members came from the ranks of the Academic Council, chosen each Spring Term. The chairman of this committee was selected by the President. The function of the committee was to:

...advise the President on the committee structure of the faculty and on the composition of the faculty standing committees with respect to size and elements of representation (except insofar as these may be stipulated by action of the Academic Senate). The President shall consult with the Committee on Committees on appointments to standing committees to the faculty.²⁶

*A review of the record disclosed that President Hannah always selected the person who received the most votes.

The functions of the Academic Council were spelled out quite directly (as opposed to the broad-stroke statement of function describing the Senate). The Council:

1. Shall be consulted by the President on all matters of educational policy. (emphasis added)
2. Shall have the right to initiate proposals on all matters pertaining to the general welfare of the University.
3. Shall serve in an advisory capacity to the President on any matters that he may choose to bring before it.
4. (In any case the right of the Council to be consulted) Shall not extend to matters of budget and finance, personnel, or general administration, except as principles of educational policy are to be formulated and administered.²⁷

Analysis of Events

As Professor Kuhn has already chronicled, between July 1941, and September 1955, Michigan State College made a quantum leap from a small agricultural and engineering College to a world-recognized University. In 1942 the composition of the faculty was 21 Professors, 82 Associate Professors, 150+ Assistant Professors and 250+ Instructors.²⁸ The student body was composed of 6,195 undergraduates and 367 graduate students.²⁹ By 1950, the institution had changed considerably. The faculty were composed of 254 Professors, 312 Associate Professors, 465 Assistant Professors and 332 Instructors.³⁰ The student population had also grown dramatically in those eight years. There were 15,042 undergraduates and 1,363 graduate students.³¹ With this

change in faculty came a need for a change in the method of faculty and administration interaction.

Prior to the development and approval of the Faculty Organization Document, there were three main forums for discussion and decision-making within the institution. The first was the Administrative Group. This body met each Tuesday morning at 9:00 a.m. This group was made up of the deans and other principal administrative officials. Dr. Hannah (1980) described the function of the Administrative Group as follows:

At these meetings we discussed the problems of the University, its aims and aspirations, its day-to-day work. The Administrative Group was the number one communications medium within the institution. Every dean had an opportunity at each meeting to tell the others about what was happening₂ in his college, or what was being planned.

These meetings of the Administrative Group would last usually about one hour, and never more than two hours.³³

The second major communication device was The Breakfast Group. This group included the President, the Provost, the Secretary to the Board, the Director of Public Information, the Vice President for Business, the Dean of University Services, the University Attorney and a few others. This group met regularly every Monday morning at 7:00 a.m. Dr. Hannah (1980) described the group as follows:

The principal administrators who were not involved in teaching research, extension, or otherwise directly in academic operations constituted the

Breakfast Group...They met regularly every Monday morning at 7:00 a.m...That did not mean 7:00 a.m. for breakfast, it meant they had their coffee and eggs before the meeting started at 7:00 a.m. These weekly meetings were part of the internal communications pattern of university business and became an important factor in the operation of the institution.³⁴

...There were no motions and no votes. We³⁵ arrived at positions and conclusions by consensus.

The Breakfast Group, like the Administrative Group rarely met for longer than one hour.³⁶

The third main body for communication and decision-making was the all-college faculty and staff meetings. The General Staff meetings were characterized by the President reporting to the body on various topics. An example of the minutes of a General Staff meeting would appear such as below:

President's Report

Took us into his confidence with a very fine presentation of the following matters which are of general staff interest.

- a. Explanation of how our budget works.
- b. MSC is asking for an increase for Agricultural Extension and Experiment Station.
- c. Explanation was then given as to why the proposed building for veterinary medicine and Bact. was moved into first place putting the lib. into second.
- d. Request for water storage and fire fighting equipment and steam mainline loop.
- e. The All College Committee for Educational Research has now been formulated under an unusually democratic plan.³⁷

The General Staff Meetings were an opportunity for the President to "speak to the troops". It was also an opportunity for staff to ask questions about certain projects or programs. It was not a decision-making body. It was a

communication forum. The General Staff Meeting was the forerunner of the Academic Assembly. As will be spelled out in more detail in chapters to follow, the Academic Assembly evolved into the University Convocation where the President delivers the "State of the University" address.

The Faculty Meetings had much the same formula to them that the General Staff Meetings had. However, there were two important differences. First, these meetings were limited, usually, in topic to academic matters. Matters such as tenure, curriculum, academic calendar and even grade changes for individual students were discussed. Second, the faculty had the opportunity to vote on matters of policy change. Most items for discussion and decision were brought to the faculty for consideration by either the President or, after January 1950, from the All College Committee on Research and Education (ACCRE). This committee was established to look at the long-range problems facing the institution as it grew in post-war America. The ever-increasing size of the school was putting a great strain on the academic resources. It was the charge of this committee to develop alternatives to meet the on-going problems. As will be shown in following chapters, this committee was absorbed by the Faculty Organization Document and evolved into the Educational Policies Committee, one of the several Standing Committees of the Academic Council.

It is important to note that most of the items presented to the faculty for discussion and approval were previously approved by the Administrative Group (the several deans). This process became a source of concern to the expanding faculty of Michigan State College.

The first recorded mention of the need for a faculty organization document can be found in the minutes of the March 4, 1952 Faculty Meeting. What is most significant about this meeting is not that the President announced the plan for development of a faculty organization, but that the announcement occurred at a meeting that has been characterized as the first major faculty revolt under the Hannah Administration.*

At this Faculty Meeting, President Hannah asked the faculty to approve a change in the Basic College (see Definition of Terms, Chapter 1). The Basic College had been established in March 1944, by a unanimous vote of the faculty.³⁸ The change being proposed involved changing the curricula of Basic College from seven subjects, from which a student could select five, to four required subjects.

*Interview with Walter Adams.

The President outlined the reasons for the proposed change. The reasons included the need to establish a common core of subjects upon which the upper schools could build. The Administrative Group had approved the proposed changes.

The Basic College had developed into a campus political issue by the time of this meeting. As stated earlier, Michigan State College (in the late 1940's and early 1950's) recruited heavily from the prestigious institutions. The tradition from which these young graduates came centered on the discipline that they taught. The concept of a "general education" core was foreign to most of the faculty. In addition, the leadership of the Basic College had consistently refused to permit joint appointments of Basic College faculty with discipline centered departments in other colleges. The discipline centered faculty tended to look down on the Basic College faculty.

The President's proposal set the stage for the confrontation. Professor Walter Adams indicated that the issue of Basic College was almost beside the point. The time had come, in the minds of many faculty, to make a stand on the role of the faculty in establishing the curriculum for Michigan State College.

A proposal was introduced that would have required that the proposed reorganization of Basic College be referred to the

All College Educational Research Committee. The Committee would be given the following charges:

1. Submit a report within one year.
2. Review the proposed report, but be free to investigate other alternatives, including a recommendation of maintaining the status quo.
3. Maintain the 45 credit minimum in general education coursework.
4. The Committee would open discussion to, and recommendations from, the following:
 - a. All of the school Education and Research Committees.
 - b. Dean and Department Heads of Basic College.
 - c. Faculty from Basic College and the Upper Schools that request a hearing.
 - d. Other competent professionals solicited by the Committee.³⁹

After this motion was presented and seconded, a motion was made to vote by written ballot. After a lengthy discussion, led by Professor Leonhart, Department of Political Science, President Hannah agreed to a written ballot. The outcome of this challenge was anticlimatic. The vote in regard to the proposal to refer to the Committee was defeated, 141-218-3. The motion to approve the changes in Basic College, effective for the Fall, 1952, was taken. The motion passed, 224-100. This vote was taken by the hand count.⁴⁰

Following this action, the minutes of that meeting described the following:

- 6) (The President) invited the AAUP and others of

the staff that are interested to turn in their ideas of what kind of faculty organization they would like to have to the All-College Educational Research Committee. The President asked the committee to concern itself with this proposal and to make recommendations to the faculty before June.⁴¹

There is no evidence in the record to indicate whether or not the notion of a faculty organization had been under discussion prior to this meeting. It was not listed as an agenda item. Professor Rollin Simonds indicated that the mentioning of the proposed faculty organization at the March 4, 1952 meeting was purely coincidental. Professor Simonds had no specific recollection of the proposal being made at the meeting. Professor Adams did not remember the announcement at this particular meeting. Nor did Professor Milton E. Muelder, who was present at the meeting. Nor did President Hannah. President Hannah indicated however that the "topic" had been under discussion prior to the meeting.

Whether there had been any prior discussion or thought of a need for a faculty organization document prior to this meeting is not a probative subject for this study. What is important, and was agreed to by all of the interviewees involved at that time, is the understanding that the institution had changed, vis-a-vis the make-up and expectations of the faculty, to the point that there was needed a change in the structure of interaction between the faculty and the administration. It was no longer effective or efficient for the President to conduct business with the faculty on an all

college plenenary basis. There was recognized a need for a more formalized and efficiency minded structure to conduct the academic business of the institution.

At the next Faculty Meeting, held on May 8, 1952, Professor Harry Kimber, Chairman of the All-College Education and Research Committee, issued a preliminary report.⁴² One year later, at a Joint Faculty Staff Meeting held on May 25, 1953, the "Kimber Committee" Report was distributed.⁴³

The minutes indicate that the "Report" was to be discussed at the first meeting of the faculty in Fall Term, 1953. There was not another Faculty Meeting until December 9, 1954.⁴⁴ The reason for this delay of eighteen months was that President Hannah, in 1953, accepted an appointment as Assistant Secretary of Defense for Manpower Needs. These duties lasted until July 1954. During the period of this appointment the President was on leave of absence.

At the December 9, 1954 meeting, the President reported that Professor Kimber had reviewed the document with the Administrative Group and the Committee was in the process of making revisions. Professor Kimber made it clear that the revision document would be circulated to the faculty and brought to the next Faculty Meeting for a vote.⁴⁵

At the February 25, 1955, Faculty Meeting the Michigan State

University Faculty Organization document was approved and transmitted to the State Board of Agriculture.⁴⁶ When approved by the Board, the document would go into effect during the Spring Term, 1955.

There are no records of any committee meetings or draft documents in regard to the process of the development of the Faculty Organization document. From interviews with President Hannah and Professor Simonds, the following can be stated within a degree of certainty.

The Academic Assembly was designed to replace the General Staff Meeting as a forum for communication between the President and the professional staff of the University. The Academic Council was designed to be the small, deliberative body that would do the majority of the work in discussing and preparing reports. The Academic Senate was to be a deliberative body and, in addition, a forum at which all of the tenured faculty could be involved in the decision-making process.

It was originally envisioned by the Ad Hoc Committee, and by the President, that the Academic Senate would be the body of primacy in the structure. Its ability to ultimately amend reports of the Academic Council (and by logical inference amend by substitution in total) is testament to that intent. As will be discussed in the ensuing chapters, the Academic

Council, in a rather short period of time surpassed the Academic Senate as the primary body for faculty participation on University-level governance.

The institution had grown considerably during the first fifteen years of President Hannah's administration. This growth necessitated a more structured interaction between the faculty and the administration. The multiplicity of programs and the sheer size of the institution dictated a more bureaucratic approach to decision-making. Thus, the faculty, under the close scrutiny of the administration, developed a representational system for faculty participation in University-level decision-making. As will be described in the remaining chapters, the structure of faculty participation evolved to a highly sophisticated and detailed plane. This evolutionary process always brought to the forefront the faculty's need to define its role in decision-making. This definition of role marked the cornerstone for each successive review and revision of what would be called "The Bylaws".

NOTES

Chapter 2

1. Madison Kuhn, Michigan State the First Hundred Years, (The Michigan State University Press) 1955, p. 471.
2. Ibid., p. 401.
3. "Divisional Faculties", October 24, 1949. (see Appendix C.)
4. Ibid.
5. Ibid.
6. Ibid.
7. Ibid.
8. Ibid.
9. John A. Hannah, A Memoir, (Michigan State University Press) 1980, p. 43.
10. Kuhn, p. 432.
11. "Minutes of the Faculty Meetings", Volume VIII, May 19, 1955, p. 520.
12. Ibid., p. 542.
13. Ibid.
14. Ibid., p. 543.
15. Ibid., p. 544.
16. Ibid.
17. Ibid., p. 545.
18. Ibid.
19. Ibid.
20. Ibid., p. 546.
21. Ibid.

22. Ibid.
23. Ibid., p. 547.
24. Ibid.
25. Ibid., p. 548.
26. Ibid.
27. Ibid.
28. Bulletin of Michigan State College of Agriculture and Applied Science, "Announcements for the Year 1941-1942", Volume XXXVI, No. 7, March, 1942, p. 7-16.
29. Ibid., p. 300.
30. Annual Report, Michigan State College Registrar's Office, 1950-51.
31. Catalog 1949-51, Michigan State College, p. 518.
32. Hannah, p.40.
33. Ibid., p. 83.
34. Ibid., p. 41.
35. Ibid., p. 83.
36. Ibid.
37. "Minutes of the Faculty Meetings", Volume VIII, January 24, 1950, p. 30.
38. Kuhn, p. 38.
39. "Minutes of the Faculty Meetings", Volume VIII, March 4, 1952, p. 247.
40. Ibid.
41. Ibid.
42. Ibid., p. 274.
43. Ibid., p. 403.
44. Ibid., p. 506.
45. Ibid.
46. Ibid., p. 510.

CHAPTER 3

DEVELOPMENT OF "BYLAWS, 1961"

Overview and Background

As described in Chapter 2, the Academic Senate and the Academic Council were the two main bodies for faculty participation in University-level governance. The first meeting of the Academic Senate was on November 10, 1955.¹ The first meeting of the Academic Council was on December 1, 1955.² The other body established in the Faculty Organization Document of 1955, the Academic Assembly, first met on October 20, 1955.³ The Academic Assembly played no significant role in the development of faculty participation in University-level governance.*

For the sake of brevity, the "Bylaws of the Michigan State Faculty Organization, 1961" will hereafter be referred to as "Bylaws, 1961". (This will hold true for each successive

*This body was abolished with the development of the "Bylaws of the Michigan State Faculty Organization, 1961". This will be discussed in full in the "Analysis Section" of this Chapter.

revision document.)

On July 28, 1959, the Ad Hoc Committee on the Future of the University submitted its "Report to the President".⁴ The "Ad Hoc Committee on the Future of the University" was initiated by President John A. Hannah in the "State of the University Address" given on January 16, 1959.⁵ One of the charges to this Committee was stated as follows:

How can we improve our faculty organization to insure that each member of the faculty has an opportunity to make his individual contribution to group thinking and decisions? From my observation, our present organization is a great improvement over what we had in years past, but there is still room for improvement.⁶

The Committee's recommendation in regard to the faculty organization involved a total restructuring; from the departmental level to the Academic Council and Academic Senate, including all of the University-level committees.⁷

On November 3, 1959, the following was adopted by the Academic Council:

1. The Steering Committee recommends that the "Faculty Organization Committee" be reactivated as an "Ad Hoc" committee; that its membership be nominated by the Committee on Committees and have some representation from the original "Faculty Organization Committee"; that this reactivated committee report directly to the Academic Council, and that it be assigned the task of considering such recommendations in the report of the Committee on the Future of the University as:
 - a. Each department and college should establish elected advisory committees as a means of facilitating continuous

faculty participation in policy-making.

- b. The Academic Council should be reconstructed to include as voting members two faculty members elected from each college, six faculty members elected by the Senate from its membership (constituting the Steering Committee), the President, Provost, and Vice President for Research Development and the deans of the academic college. Furthermore, that this committee considers the amendments to the faculty organization submitted by the AAUP and the Teachers' Union and such other matters as may be appropriate in the light of changes which have occurred since the adoption of the current organization plan.

On January 26, 1960 the following individuals were selected to the "Ad Hoc Committee for Faculty Reorganization":⁹

Everett Everson - Agriculture

Donald Come - Basic College

Charles Adrian - Business and Public Service

Leo Nothsine - Engineering

Lucille Ketchum - Home Economics

Harold Hart - Science and Arts

C. K. Whithair - Veterinary Medicine

Fred Siebert - Communication

*Rollin Simonds - Business and Public Service

*Milosh Muntyan - Education

On February 10, 1961, the "Ad Hoc" committee submitted a

*Original Faculty Organization Committee Members.

"Preliminary Report to the Faculty".¹⁰ On April 17, 1961, the "Ad Hoc" Committee submitted the "Proposed By-Laws of the Michigan State University Faculty Organization".¹¹ On June 6, 1961 the Academic Council approved the By-Laws proposed by the "Ad Hoc Committee" and amended by the Academic Council in a series of meetings held during May, 1961.¹²

On October 12, 1961, President Hannah transmitted to Professor Simonds a letter from Mr. Leland W. Carr, Jr., University Attorney, dated October 10, 1961.¹³ This letter, and its attachment, contained suggested revisions to the June 6, 1961 document. President Hannah's letter indicated strong support for Mr. Carr's recommendations.¹⁴ The Academic Council accepted most of Mr. Carr's suggestions, with some modifications.¹⁵

On October 31, 1961 the Academic Council approved the "Bylaws, 1961" and sent the document on to the Academic Senate.¹⁶ The Academic Senate approved the document on November 29, 1961.¹⁷ The Board of Trustees approved the document on December 15, 1961.¹⁸ The new Bylaws of the Faculty Organization went into effect beginning with the Fall Quarter, 1962.

Structural Analysis

The first major departure from the 1955 Faculty Organization Document was the title. The 1961 document was developed as a set of Bylaws.¹⁹ In approving this document the Board of Trustees had approved a formalized procedure for faculty participation in governance at all levels of the institution. This document not only described how the organization would function, it mandated certain actions be taken by various segments of the institution.

Article I: Composition of the Faculty

In Article I the composition of the faculty was changed. The position of "research associate" was added to the definition of faculty. There was no change, other than placement within the article, in regard to principal administrative officers of educational and research units being considered faculty. Also, there was no change in the accordence of honorary faculty status being bestowed on Lecturers and Visiting Professors.²⁰

Two new sections were added in this article. Section D defined the "voting faculty" for any administrative unit. The "voting faculty" consisted of "all persons holding full-time appointments with the rank of professor, associate professor, or assistant professor".²¹ Thus, instructors, research associates, and any person on less than a full-time appointment were not considered to be part of the "voting

faculty". As will be shown shortly, only "voting faculty" were eligible for membership on the Academic Council or Academic Senate.

Section D did permit, at the college, divisional or departmental level, the extension of voting rights to full-time instructors. It was left to the voting faculty at the respective level to determine whether or not to include full-time instructors.²²

The second new section, Section E, was a caveat to the article. The definitions in this article could not preclude "faculty privileges" being bestowed upon other University employees by the Administration.²³

Contained within Section D of Article I was the following statement:

The voting faculty shall possess and exercise those rights and duties which are conferred by the Constitution of the State of Michigan upon the faculty of Michigan State University or which may have been or shall be delegated to it by authority of the Board of Trustees of Michigan State University.²⁴

This statement did not exist in the 1955 Document nor in the 1942 Document. There was, however, a reference to the advisory nature of proposals passed by a college faculty. It was clear that only duly authorized University officials could approve proposals under the constitution. As will be discussed in the Analysis of Events Section, there developed

a tension between the faculty and the administration as to the legal limits of the faculty's decision-making authority. This statement is a reflection of that evolving tension. Later chapters that discuss other revisions will also be reflective of this tension between faculty and administration.

Articles II and III: Department Organization

While the focus of this study is on University-level participation, it is necessary at this juncture to discuss the changes that were approved at the departmental and college levels. Without this discussion the major change in the relationship between the faculty and the department heads would be less than fully understood.

In its "Report to the President" the Committee on the Future of the University made the following recommendations:

...it is recommended that each department elect an advisory committee to work with the department head in all major policy matters. Each²⁵ college should also have an advisory committee...

We recommend that the present system of indefinite appointment of department heads, division directors, and deans by the Board of Trustees be changed to term appointments of five years.²⁶

In any department in which a dean is aware of a deep seated difference of opinion between the faculty and department head, or between groups of the faculty concerning the best policy for operation of a department, a committee of peers from other departments of the University, or if need be, from other universities, should be²⁷ consulted for methods of resolving the difficulty.

From these three recommendations, the following was developed and approved regarding the organization of the department and college in "Bylaws, 1961".

First, the "department" became recognized as the "primary unit of education and administration within the University". In addition, the "chief executive officer of the department" would be designated as chairman, not department head.²⁸

Second, the chairman was designated as "responsible for all educational, research and service programs, budgetary matters, physical facilities and personnel matters in his department". However, the chairman had to "take into account" the system of advisory procedures that were delineated. The voting faculty were given the affirmative ("shall") power to establish procedures for providing the chairman with advice on departmental matters, including promotion, appointments, and preparation of "departmental plans". A "departmental plan" was to be developed each year for the upcoming five years. This plan was to be presented to the Dean annually.²⁹

And third, the department chairman served a five year appointment. The determination for reappointment of a chairman (assuming he was interested) was to be made by the Dean, "through consultation with the voting faculty of the department..."³⁰

Article IV: College Organization

The college was defined as the "major educational and administrative group within the University".³¹ It was made clear in this Article that the dean of a college was nominated by the President and approved by the Board of Trustees. Likewise, all associate and assistant deans were appointed by this same process. Unlike the department chairman, deans, associate dean and assistant deans did not have term appointments.³²

It was also made clear that the voting faculty of the college (or its elected representatives) were to be consulted regarding any such appointment. In fact, the following was inserted in this section to insure the quality of the faculty participation:

It is expected that the opinions of those consulted, as provided above, will be given serious consideration in the making of appointments, but those making the appointments are not obligated to follow the advice³³ nor prevented from seeking additional opinions.

The "Bylaws, 1961" called for a college faculty organization, which could "...take the form of a dean's advisory committee, a faculty council, or such other structure as the faculty may choose".³⁴ This organization was to provide an additional channel for communication between the faculty and the dean.

The "Bylaws, 1961" made it clear that the dean was

responsible for insuring that a faculty organization was developed.³⁵ There was a requirement that the organization adopted by any college be reviewed at least once every five years. The dean was also mandated to report to the President as to the nature of the structure to be adopted and any subsequent changes.

And finally, each college was to prepare and present to the Provost a five year plan (as described in the organization of the department, Article II.B). The Provost was to review, on an annual basis, each college program.³⁶

The contrast between Articles II and IV of the "Bylaws, 1961" and Article II of the 1955 document are most striking. The 1955 document, as discussed in Chapter Two, reiterated the 1942 "Participation" document. Simply put, there would be a college faculty organization that would meet with the dean and discuss matters of general concern, usually with an agenda prepared by the dean.

By 1961 the faculty felt compelled to itemize in great detail their expectation of the relationship that must exist between academic administrators and the "voting" faculty. Of equal significance is the fact that the faculty in 1961 were able to persuade the President and the Board of Trustees that these structural changes were acceptable.

Article V: University Faculty Organization

Article V of "Bylaws, 1961" described the University Faculty Organization.³⁷ First, the Academic Assembly was abolished. This body was replaced by a "Convocation" to be held during the Winter Term.³⁸ At this Convocation, the President ("or his academic representative") would deliver the State of the University Address. The abolition of the Assembly marked the official end to the practice of having an all-University faculty and staff meeting. The institution had grown too large and sophisticated to permit the Assembly to continue.

Academic Council

Article V, Section B dealt with the Academic Council.³⁹ The composition of the Council was altered considerably. In addition to the President, Provost, the deans, and the Steering Committee, the chief administrative officers from admissions, scholarships and registration were given membership.

In regards to faculty representation a proportional representation system was established.⁴⁰ Instead of two representatives from each college being elected for two year terms the council would have college representation of at least two and possibly eight faculty members. The base figure for representation was 40 voting faculty. For each additional 40 voting faculty members a college received an additional representative. A college, no matter

what number of voting faculty it had, could have no more than eight representatives.

It should be remembered that the 1955 Document provided for proportional nominations, up to twelve. However, the final selection of a representative was made by the President from the top three vote receivers. "Bylaws, 1961" provided for direct election of college representatives by the voting faculty.⁴¹

The limitations that were placed on college representatives were that they could not serve on the Council concurrently as a member of the Steering Committee; they could not serve more than two consecutive terms; and there could not be two college representatives from the same department.⁴²

Organizationally the President still chaired the body and selected the Secretary. However, there were some other major organizational changes. First, the Academic Council was now mandated to meet monthly, as opposed to once per quarter under the 1955 document. Second, the Committee on Committees membership would be one representative of the Academic Council from each college. The Steering Committee was removed from membership (and control) of this committee. And last, there was a restatement of the functions of the Academic Council. The Council was now considered to be "advisory to the President on all matters of educational

policy" as opposed to "consulted by the President on all matters of educational policy".⁴³

The Academic Council continued to have the right to initiate proposals on "all matters pertaining to the general welfare of the University". However, in "Bylaws, 1961" the phrase "including any parts of it such as faculty, students or administrative units" was added.⁴⁴

There was also a major change regarding the Academic Council's involvement in non-academic administrative matters. In the 1955 Document the Academic Council was specifically precluded from having the right of consultation on "... matters of budget and finance, personnel, or general administration, except as principles of educational policy..." However, in "Bylaws, 1961" the Academic Council:

In so far as feasible, taking into account such factors as time and propriety, the Administration shall inform the Council and seek its advice relative to buildings, budget policies and new proposals and developments.⁴⁵

The authority of the Academic Council (the ability to approve or disapprove legislative propositions) did not change between the 1955 Document and "Bylaws, 1961". However, there was an obvious change in the relationship of the Academic Council with the Administration (and the President). The Academic Council membership was now directly elected. During the period from 1955 to 1961 President Hannah had the authority to select a representative from one

of the top three vote receivers. Dr. Hannah, in every instance, selected the individual that received the most votes. However, the authority to select the number two or three candidate existed. "Bylaws, 1961" eliminated this authority from the President. It is tempting to analyze this change with some allusionary reference to "cutting of the apron strings" or "diminution of the royal prerogative". However, the most accurate portrayal of this change is that the system of faculty participation in University-level governance had evolved to a point that the system of Presidential selection was no longer effective for the President, nor would it be tolerated by the faculty.

The second major change in the relationship between the faculty and the administration can be seen in the "softening" of the prohibition on so-called non-academic policy matters (e.g. budget, personnel, building plans, etc.). The President was not required to inform the Academic Council, nor seek Council approval, of such matters. However, there is a strong implication in the language of Article V.B.4.d. that the faculty should be informed about such matters prior to implementation.⁴⁶ There were a number of events that occurred between 1955 and 1961 (which will be chronicled in the next section) that indicate the faculty were becoming very restless concerning the impact that the physical growth of the University was having on them.

The final major change in the relationship between the Academic Council and the President is reflected in the first statement regarding the functions of the Council.⁴⁷ The Academic Council was originally envisioned to be a small group of respected faculty that the President could, and would, consult with regarding major educational issues. The Academic Council was designed to be the efficient engine of the system of faculty governance. But, the flow of authority was clear. The body, while having limited legislative powers, was in a consultative posture to the President. The "Bylaws, 1961" changed the nature of the Academic Council. It was now an advisory body representing a specific constituency within the University. The Academic Council had asserted itself as the representative body of the faculty. The ultimate faculty "voice" was still the Senate, but the workhorse of the system was to be the Academic Council.

Academic Senate

The Academic Senate did not undergo as radical a change, neither in its relationship with the President, nor in its internal structure, as did the Academic Council. However, there were some modifications that were reflective of the already stated change in the faculty-administrative relationship.

The composition of the Senate shifted in regard to

administrative officers. In 1955 the Senate was composed of all tenured faculty, the President, the Vice President on Academic Affairs, the deans, and other major administrative heads.⁴⁸ The change in composition for the "Bylaws, 1961" involved the administrative officials of the University. Only administrative officials with academic rank could belong to the Senate.⁴⁹ As has already been discussed, there was a growth in professional administration in higher education. Michigan State University had a number of key administrative personnel that were not academicians. The purpose of this change was to separate these individuals from the non-faculty administrators.

There were some functional changes within the Senate, too. First, the number of Senate meetings was reduced from once per term (excluding summer) to once in the fall and once in the spring.⁵⁰ Of course, special sessions could still be called by the President. Second, the Steering Committee was moved from the Senate Organizational subsection and established as a separate entity within the University-level governance structure.⁵¹

Third, and of greatest significance, was the necessity of Senate action on a given item. The assumption in the 1955 Organization was that the Senate would be the primary deliberative faculty body. As has already been discussed, by 1961 the Academic Council had seized the primary role in

University-level faculty governance. The Senate did not abdicate its final authority in the legislative process. Indeed, the legislative process was still the same. What had changed, though, was that beginning with the "Bylaws, 1961" the Academic Council was to determine what actions needed Senate approval.⁵²

This was a major structural change. From this point forward the primacy of the Academic Council was assumed. The ultimate authority of the Senate did not legislatively disappear until the 1975 revision of the "Bylaws". Indeed, it will be shown in succeeding revisions that the Academic Senate's power was wielded on several significant issues. However, this revision in "Bylaws, 1961" was clearly reflective of the understanding on the part of the faculty and the administration that the Academic Council would be the cauldron in which the stuff of University-level faculty participation would simmer, and not the Senate.

Committee Structure

As indicated earlier, this study involves an examination of the development of faculty participation in University-level governance. The primary focus of the study is on the development of the Academic Council and the Academic Senate. However, there is a University-level committee structure that requires some general discussion.

The 1955 Document established the Committee on Committees.⁵³ At the first meeting of the Senate on November 10, 1955, the Committee on Committees presented a Preliminary Report. In the report the Committee identified four problem areas:

1. A study of the present committees to reveal functions, representation, frequency of meetings, and the like;
2. A statement of the proper roles of committees;
3. Provision of a method whereby new committees can be created, and committees which have outlived their purposes abandoned; and
4. Provision of a method whereby the President can easily consult with the Committee on Committees on appointments to Standing Committees of the Faculty.⁵⁴

A Report was approved by the Committee on Committees on February 20, 1956. The Report was subsequently approved by the Academic Council on April 9, 1956.⁵⁵ The Report was based upon eight generalizations fashioned by the Committee:

1. Membership should be rotational.
2. Three-year membership terms were considered desirable (for continuity).
3. Functions of the several committees needed clearer definition.
4. There was a need to give more attention to representational distribution between faculty ranks. Representational distributions between departments and colleges was satisfactory.
5. There was a need for a better ratio of membership between teaching and administrative staff.
6. There needed to be machinery to dismantle

committees that had completed their functions.

7. There needed to be machinery to pool and evaluate the deliberations of committees.
8. Committees should not be established outside a regular pattern of committee structure.⁵⁶

The Report identified four different types of committees not under its jurisdiction:

1. Committees created by the State Board of Agriculture;
2. Temporary Committees;
3. Administrative (Non-Academic) Committees; and
4. College Committees.⁵⁷

Next, the Report outlined a set of "Guiding Principles" for the Committee on Committees:

1. Primary aim is to develop a system of faculty representation that is efficient and effective.
2. Committees should not themselves administer; they should only advise on policy.
3. The number of committees should be limited to a real need.
4. The permanent Standing Committee structure should not duplicate the work of the Academic Council.
5. It is better to start with a minimum structure of committees. If the need developed, new committees could be established.⁵⁸

The Report identified five Standing Committees:

1. Instruction, Curriculum and Research;
2. University Services and Special Events;
3. Student Affairs;

4. Faculty Affairs; and
5. Tenure.⁵⁹

Finally, the Report made suggestions as to areas of responsibility for the various committees⁶⁰ and a suggested rotational system for membership.⁶¹ At the meeting of the Academic Senate on May 1, 1956 this Report was approved.⁶²

It should also be noted that at this same Senate meeting a Report was approved that gave the supervision of the election of the Academic Council to the Vice President for Academic Affairs and established procedures for election of the Steering Committee.⁶³

In the "Bylaws, 1961" Appendix there was established the "Procedures and Functions of the Faculty Standing Committee".⁶⁴ There were eight Standing Committees identified. They were:

1. University Curriculum;
2. Faculty Affairs;
3. Faculty Tenure;
4. Educational Policies;
5. Student Affairs;
6. Library;
7. University Forum; and
8. International Projects.

As previously indicated, the Steering Committee was

separated out from the Academic Senate Section in "Bylaws, 1961". The Steering Committee could now report independently to either the Council or the Senate. This change is reflective of the change in the role of the Academic Council.

The Steering Committee, in "Bylaws, 1961" was given the responsibility for agenda preparation for the Academic Council as well as the Academic Senate. Furthermore, the Steering Committee was to "...act as a means through which faculty may initiate action".⁶⁵

"Bylaws, 1961" had an article regarding "curriculum and course change". This article did not appear in the 1955 Document. The purpose of this article was to clearly define the role of faculty in curriculum change. The article also defined the process for curriculum change.⁶⁶

In essence, each department and college was to have its own curriculum committee. Any modifications in the curriculum had to be approved by the departmental committee, the college committee, and the University Curriculum Committee. And any major changes had to be approved by the Academic Council.

Analysis of Events

As indicated earlier in this chapter the impetus for changing the Faculty Organization Document of 1955 came from the "Committee on the Future of the University". This "Committee" was established by President Hannah, in part, as a reaction to the recommendations of the Russell Commission.* There were also economic concerns. The nationwide recession in 1958 had led to great budgetary concerns (including payless paydays) in Michigan. The combination of these two factors was the major cause of a lowering of morale on the campus.**

President Hannah focused on these concerns, along with the tensions of the tremendous growth experienced by the institution, when he established the "Committee on the Future" as a tool to generate major changes at Michigan State University.

The Committee's Report contained a number of recommendations regarding "Faculty Organization and Participation".⁶⁷ The Committee began this section of the "Report" with the following:

*A Legislative Commission, chaired by John Dale Russell, that made a number of recommendations regarding higher education in Michigan.

**Interviews with Walter Adams and Richard Chapin, Director of Libraries and a member of the Future Committee.

One of the most important dimensions of morale must be a pervasive confidence that administrative officers desire to consult with faculty on matters which deeply concern them or in which they possess expert knowledge of importance in solving a problem.⁶⁸

Contained within this statement was the reflection of the faculty's sentiment in regard to their perceived position within the decision-making process of the University. As has already been discussed in this chapter, major revisions occurred at all of the levels of faculty participation.

In Chapter 2 it was stated that part of the reason for developing the "Faculty Organization Document of 1955" was the fact that the influx of faculty from the more prestigious and sophisticated institutions required this type of change in the faculty-administration relationship. This very same dynamic was in place when the "Committee on the Future", and ultimately the Academic Council and Senate, made these significant recommendations. In "Bylaws, 1961" however, the source and motivation was different from 1955.

During the interview process Dr. Hannah made the statement that he realized that bringing in people from prestigious institutions was not necessarily the best process. There was no guarantee that the person would measure up to his or her reputation. Thus, one of the outcomes of the 1950's was the expansion of so-called "home-grown" talent. In essence,

key faculty and administrative positions were being filled by individuals who had advanced through the ranks at the institution. Dr. Richard Chapin, in his interview, said:

There was a number of young people that had grown up together in the structure during the 1950's. President Hannah wanted people to grow together --- to face problems together...President Hannah also realized there had to be more involvement of the faculty. He knew when he could no longer dictate. The President was not a person to get in the way of the evolutionary process.*

By 1959 the Hannah-led system of decision-making was very well entrenched. As described in Chapter 2, the President met regularly with the Administrative Group and the Breakfast Group. These meetings were the forum in which major policy issues were discussed and decided. Neither of these groups involved the faculty per se. Both of the groups were made up of administrators. The faculty's role on decision-making was in the Academic Council and Senate. As will be discussed shortly, the effectiveness of these two bodies did not encourage the President, or his administration, to increase the influence of the faculty in the decision-making process.

*Professor Walter Adams, during his interview, indicated that President Hannah had the ability to make necessary "adjustments" in his administration to meet the "pervasive mood of the time".

The "Committee on the Future" recognized this gap between administration and faculty in the decision-making process. The Committee wrote the following which identified the concerns of the times:

In the first place, if the faculty is to participate effectively in solving problems, better channels of communication must be developed and used to enable the faculty to learn what problems are confronting the University, their colleagues, or the administration. Too often faculty members are in a position of finding out, after a decision has been made, that the problem existed...⁶⁹

In the second place, if the faculty is to participate effectively in solving problems, there must be an atmosphere that suggests that those in administrative positions are deeply and genuinely concerned about faculty judgments...⁷⁰

In the third place, it is necessary that an organizational structure be developed which provides more effective participation by the faculty in those areas directly affecting the academic and educational policies of the university. There is a question as to whether the composition of the Senate, the Academic Council and the Standing Committees (and the electoral methods employed) have assured the best faculty judgment on matters of policy. The Academic Council is an area of particular concern. But important as organizational structure is, it must be recognized that unless those in administrative positions indicate a continuous desire for and a willingness to be guided by faculty views, reshuffling of organizational patterns can do little to create an environment conducive to high morale and great achievements.⁷¹ (emphasis added)

It is evident from the sentiment expressed by the "Committee on the Future" that the faculty were concerned about the quality of their involvement in decision-making at all levels in the institution. The drastic changes described earlier in this chapter in regard to departmental organization, recognition of faculty involvement in greater areas of

decision-making (e.g. consultation with the Academic Council on budget, personnel and building matters) and the internal governance changes (role of the Academic Council vis-a-vis the Senate; method of election) were all related to this need on the part of the faculty to have serious and substantive input in the decision-making processes.

The "Ad Hoc Committee on Faculty Organization" submitted a "Preliminary Report on February 10, 1961".⁷² In the Forward to the Report the Committee outlined its approach. The Committee recognized that it was attacking "many of the most significant organizational problems of the faculty".⁷³ There were three major areas of concern in the report. First, the departmental organization. The committee wrote that:

...the belief [held by the faculty] that much that makes a university environment good or bad in the eyes of a professor centers in his department. Most changes suggested here move in the direction of a stronger position for the individual faculty member, ⁷⁴ reflecting widespread faculty requests.

The "Committee" also recommended that the Senate structure be modified. The recommendations of the Committee were as follows:

The Senate, composed as at present, shall meet regularly only once each year in the winter term. It shall meet on call, however, of the Academic Steering Committee as instructed by the Academic Council.

Senate action shall be needed only on issues of major importance. Determination of whether a matter must have Senate action will be left to the

Council with the provision that 25 percent of the Council members is sufficient to require Senate action. Senate rules of procedure shall remain as at present unless officially changed.⁷⁵

As has already been described the Senate structure was modified in "Bylaws, 1961" but not quite as drastically as proposed in the "Preliminary Report".⁷⁶ Between the issuance of the "Preliminary Report" on February 10, 1961 and the first set of drafted Bylaws on April 17, 1961 the "Committee" conducted a poll in regard to the major issues raised in the "Preliminary Report". At the meeting of the Academic Council on April 25, 1961, Professor Simonds revealed the results of the survey. On the issue of one Senate meeting per year the survey results were 70 in favor and 83 opposed.⁷⁷

The results of this poll led the "Committee" to compromise on its recommendation. The compromise was reflected in the change to two meetings per year (one fall and one spring) instead of three.

The results of the remainder of the poll items were as follows:⁷⁸

Enlargement of the Academic Council:
97 yes - 43 no

Chairman versus Department Head:
120 yes - 41 no

Mail ballot on advising the dean in reference to change in chairman after 5 year term:
107 yes - 47 no

With the exception of the last items the "Bylaws, 1961" reflect the basic program developed by the "Committee". And the foundation developed by the "Committee" closely followed the recommendations of the "Committee on the Future of the University".

On the eve of the transition from the 1955 Document to the "Bylaws, 1961" there was a discussion in the Academic Council relative to the merits of the body itself. On October 10, 1961 the Academic Council was addressed by the Provost, Paul Miller.*

The remarks of the Provost were recorded by the Secretary, Professor William Combs, as follows:

The Academic Council did well on Faculty Reorganization and the 7 Point Plan** discussions. Wonders if the enlarged Academic Council (new plan) will⁷⁹ continue to concern itself with minor matters...

Secretary Combs then recorded the following in the minutes:

These statements brought forth a discussion, the points of which might be summarized as follows:

1. Council should deal less with detail and more with larger policy matters.
2. Physical arrangements within meeting room might be better.

*"Bylaws, 1961" had not yet been approved. The Council was waiting for the response from the University Attorney, which was transmitted to the Council on October 12, 1961.

**A Board of Trustees Program to restructure the Academic Programs at Michigan State University.

3. Since faculty people usually identify with their disciplines, they are less well acquainted with policies of administration and overall policy. Perhaps the administration members should bring to the Council significant members.
4. Distribution of the agenda well ahead of the meeting would enable the members to consult with the faculty for ideas and suggestions.
5. Some thought there was a chasm between the faculty and administration which ought to be bridged. Others did not think so.
6. Some conceived of the Council as a place to which faculty might bring grievances as well as matters of importance to the University.⁸⁰

The handwritten notes of Secretary Combs reveal the tone and tenor of the remarks made by the Provost:

Provost -- meeting every three weeks for 2 hours -- style and frequency of meetings -- Council regarded as an insipid group -- 1st year Council worked toward inconsequential ends -- change last year to 2 hour meetings...

Last year we had 2 first class questions ad hoc fac. org. report, Proposals on seven points...

Now we have a proposal a larger council -- shall it be only a larger insipid council...

Mood impatient...⁸¹

It is clear that even with all of the work of the "Committee on the Future" and the "Ad Hoc Committee" the dynamic tensions between the faculty and the administration regarding faculty participation were still prevalent.

The Faculty Organization did not begin an atmosphere of tensions. The first meeting of the Academic Council had

been held on September 27, 1955.⁸² This was a preliminary meeting to discuss "ways to devise ways and means of putting into effect at the earliest moment the plan of faculty organization" Professor Kimber was recorded as making the following remarks:

...stressed the idea that in presenting this plan of organization of All College Committee hoped that each of the agencies would operate as all-university units and not in a particular manner in which college interests might be set above University interests.⁸³

The first official meeting of the Academic Council occurred on December 1, 1955.⁸⁴ The meeting was held at the President's home (Cowles House). At this meeting Professor Kimber explained the procedures developed by the Committee. He referred to the Academic Council as a "deliberative assembly". Professor Combs described the functions of the Committee on Course and Curriculum. The Council approved the suggestion of Dean Milton Muelder to split the report of the Curriculum Committee into items of major and minor importance. Also discussed were reports regarding smoking regulations and sabbatical leaves. And finally, Dean Osgood placed on the agenda for the next meeting a proposal for a new organizational pattern for the Graduate School.

The Academic Council met three more times during that academic year. In addition to receiving reports from the Curriculum Committee at each meeting, the Academic Council approved a set of "Rules of Procedure for the Academic

Senate", developed provisions for supervising elections of college representatives and developed procedures for election of members to the Steering Committee.⁸⁵

The "Rules of Procedure for the Academic Senate" had an interesting beginning. The Academic Senate first met on November 10, 1955. At this initial meeting the Senate took action to approve the implementation structure of the Steering Committee and the Committee on Committees. In addition, the Senate received a report on the reorganization of the Athletic Council. Finally, the question was raised as to whether the Report of the Curriculum Committee should go to the Academic Council. The President asked Professor Kimber to prepare a recommendation concerning this issue.⁸⁶

The day after this first meeting of the Academic Senate, President Hannah sent a letter to Professor Kimber. The body of the letter was as follows:

Last night's Senate meeting was a fine object lesson.

It's perfectly evident that the Senate is going to be a useless organization; and if we have too many meetings like that one, no one will come but the discontented.

The purpose of this letter is to ask you and your committee to suggest some procedural rules for conducting these meetings. If you prefer not to have this handled by your standing committee, this is an authorization for you to select a committee from the membership of the Senate to draw up these rules. Send me the list of those you have chosen, and I will appoint them with this specific assignment. We should have this as a report for the first item of business at the next meeting.⁸⁷

On December 1, 1955, Professor Kimber forwarded a "Report" to President Hannah.⁸⁸ As already mentioned, this item was reviewed and approved at the first meeting of the Academic Council.

During the interview process there was no accurate recollection on the part of the interviewees in regard to the first Senate meeting. What was the consensus of the interviewees, however, was that the Senate never developed into the forum for which it had been designed.

It was also the consensus of the interviewees that the only Academic Senate meeting during this period that dealt with an issue of overall educational policy in a fashion envisioned by the planners was the meeting of February 8, 1960.⁸⁹ This was a special meeting of the Senate devoted to the question of the mandatory requirement of two years of ROTC for all males. A structured debate occurred in which each side on the question could present argument and rebuttal. The Senate voted to remove the mandatory requirement. This action was forwarded to the Board of Trustees. The Board refused to approve this action based on the recommendation of the President. President Hannah indicated that the Pentagon believed that the mandatory ROTC program was necessary for manpower planning purposes.

What was important about this meeting was not the outcome.

A few years later the mandatory program was discontinued. What is important is that this meeting is considered by those interviewed to be the pinnacle of the Senate acting as an overall faculty forum for debating a major educational policy issue. Also, the Board of Trustees rejection of the Senate position caused a disaffection between the Trustees and the faculty that would continue to grow during the 1960's.

The first revision of the Faculty Organization Document occurred because the institution was changing and thus there was the need to redefine the faculty/administration relationship. The "Committee on the Future" was the focal point for the growing pains facing Michigan State University. In this regard the Committee was able to use its charge, in addition to many other aspects of the University, to bring to the open the frustrations facing the faculty. The focus of "Bylaws, 1961" was on recognizing the faculty's role in the decision-making process, particularly at the departmental level.

It was the relationship between the faculty and the administration at this level of governance that underwent the most significant change. True, there were significant changes at the University-level, like direct election of faculty representatives and a change for the Academic Council from being consulted to being advisory to the

President. However, "Bylaws, 1961" changed the environment of the basic administrative unit, the department. The faculty now had a voice, and a significant voice, codified in the Bylaws, in the selection of departmental chairmen. And further, faculty had a significant voice in the long-range (five year) planning for the department. Departmental planning entailed programmatic decisions involving budgetary expenditures and personnel. These were items that most faculty had never been consulted with in the past.

As will be described in the next chapter, the five year plan was less than a smashing success. However, the process begun in 1961 of redefining the role of faculty vis-a-vis the academic department would continue. In the process of revising the Bylaws in 1968, the governance system struck boldly and reshaped the entire faculty/administration relationship in regard to faculty participation in University-level decision-making.

NOTES

Chapter 3

1. "Minutes of the Academic Senate", Volume I, November 10, 1955, p. 1.
2. "Minutes of the Academic Council", Volume I, December 1, 1955, p. 2.
3. "Minutes of the Faculty Meetings", Volume VIII, October 20, 1956, p. 545.
4. "A Report to the President of Michigan State University from the Committee on the Future of the University", Archives, Michigan State University Library, UA 14.8.10, Accessum #137, Box 457-8.
5. John A. Hannah, The State of the University, January 16, 1959, Archives, Michigan State University Library, UA 14.8.10. Accessum #137, Box 457-8.
6. Ibid., p. 10.
7. "Committee on the Future of the University", p. 45-47.
8. "Minutes of the Academic Council", Volume IV, November 3, 1959, p. 276-277.
9. "Minutes of the Academic Council", Volume V, January 26, 1960, p. 12.
10. "Minutes of the Academic Council", Volume VI, February 10, 1961, p. 115-124.
11. Ibid., April 17, 1961, p. 125-132.
12. Ibid., June 6, 1961, p. 213-221.
13. Ibid., October 10, 1961, p. 272.
14. Ibid., p. 272-295.
15. Ibid., October 31, 1961, p. 288.
16. Ibid.
17. "Minutes of the Academic Senate", Volume II, November 29, 1961 p. 380.

18. "Minutes of the Academic Council", Volume XII, October 31, 1961, p. 241.
19. Ibid.
20. Ibid., p. 242.
21. Ibid.
22. Ibid.
23. Ibid.
24. Ibid.
25. "Committee on the Future of the University", p. 46.
26. Ibid.
27. Ibid., p. 47.
28. "Minutes of the Academic Council", Volume XII, October 31, 1961, p. 242.
29. Ibid., p. 243.
30. Ibid.
31. Ibid., p. 244.
32. Ibid.
33. Ibid.
34. Ibid.
35. Ibid., p. 245.
36. Ibid.
37. Ibid.
38. Ibid.
39. Ibid.
40. Ibid., p. 246.
41. Ibid.
42. Ibid.
43. Ibid., p. 246-247.

44. Ibid.
45. Ibid.
46. Ibid.
47. Ibid.
48. "Minutes of the Faculty Meeting", Volume VIII, May 19, 1955, P. 544.
49. "Minutes of the Academic Council, Volume XII, October 31, 1966, p. 248.
50. Ibid.
51. Ibid., p. 250.
52. Ibid., p. 248.
53. "Minutes of the Faculty Meetings", Volume VIII, May 19, 1955, p. 548.
54. "Minutes of the Academic Senate", Volume I, November 10, 1955, p. 10.
55. "Minutes of the Academic Council", Volume I, April 24, 1956, p. 77-83.
56. Ibid., p. 77.
57. Ibid., p. 78.
58. Ibid., p. 79.
59. Ibid., p. 80.
60. Ibid., p. 80-81.
61. Ibid., p. 82-83.
62. "Minutes of the Academic Senate", Volume I, May 1, 1956, p. 89.
63. Ibid.
64. "Minutes of the Academic Council", Volume XII, October 31, 1966, p. 253.
65. Ibid., p. 250.
66. Ibid., p. 250-252.
67. "Committee on the Future", p. 45-47.

68. Ibid., p. 45.
69. Ibid., p. 46.
70. Ibid.
71. Ibid.
72. "Minutes of the Academic Council", Volume VI, February 10, 1961, p. 115.
73. Ibid., p. 115.
74. Ibid.
75. Ibid., p. 120.
76. Ibid., p. 125-132.
77. Ibid., p. 85.
78. Ibid.
79. "Minutes of the Academic Council", Volume VI, October 10, 1961, p. 283.
80. Ibidd.
81. Ibid., p. 284.
82. "Minutes of the Academic Council", Volume I, September 27, 1955, p. 1.
83. Ibid.
84. Ibid., p. 2.
85. Ibid., Volume I.
86. "Minutes of the Faculty Meetings". Volume VIII, May 19, 1955, p. 547.
87. "Minutes of the Academic Senate", Volume I, November 10, 1955, p. 6.
88. Ibid., p. 7.
89. Ibid., Volume II, February 8, 1960, p. 183.

CHAPTER 4

DEVELOPMENT OF "BYLAWS, 1968"

Overview and Background

As indicated at the end of Chapter 3, the "Bylaws" were revised for a second time in 1968. This time, however, there was no call for a general University overhaul as there was with the "Committee on the Future". Instead, the revision process began quietly with a letter from the Steering Committee Chairman to the Faculty Affairs Committee Chairman raising questions and concerns about several governance processes that were either in disuse or seemed to disenfranchise some faculty. By the time this process was concluded, the relationship between the faculty and the administration was drastically altered from the days when "The President took us into his confidence..."

On October 31, 1966, Professor John F. A. Taylor, Chairman, Steering Committee, sent a letter to Professor John E. Marston, Chairman, Faculty Affairs Committee, requesting that the Faculty Affairs Committee review certain portions of the "Bylaws, 1961".¹

Professor Taylor outlined seven general areas of concern that had been identified by the Steering Committee as needing review. These seven areas were:

1. The need for a Rule of Procedure governing actions of the Senate on matters of major educational policy. The concern in this area centered around the low level of faculty participation at the Senate meetings. According to Professor Taylor's letter, only 250 out of 1800 members attended Senate meetings.²

The Senate had final authority over Council actions. The small number of faculty participating was a concern in regard to the Senate's overall decision making authority. The Faculty Affairs Committee was asked to examine the possibility of mailed ballots for decision making on major policy decisions.³

2. Articles suspended by disuse. The concern in this area was the current Bylaw requirement regarding formal adoption and review of five year plans by chairmen and deans. This requirement of the "Bylaws, 1961" was not being carried out. The Committee was asked to examine the usefulness of keeping this requirement on the Bylaws.⁴

3. The Dean's Advisory Committees. The Steering Committee's concern here was that these Advisory Committees were not directly accountable within the governance process. Actions taken by these bodies had no basis in authority, nor necessity of transmittal to, the Academic Council. The Faculty Affairs committee was asked to review this situation with the clear directive that linkage to the governance system be strengthened.⁵

4. Faculty members not represented in the Academic Council. The concern raised here was in regard to faculty in programs like Continuing Education and Honors College. These faculty members had no formal representation (by elected faculty college representatives) because these units were not specifically provided for in the Bylaws. These two units were not colleges.⁶

5. The selection of members to Faculty Standing

Committees. This concern came from the "ByLaw, 1961" provision (I.2.g.[2]) that provided for Presidential appointment to standing committees that did not have all-college representation. This practice was viewed as a "dilution" of faculty authority (according to Professor Taylor). The committee was charged with developing a new pattern for selection to standing committees that would accommodate the legitimate demands of the faculty with the legitimate demands of the administration.

6. Standing procedures and functions of the committees. There was a concern that the current document regarding procedures was outside the structure of the Bylaws and needed to be incorporated.
7. Relations between Ad Hoc, Advisory and Standing Committees. The concern indicated here was to find a means of integrate the process of ad hoc committees with that of the formalized governance system.

Professor Taylor's letter, while giving a broad-based charge to the Faculty Affairs Committee, was quite clear that a new charter was not being sought. The Committee was only to make technical revisions to make the Bylaws more effective and efficient.¹⁰

On November 21, 1966, the Faculty Affairs Committee appointed a three person subcommittee to study the existing "Bylaws, 1961" and make recommendations. The three persons selected were Professors Joseph A. Strelzoff (Chairman), Merle L. Esmay, and Gerald J. Massey.¹¹

In April 1967, the subcommittee made its report to the Faculty Affairs Committee.¹² The full committee transmitted

the proposal to the Academic Council in May 1967. The Report was titled "Suggested Revisions of the Bylaws".¹³ In keeping with the charge from Professor Taylor, the "Forward" to the Report stated the following:

Although these proposed bylaws would, if adopted, replace in toto the existing bylaws, it should be noted that most of the provisions of the existing bylaws remained unchanged. The use of a more perspicuous format, the elimination of minor ambiguities, and re-arrangement of material in the interest of information retrieval made it impractical to enumerate each specific change in the bylaws and necessitated holistic replacement.¹⁴

The Report was first presented to the Academic Council on June 6, 1967. Professor Taylor indicated that the Report was being distributed at that meeting to allow faculty to review the document over the summer. The intention of the Steering Committee was to deliberate and act on the document in the fall.¹⁵

At this same meeting, Professor Massey made some general remarks as to the major changes being proposed. These comments were recorded in the minutes as follows:

1. The section on the University Curriculum Committee in the present Bylaws will appear in another document.
2. Differences are to be noted between the departmentally organized colleges and the residential colleges, especially with reference to representation on the Academic Council.
3. Some members of the faculty standing committees will be elected from the colleges; 3 members will be appointed by the President.
4. The section relating to the review of the

departmental chairman has been altered but not changed materially.

5. The establishment of college councils is a new concept.
6. The Steering Committee is made the final authority on interpretation of the Bylaws. It is, therefore, given a judicial power.
7. Provision is made for administrative support of faculty government.¹⁶

The Council began its deliberations on October 31, 1967.¹⁷ The Council then met on November 7, 27, 28 and December 1, 1967 to debate and amend the document. On December 1, 1967 the Academic Council approved the amended "Bylaws" and submitted the document for approval to the Academic Senate on January 23, 1968.¹⁸

The Senate did not approve the document. The Senate referred the document back to the Council for revision. The Senate raised concerns over the membership of the Academic Council and the provision regarding mailed ballots.¹⁹

At the February 13, 1968, meeting of the Council, Professor Taylor reported that the document had been referred back to the Faculty Affairs Committee on February 5, 1968.²⁰ The Committee, now chaired by Professor Karl F. Thompson, would make its report by April 9, 1968.

Professor Thompson transmitted the recommendations of the Committee to Professor Taylor on April 15, 1968.²¹ The

Council took up debate on the new recommendations on May 14, 1968. The Council met again on May 16, 1968 and concluded its deliberations on May 20, 1968.²² The Academic Senate met again on May 29, 1968 at which time the Bylaw revisions were approved.²³ Subsequently the Board of Trustees approved the Bylaw revisions on July 11, 1968.²⁴ "The Bylaws of the Faculty, Michigan State University, 1968" became operative immediately.

This was the second major revision to the Faculty Organization. This revision did not make major structural changes vis-a-vis the organization of the governance structure. However, major changes in the relationship between the faculty and administration did occur. To understand these changes, there are three phases, encompassing four documents, that will be discussed in this chapter. First, the comparison between the "Bylaws, 1968" and the "Bylaws, 1961" will be examined. Second, there will be an analysis of the document proposed by the Faculty Affairs Committee in May 1967. And finally, there will be an analysis of the document that was rejected by the Senate in January 1968 (followed by a discussion of the revisions that permitted Senate passage in May 1968). These sections will be followed by a discussion of the events which impacted on the council as it made its deliberations.

Structural Analysis

The first noticeable difference, again, in reviewing the document is its size. "Bylaws, 1961" was 17 pages of text, single spaced. "Bylaws, 1968" was 58 pages of text. Even though "Bylaws, 1968" is double spaced and organized in a more detailed numeric format, it is clear that the "Bylaws" were expanding in size and, as will be discussed in this chapter, scope and purpose.

Article 1: The Faculty

Article 1 in "Bylaws, 1968" did not change the definition of faculty (those persons holding the rank of professor, associate professor, assistant professor or instructor). Also, the principal administrative officers in the major educational and research units retained the status of faculty.²⁵

The faculty were now divided, though, between the "Regular Faculty" and the "Temporary Faculty". Specifically, if an individual had faculty status and was appointed under the tenure rules, he/she was a regular faculty member; if not appointed under the tenure rules, the faculty member was considered temporary.²⁶

The importance of this revision is reflected in the fact that faculty who had not yet received tenure, but were appointed in the tenure stream, were now to be a part of the

Voting Faculty.²⁷ In addition, non-tenured regular faculty (except instructors) were now eligible to be members of the Academic Senate.²⁸

The definition of the Voting Faculty was also divided. The division occurred on "internal matters (those concerning activities within the unit)" and "external matters".²⁹ Internal voting faculty included "Regular Faculty" instructors. External voting faculty excluded instructors. The definition of voting faculty was expanded to include program areas of Extension and Counseling ("Bylaws, 1961" only recognized faculty involved with teaching, research and administration).³⁰

Section 1.2.4 and 1.2.4.1³¹ detailed the procedure for identifying faculty members with dual appointments (faculty who were appointed on a 50% basis in two colleges). These two sections typify the growing diversification of the institution. These sections also provided for the enfranchisement of many more faculty members.

The last major change in the first article dealt with the rights and privileges of the faculty. "Bylaws, 1961" contained the following statement:

The voting faculty shall possess and exercise those rights and duties which are conferred by the Constitution of the State of Michigan upon the faculty of Michigan State University or which may have been or shall be delegated to it by authority

of the³² Board of Trustees of Michigan State University.

"Bylaws, 1968," rephrased and expanded this statement:

The Constitution of the State of Michigan confers upon the Board of Trustees the responsibility for the general supervision of the University: the voting faculty shall possess and exercise those rights and duties which are delegated to it by authority of the Board. These rights and duties are enumerated in the Bylaws of the Board of Trustees. In addition to the established rights and privileges of the academic profession (academic freedom and tenure, compensation and other economic benefits as liberal as the resources of the University will allow, a viable faculty organization and responsible faculty participation in the development of academic programs and policies), the Faculty possesses those rights and responsibilities set down in Article VII of the Bylaws³³ of the Board of Trustees of December 16, 1965.

Article VII of the Bylaws of the Board of Trustees was included as a part of "Bylaws, 1968" (as an appendix).³⁴ These three pages describe, in very broad terms, the rights of the faculty and the Board's charge to the faculty (teaching, research and service). Section 1.2.5 of "Bylaws, 1968" enumerated rights and privileges of the faculty that clearly go beyond the Board's Bylaws. This will be more fully discussed in the section on Analysis of Events.

Article 2: Department and School Organization

Article 2 of "Bylaws, 1968" dealt with Department and School Organization.³⁵ Structurally the departmental organization remained virtually the same as developed in "Bylaws, 1961". The only additional item of structure involved the

development of codified departmental bylaws.³⁶

"Bylaws, 1968" also included in this article a portion of the 1966 American Association of University Professors (AAUP) "Statement on Government of Colleges and Universities" regarding the selection of a chairman.³⁷ These Bylaws recognized the right of the Dean, President and Board to select a chairman. But, the 1966 AAUP "Statement" clearly indicates that the faculty's involvement in the selection (which could include a departmental election) must be given high regard.³⁸

The faculty were making a statement about the relationship of the chairman to the faculty. The role of chairman was changed drastically in "Bylaws, 1961" (see Chapter 3). This section in "Bylaws, 1968" indicated that the faculty now viewed the chairman as their representative to the institution and not the University administration's first line of supervision.

The requirement for five-year programmatic planning developed in "Bylaws, 1961" did not continue in "Bylaws, 1968". Item 2 of Professor Taylor's letter of October 31, 1966 had been dealt with expeditiously. Indeed, the provision never even appeared in the first revision document.

Article 3: College Organization

Item 3 of Professor Taylor's letter dealt with the role of the Dean's Advisory Council. "Bylaws, 1961" provided that the dean was to make provision for the establishment of the advisory council. However, as indicated in the Taylor letter, there was no mechanism for integration with the rest of the University governance system.

College Advisory Councils in "Bylaws, 1968" were still ambiguous in structure.³⁹ The type of structure was still to be determined by the college itself. However, faculty representation on the Advisory Council was now to be by election. The procedures for election were subject to the review of the Committee on Committees.⁴⁰ In addition, one elected college representative to the Academic Council would be selected as an ex-officio, non-voting member of the College Advisory Council. This representative was to act as the liaison between the college council and the elected representatives to the Academic Council.⁴¹

Obviously this system did not provide for direct linkage between the college and the University-level governance system. However, a stronger mechanism for communication between the two bodies was now in place.

Article 4: University Organization

The fourth article in "Bylaws, 1968" dealt with the University Organization.⁴² "Bylaws, 1961" was divided into four separate sections: Convocation of the Faculty, Academic Council, Academic Senate and the Academic Steering Committee. "Bylaws, 1968" removed the convocation from this article (and placed it under Article I - The Faculty) and added three new sections; The President (4.1), Principal University Academic Officers (4.2) and the Committee on Committees (4.6).

The President

The first two sections of Article 4 (4.1 and 4.2) were developed, in part, as a result of the 1966 AAUP "Statement". In these sections of "Bylaws, 1968" there were further quotations from the 1966 "Statement". In regard to the President, the following was quoted:

...The selection of a chief administrative officer should follow upon cooperative search by the governing board and the faculty...The President should be equally qualified to serve as the executive officer of the governing board and as the chief academic officer of the institution and the faculty. His dual role requires that he be able to interpret to board and faculty the educational views and concepts of institutional government of the other. He should have the confidence of the board and the faculty.⁴³ (emphasis added)

In Article 2 the faculty had redefined the role of chairman by stating that he/she would be their "representative to the administration". Section 4.1, in a similar view, redefined, in the faculty perspective, the relationship and obligation

of the President to the Board and the faculty. The faculty viewed the presidency as being, in major part, the chief faculty representative to the Board of Trustees. This would be in keeping with the general position developed in the 1966 AAUP "Statement".

The faculty further expanded on this presidential concept by obligating themselves, in the Bylaws, to develop a set of procedures, to be submitted to the Board of Trustees which would accomplish the following:

...the Academic Council shall formulate procedures which shall make it possible for the Faculty to provide such assistance and consultation at the appropriate times.⁴⁴ (emphasis added)

The operative word in this section was "shall". The faculty clearly took the position that they had a preeminent role in the selection of the President.*

Principal University Academic Officers

Section 4.2 also dealt with the question of selection. In this instance, the concern was in regard to university academic officers other than the President.⁴⁵ Again, there was a reliance on the 1966 AAUP "Statement". The President had the responsibility to consult with the faculty in regard to selection criteria for university academic

*Such a document was formulated, approved and used in the selection of President Clifton R. Wharton, Jr.

officers. This section also contained a similar obligation for the development of a procedures document for selection of these officials.

Academic Senate

Section 4.3 described the Academic Senate.⁴⁶ Organizationally the major change in the Senate was the eligibility of non-tenured faculty for membership (see the earlier discussion, Article 1). "Bylaws, 1968" cross referenced the section dealing with faculty rights and privileges (1.2.5) with the Senate section. The Senate could discuss any matter of general welfare to the University, but was limited to the tenets of Section 1.2.5. As already discussed, Section 1.2.5 was a very broad-stroke statement of faculty responsibility and authority.

Section 4.3.2.2 indicated that the faculty recognize that their privilege and authority was not unfettered. The question of faculty privilege and authority grew to be a major issue that will be more fully discussed in Chapter 6 which deals with "Bylaws, 1975".

The reporting relationship between the Senate and the Council remained as it was in "Bylaws, 1961". The wording changes provided for no substantive difference.

Academic Council

Section 4.4 dealt with the structure and organization of the Academic Council.⁴⁷ The Academic Council was structurally divided into three subgroups. The first group that was developed was the "Elected Faculty Council".⁴⁸ This group was made up of the elected faculty representatives, the President, the Provost, and the Steering Committee. A subgroup such as this was first proposed by Professor James Fisher in June, 1963.⁴⁹ All of the members of the Elected Faculty Council were voting members of the Academic Council except for the President, who could vote to break a tie.⁵⁰

The second group developed was the Appointed Council.⁵¹ This group was made up of all the deans. This group also retained its voting status in the Academic Council.

The third group to be developed was the "ex-officio" members.⁵² This group included administrative officers responsible for admissions, scholarships and registration; Undergraduate Education; Honors College, Continuing Education, the Libraries; the standing committee chairman, and the Ombudsman. In addition, and for the first time, the Academic Council would have student representation. The Associated Students of Michigan State University (ASMSU) were allowed to send two undergraduate representatives. The Graduate Council would select one graduate student. The ex-officio members, including the students, were members with

voice, but without the vote.⁵³

The apportionment and election procedures remained intact. Each college had a minimum of two representatives, with a maximum of eight representatives based on the number of faculty divided by forty. However, the method of determining the number of faculty per college was changed. A new terminology appeared in "Bylaws, 1968"; the term "full-time equivalent" (FTE). The apportionment factor was now to be based on a budget-related factor as opposed to a per capita factor. To be a member of the voting faculty still required a full-time appointment. The apportionment change to FTE was a reflection of the growing diversification of the faculty. The split appointment was being used more and more in the staffing of the colleges. Apportionment based on FTE was a truer reflection of the "size" of a college's faculty.

Another new term to appear in the "Bylaws, 1968" was the Residential College (see Definition of Terms, Chapter 1). The addition of new colleges was provided for by an "interpretation" to "Bylaws, 1961" on November 9, 1965.⁵⁴ However, in "Bylaws, 1968" the Residential Colleges were limited to only one representative with additional representation up to seven (based on the size of the faculty divided by forty).⁵⁵

Lastly, a new constituency was recognized within the voting

faculty. This was the non-college faculty.⁵⁶ This group was listed by Professor Taylor in his letter to the Faculty Affairs Committee. This group of "Regular" faculty, not represented by and through a college, were entitled to the same type of representation as the Residential Colleges.

In regard to individual faculty participation, "Bylaws, 1968" put a limitation on the length of service for an elected faculty representative. From this point on a representative could only succeed himself once.⁵⁷ However, the faculty member could still be eligible for service on a standing committee or the Steering Committee.

The functions of the Academic Council remained the same. However, as has already been discussed, the emphasis of the relationship between the Academic Council and the President was redefined. "Bylaws, 1961" stated that when it was feasible, the President would consult with the Academic Council on matters such as "buildings, budget policies and new proposals and developments".⁵⁸ "Bylaws, 1968" did not leave room for any caveat on feasibility. The Administration now would be required to "inform the Council and shall seek its advice".⁵⁹

The Academic Council was also given the sole authority to interpret the Bylaws.⁶⁰ This had been the practice of the faculty organization since 1955. The Faculty Affairs

Committee proposed, in the first draft document, that the Steering Committee have this function. There is no recorded discussion on this issue. At the November 27, 1967 meeting of the Academic Council this change was made.⁶¹ The motion was made by Professor John Reinhoel and was approved without recorded comment.

Procedurally, there were two changes in "Bylaws, 1968" for the Academic Council. One was the requirement that the Elected Faculty Council meet on a regular basis. The second was that the meetings of the Academic Council would be open to the public and the press.⁶²

Steering Committee

The Steering Committee was provided for in "Bylaws, 1968" as it had been in "Bylaws, 1961". The only difference in the Steering Committee Section (4.5) involved the appointment process to fill vacancies. Vacancies would be filled by a vote of the Academic Council and not by the President.⁶³

Committee on Committees

Finally under University Organization was the elevation of the Committee on Committees to a status distinct from the other standing committees (Section 4.6). The Committee would now be on par with the Steering Committee. The Committee's membership was expanded to include representation from both the residential colleges and the non-college

faculty.⁶⁴ An interesting development was the limited eligibility for the Committee. Membership was limited to first term elected college representatives. Committee members were elected by the other elected college representatives from their college.⁶⁵

The functions of the Committee were altered considerably. The Committee, in addition to advising the President on committee structure, now would be advisory to the Academic Council as well. In addition, the Committee on Committees would act as the conduit between all of the committees within the governance system.⁶⁶ The changes in regard to the Committee on Committees were another indication of the faculty's determination to end the perceived domination of the governance structure by the President. The Committee was now directly accountable to the Academic Council and not to the President.

Article 5: Standing Committees

Article 5 of "Bylaws, 1968" was devoted to the definition and operations of the Standing Committees. Nine Standing Committees were identified in "Bylaws, 1968". These committees were:⁶⁷

1. University Curriculum Committee;
2. University Educational Policies Committee;
3. University Faculty Affairs Committee;
4. University Faculty Tenure Committee;

5. University Committee on Honors Program;
6. University International Projects Committee;
7. University Library Committee;
8. University Student Affairs Committee; and
9. University Committee on Business Affairs.

Two of these committees were developed during the debates on the Bylaws. These were the Committees on Honors Program and Business Affairs.

Articles 6 and 7: Other Committees

General rules were established for all the standing committees. In addition, specific committee functions were developed for each of the committees.⁶⁸ Article 6 continued this process in regard to Faculty-Student Standing Committees and Agencies.⁶⁹ Article 7 dealt with the formation of "Ad Hoc" committees and the clear direction that the use of this type of body should be kept to the bare minimum.⁷⁰

Article 8: Administrative Support

Article 8 was also a new concept for the "Bylaws".⁷¹ This article dealt with Administrative Support and placed a requirement on the administration (from department through to the Provost) for necessary support (clerical, etc.) and recognition of faculty participation. In particular, this section required that participation in governance was to be

considered in a faculty members work-load (see Definition of Terms, Chapter 1). This was a reflection of the faculty's perspective on the importance of faculty participation. Participation was not to be viewed as some form of extra-curricular activity. It was a legitimate part of a faculty member's responsibilities within the institution.

Article 9: Interpretation and Amendment

Article 9 dealt with the issue of interpretation and amendment to the Bylaws.⁷² As previously stated, the interpretation of the "Bylaws, 1968" would be done by the Academic Council, and not by the Steering Committee. The Amendment process was altered to provide for a mailed ballot to all Senate members if a proposed amendment was approved by the Senate, but rejected by the Academic Council.

Articles 5 through 9 are important in understanding the overall development of faculty participation in university-level governance at Michigan State University. As with any large and diverse representative type structure, the committee system is the work-horse in the structure. The selection of committee membership is the key to the control of the work of the committees. "Bylaws, 1968" was, in great part, a change in the control of the faculty governance system. In 1955, when the Faculty Organization was first developed, the President controlled, by and large, who would and could participate in the system. "Bylaws, 1961" removed

some of this Presidential control by providing for the direct election of representatives to the Academic Council. But "Bylaws, 1961" was primarily aimed at the faculty's relationship with the departmental structure of the University. "Bylaws, 1968" was clearly system reformation at the University-level. The faculty governance system was to be responsive and accountable to the faculty, not to the administration. Indeed, the faculty, for the first time at Michigan State University, saw the President and his chief officers as accountable to, and representative of, the faculty.

"Bylaws, 1968" was not a "palace revolt". There was no thought of a direct challenge to the authority of President John A. Hannah. Indeed, there was never a concern raised by any of the interviewees that President Hannah "stacked" any standing committee or blocked the appointment of any faculty member. "Bylaws, 1968" was, instead, a recognition by the faculty, the administration and the Board of Trustees that the Faculty Organization was properly accountable to itself. The faculty governance process first recognized by the 1955 Document had come to full fruition with "Bylaws, 1968".

Analysis of Revision Process

Before an analysis of the events of the period 1961 to 1968 are discussed it is important to understand the total

revision process that developed "Bylaws, 1968". As described in the first part of this chapter, there are two other documents that require discussion; the first draft of the Faculty Affairs Committee (May 1967) and the Bylaws first approved by the Academic Council but rejected by the Academic Senate (December 1, 1967 and January 23, 1968, respectively).

The Faculty Affairs Committee reported its "Suggested Revisions of the Bylaws" in May 1967.⁷³ This document contained the following major sections:

1. The Faculty;
2. Department and School Organization;
3. College Organization;
4. University Organization;
5. Faculty Standing Committees;
6. Administrative Support of Faculty Government;
and
7. Amendment Process.

There was also an Appendix which provided for the Faculty-Student Standing Committees.

As already mentioned, the Report underwent some minor changes during the summer. The revised "Report" was submitted to the Academic Council on October 13, 1967.⁷⁴ This was the document that was used for the deliberations of the Council during the Fall Term. There was one major section

The section on Ad Hoc Committees was added to the document.⁷⁵

Article 1

Article 1 in the draft document did not propose the division of the faculty between the "Regular" and "Temporary" faculty. The draft did propose that tenure-stream faculty be eligible for inclusion in the voting faculty.⁷⁶ The development of the concept of regular and temporary faculty came about during the deliberations on November 28, 1967.⁷⁷ The concept was introduced by Dean Clarence L. Winder.

The draft document did contain the concept of internal and external voting faculty.⁷⁸ The draft document did not provide for faculty in the programmatic areas of Extension and Counseling. The inclusion of these two programmatic areas also came from deliberations on the floor of the Council. The suggestion to include these two areas came from Milton B. Dickerson, Vice President for Student Affairs, and Professor E. C. Miller.⁷⁹

The draft document also did not include the statement of faculty rights and privileges, based upon the "Bylaws of the Board of Trustees" and the 1966 AAUP Statement.⁸⁰ This too came from deliberations on the floor of the Council.

Articles 2 and 3

In regard to the Department and School Organization (Article 2), the draft document did not include the references to the 1966 AAUP "Statement" nor the resultant expectation that the chairman was to be the faculty's representative to the administration.⁸¹ Similarly, the draft document did not directly quote the 1966 AAUP "Statement" in regard to the college organization (Article 3). The "Bylaws, 1968", as already discussed, contained the provision for faculty input into the selection of deans. The draft document was followed quite closely in the final version in regard to this article. The only substantive change was the requirement that the College Advisory Council procedures be reviewed by the Committee on Committees.

Article 4

The draft document did not contain sections 4.1 and 4.2; the President and the Principal University Academic Officers, respectively. These two provisions were added after the Senate meeting which did not approve the December 1, 1967 Bylaws Report. Article 4 was the major area of dispute between the Academic Council and Academic Senate. The Chairman of the Steering Committee, Professor John Taylor, reported to the Academic Council the following at the February 13, 1968 meeting:

...(from a letter to Dr. Karl Thompson, chairman of the Faculty Affairs Committee)...although the Senate had offered no amendments to the Bylaws,

members had clearly asked for serious reconsideration of the mailed ballot and of the composition of the Academic Council. The Bylaws should provide for an agency where the voice of the faculty can be clearly defined and one where the views of the faculty and administration may be joined.⁸²

The draft document established the membership of the Academic Council on the same basic premise as had existed in the past. Specifically, the Academic Council was composed of the President and the Provost, the deans, the several major academic/administrative unit officers and the elected college representatives. All of these individuals had voting privileges.⁸³

The December 1, 1967 document contained only two modifications to the membership reported in the draft document. One was the inclusion of representation for the non-college faculty.⁸⁴ The second was the provision for student representatives to appear at least once per year to "present matters of concern to the students of the University".⁸⁵

Senate Rejection

On April 15, 1968, Professor Thompson transmitted a set of revisions prepared by the Faculty Affairs Committee to the December 1, 1967 document that were based upon the Senate's rejection. Dr. Thompson's letter of transmittal stated, in part, the following:

...Our recommendations are based on an intensive study of suggestions made by the faculty groups of many of the colleges and departments, by the local

chapter of the A.A.U.P., and by many individual faculty members and administrative officers. These suggestions were received in many forms: as responses to written personal invitations for suggestions, as responses to a general invitation for suggestions, and as statements made at an open hearing on the Faculty Bylaws. The Committee also relied heavily on the Statement on Government of College and Universities,...⁸⁶

Faculty Affairs Report

The Faculty Affairs Committee recommended changes in Articles 1 through 6. The broad-based statement of faculty rights found in Section 1.2.5 (with the reference to the Bylaws of the Board of Trustees) came from this revision report.⁸⁷ Also, the amplification of the faculty's right to involvement in the selection of chairmen and deans (with the influence of the 1966 AAUP "Statement") in Articles 2 and 3 came from Professor Thompson's committee report.⁸⁸

It was in Article 4, though, that the major objections from the Senate were dealt with. Professor Thompson, in his letter of transmittal, stated the following:

...If...the recommended manner of dealing with the voting composition of the Academic Council does not meet with the approval of the Council, the Committee suggests that the Council consider this alternative, viz. in addition to the voting elected members, to give vote only to those ex-officio members of the Council who bring with them elected voting faculty, i.e. to the Deans of the departmental and residential colleges.⁸⁹

The Faculty Affairs committee recommended that the voting privileges of the presiding officer (either President or Provost) be limited to tie breaking; that the deans and

major administrative/academic officers be limited to membership without vote; and that the Director of Undergraduate Education be added, without voting privileges.⁹⁰

Council Debate

This report was first introduced and discussed on the floor of the Academic Council on May 14, 1968.⁹¹ The change in regard to the voting posture of the presiding officer passed with no recorded comments.⁹² However, the proposed revision that would remove the vote from the deans and the other academic administrators in the Council provoked a lengthy debate. The deans' vote was the major item of debate.

Professor Thompson explained to the Council that the Committee's recommendation for membership without vote for the deans was a compromise position.⁹³ Professor Massey told the Council that his subcommittee (which drafted the revisions) was faced with three alternatives:

1. Retain the present membership...
2. Remove ex-officio members...
3. Deprive ex-officio members of a vote...

The committee, he reported, chose the third alternative.⁹⁴

Professor Albert Rabin, representing some 600 faculty members (in the form of a signed petition) spoke in opposition to membership on the Academic Council to anyone but the

elected faculty representatives. Specifically, the petition proposed the following:

1. The Academic Council shall be composed exclusively of the President and the Provost of the University, serving ex officio and with vote, and of persons elected by the regular faculty of the University, serving with vote; and
2. The decisions of the regular faculty of the University shall be made by majority vote in the Senate after proper discussion.⁹⁵

Many faculty members spoke in opposition to the proposal. The comments included statements that the deans could not outvote the faculty in the Council nor would the deans likely attend if they could not vote. Professor Taylor took the position that if the deans and other administrative officials were excluded, all disputes between the faculty and the administration would have to go to the Board of Trustees. This, according to Dr. Taylor, "would not strengthen the voice of the faculty as the six hundred petitioners wished". Comments were also generated from deans and administrative officers. Vice President Milton Muelder indicated that without the vote, deans would not be inclined to attend. Dean Willis W. Armistead agreed, and also indicated that deans needed to be present at the meetings to gain needed insight into faculty opinion.⁹⁶

President Hannah added his comments to the debate. He indicated that a decision to exclude the deans could weaken the University. Such a decision would make it more

difficult to recruit professors to serve as deans and chairmen.⁹⁷

No final action was taken at that meeting. The Academic council met again on May 16, 1968. The first item of discussion was the membership of the Academic Council. Professor Thompson again urged the Council to consider the Faculty Affairs Committee's alternative recommendation of giving the vote to elected representatives and those ex-officio members that bring with them elected members (i.e. the deans).⁹⁸ Professor Walter Adams spoke in opposition to the inclusion of the deans. The minutes of that meeting record the following:

...many Michigan State University faculty are dissatisfied with their lack of voice in University policy. They believe that the deans have the opportunity to advise in the Administrative Group and ask only for a separate faculty council that may meet separately and directly with the President and the Provost. ...He distributed a letter from the chapter of the American Association of University Professors asking that:

1. A Faculty Council, composed of elected members of the Faculty, the President, and the Provost, to meet at stated intervals and to act for the Senate where permitted by the Bylaws.
2. Joint meetings of the Faculty Council and the Administrative Group, at stated intervals and ad hoc. The agenda should be set by the Steering Committee and confined to matters first voted upon the the Faculty Council.⁹⁹

Professor Adams then moved that the Academic Council be composed of the President, the Provost, and the elected faculty representatives. Furthermore, it was understood

that deans were eligible to stand for election.¹⁰⁰

Dean Clarence Winder distributed a mimeographed substitute for the section (4.4.1) that was under discussion. In essence this proposal accomplished the following:

The Academic Council shall consist of the President and the Provost and of three subgroups: an Elected Faculty Council, an Appointed Council (of deans), and a group of ex-officio members. In Academic Council, voting would be restricted to the Councils of Faculty and Deans with the President or Provost breaking the votes as presiding officer. The Elected Faculty Council shall meet separately and it, as well as the Appointed Council, may transmit recommendations to the Academic Council.¹⁰¹

Professor Adams motion was defeated. Dean Winder's motion was approved (and given to the subcommittee to place it into Bylaw format).¹⁰²

Another major change in the membership of the Academic Council occurred at that meeting. Vice President Milton Dickerson proposed that two undergraduate students and one graduate student be added as ex-officio, non-voting members of the Academic Council. This motion was approved.¹⁰³

The revision report transmitted by Professor Thompson on April 15, 1968 also contained two new sections to the University Organization. These were the sections regarding the President and the Principal Academic Officers. As already has been discussed in detail, the influence of the 1966 AAUP "Statement" was the catalyst for the development

of these two sections. The Academic Council approved these two sections, without recorded comment on May 14, 1968.¹⁰⁴

The April 15, 1967 Report also contained numerous changes in the Article 5 dealing with the Standing Committees. Most of these changes were technical in nature. One, however, involved the inclusion of a new Standing Committee, the University Committee on Business Affairs.¹⁰⁵

On May 20, 1968 the Academic Council approved the Bylaw language that had been developed for the Winder proposal.¹⁰⁶ The Academic Senate approved of these changes and passed the new Bylaws on May 29, 1968. The Board of Trustees adopted these Bylaw Revisions on July 11, 1968.

Analysis of Event

In the opening Section of this Chapter it was stated that the governance system came to full fruition with the adoption of "Bylaws, 1968". When Professor Taylor wrote his October 31, 1966 letter which began the Bylaw revision process, Michigan State University had grown considerably since the "Bylaws" had been revised in 1961. By 1966 there were almost 1,600 individuals with faculty appointments.¹⁰⁷ The student enrollment was now over 41,000.¹⁰⁸ This figure is nearly double the size of the student body in 1960.

However, the revision process which led to "Bylaws, 1968" was not so much a function of size as it was a function of role perception. "Bylaws, 1968" was a process by which the faculty established themselves as a totally separate constituency (a type of "body politic") within the University. "Bylaws, 1968" changed the relationship between the faculty and their departments. "Bylaws, 1968" changed the faculty's relationship with the colleges and the University.

The changes that exploded on the American society in the early and mid-1960's need not be reiterated in this report. These changes brought about, in part, the reexamination of the authority structures in many of our social institutions. Michigan State University was no exception. In December 1965, the Committee on Student Affairs was charged by the Academic Council with developing a proposal concerning "Academic Freedom of Students".¹⁰⁹ Although there had been earlier discussions for this type of review, the catalyst for the project to begin came from the suspension of a student, Mr. Paul Schiff, during the summer of 1965.¹¹⁰ On January 10, 1967 the Academic Council approved the Academic Freedom Report for Students at Michigan State University.¹¹¹

While this document is not directly related to the "Bylaws", it went through a similar developmental process. In developing the document a number of assumptions were debated in

regard to student/faculty/University relations. For the purposes of this study the significance of the Academic Freedom Report on faculty participation in University-level governance is that the document contained the first reference to so-called "faculty rights". These "faculty rights" are found in Sections 2.1.4.9 and 2.2 of the Report.¹¹²

In essence, these two Sections codified the right of the faculty to only be evaluated or judged by other faculty. In the context of the "Bylaws" it is clear how this process would superimpose itself onto that revision process. This, coupled with "Position Statements" being developed at the national level by organizations like the AAUP, AAHE, etc., gave great impetus to the Academic Senate forcing the Academic Council to redesign the composition of the Academic Council, as well as institute measures suggested in the 1966 AAUP "Statement".

"Bylaws, 1968" helped to separate and identify the faculty's role in University-level decision-making. As will be discussed in Chapter 5 the faculty quickly developed a very defensive posture in regard to this newly identified role with the introduction of student participation in academic governance. And, as will be detailed in Chapter 6, it was not until the 1975 revision to the "Bylaws" that this newly identified role for the faculty in University decision-making would be formalized.

NOTES

Chapter 4

1. "Minutes of the Academic Council", Volume XII, October 31, 1966, p. 218.
2. Ibid., p. 218.
3. Ibid., p. 219.
4. Ibid.
5. Ibid., p. 220.
6. Ibid.
7. Ibid., p. 220-221.
8. Ibid., p. 221.
9. Ibid.
10. Ibid., p. 218.
11. Ibid., May 1967, p. 222.
12. Ibid.
13. Ibid.
14. Ibid.
15. Ibid., June 6, 1967, p. 138.
16. Ibid., p. 139.
17. "Minutes of the Academic Council", Volume XIII, October 31, 1967, p. 59.
18. "Minutes of the Academic Senate", Volume IV, January 23, 1968, p. 1-11.
19. Ibid.
20. "Minutes of the Academic Council", Volume XIII, February 5, 1968, p. 188.
21. Ibid., April 15, 1968, p. 321.

22. Ibid., May 20, 1968, p. 408.
23. Ibid., p. 432.
24. "Minutes of the Board of Trustees", July 11, 1968.
25. "Minutes of the Academic Council", Volume XIII, May 7, 1968, p. 439.
26. Ibid.
27. Ibid., p. 440.
28. Ibid., p. 456.
29. Ibid., p. 440-441.
30. Ibid.
31. Ibid., p. 441-441.
32. Ibid., Volume XII, October 31, 1966, p. 242.
33. Ibid., Volume XIII, May 7, 1968, p. 442-443.
34. Ibid., p. 494-496.
35. Ibid., p. 444-448.
36. Ibid., p. 448.
37. Ibid., p. 445-446.
38. AAUP Bulletin, "Statement on Government of Colleges and Universities", Volume 52, number 4, Winter, 1966, p. 375-379.
39. "Minutes of the Academic Council", Volume XIII, May 7, 1968, p. 451-453.
40. Ibid., p. 452.
41. Ibid.
42. Ibid., p. 454-471.
43. Ibid., p. 454.
44. Ibid., p. 455.
45. Ibid., p. 455-456.
46. Ibid., p, 456-460.

47. Ibid., p. 460-468.
48. Ibid., p. 460.
49. Ibid., Volume IX, April 7, 1964, p. 87.
50. Ibid., Volume XIII, May 7, 1968, p. 460.
51. Ibid., p. 461.
52. Ibid.
53. Ibid.
54. Ibid., Volume X, November 9, 1965, p. 245.
55. Ibid., Volume XIII, May 7, 1967, p. 462.
56. Ibid., p. 465.
57. Ibid., p. 464.
58. Ibid., Volume XII, October 31, 1966, p. 247.
59. Ibid., Volume XIII, May 7, 1967, p. 466.
60. Ibid.
61. Ibid., November 27, 1967, p. 129.
62. Ibid., May 7, 1968, p. 467.
63. Ibid., p. 470.
64. Ibid.
65. Ibid., p. 471.
66. Ibid.
67. Ibid., p. 472.
68. Ibid., p. 472-487.
69. Ibid., p. 488-490.
70. Ibid., p. 491.
71. Ibid., p. 492.
72. Ibid., p. 493.
73. Ibid., Volume XII, May 1967, p. 222-240.

74. Ibid., Volume XIII, October 13, 1967, p. 57-77.
75. Ibid., p. 75.
76. Ibid., p. 61.
77. Ibid., November 28, 1967, p. 130.
78. Ibid., October 3, 1967, p. 61.
79. Ibid., October 31, 1967, p. 97.
80. Ibid., October 3, 1967, p. 62.
81. Ibid., p. 63.
82. Ibid., February 13, 1968, p. 188.
83. Ibid., October 3, 1967, p. 66.
84. Ibid., October 31, 1967, p. 128.
85. Ibid., p. 130.
86. Ibid., April 15, 1968, p. 321.
87. Ibid., p. 322.
88. Ibid., p. 322-324.
89. Ibid., p. 321.
90. Ibid., p. 329.
91. Ibid., May 14, 1968, p. 348-356.
92. Ibid., p. 354.
93. Ibid.
94. Ibid., p. 355.
95. Ibid., p. 354-355.
96. Ibid., p. 356.
97. Ibid.
98. Ibid., May 16, 1968, p. 403.
99. Ibid.
100. Ibid.

101. Ibid., p. 404.
102. Ibid.
103. Ibid., p, 405.
104. Ibid., May 14, 1968, p. 353-354.
105. Ibid., April 15, 1967, p. 331-332.
106. Ibid., May 20, 1968, p. 408-410.
107. "Faculty Facts", Michigan State University, 1966, p. 3.
108. "Registrar's Report", Michigan State University, 1965.
109. "Minutes of the Academic Council", Volume X, December 7, 1965, p. 478-480a.
110. Ibid., Volume XI, January 12, 1966, p. 88-93.
111. Ibid., Volume XII, February 7, 1967, p. 75-109.
112. Academic Freedom for Students at Michigan State University, 1967.

CHAPTER 5

DEVELOPMENT OF "BYLAWS, 1971"

Overview and Background

On May 21, 1971 the Board of Trustees approved the third major revision to the Bylaws.¹ The most significant modification in "Bylaws, 1971" was the inclusion of students as voting representatives to the governance system. The document provided for student participation in the decision-making process at the departmental, college and university levels.

"Bylaws, 1971" did not tamper in any significant way with the structure and content of the governance system established in "Bylaws, 1968" (see Chapter 4). However, the inclusion of students into the process produced a different focus for the Faculty Affairs Committee and the Elected Faculty Council.

The first examination of student participation in academic governance was conducted by the Committee on Committees in 1967. At the request of the Provost, Howard Neville, the Committee made recommendations "on whether students should

be further involved in the formation of academic policy at Michigan State University".² The Committee, chaired by Professor Richard Featherstone, reported its recommendations to the Provost on May 29, 1967.³ This Report was developed during the time period in which the Academic Council and Senate were debating the "Academic Freedom Report" and as the Faculty Affairs Committee was reviewing the "Bylaws, 1961".

In its Report, the Committee identified two basic premises upon which it based its recommendations:

1. The University is a hierarchical structure in which there are demonstrated differences in degree of skill, knowledge, experience, and responsibility. Two of the levels in this hierarchy are the faculty and students. Each has its own interests, but a mutual concern is the advancement of the University and its purposes.
2. The University consequently must provide channels for communication and reciprocal evaluation among levels of the hierarchy.⁴

The Committee's Report took the position that basic decision-making power in academic matters must rest with the faculty, but that the faculty had an "obvious interest" in making "enlightened" decisions.⁵ Thus, student interaction with the academic governance system would be appropriate.

The Committee postulated that input from students, both undergraduate and graduate, was important and necessary for better and more informed decisions to be made at the

Standing Committee level of governance. The Committee recommended that the Curriculum, Educational Policies, International Projects, Library and Student Affairs Committees add student representation. Student representation was to be in the form of discussion only. The Committee's Report stated that at the present time a student vote was not necessary. The Report also stated that the "student consultants" to the Committee on Committees agreed with this posture.⁶

The Faculty Affairs and Faculty Tenure committees were not included in these recommendations. However, the report did recommend that these two committees review, during the next academic year (1967-68), the question of student participation.⁷

The Committee's recommendations for student participation at the Standing Committee level included the suggestion that this program be tried for a two-year period. At the end of the trial period the Committee, in conjunction with ASMSU, would evaluate the effectiveness of the program and suggest needed modifications.⁸

The Committee was also charged with considering student participation in the Academic Council. The Committee recommended that the Academic Council invite student representatives (selected by ASMSU) to make a formal presentation

at least once per academic year. This program would also be evaluated after a two year period.⁹

The report was submitted to the Academic Council on June 6, 1967.¹⁰ After considerable discussion regarding the "Preamble," method of selection and an attempt to postpone until the fall, the Report was approved.¹¹

During the next academic year (1967-68), the Academic Council deliberated over the second major revision to the academic governance system (see Chapter 4). As a result of this process a new set of Bylaws came into being in June 1968. Contained within these Bylaws was provision for non-voting student participation on the five committees identified by the Featherstone Report. The "Bylaws, 1968" went beyond the Featherstone Report by providing for three student representatives to be ex-officio, non-voting members of the Academic Council.

The Academic Council met on October 8, 1968 for the first time under the revised Bylaws.¹² At this meeting a number of changes from prior years were evidenced. First, spectators and the press were allowed into the meeting. Second, three students were seated with the Academic Council. The two undergraduate representatives were Ms. Susan Hughes and Mr. Jeffrey Zieg. The graduate student was Mr. John Bowker.¹³ A third change (that would be instituted as a

result of the meeting) was the Council's action to tape record the meetings. This motion was made by Professor Walter Adams.¹⁴

At this meeting the question of expanded student participation was discussed. On a motion made by Professor Harold Hart, the University Committee on Faculty Affairs was asked to consider amending Section 4.4.1.1.3 of the Bylaws to give the three student representatives to the Academic Council voting privileges.¹⁵

At the next meeting of the Academic Council, November 5, 1968, the Faculty Affairs Committee gave its report.¹⁶ The Committee recommended that an Ad Hoc Committee be established by the Committee on Committees to review and make recommendations, system wide, in regard to student participation. This review was to be ready for the Spring, 1969 Senate meeting. The charge to this Ad Hoc Committee included the following:

The ad hoc committee's recommendations shall embrace the following: the number of student representatives, the manner of selection, and the capacity they¹⁷ serve in (e.g. voting or ex-officio non-voting).

The recommendation from the Faculty Affairs Committee included the Ad Hoc Committee's membership. There were to be two faculty members each from the Faculty Affairs, Student Affairs and Academic Rights and Responsibilities Committee, three undergraduate students and two graduate

students, and a representative from the Provost's Office and the Dean of Student's Office.¹⁸

These recommendations were approved by the Academic Council. Professor Walter Adams asked that the students presently on the Academic Council be given interim voting privileges. This motion was defeated.¹⁹

On April 23, 1969, the "Ad Hoc Committee on Student Participation in Academic Government" issued its Report.²⁰ The Report became known as the "Massey Report" (Professor Gerald Massey, representing the Faculty Affairs Committee, was the Chairman of the Committee). The remainder of the membership included:

Professor Erwin Bettinghaus (Faculty Affairs)

Professor Theodore Brooks (Student Affairs)

Mr. W. Raymond Cummins (COGS)

Mr. Nathan Dickmeyer (Student Academic Council)

Professor Harold Grant (Academic Rights & Responsibilities)

Ms. Susan Hughes (ASMSU)

Professor Waldo Keller (Academic Rights and Responsibilities)

Professor William Kelly (Director, Honors College)

Professor Alan Mandlestamm (Student Affairs)

Professor Eldon Nonnamaker (Associate Dean of Students)

Mr. Floyd Patterson (COGS)

Ms. Gina Schaack (Undergraduate Student)²¹

The Committee first met on January 15, 1969. The Committee's Report indicated that they spent several sessions eliciting and reviewing information from a variety of sources, both internal and external to the University. As a result of their deliberations, the Massey Committee developed and submitted some fifteen recommendations regarding student participation (a full analysis will appear later in this Chapter).

The Academic Council did not begin debate on this document until October 14, 1969.²² The delay in beginning debate on this report was due to a combination of dynamic factors that occurred during 1969. First, in February, President Hannah announced his retirement, with the Board of Trustees selecting Professor Walter Adams to be Acting President. Professor Adams assumed his new duties on April 1, 1969. Beginning with President Hannah's announcement, the Academic Council spent much of the late winter and early spring with the mechanics of the Presidential Search and Selection process.*

After its introduction on October 14, the Academic Council

*The faculty's role in the Presidential Selection Process was detailed in a document approved by the Academic Council entitled "Recommendations of the Ad Hoc Committee on Procedures for Selecting the Chief Academic Officers of the University". This became known as the Taylor I Report. A copy of the Report is included in the Minutes of the Academic Council, Volume XIV, Pt. 1, Pgs. 198-220.

continued to debate the Massey Report in meetings held on October 21, 22, 27, and 28.²³ During this debate the Council was able to approve the Preamble, Recommendations 1 and 2. Recommendation 3 was rejected by the Council. By the time the Council got to Recommendation 4 regarding student representation to the Academic Council it had become clear that the Council was having large difficulties with the Report. (A full discussion of these concerns appears in the Analysis Section of this Chapter.) Ms. Gina Schaack, on October 28, 1969, requested that the Report be resubmitted to a new ad hoc committee.²⁴ This action was agreed to by the Academic Council.

A new ad hoc committee was formed in November, 1969.²⁵ This committee was chaired by Professor James McKee. The other members of the committee were:

Professor Sam Baskett

Professor Erwin Bettinghaus*

Dean Edward Carlin

Professor Michael Harrison

Professor John Masterson

Ms. Gina Schaack*

Mr. Harry Chancey

Mr. Michael Freed

Mr. Charles McMillan²⁶

*Members on the Massey Committee.

The Report of this Committee was transmitted to the Academic Council on February 17, 1970.²⁷ This Report contained thirty-two recommendations (to be discussed in the Analysis Section).²⁸

The Academic Council first began debating the McKee Report on March 3, 1970.²⁹ The Council continued its deliberations on March 5, 10, 12; April 7, 13; and May 15. On May 15, 1970 the Academic Council approved a set of Bylaw Revisions.³⁰

On June 3, 1970, the Academic Senate met to debate the proposed Bylaw revisions. The Senate rejected the Bylaws as presented and returned them to the Academic Council. The rejection was based upon concerns raised over the composition of the Academic Council.³¹

On October 6, 1970, Professor Gordon Guyer, Chairman of the Steering Committee introduced a resolution to establish a "Special Panel" to reconcile the McKee Report. This "Special Panel" would be chaired by Professor John Taylor and would include Professors Beatrice Puolucci and Willard Warrington.³² On November 3, 1970, the "Taylor Report" was submitted to the Academic Council.³³

On May 4, 1971 the Academic Council approved a revised set of Bylaws.³⁴ On May 19, 1971, the Senate approved the document.³⁵ On May 21, 1971, the Board of Trustees also

approved the third major revision to the Bylaws.³⁶

Structural Analysis

As already stated, the basic structure of the governance system -- departmental committees, college committees, standing committees, the Elected Faculty Council, the Appointed Council, the Academic Council and Academic Senate -- was unchanged by this Bylaw revision. The major change involved student participation on an expanded and systematic basis. There were also changes in the Faculty Affairs Committee and Elected Faculty Council that occurred as a by-product of the inclusion of students into the governance process.

The title of the Bylaws was changed as a result of this process. From 1961 until 1971 the faculty organization Document had been referred to as the Bylaws of the Faculty. With the adoption of the "Bylaws, 1971" came new terminology. The document was now titled "The Bylaws for Academic Governance". This title change depicted the expansion of the system that now encompassed representation of the three main constituencies of the institution: the faculty, the students, and the academic administration.

Article 1: The Faculty

Article 1 of the document was changed only to reflect the inclusion of students as qualified voting members of any

particular academic unit.³⁷ It was in Articles 2 and 3 that the framework for student participation in departmental and college governance was established.³⁸ As will be described in the section regarding the three revision reports, prior to 1971 some departments already had student participation.

Articles 2 and 3: Department and School Organization/
College Organization

The "Bylaws, 1971" imposed no pre-designed structure on the departments or colleges. However, the "Bylaws, 1971" did impose an affirmative responsibility for departments and colleges to establish participation mechanisms that met the particular needs of the unit. The unit also had the responsibility for identifying the composition of the student constituency. One of the questions that had to be answered was whether or not a freshman or sophomore having a departmental preference would be included in the departmental constituency. It was clear, however, that every student in a particular college had to be part of some constituency.³⁹

Once the composition of the constituency was established, as well as the mechanism for participation, the process for student selection had to be approved by the student constituency. Academic units were free to establish selection processes that could be election or selection. Once chosen, a student served on the committee for a one year term. A

student could serve an additional one year term.⁴⁰

Students who acted as representatives had full voting rights on all issues with the following exceptions enumerated in Section 2.5.6 of the Bylaws, 1971:

1. Matters of exclusive concern to the faculty such as their salary, leaves, insurance, and the other fringe benefits, health service and housing retirement;
2. Matters affecting the distinctly professional duties of the faculty, namely, the duties that flow from the faculty's obligation to maintain the intellectual authority of the University as a center of detached inquiry and disinterested pursuit of truth;
3. Matters in which the distinctly professional rights of the faculty are at issue, as in decisions concerning the substantial issues of tenure, that is, the reappointment, promotion, or dismissal of individual members of the faculty whose appointment places them under the rules of tenure.⁴¹

Following these exceptions to student voting rights came the following statement:

2.5.7 Any act which diminishes, suspends or compromises the distinctly professional rights or duties of the faculty is destructive of the interests of the University and is forbidden by these rules.⁴²

As will be discussed in the Analysis Section for the three revision documents, the language of sections 2.5.6 - 2.5.8 was the cornerstone for the eventual acceptance by the Senate of student voting privileges in the governance system.

The "Bylaws, 1971" gave notice to the fact that students did have a legitimate stake in the teaching functions of the University. However, if a decision in regard to reappointment of a faculty member rested on his or her teaching performance, the final evaluation was still left to the faculty.⁴³

There was a footnote to this section on student representation. The footnote stated the following:

The pattern of student participation set forth in this document is to be tried experimentally for a period of two years, beginning May 19, 1971. At the end of this time the pattern is to be reconsidered by the Academic Council and the Academic Senate. These bodies will then be free to amend or confirm⁴⁴ the pattern as experience shall have taught us.

This statement was proposed on the floor of the Academic Council on November 17, 1970. The motion was made by Professor Walter Johnson.⁴⁵ As indicated by both Professors Johnson and Bettinghaus during their interviews, the purpose of this two year trial period was to soften the concern many faculty had that once the system of student participation was established it would be unreviewable. This "sunshine" provision along with sections 2.5.6 - 2.5.8 were absolutely necessary to make the document approvable.

Article 4: University Organization

Article 4 received the lion's share of revisions in "Bylaws, 1971". The Academic Council redefined its subgroups

(established in Bylaws, 1968 -- see Chapter 4). There still existed the Elected Faculty Council* and the Appointed Council (the Deans).

Identified as a third subgroup (but not a Council unto itself) were the student representatives. Finally, the ex-officio subgroup was identified. To this last subgroup was added the Vice President for Student Affairs.⁴⁶

The voting membership was redefined as well. The "Bylaws, 1968" revoked the franchise for the ex-officio subgroup members. In "Bylaws, 1971", with the exception of the Presiding Officer (President or Provost) and the Ombudsman, all members of the Academic Council had voting privileges.⁴⁷

Student Representation

Student representation to the Academic Council was divided into three categories: undergraduate, graduate, and at-large.

Each college was to be represented by one undergraduate student (with one representative for the three medical

*The elected Faculty Council consisted of the elected faculty representatives, the faculty members on the Steering Committee, and the addition of the chairman of the Faculty Affairs and Faculty Compensation Committee.

colleges -- Human Medicine, Osteopathic Medicine and Veterinary Medicine).⁴⁸ These students were to be selected by procedures established by the colleges. Unlike "Bylaws, 1968" ASMSU was not involved in the selection process. ASMSU was expressly rejected by the faculty during the revision process as being unreliable for the purposes of academic representation.

Graduate student representation would come from students selected by the Council of Graduate Students (COGS). There were six seats allocated for graduate students.⁴⁹ It is interesting to note that COGS was the graduate counterpart to ASMSU. However, because of their internal structure (college representation) COGS was felt to be a reliable determiner for student representation.

The third and final subgroup for student representation was the at-large representatives. The "Bylaws, 1971" provided for at-large student seats. These representatives were to be elected on a campus-wide basis. There was to be a student nominating committee to develop a slate of candidates. The ten at-large seats were mandated to have at least six representatives who were non-white minorities and at least five were to be women.⁵⁰

This section was highly controversial and evoked protracted debate throughout the revision process. Section 4.4.3.8.7

details the rational for the at-large student representation system:

The purpose of these provisions is not to dignify our separations or to make permanent our divisions but to affirm the pluralism that is indispensable to our form of community. Our purpose is to institute a guarantee, to ensure a result not certified by the ordinary processes of election, namely, that the voice of the non-white minorities in this University shall on all occasions, irrespective of the results of college and graduate student elections, be positively heard.⁵¹

The Steering Committee's membership was expanded to include one student selected by the student representatives to the Academic Council.⁵² The Committee on Committees did not have students added to its membership.⁵³

Other Changes

Two other changes were written into Article 4. Section 4.4.4.7 dealt with the authority of the Academic Council to be the final authority in regard to interpretation of the Bylaws. "Bylaws, 1971" amended this section with the following language:

Within the constraints of the constitutional authority of the Board of Trustees, the Academic Council shall be the final authority with regard to the interpretation of these Bylaws.⁵⁴ (emphasis shows the new language).

A new section, 4.7, was added. This section incorporated the Graduate Council under the Bylaws.⁵⁵

Article 5: Standing Committees

Article 5 also reflected many changes due to the inclusion of student representation. In addition, three new committees were developed, one as a direct result of the revision process.

As indicated earlier in regard to the title change for the document, the standing committees were changed from Faculty Standing Committees to Council Standing Committees.⁵⁶ All of the Council Standing Committees were to have student representation except for the Faculty Affairs and Faculty Compensation Committee.⁵⁷ The student representation would, as with the Academic Council, be undergraduate, graduate and at-large. The ratio on the committees would be three undergraduates, one graduate, and two at-large students.⁵⁸ Some committees would have a double ratio of undergraduate and graduate students (Curriculum, Educational Policies and Honors Program). The faculty representation formula did not change for the established committees except for the University Student Affairs Committee (USAC).⁵⁹

USAC was composed of six faculty, five undergraduates appointed by ASMSU, four graduate students appointed by COGS, and two at-large representatives appointed by the student representatives of the Academic Council acting as a student committee on committees. This was the only Council Standing Committee to have a student majority. USAC also had an

expanded role. In addition to its responsibility to advise the Vice President for Student Affairs, the Committee was given the responsibility formerly with the Committee on Academic Rights and Responsibilities established from the Academic Freedom Report.⁶⁰ Because the Academic Freedom Report dealt with faculty rights and freedoms as well as student rights and freedoms, this enlargement of USAC's responsibilities led to concern over student dictatorship in regard to academic freedom concerns. As will be discussed shortly, sections 2.5.6 - 2.5.8 were developed, in part, as a result of this expansion of USAC's charge.

USAC was one of only two places where ASMSU had direct input into the appointment process. Undergraduate representatives to Council Standing Committees were selected from three main groupings of colleges (Liberal Arts, Social Science, and Natural Science). The selection process was to be developed by the students on the Academic Council.⁶¹ Graduate student representatives to Council Standing Committees were selected by COGS.⁶²

Three new standing committees were added to the nine established committees in Bylaws, 1971. One was the University Committee on Academic Governance (UCAG).⁶³ This was a very large committee. UCAG was composed of one faculty and one student representative from each college, one non-college faculty representative, two student at-large

representatives and one faculty member selected by the Committee on Committees to represent "the lower faculty ranks". The charge to UCAG was to monitor, on an on-going basis, the steps taken to implement the revisions in "By-laws, 1971". UCAG was also charged with making recommended Bylaw changes. This was formerly the charge, in part, of the Faculty Affairs Committee.

The second new standing committee was the University Committee on Public Safety (UCOPS).⁶⁴ The composition of UCOPS was seven faculty (including two from the lower faculty ranks), four undergraduates (appointed by ASMSU), one graduate student (appointed by COGS) and two students at-large. The Directors of the School of Criminal Justice and the Department of Public Safety were ex-officio, non-voting members. UCOPS was established as a result of the anti-war demonstrations both at Michigan State University and elsewhere. The idea behind this committee was to be a quasi-civilian review board.

The final new standing committee was the University Committee on Buildings, Lands and Planning (UCBLP).⁶⁵ The composition of UCBLP was similar to the other standing committees mentioned earlier. The ex-officio members of this committee were the Executive Vice President; the Directors of Campus Parks and Planning, and Space Utilization; and the University Architect. UCBLP was to function

as an oversight committee (without veto authority) in regard to new buildings and land utilization. The concern over the ecology and aesthetics of the physical growth of Michigan State University was now a function of the academic governance system.

Two changes were made in regard to the charge of two established standing committees. First were changes to the University Committee on Faculty Tenure (UCFT). Three statements were added to the language from the "Bylaws, 1968" in regard to UCFT:

1. Decisions of the UCFT involving the interpretation of tenure rules and cases involving deviation from tenure rules shall be binding on the administration and the faculty concerned.
2. UCFT shall report promptly to the Academic Council any case in which the administration acts contrary to the committee's decision on a question involving tenure.
3. The voting rights of the student representatives are limited under the rules of faculty privilege identified in Section 2.5.⁶⁶

According to Professor Charles Larrowe, formerly Faculty Grievance Officer, these changes occurred because of the involvement of the trustees in the tenure decision regarding Dr. Eileen Van Tassel.

The second change was in regard to the University Committee on Faculty Affairs. The Committee was retitled the University Committee on Faculty Affairs and Faculty Compensation

(UCFAFC).⁶⁷ UCFAFC was composed of the usual faculty allotment. There were no student representatives. The Provost served as a non-voting, ex-officio member.

In "Bylaws, 1968," UCFA was charged to examine all policies (excluding tenure) affecting faculty services and benefits. The following items were specifically listed (not an inclusive list):

...promotion, salary, leaves, outside work for pay, military service, participation in partisan politics, physical examination, faculty publications, insurance and other fringe benefits, faculty evaluation, health service, retirement, faculty housing. The Committee shall serve as the body for on-going evaluation of the Bylaws of the Faculty and make recommendations thereupon when appropriate.⁶⁸

In "Bylaws, 1971", as already mentioned, the responsibility for Bylaw revision was given to UCAG. However, and in addition to the items listed above, the UCFAFC was given a much broader charge. The committee was now responsible for reviewing and making recommendations on:

1. The level and structure of faculty salaries and other forms of compensation.
2. Adjustments in salaries and other economic benefits...with a view toward improving the economic status of the Michigan State University faculty.
3. Policies relating to faculty rights and responsibilities. Specifically, no recommendation regarding faculty rights and responsibilities could be considered by the Academic Council unless first reviewed by UCFAFC and approved by the Elected Faculty Council.
4. Procedures for equitable adjudication of individual faculty grievances concerning

salaries, benefits and personal policies.⁶⁹

In addition to these responsibilities the UCFAFC was to be consulted by the Provost, in a timely fashion, regarding the annual academic budget that would be submitted to the State. Prior to this consultation, the UCFAFC was to meet, again in a timely fashion, with the Elected Faculty Council to hear recommendations that would help the committee in its consultation with the Provost. This meeting was to be closed.⁷⁰

As will be explained in the section dealing with the three revision reports, this change in the role of the UCFAFC was essential if student participation was to occur. The UCFAFC and the Elected Faculty Council were to become the final bastion of faculty prerogative. Indeed, the outcome for the UCFAFC described above was somewhat diminished from what had been passed by the Senate and sent to the Board of Trustees on October 16, 1970.⁷¹ The UCFAFC's role in the academic budget process in the first document was more than consultative.

Analysis of the Revision Reports

As stated in the Introduction to this Chapter, the first revision report that led to "Bylaws, 1971" was transmitted to the Academic Council on April 23, 1969. This document was to become known as the Massey Report (named after the chairperson, Professor Gerald Massey).

The Massey Report

The Preamble developed by the Committee discussed governance in the sense of an "academic community" in which the students, faculty and administrators had a "joint responsibility" to "seek and promote". To this end the committee wrote the following.

...we think that both the sense of community and the effectiveness of student participation is but achieved by bringing students, in sufficient numbers, into the existing policy-making and decision-making bodies and committees of departments, schools, colleges and the university, rather than₇₂ proliferating parallel student advisory groups.

This sense of academic community parallels the Preamble to the Academic Freedom Report. In that Preamble, Michigan State University was described as a community of scholars made up of its students, faculty and administrators. The Academic Freedom Report was less than two years old when the Massey Report was developed.

As reported earlier in this chapter, there were fifteen recommendations prepared by the Massey committee. These recommendations were divided into four major groups: General, University level, College level, and Department/School level.

Under the heading of General Recommendations there were listed three specific recommendations. The first recommendation would extend voting privileges on "Internal" matters

to any member of the University community. Thus, if a department or college chose to do so, any student or employee could be allowed to vote on matters internal to that academic unit.⁷³

The second recommendation was that if students were to participate, that participation must be with the franchise. The Committee stated that the practice of voice without vote weakened the system and led to distrust. This statement was a major change from the position of the Featherstone Report of 1967. It reflected, in part, the growing misapprehension many students and faculty had about the effectiveness of the institution's decision-making processes.⁷⁴

The last General Recommendation concerned the value of the learning experience in student participation. Specifically, the Educational Policies Committee was to prepare a report regarding academic credit for "substantial" participation in academic government.⁷⁵ In the "Bylaws, 1968" (see Chapter 4) revision process there was discussion regarding faculty participation as a part of a faculty member's workload.

The Preamble, Recommendations 1 and 2 were passed by the Academic Council. Recommendation 3 was not approved.⁷⁶ It was when the Academic Council got to Recommendation 4 that the entire Report was sent back to a new committee.⁷⁷ There exists no recorded deliberations regarding the remainder of

the recommendations. They are presented as follows with comment only in regard to the eventual outcome described earlier in this chapter as "Bylaws, 1971".

There were seven University-level recommendations made by the Massey Committee.⁷⁸ The first (Committee Recommendation 4) stated that each college shall have a student representative, selected by the students of the college with procedures approved by the voting faculty of the college.⁷⁹ "Bylaws, 1971" accepted this recommendation (with the exception that selection procedure had to be approved by a vote of the student constituency).⁸⁰

Recommendation 5 called for five at-large student representatives.⁸¹ Three were to be undergraduates selected by ASMSU. Two were graduate students selected by COGS. This recommendation was drastically changed in the revision process. As already stated, ASMSU fell into disfavor with the Academic Council and was eliminated from the selection process in any meaningful way. The number of graduate students was expanded from two to six. And, the concept of at-large student representation became a mechanism to ensure minority and female student representation.

Recommendation 6 called for the election of one student, from among the student representatives, to be on the Steering Committee.⁸² As already stated, this process

became part of "Bylaws, 1971".

Recommendation 7 dealt with the Standing Committees.⁸³ The first part of the recommendation called for the title change from "Faculty" to "University". This recommendation did survive through the revision process. The second part of the recommendation dealt with the number of students on each of the standing committees:

<u>Committee</u>	<u>Undergraduates</u>	<u>Graduates</u>
Curriculum	3	2
Education Policies	9	6
Faculty Affairs	1	1
Faculty Tenure	2	2
Honors Program	2	1
International Projects	2	1
Library	2	2
Student Affairs	2	2
Business Affairs	1	1

As discussed earlier in this chapter, the number of students in the standing committees eventually took a much different form. Also, the Massey recommendation called for selection procedures to be established by ASMSU and COGS, respectively. COGS, of course, retained input into committee selection. ASMSU was limited to USAC and the new UCOPS.

Recommendation 8 dealt with the Graduate Council. This recommendation called for a review of the composition and function of the Graduate Council. It also called for its inclusion into the Bylaws structure. And finally, the Massey Committee recommended that three graduate students and one undergraduate student join the membership.⁸⁴ The Graduate Council was incorporated into the Bylaws (Section 4.7) with student representation limited to graduate students.

The ninth recommendation dealt with student participation in the selection of all principal academic affairs.⁸⁵ (Students were members of the Search and Selection Committee which recommended President Wharton.) "Bylaws, 1971" made no reference to membership on selection committees.

The last recommendation in this section (10) called for student representation on all ad hoc or special committees.⁸⁶ There is no mention of specific membership requirements in Article 7 of "Bylaws, 1971".

Recommendations 11 through 14 dealt with student participation at the college level. The college was either to include an appropriate number of students in the College Advisory Committee, or develop a separate Dean's Student Advisory Committee. In addition, each college Standing Committee was to provide for an appropriate number of voting

students. Students were also to be involved in any consultation committees regarding the selection of a dean.⁸⁷

The ambiguous language which appeared in Article 3 of "Bylaws, 1971" reflects fairly consistently the sentiments of these recommendations. It must be noted that there is an apparent inconsistency in these recommendations with the Preamble developed by the Committee. The Preamble states that the proliferation of parallel student advisory groups was less than effective in fostering this sense of academic community being generated by the Massey Report. Yet, Recommendation 11 gave clear license for colleges to create parallel structures.

Finally, there were two recommendations in regard to the Department/School level (14 and 15). The department/school level committees, whether advisory or decision-making, were to have an appropriate number of students. The recommendation specifically called for the establishment of Teaching Committees. These committees were to develop methods for the evaluation of teaching. Also, as with the college-level, students were to be involved in the selection process for department chairman.⁸⁸ Again, as with the college-level recommendations, the ultimate language of Article 2, "Bylaws, 1971" was reflected in the general tone and ambiguous thrust of the recommendations.

According to Professors Adams, Bettinghaus and Johnson, the Massey Report was clearly unacceptable to the majority of faculty on the Academic Council. The following is a sample of faculty concerns regarding the Massey Report:

The Council expects a written rationale for each recommendation (Professor John Dietrick, Assistant Provost, Chairman of the Committee on Committees)

There was confusion over the rationale of the number of students per committee (Professor Floyd Parker, Chairman, Educational Policy Committee)...

The Preamble indicates a 50-50 relationship, this is not acceptable to the faculty (Professor Thomas Greer)...

The McKee Report

As a result of the faculty concerns, the Academic Council voted to form a new ad hoc committee. Appropriately, this committee was titled "The New Committee on Student Participation in Academic Government".⁹⁰ The Committee's report quickly became known as the McKee Report, as the committee chair was Professor James McKee.

In its introduction the McKee Report acknowledged that the question before the committee was not whether students should be involved, but what was to be the nature of the involvement, the number of students and the method of selection. The committee made recommendations to the Academic Council (32 in all) that concerned five general areas:

- 1) Student involvement in departmental and college governance;

- 2) Student involvement in the Academic Council;
- 3) Student involvement in the Standing Committees;
- 4) Provisions for minority student involvement; and
- 5) Establishment of a new Standing Committee on Academic Governance.⁹¹

The Committee also suggested that the inclusion of student representation on the Graduate Council be left to a separate report (a separate action by the Academic Council provided for this).⁹²

The McKee Committee's Report stated that they conducted a poll to determine the current nature and status of student participation at the departmental and college level. What the committee determined was that there was a potpourri of structures and procedures at these two levels. Some units had students sitting and voting with faculty, some had student advisory committees, some only had undergraduates, some were student elected positions, others were by faculty appointment. The Committee concluded their analysis with the following statement:

The variety of these approaches being developed throughout the University suggests that it would be unwise to insist now on any one model for the involvement of students in the affairs of departments, colleges, centers and institutes. However, as a result of the information obtained in the surveys, and after extensive committee deliberations, we would like to indicate a preference for certain arrangements in regard to (A) The setting up of committees and (B) The selection of students for membership on those committees.⁹³

The "preference" of the Committee was that students and faculty sit jointly on committees; that more than one student be a member of the committee (to do otherwise was considered "tokenism"); that a greater emphasis be placed on graduate student representation; and, that committee procedures for student representation be formalized in departmental and college bylaws. Furthermore, the Committee felt that student representation should be by peer group selection and that provision must be made for minority student representation.⁹⁴

The first three formal recommendations of the Committee were written to operationalize these thoughts. To ensure that departments and colleges met these requirements, the Committee recommended that a Committee on Academic Governance be established to monitor and ensure compliance with the departments and colleges.⁹⁵

The Committee made two recommendations in regard to student participation in the Academic Council. The first was to have one undergraduate student from each of the colleges.⁹⁶ The Committee's preference was for student elections in each college. However, the Committee recognized that some colleges preferred selection as opposed to election.⁹⁷ As indicated earlier, "Bylaws, 1971" retained this flexibility but required that selection/election procedures had to be approved by the student constituency.

The second recommendation called for six graduate student representatives to be selected by COGS.⁹⁸ This recommendation was based upon discussions the Committee had with COGS. Again, as stated earlier, this recommendation was adopted in toto in "Bylaws, 1971".

The McKee Report stated that they had reviewed a number of proposals made during the Massey Report debates and subsequently during the deliberations of this committee.⁹⁹ The Report listed some of the major recommendations that were examined and why they were dismissed:

1. Completely parallel faculty and student governing bodies -- Under this system there would be a separate student and faculty structure from the department level through the Academic Senate. This plan, which initially received strong support on the committee, was rejected for two reasons. First, joint departmental committees were already in place. This would cause their elimination. And second, it would have been technically possible, and even probable, that parallel structures could develop opposing policies in regard to the same issue...The committee felt that even the possibility of separate decisions would further serve to divide the academic community rather than to unify it, and further serve to hinder the decision making process rather than to expedite it.¹⁰⁰
2. Selection of undergraduate students at large, chosen from current student government -- ASMSU was considered by the committee not to be...consonant with the kinds of academic questions that members of the academic council are asked to consider. The structure of ASMSU at that time was based on where a student resided (residence hall, co-operative, greek unit, off campus, etc.). The Committee felt that geography was not the proper basis for academic representation.¹⁰¹

3. Selection from the various colleges of non-voting student members of the Academic Council -- This recommendation was rejected because the Academic Council had, and continued to have, involvement in matters that went beyond matters that solely affected the faculty. The Committee listed such areas as grading reports, dormitory living conditions, control of disruptions, curricular changes and the October 15 Moratorium...to refuse students the opportunity to participate with their vote as well as their voice would lead to a lack of commitment on the part of students to any decisions made by the Council.¹⁰²
4. Formation of a student advisory committee which the Academic Council would be held "accountable" -- The committee found this suggestion as unworkable because no clear and agreed upon definition of "accountability" could be developed.¹⁰³

These rejected suggestions reflect the depth of concern many faculty had in regard to student participation in the Academic Council. This level of concern will be more fully discussed with the examination of the events surrounding the Senate's rejection of this document.

The third general area of the McKee Report involved student participation in the Standing Committees of the Academic Council. Recommendations 6 through 17 addressed the Standing Committees.¹⁰⁴ These recommendations were included, virtually in toto, by the "Bylaws, 1971". The Curriculum, Educational Policy and Honors Program Committees were all to have six undergraduates and three graduate students. All of the other committees (except Faculty Affairs and Student Affairs) were to have three undergraduate students and one

or two graduate students. The Faculty Tenure Committee was to issue its own report as to the extent to which students were to participate in tenure decisions.

The Faculty Affairs Committee would have no students involved. In addition, the Faculty Affairs Committee would be charged with matters for exclusive concern to the faculty (e.g. salary, fringe benefits, insurance, etc.). This recommendation was predicated on the establishment of the Academic Governance Committee that would have primary responsibility for monitoring the governance system.¹⁰⁵

Recommendations regarding the Faculty Affairs Committee, Student Affairs Committee and Academic Governance Committee were found in Part V of the McKee Report. The Faculty Affairs Committee has already been discussed. The other two committees were described as follows.

The Academic Governance Committee was a new proposal. This committee was to have one student and one faculty member from each college. In addition, five faculty members were to be selected by the Committee on Committees to represent all three faculty ranks.¹⁰⁶ As stated previously, this committee was to insure compliance with the student participation provisions of the "Bylaws". This committee was also to make necessary recommendations regarding needed changes

in the Bylaws as circumstances in the University dictated.¹⁰⁷

Recommendations 28 through 31 dealt with the Student Affairs Committee. The Report urged the integration of the responsibilities established in the Academic Freedom Report for this committee. In addition, the McKee Report recommended that this committee be made up entirely of students.¹⁰⁸ The Committee's rationale for an all student composition for USAC mirrored the rationale for an all faculty composition of the USAC; namely, "Concerns peculiar to the students should be considered by the students alone".¹⁰⁹

The UFAC and USAC composition was the only place where the McKee committee recommended a parallel structure. Each committee was advisory to a principal University officer (Provost and Vice President for Student Affairs). As would be finally determined, the UFAC remained composed entirely of faculty representatives while the USAC was altered to include faculty, but not in a majority.

The final recommendation of the McKee Committee (Number 31) dealt with appointing a student representative to the Steering Committee.¹¹⁰ This recommendation was a carry-over from the Massey Report and did become part of "Bylaws, 1971".

The Killingsworth Memorandum

On June 3, 1970 the Academic Senate met to debate the McKee Report (as stated earlier, Bylaw language was approved by the Academic Council on May 15, 1970). The proposed Bylaws became a very major issue of discussion during this two week period. Proponents and opponents of the revisions marshaled their forces in preparation for the Academic Senate meeting. The major faculty opposition to the McKee Report prepared and issued a memorandum on the day of the Senate meeting that argued vigorously for the Senate to return the revision document (McKee Report) to the Academic Council.¹¹¹ The memorandum was addressed to all members of the Academic Senate and the following list of faculty were identified as the signatories:

Herbert Garfinkel	Albert Rubin
Charles C. Killingsworth	Herbert Rudman
Mordichai Kreinin	C. R. St. Clair
R. Winston Oberg	Joseph Schesinger
Beatrice Paolucci	Chitra Smith
Charles Press	Harold Walsh

This memorandum accompanied a report entitled, "Six Questions Concerning 'McKee Committee' Recommendations".¹¹² According to the memorandum the document was prepared by Professor Killingsworth.

The first question posed by the document was stated as

follows:

1. Should the faculty accept as its official spokesman a body in which its elected representatives are in a minority?"¹¹³

The report argued that the McKee revisions would have 62 elected faculty representatives out of a total voting membership of 129. Of that 129 voting members, 31 would be students and 36 would be deans and other administrative officials. Even though 98 of the 129 voting members would be faculty, this report took the position that:

The Deans and other administrators (despite their great merits in other respects) lack legitimacy as faculty representatives simply because they are not chosen by the faculty for that purpose. Would the student body accept 31 students appointed by the President¹¹⁴ as their legitimate spokesman? Obviously not.

These faculty members raised this question in the context of Section 4.4.4.1 of the present and proposed Bylaws. This section stated that the Council acts on the behalf of the Academic Senate. Thus, as the Senate was the sole legitimate voice of the faculty, how could the Academic Council legitimately act on the Senate's behalf when less than 50% of the membership were not elected faculty representatives.

This document took the position that the McKee Report did nothing to provide for a "distinctive and legitimate voice" for faculty in institutional affairs. ASMSU and COGS, under the McKee Report, were perceived to have been given increased power and scope. The blue collar workers at the

University were represented by Unions. This "question" rejected the McKee Report on the basis that "...the faculty will have no comparable organization under its exclusive or even majority control".¹¹⁵

The second question raised by this document was written as follows:

2. Should the powers and scope of the Elected Faculty Council be expanded and should this body be designated the spokesman for the Academic Senate?¹¹⁶

According to Professor Killingsworth's Report, the only power given to the Elected Faculty Council under the Revision Report was to refer matters of exclusive faculty concern to the Academic Senate: "The main joker here is that nobody has a clear idea what might be of "exclusive" concern to the faculty".¹¹⁷ The Killingsworth Report took the position that the McKee Report saw only faculty compensation as an area of "exclusive concern".¹¹⁸

Professor Killingsworth proposed that the Bylaws be revised to grant to the Elected Faculty Council the same rights that were already in existence for ASMSU, COGS, AFSCME (the "blue collar" union) and others; namely, to speak and act on behalf of their constituency.¹¹⁹

The third question proposed by Professor Killingsworth was as follows:

3. Does the faculty wish to have students voting on faculty hiring, promotions, salary increases, tenure decisions and dismissals?¹²⁰

Professor Killingsworth referred to an apparent ambiguity in the proposed Bylaw language regarding student participation in these areas at the departmental level. He also raised the specter of students controlling decisions about faculty hiring, etc., in relationship to criteria other than teaching, research and service (i.e. politics). Professor Killingsworth presented the following as a rationale for rejection of the McKee Report:

The principle that the professional competence of professionals should be judged only by professionals has been the cornerstone of academic freedom. We should amend the proposed bylaws to eliminate any possible doubt that we intend to insist upon that principle in the future as in the past.¹²¹

The fourth question raised by this Report concerned the issue of academic rights and responsibility. The question was posed as follows:

4. Does the faculty wish to give authority over the 'academic rights and responsibilities of the faculty' to a committee with a substantial student majority?¹²²

During the course of the deliberations on the McKee Report the Student Affairs Committee was altered to include six faculty members, selected by the President. The students were still to be in the majority. Part of the charge to this Committee was the issue of academic rights and responsibilities identified in the Academic Freedom Report. Any

amendment to the Academic Freedom Report had to be approved by the Committee. Professor Killingsworth took the position that this Committee should have a majority of faculty representatives because the issue of academic rights and responsibilities of the faculty could be involved.

Professor Killingsworth also argued that the proposed safeguard that had been developed from the debate (that any issue regarding faculty academic rights and responsibilities be sent to the Elected Faculty Council for approval before submission to the Academic Council) was not worded strongly enough. The ambiguous language could provide for an erosion of this safeguard because the exclusive rights of the faculty were not clearly defined. Sections 2.5.6 through 2.5.8 were developed to address this concern.

The fifth question in the Killingsworth Report also dealt with the power and authority of the Faculty-Student Affairs Committee. The question posed was this:

5. Does the faculty wish to establish a student-dominated committee which would have veto power over certain actions of the Academic Council or the Board of Trustees?¹²³

The Faculty-Student Affairs Committee, under the McKee Report was charged with the responsibility of reviewing and approving all amendments to the Academic Freedom Report and the General Student Regulations. The amendment process did require that any amendments made by the Academic Council to proposals approved by this Committee had to also be approved

by the Committee before being forwarded. This process differs from the long standing procedures of the governance system whereby the Academic Senate, on second submission, could amend any proposal approved by the Academic Council.

Professor Killingsworth saw this process (which was written into the Academic Freedom Report amending process) as extraordinary to academic governance. In very strong language he took the position that the McKee Report must be revised in this issue. He wrote that:

This arrangement is not simply "student participation"; it begins to approach "student dictatorship", at least in important areas of academic government.¹²⁴

The final question posed in this document dealt with the issue of guaranteed minority student representation. Professor Killingsworth wrote the following:

6. Does the faculty wish to approve a minority representation plan which is probably in violation of the U. S. Civil Rights Act of 1964, and which could cause a cutoff of all federal funds to the University?¹²⁵

Professor Killingsworth argued in this section that the proposal requiring ten at-large seats specifically designated for women and minorities was in possible violation of the 1964 U. S. Civil Rights Act. Professor Killingsworth questioned the opinion given by the University's attorney, Mr. Leland Carr, that the provision was permissible under the law. Professor Killingsworth urged rejection of this provision at least until the Department of Health Education

and Welfare assured the University that there would be not cutoff in federal funds because of this provision.

Professor Killingsworth concluded his Report by indicating that the Senate must reject the document so that the Academic Council could revise it. And, if the Council did not revise, then the Senate itself could amend the document, without resubmission to the Council. Professor Killingsworth stated that rejection of the McKee Report was not a rejection of the concept of student participation. Instead, it was a vote for devising a "viable" system. The McKee Report, obviously to Professor Killingsworth and the other signatories, was not viable.

Senate Rejection

Attached to the Killingsworth Report was a "Proposed Resolution for the Academic Senate" (in the form of a "Motion to Refer").¹²⁶ The resolution was in four parts. First, the Academic Senate was to endorse to concept of greater student involvement in academic governance. Second, the proposed Bylaw revisions contained ambiguities that needed clarification and should be reconsidered. Third, therefore the bylaw revisions were to be returned to the Academic Council. And fourth, the Senate request that: a) the revisions to the McKee Report be completed during the fall so that the new system could be implemented by January 1, 1971; and, b) that departments and colleges, in the interim, be permitted to

establish procedures as indicated by the McKee Report. This resolution was approved by the Academic Senate and the McKee Report was referred back to the Academic Council.

The Taylor Report

On October 6, 1970 the Academic Council appointed a three person panel to reconcile the McKee Report with the objections raised by the Academic Senate.¹²⁷ The members of this special panel were Professor John Taylor (Chairperson of the panel), Professor Beatrice Paolucci (from the McKee Committee) and Professor Willard Warrington.¹²⁸ The concept of a "Special Panel" was endorsed by Professor McKee as the best way to reconcile the Report.¹²⁹

The panel issued its report on November 3, 1970 to the Academic Council.¹³⁰ The report was titled "The Report of the Special Panel of Academic Council -- Revised Recommendations Concerning Student Participation in the Academic Government". The report quickly became known as the "Taylor Report".

The Taylor Report discussed seven "primary" areas that were the basis for the June 3, 1970 Senate rejection. On some issues the Special Panel made quite detailed recommendations. Others made general suggestions, and in other cases, the Special Panel took no position at all.

The first issue addressed by the Special Panel dealt with student participation and faculty rights.¹³¹ The Report stated firmly that student participation, with voting privileges, was essential and accepted by most faculty. The Report went on to indicate, however, that the faculty was determined not to have students involved in decision-making which affected "faculty prerogative". The Report stated the following:

No useful purpose is served in suggesting, or in allowing students to believe, that these matters are, as the faculty views them, negotiable. They are not. And that was in effect what the Senate's rejection of the Council's revisions signified -- not a rejection of student participation or a failure of respect, but a simple reminder to all parties, that disciplined capacity implies precedence in the community of scholars.¹³²

The Report went on to indicate that the students, if they were to accept this notion, had to have a clear idea of what matters were to be the specific purview of the faculty. The panel developed language which became sections 2.5.6 through 2.5.8 of "Bylaws, 1971", which enumerates the areas of exclusive faculty concern and the process involved in determining if an issue is totally within the faculty's purview.¹³³

The second area discussed by the panel dealt with whether or not the Senate meetings were to be open to the public or not. The Panel indicated that the June 3, 1970 Senate vote (255 "yes" to 289 "no") was inconclusive. The Report indicated that the Council needed to make the decision as to

whether the recommendation to open Senate Meetings should be returned to the Senate.¹³⁴ Section 4.3.3.2 of the "Bylaws, 1971" retained the closed status of the Senate meeting.

The composition of the Academic Council was the third area of discussion by the Taylor Panel. The Panel recommended little numerical change from the McKee Report. A table was prepared which indicated the differences from "Bylaws, 1968".¹³⁵ As with the McKee Report, all members of the Academic Council, except for the President, were to be voting members. The elected faculty representatives were still the plurality but not the majority (61 out of 132 members). However, the limitations placed on student voting in Sections 2.5.6 through 2.5.8 coupled with the procedures involving the Elected Faculty Council (discussed under the fourth recommendation) made the system acceptable.

The major question in the Fall, 1970 was in regard to the at-large representatives. The bulk of the Taylor Report recommendation in this section dealt with justification for this concept.¹³⁶ As discussed previously, Professor Killingsworth raised serious questions regarding the legality of this provision. On October 1, 1970 President Clifton Wharton sent a letter to Professor Gordon Guyer, Chairman of the Steering Committee, in regard to this issue.¹³⁷ In this letter President Wharton indicated that the concerns raised by Professor Killingsworth were unfounded. The proposed

system of at-large minority/female student representation would not violate Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964. Nor would it cause a suspension of federal funding. However, the method of selection proposed by the McKee Report (selection by recognized interest groups -- primarily the ASMSU Office of Black Affairs) was not acceptable.¹³⁸ The Taylor Panel recommended that these positions be elected by the student body. Bylaw language was proposed to accomplish this task.¹³⁹ These recommendations were incorporated into "Bylaws, 1971".

As previously reported, the fourth general area of discussion concerned the Elected Faculty Council. The Panel began its recommendation with the following statement:

The Academic Council is no longer exclusively, or even primarily, a faculty body. Its present function is to register the judgment of the academic community as a whole.¹⁴⁰

The Taylor Report indicated that this realization was a significant advancement for the University, but that this realization also left the faculty without its own "organization" to speak for it as did the students with ASMSU and COGS.¹⁴¹

The Taylor Report recommended that the Elected Faculty Council could and should fill this role. However, based on the delineation of faculty prerogative in Sections 2.5.6 through 2.5.8, the recommendations of the McKee Report to

allow the Elected Faculty Council to bypass the Academic Council and report directly to the Academic Senate was unnecessary and in contradiction to the spirit of the entire revision process.¹⁴² "Bylaws, 1971" reflects this recommendation in its description of the duties and powers of the Elected Faculty Council.

The fifth recommendation dealt with the issue of having a student on the Steering Committee.¹⁴³ The Taylor Panel endorsed this concept and it was implemented in "Bylaws, 1971".

The issue of representation on the Standing Committees was the sixth area of discussion. The Taylor Panel recommended specific faculty, undergraduate, graduate and at-large student representation.¹⁴⁴ With the exception of the University Committee on Business Affairs (two graduate students as opposed to one) "Bylaws, 1971" adopted the committee representation structure recommended by the Taylor Report.

The final recommendation of the Special Panel was a non-recommendation in regard to two issues that had been approved by the Senate at the June 3, 1970 meeting but rejected by the Board of Trustees on October 16, 1970.¹⁴⁵ One issue dealt with the scope of the University Committee on Faculty Compensation and Academic Budget. The other dealt with interpretation of the tenure rules.

Analysis of Event

The period between 1968 and 1971 was a very dynamic and painful era for Michigan State University. The era was dynamic in that the institution went through a process of selecting a new president for the first time in 28 years. Because President Hannah's tenure had been so long, there were no reliable or agreed upon mechanisms in place to handle this type of transition. It was painful in the sense that like many campuses nationwide, the protestations against American involvement in Indo-China were becoming more massive and more violent.

Given the strength and force of President Hannah's leadership, his departure left a large vacuum in the decision-making processes of the University. As was indicated in the Analysis of Events Section in Chapter 4, the faculty had established themselves as a "body politic" within the institution. With President Hannah's departure, the faculty attempted to move quickly to secure their voice in the governance structure.

According to Vice President Cantlon (and others) this was a time of great tension between the faculty and the Board of Trustees (Dr. Cantlon was Provost during this period). The tension centered primarily in the decision-making process regarding the selection of a new president. The Trustees had agreed to limit their selection to candidates proposed

by the Search and Selection Committee. However, when the candidate list was first proposed, the Trustees were not able to agree on a new president. The process that led to the selection of Clifton R. Wharton, Jr., as President will not be examined in this study. However, what is important is that the problems with the process caused very strained relations between the faculty and the Trustees. This tension continued long after President Wharton's selection. Indeed, President Wharton indicated in his interview that on many occasions he had to take the role of a buffer between the faculty and the Trustees.

Added to this internal decision-making tension was the student constituency that was seeking its participation rights. As was indicated in the analysis of the revisions reports, the level of participation (i.e., yearly consultation) identified by the Featherstone Committee in 1966 was no longer acceptable or practical. By 1971, it was clear that student participation, to be meaningful at all, would have to be system-wide.

Given the role that the faculty perceived for themselves in the "Bylaws, 1968", plus the increasingly violent student protest both at Michigan State University and nationally, many faculty were greatly apprehensive about including students in the governance system. As was clearly expressed by the Killingsworth Memorandum, many faculty feared that

unbridled student participation would, at a minimum, lead to the equivalent of a "storming of the Bastille".

Many of the students involved in leadership positions during this era (including this writer) felt that the faculty's concerns were both paranoid and paternalistic. The researcher believes that student desires for participation were not grounded in an attempt to dislocate the faculty from their traditional responsibilities. Student participation in University-level governance was, at that time, more symbolic than substantive. It was another "forbidden fruit" that had to be consumed in an era of quickly changing social mores.

As will be described in the next Chapter, once student participation became a fact, the concerns of student rebellion or "dictatorship" quickly dissipated. Indeed, most of the interviewees concluded that the initial group of students involved with the Academic Council participated in a very effective and efficient manner. This was so much so that when the Bylaws were reviewed after two years, there was never any serious consideration given to disenfranchising the students.

One final note in regard to these Bylaw revisions. One of the questions posed during the interview process was what effect the changes in presidency in 1969-70 had on the

revision process? Other than the faculty-Trustee tensions that developed over the selection process, all of the interviewees agreed that neither President Adams nor President Wharton personally tried to alter the process. Indeed, many indicated that the only impact these two Presidents had on the development process was that they did not try to interfere. The unstated inference by many was that President Hannah would have become more personally involved in the development of student participation, and that his involvement would more than likely have limited student participation than expanded it.

NOTES

Chapter 5

1. "Minutes of the Board of Trustees", May 21, 1971.
2. "Minutes of the Academic Council", Volume XII, May 29, 1967, p. 210.
3. Ibid., p. 210-212.
4. Ibid.
5. Ibid.
6. Ibid.
7. Ibid.
8. Ibid.
9. Ibid.
10. Ibid., June 6, 1967, p. 125.
11. Ibid., p. 136.
12. Ibid., Volume XIV, October 8, 1968, p. 1.
13. Ibid., p. 6.
14. Ibid., p. 3.
15. Ibid., p. 6.
16. Ibid., November 5, 1968, p. 90.
17. Ibid.
18. Ibid., p. 91.
19. Ibid.
20. "Ad Hoc Committee on Student Participation in Academic Government", University Archives, UA.1406, Secretary for Academic Governance, Box 3, April 23, 1969, p. 1-6.
21. Ibid., p. 6.

22. "Minutes of the Academic Council", Volume XV, October 14, 1969, p. 2.
23. Ibid., p. 50-77.
24. Ibid., p. 77.
25. Ibid., March 3, 1970, p. 285.
26. Ibid.
27. Ibid.
28. Ibid., p. 285-294.
29. Ibid., p. 268.
30. Ibid., May 15, 1970, p. 395.
31. "Minutes of the Academic Senate", Volume III, June 3, 1970, p. 138-168.
32. "Minutes of the Academic Council", Volume XVI, October 6, 1970, p. 6.
33. Ibid., November 3, 1970, p. 78-127.
34. Ibid., May 4, 1971, p. 398.
35. "Minutes of the Academic Senate", Volume IV, May 19, 1971.
36. "Minutes of the Board of Trustees", May 21, 1971.
37. "Bylaws for Academic Governance", Michigan State University, 1971, p. 7.
38. Ibid., p. 10-14.
39. Ibid.
40. Ibid.
41. Ibid.
42. Ibid.
43. Ibid., p. 12.
44. Ibid., p. 10.
45. "Minutes of the Academic Council", Volume XVI, November 17, 1970, p. 146.

46. "Bylaws for Academic Governance", Michigan State University, 1971, p. 18.
47. Ibid., p. 19.
48. Ibid., p. 21.
49. Ibid.
50. Ibid.
51. Ibid., p. 23.
52. Ibid., p. 25.
53. Ibid.
54. Ibid., p. 24.
55. Ibid., p. 28.
56. Ibid., p. 32.
57. Ibid., p. 40.
58. Ibid., p. 58.
59. Ibid., p. 45.
60. Ibid.
61. Ibid., p. 34.
62. Ibid., p. 36.
63. Ibid., p. 46-47.
64. Ibid., p. 47-48.
65. Ibid., p. 48-49.
66. Ibid., p. 42.
67. Ibid., p. 40.
68. "Minutes of the Academic Council", Volume XIII, May, 1968, p. 479.
69. "Bylaws for Academic Governance", Michigan State University, 1971, p. 40.
70. Ibid., p. 41.
71. "Minutes of the Board of Trustees", October 16, 1970.

72. "Ad Hoc Committee on Student Participation", April 23, 1969, p. 2.
73. Ibid.
74. Ibid.
75. Ibid.
76. "Minutes of the Academic Council", Volume XV, October 22, 1969, p. 72.
77. Ibid., October 28, 1969, p. 77.
78. "Ad Hoc Committee on Student Participation", April 23, 1969, p. 2-5.
79. Ibid., p. 2.
80. "Bylaws for Academic Governance", Michigan State University, 1971, p. 21.
81. "Ad Hoc Committee on Student Participation", April 23, 1969, p. 3.
82. Ibid.
83. Ibid.
84. Ibid., p. 4.
85. Ibid.
86. Ibid.
87. Ibid., p. 5.
88. Ibid.
89. Delores Major, State News, November 4, 1969, Volume 62, p. 1.
90. "Minutes of the Academic Council", Volume XVI, March 3, 1970, p. 285.
91. Ibid., p. 286.
92. Ibid.
93. Ibid.
94. Ibid.
95. Ibid., p. 287.

96. Ibid., p. 289.
97. Ibid.
98. Ibid.
99. Ibid., p. 287.
100. Ibid., p. 288.
101. Ibid.
102. Ibid.
103. Ibid.
104. Ibid., p. 290-291.
105. Ibid., p. 291.
106. Ibid., p. 292.
107. Ibid., p. 292-293.
108. Ibid., p. 293-294.
109. Ibid., p. 293.
110. Ibid., p. 294.
111. Charles C. Killingsworth, et. al., "McKee Committee Proposals for Bylaw Revisions", University Archives, UA.1406, Secretary for Academic Governance, Box 3, June 3, 1970.
112. Ibid., p. 1-6.
113. Ibid., p. 1.
114. Ibid.
115. Ibid.
116. Ibid.
117. Ibid.
118. Ibid., p. 2.
119. Ibid.
120. Ibid.
121. Ibid.

- 122. Ibid.
- 123. Ibid., p. 3.
- 124. Ibid.
- 125. Ibid.
- 126. Ibid., no page numbers
- 127. "Minutes of the Academic Council", Volume XVI, October 6, 1970, p. 6.
- 128. Ibid.
- 129. Ibid.
- 130. Ibid., November 3, 1970, p. 78-127.
- 131. Ibid., p. 81.
- 132. Ibid., p. 82.
- 133. Ibid.
- 134. Ibid., p. 83-84.
- 135. Ibid., p. 79.
- 136. Ibid., p. 84-86.
- 137. Clifton R. Wharton, October 1, 1970, University Archives, UA.1406, Secretary for Academic Governance, Box 3.
- 138. Ibid.
- 139. "Minutes of the Academic Council", Volume XVI, November 3, 1970, p. 97-100.
- 140. Ibid., p. 86.
- 141. Ibid.
- 142. Ibid., p. 87.
- 143. Ibid.
- 144. Ibid., p. 80.
- 145. Ibid., p. 88.

CHAPTER 6

DEVELOPMENT OF "BYLAWS, 1975"

Overview and Background

As indicated in Chapter 5, "Bylaws, 1971" became operational during the Fall Quarter of 1971. Professor Gordon Guyer reported the following at the October 5, 1971 meeting of the Academic Council:

1. The Secretary for Academic Governance has published and distributed the new Bylaws.
2. The Committee on Committees is ahead of schedule on implementation of student participation.
3. ASMSU and COGS have selected representatives for the At-Large Representative Nomination Committee.
4. College reports on implementation will be sent to the Steering Committee before January 1, 1972.¹

The only major development in regard to implementation of the new Bylaws developed when an undergraduate student, Mr. Mark Bathurst, challenged the legitimacy of the at-large selection process which excluded white male candidates. Mr. Bathurst filed a complaint with the Student-Faculty Judiciary. It was reported to the Academic Council on November 30, 1971, that the Student-Faculty Judiciary had declined to

accept the case because only the Academic Council had the authority to interpret the Bylaws.² On November 30, 1971, the ten at-large representatives were seated on the Academic Council.³

There was another issue, related to the process of academic governance, that was a frequent subject of discussion for Academic Council during this period of 1971-72. This was the issue of collective bargaining for the faculty at Michigan State University.

Collective bargaining for faculty in higher education had become a national phenomena by 1971. Professor Daniel Coleman (then professor at St. Cloud College, Minnesota) reported the following in his 1972 article "The Evolution of Collective Bargaining as it Relates to Higher Education in America":

In 1965 Michigan was the first state to develop comprehensive legislation covering the professional higher education staff. In 1967, New York and Wisconsin followed in pursuit. Since 1968, California, Hawaii, Kansas, Maine, Massachusetts, Nebraska, Nevada, New Jersey, Pennsylvania, and South Dakota developed comprehensive legislation which provides collective bargaining rights for the college professional staff.⁴

On the national scene faculty collective bargaining received a large boost when the National Labor Relations Board, in December 1970, reversed a nineteen year policy and provided for collective bargaining for faculty at private colleges and universities.⁵ On October 30, 1971, the AAUP adopted

the following resolution:

The Association will pursue collective bargaining as a major way of realizing the Association's goals in higher education, and will allocate such resources and staff as are necessary for the vigorous selective development of this activity beyond present levels.⁶

It must also be noted that two other organizations, the American Federation of Teachers and the National Education Association has been involved in attempting to organize higher education faculty for several years prior to the AAUP 1971 decision.

As Dr. Coleman's article stated, Michigan passed enabling legislation in 1965, the Public Employees Relations Act. According to Professor Walter Johnson, by 1971 two major universities, Wayne State University and Central Michigan University, had already approved collective bargaining for the faculty.

At Michigan State University, two organizations, the Faculty Associates (sponsored by the Michigan Education Association) and the local AAUP chapter filed sufficient signatures on petitions to call for a representational election. This election was held on October 22 and 23, 1972.⁷ The vote was 1,213 "No Agent", 280 AAUP and 523 Faculty Associates. Thus, no union was certified. All of the interviewees agreed that the main issue surrounding collective bargaining

in 1972 was salaries.

In the fall of 1971 Professor Robert Repas, in conjunction with Trustee Clair White, made public the faculty salary list. At this time faculty salaries were not a public document. The Academic Council for only the second time in its history,* on November 30, 1971 voted to censure Professor Repas and Trustee White. The vote was 46-4-6 in favor of censure.⁸

The Academic Council appointed an Ad Hoc Committee to study the effect collective bargaining might have on the governance system. The committee, chaired by Professor Herbert Jackson, issued its report on January 31, 1972.⁹ The conclusions reached in the Report, and the impact of this unionization drive on academic governance will be discussed in the section on Analysis of Events.

On April 3, 1973 the Steering Committee, through the chairperson, Professor James Bonnen, sent a memorandum to the Academic Council indicating that it was time, under the Bylaws, to commence the two year review established in Bylaws, 1971.¹⁰ On May 1, 1973 the Academic Council

*The first censure motion was in regard to Professor John Moore, who in 1960 made unsubstantiated public remarks regarding communist party influence among the faculty at Michigan State University.

approved the formation of an Ad Hoc Committee to review the Bylaws, not only in regard to student participation, but on a systematic basis.¹¹ On May 31, 1971, President Wharton named the following people to be on the Ad Hoc Committee:¹²

Glen Hatcher, graduate student

Professor Lester Manderscheid

Professor Bruce Miller

Professor Gerald Miller

Cassandra Simmons, undergraduate student

Professor Donald Taylor

Dean Clarence Winder

On November 27, 1973, the Academic Council received the "Report of Ad Hoc Committee to Review Academic Governance - Michigan State University, November 13, 1973".¹³ At this meeting, the Academic Council approved a document entitled "Plans for Consideration of the Report of the Ad Hoc Committee to Review Academic Governance".¹⁴ The discussions and deliberations were to be in a two stage process. First, the Academic Council was to approve the topical sections of the Ad Hoc Report. Then, the Ad Hoc Committee would develop Bylaw language and submit this to the Council for approval. The intent of this document was to try and expedite the deliberative process and prevent the reoccurrence of a two-year process that occurred with "Bylaws, 1971". To further this aim, President Wharton, in his role as presiding officer, established a five minute limit per speaker per issue.¹⁵

The Academic Council began its deliberations at the first meeting of the Winter Term; January 8, 1974.¹⁶ The deliberations continued at meetings on January 15, 22, 29; February 5, 19, 26; April 9, 23; and May 7. On May 7, 1974 the topical section of the Ad Hoc Report was approved by the Academic Council. As will be discussed in greater detail further on, the major issues debated were the reduction in the number of at-large student representatives, the establishment and definition of the "Modes of Participation" for participants in the governance system, the method of apportionment for elected faculty representatives, the realignment and staffing structures for the several standing committees, and the role of the Academic Senate.

On October 8, 1974 the Ad Hoc Committee submitted the proposed Bylaws based upon the actions approved by the Academic Council the previous spring.¹⁷ At this same meeting the Council also approved a "Procedures for Debate on Bylaws".¹⁸

The Elected Faculty Council met on November 5, 1974 to debate the proposed Bylaws. The Academic Council began its deliberations on November 12, 1974. The debate continued at meetings held on November 26, December 3, January 7, 14 and 21. The proposed Bylaws were approved by the Academic Council on January 21, 1975.¹⁹

A review of the minutes reflect that the following were the major issues during the process: 1) The five year review of the several deans;²⁰ 2) The legal basis for the Modes of Participation;²¹ 3) The role of the Academic Senate;²² 4) The number of at-large student representatives;²³ 5) The communications requirement for standing committee chairs;²⁴ 6) The issue of whether committee meetings were to be open or closed;²⁵ and, 7) The structure of the standing committees.²⁶

At the December 3, 1974 meeting, President Wharton, acting as the presiding officer, established a "gag" rule for the deliberations. The President, in an effort to prevent foot-dragging, ruled that no discussion would be permitted that raised issues already settled by the approval of the Ad Hoc Report.²⁷ The President exercised this option in regard to items involving the at-large student representatives, the communications requirement for the committee chairs (the Council overruled the President on this issue), and attempts to re-establish committees that were to be abolished.

The proposed Bylaws were submitted to the Academic Senate on February 18, 1975 and to the Board of Trustees on March 21, 1975. Both bodies approved the document. "Bylaws, 1975" became operational beginning with the Fall Term, 1975.²⁸ The process, from submission of the Ad Hoc Report to

approval by the Board of Trustees took just sixteen months.

Analysis of the Ad Hoc Report and Bylaw Revisions

Because the "Bylaws, 1975" was a systematic revision of the governance system this Chapter will combine the analysis of the revision report and the final product. As will be reviewed in this Section, the Ad Hoc Committee's Report, which quickly became known as the "Manderscheid Committee" (following the practice of all of the revision processes) dealt with the actual foundation of the faculty's role in University decision-making. To understand the Bylaws that were finally developed and approved, the Manderscheid Committee Report must be examined in close detail.

The Manderscheid Report (Principles)

The Manderscheid Report was clearly the most systematic review of the academic governance process conducted by the faculty at Michigan State University. The Report was some forty pages in length, plus six pages of introductory summarization. The Report was divided into six sections.

These six sections were titled as follows:

- I. Fundamental Principles for the Examination of Academic Governance
- II. Foundations of Academic Governance at Michigan State University
- III. An Evaluation of the Present Governance System
- IV. University-Level Governance Structure

V. College, School and Department Academic Governance

VI. Academic Governance and Judicial Systems²⁹

The Preface to the Report lists the charge given to the Manderscheid Committee. The charge was threefold in nature. First, the Committee had to define the purpose of academic governance. Second, the Committee was to review and evaluate the present system. Particular attention was to be given to the following:

- a. The purpose and appropriate effective means for student, faculty and administrative participation,
- b. What should be the interrelationship between the administration and the governance system in regard to academic policy formulation and decision making,
- c. How the various judicial structures should interrelate to the governance system,
- d. What should be the interrelationship between bylaws and policy actions of the departments (etc.), and the bylaws and policies at the University-level.

And third, the Committee was to develop recommendations to improve the effectiveness of academic governance and report to the President by November 13, 1973.³⁰

In the first section of the Manderscheid Report, the "Fundamental Principles" were examined on two separate levels.

The first level was the "Given Legal Context":

Before the foundation of academic governance can be determined and before its structure can be recommended, the legal context in which it operates must be specified. The Constitution of the

State of Michigan and the Bylaws of the Board of Trustees of Michigan State University provide the limits and the authority for the governance of the University.³¹

The remainder of this section cited relevant portions of these two documents. As has already been discussed in previous chapters, there was a long standing struggle between the faculty and the Board of Trustees in regard to role and authority in the decision-making process. This section was a clear recognition on the part of the faculty that the legal authority for decision-making at Michigan State University emanated from the State constitution and the Board of Trustees. As will be examined presently, this recognition laid the foundation for the definition of the several "Modes of Participation" developed by the Manderscheid Committee.

The second level of examination in this section on fundamental principles was titled "Shared Values".³² It was in this section that the Committee attempted to define, in extremely broad and general terms, the hierarchical structures of the institution and the role and purpose of the various levels within this hierarchy.

The hierarchy was described with the Board of Trustees at the top; with recognition of their ultimate legal authority. Flowing from the Board was the decision-making prerogatives from the President, Provost, deans and chairpersons to the

individual faculty members. This was labeled the administrative authority hierarchy. The committee established that there was also an apparent parallel hierarchical structure of academic governance composed of faculty and students.

In describing this parallel hierarchical structure the Committee postulated the following:

This formal hierarchical structure of university administration and faculty and student committees disguises a decentralized organization of decision-making on the most important functions of the university -- teaching, service, research, and creative activity.³³

To further emphasize this position the committee indicated that policies could and were made by the Board, administration and governance system that placed limits on the teaching, research and other academic activities, but that faculty, almost exclusively, could and should determine both content and methodologies for teaching, research and other academic pursuits.³⁴

Just as it was clear that the Board has ultimate decision-making authority, it was also clear that the faculty did not relinquish its traditional stance that their individual expertise was paramount in any and all academic decisions.

The section on "Shared Values" concluded with a recognition (and the belief) that an institution of higher education does have centers of power, but that:

...there exists a mutuality of trust and common commitment to the purposes of the University and academic governance. This does not imply that there is no conflict among groups within the University; it does imply that conflict exists in an atmosphere in which individuals and groups do not have as their only goal maximization of their own well being and do not treat others as nothing more than competitors for power.³⁵

This last point also would lay the basic foundation for the development of the "Modes of Participation". With a more clear definition of role and place within the decision-making structure, the tensions between the Board, the administration, the faculty and the students over authority should diminish.

Building on the principles established in the first section, the Manderscheid Committee next examined the "Foundations of Academic Governance at Michigan State University".³⁶ This section began by examining the relationships between the governance structure and the administrative structure:

There are many ways to view the relationship between academic governance and academic administration...we perceive a need for strong administrative/managerial leadership in a period of increasing demands for accountability, increasing external efforts to control the University and stagnant or declining real resources available to the University. Equally, we believe that a strong academic governance system is essential to ensure the quality of decisions and to provide the understanding and consensus formation that will enhance commitment on the part of the University community to decisions.³⁷

The Report examined in some detail the actual authority and lines of responsibility of the administrative structure,

including the non-academic administrators. There was also a discussion of the responsibility the participants in academic governance had in providing information and feedback for administrators in decision-making, which included administrator selection processes.

Next, the Committee reported on four principles that had been developed which justified faculty and student participation. These four principles were as follows:

Principle of Decision Quality.

Principle of Expertise

Principle of Anomie Reduction

Principle of Autonomy³⁸

The first principle was described by the Committee's Report as the mechanism by which the quality of decisions would be increased because of the diversity of input in the governance process. The second principle re-emphasized the perspective of professional expertise in academic matters. The third principle was built around the sociological concept of human beings having a need to belong to the group. Participation would bring a sense of belonging and involvement in the institution's process. The final principle was based upon the notion that if faculty and students were to be affected by decisions they should have a role in the decision-making process.

With this justification established, the Manderscheid

Committee developed four so-called "Modes of Participation".³⁹ These four "Modes" formed the cornerstone of the relationship that was to exist between the administrative and governance structures under revised bylaws. The four "Modes of Participation" were described as follows:

1. Consultation. Faculty and/or students have a formal channel for discussion with administrators on a given topic. This is not a voting type situation. It is an exchange of information forum that is dependent on the candidness and receptiveness of the administrator.⁴⁰
2. Advisory. Faculty and/or students form a deliberative body which recommends policy to administrators who are authorized to make policy decisions. The administrator may accept or reject the recommendation or ask the body to reconsider. The recommendation action⁴¹ was to be based upon a formalized vote.
3. Shared Authority. The decision to be made by the administrator must be from among those recommended by a committee. This differs from the advisory mode in that the administrator is bound⁴² to accept or act upon a recommendation.
4. Delegated Authority. The Board of Trustees, through the President, delegates authority to faculty and/or students for decision-making. The Board retains⁴³ the right to review any delegated decision.

The Report indicates that all four Modes are needed at various times to define the interrelationship between structures on decision-making. As will be discussed later in the Chapter, the realignment of the standing committee structure and the Modes of Participation established for the various levels in governance provided for a significant

change in the structure of the Bylaws. There will also be a discussion in regard to the concern that arose in regard to the concept of Shared Authority.

The Manderscheid Report (Recommendations)

The Manderscheid Committee summarized their evaluation of the present governance system in two parts.⁴⁴ The first part was an evaluation of the two year experiment in student participation. The results of their examination indicated that there was no need to radically alter the structure of student participation. The second part of their evaluation indicated that the major problem facing the governance system was in ineffectiveness due to its large size size and number of participants.

With all of this as background, the Manderscheid Committee made its recommendations regarding the structure of academic governance.⁴⁵ The Committee recommended that the Academic Senate retain its power to approve Bylaw amendments, but only need act on any other matter which the Academic Council or Elected Faculty Council deemed necessary. The Senate was also to be restricted from any form of amendment power. A 10% quorum was to be established. If quorum was not established, the action of the Academic Council or Elected Faculty Council would stand. The Committee also recommended that the Senate be used as a forum for the dissemination of information.⁴⁶

The Academic Council was also recommended to be restructured. The Council was to be composed of three component councils: The Elected Faculty Council, the Elected Student Council and the Appointed Council.

The Elected Faculty Council would be composed of all of the elected faculty representatives; faculty representation would be determined at a minimum of two from each college plus an additional representative for each additional fifty faculty members up to a maximum of six. Also to be included were the five faculty members of the Steering Committee.⁴⁷

The Elected Student Council was to be established. This Council would be made up of student representatives; at least one from each college with an additional representative for any college with an excess of 2,000 undergraduate students. In addition there were to be six at-large student representatives to be elected, five to be non-white and two to be women. COGS would retain its allotment of six graduate representatives. There would also be the two student members of the Steering Committee.⁴⁸

The third Council, the Appointed Council was to be composed of all of the deans of academic programs as well as the directors of Honors College, Library and Continuing Education. There were also to be several designated ex-officio, non-voting members of the Academic Council. These members

were the President, Provost, Vice President for Student Affairs, Vice President for Research and Development, Dean of Students, Assistant Provost for Admissions and Scholarships, Assistant Provost for Undergraduate Education, the Ombudsman, the Faculty Grievance Official, and the Secretary for Academic Governance.⁴⁹

Given the then current structure of the University, the proposed system would have reduced the Academic Council by 24 voting members, and increased the non-voting members by 6. The number of voting faculty would be reduced from 85 to 63. The number of voting students would be increased from 35 to 38. The number of voting administrators would be reduced from 29 to 23. The number of non-voting administrators increased from 1 to 7.⁵⁰

There was also to be established an Executive Committee. This Committee would have two subcommittees, the Steering Committee and the Coordination Committee.

The Steering Subcommittee would be composed of five faculty members elected at large and two students (one undergraduate and one graduate student) selected by the Elected Student Council. The Steering Committee would still perform the function of setting the agenda for the Academic Council and Senate.⁵¹

The Coordination Subcommittee was to be composed of the chairpersons of the six standing committees plus the chair of the Steering Subcommittee, who would also chair the Coordination Subcommittee. This Subcommittee was to meet infrequently but their purpose was to prevent any type of log-jam in the committee system.⁵²

The Executive Committee would meet periodically with the President and Provost to exchange information. The Executive Committee was also to be empowered to act for the Academic Council in extraordinary situations.

The Standing Committee structure was also significantly revamped. The Committee's Report identified four basic aspects of University life:

Academic Affairs

Faculty Affairs (including tenure)

Student Affairs

Academic Environment⁵³

Based on these four elements, the Manderscheid Committee proposed that there be six Standing Committees. These were to be as follows:

University Committee on Academic Governance

University Committee on Academic Affairs

University Committee on Faculty Affairs

University Committee on Student Affairs

University Committee on Faculty Tenure

University Committee on Academic Environment⁵⁴

The Committee recommended that these six committees be staffed by members of the Academic Council.⁵⁵ This change in staffing was supposed to reduce the number of participants, help to better coordinate the governance process and reduce the friction between Council and committees.

The Academic Governance Committee was to have fourteen members, seven faculty and seven students. This committee was to have a two-fold function. First, it was to recommend individuals for committee appointments. Second, the Committee was to conduct an ongoing review of the Bylaws. This Committee would be carrying on the combined functions from the Committee on Committees and Committee on Academic Governance that were then currently in existence.⁵⁶

The Academic Affairs Committee was to be composed of seven faculty and five students, plus the Provost (who served without vote). The Academic Affairs Committee was to exercise the faculty's delegated authority to review and approve or reject all changes in course and curricula. In addition, this Committee was to advise the Provost on matters of creation or abolition of programs and other educational policies. The Committee was to consult with the Provost on admissions policies, financial aid and use, and distribution of educational resources. The Curriculum and Educational Policy Committees that currently existed were to

be disbanded. Academic Affairs would assume both committees' functions.⁵⁷

The Faculty Affairs Committee was to be composed of ten faculty members. Also, the Provost would serve in a non-voting manner. There would be no student representation. The Committee was to advise the Provost in regard to compensation matters and consult with the Provost during formulation of the academic budget. The Committee was also to share authority with the Provost in regard to formulation of the grievance procedure. These functions were quite similar to the existing committee. Two new functions were added. The Faculty Affairs Committee was to advise the Provost on matters of appointment, reappointment and promotion as well as assignments to teaching, research and administration.⁵⁸

The Student Affairs Committee was to be composed of four faculty and seven students, plus the Vice President for Student Affairs would serve as a non-voting member. The Committee was to advise the Vice President on policy in regard to the Student Affairs Office and to initiate and review proposed amendments to the Academic Freedom Report and General Student Regulations.⁵⁹

The University Committee on Faculty Tenure was to be composed of eight faculty members and three students. The Provost would also serve as an ex-officio, non-voting

member. The charge to this committee was unchanged from "Bylaws, 1971". The report indicated that there were discussions of combining the functions of the Tenure and Faculty Affairs Committee. This concept was rejected for two reasons. First, the Committee felt this might detract from the basic purpose of tenure (i.e. academic freedom). And second, issues other than tenure might cloud the discussions regarding tenure policy.⁶⁰

The final committee developed by the Manderscheid Report was the University Committee on Academic Environment. This Committee was to be composed of eight faculty and three student members. This committee was to consult and advise non-academic administrators in regard to proposed and existing policies that might have an impact on academic achievement:

It is our intent to centralize in one Committee the activities of the present University Committees on Business Affairs, Public Safety and Buildings, Land and Planning as well as some administrative committees. In addition, all other areas of non-academic administration such as transportation and maintenance fall within the scope of this committee's charge.⁶¹

The Manderscheid Committee realized that there were an abundance of so-called administrative committees that were currently in existence. The Report asked that the Academic Council establish the following as Advisory-Consultative Committees to be identified as Academic Council Committees on:

Graduate School
 International Programs
 Continuing Education
 Libraries
 Computer Laboratory
 Honors College
 Honorary Degrees
 Military Education
 Research Development⁶²

This proposal would have eliminated the Graduate Council as a legislative body as well reduce the scope of authority for three standing committees (International Projects, Honors Program and the Library Committee). The Manderscheid Committee envisioned the following process:

An Advisory-Consultative Committee shall review with the administrator(s) involved University policies and procedures within the designated area. The Committee shall consult with (or advise if the administrator so chooses) the administrator on issues under current consideration. The Committee shall recommend to the Academic Council, through either the Executive Committee or the appropriate standing committee, needed changes in University policies and procedures. An annual report should be filed with the Executive Committee for summary and distribution as part of the Council's minutes.⁶³

The final recommendation of the Manderscheid Committee in regard to the University's committee structure centered on the Athletic Council. The Committee offered no changes in regard to the Athletic Council other than to indicate that it was proper to recognize its existence in the new

Bylaws.⁶⁴

There were two other sections developed by the Manderscheid Committee; one regarding academic governance at the department, school or college level and the other regarding the university's judicial structure.⁶⁵ These two sections will be discussed in brief detail later in this Chapter.

The important focus of this Chapter is on the Manderscheid Committee Report, and the development of new Bylaws as they pertained to the University-level academic governance structure. The following will examine the "Bylaws, 1975" that were adopted as to how they either agreed or departed from the Manderscheid Committee's Report.

Article 1: Definitions

The first article of "Bylaws, 1975" is reflective of the overall theme of the Manderscheid Report. All previous Bylaws have used Article 1 to describe and define the faculty; with particular attention to the intra-faculty relationships (regular versus temporary, joint appointments, etc.) and the role of the faculty within the institution in relationship to the administration and Board of Trustees. These elements appear in the context of Article 1, "Bylaws, 1975", but the tone and style are very different. Bylaws 1961, 1968 and 1971 may be characterized by the faculty attempting to superimpose their position and role in an

institutional framework that separates function between faculty and administration. "Bylaws, 1975", in contrast, established a tone and tenor that was fluid with the environment. The Article has three subsections. The faculty were defined,⁶⁶ the student constituency was defined⁶⁷ and the Modes of Participation were defined.⁶⁸

The Modes of Participation were the crucial link in developing this fluidity. This section defined the faculty and students relationship to the decision-making processes of the University. The four "Modes of Participation" remained the same in the "Bylaws, 1975" as were developed by the Manderscheid Committee with this important change. The concept of Shared Authority developed by the Committee (the decisions made by an administrator must be from those recommended by a faculty and/or student committee) was altered by vote of the Academic Council to that of Shared Responsibility. The major difference between the two concepts revolved around final decision-making. If an administrator did not want to accept a committee decision acting under this Mode, the issue would be taken to the next highest level (the Board of Trustees). It became clear during the debate on this matter, concluding with a presentation by the University Attorney, Leland Carr,⁶⁹ that neither any committee, nor the Academic Council itself, could be held legally accountable for any decision. Thus, ultimate decision-making authority had to reside with an administrator.

The development of the Modes of Participation was the cornerstone to the Bylaw revisions approved in 1975. Interviews with former President Wharton, Professor Manderscheid, Professor Gordon Guyer, Professor James Bonnen and Professor Frederick Horne* indicated that the faculty's role in decision-making had been ambiguous and that definition had to be developed. None of the interviewees felt that the collective bargaining movement had any direct bearing on this development, but as will be discussed later, one indirect result of the defeat of collective bargaining was a greater sharing of information between the governance system and the administration.

Article 2: Governance in Schools, Colleges and Other Units

The Manderscheid Committee offered few changes in regard to department, school or college governance structures. The Committee recommended that these structures, referred to as academic units, should be kept simple, but in conformity with the overall Bylaws. Furthermore, the University Committee on Academic Governance was to be charged with the review of academic unit bylaws.⁸⁹ The one significant change that was adopted and incorporated into "Bylaws, 1975" was the inclusion of deans in the five year review process for chief academic unit administrators.⁹⁰

*Except for Dr. Wharton, all of these individuals served as chairperson of the Steering Committee.

Article 3: University Academic Governance

Article 3 of "Bylaws, 1975" described the University-level Academic Governance Structure. It was at this level that the Manderscheid Committee envisioned direct interaction between the two parallel hierarchical structures it had described in the section on Foundations.

First, "Bylaws, 1975" recognized that the Academic Senate was totally ineffective as a legislative/deliberative body. With the exception of Bylaw amendments, the Academic Senate would only meet when the Academic Council or Faculty Council felt there was a necessity.⁷⁰ While the Senate had been in decline for several years, the development of the Faculty Council, as a voice for the faculty (see Chapter 5) was expanding. During the course of interviews many of the participants were asked to comment as to whether or not the Faculty Council was viewed as a microcosm for the Senate. There was very little support for this proposition among any of the interviewees. Only Professors Guyer and Horne supported this contention and only in very guarded terms. Professor Guyer commented that the functions of the Faculty Council were different from the Senate. Professor Horne viewed the Faculty Council as a micro-senate only in terms of recent (post 1978) events. The functions of the Senate, even though emasculated, were clearly seen as differing than the functions of the Faculty Council.

The structure of the Academic Council and its component parts of Faculty, Student and Appointed Council were detailed in Section 3.2 of "Bylaws, 1975".⁷¹ Again there was no significant deviations from the recommendations of the Manderscheid Committee Report. There were, however, two representational issues that were argued vigorously on the floor of the Academic Council. The first involved the apportionment figures for faculty representation. The Manderscheid Committee established itself early on as attempting to reduce the size of the governance system. To this end the faculty representation was reduced from a maximum of eight to six, based on a ratio of 50 faculty as opposed to 40. There were several attempts to return to the 40 ratio for apportionment, but the ultimate sentiment was to reduce numbers. Thus, the Committee's recommendation was accepted.

The second representational question centered on the at-large seats. Primarily as a reaction to the two-year experience, the Committee recommended reduction from ten to six at-large seats because the number of women selected as student representatives from colleges did not necessitate a furtherance of the quota system.⁷² There were several attempts to maintain the status quo in this area. In fact, one attempt was made at the December 3, 1974 meeting which necessitated Dr. Wharton invoking the "gag rule" that had been established.⁷³

As discussed earlier, the Manderscheid Committee recommended the establishment of an Executive Committee that would be composed of two sub-units: the Steering Committee and the Coordination Committee. The Committee viewed this group as a means by which quick decision-making could be effectuated as well as a vehicle for increased communication.

"Bylaws, 1975" did not adopt this proposal intact. Instead, three inter-related but separate bodies were developed. First, the Steering Committee was retained with its traditional functions of developing the agenda for the Council. The only change for the Steering Committee was the addition of a second student representative; and, student members of the Steering Committee, like their faculty counterparts, could not serve concurrently as an elected or appointed student representative.⁷⁴

Second, there was developed a Coordinating Committee composed of all of the chairpersons of the Standing Committees along with the chairperson of the Steering Committee. This committee was to meet periodically to ensure the even flow of the standing committee processes.⁷⁵

The third committee established was the Executive Committee. This group was a combination of the Steering and Coordination Committee. The purpose of this group was to meet periodically with the President and Provost to exchange

information. This committee was also empowered to act for the Academic Council, subject to Academic Council review at the next meeting.⁷⁶

There was great hesitation on the part of the Academic Council in regard to this development. While the language in the "Bylaws, 1975" was similar to the Manderscheid Committee Report, the intention was clearly established that this vehicle should only be used in extraordinary circumstances.

One final note in regard to Article 3. The Office of Secretary for Academic Governance was specifically provided for, as was recommended by the Committee.⁷⁷

Article 4: Standing Committees

The last major area of change recommended by the Manderscheid Committee for University-level governance was the Standing Committee structure. As has already been reported, the number of University-level Standing Committees grew from five in 1955⁷⁸ to 12 by the time of the 1975 revision. One of the tasks of the Manderscheid Committee was to downsize the Standing Committee structure.

As already stated, the Manderscheid Committee Report took the position that, for the purposes of academic governance, there were four basic areas that had to be dealt with:

Academic Affairs

Faculty Affairs, including tenure

Student Affairs

Academic Environment

In the interview with Professor Manderscheid he indicated that initially the Committee was leaning towards a committee structure with this type of limitation. There came to be a recognition that two additional committees were necessary. One, as has already been described, was the need for a separate Tenure committee. The other was the need for a governance committee, separate from the Executive Committee, to monitor and review the system.

The Academic Council expanded the Manderscheid Report's recommendations into two more committees. One was the retention of the University Committee on Curriculum. The other was the University Graduate Council.

The retention of the Curriculum Committee came about as a matter of task. It was argued, successfully, by members of Curriculum and Educational Policies Committees that combining the functions would create an unmanageable workload. Thus, in essence, these two committees were retained, although Education Policies was renamed Academic Policy.

The retention of the Graduate Council was clearly a matter of politics. The Academic Council, as a body, was unwilling

to dismantle this legislative body that had existed since the mid 1950's.

In regard to the staffing of the Standing Committees, the Academic Council reached a compromise position. The Manderscheid Committee recommended that Standing Committees should be composed of student and faculty representatives from the Academic Council. As Dr. Manderscheid indicated, there was a feeling among many that committee reports were being redone step by step on the floor of the council. Committees staffed by members of the Council should tend to reduce this type of redundant effort.

On the other side of the argument were faculty (referred to by Professor Horne as "idealists") who felt that the governance structure participation level should be as expansive as possible.

The compromise that was reached involved some committees being staffed by members of the Council, and others staffed by non-members. Faculty appointments to all committees would be in a college rotational basis, established by the Faculty Council. This was necessary because no committee (except Curriculum) was to have representation from every college as had occurred in the past.

The following committees were staffed by non-Council

members:

Academic Policy⁷⁹
 Graduate Council⁸⁰
 Curriculum⁸¹
 Faculty Tenure⁸²
 Faculty Affairs⁸³
 Student Affairs⁸⁴

The remaining two Committees, Academic Governance⁸⁵ and Academic Environment⁸⁶ were staffed by members from the Academic Council.

Article 5: Other Committees

The "Bylaws, 1975" accepted the Manderscheid Committee's recommendations to incorporate the Athletic Council and the concept of "Academic Council Advisory-Consultative Committees".⁸⁷ However, the specific recommendations for these Advisory-Consultative Committees were not present in the "Bylaws, 1975". In addition, the "Bylaws, 1975" retained, in substantive form, the established articles in regard to University Student Faculty Judiciaries, Administrative Support of Academic Governance and Interpretation and Amendment.⁸⁸

The final area of review by the Manderscheid Committee involved the area of judicial systems. The Report gave considerable discussion to the apparent problem of a proliferation of judicial structures that had no inter-relation

among themselves nor with the academic governance structure.⁹¹ The Committee recommended that the Academic Council appoint a separate body to review this problem in detail and make recommendations. Thus, there was no recommendation that affected "Bylaws, 1975" and will not be commented on any further.

Analysis of Events

The process of development and adoption of "Bylaws, 1975" provided little of the campus uproar or acrimony that was described in Chapter 5 regarding the adoption of "Bylaws, 1971". There are three major reasons for this change in atmosphere. The first was the defeat of the representational election for faculty collective bargaining. The second was a virtual end of campus disturbances surrounding the war in Indo-China and lastly was the administration of the institution under President Wharton.

In regard to collective bargaining the Academic Council appointed an Ad Hoc Committee to prepare a report which would review the impact collective bargaining might have on the University. The Committee issued its report on January 31, 1972. The Committee reported their findings in regard to impact on all levels of the institution. In regard to the impact on academic governance, the Committee reported the following:

1. The impact of collective bargaining is impossible to delineate with any degree of

certainty.

2. It is possible, however, that collective bargaining could drastically alter the governance system, especially at the University-level.
3. Collective bargaining could make faculty more effective in influencing the Board of Trustees, especially in reducing arbitrary and capricious actions.
4. There could be an increase in influencing decision making in regard to working conditions.
5. This would be accompanied by a probable standardization of conditions that would impinge upon freedoms that faculty currently take for granted.
6. There would be a probable decreased role in University business affairs and new program development.
7. Collective bargaining may effect student participation in governance.
8. Managerial¹₂ accountability would be increased.

The development of faculty collective bargaining at Michigan State University is not the theme of this study. Its effect, however, is probative. As was reported earlier in this Chapter, the faculty voted on October 22 and 23, 1972 not to support collective bargaining. In discussing this issue with many of the interviewees the following was reported.

President Wharton indicated that collective bargaining failed in part because a majority of the faculty felt their needs and concerns were being addressed by the governance

system. However, as a result of the negative vote, the administration was more responsive to sharing information, particularly of a budgetary nature, with the Faculty Affairs Committee. Dr. John Cantlon, then Provost, concurred with Dr. Wharton's assessment. He also added that the debate which surrounded collective bargaining had an impact of the need to develop the Modes of Participation, especially in regard to shared and delegated authority.

Professor Walter Johnson indicated that the Faculty Affairs Committee received considerable more "clout" as a result of the defeat of collective bargaining. The other interviewees questioned on the subject tended to agree with this perception. The reason that the discussion in regard to the defeat of collective bargaining centered on the Faculty Affairs Committee was because of money. All of the interviewees questioned, and in particular Professors Horne and Larrowe, stated that the only issue surrounding collective bargaining in the fall of 1972 was salaries. The release of the faculty salary list by Trustee White and Professor Repas focused many faculty on the apparent disparity in faculty salaries.

The second major event which had an impact on the development of "Bylaws, 1975" was the lack of significant student unrest between 1972 and 1975. Student participation at the University-level was generally rated as constructive by all

of the interviewees. The fears of student domination expressed by Professor Killingsworth and others (see Chapter 5) did not materialize. Thus a potentially divisive issue, the continuation of student participation, was never to surface in any serious sense. Student participation was not only accepted, but was expanded with the development of the Student Council.

The development of the Student Council was illustrative of the third factor which led to the development of "Bylaws, 1975". President Wharton was a strong advocate of the development of the Student Council. Through his administration he was able to nurture this body to its acceptance in 1975. Other interviewees, specifically Professors Manderscheid and Horne stated that Dr. Wharton, while not directly involved in the deliberations, let the system develop in a controlled setting. The tensions between the faculty and the Trustees had been reduced. There was a greater sharing of information between the central administration and the governance system. In short, "Bylaws, 1975" developed as a document focusing on a total system because the institution had developed and matured to a system that was not, in any significant way, tearing at itself internally.

As will be indicated in Chapter 7, some of the changes in the structure of the governance system developed in "Bylaws,

1975", would be short-lived. Within two years from the date of adoption of "Bylaws, 1975" the governance system would be faced with proposals to expand the size of the Academic Policy (formerly Educational Policy) Committee, further define the role of the governance system in regard to "delegated authority", and seek ways to conduct business with a decreasing number of active participants.

NOTES

Chapter 6

1. "Minutes of the Academic Council", Volume XVII, October 5, 1971, p. 135.
2. Ibid., November 30, 1971, p. 236.
3. Ibid.
4. Daniel Coleman, "The Evolution of Collective Bargaining as it Relates to Higher Education in America", Journal of College and University Personnel Association, Volume 23, No. 2, March 1972, p. 53.
5. Ibid., p. 60.
6. AAUP Bulletin, "Statement on Collective Bargaining", Volume 58, No. 4, Winter, 1972, p. 423.
7. State News, Volume 65, No. 50, October 24, 1972, p. 1.
8. "Minutes of the Academic Council", Volume XVII, November 30, 1971, p. 236.
9. "Report of the Ad Hoc University Committee on Collective Bargaining", January 31, 1972, University Archives, UA.14.06, Secretary for Academic Governance, Box 11, File: Collective Bargaining 1970-1975.
10. "Minutes of the Academic Council", Volume XVIII, April 3, 1973, p. 283.
11. Ibid., p. 324.
12. Ibid.p. 393.
13. Ibid., Volume XIX, November 27, 1973, p. 86.
14. Ibid., p. 88.
15. Ibid., p. 86.
16. Ibid., January 8, 1974, p. 112.
17. Ibid., Volume XX, October 8, 1974, p. 2.
18. Ibid.

19. Ibid., January 21, 1975, p. 285.
20. Ibid., p. 184 and p. 263.
21. Ibid.
22. Ibid.
23. Ibid., p. 250.
24. Ibid., p. 250 and p. 255.
25. Ibid., p. 255.
26. Ibid.
27. Ibid., p 250.
28. "Bylaws for Academic Governance", 1975, Michigan State University.
29. "Report of the Ad Hoc Committee to Review Academic Governance", Michigan State University, November 13, 1973.
30. Ibid., p. i.
31. Ibid., p. 1.
32. Ibid., p. 2.
33. Ibid.
34. Ibid., p. 3.
35. Ibid.
36. Ibid., p. 4-13.
37. Ibid., p. 4.
38. Ibid., p. 7.
39. Ibid., p. 9-11.
40. Ibid., p. 9.
41. Ibid., p. 10.
42. Ibid.
43. Ibid.
44. Ibid., p. 14-17.

45. Ibid., p. 18-32.
46. Ibid., p. 18.
47. Ibid.
48. Ibid., p. 19.
49. Ibid.
50. Ibid., p. 20-21.
51. Ibid., p. 23.
52. Ibid., p. 24.
53. Ibid.
54. Ibid., p. 25.
55. Ibid.
56. Ibid., p. 26.
57. Ibid., p. 26-27.
58. Ibid., p. 27.
59. Ibid., p. 28.
60. Ibid.
61. Ibid.
62. Ibid., p. 29.
63. Ibid., p. 30.
64. Ibid.
65. Ibid., p. 31-38.
66. "Bylaws for Academic Governance", Michigan State University, 1975, p. 7.
67. Ibid., p. 8.
68. Ibid., p. 9.
69. "Minutes of the Academic Council", Volume XX, January 21, 1975, p. 263.
70. "Bylaws for Academic Governance", Michigan State University, 1975, p. 14-15.

71. Ibid., p. 15-21.
72. "Report of the Ad Hoc Committee to Review Academic Governance", Michigan State University, November 13, 1973, p. 22.
73. "Minutes of the Academic Council", Volume XX, December 3, 1974, p. 250.
74. "Bylaws for Academic Governance", Michigan State University, 1975, p. 21-22.
75. Ibid., p. 23.
76. Ibid.
77. Ibid., p. 23-24.
78. "Minutes of the Faculty Meeting", Volume VIII, November 1, 1956, p. 551.
79. "Bylaws for Academic Governance", Michigan State University, 1975, p. 27.
80. Ibid., p. 28.
81. Ibid., p. 29.
82. Ibid., p. 30.
83. Ibid., p. 31.
84. Ibid., p. 32.
85. Ibid.
86. Ibid., p. 33.
87. Ibid., p. 34-35.
88. Ibid., p. 36-37.
89. "Report of the Ad Hoc Committee to Review Academic Governance", Michigan State University, November 13, 1973, p. 31-32.
90. "Bylaws for Academic Governance", Michigan State University, 1975, p. 11.
91. "Report of the Ad Hoc Committee to Review Academic Governance", Michigan State University, November 13, 1975, p. 33-38.

92. "Report of the Ad Hoc University Committee on Collective Bargaining", January 31, 1972, p. 30.

CHAPTER 7

DEVELOPMENT OF "BYLAWS, 1978"

Overview and Background

As indicated in Chapter 6, the "Bylaws, 1975" were approved by the Board of Trustees on March 21, 1975. The Manderscheid Committee was cognizant of the structural changes that were being proposed. With this notion in mind, the Committee developed a Transition document which was attached as an appendix to the Report.

The Report developed implementation dates based upon approval during the 1974-75 academic year. As described in the previous chapter, final approval did not occur until the 1975-76 academic year. Thus, the Report dates reflect a one-year time lag. The transition document established the following parameters:

1. Elected faculty representatives to the Academic Council, whose term expired on June 30, would remain to finish their term.
2. The chairpersons of the Educational Policies, Curriculum, Faculty Affairs and Faculty Compensation, and Faculty Tenure Committees would remain as members of the Academic Council for the first year.
3. The chairpersons of Educational Policies and

Curriculum shall be appointed to the new Academic Affairs Committee.

4. The current chairpersons of the Faculty Affairs and Faculty Compensation Committee and the Faculty Tenure Committee shall be retained as members of the two new committees.
5. All other current Standing Committees and the Graduate Council were to be discharged and replaced as proscribed in the new bylaws.
6. An interim Committee for Academic Governance, selected by the Elected Faculty Council and Student Council, was to make the necessary appointments to the Standing Committees.¹

The Transition Plan was adopted by the Academic Council on April 8, 1975.² This document did not differ greatly from the one proposed by the Committee. Some of the general provisions were as follows:

1. Elected representatives to Academic and Faculty Councils, and the Steering Committee, retained their seats until August 31, 1975,
2. Steering Committee will decide questions regarding whether old or new bylaw procedures are most appropriate.
3. Two members from Educational Policies Committee will serve for one year as ex-officio, non-voting members of Academic Policy Committee.
4. One member from Business Affairs Public Safety and Building, Lands, and Planning will serve a one year term on the Academic Environment Committee.
5. All other committees will be reconstituted according to the new bylaws.³

The major difference between the proposed and approved transition documents was the deletion of continuing for one year the involvement of several of the Standing Committee

chairs.

There was an attempt to retain for one year several of the standing committees that were being abolished. This fight was led by Professor Martin Fox. Specifically, he tried to retain the Business Affairs; Public Safety; Building, Lands and Planning; Computer Advisory; and Lecture-Concert Committees. These attempts proved fruitless. The Academic Council did not amend the transition document.

The first meetings of both the Academic Council and Faculty Council under "Bylaws, 1975" took place on October 7, 1975.⁴ At the meeting of the Academic Council President Wharton announced some major administrative changes. These changes would become part of the bylaw changes proposed during the following Spring Term.

A point of interest, but not directly related to bylaw changes, occurred at the November 4, 1975 meeting of the Academic Council. President Wharton announced that the Board of Trustees had, on October 24, 1975, amended their Bylaws to include the position of Provost as an officer of the Board.⁵ This action, to many of the faculty, was a recognition by the Trustees of the pre-eminence of the faculty's role in academic decision-making matters. The Provost, as chief academic officer, was now officially a part of the University's legal structure.

At the February 3, 1976 meeting of the Faculty Council an ad hoc committee was established to develop "Rules and Procedures".⁶ This action was taken in response to a memorandum prepared by Professor Jack Bass.⁷ The committee was chaired by Professor Bass and included Professors Lester Manderscheid, Gerald Miller, Jack Stieber and Ralph Taggart.

The Committee reported back to the Faculty Council on March 9, 1976. The Faculty Council approved the Report at that meeting. The first "Rules and Procedures" for the Faculty Council included the following:

1. Unless otherwise specified the Council would operate under Roberts Rules of Order.
2. The Council would meet at least once per term, and more often if called into session by the President or Provost.
3. The Agenda would be sent to all members one week in advance of the meeting. If ten or more members requested an item be placed on the agenda, it shall be placed on the agenda.
4. All Council meetings were open to the public except the meeting at which the Faculty Affairs Committee gave its report on proposed salary and fringe benefit increases.
5. Replacement of faculty members, necessitated by an early vacancy, to committees will be handled by a mail ballot. The Academic Governance Committee will prepare a nomination slate.⁸

On May 31, 1977 the Faculty Council amended these "Rules of Procedures". The first amendment dealt with the closed meeting provision. The State of Michigan passed legislation commonly referred to as the "Sunshine Act". This

legislation was designed to prohibit public institutions from making policy decisions in closed or executive sessions. As a result of this legislation, President Wharton asked the Faculty Council to change their rules.⁹

The second amendment, again developed by Professor Bass, added a new quorum requirement for the Council. The amendment, as adapted, read as follows:

If by 10 minutes after the scheduled meeting time, a majority of the Faculty Council is not present, then 40% of the membership shall be sufficient to open the meeting, approve the agenda and minutes, and commence decision. Until a majority is present, formal motions may be passed only with the support of 25% of the membership of the Faculty Council membership plus one.¹⁰

It became necessary, obviously, to reduce the quorum from the generally accepted figure of 50%, if the Faculty Council was to be operational. This question was raised during the discussion on the adoption of the Rules of Procedure in March 1976. Professor Bettinghaus asked if the ad hoc committee had discussed the issue of a less than 50% quorum. Professor Bass indicated that the Committee had not discuss the issue.¹¹

During the academic years 1975-77 the Academic Council spent numerous hours discussing and revising several major academic documents. These included the Code of Teaching Responsibility (CTR), the Student Instructional Rating Survey (SIRS), the Policy on Dismissal of Tenured Faculty,

the Report of the Ad Hoc Committee to Review the Judicial Structure and a proposed Faculty Liaison to the Board of Trustees. In addition, the President, in several of his opening remarks, kept the Academic Council appraised of the budget reductions being imposed the Governors' Executive Order. And finally, several sessions were devoted to discussion regarding the faculty's responsibility for inter-collegiate programs due to the pending investigation by the National Collegiate Athletic Association (NCAA) of recruiting violations in the football program.

At the first meeting of the Academic Council for Fall, 1977 (October 4, 1977), the Chairperson of the Steering Committee, Professor Gwendolyn Norrell, listed the following as the crucial issues facing the Academic Council for the upcoming year:

1. Faculty Grievance Procedure
2. Faculty Rights and Responsibilities Document
3. SIRS
4. Policy on Remedial Courses
5. The Ad Hoc₁₂ Committee Report on Judicial Procedures.

As indicated, many of the issues facing the Academic Council had not yet been resolved by the fall of 1977. The Bass amendment to the "Rules of Procedure" for Faculty Council (lowering quorum from 50% to 40%) was indicative of the lethargic state in which the Academic Council found itself.

To many of the interviewees it appeared as if academic governance was moving slowly along, being fueled only by its own inertia. It was under this backdrop that in the spring of 1977 the University Committee on Academic Governance transmitted three different sets of Bylaw amendments to the Academic Council. These three packages were to make up the changes that developed into "Bylaws, 1978". Nowhere in the three sets of proposals was there any change of the magnitude that occurred in the previous Bylaw revisions. These changes will be described in the next Section. Following the description of the changes will be analyses of what these particular changes (the last major revision to the Bylaws) meant to the structure of faculty-participation in University-level governance.

Structural Analysis

On April 5, 1977 the University Committee on Academic Governance (UCAG) transmitted a set of four "Proposed Amendments to Bylaws for Academic Governance, 1975" to the Steering Committee.¹³ This was the first of three separate proposal memorandums to be transmitted by UCAG to the Steering Committee. The other two were transmitted on April 29, 1977. One dealt with a set of proposals developed by the Student Council.¹⁴ The second dealt with a "Clarification of Delegated Authority".¹⁵

UCAG Proposals

The April 5, 1977 package was enumerated in a set of four proposals. The four proposals are described as follows:¹⁶

- I. The purpose of this proposal was to correct titles (due to the reorganization announced by President Wharton the previous year). The proposal made no change in the Bylaws, per se.
- II. This proposal added the Provost to the membership (without vote) of the Student Council. UCAG indicated that this proposal was requested by the Student Council itself because many of the issues it was dealing with involved academic concerns. Also, proposed amendments to the Academic Freedom Report, General Student Regulation, or other policies regarding student rights were to be presented to Student Council prior to review by the Academic Council.
- III. This proposal was designed to mandate that college faculty elections be completed prior to the end of spring term. This, apparently, had not occurred during the previous year and caused problems in staffing committees.
- IV. This proposal, based upon a request from the University Committee on Academic Policy, would expand the membership of the committee. The Committee's membership was presently nine faculty (on a college rotational basis), two undergraduates and one graduate student. UCAG proposed that the Committee be expanded to one faculty representative from each college, with the exception that the three residential colleges plus the College of Urban Development have one representative, that the Colleges of Human and Osteopathic Medicine have a joint representative, and that the student membership be doubled to four undergraduates and two graduate students.

At the May 3, 1977 meeting of the Academic Council these four proposals were acted upon. Proposals I and II were approved without amendment. Proposal III was amended to

require election no later than May 15. This amendment was introduced by Professor Manderscheid. Professor Manderscheid indicated that this action was necessary to insure that new chairpersons would be elected by the end of Spring Term as required by Section 4.2.2 of the Bylaws. Proposal IV was amended to remove the restrictions on representation in regard to the residential colleges, medical colleges, and College of Urban Development.¹⁷

Student Council Proposals

The second package of proposals was developed by the Student Council. These proposals dealt with three specific areas of concern. The first was a problem of graduate student representation. The second dealt with which Student Council members appoint student committee representatives. The third dealt with the issue of the requirements for the at-large representative positions.¹⁸

At the June 7, 1977 meeting of the Academic Council this second package of proposals was debated.¹⁹

The Council decided to discuss the question of at-large student representation first. The proposed amendment to Section 3.2.4.3 would have deleted the requirement that the six at-large positions be filled by at least five non-whites and at least two females. The central issue in this discussion was the apparent low participation level by the

at-large representatives. Mr. Stephen Politowicz spoke against the amendment, indicating that participation by these representatives was on the increase. Professor Bass offered an amendment to reduce the non-white requirement to three. Ms. Denise Gordon proposed to change the designation from "non-white" to "minority". Both of these amendments were defeated, as was the main motion. Section 3.2.4.3, designating five of the six at-large student representative positions as non-white, with two of the six being female, remained intact in "Bylaws, 1978". The Academic Council adjourned for the summer before acting on any of the other proposed Bylaw amendments.²⁰

At the first meeting of the Fall Term, held on October 4, 1977, the Academic Council continued to debate this second package of Bylaw amendments.²¹ The first item discussed was graduate student representation. The proposal called for a change in Section 3.2.4.2. This section provides for COGS to appoint six representatives to the Academic Council. However, only one representative per college was permitted. This proposal would reduce the restriction from college to department (along with some ambiguous language regarding selection based on a University-wide representation as far as possible). The problem, so indicated by Mr. Jeff Freidle, was that COGS was finding it difficult to find graduate students to participate given the college restriction. This amendment was defeated by the Academic Council.

However, the Academic Council did approve the department standard for the Graduate Council, Section 4.4.1.²²

Amendments to Sections 3.2.4.4.1, 3.2.4.6 and 4.2.1.11 were approved by the Academic Council. Section 3.2.4.4.1 required college elections to be completed by mid-spring. The Academic Council approved language requiring election by May 15. Section 3.2.4.6 called for the newly elected members of Student Council (whose term of office begins on September 1) to meet during the Spring Term to make their selections for committee assignments. Section 4.2.1.11 was amended to synchronize the process established on 3.2.4.6. The outgoing Student Council, however, was to prepare the slate of nominations for the new council.²³

Steering Committee Proposals

The third package of amendments to "Bylaws, 1975" dealt with the "Clarification of Delegated Authority". This package was transmitted to the Steering Committee on April 29, 1977. This last set of proposals was acted upon at the October 18, 1977 meeting of the Academic Council.²⁴ The proposal offered the following language to be added to the sections dealing with the Mode of Participation for the Committee on Academic Policy (4.3.3), the Graduate Council (4.4.3) and the Committee on Curriculum (4.5.3):

...the Steering Committee will determine those items to be placed on the agenda of the Academic Council.²⁵

These three committees all had "Delegated Authority" to act upon grading policies, curricula and degree requirements. The Academic Council was told by Professor Lester Hyman, Chairperson of the Curriculum Committee, that these amendments were necessary because curriculum changes occurring over the summer would require Academic Council approval, which would make it impossible to institute changes prior to Fall Term.²⁶

This proposal caused a great deal of debate. Professors Zolton Ferency and James McKee spoke in opposition to the amendment. Professor Ferency pointed out that Section 3.3.2.1 mandates the Steering Committee to refer matters to the Academic Council.²⁷ Professor McKee, in response to a statement by Professor Gerald Miller, who supported the amendment, stated that the Academic Council was not to be a "rubber stamp". The proposal was defeated by a vote of 42 to 27.²⁸

Following this debate Professor Chitra Smith proposed that UCAG examine the following three issues:

1. What power does the Academic Council have to review and reverse decisions made by committees under delegated authority?
2. What is the gatekeeper function of the Steering Committee? Is it the Academic Council, solely, that is to decide what it will debate?
3. The terms "major" and "minor" cannot be defined. A list of "major" and "minor" issues should be developed.²⁹

To this list President Wharton added the following two items:

4. Should committees exercise delegated authority?
5. How can communications between Standing Committees³⁰ and the Academic Council be improved?

No action was reported on these issues during the remainder of the Fall Term. The rest of the meetings of the Academic Council for 1977 dealt with the issue of presidential selection. On October 27, 1977, President Wharton announced he would be leaving Michigan State University, effective December 31, 1977, to assume the chancellorship of the State University of New York system.³¹

The amendments to the Bylaws approved during the spring and fall of 1977 were approved by the Board of Trustees on June 23 and December 9, 1977, respectively. In September 1978, the Secretary for Academic Governance distributed Bylaws for Academic Governance, 1978.³² This marked the fifth revision to the Faculty Organization Document that was first approved in 1955.

Analysis of Events

While it was purely coincidental, the resignation of President Wharton and the Bylaw debates in the fall of 1977 both signal an end to a particular era in the development of faculty participation in University-level governance. The debates over the Bylaw changes in 1971 and 1975, as well as

1978, dealt with the role of groups within the decision-making structure. In 1971 the flash point of the debate was the role of students in academic governance, per se. In 1975, the focus point of the debates was how the academic governance system, and its multiple sub-units, could interact with the legal requirements being placed on the University's administration vis-a-vis decision-making.

In 1977 the bylaw debates were more introspective than in 1975. The first package of proposals dealt with tightening-up procedures for election and selection. This package also caused a retreat from a position taken during the 1975 debates regarding workload. The Committee on Academic Policy (prior to 1975, the Educational Policies Committee) was able to convince the Academic Council that it too, like the Curriculum Committee, needed representation from all colleges.

This action was not surprising given the workload described earlier in this chapter. From 1975 to 1978 the University-level academic governance system committed the majority of its time in an attempt to codify, or recodify, many aspects of both faculty rights and so-called academic policies. Numerous drafts and hours of debate occurred during this period in regard to such items as the Faculty Rights and Responsibilities Document (which was never approved); Faculty Grievance Procedure (which was not approved - an

interim document was still in place by 1978); and a review of the University's judicial structure (which was never completed). In addition, policies that were already in existence, like the Code of Teaching Responsibility and the Student Instructional Rating System, were recodified after long and tedious hours of committee and Academic Council work.

The point is twofold. First, the workload necessitated an expansion of the Academic Policy Committee. And second, the need for representation by all colleges signified that the systematic approach, established as a goal by the Manderscheid Committee, could not become fully operational. The expansion of the Academic Policy Committee signifies, in part, that no matter what the structure, or even underlying philosophy developed for that structure, the faculty continue to perceive themselves in regard to their discipline and department. Faculty members were reluctant to make decisions that may effect another unit without input from that unit.

The crown piece to this argument was the failed attempt to provide authority to the Steering Committee to decide if a decision made by any committee with "delegated authority" needed consent from the Academic Council. This writer was a participant-observer, for over ten years, of the University-level governance system. From first hand

experience, plus the research involved in this study, it can be stated with surety that the Academic Council rarely did not concur with the decision of the Curriculum Committee. But as a matter of process and a reluctance to delegate, the Academic Council refused to trust the judgement of a few peers and colleagues against the collective decision-making process of the Academic Council.

From 1955 to 1978 the "Bylaws" evolved from a statement of organization to a definition of the University's decision-making infra-structure. This chapter concludes the description and analysis of the evolution of the "Bylaws" which governs faculty (and later student) participation in University-level decision-making.

The next and final chapter will attempt to put into perspective this 23 year process in relationship to the development of the institution. The chapter will conclude with recommendations both for continued study in this area as well as for the process of faculty and student participation in University-level governance.

NOTES

Chapter 7

1. "Report of the Ad Hoc Committee to Review Academic Governance", Michigan State University, November 13, 1973, p. 39-40.
2. "Minutes of the Academic Council", Volume XX, April 8, 1975, p. 416.
3. Ibid., p. 416-419.
4. Ibid., Volume XXI, October 7, 1975, p. 1.
5. Ibid., November 4, 1975, p. 77.
6. Ibid., February 3, 1976, p. 187.
7. Ibid., p. 189.
8. Ibid., March 9, 1976, p. 235.
9. Ibid., Volume XXII, May 31, 1977, p. 389.
10. Ibid., p. 393.
11. Ibid., Volume XXI, March 9, 1976, p. 231.
12. Ibid., Volume XXIII, October 4, 1977, p. 3.
13. Ibid., Volume XXII, April 5, 1977, p. 320-321.
14. Ibid., p. 519.
15. Ibid., p. 522.
16. Ibid., p. 320-321.
17. Ibid., May 3, 1977, p. 396.
18. Ibid., May 31, 1977, p. 520.
19. Ibid., June 7, 1977, p. 532.
20. Ibid.
21. Ibid., Volume XXIII, October 4, 1977, p. 3-5.
22. Ibid.

23. Ibid.
24. Ibid., October 18, 1977, p. 85.
25. Ibid., Volume XXII, April 29, 1977, p. 522-524.
26. Ibid., Volume XXIII, October 18, 1977, p. 87.
27. Ibid., p. 86.
28. Ibid., p. 87.
29. Ibid., p. 88.
30. Ibid.
31. State News, Volume 71, No. 145, October 27, 1977, p.1.
32. "Bylaws for Academic Governance", Michigan State University, September 1978.

CHAPTER 8

SUMMARY, OBSERVATIONS, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Summary

This study has described the three decade evolutionary process regarding faculty participation in university-level governance at Michigan State University. The institution has been dynamic in its growth since the end of the Second World War. It is difficult to separate any one particular aspect of the University, such as faculty participation in governance, and examine it in a vacuum from all the other changes that have occurred. However, in examining the development of the structure of faculty participation two causal factors dominate. First, the structure of faculty participation is a direct by-product of the tremendous growth of the institution. And second, there is a "collective need" on the part of the faculty to be involved in the decision-making process.

The growth of Michigan State University in the post-war era is a phenomenal story in itself. In the fall of 1942, just one year after John A. Hannah became President, the institution had approximately 500 faculty members. A breakdown

of the faculty ranks was as follows:

21 Professors

82 Associate Professors

150 Assistant Professors (Approximately)

200 Instructors (Approximately)¹

In 1946, just one year after the war, the size of the faculty had grown to the following:²

126 Professors

157 Associate Professors

325 Assistant Professors

337 Instructors

Even though the faculty had grown by nearly 100%, the relationship between the faculty and the administration remained virtually the same. Indeed, as President Hannah stated in his interview, most of the decision-making was done through the Administrative Group and the Breakfast Group. The faculty had little involvement. (See Table 1.)

Table 1

1941 College-level Governance Structure³

<u>Standing Committees</u>	<u>Administrators</u>	<u>Faculty</u>	<u>Students</u>
Dormitories	5	0	0
Eligibility for Student Activities	3	0	0
Freshman Week	3	4	0
Graduate Council	3	5	0
Lecture Course	0	2	0
Library	3	4	0
Patents	2	1	0
Physical Education for Men and Military Science	1	2	0
Physical Education for Women	2	2	0
Registration	4	1	0
Retirement	3	2	0
Course Scheduling	2	5	0
Scholarships	2	1	0
Social Affairs	4	0	0
Student Loans	4	0	0
Student Organizations	4	0	0
Summer School	3	3	0
Union	5	0	0
Commencement	<u>3</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>0</u>
TOTAL	56	34	0

The All-College Legislative Body was the Faculty Meeting.

In 1950 the size of the faculty was still increasing, as described below:

164 Professors

221 Associate Professors

389 Assistant Professors

291 Instructors⁴

While the size of the faculty by 1950 had increased by only 120 positions, a different growth pressure was becoming evident. This was the tremendous growth in the size of the student population. In 1942 there were 6,583 students enrolled at Michigan State College.⁵ By 1946 the student body had only increased to 7,177.⁶ However, by 1950 the student population had more than doubled to 16,405.⁷

This growth was placing a tremendous strain on the resources of the school. The faculty were becoming increasingly frustrated with the demands being placed upon them, with little or no input into the final decision making process. (See Table 2.) This tension, in part, manifested itself in the events described in Chapter 2 surrounding the decision to restructure Basic College. As detailed in that Chapter, the debate surrounding this issue became the catalyst for the eventual development of the Faculty Organization Document (which was the forerunner to the Bylaws).

Table 2

1950 College-level Governance Structure⁸

<u>Standing Committees</u>	<u>Administrators</u>	<u>Faculty</u>	<u>Students</u>
All College Research	7	0	0
Athletic Council	8	0	2
Band	5	0	0
Board of Publications	4	0	3
Catalogue	5	0	0
College Calendar	3	5	0
Commencement	3	2	0
Course Scheduling	1	8	0
Course and Curriculum Changes	3	2	0
Educational Costs and Other Related Matters	2	5	0
Graduate Council	3	8	0
Honorary Degrees	7	0	0
International Center	0	9	3
Lecture-Concert Series	2	4	0
Library	1	5	0
Michigan State College Press	3	5	0
Military Affairs	2	5	0
Museums	2	6	0
Orientation and Freshman Week	3	7	0
Out-of-State Admissions	2	2	0
Out-of-State Fees	4	0	0

Table 2 (cont'd.)

<u>Standing Committees</u>	<u>Administrators</u>	<u>Faculty</u>	<u>Students</u>
Patents	2	2	0
Rating Scale, Administration of	1	7	0
Registration of Basic College Students	2	7	0
Retirement	5	0	0
Scholarships	6	0	0
Social Affairs	1	4	5
Special Lectures	3	0	0
Student Eligibility	6	0	0
Student Loans	6	0	0
Student Organizations	<u>5</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>0</u>
TOTAL	107	95	10

The All-College Legislative Body was the Faculty Meeting.

As indicated in Tables 1 and 2, there were increased areas of activity which clearly indicate how the institution had grown after World War II. Additions such as the All-College Research Committee, Course and Curriculum Changes, International Center, Michigan State College Press, Out-of-State Admissions and Fees, and Retirement are all indications of an institution that was directing itself toward the goal of being a major educational and research institution. In moving toward this goal the faculty were becoming increasingly involved in the decision-making processes of the institution. As shown in Table 2, the number of Standing Committees had increased from 19 to 31. The number of faculty positions on the committees had nearly tripled. However, those people identified as administrators were still heavily involved. What must be remembered is that direct input into presidential decision-making still resided primarily with the Administrative Group and the Breakfast Group.

From 1955 to 1975 the institution continued to grow to where there was over 2,300 teaching and research personnel on faculty appointment, as well as student population of well over 40,000.⁹ However, it was not the pressures of growth, per se, that led to the major revisions of the Bylaws in 1961, 1968, 1971, 1975 and 1978. Instead, each successive revision to the Faculty Organization Document of 1955 has to be viewed in the context of the "collective need" of the

faculty to be significantly involved in the decision-making processes of the University.

As indicated in Chapter 3, the revisions made in 1961 changed the relationship between the faculty and the academic department. The department head became a department chairman with a limited tenure of five years. "Bylaws, 1961" changed the decision-making structures at the basic unit of the University. The overall University-level structure did not change, although it did expand. (See Tables 3 and 4.)

As indicated in Table 3, with the advent of the representational governance system the nature of faculty participation changed. One of the changes was an increase in the number of faculty participating in decision-making. There were now over 200 faculty serving on 42 committees or subcommittees. A second change with the advent of the Faculty Organization was a split in the reporting relationship of the committees. Standing Committees were responsible to the Academic Council. However, Administrative and Board Established Committees were not directly accountable to the governance system. The only linkage was the Committee on Committees, with its responsibility to submit nominations to the President. This practice of Presidential appointment would not end until the adoption of "Bylaws, 1968".

Table 3

1956 University-level Governance Structure¹⁰

<u>Standing Committees</u>	<u>Administrators</u>	<u>Faculty</u>	<u>Students</u>
Faculty Affairs	1	5	0
Instruction, Curriculum and Research	3	5	0
*Course and Curriculum Change	3	3	0
*English, All-University	0	4	0
*Instruction	0	9	0
*Scholarships	2	2	0
Student Affairs	1	5	0
*Faculty-Student Motor Vehicle	3	3	2
*International Center	5	2	1
*Orientation Policy	7	9	3
*Social Affairs	3	2	8
*Student Conduct	2	10	0
*Student Organizations	2	6	0
*Student Loans	4	0	0
University Services	1	5	0
*Audio-Visual	1	10	0
*Commencement	2	4	0
*Honorary Degrees	3	4	0
*Lecture-Concert Series	2	5	1
*Library	3	10	0
*Military Affairs	2	5	0
*Museum	1	10	0

Table 3 (cont'd.)

<u>Standing Committees</u>	<u>Administrators</u>	<u>Faculty</u>	<u>Students</u>
*Publication Policies and Procedures	2	7	0
Faculty Tenure Committee	<u>0</u>	<u>14</u>	<u>0</u>
Subtotal	5	139	15

<u>Administrative Committees</u>	<u>Administrators</u>	<u>Faculty</u>	<u>Students</u>
Church Related Programs	0	7	0
Course Schedules	1	9	0
Fulbright	2	3	0
Hidden Lake Gardens	1	3	0
Out-of-State Admissions and Fees	4	0	0
Patents	1	5	0
Radioactive Isotopes	4	11	0
Safety and Sanitation	4	3	0
Student Publications	3	2	4
Summer School	<u>13</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>
Subtotal	33	43	4

<u>Board Established Committees</u>	<u>Administrators</u>	<u>Faculty</u>	<u>Students</u>
All-University Research	11	0	0
Athletic Council	2	7	1
Committee of Deans	7	0	0
Secondary School Teaching Faculty	2	8	0
Labor and Industrial Relations Center	3	0	0

Table 3 (cont'd.)

<u>Board Established Committees</u>	<u>Administrators</u>	<u>Faculty</u>	<u>Students</u>
Michigan State University Press	5	9	0
Retirement	<u>4</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>0</u>
Subtotal	34	25	1
TOTAL	120	207	20

All-University Legislative Bodies were the Academic Senate and Academic Council.

*Officially listed as subcommittees.

Table 4 indicates that there was very little change in the structure of the University-level governance system between 1956 and 1961. There was only one less committee in existence, and the number of faculty remained virtually constant.

Table 4

1961 University-level Governance Structure¹¹

<u>Standing Committees</u>	<u>Administrators</u>	<u>Faculty</u>	<u>Students</u>
Educational Policies	0	10	0
*Course and Curriculum	2	3	0
*Honors College	0	11	0
*Scholarships	3	2	0
*Written English	0	5	0
Faculty Affairs	1	5	0
*Faculty Club	0	3	0
Faculty Tenure	0	14	0
Student Affairs	1	5	0
*Faculty Motor Vehicle	1	5	3
*International Center	4	5	1
*Orientation Policy	5	12	2
*Social Affairs	3	3	8
*Student Conduct	3	11	0
*Student Loans	4	0	0
*Student Organizations	2	5	0
University Services	1	4	0
*Audio Visual	2	9	0
*Commencement	3	3	0
*Honorary Degrees	1	7	0
*Lecture-Concert Series	2	5	2
*Libraries	3	8	0
*Museums	1	10	0

Table 4 (cont'd.)

<u>Standing Committees</u>	<u>Administrators</u>	<u>Faculty</u>	<u>Students</u>
*Publication Policy and Procedures	<u>3</u>	<u>6</u>	<u>0</u>
Subtotal	45	151	16

<u>Administrative Committees</u>	<u>Administrators</u>	<u>Faculty</u>	<u>Students</u>
Building	8	0	0
Church Related Programs	0	8	0
Course Scheduling	1	10	0
Computer Advisory	5	6	0
Fulbright	2	3	0
Out-of-State Admissions and Fees	4	0	0
Radioactive Isotopes	6	4	0
Safety and Sanitation	6	4	0
Student Publications	4	1	4
Summer School and Evening College Advisory	<u>14</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>
Subtotal	50	36	4

<u>Board Committees</u>	<u>Administrators</u>	<u>Faculty</u>	<u>Students</u>
All-University Research	11	0	0
Athletic Council	3	7	2
Labor and Industrial Relations Center Policy Board	1	4	0

Table 4 (cont'd.)

<u>Board Committees</u>	<u>Administrators</u>	<u>Faculty</u>	<u>Students</u>
Michigan State University Press Board of Directors	7	9	0
Retirement	7	0	0
Secondary School Teaching	<u>9</u>	<u>8</u>	<u>0</u>
Subtotal	38	28	2
TOTAL	133	215	22

All-University Level Legislative Bodies were the Academic Senate and Academic Council.

*Officially listed as a subcommittee.

Table 4 also indicates that of the 40 committees identified as University-level in nature in 1961, only 10 had more administrators (as identified by title/position) than faculty. However, although there were more committees and more faculty involved in these committees, the faculty continued to believe that their interests were not being properly represented in the decision-making processes of the University. The "Report of the Committee on the Future", discussed in Chapter 3, clearly describes a faculty that believed it was on the outside-looking-in in regard to decision-making.

In 1968, the Bylaws were again revised. In this revision, University-level participation underwent major structural changes. The governance system was now to be controlled by

the Academic Council and not the administration. Committee appointments would not be the domain of the President. Also, the faculty were now specifically to be included (on a consultative or advisory basis) in decision-making pertaining to budget, personnel, buildings and the like. These were areas that had been specifically outside the purview of the faculty in "Bylaws, 1955" and only marginally provided for in "Bylaws, 1961".

During the decade of the 1960's, the combination of the Civil Rights Movement and the anti-war movement (nationally) created a local climate for unprecedented change in how the institution interacted with its faculty. Coupled with this national mood was the process of developing the Academic Freedom Report at Michigan State University. This process, completed just one year prior to the development of "Bylaws, 1968", focused on the institution's responsibilities to faculty, students and society. From this debate the faculty were able to codify their role of pre-eminence in the academic decision-making process. The dynamics of this process carried over into the debate on the Bylaw revisions.

"Bylaws, 1968" marked the turning point in the faculty's relationship with the University. Upon adoption, the faculty established for themselves a role as a "body politic" with the institution. It is this role that was at the heart of the remainder of the major Bylaw revisions.

Table 5

1968 University-level Governance Structure¹²

<u>Faculty Standing Committees</u>	<u>Administrators</u>	<u>Faculty</u>	<u>Students</u>
Business Affairs	1	12	0
Educational Policies	2	12	2
Faculty Affairs	1	11	0
Faculty Tenure	1	14	0
Honors Program	1	11	0
International Projects	1	11	2
Student Affairs	2	11	2
Curriculum	3	12	2
Library	<u>1</u>	<u>12</u>	<u>2</u>
Subtotal	13 *	106	10

<u>Faculty-Student Standing Committees</u>	<u>Administrators</u>	<u>Faculty</u>	<u>Students</u>
Academic Rights and Responsibilities	1 *	5	5
Advisory Board for the State News and the Wolverine	2	4	4
Student-Faculty Judiciary	<u>1</u> *	<u>7</u>	<u>4</u>
Subtotal	4	16	13

<u>Administrative and Advisory Committees</u>	<u>Administrators</u>	<u>Faculty</u>	<u>Students</u>
Building	7	0	0
Church Related Programs	0	6	0
Commencement	5	3	1
Community College Committee	0	13	0
Computer	5	12	0

Table 5 (cont'd.)

<u>Administrative and Advisory Committees</u>	<u>Administrators</u>	<u>Faculty</u>	<u>Students</u>
Honorary Degrees	2	7	0
International Programs	8	25	0
Out-of-State Fees	5	0	0
Public Safety	1	5	0
Radioactive Isotopes	1 *	5	0
Safety and Sanitation	<u>5</u>	<u>5</u>	<u>0</u>
Subtotal	39	81	1
<u>Board Committees</u>	<u>Administrators</u>	<u>Faculty</u>	<u>Students</u>
All-University Research	15	0	0
All-University Traffic	7 *	2	4
Athletic Council	4	6	1
Hidden Lake Gardens	1	3	0
Teacher Education	14	15	0
Michigan State University Press, A Corporation	<u>6</u> *	<u>12</u>	<u>0</u>
Subtotal	47	38	5
TOTAL	103	241	29

All-University Legislative Bodies were the Academic Senate, Academic Council and the Graduate Council.

*Designated as ex-officio.

Table 5 indicates that the number of committees decreased to 29 by 1968. However, the number of faculty participating at the University-level increased to 241. The major difference is in the area of the Standing Committees and the Administrative and Advisory Committees. In 1961 there were 151 faculty positions on Standing Committees and sub-committees (Table 4). By 1968 this number had decreased to 106 (Table 5). However, the reverse occurred for Administrative Advisory Committees. In 1961 there were 36 faculty positions (Table 4). By 1968 this number had increased to 81 positions (Table 5). Thus, while the structure under the Bylaws had consolidated itself in terms of size and number of participants, faculty were becoming more involved in many of the administrative committees.

Unlike the structure of some University-level committees in 1961, there were no administrators in a voting capacity on any Standing Committees established under "Bylaws, 1968". The Academic Council, and its Standing Committees, had evolved in 13 years from an organization dominated and controlled by President Hannah to an organization that identified and represented its own constituency within the decision-making structure at Michigan State University.

Chapter 5 describes a very painful period in the history of Michigan State University. Both the Civil Rights and anti-war movements had, in many cases, led to violent

confrontation. Michigan State University was not immune from such demonstrations. It was within this context of social upheaval that the governance system attempted to continue the process it began in 1968 by including students in the decision-making process.

The faculty, which was very united in making the changes that were made in 1968, were very divided over the issue of student participation. The debates in the governance system can be described as both fearful and acrimonious. Many faculty focused their concerns about student participation in the context of the demonstrations. As a result, many faculty could not see students, in their present mode, able to participate rationally in a highly ordered decision-making system as had been developed at Michigan State University.

An examination of the Killingsworth Memorandum (Chapter 5) reveals that the concern went much beyond student demonstrators. The concern was centered on the role the "faculty body politic" would play if students were included as full-fledged participants. The pre-eminence the faculty felt they had obtained in 1968 was being challenged.

As was described in Chapter 5, a compromise solution that preserved faculty prerogative was developed. As a result of this compromise the Elected Faculty Council, and not the

Academic Council, became the stronghold for faculty prerogative. This shift changed the role of the Academic Council. The Academic Council still had final authority in the governance decision-making process (the Senate had virtually atrophied by this juncture), but the Elected Faculty Council, in many ways, had control over what matters the Academic Council could review. Matters that were deemed to be in the exclusive purview of the faculty had to be reviewed by the Elected Faculty Council before the Academic Council. This gave the elected faculty representatives a strong control over the governance process.

By 1975 the governance system was facing pressures again. This time the pressures were both a function of size as well as definition of the faculty's role. It was the size of the governance system itself, and not massive institutional growth, that was the concern. In the view of many at the institution the governance system needed to be streamlined. During his interview, former President Clifton R. Wharton, Jr., indicated that there was no real problem with the mechanisms in place, they just needed to be streamlined. Coupled with this concern was a need to better define what the role of the governance system was in the decision-making process. According to both President Wharton and Professor Manderscheid, there was confusion within the system as to the areas in which the system had decision-making authority, and what areas were designated for advice and input.

Table 6

1971 University-level Governance Structure¹³

<u>Standing Committees</u>	<u>Administrators</u>	<u>Faculty</u>	<u>Students</u>
Academic Governance	0	18	18
Buildings, Lands & Planning	0	14	6
Business Affairs	2	14	7
Curriculum	3	16	9
Educational Policies	2	17	11
Faculty Affairs and Faculty Compensation	2	17	0
Faculty Tenure	1	13	6
Honors Program	1	13	9
International Projects	1	13	7
Library	1	14	7
Public Safety	2	7	7
Student Affairs	<u>4</u>	<u>6</u>	<u>11</u>
Subtotal	19 *	162	98
Student-Faculty Judiciary	1 *	7	4

<u>Administrative Advisory Committees</u>	<u>Administrators</u>	<u>Faculty</u>	<u>Students</u>
Building	8	0	0
Church Related Programs	0	5	0
Commencement	5	3	2
Community College	0	13	0
Computer	4	13	0
Honorary Degrees	2	5	0
Military Education	1	8	2

Table 6 (cont'd.)

<u>Administrative Advisory Committees</u>	<u>Administrators</u>	<u>Faculty</u>	<u>Students</u>
Out-of-State Fees	5	0	0
Public Safety	1 *	5	0
Radioactive Isotopes	1 *	5	0
Safety and Sanitation	<u>6</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>
Subtotal	33	57	4

<u>Board Committees</u>	<u>Administrators</u>	<u>Faculty</u>	<u>Students</u>
All-University Research	19	0	0
All-University Traffic	5 *	3	4
Athletic Council	3	7	1
Hidden Lake Gardens	4	1	0
Retirement	4	1	0
Teacher Education	13	12	0
Michigan State University Press: A Corporation	<u>4</u> *	<u>13</u>	<u>0</u>
Subtotal	52	37	5
TOTAL	105	263	111

The All-University Legislative Bodies were the Academic Senate, the Academic Council and the Graduate Council.

*Designated as ex-officio.

Table 6 indicates that faculty (and now student) participation expanded even further into areas that had previously been closed to the governance system. The addition of Buildings, Lands and Planning; Business Affairs; and Public Safety mark these new areas of governance participation. Table 6 also indicates that the number of committees at the University-level maintained the reduced level of 29. An examination of the committee structure in 1955 (Table 3) indicates that many of the subcommittee functions had evolved into either committees of their own (Faculty-Student Motor Vehicle and Library) or had been absorbed by other Standing Committees. Table 6 also indicates that the size of faculty participation had grown to 263 positions. Coupled with 111 student positions it is little wonder that there was a desire to downsize the governance structure.

In Chapter 6 there is detailed the development of the "Modes of Participation" and the revamping of the Academic Council and the Standing Committee Structure. As indicated in the Chapter there was very little concern over the "Modes of Participation". It was the change in the Standing Committee structure, and particularly how committees would be staffed, that was the center of attention. Again, a compromise was reached.

"Bylaws, 1975" marked the maturation of the process established in "Bylaws, 1968". The academic governance system's

role in decision-making was reaffirmed. However, it was also given a set of parameters in which it could operate. The fundamental question, according to most of the interviewees, was accountability. Vice President John Cantlon (formerly Provost) made the following statement in this regard (paraphrased):

Policies cannot be set solely by the Trustees or the administration. Policy decisions impact on the raison d'etre of the university. Thus, there is a need to have the faculty react to any policy change. The faculty are the people who make the place work. However, there are constraints because MSU is a public institution and academic governance committees cannot be held legally accountable.

One final note in regard to "Bylaws, 1975"; the system of student participation was also reaffirmed with very little debate. The concerns raised in the 1971 process never resurfaced. Most of the interviewees indicated that the level of student participation, at least in the era of 1971-1975, was very positive.

As described in Chapter 7 the changes made in "Bylaws, 1978" were more technical than substantive. The most significant debate centered on a proposed change that was never adopted. The academic council refused to allow the Steering Committee to act in its stead if the Academic Council could not meet on a timely basis to discuss a problem. "Bylaws, 1975" set out to establish an efficient system that could meet the challenges facing the institution in the mid-1970's. By 1978 the governance system was not willing to sacrifice

decision-making authority for the sake of expediency.

Table 7 is reflective of a streamlined and more defined structure of governance participation in University decision-making. Again, and as was indicated in Chapter 6, the Standing Committee structure was realigned to have more broad-based responsibility areas than had occurred in the past. Table 7 also indicates a growth in Board established committees in the area of discrimination policies. Faculty were involved in all of these new areas. Thus, it is clear that the faculty had expanded their role in the governance structure, both in size and in content areas.

Table 7

1977 University-level Governance Structure¹⁴

<u>Standing Committees</u>	<u>Administrators</u>	<u>Faculty</u>	<u>Students</u>
Academic Policy	1	9	3
Graduate Council	1	19	5
Curriculum	3	18	7
Faculty Affairs	2	14	0
Faculty Tenure	1	16	3
Student Affairs	1	4	7
Academic Governance	0	7	7
Academic Environment	<u>1</u>	<u>8</u>	<u>3</u>
Subtotal	10 *	95	35
Student-Faculty Judiciary	1 *	7	4
University Graduate Judiciary	<u>1</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>3</u>
Subtotal	2	11	7
<u>Council Advisory- Consultative Committees</u>	<u>Administrators</u>	<u>Faculty</u>	<u>Students</u>
International Studies and Programs	0	16	4
Library	<u>0</u>	<u>16</u>	<u>4</u>
Subtotal	0	32	8
<u>Administrative and Advisory Committees</u>	<u>Administrators</u>	<u>Faculty</u>	<u>Students</u>
Building	5	0	0
Commencement	6	4	2
Computer	4	14	1
Honorary Degrees	2	6	0

Table 7 (cont'd.)

<u>Administrative and Advisory Committees</u>	<u>Administrators</u>	<u>Faculty</u>	<u>Students</u>
Military Education Advisory	0	11	4
Operations	12	0	0
Out-of-State Fees	8	0	2
Radioactive Isotopes	1 *	5	0
Medical Isotopes	4	3	0
Safety and Sanitation	<u>8</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>0</u>
Subtotal	50	46	9

<u>Board Committees</u>	<u>Administrators</u>	<u>Faculty</u>	<u>Students</u>
All-University Health Care	1 *	2	6
All-University Research	14	0	0
All-University Traffic	5 *	5	6
Anti-Discrimination Judicial	1 *	3	4
Athletic Council	5 *	6	1
Committee Against Discrimination	1 *	3	3
Hidden Lake Gardens	3	1	0
Minority Advisory Council	3	1	0
Retirement Committee	6	3	0
Teacher Education	13	16	0
University Appeals Board	0	29	0

Table 7 (cont'd.)

<u>Board Committees</u>	<u>Administrators</u>	<u>Faculty</u>	<u>Students</u>
Michigan State University			
Press: A Corporation	<u>7</u> *	<u>12</u>	<u>0</u>
Subtotal	59	81	20
TOTAL	121	265	79

The All-University Legislative Bodies were the Academic Senate, the Academic Council, the Faculty Council and the Student Council.

*Designates ex-officio.

Observations and Conclusions

There has been a Faculty Organization since 1955 at Michigan State University. The purpose for developing this organization was to institute a system of orderly, systematic faculty participation in the institution's decision-making processes. Since 1955 this system for faculty participation has been revised on five separate occasions. This study has chronicled the structural changes that have taken place as well as the events which impacted on these changes. This section will discuss what these various changes have meant to the development of decision-making at Michigan State University.

In researching this topic it became clear that the faculty, since World War II, have been in a state of tension as to what their role should be vis-a-vis University-level decision-making. Each interviewee was asked to define the

role faculty should play in the decision-making processes of the University. There was total agreement with the position that in the areas of curriculum, grading, research, etc., the role of the faculty was authoritative. However, there are many other academic policy decisions that go beyond these traditional hallmarks of faculty prerogative.

During the course of examining the primary research sources and interviewing the identified participants there surfaced a picture of Michigan State University during the Presidency of John A. Hannah. John A. Hannah was the decision-maker for Michigan State University. President Hannah's role in this capacity was recognized and unchallenged. In many areas the President had recognized codified authority to make decisions. Examples can be found in the Bylaws of the Board of Trustees and the Bylaws of the Faculty.

President Hannah also had major control over the informal network of decision-making. Virtually all of the academic and non-academic administrators were appointed by President Hannah and served in office at the pleasure of the President. With reference to the faculty, department heads (later chairmen), directors and deans were accountable, directly or indirectly, to the President. Thus, the resources necessary for providing faculty with the ways and means of doing their jobs were controlled by the President.

None of the people interviewed indicted President Hannah for this type of control. Indeed, virtually all interviewees were laudatory of his accomplishments, and his ability to control the vast institutional growth that had occurred by the time he retired in 1969.

What became clear to the researcher was a dichotomy regarding faculty participation in University-level decision-making. A structure of faculty participation was developed and put into place in 1955. This structure was altered twice during the tenure of President Hannah, once in 1961 and again in 1968 (less than one year before he retired). Each revision to the 1955 document came as a result of dynamic pressures. In 1961, the institution had just weathered the storm of a severe recession in the State. The "Committee on the Future" was a tool used by President Hannah to "rally the troops" during a period of very low morale. As a result, the faculty gained greater recognition in decision-making at the department-level; and a recognition of an advisory status at the University-level (via the Academic Council) in decision-making related to buildings, budget, personnel, etc.

In 1968, the dynamic pressure was mainly external to the institution. On a nation-wide basis the structure of educational institution decision-making was being revised and altered. It was in this atmosphere that the "Bylaws,

1968" was developed.

The point of the dichotomy is that even with these two major structural changes, there is no evidence that the process of decision-making changed. The faculty were involved in more areas of decision-making and in greater numbers on an increasing scale between 1955 and 1968. But, there is no evidence to support the notion that the particular structure that was developed in 1955, and revised twice before President Hannah left, had any discernible impact on the quality or effectiveness of the decision-making that was taking place.

The administrative styles of President Adams and President Wharton differed greatly from that of President Hannah. Neither President Adams nor President Wharton had the type of personal control over the institution that was exhibited by President Hannah for 28 years. Even so, there was no evidence in the research to indicate that the changes in the Presidency had any significant impact on the University-level governance processes.

Beginning in 1968 the faculty had established for themselves in the Bylaws, a body that recognized the faculty as a distinct constituency. The body was the elected Faculty Council. The elected Faculty Council became the focal point for faculty input into University-level decision-making.

This became even more pronounced after the inclusion of students, on a systemic basis, in 1971. However, there is no evidence to indicate that the Elected Faculty Council has had any more impact or any less impact on University-level decision-making than did the Academic Council prior to 1968.

In regard to the question of the proper role for faculty in University-level governance, the following statements were made to the researcher:

President Wharton:

The system of academic governance provides the President and the governing board with a set of recommendations that are the best available at that time. These recommendations constitute a consensus of the faculty. However, there are instances of policy making when a president does not have the luxury of using the governance system.

Professor Walter Adams:

Academic governance creates an atmosphere for genuine consultation and participation in decision-making to occur. As a president this system provides for two results. First, the faculty became educated in regard to the difficulty and complexity of a particular problem. And second, the faculty are essentially co-opted in that they are made a part of the decision-making processes. Thus, they must share in the consequences of any decision arrived at by the system.

Essentially, these two men are in agreement. Both men agree that the faculty should play a role in the decision-making process. Both agree that faculty participation can lend itself to consensus building. Professor Adams also

indicates that this type of process can be helpful to a president when difficult or complex decisions need to be made. The consequences are shared by all. President Wharton, while not addressing that issue, also indicates that there are times when the type of decision-making needed does not lend itself to consensus building.

Why is consensus building important? What does it matter if the faculty concur with a policy decision, or are involved in the decision-making process?

During his interview, Professor Milton Muelder, Vice President and Dean emeritus, stated the following:

A university is the reverse of large industry. A large industry does not need the greatest intelligence "on-the-line". In a university the faculty are "on-the-line". Governance is not the heart of the faculty's contribution to the mission of the university, but it is necessary. There is a need for a forum for discussion, interaction and representation. The image of participation is important. The purpose of administration is to help the individual faculty member progress and develop as a scholar.

Without a structure for organized faculty participation in University-level decision-making, an institution like Michigan State University could not function. Decision-making occurs at all levels of the University. Some faculty only concern themselves with matters related to their department. The decision-making at this level may have the most direct impact on their position. Other faculty have

interest in decision-making at the college and University levels. This does not mean that they are any less concerned about department level decisions, but they believe that faculty input is necessary at these upper levels so that the best possible decisions may be made, with the broadest base of support.

Without the support of the faculty on a regular basis, departments, colleges and ultimately the University would quickly atrophy. Thus, what becomes important to the mission of Michigan State University (and hopefully to other higher education institutions) is that there is a structure for faculty participation. Whether any one particular structure lends itself to better decision-making is inconclusive. The changes that occurred in the structure of governance at Michigan State University were reflective of changes within the institution as a result of growth, evolution and societal perspectives. The structural changes did not occur in an attempt to enhance the quality of the decision-making process.

This study has focused on the development of faculty participation in University-level governance. There was material presented which also described the development of student participation in University level governances (see Chapters 5 through 7).

The immediate impact of student participation in the governance system after 1971 was to change the focus of the Elected Faculty Council and the Faculty Affairs Committee. This phenomena is detailed in Chapter 5. However, this study does not focus in on what impact student participation may have had on the governance system at Michigan State University. This is because student participation goes far beyond the Bylaws. There are a variety of areas in which students participate in decision-making at the University. In the following section on Recommendations this issue will be addressed.

What was evident in this study was that there is no consensus as the the impact that student participation has had in the academic governance system. Some of the interviewees commented that student participation has been effective and has had significant impact on the decision-making process. In particular, President Wharton indicated that student participation in the Academic Council was effective and useful to him in the process of consensus building during his administration.

However, others who were interviewed indicated the quality and effectiveness of student participation was extremely suspect. Many of these individuals felt that student opinion was disregarded by most faculty in the Academic Council, or the quality of the student participation was

ineffective, or both.

Professor Bettinghaus, currently Dean of the College of Communication Arts and Sciences, indicated that the development of a student participation structure that eliminated ASMSU from the process of governance was destructive to the development of ASMSU. As a former professional staff member in the Office of Student Affairs, the researcher is aware that Professor Bettinghaus' perception was shared by the staff of the Office of Student Affairs.

What must be remembered in regard to student participation is that, like the faculty, not all students are concerned about decision-making at the University-level. Student interest in the processes of Michigan State University are at least as diverse as the faculty's, if not more so. It is the fact that a structure for participation exists for students that is important. It is also important that the structure provides for a nearly equal level of participation with that of the faculty. Without this level of parity in the governance system, student participation would be merely tokenism. The quality of the participation may be lacking in the view of some faculty, but on a structural level (with the exception of those items reserved under faculty prerogative) the participation is equal.

Michigan State University has developed for itself a unique

role in regard to its mission. This role is extremely diverse in regard to the social institutions and people that Michigan State is attempting to serve. As a result, Michigan State University means different things to different people. This is true for the faculty and students who compose the University. For this very reason it is important that a structure exist that allows these diverse constituencies within the institution to participate in the decision-making process. Without a structure that provides for consensus building, the diversity which comprises the uniqueness of Michigan State University would be altered. In Chapter 1 it was indicated that a sixth review of the structure of the Bylaws is under consideration. It is not the structure of decision-making that needs review, but the process of consensus building that should be examined. If in reviewing the process of consensus building structural changes are indicated, then they should be made. But structural changes in the decision-making processes of the University that are not designed to enhance consensus building are nothing more than cosmetic changes.

Recommendations for Further Study

In researching this study a number of avenues for further study became apparent. The recommendations to be made are being offered with the context of the statements made by Frederick Rudolph and John Brubacher (see Chapter 1). The administration of an institution of higher education has

developed into a profession. The study of a particular aspect of an institution's development is necessitated beyond just historical importance. Any institution, particularly one like Michigan State University, offers to a professional higher education administrator a living laboratory. By studying how a particular program or system developed, in an historical and sociological context, the student can be provided with an immense area of knowledge in regard to the process of decision-making. The historical context allows for a review of the decision-making process and the consequences (at least to date) of the decisions. The student will have the opportunity to examine the background to a particular issue as well as the pressures and circumstances surrounding the decision-making process. Hopefully, this will give the professional administrator a better understanding of the need to explore all of the consequences of a decision before reaching one.

In this regard there are four major areas of study that may be of benefit to students of professional higher education administration.

First, the development of student participation, not only in the academic governance system, but on an institutional basis. In particular the tremendous growth of the student population at Michigan State University should be examined in the context of the pressures it caused on the resources

of the institution and the structures developed by the institution, and the students themselves, to deal with these pressures.

Second, the history of the Standing Committees should be chronicled. In particular, tracing the evolution of the All-College Research and Education Committee to the Educational Policies Committee to the University Committee on Academic Policy could help in understanding how most of the academic programs at Michigan State University developed since World War II.

Third, the evolution of the Basic College to the University College and, finally, to the program for General Education should be studied. In reviewing the history of the governance system it became apparent that many of the major conflicts in the development of the University occurred simultaneously with proposed changes in this program.

And finally, there should be a study which chronicles the recommendations of the "Committee on the Future of the University". The Report of this Committee helped to shape the development of Michigan State University in the decades of the 1960's and 1970's. This type of study could add immensely to the knowledge of the effects of programmatic decision-making at a major higher education institution.

NOTES

Chapter 8

1. Bulletin of Michigan State College of Agriculture and Applied Science, "Announcements for the Year 1941-42", Volume XXXVI, No. 7, March 1942, p. 7-16.
2. "Report of the Registrar," Michigan State College, 1946-7.
3. Catalog, Michigan State College of Agriculture and Applied Science, 1941-42, p. 20.
4. "Report of the Registrar," Michigan State College, 1950-51.
5. Bulletin of Michigan State College of Agriculture and Applied Sciences, p. 300.
6. Catalog, Michigan State College, 1946-7, p. 434.
7. Catalog, Michigan State College, 1949-51, p. 518.
8. Catalog, Michigan State College, 1949-51, p. 46-48.
9. "Annual Report, Office of the Registrar, Michigan State University, 1975-76.
10. Catalog, Michigan State University, 1955-6, p. 388-390.
11. Catalog, Michigan State University, 1961-2, p. A164-A168.
12. Description of Courses and Academic Programs, Michigan State University, 1968, p. A128-A132.
13. Faculty and Staff Directory, Michigan State University, 1971-72 p. 189-195.
14. Catalog, Academic Programs, Pt. 1, Michigan State University, 1977-78, p. 335-340.

APPENDICES

APPENDIX A

LIST OF INTERVIEWEES AND TOPICS OF DISCUSSION

LIST OF INTERVIEWEES AND TOPICS OF DISCUSSION

1. Adams, Walter: April 4, 1983.
 - A. Role of the faculty in University-level decision-making.
 - B. Development of the Faculty Organization Document, 1955.
 - C. Intended role of the Academic Senate and Academic Council.
 - D. Impact of the Committee on the Future on the structure of governance.
 - E. Impact of the changes in the presidency, 1969-70.
 - F. Impact of student participation in governance.
2. Bettinghaus, Erwin: July 28, 1982.
 - A. Role of the faculty in University-level decision-making.
 - B. Impact of President Hannah's absences on Academic Council, 1961-68.
 - C. What ambiguities in "Bylaws, 1961" were addressed in "Bylaws, 1968".
 - D. Academic Senate rejection of the December 1967 Bylaw Report.
 - E. Impact of the changes in the presidency, 1969-70.
 - F. Role of the Faculty Council.
 - G. Impact of student participation in governance.
3. Bonnen, James: August 3, 1982.
 - A. Role of the faculty in University-level decision-making.
 - B. Effect of the vote on faculty collective bargaining, 1972.
 - C. Impact of tensions between the Board of Trustees and the faculty.
 - D. Rationale for 1975 revision to the Bylaws.
 - E. Impact of the changes in the presidency, 1969-70.
 - F. Role of the Faculty Council.
 - G. Impact of student participation in governance.
4. Cantlon, John: July 22 and August 19, 1982.
 - A. Role of the faculty in University-level decision-making.
 - B. Effect of the vote on faculty collective bargaining, 1972.
 - C. Impact of tensions between the Board of Trustees and the faculty.
 - D. Rationale for 1975 revision to the Bylaws.
 - E. Impact of the changes in the presidency, 1969-70.
 - F. Role of the Faculty Council.
 - G. Inability of the governance system to develop a Faculty Rights Document or a Faculty Grievance Procedure.

5. Chapin, Richard: July 22, 1982.
 - A. Role of the faculty in University-level decision-making.
 - B. Role and impact of the Committee on the Future on the structure of governance.
 - C. Development of the recommendations of the Committee on the Future for the governance system.
6. Guyer, Gordon: August 5, 1982.
 - A. Role of the faculty in University-level decision-making.
 - B. Effect of the vote on faculty collective bargaining, 1972.
 - C. Impact of tensions between the Board of Trustees and the faculty.
 - D. Rationale for 1975 revision to the Bylaws.
 - E. Impact of the changes in the presidency, 1969-70.
 - F. Role of the Faculty Council.
 - G. Impact of student participation in governance.
7. Hannah, John: April 4, 1983.
 - A. Role of the faculty in University-level decision-making.
 - B. Development of the Faculty Organization Document, 1955.
 - C. Impact of the faculty "revolt" in March 1952.
 - D. Impact of the first Academic Senate meeting, November 10, 1955.
 - E. Impact of the Academic Senate meeting regarding ROTC, 1959.
 - F. Impact of the Committee on the Future on the structure of governance.
 - G. Impact of the Academic Freedom Report on the Bylaw revision process.
 - H. What impact does a particular structure have on University-level decision-making?
8. Horne, Frederick: July 30, 1982.
 - A. Role of the faculty in University-level decision-making.
 - B. Effect of the vote on faculty collective bargaining, 1972.
 - C. Impact of tensions between the Board of Trustees and the faculty.
 - D. Rationale for 1975 revision to the Bylaws.
 - E. Impact of the changes in the presidency, 1969-70.
 - F. Role of the Faculty Council.
 - G. Impact of student participation in governance.
9. Johnson, Walter: July 15, 1982.
 - A. Role of the faculty in University-level decision-making.
 - B. Effect of the vote on faculty collective bargaining, 1972.

- C. Rationale for 1975 revision to the Bylaws.
 - D. Impact of the changes in the presidency, 1969-70.
 - E. Role of the Faculty Council.
 - F. Impact of student participation in governance.
10. Larrowe, Charles: July 28, 1982.
- A. Role of the faculty in University-level decision-making.
 - B. Effect of the vote on faculty collective bargaining, 1972.
 - C. Impact of the changes in the presidency, 1969-70.
 - D. Academic Senate rejection of the December 1967 Bylaw Report.
 - E. Impact of the interim Faculty Grievance Procedure and the Faculty Grievance Officer.
 - F. Role of the Faculty Council.
 - G. Impact of student participation in governance.
11. Manderscheid, Lester: July 21, 1982.
- A. Role of the faculty in University-level decision-making.
 - B. Effect of the vote on faculty collective bargaining, 1972.
 - C. Rationale for 1975 revision to the Bylaws.
 - D. Impact of the changes in the presidency, 1969-70.
 - E. Role of the Faculty Council.
 - F. Impact of student participation in governance.
 - G. Impact of the interim Faculty Grievance Procedure and the Faculty Grievance Officer.
 - H. Effect of the NCAA football investigation on the Bylaw process.
12. Muelder, Milton: July 26, 1982.
- A. Role of the faculty in University-level decision-making.
 - B. Development of the Faculty Organization Document, 1955.
 - C. Impact of the faculty "revolt" in March 1952.
 - D. Impact of the first Academic Senate meeting, November 10, 1955.
 - E. Impact of the Committee on the Future on the structure of governance.
 - F. Impact of the changes in the presidency, 1969-70.
13. Norrell, Gwendolyn: July 28, 1982.
- A. Role of the faculty in University-level decision-making.
 - B. Impact of the changes in the presidency, 1969-70.
 - C. Impact of student participation in governance.
 - D. Role of the Faculty Council.
 - E. Rationale for the 1975 revisions to the Bylaws.
 - F. Impact of the NCAA football investigation on the Bylaw revision process.

14. Simonds, Rollin: July 19, 1982.
 - A. Role of the faculty in University-level decision-making.
 - B. Development of the Faculty Organization Document, 1955.
 - C. Impact of the faculty "revolt" in March 1952.
 - D. Impact of the Committee on the Future on the structure of governance.
 - E. Development of "Bylaws, 1961".
15. Wharton, Clifton: May 28, 1982.
 - A. Role of the faculty in University-level decision-making.
 - B. Impact of the tensions between the Board of Trustees and the faculty.
 - C. Impact of the changes in the presidency, 1969-70.
 - D. Rationale for the 1975 revisions to the Bylaws.
 - E. Effect of the vote on faculty collective bargaining.
 - F. Impact of student participation in governance.
16. Williams, Frederick: July 26, 1982.
 - A. Role of the faculty in University-level decision-making.
 - B. Impact of the Academic Freedom Report on the Bylaw revision process.
 - C. Academic Senate rejection of the December 1967 Bylaw Report.
 - D. Rationale for the 1975 revisions to the Bylaws.

APPENDIX B

DIVISIONAL FACULTIES
OCTOBER 24, 1949

Divisional Faculties
October 24, 1949

At a combine general staff and faculty meeting on June 4, 1942 the faculty approved the recommendation for Divisional Faculties which is stated in full below:

"Section 1. Membership. The divisional faculty shall consist of all persons above the rank of graduate assistant who are appointed for at least one year and a part of whose teaching, research or extension work for the current year is in a department included in the division.

"Section 2. Meetings. Each divisional faculty shall meet at least once a term between October and June, with the dean of the division as presiding officer. Additional meetings may be held on call of the dean of the division. A copy of the minutes of each meeting of a divisional faculty shall be sent to the president of the college and to the dean of each division.

"Section 3. Powers. Each divisional faculty shall have general legislative power over all matters pertaining to its own meetings. Its functions with respect to all matters which affect the general interests of the college shall be advisory. Proposals which it may make shall be subject to approval by the college faculty and administrative officials as constituted by the laws of the State of Michigan. Divisional faculties may properly make known their ideas with respect to curricula, instructions, examinations, grading, degrees, standard for promotion and standards for salary increases, etc., through discussion and the passing of resolutions to be transmitted to the college faculty.

"Section 4. Advisory Committees.

"a. In October of each year each divisional faculty shall elect an advisory committee consisting of representatives from each of the following ranks: Professor, Associate Professor, Assistant Professor, Instructor, including research and extension equivalents. The size of the committee and period of office to be determined by each division. In the case of any person having more than one title his rank shall be determined by his highest title.

"b. Elections to the advisory committee shall be by secret ballot. In case no one receives a clear majority on the first ballot a second vote shall be taken to choose from among those who received the largest number of votes on the first ballot.

"c. The dean of the division may consult with this committee on all matters of divisional policy. He shall normally discuss with this committee the agenda for meetings of the divisional faculty at least 24 hours prior to the meeting and preferably sufficiently far in advance of the

meeting so that written notice of the agenda may be sent to all members.

"d. Such other committees as are deemed advisable shall be provided for by regular procedure within each divisional faculty.

Section 5. Parliamentary Procedure. Meeting of a divisional faculty shall be conducted according to the procedure prescribed in Roberts' Rules of Order."

APPENDIX C

STATEMENT TO THE MSU ACADEMIC COMMUNITY
NOVEMBER 30, 1982

STATEMENT TO THE MSU ACADEMIC COMMUNITY
November 30, 1982

The recent vote of the MSU faculty highlights the responsibility of Academic Governance to continue providing effective faculty representation at the unit, college, and University levels. In this regard, the elected faculty members of the Steering Committee of Academic Council wish to reaffirm their commitment to the following:

1. The Academic Governance role of the faculty at MSU, like that of other world class universities, is one of high professionalism and integral to all aspects of University activity.

2. The participatory mode of the students, faculty, and Administration as they engage in academic governance in matters is collegial and integrative. As stated in Article 7 of the Bylaws of the Board of Trustees, "The Board of Trustees, the Administration, and the faculty carry out their responsibilities not as isolated entities, but as major and primary constituents of a total University organization and structure which remain mutually interdependent and must be supportive of each other's purposes, functions, and obligations".

3. We believe that the academic governance system at MSU is an outstanding model and has performed well even during the University crises of the early 1980;s. Some, however, judge the system to be inefficient and insufficiently responsive over the short term. It is, therefore, extremely important that everyone, including those critical of the system, take constructive action to increase the ability of academic governance to provide appropriate and timely responses to any and all issues requiring its attention.

Academic governance at MSU represents the interests of the entire University community. The Steering Committee of the Academic Council welcomes all comments from any individual, group, or unit, regarding the operations of governance and suggestions as to how academic governance can be improved.

Faculty members of the Steering Committee of Academic Council

MSU IS AN AFFIRMATIVE ACTION/EQUAL OPPORTUNITY INSTITUTION

BIBLIOGRAPHY

BIBLIOGRAPHY

AAUP BULLETIN, Volume 47, Winter, 1966; Volume 52, December 1966; Volume 58, Winter 1972.

Academic Freedom for Students at Michigan State University, 1967.

"Ad Hoc Committee on Student Participation in Academic Government", Michigan State University, April 23, 1969.

"Annual Report", Registrar's Office, Michigan State College, 1946-47; 1950-51; 1965-66; 1975-76.

"A Report to the President of Michigan State University from the Committee on the Future of the University", July 1959.

Brubacher, John, Higher Education in Transition, New York, Harper and Row, 1958.

Bulletin of Michigan State College of Agriculture and Applied Science, Volume XXXVI, Michigan State College, 1942.

Bylaws for Academic Governance, Michigan State University, 1971; 1975; 1978.

Catalog, Michigan State College, 1946-47; 1949-50.

Catalog, Michigan State University, 1955-56; 1961-62; 1968-69; 1971-72; 1977-78.

Coleman, Daniel, "The Evolution of Collective Bargaining as it Relates to Higher Education in America", Journal of College and University Personnel Association, Volume 23, March 1972.

Faculty Facts, Michigan State University, 1949-77.

Faculty-Staff Directory, Michigan State University, 1971-72.

Hannah, John A., A Memoir, East Lansing, Michigan State University Press, 1980.

Hannah, John A., "The State of the University", Michigan State University Archives, January 16, 1959.

Killingsworth, Charles, et al, "McKee Committee Proposals for Bylaw Revisions", Michigan State University Archives, June 3, 1970.

Kuhn, Madison, Michigan State University the First Hundred Years, East Lansing, Michigan State University Press, 1955.

Mason, Henry L., College and University Government: A Handbook of Principle and Practice, New Orleans, Tulane University Press, 1972.

"Michigan State News", volume 62, November 4, 1969; volume 65, October 24, 1972; volume 71, October 27, 1977; volume 74, Welcome Week Edition; volume 75, February 9, 1981.

Millett, John, Higher Education and the 1980's, Washington, D.C., Academy for Educational Development, 1978.

Millett, John, New Structures of Campus Power, San Francisco, Jossey-Bass Publishers, 1978.

"Minutes of the Academic Council", volumes I-XXIII, Michigan State University, 1955-78.

"Minutes of the Academic Senate", volumes I-IV, Michigan State University, 1955-75.

"Minutes of the Board of Trustees", Michigan State University, October 16, 1970 and May 21, 1971.

"Minutes of the Faculty Meeting", volume VIII, Michigan State University, 1949-55.

"Report of the Ad Hoc Committee to Review Academic Governance", Michigan State University Archives, November 13, 1973.

"Report of the Ad Hoc University Committee on Collective Bargaining", Michigan State University Archives, January 31, 1972.

Rudolph, Frederick, The American College and University: A History, New York, Vintage Books (Random House), 1962.

Weber, Arnold, et al., "Faculty Participation in Academic Governance", Washington, D.C., American Association for Higher Education, 1967.

General References

Carnegie Commission, Governance in Higher Education, Washington, D.C., 1972.

Corson, John, Governance of Colleges and Universities, New York, McGraw-Hill, 1975.

Foote, Caleb and Mayer, Henry, The Culture of the University, San Francisco, Jossey-Bass, 1968.