

69-20,854

FEDORE, Robert Ryvan, 1926-
AN EVALUATION OF THE REPORT ON THE
"ACADEMIC FREEDOM FOR STUDENTS AT
MICHIGAN STATE UNIVERSITY".

Michigan State University, Ph.D., 1969
Education, administration

University Microfilms, Inc., Ann Arbor, Michigan

AN EVALUATION OF THE REPORT ON THE
"ACADEMIC FREEDOM FOR STUDENTS AT
MICHIGAN STATE UNIVERSITY"

By

Robert Ryvan Fedore

A THESIS

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

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

Department of Administration
and Higher Education

1969

ABSTRACT

AN EVALUATION OF THE REPORT ON THE "ACADEMIC FREEDOM FOR STUDENTS AT MICHIGAN STATE UNIVERSITY"

By

Robert Ryvan Fedore

Problem

The purposes of this study were (a) to compare the opinions of students, student leaders, faculty and administrators with respect to the desirability of selected principles or statements contained in the Report on "Academic Freedom for Students at Michigan State University" and (b) to compare opinions of these four groups with regard to the degree which practices in the University have moved closer to these principles. In addition the study presents a brief historical development of the Report including the considerations and procedures that went into the Report leading up to its final adoption.

Methods and Procedures

A random sample of four groups (students, student leaders, faculty and administrators) associated with Michigan State University were chosen for the study.

A questionnaire consisting of forty principles or guidelines selected from the Report on the "Academic

Freedom for Students at Michigan State University" was sent to one hundred individuals in each of the four sample groups. A total of 332 or 83% of the questionnaires were returned.

Chi Square, a non-parametric statistical procedure was used for analyzing the data. The .05 level of confidence was used to determine the level of significant differences. Comments solicited to each principle were edited and reported.

Findings

Analysis of the forty statements revealed that in general the guidelines put forth in the Report were well accepted by the various segments making up the University community.

The two areas most prone to disagreement were centered around those rights pertaining to classroom and academic freedoms and student publications and their distribution. It was over these same areas of student rights that considerable disagreement existed in the formulation of the Report prior to its final adoption by the University.

Conclusions regarding the extent to which practices had changed as a result of the implementation of the Report could not be made. Many members of the University felt that a number of the guidelines had long been implemented into practices but simply were implied and not made explicit until the adoption of the Report.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The author expresses his sincere appreciation to the members of his Guidance Committee, Dr. Walter F. Johnson, Dr. Leland W. Dean and Dr. James B. McKee for assistance given during this study. A special note of gratitude is extended to Dr. Eldon R. Nonnamaker, Chairman of the Guidance Committee, whose encouragement and understanding inspired the author throughout the study.

Appreciation is also expressed to Dr. John C. Howell and the many persons at Michigan State without whose guidance and cooperation this study would not have been possible.

Above all, the deepest gratitude is expressed to my wife and children who have endured the author these many years as husband, father and student.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
ACKNOWLEDGMENTS	11
LIST OF TABLES	v
Chapter	
I. THE PROBLEM	1
Introduction	1
Purpose of the Study	7
Statement of the Problem	8
Definition of Terms.	9
Limitations of the Study	10
Procedures for the Study	10
Organization of the Study.	12
II. HISTORICAL DEVELOPMENT OF ACADEMIC FREEDOM IN THE U. S. AND REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE .	14
Introduction	14
Historical Development.	14
Related Literature and Research.	24
Summary.	28
III. HISTORICAL DEVELOPMENT OF THE REPORT ON THE "ACADEMIC FREEDOM FOR STUDENTS AT MICHIGAN STATE UNIVERSITY"	31
Introduction	31
The Committed Generation	31
Advent of the Freedom Report.	37
Summary.	59
IV. DESIGN AND METHODOLOGY.	61
Introduction	61
Description of the Population and Selection of the Sample.	61
Procedures Used in Developing the Instrument and Obtaining the Data	63
Analyzing the Data	65
Summary.	66

Chapter	Page
V. ANALYSIS OF THE DATA	67
Introduction	67
Access to the Report	68
Analysis	69
Academic and Classroom.	69
Student Records	84
Regulations, Rules and Student Conduct	102
Freedom of Expression	128
Summary.	145
VI. SUMMARY, FINDINGS AND CONCLUSIONS	147
The Problem	147
Design of the Study.	148
Desirability of the Principles	149
Academic and Classroom.	149
Student Records	149
Regulations, Rules and Student Conduct	150
Freedom of Expression	150
Change in Practices.	152
Academic and Classroom.	152
Student Records	153
Regulations, Rules and Student Conduct	153
Freedom of Expression	154
Conclusions	155
Implications for Further Study	158
BIBLIOGRAPHY	160
APPENDICES.	165

LIST OF TABLES

Table	Page
1. Responses to the Questionnaire	66
2. Responses to the questions as to whether the respondent had access to the Report and whether he had read the Report	68
3. The student is free to take reasoned exception to data and views offered in the classroom, and to reserve judgment about matters of opinion, without fear of penalty	70
4. The student is protected against improper disclosure of information concerning his grades, views, beliefs, political associations, health, or character which an instructor acquires in the course of his professional relations with the student	72
5. The student receives accurate and clearly stated information which enables him to determine his own academic relationship with the University and any special conditions which apply	74
6. The student receives accurate and clearly stated information which enables him to determine the general requirements for establishing and maintaining an acceptable academic standing	76
7. Procedures are established for hearing complaints to reconcile a right of the faculty and the right of a student	78
8. Membership is provided for students on regular departmental and college committees in which problems are discussed and policies formulated.	80
9. Department and colleges have clearly defined channels for the receipt and consideration of student complaints concerning the quality of instruction	83

10.	All policies and practices concerning records are based on respect for the privacy of the individual student	85
11.	There is a demonstrable need for all records retained which is reasonably related to the basic necessities and purposes of the institution	87
12.	Records of a student's religious or political beliefs are not retained without his knowledge or consent	88
13.	A student has the right to inspect the official transcript of his own academic record . .	90
14.	A student has the right to inspect reports and evaluations of his conduct, except letters of recommendation and similar evaluations which are necessarily prepared on a confidential basis	92
15.	Evaluations of students are made only by persons qualified to make that evaluation . . .	93
16.	All persons handling confidential records are instructed concerning the confidential nature of such information and concerning their responsibilities regarding it	95
17.	No one outside the faculty or administrative staff has access to the record of a student's offenses against University regulations without the express permission of the student in writing	97
18.	Transcripts of academic record contain only information about the academic status of the student	99
19.	Membership lists of student organizations, especially those related to matters of a political belief, or action, are not retained .	101
20.	The enforcement of the students duties to the larger society is left to legal and judicial authorities duly established for the purpose .	103

21.	Only where the institution's interests as an academic community are distinct and clearly involved is the special authority of the institution asserted in addition to penalties prescribed by civil authorities . . .	104
22.	Students participate to the maximum extent feasible in formulating and revising regulations governing student conduct. . . .	106
23.	All regulations governing student conduct are made public in an appropriate manner . . .	108
24.	Regulations relating to the communication of ideas encourage the competition of ideas . . .	110
25.	There is a demonstrable need for each regulation which is reasonably related to the basic purposes and necessities of the University . . .	112
26.	Procedures and penalties for the violation of regulations are designed for guidance or correction of behavior rather than for retribution	114
27.	All regulations seek the best possible reconciliation of the principles of maximum freedom and necessary order	116
28.	Clearly defined channels and procedures exist for the appeal and review of the finding of guilt in an alleged violation of a regulation . . .	118
29.	Clearly defined channels and procedures exist for the appeal and review of the reasonableness, under the circumstances, of the penalty imposed for a specific violation	119
30.	Clearly defined channels and procedures exist for the appeal and review of the substance of a regulation or administrative decision	121
31.	Every regulation specifies to whom it applies and whether responsibility for compliance lies with individuals, groups or both . . .	123

32.	Any student accused of violating a regulation has the right to appear before one or more members of a duly constituted judicial body	124
33.	Premises occupied by students and the personal possessions of students are not searched unless appropriate authorization has been obtained	126
34.	Faculty, administrators and students who are not staff members do not exercise any powers of veto or censorship over news or editorial content in the student newspaper	129
35.	Students have maximum freedom to express opinions and communicate ideas by writing, publishing and distributing materials	131
36.	The University does not authorize student publications	133
37.	Responsibility for editorial or other content, finance and distribution lies with the sponsoring agency group, or organization	135
38.	The privilege of distribution which is accorded to any free student publication is equally accorded to all	137
39.	The University neither authorizes nor prohibits the solicitation of advertising by any student publication	138
40.	Students and student organizations are free to examine and to discuss all questions of interest to them, and to express opinions publicly and privately	140
41.	Students are allowed to invite and to hear any person of their own choosing	142
42.	Procedures required before a guest speaker is invited to appear on campus are designed only to insure that there is orderly scheduling of facilities and adequate preparation for the event	144

CHAPTER I

THE PROBLEM

Introduction

The quest by students for a greater voice and a higher degree of freedom in their respective academic communities is an expanding movement. Such issues, both of a social and educational nature, have brought about disruptions ranging from the "Free Speech Movement" at Berkeley in 1964-65 to the violent uprisings at Columbia University in 1968 and at San Francisco State College in 1969. Civil disobedience tactics, borne and refined from the civil rights movement, have been characteristic of student confrontations with authority. Speaking of the revolt of youth today, Justice Fortas believes that it may forecast the development of greater maturity and independence of outlook among our young people, and this may be productive of much good. It may bring about the development of increased maturity in the educational and living rules of our colleges. In any event, it presents a challenge to the older generation as well as to youth to reconsider the goals of our society and its values, and urgently to reappraise the distribution of function and responsibility among the generations. He says:

I know of no legal principle which protects students on campus from the consequences of activities which would be violations of law if undertaken elsewhere. This is the law; but we are now confronted with a problem which is not solved by a mechanical application of the criminal law: the problem of readjusting campus life to the new attitudes and demands, and of coping with the disaffections which afflict so many students.¹

In some cases the tendency for issues and conditions to polarize students, faculty and administration into competing interest groups has prevented a legitimate solution to problems which could be resolved through reason and trust. Student protest which disrupts or even threatens to destroy an academic community is becoming more and more prevalent. Colleges and universities which felt that such demanding action was simply out of the question on their respective campuses are now faced with the proposition of working out solutions to these controversial issues in a manner which includes participation by the total academic community. The urgent need to make a serious effort to manage such difficulties is recognized by Kadish in the following:

The rights of students or faculty are not objects to be discovered but constructions to be instituted, proposals for the conduct of affairs to be made good. . . . student, faculty, administration, and community at large each have specific interests; these interests, while they may often overlap or reinforce one another, are not, despite the rhetoric of the "University" and its noble functions, identical or necessarily compatible . . . consideration must be given to the various interests of each of the groups which make up the institution, and including the interest of

¹Abe Fortas, Concerning Dissent and Civil Disobedience (New York: Signet Books, 1968), pp. 47-49.

each group to announce and defend its own interests as it sees them.²

The seeking of freedom and rights by students, as an interest group, has been directed initially at those aspects of student life outside the classroom such as dress regulations, moral codes, student records, women's hours and the right to discuss controversial issues. However, since the Student Power Conference held at the University of Minnesota in the fall of 1967, there has been a demand for greater involvement on the part of students in the academic governance of institutions of higher education. The search for freedom, originally directed at the extra curricular aspects of college life, is now reaching out into such areas as the curriculum, grading system, evaluation of instruction and even tenure of faculty.

As Frankel points out, any discussion of the rights and responsibilities of faculty, students and administrators is of limited value unless attention is paid to the character and tone of the environment in which these rights and responsibilities operate. The development of rights and responsibilities of both students and faculty in an educational institution must be a product of the faculty, administration and the students. If the university fails to grant any change in the authority and status relationship, then change may be forced upon the university through rebellion and

²Mortimer R. Kadish, "Nature of the Problem," in Freedom and Order in the University, ed. by Samuel Gorovitz (Cleveland: Western Reserve University Press, 1967), pp. 167-170.

protest. On the other hand, if the university grants but token freedoms, it may only create further mistrust and cause for confrontation. The recognition of such consequences may enable a university to establish the procedures and processes for effectively dealing with areas of potential controversy.³

Speaking of such processes and procedures, Culpepper has the following to say:

It is important that each of the main constituents of higher education recognize that all have major roles to play and that each should respect the interests of the other. Teamwork, exchange of information, understanding relationships, recognition of rights, and knowledge of duties and responsibilities of the other constituents will enable all to contribute most effectively to the operation of the institution.⁴

Harold Taylor calls to our attention an interesting aspect of such democratically administered educational institutions:

To put the matter broadly, the ultimate form of radical democracy in social organization or in education is either the anarchy of accepting no authority and thus deliberately cultivating the disorder of laissez faire, or it is a consensus resting upon the unanimous judgment of the community, thus enforcing a new, and in some ways, a

³Charles Frankel, "Rights and Responsibilities in the Student-College Relationship," in The College and the Student, ed. by Lawrence E. Dennis and Joseph F. Kauffman (Washington, D.C.: American Council on Education, 1967), pp. 232-251.

⁴J. Broward Culpepper, "All Have Major Roles to Play," in Whose Goals for American Higher Education? ed. by Charles G. Dobbins and Calvin B. T. Lee (Washington, D.C.: American Council on Education, 1968), pp. 133-140.

more unpleasant kind of authority than that which the liberals have sought to overthrow.⁵

As argued by Edward Schwartz, President of the National Student Association, processes and procedures are not the answer in and of themselves. Schwartz points out that guarantees of individual freedom and political order are insufficient and that men may desire an expanding relationship between one another, a sense of community within their environment which transcends questions of freedom and order.⁶

The report on the "Academic Freedom for Students at Michigan University," is a document which demonstrates how a large university, considering its own institutional character, proposed to recognize and deal with these expanding relationships and in part to embark upon a form of community government. The crux of the Report rests in the fiduciary relationship, which is best expressed in the last paragraph of the foreword to the Report:

The real significance of this document, as we believe, is not that students have acquired rights, but that they have explicitly been made party to our social trust. The responsibility which lies upon the administration and faculty continues. They remain guardians of the university, charged with preserving

⁵Harold Taylor, "Freedom and Authority on the Campus," in The American College, ed. by Nevitt Sanford (New York: Wiley and Sons, 1966), pp. 774-775.

⁶Edward Schwartz, "Comment: Legal Aspects of Student-Institutional Relationships," Denver Law Journal, Vol. 45, No. 4 (1968), pp. 525-532.

in the genius of scholarship and the conditions of inquiry which society has entrusted to their care.⁷

After extensive study, investigation and discussions with students, administrators and faculty the report on the "Academic Freedom for Students at Michigan State University" was prepared by the Faculty Committee on Student Affairs. The Report was reviewed and revised by the Academic Council and adopted by the Board of Trustees on March 16, 1967 with implementation initiated 120 days after that date. The Report is a bold experiment in higher education which is based upon certain statements or principles of good faith. In order to implement these principles or guidelines into policies and procedures the Report established for change through orderly procedures. It has already been demonstrated that these procedures have enabled several disagreements to be resolved in a reasoned manner rather than through protest and disruption. Another transition in the University which perhaps is an outgrowth of the Report itself is the inclusion of students on certain standing and advisory committees within the University.

For those administrators working in the area of student affairs the Report appears to be a most workable document, enabling students to participate constructively

⁷Foreword to the Report on the "Academic Freedom for Students at Michigan University," prepared by the Faculty Committee on Student Affairs, Michigan State University, East Lansing, Michigan, March, 1967.

in developing solutions to problems directly related to their education. For other members of the University community the Report may yet be an unknown and perhaps in their minds a document of limited value. Apparently in the eyes of some students the Report is not a liberal document and represented but token participation on the part of students in its formulation.⁸ As one student wrote,

. . . it [academic freedom] flowered briefly in a burst of liberal consciousness as the Williams Report went through various amputations in the Academic Council and Senate, and emerged a stunted document over a year ago as the Academic Freedom Report.⁹

Purpose of the Study

The Report demonstrates how Michigan State University has attempted to define and implement academic freedom for students. In the period extending over one year since its implementation, the Report appears to have gained support from members of the University community. There is some evidence that the Report has its critics. It is inevitable that the success of this document rests upon the good faith of all members of the University. The effectiveness of policies, practices and procedures which have evolved and which will evolve from the guidelines of the Report will

⁸Lynn H. Jondahl, "The Freedom of Higher Education," Crossroads (United Presbyterian Church; Board of Christian Education, April-June, 1968).

⁹Sue Hughes, "Freedom Report Found Dead," Collage, Michigan State News, October 4, 1968.

depend upon the acceptance of the spirit in which those guidelines were constructed. It is anticipated that this dissertation will contribute to a better understanding of the development of the Report and its intended purposes as well as serving as a means of its evaluation.

Statement of the Problem

This study compares the opinions of students, faculty members and administrators regarding the desirability of selected principles or statements contained in the report on the "Academic Freedom for Students at Michigan State University." It is assumed that if the principles embodied in the Report are considered desirable and have been accepted in spirit, changes in practices will have occurred throughout the University which adhere to those principles. An attempt is made to analyze the differences which members of the University community may have with respect to the desirability of these principles and any changes which are believed to have come about through their implementation.

Some of the objectives of the study are:

1. To assess the degree of awareness of the total University community to the existence of the Report.
2. To assess the degree to which there is agreement or disagreement with selected guidelines or principles contained in the Report.

3. To solicit and identify specific concerns regarding principles put forth in the Report.
4. To assess some of the possible difficulties in the subsequent implementation of principles contained in the Report.

Definition of Terms

Principle

A fundamental statement or guideline which underlies practices, policies and procedures.

Administrator

Full-time professional staff or faculty member who engages in general or academic administration of the University.

Faculty

A member of the academic faculty at Michigan State University holding the rank of assistant professor or above.

Student

A full-time (12 credits or more) undergraduate of sophomore standing or above who attended the University during the 1967-68 academic year and who is currently enrolled.

Student Leader

A student who has been selected by his peers to serve in the student government of the University, either as living unit president or at the All-University level.

Limitations of the Study

In addition to the customary factors inherent in the use of any questionnaire a limitation of this study is that certain practices relating to principles put forth in the Report may well have been implemented prior to the Report and thus, are not a direct result of the Report. Another limitation is that the study was not designed to evaluate the effectiveness of the practices, policies or procedures that have evolved from these principles.

Procedure for the Study

A forty item questionnaire, based on general guidelines or principles from the report on the "Academic Freedom for Students at Michigan State University," was designed to solicit the opinions of a sampling of members of the University community. The forty items were selected and refined from a questionnaire composed of seventy principles and policies. A pilot study with twenty student personnel deans responding resulted in the elimination of policy statements and the clarification in wording and form of the selected principles. The instrument was designed to solicit two responses for each of the forty principles:

- (a) the degree to which the principle is believed to be desirable.
- (b) the degree to which practices have already moved closer to the principle over the past year because of the implementation of the Report.

The items in the questionnaire included principles or statements of student rights and responsibilities in four general areas; academic and classroom, student records, regulations, rules and student conduct, and freedom of expression.

Thirty-six of the statements were taken directly from the report on the "Academic Freedom for Students at Michigan State University." Four statements not included in the Report but believed to be underlying principles for the development of a speaker's policy in 1962 and a residence hall room search policy developed in 1967 were added.

A random sample of individuals for the study was selected from the following populations: (1) all full time (12 or more credits) sophomores, juniors and seniors who attended Michigan State during the 1967-68 academic year and who were enrolled for the fall term of 1968; (2) all living unit presidents or elected student leaders at the all-university level of student government who met the same qualifications as indicated above for the students; (3) all academic faculty of the rank of assistant professor

or above who held appointments at Michigan State during the 1967-68 academic year and who held comparable appointments during the fall term of 1968; and (4) professional staff and academic administrators who were on campus during the 1967-68 academic year and who had administrative appointments for the fall term of 1968. From each of these populations 100 individuals were randomly sampled.

Respondents were requested to give their opinion on each of the two arbitrarily established five (5) point scales. The rating for Scale a, having to do with the desirability of the principle, ranged from undesirable to highly desirable. The rating ranged from no change in practices on Scale b to great change in practices. Chi square, a non-parametric statistic, was used to determine any significant differences in the responses of the four groups. Comments were solicited after each item or principle. The comments were edited and those comments, similar in meaning and content, made by two or more respondents were included in the analysis of the study.

Organization of the Study

This study is presented in six chapters. Chapter I is an introduction to the study and includes a statement of the problem, purpose of the study, procedures used and the limitations of the study. Chapter II includes a brief description of the historical development of academic freedom for students and a review of the literature related to

this topic. To better understand the significance of the study, the historical development of the report on the "Academic Freedom for Students at Michigan State University" has been included as Chapter III. The details of the design for the study including the development of the questionnaire, procedures for conducting the study and analyzing the data are contained in Chapter IV. The analysis of the findings are reported in Chapter V and the summary, conclusions and implications for further study are found in Chapter VI.

CHAPTER II

HISTORICAL DEVELOPMENT OF ACADEMIC
FREEDOM IN THE UNITED STATES AND
REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

Introduction

Chapter II is concerned with the literature relating to the historical development of academic freedom for students in the United States. It is presented in the perspective of the philosophical and legal history of the concept of academic freedom for students. A review of the literature and research pertinent to this study is also presented.

Historical Development

The term academic freedom as known in the United States is comparatively new even when used in connection with those who teach or advocate. Samuel Eliot Morison refers to the term as the newest arrival in the freedom ranks. He noted that:

the phrase itself did not enter the English language until the turn of the nineteenth to the twentieth century [in the year 1897]; and President Charles W.

Eliots' Phi Beta Kappa address of 1957, "Academic Freedom," is the earliest title one can find in a library on the subject.¹

Historically, the philosophical concept flourished in Germany during the nineteenth century and it was even stated in the Prussian Constitution of 1850 that science shall be free. The German definition of academic freedom was described in two words: Lernfreiheit and Lehrfreiheit. According to Metzger the following describes the meaning of Lernfreiheit:

By Lernfreiheit he [the German professor] meant the absence of administrative coercions in the learning situation. He referred to the fact that German students were free to roam from place to place, sampling academic wares; that wherever they lighted, they were free to determine the choice and sequence of courses, and were responsible to no one for regular attendance; that they lived in private quarters and controlled their private lives. This freedom was deemed essential to the main purposes of the German university.²

Lehrfreiheit or freedom of the teacher had to do with the total permissive atmosphere that surrounded the process of research and teaching. Metzger points out that both the teacher and the learner enjoyed privileged status. For the learner it marked his arrival at man's estate. For the professor it placed him in the ranks of the elite. Thus were the beginnings of the academic community.

¹Milton R. Konvitz, *Expanding Liberties* (New York: The Viking Press, 1966), p. 86.

²Walter P. Metzger, *Academic Freedom in the Age of the University* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1955), pp. 112-115.

Ralph Fuchs states that academic freedom as known in the United States today has evolved mainly from three historical foundations:

- (1) the philosophy of intellectual freedom, which originated in Greece, arose again in Europe, especially under the impact of the Renaissance, and came to maturity in the Age of Reason;
- (2) the idea of autonomy for communities of scholars which arose in the universities of Europe; and
- (3) the freedoms guaranteed by the Bill of Rights of the Federal Constitution as elaborated by the courts.³

It is this third historical foundation which has expedited and expanded the concept of academic freedom in the United States, particularly as it pertains to student freedoms and eventually the word "rights." According to Konvitz even for faculty academic freedom was not, as recently as 1937, stated by law to be a 'property' right or a constitutional privilege, or even a legal term.

Konvitz states:

During the 1950's, however, academic freedom came to the fore in a number of Supreme Court cases, and at last it can be said that academic freedom has emerged as an interest with a strong claim on constitutional protection.⁴

Although these constitutional liberties were attended to by the courts on behalf of faculties only as recently as

³Ralph Fuchs, "Academic Freedom--Its Basic Philosophy, Function and History," Law and Contemporary Problems, Vol. XXVIII, No. 3 (Summer, 1963), p. 431.

⁴Konvitz, op. cit.

the 1950's, they were completely ignored on behalf of students. In order to understand the latent development of academic freedom for students one needs only to consider the history of American colleges and universities. Rudolph describes the typical early American college as being patterned after the British residential college, which offered few freedoms.⁵ In fact, the basic educational objective was to have the student conform in every respect to a specific way of life, regulating his total environment. This relationship which existed for over two centuries and still exists today in some colleges, is called 'in loco parentis.' The standing in place of the parent or 'in loco parentis' resulted in the regulation of all aspects of student behavior and is best described in the court ruling of Berea College in Kentucky in 1913, where students were prohibited by the college from patronizing off-campus restaurants. In upholding the college the court ruled that:

College authorities stand 'in loco parentis' concerning the physical and moral welfare and mental training of pupils. For the purpose of this case, the school, its officers and students are a legal entity, as much as any family, and, like a father may direct his children, those in charge of boarding schools are well within their rights and powers when they direct their students what to eat and where they may get it; where they may go and what forms of amusement are forbidden.⁶

⁵Frederick Rudolph, The American College and University (New York: Random House, 1962), pp. 136-364.

⁶Gott v. Berea College, 156 Ky., 376, 161 S.W. 204 (1913).

In speaking to such a concept as it may exist in some colleges today, Weiss states:

Nevertheless, this belief that acting 'in loco parentis' as a latent function of the university is but a myth. College and universities are not households; rather, they are repositories, forums, mediums, laboratories, arenas--they offer thousands of possibilities for description, none of which includes the concept of family. It is at the university in fact, that children are alienated from their parents by savants who are essentially alienated from contemporary society; and both children and teachers are involved in the process of creating the future. The roles of such children and teachers exclude, in relation to each other, the roles of off-spring and parents. The all too misleading analogy that exists only in the sense that parents and teachers alike shape the minds of young people. However, the home more often than not attempts to perpetuate traditions, whereas the school attempts to create new ones through the examination of the old.⁷

A more compatible concept of academic freedom is defined by Fuchs as that freedom of members of the academic community, assembled in colleges and universities, which underlies the effective performance of the arts and research. Such a right must be maintained in order to enable faculty and students to carry out their roles.⁸

In assessing the events which have led up to the present, it is rather difficult to interpret whether the 'in loco parentis' concept has been changed from within through the enlightenment of the institution and its

⁷Donald H. Weiss, "Freedom of Association for Students," The Journal of Higher Education, XXXVIII, No. 4 (April, 1967), p. 187.

⁸Fuchs, op. cit.

students or from without as a result of social changes and the intervention of courts in cases of civil liberties.

Sanford speaks to this point when he says:

In trying to deal with all the kinds of influence that are brought to bear upon students one must not only consider policies and practices deliberately adopted by the faculty and administration but also a great variety of factors arising out of the general culture and social organization of the college community. When colleges do change, it is usually because of influences coming from outside. From this point of view the students singularly or aggregate, are parts of the system; they interact with the other components; and thus their environment is to some extent of their own making.⁹

Undoubtedly the courts have played an important role in clarifying students' rights. Van Alstyne notes the following changes which have tended to increase student rights:

- (1) Education is no longer regarded as the prerogative of a small privileged group but is viewed as something which, in the interest of the nation's economic, social, and political well-being, should be open to all who can benefit from it.
- (2) Student academic freedom is now being championed by a number of groups, such as the American Association of University Professors, which 50 years ago took no interest in it.
- (3) Today the Supreme Courts' concern for constitutional liberties is such that most of its time is taken up with civil liberties cases.
- (4) Most students are now enrolled in public rather than private institutions whereas the reverse used to be true.

⁹ Nevitt Sanford, ed., The American College (New York: Wiley and Sons, 1966), p. 48.

- (5) The old doctrine of 'in loco parentis' is out of date in an age when, at large universities, most students are over 21.¹⁰

It is Van Alstyne's fourth point which seems to have encouraged the courts to assert themselves more readily in the past decade. The best example is the Dixon v. Alabama State Board of Education which presents a leading case on due process for students.¹¹

Moneyppenny elaborates on the distinction between public and private institutions relative to student rights:

the application of constitutional limitations for student rights in general rests on the continued tenability of the distinction between public and private institutions. The recent cases overturning decisions of dismissal for asserting the civil liberties of faculty and students have all arisen at public institutions. They have rested on the view that the fourteenth amendment applies to the campus as to other areas of state governmental action, and that neither attendance nor employment can be made to rest on a waiver of the fourteenth amendment rights. When the institution involved is a public one, there is ample precedent for going into court over the denial of civil liberties rights, including the right to procedural due process. The due process and legal protection conceptions presumably also include the question of whether regulations are reasonable, fair in relation to various situations and parties, and whether their application in a given instance rests upon some kind of evidence.¹²

¹⁰ William W. Van Alstyne, Law in Transition Quarterly (Winter, 1965).

¹¹ Dixon v. Alabama State Board of Education, 294 Federal Reporter, 2nd series, No. 18641, United States Court of Appeals, Circuit 5, 1961, pp. 150-165.

¹² Phillip Moneyppenny, "The Student as a Student," Denver Law Journal, Vol. 45, No. 4 (Special, 1968), p. 654.

The self-exertion of the students in seeking extended freedoms, reinforced by recent court actions, have not been the only reason for students to have achieved the conditions of freedom. Academic freedom for the faculty seems to have been an institutional thing rather than an educational cause and thus, previous to recent times, has tended to muffle the concern in the rear echelons for student freedoms. However, there appears to be a resurgence and a re-dedication to the long overlooked principle that learning and teaching are indivisible. These concerns have become realities and have caused academic freedom for students not to be thought of as subject matter but rather as the object of education.

In 1950 students first asserted themselves through the United States National Student Association by formulating the Student Bill of Rights. In the present decade several professional groups have assumed a guardianship role for student freedom and have published rather detailed proposals. Generally, these statements have abandoned former neutrality roles and called for what some would refer to as extreme stands relative to student freedoms. The first position paper to have been presented by a special interest or professional group was the statement on student freedoms published by the American Civil Liberties Union in 1961.¹³

¹³American Civil Liberties Union, "Teacher Disclosure of Information About Students to Prospective Employers," 1961.

In the autumn of 1964 the Committee S of the American Association of University Professors published the "Statement on Faculty Responsibility for the Academic Freedom of Students" which designated four areas of faculty concern for student freedom: the responsibility of the professor as a teacher; the responsibility of the professor as a participant in institutional government; responsibility of the faculty for safeguarding off-campus freedoms of students and the responsibility of faculty for procedural due process in cases of alleged misconduct.¹⁴ In July of 1967 the American Council of Education recognized the obligation that educational institutions have to:

protect their students from unwarranted intrusion into their lives and from hurtful or threatening interference in the exploitation of ideas and their consequences that education entails. The American Council on Education therefore urges that colleges and universities adopt clear policies on the confidentiality of students' records, giving due attention to the educational significance their decisions may have.¹⁵

An attempt at some kind of consensus of appropriate student freedoms is presented through the "Joint Statement on the Rights and Freedoms of Students." This statement, drafted by representatives from ten national educational associations such as the American Association of University

¹⁴"Statement on Faculty Responsibility for Academic Freedom for Students," Committee S of the American Association of University Professors, A.A.U.P. Bulletin, Autumn, 1964, pp. 254-257.

¹⁵Statement on Confidentiality of Student Records, American Council on Education, July 7, 1967, p. 2.

Professors, the National Association of Student Personnel Administrators, the National Student Association, the American Council on Education, et al., has been submitted to the respective organizations for such action as those bodies deem appropriate. The statement is an attempt to establish some consensus in very general terms for student freedoms in such areas as access to higher education, student records, student rights in the classroom and student publications to mention a few.¹⁶ The associations instrumental in drafting the Joint Statement are currently attempting to promote the statement and to seek acceptance of the principles in standards for accreditation.

It is well to close the historical development of academic freedom for students with the "Joint Statement on the Rights and Freedoms of Students" for it provides the educational as well as the legal basis for the realm of academic freedom for students. In addition, the "Joint Statement," which incorporates the belief that freedom to learn and teach are inseparable, serves as a model of the "best existing practices" for universities to identify and establish their own concept of student freedoms as they deem necessary and desirable within the context of their respective educational goals.

¹⁶Joint Statement on Rights and Freedoms of Students, under the auspices of the American Association of University Professors. Thirty-three representatives from the national educational organizations. Washington, D.C., 1966.

Related Literature and Research

Several universities and colleges have developed statements relating to student freedoms. For the most part these statements, either in the preliminary or final stages, appear to be an attempt to codify regulations and to establish channels and procedures for hearing and resolving differences.

In doing an analysis of student freedoms as found in handbooks solicited from 12 institutions of higher learning Kluge and Smith found that each institution could be placed on a continuum with the two extremes represented:

(a) by the university which has merely come to a recognition of the need for a change and (b) by that institution which has joined hands with its students to establish a new statement of rights and freedoms designed to govern the entire academic community.¹⁷

The stance taken by several universities are quoted from Kluge and Smith:

the University of Michigan challenges each student with "freedom and responsibility" by placing upon the student the responsibility of exercising his privileges of freedom within the framework of respect for individual integrity combined with respect for the best interests of the community.¹⁸

A clear indication of student involvement and a statement on student rights came from a committee of faculty and students at the University of Kentucky. The main premise was that students have both

¹⁷ Donald A. Kluge and Jacqueline Smith, "Recent Statements of Principles, Rights, and Procedures in Student Behavior," Journal of the National Association of Women Deans and Counselors, Winter, 1968, pp. 64-68.

¹⁸ Ibid.

a legal and moral right to know what is expected of them, and the committee identified for the student five different roles: scholar, tenant, member of a student organization, employer, and customer of goods and services.¹⁹

Smith and Kluge felt that a liberal agreement based on freedom and responsibility between the University of Chicago and the student was the most educationally oriented definition of student rights found among the 12 institutions. They observed that students are accorded the freedoms of expression and inquiry but must assume the obligation of membership in the free community.²⁰

The Committee on Academic Innovation and Development at the University of California at Los Angeles has advocated greater freedom for students with the main purpose, as indicated by its chairman, Professor Knotter, was making the student a more active participant in the university rather than as a spectator.²¹

A University Council on Student Affairs was established at Brown University to insure a faculty-student partnership in developing social policies, enforcing rules and carrying out disciplinary action. Professor McGrath stated in his committee report:

¹⁹Ibid.

²⁰Kluge, op. cit.

²¹"Committee on Academic Innovation and Development at the University of California at Los Angeles," printed in Los Angeles Times, December 6, 1967.

Participation in decision making by those whom the decision may affect is an increasingly evident pattern in many institutions, and we believe that such participation is essential in the social and student conduct areas More specifically, it is our conviction that the students' role should be very substantial . . . we believe that the students are more likely to act maturely and responsibly within a social system which they help to create and enforce.²²

In the spring of 1968 a Research Seminar on Student Conduct and Discipline was offered at New York University School of Law. Sixteen students and four faculty members worked out a code and rationale which they believe would allow students as much freedom as possible to pursue their educational objectives. These codes with commentary were published as "Student Conduct and Discipline Proceedings in a University Setting" by the New York University School of Law in August of 1968.²³

The concept of freedom as evidenced by the trends today is nothing new. Harold Taylor takes a sceptical view since he observed an experimental approach to student freedoms at Sarah Lawrence College in the 1930's and 1940's. Taylor observed that at first this degree of freedom was vigorously expressed and students participated in an atmosphere of autonomy through their publications, political organizations and rule making. However, during the

²²"A Looser Rein on Students," Summary of the McGrath Report at Brown University, New York Times, May 14, 1967.

²³Student Conduct and Discipline Proceedings in a University Setting, New York University School of Law, August, 1968.

the 1950's the vigor that existed when college authority was first removed soon waned with students neglecting the responsibilities they had so enthusiastically assumed.

Taylor maintains that:

If students are given responsibility and authority for an autonomous student community, without a direct and working connection with the two other essential community components--the faculty and the administration--the system grinds to a stop and ceases to function as a true community. It is fallacious to assume, as the older progressive theory holds, that absence of institutional authority and the award of freedom to the young in a radically democrat system will develop an understanding of democracy. On the contrary, we have found that in many cases it actually tended to foster authoritarian attitudes. The fallacy lies in assuming that because students have student rights and equal status with faculty and administration, they should perform the same role. If this fallacy is acted upon in educational planning, students may insist upon the right to make decisions on all questions, regardless of competence, experience or knowledge, and regardless of the rights and judgment of faculty and administration. It may result in so much student bickering over legalisms and procedure that no student enjoys any part of self-government.²⁴

The single objective study completed to date is significant. Reference is made to study on the "American Students Freedom of Expression" as conducted by E. G. Williamson and John L. Cowan, a project carried out on a national scope in 1963.²⁵

²⁴ Harold Taylor, "Freedom and Authority on Campus," in The American College, ed. by Nevitt Sanford (New York: Wiley and Sons, 1966), pp. 774-804.

²⁵ E. G. Williamson and John L. Cowan, The American Students' Freedom of Expression (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1966).

College presidents, deans of students, faculty and student leaders were asked to assess the state of freedom at their respective institutions and to express their views of desirable changes. Eight hundred fifty institutions of different types responded with their perceptions of student freedoms. Williamson found that most respondents, regardless of the type of their college, agreed that students have unrestricted freedom to discuss controversial issues. Less consensus was found regarding permissible methods of advocating partisan action and off-campus speaker policies.

The study revealed that students participate in varying degrees in formulating college policies. Williamson concluded that institutions should define and adopt forms of student freedom that are desirable within the context of the educational goals of the institution. Williamson recommends that guidelines or statements of desirable academic freedoms be established. He also sees the need for further delineation of the problems and issues of student academic freedom through research methods.

Summary

Colleges and universities have approached the need to identify legitimate student rights by different means and in different ways. Nevertheless, it stands out that each institution must work out its own solutions to insure the freedom of the student to learn within the context of its own "institutional drift." Surely, what one institution

would feel appropriate perhaps would be totally unacceptable to another. However, there appear to be certain guidelines for conditions both on and off campus which are relevant in defining the relationship of the institution with the student. Such considerations are stated in the Preamble to the "Joint Statement" or as it is sometimes referred to as the "Student Bill of Rights." In addition to pointing out that institutional procedures for the purposes of identifying legitimate academic freedoms for students may vary from campus to campus, certain minimal standards are essential. The last paragraph speaks to the development of such desired conditions for learning as follows:

The responsibility to secure and to respect general conditions conducive to the freedom to learn is shared by all members of the academic community. Each college and university has a duty to develop policies and procedures which provide and safeguard this freedom. Such policies and procedures should be developed at each institution within the framework of general standards and with the broadest possible participation of the members of the academic community. The purpose of this statement is to enumerate the essential provisions for student freedom to learn.²⁶

The next chapter describes how a larger public university came to recognize the need for studying the relationship of the university with the student in order to insure its central purpose, the right to learn. It describes the conditions and circumstances which lead to

²⁶ Joint Statement . . . , op. cit.

the development of the report on the "Academic Freedom
of Students at Michigan State University."

CHAPTER III

HISTORICAL DEVELOPMENT OF THE REPORT ON THE "ACADEMIC FREEDOM FOR STUDENTS AT MICHIGAN STATE UNIVERSITY

Introduction

Chapter III describes some of the events, conditions and circumstances leading to the development of the report on the "Academic Freedom for Students at Michigan State University." Included are the procedures and considerations which went into its preparation and final adoption.

The Committed Generation

Michigan State University, like most institutions of higher education, experienced a relatively calm period during the 1950's. Along with McCarthyism came an attitude of caution and conservatism which was reflected in the student bodies of colleges across the country. Students tended to hold little interest for political activity or social reform and tended only to devote themselves to their own studies, friends and social life. There was some evidence, however, at Michigan State that a new direction was being sought by students to become involved to the extent of having a greater voice in their own

affairs. Madison Kuhn describes some of those changes that occurred at Michigan State

As the [Student] Council extended its activities, it reorganized in 1951 to create a strong president of student government, a congress representing living areas, a small judiciary composed of faculty and students.¹

Kuhn saw the judiciary as an integral part of the disciplinary machinery and notes that actions imposed by the Dean of Students were only as a confirmation of the judiciary's decision.

In describing student behavior of this period, Kuhn states:

As a result of improved means of expressing student sentiment, long-standing rules were relaxed . . . By a student vote in 1946, the tradition against smoking on campus, which had been violated with increased frequency by returned veterans, was abandoned. Within the year coeds were permitted to smoke in dormitory rooms. Restrictions on student driving were modified despite a growing congestion on campus and despite an observation by the Dean of Students that about 95 per cent of the cases reviewed by this office are the result of students who get into trouble in one way or another while in a car.²

Kuhn goes on to say:

In contrast, a new boisterousness erupted at times to throttle traffic on Grand River Avenue or to send hundreds of men on a raid of women's dormitories. Although leadership seemed to come not from the veteran but from the immature, the presence of onlookers converted a small demonstration into an apparent mass movement. Such

¹Madison Kuhn, Michigan State: The First Hundred Years (East Lansing: Michigan State University Press, 1955), pp. 458-459.

²Ibid.

disturbances were neither preceded nor unique to Michigan State, but they proved deeply embarrassing.³

During the early 1960's students began to appear at Michigan State with new and different attitudes relative to authority relationships. Offspring of a much different society, these students started to question the relevance of their education. Their concerns and commitment began to extend beyond the civil rights movement and the war in Viet Nam. Disillusioned with the state of affairs and disappointed in the capability of the adult generation to resolve the problems, they placed excessive expectations upon their university for the answers to the problems of society.

The first indication of a "formal" student activist movement appeared at Michigan State University in January of 1965. A group which referred to itself as the Committee for Student Rights organized for the purpose of changing University regulations. In February of 1965, this group approved ten recommendations, "dealing with specific problems arising from the University's current stands on such matters as student housing, off-campus enforcement of University regulations and procedures for punishment of violations on and off-campus."⁴ This was the first

³Ibid.

⁴Release by the Committee on Student Rights, Michigan State University, February, 1965.

organized attempt to strike down some of the concepts of paternalism held so long by the University.

In order to advocate a move against the University's 'in loco parentis' policies, in the early spring of 1965 the committee published a pamphlet entitled, "Logos." Matters involving the refusal of this committee to seek recognition by the University by registering with student government as a student organization and the distribution methods used for "Logos," brought to the surface the issue of freedom of expression. Desiring to work outside of the established channels, members of the committee openly defied the University's distribution regulations. One of the leaders on the Committee for Student Rights was a young man by the name of Paul Schiff.

It was Mr. Schiff's involvement in the publication and distribution of "Logos" that eventually brought about the greatest impetus for the consideration and review of disciplinary procedures and student rights at Michigan State University. Although he continued to be active in the Committee for Student Rights, Mr. Schiff was not enrolled for spring term of 1965. In June of 1965, Paul Schiff applied for readmission as a graduate student to the University for the summer term of 1965. John A. Fuzak, Vice President for Student Affairs refused to approve Schiff's application for readmission on the grounds of his conduct, which among other things had to do with the

Committee for Student Rights and the publication and distribution of "Logos."

Mr. Schiff appealed to the Federal District Court of the Western District of Michigan claiming that the University had denied his civil rights in that he was not granted readmission because of his political activities. The University was directed by a panel of three federal judges to present to Mr. Schiff a specification of the reasons for his denial of readmission. The court ordered that these specifications were to be presented to Mr. Schiff within ten days. Mr. Schiff was directed to respond and ten days after receiving his reply the University was to hold a hearing. The court further directed that the body conducting the hearing should follow the procedure set forth by the judges who handed down the decision in Dixon v. Alabama.⁵

The hearing was conducted by the Faculty Committee on Student Affairs with Professor Frederick Williams serving as its Chairman. Careful consideration was given by the Committee to insure that the interests of all parties concerned would be protected. Such procedural aspects of due process as open or closed hearing, attorney as counsel, and cross examination of witnesses had to be considered.

⁵Extracted from Professor William's Progress Report on the Paul Schiff Case, December 1, 1965. Minutes of the Faculty Committee on Student Affairs, Michigan State University.

The case of Dixon v. Alabama had recommended against an open hearing and cross-examination.⁶

The Committee made it very clear that its mission was to adjudge in fact whether Mr. Schiff had violated University regulations and not whether Mr. Schiff's constitutional rights had been violated. Further, the Committee felt that whether the University regulations were in conflict with the constitution and whether Mr. Schiff had been denied his constitutional liberties were matters for the Federal court to decide.

The hearing was commenced on November 9, 1965 and concluded on November 17, 1965. Careful deliberation was given to the testimony of all witnesses and to all exhibits and documents comprising the record of hearing. The Faculty Committee found that on the basis of his conduct Mr. Schiff had been properly denied readmission. He applied and was granted readmission for the winter term of 1966.

The order directing the University to present Mr. Schiff a statement of charges and provide him with a hearing was consistent with the decisions being handed down in similar cases throughout the United States. Most of all it alerted the University to the need for reform in its structures in dealing with student conduct and matters pertaining to the academic freedom for students.

⁶Dixon v. Alabama, op. cit.

Advent of the Freedom Report

The realization of the need to study the rights and responsibilities of students at Michigan State was reflected approximately three weeks after the conclusion of the Schiff case in the resolution by the Academic Council of the University on December 7, 1965:

The Academic Council recognizes the need for a comprehensive reform of the University's rules and structures dealing with the academic freedom of students, i.e., with freedom of speech, press and association on the campus with procedural due process. Such a reform has become urgent for the following reasons:

- (a) The growth of the University and the diversification of its functions have altered the relations between students, faculty and administration;
- (b) Changes in the outlook of students have generated new problems which must be handled by appropriate educational policies and democratic practices; and
- (c) Existing regulations and campus institutions appear to be insufficiently coordinated and in part out of keeping with the current educational and social issues of the University.⁷

In the same resolution it was recommended that an Ad Hoc Committee on the Academic Freedom of Students be constituted. Among the charges assigned to this Committee in the resolution were: to make a general assessment of the current situation and aspiration of academic youth, paying particular attention to any available scientific evidence; to formulate broad objectives of education and democratic policy which the university should pursue in handling

⁷Resolution of the Academic Council of Michigan State University, December 7, 1965. Minutes on the Academic Council, Michigan State University.

matters of academic freedom for students; and to formulate proposals for a comprehensive reform of existing university rules and structures relating to the academic freedom of students.

Eldon R. Nonnamaker, Associate Dean of Students, appealed to the Council to have the matter referred to the duly constituted standing committee for dealing with student affairs.

After considerable debate the matter was referred to the Faculty Committee on Student Affairs. On December 16, 1965 this Committee discussed the charge that had been placed in its hands. Tentatively, it was proposed that the Committee attempt to make a progress report in mid-February which would define the problem and delineate the areas which the Committee proposed to study. It was proposed that a second report might be sent to the Council at a later date which would delineate those agencies which would have to be established to study those areas identified in the previous report.

During the December 16 meeting, through the Chairman of the Faculty Committee on Student Affairs, Dr. Frederick D. Williams, President Hannah expressed by letter his concern about the relationships of students at Michigan State University with other members of the University community and with those beyond the campus. Some of the considerations passed on by President Hannah to the

Faculty Committee on Student Affairs may be summarized as follows:

- (a) The conditions under which the University was operating differed considerably from those prevailing in the past, in part because the society the University served had changed in many ways.
- (b) The necessity for a definition of the term "the academic freedom for students."
- (c) The necessity to define the University's relationship to the individual as a student and as a citizen.
- (d) The necessity for the delineation of the kind of rules and regulations the University should have in light of its mission.
- (e) The necessity for establishing processes and procedures for the formulation of rules and regulations.
- (f) The identification of those who should participate in the enforcement of regulations, the manner of enforcement and the specification of review and appeal procedures.
- (g) The discussions and deliberations of the entire matter should include students and faculty members not necessarily members of the committee.⁸

On January 19, 1966 John C. McQuitty, Chairman of the Board of the Associated Students of Michigan State University, directed a letter to Chairman Williams offering the assistance of student government in whatever way the Committee felt appropriate.⁹

⁸ Letter from President Hannah to Associate Professor Frederick D. Williams. Minutes of the Faculty Committee on Student Affairs, December 16, 1965.

⁹ Letter from John C. McQuitty to Professor Frederick Williams, Chairman, Faculty Committee on Student Affairs, January 19, 1966. Minutes of Faculty Committee on Student Affairs, December 20, 1966.

So it was that faculty, administration and students became involved in the process of dealing with the academic freedom for students.

On Januray 26, 1966, President Hannah met with the Faculty Committee on Student Affairs and discussed with the Committee the importance of the charge which had been placed upon the Committee by the Academic Council. President Hannah was hopeful that the Committee would be able to present a final report by the end of spring term.¹⁰

The Committee met with Professor Philip Moneypenny of the University of Illinois on January 28. Professor Moneypenny chaired the American Association of University Professors' Committee S which prepared the "Statement on Faculty Responsibility for the Academic Freedom of Students."¹¹

An initial press release was made by the Faculty Committee on Student Affairs for publication in the State News of January 31, 1966. It gave notice to the University of the assignment given by the Academic Council to the Committee and outlined the procedures which the Committee proposed to follow in conducting the study including the role students were expected to play.¹²

¹⁰ Minutes, Faculty Committee on Student Affairs, January 26, 1966.

¹¹ Committee S Report, op. cit.

¹² Press release by the Faculty Committee on Student Affairs, State News, January 31, 1966.

The release informed the academic community that the Committee would divide into four sub-committees, each with a special assignment. The sub-committees to be formed were:

- (1) The committee on Student Rights and Responsibilities in the classroom.
- (2) The committee on Student Rights and Responsibilities in activities on and off campus.
- (3) The committee on Student Records.
- (4) The committee on Student Rights and Responsibilities in Disciplinary Proceedings.

Each sub-committee was to be headed by a chairman. The chairman of the Faculty Committee was to be a member of each of the sub-committees with the responsibility for coordinating their activities. Comparable committees were to be established by the Associated Students of Michigan State University with the chairmen of the student sub-committees sitting with the Faculty sub-committee corresponding to their own.

Each sub-committee chairman was to be responsible for:

- (1) Compiling existing rules and structures relating to student rights and responsibilities in his assigned area of study. If information on such matters as origin of rules, substance of rules, enforcement procedures, and the like was unclear or non-existent, he was to indicate and attempt to define as accurately as possible actual current practices in such cases.
- (2) Coordinating the work of his committee with that of the comparable student group.
- (3) Calling and leading the meetings of his committee and reporting the results to the parent committee.

- (4) Conducting at least one open hearing in which interested members of the staff could place before the committee relevant criticisms and/or proposals.

The responsibilities of the Chairman of the Faculty Committee on Student Affairs as outlined in the press release were:

- (1) To sit with each of the sub-committees and participate in their activities as much as possible.
- (2) To assume the responsibility for coordinating and expediting the work of all sub-committees, student as well as faculty.
- (3) To be responsible for press releases in the activities of the committee.

The organizational chart on page 43 was released with the above information.¹³

On February 8, 1966 Chairman Williams presented the Academic Council with a progress report. In his opening comments he elaborated on a concept of academic freedom which was to provide a basic philosophy for the report:

Before enumerating our accomplishments and plans to date, I wish to acquaint you with the frame of reference we propose to utilize, at least tentatively, as we undertake our review and study. All of you doubtless realize that on campuses across the nation the matter of academic freedom for students is generating great controversy. Literature on this subject reveals at once how widely students and accomplished scholars differ in their definitions of the term. Some insist that 'academic freedom for students' is the equivalent of civil liberties, in that it obligates a university to exercise extraordinary restraint in governing the conduct of students. Some content that the term means only 'the right to learn,' others maintain that it means

¹³ Press release to State News, January 31, 1966.

FACULTY COMMITTEE ON STUDENT AFFAIRS
SUB-COMMITTEES

CLASSROOM RIGHTS AND RESPONSIBILITIES	ACTIVITIES ON AND OFF CAMPUS	RECORDS	PROCEDURE FOR DISCIPLINARY PROCEEDINGS
CLASSROOM ADVISEMENT COURSES ATTENDANCE LIBRARY	ORGANIZATIONS SPEAKERS PUBLICATIONS DISTRIBUTIONS ROOMS & EQUIPMENT OFF CAMPUS ACTIVITIES	ACADEMIC PLACEMENT COUNSELING RES. HALLS DISCIPLINARY	CHARGES HEARING APPEALS HANDBOOK OF RULES INVESTIGATION OF CONDUCT

THE CHAIRMAN OF THE FACULTY COMMITTEE
IS A MEMBER OF ALL SUB-COMMITTEES
WHOSE WORK HE SHALL COORDINATE

CLASSROOM ACTIVITIES	ASSOCIATED STUDENT OF MICHIGAN STATE UNIVERSITY	RECORDS	PROCEDURES
----------------------	--	---------	------------

THE BOARD OF ASMSU SHALL, THROUGH PROCEDURES IT DEEMS APPROPRIATE, STUDY THE RULES AND STRUCTURES RELATING TO STUDENT RIGHTS AND RESPONSIBILITIES. ALL STUDENTS SHALL BE GIVEN AN OPPORTUNITY TO EXPRESS THEIR VIEWS. AFTER COMPLETING THE STUDY, THE BOARD SHALL REPORT ITS FINDINGS IN DETAIL AND WITH SUPPORTING EVIDENCE TO THE FACULTY COMMITTEE ON STUDENT AFFAIRS, WHICH SHALL PARTICIPATE IN ALL PHASES OF THIS STUDY.

students have the right to be treated intelligently,' and still others insist that there is no such thing as 'academic freedom for students.'

After considering these and other views on the subject, the committee believes that it is most meaningful and realistic to regard 'academic freedom for students' as a term which refers to students' rights and responsibilities. But the problem now is to define those rights and responsibilities. In so doing, it would seem reasonable to consider first of all the purpose and function of a university.

Speaking generally a university exists to serve society, and its primary function is the advancement and dissemination of knowledge. Students are primarily concerned with study and learning, and certainly they have a right to do both. Accordingly a university should dedicate itself to the promotion of learning, not only in the classroom, but everywhere on campus. That this can be accomplished best where freedom and order prevail is beyond question. The difficulty, of course, is to strike a proper balance between the two. Each is essential. Freedom without order leads to chaos, and undue emphasis on order results in fettered freedom. The committee therefore believes that the most valid principle to observe throughout its study is maximum freedom and necessary order, for rules and structures which adhere to that principle are best designed to promote the primary function of the University.¹⁴

Professor Williams also informed the Council of the Committee's accomplishments to date which included: the procedure the Committee was to follow; the invitation extended to members of the campus community and the Greater Lansing community to submit letters expressing their views; the assignment of the sub-committees to deal with the particular aspects of the study; and the inclusion of four distinguished faculty consultants to assist the Committee.

¹⁴ Report to the Academic Council by Professor Frederick Williams, Chairman, Faculty Committee on Student Affairs, February 8, 1966.

After several meetings of the sub-committees guidelines on student rights and responsibilities were established against which to test the substance of a regulation or a decision. In the March 4th meeting the Committee passed a motion to present these revised and approved guidelines with an introductory statement as a basis for further direction and study. It was further moved that Professor Killingsworth develop a statement, which with guidelines would be presented as a progress report and a tentative document. This document with subsequent revisions was to become Article I of the "Freedom Report."¹⁵

At the direction of the Faculty Committee on Student Affairs, on April 21, 1966 Chairman Williams distributed to all members of the University Senate (tenured faculty) copies of three tentative guidelines which had been prepared by the subcommittees and approved by the Committee: On Student Rights and Duties (Article I); On Academic Rights and Responsibilities (Article II); and On Student Records at Michigan State University (Article III).

In the letter of explanation accompanying the guidelines, Professor Williams stated:

It should be clearly understood that the Committee on Student Affairs is neither revising existing regulations nor writing new ones. The Committee is reviewing and evaluating the University's regulations and structures relating to academic freedom for students.

¹⁵Minutes of the Faculty Committee on Student Affairs, March 4, 1966.

After several meetings devoted to procedural considerations, the Committee decided that its first major step was to establish guidelines. Then, once that task had been accomplished, the work of testing existing regulations against the guidelines, and the guidelines against the regulations, would be undertaken.

The Committee has now written three sets of guidelines and is testing them and existing regulations and record-keeping policies. This is being accomplished by members of the Committee, working in teams of two or three, who are interviewing officials of ~~all~~ University agencies or sub-divisions that have either regulations or records, or both. After completing these interviews, Committee members evaluate the regulations and/or record-keeping policies.¹⁶

Also in the letter of explanation Professor Williams solicited suggestions and criticisms relative to the three proposed guidelines. Several faculty members responded with suggestions for consideration and revision. In addition to the faculty the views of administrators were sought.

Prior to the Faculty Committee on Student Affairs work on the report, a student judiciary evaluation committee, appointed by the Associated Students of Michigan State University, had been in the process of evaluating and making recommendations for the revision of the judicial structure and procedures relating to student government. This committee, together with appointed members of the Faculty Committee on Student Affairs, formed a sub-committee on judicial process and procedures. The recommendations of

¹⁶Letter sent to Faculty Senate Members, April 21, 1966.

this sub-committee were developed into Article IV of the Report. Of special significance is the fact that Article IV provided for the establishment of a student-faculty judiciary which was given several responsibilities in addition to hearing cases of violations of student conduct regulations. The Student-Faculty Judiciary was assigned to consider appeals from students or student groups who object to the ruling of a lower judicial body, or who have asked to appear before such a body and have been denied a hearing, or from students or student groups who are appealing administrative decisions of a disciplinary nature. In addition, the Student Faculty Judiciary was assigned the responsibility of reviewing the substance of a regulation or an administrative decision which is alleged to be inconsistent with the guidelines in Article I ("Student Rights and Responsibilities"), Article II ("Academic Rights and Responsibilities"), Article III ("Student Records"), and Article VI ("Student Publications").¹⁷ Also the Student Faculty Judiciary was given the charge "to establish procedural rules for expediting urgent cases in which it is alleged that a regulation or administrative decision threatens immediate and irreparable infringement on student rights as defined by Articles I, II, III and IV of the Report."¹⁸ If the Student Faculty

¹⁷ Report on the "Academic Freedom for Students at Michigan State University," March 16, 1967. Article 4.3 4.6.

¹⁸ Op. cit., Article 4.3 4.6.

Judiciary decided that such was the case, the individual or group responsible for enforcing the challenged regulation or administrative decision could be requested to postpone or withdraw such action.

So it was that the Faculty Committee on Student Affairs built into the Report a process whereby those student rights properly defined in the report could be insured and the appropriateness of regulations could be tested. In addition provisions were made for the resolving of conflict or disagreement through orderly procedures.

During the deliberations of the Faculty Committee a new dimension in student-university relations came under consideration. Chairman Williams, after informal discussion, presented the Committee with a proposition for the establishment of a university official referred to as an Ombudsman. Williams' original proposal was revised considerably by the Committee. However, before the Committee's report to the Academic Council in June, the description and responsibilities of this office had been so well defined that eventually it became incorporated in Article VIII with little revision.¹⁹ The Ombudsman was perceived to be a high prestige official selected from the senior faculty with the responsibility of hearing and resolving complaints and grievances. He was to be given ready access to all university officials from the President on down.

¹⁹ Minutes of the Faculty Committee on Student Affairs, Tuesday, September 20, 1968.

In summarizing this new and unique office after the first years experience, the Ombudsman at Michigan State University, Dr. James Rust, made the following observations:

. . . the Ombudsman at Michigan State deals with problems and grievances of many different kinds. Many arise from misunderstanding or human fallibility. Some arise from attempts by clerks and secretaries to deal with matters they are not really qualified to handle. Many, of course, turn out to be groundless when carefully investigated. Nevertheless, the fact that there was someone to whom the student could appeal is of considerable importance.

In the best of worlds, there would be no need for an ombudsman, for all public servants and all faculty members and employees of universities would be doing their jobs perfectly. Until that world arrives, however, trouble-shooters, whether called ombudsman or not, will be needed.²⁰

Simultaneous to the considerations being undertaken by the sub-committee on judicial structure and procedures, a subcommittee was in the process of drawing up recommendations relating to the State News, the student newspaper, and student publications. This subcommittee worked closely with the Board of Student Publications and consulted with such persons as the Chairman of the Greater Lansing Branch of the Civil Liberties Union, the University attorney and consultants on campus who were familiar with the topic of student publications and their distribution. The recommendations put forth by this subcommittee were to undergo extensive revisions and later to become Article VI of the Report.

²⁰ Brochure prepared by the Ombudsman, Michigan State University, 1968.

At the same time a subcommittee was at work drawing up recommendations for procedures for student government to formulate regulations governing student conduct. Essentially it provided the structure for involvement of all levels of student government in formulating regulations. Further, it provided the mechanics to work out points of disagreement between the Student Board of the Associated Students of Michigan State University and the Faculty Committee on Student Affairs over proposed regulations. The recommendations presented by this subcommittee were subject to little revision and eventually became Article V.

With the addition of a section on the procedure for revising and amending the guidelines and a section on general recommendations including the orientation of new students regarding their rights and duties, the report was completed by the Faculty Committee on Student Affairs for presentation to the Academic Council on June 8, 1966.

In the introduction the Faculty Committee on Student Affairs gave a brief description of the Report. This introduction with the deletion of the second paragraph, which described those specific tasks left unfinished by the Committee, was to become the preface to the Report. It read as follows:

The Faculty Committee on Student Affairs prepared this report after an extensive and intensive review and study of the University's rules and structures relating to academic freedom for students. The report recommends guidelines which represent the Committee's attempt to identify rights and duties of students in regard to conduct, academic pursuits, the keeping of records, and publications. It proposes structures and procedures for the formulation of regulations governing student conduct, for the interpretation and amendment of the guidelines, for the adjudication of student disciplinary cases, and for channeling to the faculty and administration student complaints and concerns in the academic area. The report also contains a section of general recommendations on a number of important subjects.

We wish to caution against one possible kind of misinterpretation of our recommendations. In some respects, what we propose represents major changes in present policies, structures, and procedures. But that is not true of all of our proposals. In some important respects, our recommendations simply make explicit what has long been understood and practiced at Michigan State University.

Although the Committee's study centered on academic freedom for students, we made no attempt to formulate a general and abstract definition of that term, or to explain it in an interpretive essay. Instead we have directed our energies to the formulation of an operational definition and concrete application of the concept. This report identifies rights and duties of students and provides for them a carefully prescribed system of substantive and procedural due process; and we submit these guidelines, structures, and procedures as a testament of the Committee's concept of academic freedom for students.²¹

Of particular note in the introduction is the paragraph calling attention to the fact that some of the recommendations contained in the report were simply a restatement of principles long practiced at Michigan State

²¹ Preface to the report on the "Academic Freedom for Students at Michigan State University."

University. So it was that such implied student rights long recognized at Michigan State University became explicit.

The report of the Faculty Committee on Student Affairs, entitled, "Academic Freedom for Students at Michigan State University," was received by the Academic Council on June 7, 1966. The Council moved to have the Steering Committee of the Academic Council over the summer period assume the responsibility for receiving opinions from members of the academic community, for identifying in particular the areas of significant agreement in the report, and for preparing materials in a form which would facilitate the deliberations of the Council scheduled to begin in September.²²

During the summer of 1966 the Academic Steering Committee considered the report and forwarded its recommendations on to the Faculty Committee on Student Affairs. On September 19, the recommendations of the Steering Committee were taken under advisement by the Faculty Committee on Student Affairs.²³

On September 21, 1966 a special meeting of the Academic Council was called by President Hannah for the express purpose of considering the Report. Dr. John F. A.

²²Minutes of the Academic Council, Michigan State University, June 7, 1966.

²³Minutes of the Faculty Committee on Student Affairs, Michigan State University, September 19, 1966.

Taylor, Chairman of the Steering Committee, reported that his committee had solicited opinions from members of the academic community for identifying in particular the areas of disagreement with the report. At that time he submitted a set of recommendations for consideration by the Council. With the concurrence of Dr. Williams, Chairman of the Faculty Committee on Student Affairs, Dr. Taylor presented the Council with suggested changes. The Steering Committee was in general agreement with the report and only minor revisions were made. One exception existed, however, and that related to the whole question of student publications. The Steering Committee recommended that an ad hoc committee be formed to review this difficult area of student publications. However, it was brought to the attention of the Council by Dr. Charles Killingsworth, consultant to the Committee on Student Affairs, that it was important that the section of the Report on student publications not be separated. A lengthy discussion followed in which questions were raised about the various degrees of freedom which should be accorded the students in expressing their views through various publications. In addition much discussion centered around the many legal and technical problems involved in the relationship of such publications and the University.²⁴

²⁴Minutes of the Academic Council Meeting, September 21, 1966.

It was moved by the Council to refer the matter concerning the State News and other student publications back to the Committee on Student Affairs for reconsideration. Dr. John H. Reincoehl, the newly elected chairman of the Committee on Student Affairs, moved that the Council approve in principle the position taken by the Committee with respect to the freedom and responsibility of students in regard to student publications.²⁵

At the September 27th meeting of the Council some concern was expressed over the speed of the deliberations in considering the Report. The Council was assured by President Hannah that he wished only to keep the momentum going for the consideration of the Report and that its acceptance should come about only after thorough discussion and deliberation.²⁶

At that same meeting the Chairman of the Steering Committee presented the Council with a number of recommendations for revision of the Report. The Report was considered item by item and line by line. It should be noted that the recommendations presented to the Council had the concurrence of the Committee on Student Affairs. The Report was then returned to the Committee on Student Affairs for revision in light of the recommendations, and recommendations yet

²⁵Op. cit.

²⁶Minutes of the Academic Council Meeting, September 27, 1966.

to be considered, with the understanding that the Report would be returned to the Academic Council for further consideration.²⁷

In the October 11th meeting of the Academic Council the Council considered the remaining recommendations which completed the charge of the Steering Committee to receive, order and transmit the faculty responses to the Report.²⁸

The recommendations made by the Academic Council during the fall meetings were taken under advisement by the Faculty Committee on Student Affairs. There appeared to be general concurrence on the part of the Faculty Committee on Student Affairs with the recommendations referred to the Committee by the Academic Council. However, in the area of student publications the Faculty Committee on Student Affairs had reaffirmed its earlier position.

A revised version of the Report was accepted by the Academic Council for purposes of discussion by its members at the November 8 meeting. Responses were made to the Report by the Chairmen of the Educational Policies Committee and Faculty Affairs Committee. Concerns over substantive matters in the report by the members of the Academic Council were heard. Also President Hannah made a number of

²⁷Minutes of the Academic Council Meeting, September 29, 1966.

²⁸Minutes of the Academic Council Meeting, October 11, 1966.

suggested changes in the Report for consideration by the Committee.²⁹

The Associated Students of Michigan State University considered the revised November version of the Report and forwarded a document of suggested revisions to the Faculty Committee on Student Affairs. In the introduction to the suggested amendments James M. Graham, Chairman of the Associated Students stated the following:

The Associated Students of Michigan State University have spent a good deal of time these two weeks in considering the revised Academic Freedom Report of the Faculty Committee on Student Affairs. The enclosed recommendations are the product of hours of serious thought and discussion over certain sections of the report.

You will notice that our major concern is over student responsibilities in the academic area. Basically, however, the Student Board supports the entire report as a truly progressive step in student involvement. It is our hope that the report will be adopted, incorporating our recommendations.³⁰

Thus, in the final stages of developing the Report there tended to be some area of disagreement. With the students it was the article dealing with academic rights and responsibilities. They contended that student participation should be expanded in the areas of academic administration, advising, classroom conduct and course content and that the report had made little provision for such

²⁹Minutes of the Academic Council Meeting, November 8, 1966.

³⁰"A Report of Suggested Revisions of the Associated Students of Michigan State University to the Faculty Committee on Student Affairs," November, 1966.

participation. On the other hand some faculty expressed concerns that commitments had been made to students in this area which at some future date the University might find impossible to fulfill. This sentiment seemed to be expressed through the eventual inclusion of the section dealing with the professional rights of the faculty. For the administration the area of greatest concern had to do with the responsibilities for the management of student publications and the extension of the statement of rights, responsibilities and conduct of students to cover areas beyond the classroom. It should be noted that every attempt had been made to publicize the various versions of the Report and other documents relating to the Report in the State News so that all members of the University would be informed and would have the opportunity to communicate to the Faculty Committee on Student Affairs.

Deluged with such recommendations the Faculty Committee on Student Affairs had the arduous task of screening, communicating and interpreting such concerns.³¹ In light of the revisions made with the concurrence of the Academic Council and the comments received from the several faculty committees, student government and individuals, the Faculty Committee on Student Affairs prepared a second revision of the Report and submitted it to the Academic Council for

³¹Minutes of the Faculty Committee on Student Affairs, Michigan State University, November 10, 1966.

consideration on December 6, 1966. A special meeting of the Academic Council was called on January 4, 1967 for the primary purpose of considering the Report . In order to expedite the matter of considering the Report the following procedures were established by the Academic Council.³²

- a. The Council was to remain in continuous session, meeting daily until the final disposition of the report could be gained.
- b. Four members of the Committee on Student Affairs, whose appointments had expired, were requested to continue in a consultative capacity to the Council.
- c. An invitation was extended to the officers of the student government to make a formal presentation of their views.

After an explanation presented by the Chairman of the Student Affairs Committee of the changes made in the revised Report the Council considered the report item by item. The following significant amendments were made during the four days of deliberation by the Academic Council:³³

- a. As a frame of reference, including a social basis for student action, a preamble was added to the Report.
- b. The role of the Committee on Academic Rights and Responsibilities of Students which had been established by the report was clarified.

³²Minutes of the Faculty Committee on Student Affairs, Michigan State University, November 10, 1966.

³³Minutes of the Academic Council, Michigan State University, January 4, 5, 6, 10, 1967.

- c. The addition of a section on the professional rights of the faculty to the article on academic rights and responsibilities of students.
- d. A substantial revision of the sections dealing with student publications and their distribution.

The Report was approved by the Academic Council on January 10, 1967 and sent to the Faculty Senate, which approved it on February 28, 1967. Adoption became final with the approval of the Board of Trustees on March 16, 1967.

Summary

This chapter has presented a brief history of the development of the report on the "Academic Freedom for Students at Michigan State University." It represents a new dimension in student-university relations at Michigan State University, developed only after long and arduous labor on the part of many members of the University, students, faculty and administrators. It represents the efforts of a large public university to not only take a look at the many complex problems facing students but also a willingness to work out differences in a reasoned manner and to make needed changes where and when necessary. Most important it establishes procedures and guidelines so that changes can be made in an orderly fashion. Those who were greatly involved in the development of the Report look upon it in the form of a constitution or articles of

good faith. In the final analysis the success of this bold experiment rests in the good faith placed in the document and its principles by all members of the University.

CHAPTER IV

DESIGN AND METHODOLOGY

Introduction

Chapter IV is devoted to a description of the methods and procedures used in conducting the study. A description of the following is included: the description of the population and the method for sampling; the description of the instrument used and procedure for its development; and the procedures used in obtaining and analyzing the data.

Description of the Population and Selection of the Sample

Four different populations were used for this study:

1. The student population consisted of all full-time (12 credits or more) sophomores, juniors and seniors attending Michigan State during the fall of 1968 and who had attended Michigan State during the 1967-68 academic year.
2. The student leader population consisted of those students who qualified for the above and who had been selected by their peers to serve in the student government of the University, either as a living unit president or at the All-University level.
3. The faculty population included all the Michigan State University faculty currently holding the academic rank of assistant professor, associate professor or full professor and who had appointments at Michigan State during the 1967-68 academic year.

4. The administration population consisted of full-time professional staff or faculty members who were engaged during the fall term in general or academic administration at Michigan State University and who held appointments during the 1967-68 academic year.

The 1968 Student Directory was used to randomly select 100 undergraduate students of sophomore, junior or senior standing at Michigan State University. The 1967 Student Directory was used to verify attendance during the 1967-68 academic year. A random procedure was used in selecting 100 individuals for the sample from a population of approximately twenty thousand. Of the 100 students selected 83 or 83 per cent returned the questionnaire of which 74 were useable for statistical purposes.

The population used for selecting elected student leaders consisted of all residence hall, fraternity, sorority, and cooperative presidents, student organization presidents and officers of the Associated Students of Michigan State University. One hundred (100) student leaders were randomly selected from a population of 162. Class standing was checked through the 1968 Student Directory and verification of attendance for the 1967-68 academic year was substantiated by using the 1967 Student Directory. Of the 100 student leaders selected 79 or 79 per cent responded of which 74 were statistically useable.

A card file containing the names and rank of all faculty at Michigan State University for the academic year of 1967-68 was used to select faculty. One hundred (100)

93

faculty were selected randomly from a population of approximately eighteen hundred. The current faculty and staff directory was used to determine if the faculty person was in fact at the University during the fall term of 1968. Of the 100 sampled 89 or 89 per cent returned the questionnaire. Eighty-two (82) of the questionnaires were useable statistically. Seven faculty felt that they could not respond by giving opinions and five responded by indicating comments only.

Reasons given for returning questionnaires without responses were that the respondent was unfamiliar with the document and its purposes or that his responsibilities and duties were not related to the principle. One hundred (100) administrators were selected from the academic and central administration organizational listings of Michigan State University, for the 1968-69 academic year. The population consisted of over two-hundred (200) department chairmen, directors, assistant deans, deans and central administrators. Of the one-hundred (100) selected eighty-one (81) responded with seventy-four (74) of the returns statistically useable.

Procedures Used in Developing the Instrument and Obtaining the Data

An instrument consisting of forty statements or principles extracted from the report on the "Academic Freedom for Students at Michigan State University" was

developed to solicit the opinions of randomly selected respondents.¹ The forty statements were selected and refined from an original seventy item questionnaire. The original questionnaire included policies and practices which were subsequently eliminated from the questionnaire. The original questionnaire was responded to by twenty student personnel deans throughout the United States. They were invited to critique the questionnaire as to clarity, purpose and content. In addition personal interviews were conducted with several individuals knowledgeable in questionnaire construction and survey methods. The office of Institutional Research at Michigan State University was consulted for an appraisal of the questionnaire.

The basis for the questionnaire was the assumption that the selected principles are desired goals which if accepted in spirit, would bring University policies and practices closer to these principles. Those principles or guidelines used were categorized into four areas: academic and classroom, student records, student conduct and regulations and student publications and freedom of expression. Each respondent was asked to make two responses to each principle:

- (a) the degree which he felt the principle to be desirable;

¹Copy of the questionnaire is found in Appendix A.

- (b) the degree which he felt practices have moved closer to the principle over the past year because of the Academic Freedom Report.

Respondents were asked to select and circle a number on a scale ranging from one to five, indicating the degree which they felt the principle to be desirable and practices to have changed. Also the respondents were questioned as to whether they had access to the Academic Freedom Report and had in fact read the document.

During the week of November 19, 1968, the questionnaire was mailed with a personal cover letter to each person selected in the sample. A self-addressed, stamped envelope was enclosed with the questionnaire to enhance a prompt return. Each questionnaire was coded for identifying non-respondents. After a period of two weeks a follow-up letter was sent to faculty and administrators in the sample groups who had not responded. Students and student leaders who had failed to respond were given a personal telephone call. In the event the questionnaire had been mislaid or discarded, another questionnaire was mailed. The responses of the sample groups are summarized in Table 1.

Analyzing the Data

The data obtained from the questionnaire was key punched and programmed on an IBM 3600 computer. Contingency tables are used to interpret the findings with responses being reported in frequencies and percentages. The

TABLE 1.--Responses to the questionnaire: number and percentage of responses by sample groups.

	No. in Sample	Number Responded	Useable Responses	Per Cent Responded
Students	100	83	74	83%
Student Leaders	100	79	74	79%
Faculty	100	89	82	89%
Administrators	100	81	74	81%
TOTAL	400	332	304	83%

statistic used in analyzing the data in the study was chi square with the .05 level of confidence being established to determine statistical significance.

Comments made by two or more respondents relating to specific principles were edited and are included in reporting the data.

Summary

The design and methodology for this descriptive study has been presented in this chapter. A description of the populations and procedures used in the selection of samples was given along with the methods for analyzing the data.

CHAPTER V

ANALYSIS OF THE DATA

Introduction

Chapter V contains an analysis of the data concerning the opinions of the four groups of respondents to (a) the desirability of selected principles contained in the report on the "Academic Freedom for Students at Michigan State University" and (b) the degree which they felt practices at Michigan State University had changed as a result of the implementation of the principle. It should be noted that the statements under items 38, 39 and 40 in the questionnaire are not principles contained in the Report but are guidelines relating to students freedom of expression which underlie the speaker's policy developed at Michigan State University in 1962.

Comments, similar in content and meaning, made by two or more respondents have been edited and are included with the statistical analysis of the responses to each principle. The data is grouped under four areas of student freedoms: academic and classroom; student records; regulations, rules and student conduct; and freedom of expression.

Access to the Report

It was written into the Report as a part of Article VII that current regulations and structures relating to student rights and responsibilities be made available to every member of the academic community. Copies of the Report were mailed to all faculty and staff and distributed to students at registration. To evaluate the awareness of the respondents to the Report, they were asked (1) if they had access to the Report and (2) whether they had read the Report. Table 2 presents an analysis of the responses to the two questions.

TABLE 2.--Responses to the question as to whether the respondent had access to the Report and had read the Report.

	a. Responses to having access to Report			b. Responses to having read the Report		
	Yes	N	No	Yes	N	No
Students	59		13	28		43
Student Leaders	73		1	61		13
Faculty	75		1	58		14
Administrators	68		0	65		2
TOTAL	275		15	212		72

Respondents tended to complete the questionnaire even though they had not read the Report. No mention was made in the directions to the questionnaire that the respondent should or should not answer the questionnaire relative to his response to having read the Report. It should be noted that some of the questionnaires were returned unanswered but with the comment from the respondent that he had not read the Report, therefore he did not feel qualified to respond to the questions.

Many of those sampled made responses only to those principles about which they felt knowledgeable. Many felt unqualified to make any judgment in the change in practices as indicated on Scale b. While student leaders tended to respond to both Scale a and b, administrators and faculty tended to respond to Scale b only when they felt the principle was relevant to their specific position or duties in the University.

Analysis

Academic and Classroom

As shown in Table 3 there was no significant difference among the four groups on either Scale a or b under the principle stating that the student is free to take reasoned exception to data and views offered in the classroom, and to reserve judgment about matters of opinion, without fear of penalty.

TABLE 3.--The student is free to take reasoned exception to data and views offered in the classroom, and to reserve judgment about matters of opinion, without fear of penalty.

Scale	a. Undesirable						a. Highly Desirable					
	b. No Change						b. Great Change					
	1		2		3		4		5			
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	Total	
Students	a. 0	0.0	0	0.0	7	0.5	14	18.9	53	71.6	74	
	b. 19	29.7	17	26.6	22	34.4	5	7.8	1	1.6	64	
Student Leaders	a. 0	0.0	1	1.4	4	5.4	10	13.5	59	79.7	74	
	b. 16	21.9	21	28.8	28	38.4	6	8.2	2	2.7	73	
Faculty	a. 2	2.5	1	1.3	4	5.0	14	17.5	59	73.8	81	
	b. 23	39.0	16	27.1	14	23.7	5	8.5	1	1.7	59	
Administrators	a. 0	0.0	1	1.4	4	5.5	12	16.4	56	76.7	73	
	b. 18	28.6	17	27.0	25	39.7	3	4.8	0	0.0	63	
Total	a. 2		3		19		50		227		301	
	b. 76		71		89		19		4		259	
Mean	a. 4.7				Std. Dev.		a. .7					
	b. 2.2						b. 1.0					

All four groups indicated the principle to be highly desirable with a mean response of 4.7 on the 5.0 point scale. Relative to the change in practices that had occurred as the result of implementation of the principle, the groups tended to indicate that little change had taken place with a mean response of 2.2 on the 5 point scale.

Twelve (12) students and student leaders made the comment that this practice was in existence before the Report and that they had experienced no difficulty in expressing their views in class. Sixteen (16) faculty commented that the student had always been availed of this right in their classes and therefore no change was necessary. Eighteen (18) administrators took the same position.

Five (5) students and student leaders felt that although disagreement is allowed, it is necessary that the opinion of the professor be written on examinations and not that of their own. Three (3) students and student leaders felt that they were hesitant in expressing their views for fear of receiving a lower grade in the course. Three (3) students, two (2) student leaders, four (4) faculty and four (4) administrators commented that this right could be abused by the student and valuable class time dissipated.

In Table 4 an analysis is presented of the responses to the principle stating that the student is protected against improper disclosure of information concerning his

TABLE 4.--The student is protected against improper disclosure of information concerning his grades, views, beliefs, political associations, health, or character which an instructor acquires in the course of his professional relations with the student.

Scale	a. Undesirable								a. Highly Desirable		
	b. No Change								b. Great Change		
	1		2		3		4		5		Total
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	
Students	a. 0	0.0	1	1.4	4	4.5	14	18.9	55	74.3	74
	b. 19	32.2	12	20.3	20	33.9	7	11.9	1	1.7	59
Student Leaders	a. 0	0.0	3	4.1	3	4.1	12	16.2	56	75.7	74
	b. 13	18.6	18	25.7	18	25.7	15	21.4	6	8.6	70
Faculty	a. 4	5.1	3	3.8	10	12.2	9	11.5	52	66.7	78
	b. 15	24.6	18	29.5	20	32.8	6	9.8	2	3.3	61
Administrators	a. 3	4.2	0	0.0	3	4.2	16	22.2	50	69.4	72
	b. 10	15.2	12	18.2	22	33.3	16	24.2	6	9.1	66
Total	a. 7	2.3	7	2.3	20	6.7	51	17.7	213	71.5	298
	b. 57	22.3	60	23.4	80	31.3	44	17.7	15	5.9	256
Mean	a. 4.5								a. .9		
	b. 2.6								b. 1.2		

grades, views, beliefs, political associations, health or character which an instructor acquires in the course of his professional relations with the student.

No significant difference existed in the opinion of the groups. Two-hundred and thirteen (213) or 71.5% of the 298 persons responding to the item indicated the principle to be highly desirable. The mean rating for the four groups was 4.5 on the 5 point scale.

Of the 256 responding to Scale b, 197 or 77% marked the scale at 3 or below indicating in their opinion there had been no or little change in practices. The mean on Scale b was 2.6. This was clarified by comments in which three (3) students, seven (7) student leaders, ten (10) faculty, and nine (9) administrators indicated that the practice was followed before implementation of the Report. Four (4) faculty and administrators commented that their awareness of the practice had increased. Two (2) faculty felt that the principle may cause faculty to be over-protective to the possible detriment of the student. Three (3) students and student leaders indicated a concern about fellow students (resident assistants and fraternity officers) having access to their grades. Eight (8) students and student leaders felt that this right had never been violated in their years at the University.

Table 5 shows that the principle stating that the student receives accurate and clearly stated information

TABLE 5.--The student receives accurate and clearly stated information which enables him to determine his own academic relationship with the University and any special conditions which apply.

Scale	a. Undesirable						a. Highly Desirable					
	b. No Change						b. Great Change					
	1		2		3		4		5		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%		
Students	a. 1	1.4	0	0	6	8.1	12	16.2	55	74.3	74	
	b. 30	45.5	20	30.3	10	15.2	5	7.6	1	1.5	66	
Student Leaders	a. 1	1.4	1	1.4	3	4.1	11	15.1	57	78.1	73	
	b. 21	29.2	27	37.5	13	18.1	9	12.5	2	2.8	72	
Faculty	a. 0	0.0	2	2.7	2	2.7	14	18.7	57	76	75	
	b. 11	19.3	18	31.6	14	24.6	13	22.8	1	1.8	57	
Administrators	a. 1	1.4	0	0.0	7	10.0	4	5.7	58	82.9	70	
	b. 9	14.1	18	28.1	29	45.3	7	10.9	1	1.6	64	
Total	a. 3	1.0	3	1.0	18	6.2	41	14	227	77.7	292	
	b. 71	27.4	83	32	66	25.5	34	13.1	5	1.9	259	
Mean	a. 4.7					Std. Dev.	a. .7					
	b. 2.3						b. 1.1					
Scale b. DF 12 χ^2 34.961 Significant at .01 level												

which enables him to determine his own academic relationship with the University and any special conditions which apply was perceived to be a highly desirable principle by all four groups. Little difference was indicated in their responses with the mean being 4.7 for all groups.

Some difference existed in the opinions that practices have changed as a result of the principle. Significant difference was found among the groups at the .01 level of confidence. Faculty and administrators perceived a greater change in practices than did students and student leaders. Seven (7) administrators and three (3) faculty commented that their departments and colleges were striving to improve practices in academic advising and the communicating of requirements. Three (3) students and two (2) student leaders stated that the academic advisors were effective in translating the requirements but that they were often busy or difficult to locate. Four (4) students and three (3) student leaders indicated that the information even when obtained was rather vague. Five (5) student leaders and two (2) students felt that the student should rely on his own initiative and not rely on the academic advisors.

Table 6 gives an analysis of the responses to the principle that the student receives accurate and clearly stated information which enables him to determine the general requirements for establishing and maintaining an acceptable academic standing. Significant differences were

TABLE 6.--The student receives accurate and clearly stated information which enables him to determine the general requirements for establishing and maintaining an acceptable academic standing.

Scale	a. Undesirable						a. Highly Desirable					
	b. No Change						b. Great Change					
	1		2		3		4		5			
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	Total	
Students	a. 0	0.0	1	1.4	5	6.8	10	13.5	58	78.4	74	
	b. 24	38.1	17	27	13	20.6	8	12.7	1	1.6	63	
Student Leaders	a. 0	0.0	0	0.0	2	2.7	11	14.9	61	82.4	74	
	b. 26	35.1	17	23	20	27	9	12.2	2	2.7	74	
Faculty	a. 0	0.0	0	0.0	4	5.3	9	11.8	63	82.9	76	
	b. 16	28.6	15	26.8	18	32.1	6	10.7	1	1.8	56	
Administrators	a. 0	0.0	0	0.0	2	2.8	8	11.1	62	86.1	72	
	b. 12	17.9	16	23.9	25	37.3	10	14.9	4	6	67	
Total	a. 0	0.0	1	.3	13	4.4	38	12.8	244	82.4	296	
	b. 78	30	65	25	76	29.2	33	12.7	8	3.1	260	
Mean	a. 4.8											
	b. 2.3											
					Std. Dev.		a. .5					
							b. 1.1					

not found for either Scale a or b. The principle was perceived to be highly desirable as indicated by the mean of 4.8.

Little difference was noted in opinions of the four groups regarding change in practices. The mean was 2.3. Eleven (11) student leaders and six (6) students indicated that although the information may be available in some form, it is often unclear and not thoroughly understood. Four (4) student leaders and (2) students expressed an opinion that this was especially the case with the new grading system and the step scale. On the other hand five (5) students and six (6) student leaders maintained that the information was received in an understandable manner. Six (6) administrators and four (4) faculty indicated that special efforts had been made in recent years to improve communications. Three (3) administrators and two (2) faculty felt that their colleges had done well in this area prior to the Report.

Responses to the principle dealing with the establishment of procedures for hearing complaints to reconcile the right of a faculty and the right of a student are analyzed in Table 7. The responses to the desirability of the principle tended to be high with a mean of 4.7 for the four groups. Although the difference in responses was slight, it was high enough to be significantly different at the .05 level of confidence.

TABLE 7.--Procedures are established for hearing complaints to reconcile a right of the faculty and the right of a student.

Scale	a. Undesirable						a. Highly Desirable					
	b. No Change						b. Great Change					
	1		2		3		4		5		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%		
Students	a.	0	0.0	0	0.0	2	2.7	13	17.6	59	79.7	74
	b.	7	11.1	14	22.2	21	33.3	14	22.2	7	11.1	63
Student Leaders	a.	0	0.0	1	1.4	2	2.7	8	10.8	63	85.1	74
	b.	8	11.3	16	22.5	16	22.5	23	32.4	8	11.3	71
Faculty	a.	0	0.0	1	1.3	6	7.6	15	19.0	57	72.2	79
	b.	10	15.6	6	9.4	17	26.6	19	29.7	12	18.8	64
Adminis- trators	a.	0	0.0	0	0.0	11	15.3	7	9.7	54	75	72
	b.	5	7.1	16	22.9	22	31.4	15	21.4	12	17.1	70
Total	a.	0	0.0	2	0.7	21	7.0	43	14.4	233	77.9	299
	b.	30	11.2	52	19.4	76	28.4	71	26.5	39	14.6	268
Mean	a.	4.7				Std. Dev.		a.	.6			
	b.	3.1						b.	1.2			

Scale a. DF 9 χ^2 17.24 Significant at .05 level

No significant difference was observed in the responses to Scale b. The mean for the four groups was 3.1. Five (5) administrators, four (4) faculty and two (2) student leaders commented that such procedures existed before the implementation of the Report. Three (3) faculty indicated that awareness had increased and that channels had been established in their departments since the implementation of the Report. Two (2) administrators and three (3) faculty felt that faculty rights had been overlooked regarding this principle. Four (4) students considered the Ombudsman to be very helpful in this matter. Four (4) student leaders and two (2) students commented that although procedures may exist, they are too involved and time consuming. Two (2) student leaders felt that this was the most significant principle in the Report.

Table 8 shows an analysis of the responses to the principle that membership is provided for students on regular departmental and college committees in which problems are discussed and policies formulated. Students and student leaders perceived the principle to be more desirable than faculty and administrators. Difference was found to be significant at the .01 level of confidence. Although opinions of the groups differed, the principle was still believed to be desirable with a mean response of 4.2 for the four groups.

TABLE 8.--Membership is provided for students on regular departmental and college committees in which problems are discussed and policies formulated.

On Scale b there tended to be general agreement as to the extent in the change of practices with a mean response of 3.3 noted for the four groups. Students perceived less change in practices than the other three groups.

Three (3) students commented that the methods used in the selection of students to serve on such committees were not truly representative. Three (3) student leaders felt that such representation should be extended to the Board of Trustees. Five (5) student leaders and two (2) students felt that such committees were not really meeting the students needs. Two student leaders believed that students were on such committees only because they demanded such representation and not because of the good will of the faculty. One (1) student leader and one (1) student questioned the knowledgeability of students serving on such committees to the extent to be able to make a contribution in academic matters.

Three (3) administrators felt that this principle has brought about the most extensive change in practices in the University. It was felt by two (2) administrators and three (3) faculty members that some committees should not have student representation. There was concern that students should not participate in discussions on faculty matters. Two (2) administrators and (1) faculty person felt that students tended to lose interest quickly in the work of such committees. Three (3) administrators

indicated that their colleges or departments had established advisory committees which were functioning rather well.

The analysis of responses to the principle stating that departments and colleges have clearly defined channels for the receipt and consideration of student complaints appears in Table 9. No significant difference was found among the groups relative to the desirability of the principle. The mean rating was 4.6, indicating the four groups believed the principle to be highly desirable.

Some difference was noted among the groups on Scale b in that students tended to rate the change in practices slightly lower than the other three groups. The difference was significant at the .05 level of confidence. Little change was recognized by the four groups with the mean rating being 2.3.

Ten (10 student leaders, four (4) students and two (2) administrators made comments that either the channels are non existent or they are so poorly defined it is impossible to use them. One (1) student leader and one (1) faculty person indicated that the channels exist but nothing is really ever done about complaints. Two (2) administrators felt that colleges and departments are making progress in this area, while another administrator felt that they were dragging their feet on this principle.

α
3

Scale	a. Undesirable						a. Highly Desirable						Total
	b. No Change						b. Great Change						
	1		2		3		4		5				
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%			
Students	a. 0	0	1	1.4	6	8.1	13	17.6	54	73	74		
	b. 26	41.3	22	34.9	11	17.5	3	4.8	1	1.6	63		
Student Leaders	a. 0	0	1	1.4	2	2.7	10	13.5	61	82.4	74		
	b. 20	27.4	24	32.9	19	26	10	13.7	0	0	73		
Faculty	a. 0	0	1	1.3	9	11.5	18	23.1	50	64.1	78		
	b. 15	22.7	16	24.2	20	30.3	8	12.1	7	10.6	66		
Administrators	a. 0	0	1	1.4	6	8.2	19	26	47	64.4	73		
	b. 13	19.7	22	33.3	19	28.8	10	15.2	2	3.0	66		
Total	a. 0.0		4		23		60		212		299		
	b. 74		84		69		31		10		286		
Mean	a. 4.6				Std. Dev.		a. 0.7						
	b. 2.3						b. 1.1						
Scale b. DF 12 χ^2 25.74 Significant at .05 level													

Student Records

Table 10 shows an analysis of the responses to the principle that all policies and practices concerning records are based on respect for the privacy of the individual student. The principle was perceived to be highly desirable with the mean response for the four groups being 4.6.

Greater difference existed among the groups regarding opinions on the extent which practices had changed in the University. The student leaders and administrators felt that practices had changed slightly more than did students and faculty. Difference among the four groups was significant at the .05 level of confidence.

Four (4) administrators, four (4) faculty, three (3) student leaders and two (2) students felt that this practice was evident before the implementation of the Report. Four (4) student leaders and two (2) students made comments that there seemed to be a tightening up on the release of records. This has been evidenced, they indicated by the changes in various record policies. Four (4) student leaders and one (1) student felt that various individuals in the University violated this respect for privacy.

The responses to the principle stating that there is a demonstrable need for all records retained which is

TABLE 10.--All policies and practices concerning records are based on respect for the privacy of the individual student.

Scale	a. Undesirable						a. Highly Desirable					
	b. No Change						b. Great Change					
	1		2		3		4		5		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%		
Students	a.	0	0	1	1.4	4	5.4	8	10.8	61	81.4	74
	b.	16	25.8	13	21.0	23	37.1	7	11.3	3	4.8	62
Student Leaders	a.	0	0	1	1.4	4	5.5	5	6.8	63	86.3	73
	b.	12	17.4	8	11.6	24	34.8	16	23.2	9	13.0	69
Faculty	a.	0	0	4	5.1	10	12.7	10	12.7	55	69.6	79
	b.	14	23	18	29.5	17	27.9	9	14.8	3	4.9	61
Administrators	a.	0	0	2	2.0	8	11.0	13	17.8	50	68.5	73
	b.	11	16.2	10	14.7	20	29.4	13	19.1	14	20.6	68
Total	a.	0		8		26		36		229		299
	b.	53		49		84		45		29		260
Mean	a.	4.6					Std. Dev.	a.	.8			
	b.	2.8						b.	1.3			
	Scale b.	DF	12	χ^2	22.50		Significant at .05 level					

reasonably related to the basic necessities and purposes of the institution are analyzed in Table 11.

Sixty-seven per cent (67%) of the faculty and sixty-five per cent (65%) of the administrators responding to the question tended to perceive the principle as being highly desirable whereas only thirty per cent (30%) of the students and forty-nine per cent (49%) of the student leaders categorized their responses accordingly. Difference regarding the desirability of the principle was significant at the .01 level.

Little change in practices were perceived by the four groups with the mean response being 2.5. Five (5) administrators, two (2) faculty and one (1) student made comments that in their opinion there had been little change since practices in the University adhered to this principle before implementation of the Report. Three (3) student leaders, three (3) students and one (1) faculty member expressed concern that many records were being retained by the University which did not relate to the individual's status as a student. One (1) faculty person and one (1) administrator felt that the various colleges and departments in the University needed to evaluate their practices relative to this principle.

Table 12 shows the responses to the principle stating that records of a student's religious or political beliefs are not retained without his knowledge or consent. The

TABLE 11.--There is a demonstrable need for all records retained which is reasonably related to the basic necessities and purposes of the institution.

Scale	a. Undesirable								a. Highly Desirable		Total
	b. No Change								b. Great Change		
	1		2		3		4		5		
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	
Students	a. 2	2.9	3	4.3	17	24.6	26	37.7	21	34.4	69
	b. 16	28.6	7	12.5	25	44.6	5	8.9	3	5.4	56
Student Leaders	a. 0	0.0	1	1.4	15	20.5	21	28.8	36	49.3	73
	b. 18	26.1	10	14.5	26	37.7	13	18.8	2	2.9	69
Faculty	a. 0	0.0	3	3.8	8	10.3	14	17.9	53	67.9	78
	b. 20	35.1	15	26.3	15	26.3	4	7.0	3	5.3	57
Administrators	a. 0	0.0	3	4.3	5	7.1	16	22.9	46	65.7	70
	b. 14	23.3	11	18.3	18	30.0	8	13.3	9	15.0	60
Total	a. 2		10		45		77		156		290
	b. 68		43		84		30		17		242
Mean	a. 4.3					Std. Dev.	a. .9				
	b. 2.5						b. 1.2				
Scale a. DF 12 χ^2 35.01 Significant at .01 level											

TABLE 12.--Records of a student's religious or political beliefs are not retained without his knowledge or consent.

Scale	a. Undesirable						a. Highly Desirable					
	b. No Change						b. Great Change					
	1		2		3		4		5		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%		
Students	a.	1	1.4	3	4.1	8	11	14	19.2	47	64.4	73
	b.	18	31	10	17.2	16	27.6	9	15.5	5	8.6	58
Student Leaders	a.	1	1.4	1	1.4	3	4.1	12	16.2	57	77	74
	b.	16	22.5	13	18.3	9	12.7	17	23.9	16	22.5	71
Faculty	a.	6	7.6	5	6.3	5	6.3	9	11.4	54	68.4	79
	b.	21	40.4	6	11.5	14	26.9	7	13.5	4	7.7	52
Administrators	a.	2	2.8	5	6.9	9	12.5	8	11.1	48	66.7	72
	b.	16	28.1	4	7.0	20	35.1	9	15.8	8	14.0	57
Total	a.	10		14		25		43		206		298
	b.	71		33		59		42		33		238
Mean	a.	4.4					Std. Dev.	a.	1.0			
	b.	2.7						b.	1.4			
Scale b. DF 12 χ^2 22.63 Significant at .05 level												

four groups perceived this to be a much desired practice as evidenced by the mean of 4.4.

The perceptions of the four groups varied regarding change in University practices relative to this principle. The difference was significant at the .05 level of confidence.

Table 13 presents an analysis of the responses to the principle that a student has a right to inspect the official transcript of his own academic record. Of the forty principles surveyed this principle was perceived to be the most desirable. Ninety-two per cent (92%) of the students, ninety two per cent (92%) of the student leaders, ninety-four per cent (94%) of the faculty and eighty-five per cent (85%) of the administrators indicated the principle to be highly desirable. The mean rating for the four groups was 4.9.

The mean response on Scale b for the four groups was 2.5. Differences existed among the groups at the .01 level of significance. Eleven (11) administrators, eleven (11) faculty, six (6) student leaders and three (3) students commented that students had been availed of this right before the Report. Four (4) student leaders and one student indicated that there is still too much red tape involved in viewing one's own record. Two (2) students and two (2) student leaders stated that they had experienced no problem and their records were made readily available to them.

TABLE 13.--A student has the right to inspect the official transcript of his own academic record.

Scale	a. Undesirable						a. Highly Desirable					
	b. No Change						b. Great Change					
	1		2		3		4		5		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%		
Students	a. 0	0.0	1	1.4	1	1.4	4	5.5	67	91.8	73	
	b. 25	43.9	9	15.8	14	24.6	7	12.3	2	3.5	57	
Student Leaders	a. 0	0.0	0	0.0	1	1.4	5	6.8	68	91.9	74	
	b. 18	26.5	13	19.1	20	29.4	10	14.7	7	10.3	68	
Faculty	a. 1	1.3	1	1.3	0	0.0	3	3.8	74	93.7	79	
	b. 27	52.9	3	5.9	6	11.8	6	11.8	9	17.6	51	
Administrators	a. 0	0.0	0	0.0	2	2.7	9	12.3	62	84.9	73	
	b. 22	39.3	7	12.5	6	10.7	8	14.3	13	23.2	56	
Total	a. 1		2		4		21		271		299	
	b. 92		32		46		31		31		232	
Mean	a. 4.9		Std. Dev.				a. .5					
	b. 2.5						b. 1.5					
Scale b. DF 12 χ^2 26.92 Significant at .01 level												

The analysis of the responses to the principle that a student has the right to inspect reports and evaluations of his conduct, except letters of recommendation and similar evaluations which are necessarily prepared on a confidential basis is shown in Table 14. Little difference was shown in the responses of the four groups relative to the desirability of the principle. The mean rating for the four groups was 4.3.

Little difference was shown in the perceptions of the four groups relative to change in practices. In commenting three (3) students and three (3) student leaders felt that a student should have the right to examine all reports relating to him whether prepared on a confidential basis or not. Two (2) administrators and one (1) faculty felt that this principle had enabled them to clarify their practices which has brought about an improvement in the area of student records. Two (2) faculty indicated concern over the word "inspect" and felt that the words "have interpreted" would have been more appropriate. Two (2) students felt that such a statement was long needed and now they know exactly where they stand relative to their personal records. Two (2) student leaders felt that too many individual records were retained in too many different places.

Table 15 presents the analysis of the responses to the statement that evaluations are made only by persons

TABLE 14.--A student has the right to inspect reports and evaluations of his conduct, except letters of recommendation and similar evaluations which are necessarily prepared on a confidential basis.

Scale	a. Undesirable						a. Highly Desirable					
	b. No Change						b. Great Change					
	1		2		3		4		5		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%		
Students	a. 2	2.7	4	5.5	5	6.8	13	17.8	49	67.1	73	
	b. 22	39.3	12	21.4	14	25	5	8.9	3	5.4	56	
Student Leaders	a. 1	1.4	2	2.7	6	8.1	9	12.2	56	75.7	74	
	b. 24	33.3	16	22.2	17	23.6	10	13.9	5	6.9	72	
Faculty	a. 4	5.2	6	7.8	9	11.7	8	10.4	50	64.9	77	
	b. 20	39.2	7	13.7	17	33.3	2	3.9	5	9.8	51	
Administrators	a. 4	5.8	7	10.1	10	14.5	13	18.8	35	50.7	69	
	b. 10	18.9	15	28.3	15	28.3	10	18.9	3	5.7	53	
Total	a. 11		19		30		43		190		293	
	b. 76		50		63		27		16		232	
Mean	a. 4.3											
	b. 2.4											
					Std. Dev.		a. 1.1					
							b. 1.2					

TABLE 15.--Evaluations of students are made only by persons qualified to make that evaluation.

Scale	a. Undesirable						a. Highly Desirable					
	b. No Change						b. Great Change					
	1		2		3		4		5			
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	Total	
Students	a. 2	2.8	1	1.4	4	5.6	6	8.3	59	81.9	72	
	b. 28	47.5	11	18.6	13	22	6	10.2	1	1.7	59	
Student Leaders	a. 0	0.0	1	1.4	4	5.5	5	6.8	63	86.3	73	
	b. 20	29	13	18.8	18	26.1	13	18.8	5	7.2	69	
Faculty	a. 0	0.0	1	1.4	2	2.7	7	9.6	63	86.3	49	
	b. 17	34.7	15	30.6	9	18.4	5	10.2	3	6.1	49	
Administrators	a. 0	0.0	1	1.4	3	4.1	4	5.5	65	89	73	
	18	31	16	27.6	13	22.4	6	10.3	5	8.6	58	
Total	a. 2		4		13		22		250		291	
	b. 83		55		53		30		14		235	
Mean	a. 4.8				Std. Dev.		a. .7					
	b. 2.3						b. 1.2					

qualified to make that evaluation. This principle was perceived as being highly desirable by more than eighty per cent (80%) of the total respondents. The mean rating for the desirability of this principle was 4.8.

Analysis of the responses showed no difference in the change of practice as perceived by the four groups. The mean response was 2.3. Two (2) students, one (1) faculty and three (3) administrators believed this practice to be in existence before the implementation of the Report. Seven (7) students, five (5) student leaders and two (2) faculty questioned the difficulty in determining just who is a "qualified" person to make such evaluations. Eight (8) student leaders, two (2) students, one (1) faculty and one (1) administrator commented that the elimination of evaluations made by resident assistants was a definite move to bring practices closer to this principle.

Table 16 gives an analysis of the responses to the principle that all persons handling confidential records are instructed concerning the confidential nature of such information and concerning their responsibilities regarding it. This was found to be a highly desirable principle by more than eighty-seven per cent (87%) of all respondents. The mean rating was 4.8.

Some difference existed in the opinions on the degree of change with administrators indicating a greater degree of change than students. The difference among the four

TABLE 16.--All persons handling confidential records are instructed concerning the confidential nature of such information and concerning their responsibilities regarding it.

Scale	a. Undesirable						a. Highly Desirable					
	b. No change						b. Great Change					
	1		2		3		4		5		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%		
Students	a. 0	0.0	2	2.7	2	2.7	5	6.8	65	87.8	74	
	b. 25	43.9	8	14	17	29.8	5	8.8	2	3.5	57	
Student Leaders	a. 1	1.4	0	0.0	1	1.4	6	8.1	66	89.2	74	
	b. 16	24.2	20	30.3	26	39.4	3	4.5	1	1.5	66	
Faculty	a. 0	0.0	2	2.6	1	1.3	6	7.7	69	88.5	78	
	b. 16	32.7	13	26.5	14	28.6	3	6.1	3	6.1	49	
Administrators	a. 0	0.0	1	1.4	2	2.8	6	8.3	63	87.5	72	
	b. 14	21.9	13	20.3	18	28.1	12	18.8	7	10.9	64	
Total	a. 1		5		6		23		263		298	
	b. 71		54		75		23		13		236	
Mean	a. 4.8											
	b. 2.4											
					Std. Dev.		a. .6					
							b. 1.2					
	Scale b.	DF 12	χ^2 25.24				Significant at .05 level					

groups was found to be significant at the .05 level of confidence. Four (4) administrators and three (3) faculty stated that this had been the practice at the University prior to the Report. Three (3) administrators and one (1) faculty member felt that this principle served to encourage an improvement in practices in this area since there has been some indication of various divisions of the University to formulate records policies. Four (4) students and six (6) student leaders felt that regardless of how persons with such responsibility were instructed, there would continue to be abuses in the use of student records.

Differences are noted among the four groups in the analysis of the principle stating that no one outside the faculty or administrative staff has access to the record of a student's offenses against University regulations without the express permission of the student in writing. Table 17 shows a difference among the four groups that is significant at the .01 level of confidence. The principle was perceived to be desirable with a mean rating of 4.3 on the 5 point scale. Students and student leaders tended to find the principle slightly more desirable than did faculty and administrators.

Differences are noted in the analysis of the responses to change in practices. Faculty tended to see a greater degree in the change of practices than the other three

TABLE 17.--No one outside the faculty or administrative staff has access to the record of a student's offenses against University regulations without the express permission of the student in writing.

Scale	a. Undesirable						a. Highly Desirable					
	b. No Change						b. Great Change					
	1		2		3		4		5			
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	Total	
Students	a. 5	6.8	2	2.7	5	6.8	6	8.1	56	75.7	75	
	b. 22	37.9	10	17.2	13	22.4	11	19.0	2	3.4	58	
Student	a. 2	2.7	3	4.1	5	6.8	1	1.4	63	85.1	74	
	b. 23	33.8	9	13.2	18	26.5	12	17.6	6	8.8	68	
Faculty	a. 8	10.4	6	7.8	11	14.3	12	15.6	40	51.9	77	
	b. 14	30.4	12	26.1	8	17.4	8	17.4	4	8.7	46	
Adminis- trators	a. 5	7.2	2	2.9	10	14.5	9	13	43	62.3	69	
	b. 10	20.8	1	2.1	15	31.3	12	25	10	20.8	48	
Total	a. 20		13		31		28		202		294	
	b. 69		32		54		43		22		220	
Mean	a. 4.3				Std. Dev.		a. 1.2					
	b. 2.6						b. 1.4					
	Scale a.	DF	12	x^2	26.41						Significant at .01 level	
	Scale b.	DF	12	x^2	23.66						Significant at .05 level	

groups. Difference among the four groups was significant at the .05 level of confidence.

Three (3) administrators felt that this principle had been practiced by the University prior to the Report. Two (2) administrators and two (2) faculty members felt that the practice of this principle was a dichotomy in that the student is protected by such practices when in difficulty but otherwise believed to be mature. Two (2) administrators and two (2) faculty stated that the University's practices should be the same as society's approach. Four (4) faculty members stated that agencies for national security should have access to such information. Three (3) students and three (3) student leaders commented that faculty should not have access to such information.

Table 18 shows the analysis for the responses to the statement that transcripts of academic record contain only information about the academic status of the student. Little difference appears among the four groups. The principle is perceived to be highly desirable as shown by the mean rating on the scale for the four groups at 4.4.

Likewise, there appears to be little difference in the perceptions of the respondents relative to change in practices.

Four (4) administrators and three (3) student leaders commented that this had been the practice prior to the Report. Three (3) students and four (4) student leaders

TABLE 18.--Transcripts of academic record contain only information about the academic status of the student.

Scale	a. Undesirable										a. Highly Desirable	
	b. No Change										b. Great Change	
	N	1 %	N	2 %	N	3 %	N	4 %	N	5 %	TOTAL	
Students	a. 3	4.1	2	2.7	8	11	10	13.7	50	68.5	73	
	b. 24	39.3	12	19.7	13	21.3	6	9.8	6	9.8	61	
Student Leaders	a. 1	1.4	5	6.8	8	10.8	5	6.8	55	74.3	74	
	b. 20	29.4	9	13.2	19	27.9	14	20.6	6	8.8	68	
Faculty	a. 6	7.9	2	2.6	8	10.5	6	7.9	54	71.1	76	
	b. 19	38.8	12	24.5	7	14.3	8	16.3	3	6.1	49	
Administrators	a. 4	5.5	2	2.7	14	19.2	5	6.8	48	65.8	73	
	b. 21	38	5	9.3	12	22.2	6	11.1	10	18.5	54	
Total	a. 14		11		38		26		207		296	
	b. 84		38		51		34		25		232	
Mean	a. 4.4					Std. Dev.	a. 1.1					
	b. 2.5						b. 1.4					

suggested that organizations and activities should be included with the transcript of record.

Table 19 presents the analysis of responses to the principle stating that membership lists of student organizations, especially those related to matters of political belief, or action, are not retained. Although the principle was perceived to be slightly less desirable than most, no significant difference was noted among the groups. The mean rating on the scale for the four groups was 3.9.

No significant difference existed in the responses of the four groups in their opinions to the change in practices.

Two (2) administrators and one (1) faculty person stated that the practice was in existence before the implementation of the Report. Three (3) faculty and one (1) student suggested that records of membership should be maintained if the organization goes against the law or is counter to the best interests of the University. Two (2) student leaders, one (1) faculty and administrator expressed a concern that such information was retained by the Department of Public Safety.

Three (3) student leaders and one (1) student felt that membership lists should be maintained and should be accessible to anyone in the University. Two (2) students and (2) student leaders commented that the membership of a student in an organization should be retained if the student so requests.

TABLE 19.--Membership lists of student organizations, especially those related to matters of political belief, or action, are not retained.

Scale	a. Undesirable						a. Highly Desirable						
	b. No Change						b. Great Change						
	1		2		3		4		5				
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	TOTAL		
Students	a.	4	5.6	3	4.2	18	25	15	20.8	32	44.4	72	
	b.	21	36.8	13	22.8	17	29.8	5	8.8	1	1.8	57	
Student Leaders	a.	5	6.8	4	5.4	11	14.9	12	16.2	42	56.8	74	
	b.	20	28.6	20	28.6	14	20	10	14.3	6	8.6	70	
Faculty	a.	8	10.4	9	11.7	14	18.2	8	10.4	38	49.4	77	
	b.	15	35.7	8	19	10	23.8	7	16.7	2	4.8	42	
Adminis- trators	a.	10	14.1	10	14.1	12	16.9	5	7	34	47.9	71	
	b.	16	33.3	7	14.6	11	22.9	4	8.3	10	20.8	48	
Total	a.	27		26		55		40		146		294	
	b.	72		48		52		26		19		217	
Mean	a.	3.9	Std. Dev.				a.	1.4					
	b.	2.4					b.	1.3					

Regulation, Rules and
Student Conduct

Table 20 gives an analysis of responses to the principle that the enforcement of the students duties to the larger society is left to legal and judicial authorities duly established for that purpose. No significant difference was found among the four groups on the desirability of the principle. The mean response on the scale was 4.3, indicating the principle was perceived to be desirable.

No significant difference was found among the groups in the change of practices.

One (1) administrator and one (1) faculty person indicated that this had been the practice at the University prior to the implementation of the Report. Two (2) students, two (2) faculty and one (1) administrator felt that the neglect of the students duties to society may also infringe upon the University and therefore, the student should be accountable to both society and the University. Five (5) student leaders and one (1) student believed that the University was still placing the student in double jeopardy. Two (2) student leaders and one (1) faculty member cited the resolution passed by the Board of Trustees as an example of how this principle has been violated.

Table 21 includes the analysis of responses to the principle that only where the institution's interests as an academic community are distinct and clearly involved is the special authority of the institution asserted in

TABLE 20.--The enforcement of the students duties to the larger society is left to legal and judicial authorities duly established for that purpose.

Scale	a. Undesirable						a. Highly Desirable					
	b. No Change						b. Great Change					
	1		2		3		4		5			
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	TOTAL	
Students	a.	4	5.4	2	2.7	10	13.5	14	18.9	44	59.5	74
	b.	17	27.4	20	32.3	14	22.6	8	12.9	3	4.8	62
Student Leaders	a.	1	1.4	3	4.1	7	9.5	13	17.6	50	67.6	74
	b.	18	25	19	26.4	21	29.2	13	18.1	1	1.4	72
Faculty	a.	3	3.9	2	2.6	9	11.7	14	18.2	49	63.6	77
	b.	13	23.6	12	21.8	16	29.1	11	20	3	5.5	55
Adminis- trators	a.	4	5.6	4	5.6	11	15.5	14	19.7	38	53.5	71
	b.	11	17.7	11	17.7	17	27.4	14	22.6	9	14.5	62
Total	a.	12		11		37		55		181		296
	b.	59		62		68		46		16		251
Mean	a.	4.3										
	b.	2.6										
						Std. Dev.		a.	1.1			
								b.	1.2			

TABLE 21.--Only where the institution's interests as an academic community are distinct and clearly involved is the special authority of the institution asserted in addition to penalties prescribed by civil authorities.

Scale	a. Undesirable						a. Highly Desirable					
	b. No Change						b. Great Change					
	1		2		3		4		5			
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	TOTAL	
Students	a.	4	5.6	1	1.4	11	15.5	18	25.4	37	52.1	71
	b.	23	37.7	12	19.7	19	31.1	4	6.6	3	4.9	61
Student Leaders	a.	8	11	3	4.1	13	17.8	11	15.1	38	52.1	73
	b.	23	32.4	10	14.1	24	33.8	13	18.3	1	1.4	71
Faculty	a.	2	2.6	3	3.9	9	11.8	12	15.8	50	65.8	76
	b.	6	12.5	16	33.3	12	25	11	22.9	3	6.3	48
Administrators	a.	6	8.5	5	7	4	5.6	10	14.1	46	64.8	71
	b.	9	14.8	8	13.1	19	31.1	12	19.7	13	21.3	61
Total	a.	20		12		37		51		171		291
	b.	61		46		74		40		20		241
Mean	a.	4.2						a.	1.2			
	b.	2.6						b.	1.3			

Scale b. DF 12 χ^2 41.75

Significant at .01 level

addition to penalties prescribed by civil authorities. No significant difference was found among the groups regarding the desirability of the principle. The mean response for the four groups was 4.2, indicating the principle to be desirable.

The degree to which respondents believed practices to have changed within the University because of the implementation of the Report showed a significant difference among the four groups at the .01 level of confidence. More change was perceived to have occurred by the faculty and administrators than by students and student leaders.

One (1) administrator, one (1) faculty and one student leader felt that there were inconsistencies in the University's approach to this practice. Three (3) student leaders and one (1) student commented that the University never should assert its authority in addition to those prescribed by civil authorities. One (1) student and one (1) student leader implied that the University should protect students and serve as a buffer between the student and society.

Item 20 in the questionnaire stated the principle that students participate to the maximum extent feasible in formulating and revising regulations governing student conduct. The analysis for this principle is shown in Table 22. The principle was perceived to be highly desirable as indicated by the mean response of the four groups of 4.5 on the scale. Difference in the responses was significant at the .01 level

TABLE 22.--Students participate to the maximum extent feasible in formulating and revising regulations governing student conduct.

Scale	a. Undesirable										a. Highly Desirable		
	b. No Change										b. Great Change		
	1		2		3		4		5		TOTAL		
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%			
Students	a.	1	1.4	2	2.7	7	9.5	16	21.6	48	64.9	74	
	b.	5	7.8	15	23.4	22	34.4	12	18.8	10	15.6	64	
Student Leaders	a.	2	2.7	1	1.4	2	2.7	5	6.8	64	86.5	74	
	b.	10	13.7	10	13.7	24	32.9	17	23.3	12	16.4	73	
Faculty	a.	1	1.3	4	5.3	16	21.1	11	14.5	44	57.9	76	
	b.	3	5.4	5	8.9	19	33.9	17	30.4	12	21.4	56	
Administrators	a.	0	0	0	0	11	15.3	15	20.8	46	63.9	72	
	b.	5	7.6	6	9.1	19	28.8	19	28.8	17	25.8	66	
Total	a.	4		7		36		47		202		296	
	b.	23		36		84		65		51		259	
Mean	a.	4.5					Std. Dev.	a.	.9				
	b.	3.3						b.	1.2				
Scale a. DF 12 χ^2 29.88												Significant at .01 level	

of confidence. Eighty-six per cent (86%) of the student leaders considered the principle to be highly desirable (rating of 5), while only fifty-seven per cent (57%) of the faculty marked it accordingly.

Although the responses of the four groups indicated that some change in practices had occurred since the implementation of the Report, no significant difference was noted. The mean response on the Scale b for the four groups was 3.3.

Eleven (11) student leaders and three (3) students felt that although students had been granted some participation in the formulation of regulations, it was not nearly enough. Four (4) student leaders and one (1) student commented that students alone should formulate regulations by which students are to live. Three (3) students and one (1) student leader took the opposite view, indicating that the formulation of rules should be a shared responsibility with faculty and administration. Two (2) faculty and one (1) administrator felt that students can become excessively involved in the process and that representation is necessary from the total University community. Three (3) students felt that the transient status of the student made total participation questionable.

An analysis of responses to the statement that all regulations governing student conduct are made public in an appropriate manner appears in Table 23. Two hundred and

TABLE 23.--All regulations governing student conduct are made public in an appropriate manner.

Scale	a. Undesirable						a. Highly Desirable					
	b. No Change						b. Great Change					
	1		2		3		4		5		TOTAL	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%		
Students	a.	0	0.0	0	0.0	4	5.4	8	10.8	62	83.8	74
	b.	12	19.4	23	37.1	8	12.9	13	21	6	9.7	62
Student Leaders	a.	1	1.4	1	1.4	3	4.1	3	4.1	66	89.2	74
	b.	15	20.5	11	15.1	25	34.2	16	21.9	6	8.2	73
Faculty	a.	1	1.3	0	0.0	3	3.9	6	7.8	67	87	77
	b.	8	14.3	5	8.9	23	41.1	12	21.4	8	14.3	56
Adminis- trators	a.	1	1.4	1	1.4	2	2.7	5	6.8	64	87.7	73
	b.	6	9.4	12	18.8	16	25	18	28.1	12	18.8	64
Total	a.	3		2		12		22		259		298
	b.	41		51		72		59		32		255
Mean	a.	4.8										
	b.	3.0										
						Std. Dev.	a.	.6				
							b.	1.3				

Scale b. DF 12 χ^2 30.77

Significant at .01 level

fifty nine (259) or eighty-seven per cent (87%) of those responding marked the principle as highly desirable.

The four groups perceived differences in the extent to which practices had changed. The difference in the responses of the four groups was significant at the .01 level of confidence. Students perceived the least change.

One (1) administrator, two (2) students and four (4) student leaders commented that regulations have been effectively communicated. Two (2) students and three (3) student leaders felt that the University could do a much better job of this. One (1) administrator and one (1) faculty member felt that regulations appear at different times in too many different publications and that only one student handbook is needed. One (1) faculty member and two (2) student leaders indicated that the Trustees suspension resolution violated this principle. One (1) student, one (1) faculty, one (1) administrator and one (1) student leader questioned the number of persons who read the regulations.

No significant difference existed among the four groups on the desirability of the principle that regulations relating to the communication of ideas shall encourage the competition of ideas. The principle was found to be very desirable as indicated in the analysis of responses in Table 24. The mean response for the four groups on the scale was 4.1.

TABLE 24.--Regulations relating to the communication of ideas shall encourage the competition of ideas.

Scale	a. Undesirable								a. Highly Desirable			
	b. No Change								b. Great Change			
	1		2		3		4		5			
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	TOTAL	
Students	a.	4	5.7	3	4.3	13	18.6	12	17.1	38	54.3	70
	b.	19	31.7	13	21.7	19	31.7	7	11.7	2	3.3	60
Student Leaders	a.	8	11.1	6	8.3	11	15.3	9	12.5	38	52.8	72
	b.	18	26.5	22	32.4	15	22.1	10	14.7	3	4.4	68
Faculty	a.	5	8.5	1	1.7	7	11.9	13	22	33	55.9	59
	b.	12	27.9	12	27.9	13	30.2	4	9.3	2	4.7	43
Adminis- trators	a.	3	4.6	5	7.7	10	15.4	8	12.3	39	60	65
	b.	12	21.8	14	25.5	17	30.9	9	16.4	3	5.5	55
Total	a.	20		15		41		42		148		266
	b.	61		61		64		30		10		226
Mean	a.	4.1										
	b.	2.4										
						Std. Dev.		a.	1.3			
								b.	1.1			

The four groups perceived the degree of change in practices to be about the same. No significant difference existed in the responses.

Three (3) faculty and three (3) student leaders were opposed to the principle, indicating that regulations relating to the communication of ideas simply should not exist. Two (2) administrators, one (1) student and one (1) student leader felt that the State News violated this principle by presenting opinions rather than transmitting news. Two (2) administrators and two (2) faculty commented that the principle was most appropriate but could be subject to abuse.

Table 25 gives an analysis of the responses to the principle stating that there is a demonstrable need for each regulation which is related to the basic purposes of the University. Faculty tended to perceive this principle to be slightly more desirable than did students, student leaders and administrators. A significant difference at the .05 level of confidence was demonstrated.

Administrators and faculty perceived a slightly greater degree in the change of practices relating to this principle than did the other two groups. The difference in the responses of the groups was significant at the .05 level of confidence.

Two (2) administrators, one (1) faculty, and one (1) student felt that the statement was over-generalized and

TABLE 25.--There is a demonstrable need for such regulation which is related to the basic purposes and necessities of the University.

Scale	a. Undesirable						a. Highly Desirable					
	b. No Change						b. Great Change					
		1		2		3		4		5		TOTAL
		N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	
Students	a.	5	6.8	2	2.7	12	16.2	21	28.4	34	35.9	74
	b.	21	34.4	14	23.0	19	31.1	7	11.5	0	0.0	61
Student Leaders	a.	3	4.1	5	6.8	8	10.8	13	17.6	45	60.8	74
	b.	17	23.3	24	32.9	20	27.4	11	15.1	1	1.4	73
Faculty	a.	1	1.4	2	2.8	3	4.2	9	12.7	56	78.9	71
	b.	10	19.2	15	28.8	12	23.1	10	19.2	5	9.6	52
Administrators	a.	1	1.5	1	1.5	9	13.4	14	20.9	42	62.7	67
	b.	5	8.9	16	28.6	25	44.6	8	14.3	2	3.6	56
Total	a.	10		10		32		57		177		286
	b.	53		69		76		38		8		242
Mean	a.	4.3				Std. Dev.		a.	1.0			
	b.	2.5						b.	1.1			
	Scale a.	DF	12	x ²	23.40					Significant at .05 level		
	Scale b.	DF	12	x ²	24.97					Significant at .05 level		

could not be implemented until the nature and purposes of the University have been identified. Two (2) administrators, three (3) students, and one (1) faculty commented that the necessity for specific regulations needs to be more clearly defined and communicated. Five (5) student leaders and two (2) students felt that if this principle were followed, there would be no more social regulations. Two (2) student leaders, two (2) students, two (2) administrators and one (1) faculty member expressed the opinion that the principle had caused the University to more closely scrutinize its existing regulations.

The responses to the statement that procedures and penalties for violation of regulations are designed for guidance or correction of behavior rather than for retribution are found in Table 26. No significant difference appeared in the responses to either Scale a or Scale b. The principle was perceived to be desirable as indicated by the mean response of 4.6 on the five point scale.

Four (4) administrators, two (2) students, two (2) faculty and one (1) student leader felt that this principle had been a practice in the University before the implementation of the Report. Two (2) faculty persons indicated that the University should not be in the business of guidance or correction and should only teach or instruct. One (1) student leader, two (2) students and one (1) administrator felt that penalties should be severe enough to prevent a

TABLE 26.--Procedures and penalties for violation of regulation are designed for guidance or correction of behavior rather than for retribution.

Scale	a. Undesirable								a. Highly Desirable			
	b. No Change								b. Great Change			
	1		2		3		4		5		TOTAL	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%		
Students	a.	2	2.7	1	1.4	6	8.1	10	13.5	55	74.3	74
	b.	26	41.9	11	17.7	15	24.2	6	9.7	4	6.5	62
Student Leaders	a.	2	2.7	2	2.7	3	4.1	14	18.9	53	71.6	74
	b.	22	30.1	12	16.4	22	30.1	13	17.8	4	5.5	73
Faculty	a.	2	2.7	0	0.0	3	4.0	13	17.3	57	76.0	75
	b.	8	15.7	15	29.4	18	35.3	7	13.7	3	5.9	51
Administrators	a.	1	1.4	1	1.4	9	12.9	9	12.9	50	71.4	70
	b.	15	25.9	12	20.7	14	24.1	13	22.9	4	6.9	58
Total	a.	7		4		21		46		215		293
	b.	71		50		69		39		15		244
Mean	a.	4.6					Std. Dev.		a.	.9		
	b.	2.5							b.	1.2		

re-occurrence of misconduct. Two (2) student leaders and two (2) students observed that the sanctions imposed by the University appear to be designed more for retribution than for correction of behavior. One (1) student and one (1) faculty member felt that the legalistic approach presented through the procedural due process is contradictory to this statement in that the emphasis moves from guidance to behavioral correction.

Item number 25 of the questionnaire states that all regulations seek the best possible reconciliation of the principles of maximum freedom and necessary order. The responses are analyzed in Table 27. The principle was perceived to be highly desirable by all four groups. The mean responses on the 5 point scale was 4.7.

There was no significant difference in responses to change in practices. Two (2) student leaders, two (2) students, three (3) faculty and three (3) administrators commented that necessary order had suffered at the hands of excessive freedom. On the other hand, two (2) students and two (2) student leaders indicated that the rigidity of social regulations far exceeded the necessary order. Three (3) student leaders felt that changes in practices relating to this principle came about only as a result of students exerting their rights rather than through implementation of this principle.

TABLE 27.--All regulations seek the best possible reconciliation of the maximum freedom and necessary order.

Scale	a. Undesirable						a. Highly Desirable					
	b. No Change						b. Great Change					
	1		2		3		4		5		TOTAL	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%		
Students	a.	0	0.0	2	2.7	4	5.5	15	20.5	52	71.2	73
	b.	16	26.2	13	21.3	17	27.9	15	24.6	0	0.0	61
Student Leaders	a.	1	1.4	2	2.7	4	5.4	10	13.5	57	77	74
	b.	14	19.2	14	19.2	23	31.5	15	20.5	7	9.6	73
Faculty	a.	0	0.0	1	1.4	1	1.4	10	13.7	61	83.6	73
	b.	7	13.7	9	17.6	19	37.3	14	27.5	2	3.9	51
Adminis- trators	a.	3	4.3	0	0.0	1	1.4	12	17.1	54	77.1	70
	b.	14	23.3	15	25	16	26.7	10	16.7	5	8.3	60
Total	a.	4		5		10		47		224		290
	b.	51		51		75		54		14		245
Mean	a.	4.7										
	b.	2.7										
					Std. Dev.		a.	0.8				
							b.	1.2				

Table 28 presents an analysis of the responses to the principle stating that clearly defined channels and procedures exist for the appeal and review of the finding of guilt in an alleged violation of a regulation. The principle was perceived to be highly desirable by all four groups with eighty-four per cent (84%) of all the respondents rating it as a 5 on the scale.

Student leaders, faculty and administrators believed that greater change in practices had occurred than did students. The significance of the difference in the responses was at the .01 level of confidence.

Two (2) faculty and one (1) student leader stated that such procedures were in existence before implementation of the Report. Three (3) administrators felt that procedures had been improved to implement this principle. Six (6) student leaders and two (2) students commented that the channels and procedures are not clearly defined or that the process has been too slow.

Table 29 shows the analysis of the responses to the principle stating that clearly defined channels and procedures exist for the appeal and review of the reasonableness, under the circumstances, of the penalty imposed for a specific violation. The mean of the responses for the four groups was 4.7, indicating the principle to be highly desirable. Little difference was shown in the responses of

TABLE 28.--Clearly defined channels and procedures exist for the appeal and review of the finding of guilt in an alleged violation of a regulation.

Scale	a. Undesirable											a. Highly Desirable		
	b. No Change											b. Great Change		
		1		2		3		4		5		TOTAL		
		N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%			
Students	a.	1	1.4	0	0.0	3	4.1	9	12.2	61	82.4	74		
	b.	15	24.6	14	23	25	41	6	9.8	1	1.6	61		
Student Leaders	a.	2	2.7	2	2.7	0	0.0	5	6.8	65	87.8	74		
	b.	11	15.1	8	11	14	19.2	26	35.6	14	19.2	73		
Faculty	a.	1	1.3	1	1.3	1	1.3	6	7.8	68	88.3	77		
	b.	8	14	5	8.8	11	19.3	23	40.4	10	17.5	57		
Administrators	a.	0	0.0	0	0.0	6	8.3	8	11.1	58	80.6	72		
	b.	8	11.9	11	16.4	21	31.3	18	26.9	9	13.4	67		
Total	a.	4		3		10		28		252		297		
	b.	42		38		71		73		34		258		
Mean	a.	4.8												
	b.	3.1												
Scale b. DF 12 χ^2 36.92 Significant at .01 level														

TABLE 29.--Clearly defined channels and procedures exist for the appeal and review of the reasonableness, under the circumstances, of the penalty imposed for a specific violation.

Scale	a. Undesirable						a. Highly Desirable					
	b. No Change						b. Great Change					
	1		2		3		4		5			
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	TOTAL	
Students	a.	0	0.0	2	2.7	1	1.4	14	18.9	57	77	74
	b.	12	19.7	19	31.1	17	27.9	12	19.7	1	1.6	61
Student Leaders	a.	2	2.7	1	1.4	2	2.7	7	9.5	62	83.8	74
	b.	8	11.3	11	15.5	26	36.6	17	23.9	9	12.7	71
Faculty	a.	1	1.3	0	0.0	4	5.3	9	12	61	81.3	75
	b.	4	7.7	6	11.5	15	28.8	19	36.5	8	15.4	52
Adminis- trators	a.	1	1.4	1	1.4	7	9.7	8	11.1	55	76.4	72
	b.	8	12.1	7	10.6	26	39.4	13	19.7	12	18.2	66
Total	a.	4		4		14		38		235		295
	b.	32		43		84		61		30		250
Mean	a.	4.7				Std. Dev.	a.	.7				
	b.	3.1					b.	1.2				
Scale b. DF 12 χ^2 27.30 Significant at .01 level												

the four groups with seventy-nine per cent (79%) of the respondents rating the desirability at 5 on the scale.

Faculty, student leaders and administrators tended to perceive a greater degree of change in practices than did students. The difference in the responses was significant at the .01 level of confidence.

Two (2) students, two (2) administrators and one (1) student leader commented that now the channels have been regularized, the appeal process is much more explicit. Two (2) student leaders commented that the student defenders bill passed by A.S.M.S.U. has insured the implementation of this principle.

The responses to item 28 are summarized in Table 30. The principle stating that clearly defined channels and procedures exist for the appeal and review of the substance of a regulation or administrative decision was perceived to be very desirable. Seventy-seven per cent (77%) of those responding rated the principle at 5 on the scale.

Student leaders, faculty and administrators sensed a greater degree in the change of practices relative to this principle than did the students. Difference in the responses was significant at the .05 level of confidence.

Two (2) administrators indicated that appeal channels had always existed within the University. Three (3) student leaders and one (1) student believed that there was still more opportunity for the review of an administrative decision. Five (5) student leaders and three (3)

TABLE 30.--Clearly defined channels and procedures exist for the appeal and review of the substance of a regulation or administrative decision.

Scale	a. Undesirable						a. Highly Desirable					
	b. No Change						b. Great Change					
	1		2		3		4		5			
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	TOTAL	
Students	a.	1	1.4	1	1.4	5	6.8	9	12.2	58	78.4	74
	b.	17	27.9	18	29.5	15	24.6	10	16.4	1	1.6	61
Student Leaders	a.	1	1.4	2	2.7	3	4.1	10	13.5	58	78.4	74
	b.	16	22.2	15	20.8	19	26.4	14	19.4	8	11.1	72
Faculty	a.	0	0.0	3	3.9	4	5.3	8	10.5	61	80.3	76
	b.	6	11.5	13	25	11	21.2	13	25	9	17.3	52
Administrators	a.	2	2.8	1	1.4	6	8.6	12	16.9	50	70.4	71
	b.	7	10.6	10	15.2	27	40.9	12	18.2	10	15.2	66
Total	a.	4		7		18		39		227		295
	b.	46		56		72		49		28		251
Mean	a.	4.6										
	b.	2.8										

Scale b. DF 12 χ^2 24.03

Significant at .05 level

students felt that the channels were still unclear and extremely slow. Two (2) student leaders felt that it would be futile to appeal under any circumstances.

The responses to the principle stating that every regulation specifies to whom it applies and whether responsibility for compliance lies with individuals, group or both, are shown in Table 31. Seventy-four per cent (74%) of those responding identified the principle as highly desirable. No significant differences existed among the four groups.

No significant difference existed in responses to the degree in change of practices. Five (5) student leaders and three (3) students believed many regulations vague and ambiguous as to whom they apply. Two (2) students and two (2) faculty felt that often responsibility was not assigned or procedures were not established to insure responsibility to be carried out.

Responses to the principle stating that any student accused of violating a regulation has the right to appear before one or more members of a duly constituted judicial body are analyzed in Table 32. The principle was found to be highly desirable. The mean rating for the four groups was 4.7 on the 5 point scale. Ninety-two per cent (92%) of the students, eighty-four per cent (84%) of the student leaders, eighty-two per cent (82%) of the faculty and sixty-eight per cent (68%) of the administrators

- .

TABLE 31.--Every regulation specifies to whom it applies and whether responsibility for compliance lies with individuals, groups or both.

Scale	a. Undesirable						a. Highly Desirable					
	b. No change						b. Great Change					
	1		2		3		4		5		TOTAL	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%		
Students	a.	1	1.4	1	1.4	8	11	7	9.6	56	76.7	73
	b.	21	35.6	17	28.8	17	28.8	3	5.1	1	1.7	59
Student Leaders	a.	1	1.4	1	1.4	4	5.4	9	12.2	59	79.7	74
	b.	15	20.5	18	24.7	26	35.6	12	16.4	2	2.7	73
Faculty	a.	1	1.3	2	2.6	6	7.9	12	15.8	55	72.4	76
	b.	11	22.4	10	20.4	16	32.7	5	10.2	7	14.3	49
Adminis- trators	a.	0	0.0	2	2.8	6	8.5	13	18.3	50	70.4	71
	b.	9	15.3	15	25.4	21	35.6	8	13.6	6	10.2	59
Total	a.	3		6		24		41		22		294
	b.	56		60		80		26		16		240
Mean	a.	4.6					Std. Dev.	a.	.8			
	b.	2.5						b.	1.2			

TABLE 32.--Any student accused of violating a regulation has the right to appear before one or more members of a duly constituted judicial body.

Scale	a. Undesirable						a. Highly Desirable					
	b. No Change						b. Great Change					
	1		2		3		4		5		TOTAL	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%		
Students	a.	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	1.4	5	6.8	68	92	74
	b.	12	9.7	8	13.1	24	39.3	14	23	3	4.9	61
Student Leaders	a.	0	0.0	1	1.4	4	5.4	7	9.5	62	83.8	74
	b.	9	12.5	6	8.3	23	31.9	18	25	16	22.2	72
Faculty	a.	1	1.3	0	0.0	2	2.6	11	14.5	62	81.6	76
	b.	6	10.7	9	16.1	13	23.2	21	37.5	7	12.5	56
Administrators	a.	3	4.2	2	2.8	5	6.9	13	18.1	49	68.1	72
	b.	5	7.7	13	20	16	24.6	13	20	18	27.7	65
Total	a.	4		3		12		36		241		296
	b.	32		36		76		66		44		254
Mean	a.	4.7										
	b.	3.2										
Std. Dev. a. .7												
b. 1.2												
Scale b. DF 12 χ^2 25.86												
Significant at .05 level.												

faculty and sixty-eight per cent (68%) of the administrators rated the principle as highly desirable. No significant difference was found among the groups.

Student leaders, faculty and administrators perceived a greater change in practices than did those students who responded. The difference among the groups was significant at the .05 level of confidence. Four (4) administrators, two (2) students and one (1) student leader commented that this principle was practiced before implementation of the Report. Two (2) student leaders and one (1) student felt that this principle represents one of the most striking gains in the Report. Two (2) student leaders questioned whether the student was still being afforded his rights. Two (2) administrators felt that such an elaborate system of judiciaries would place an excess burden upon the time of those students serving on such judiciaries.

Item number 31 is analyzed in Table 33. This statement did not appear in the Report as a principle but was a guideline used in the development of a room search policy which came into being just prior to the Report. The principle states that the premises occupied by students and the personal possessions of students are not searched unless appropriate authorization has been obtained. This principle was found to be

TABLE 33.--Premises occupied by students and the personal possessions of students
are not searched unless appropriate authorization has been obtained.

Scale	a. Undesirable		b. No Change								a. Highly Desirable		b. Great Change		TOTAL
		1		2		3		4		5					
		N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%				
Students	a.	2	2.7	0	0.0	3	4.1	9	12.2	60	81.1				74
	b.	21	34.4	13	21.3	14	23	13	21.3	0	0.0				61
Student Leaders	a.	1	1.4	0	0.0	5	6.8	3	4.1	65	87.8				74
	b.	20	27.8	14	19.4	14	19.4	12	16.7	12	16.7				72
Faculty	a.	3	4.1	1	1.4	2	2.7	7	9.5	61	82.4				74
	b.	12	27.3	13	29.5	10	22.7	6	13.6	3	6.8				44
Adminis- trators	a.	2	2.8	2	2.8	8	11.1	9	12.5	51	70.8				72
	b.	11	22	9	18	11	22	10	20	9	18				50
Total	a.	8		3		18		28		237					294
	b.	64		49		49		41		24					227
Mean	a.	4.6													
	b.	2.6													
											Std. Dev.		a.	.9	
													b.	1.3	

highly desirable by eighty-one per cent (81%) of the students, eighty-eight per cent (88%) of the student leaders, eighty-two per cent (82%) of the faculty and seventy-one per cent (71%) of the administrators. The mean response was 4.6 on the 5 point scale. No significant difference was shown among the four groups.

No significant difference existed among the groups relative to change in practices. The mean response was 2.6 for the four groups. Three (3) student leaders, two (2) students and one (1) faculty member felt that the only form of authorization should be a search warrant obtained by the police. Three (3) student leaders, two (2) students and one (1) faculty member felt that unauthorized searches were continuing to be made. Two (2) student leaders felt that only those students living in the residence halls were protected by this right and such a principle should also apply to those students living in supervised housing off-campus.

Freedom of Expression

The analysis for item number 32 appears in Table 34. This principle states that faculty, administrators and students who are not staff members do not exercise powers of veto or censorship over news or editorial content in the student newspaper. Fifty-seven per cent (57%) of the students and fifty-nine per cent (59%) of the student leaders found the principle to be highly desirable, whereas, thirty-nine per cent (39%) of the faculty and forty-one per cent (41%) of the administrators found the principle to be highly desirable. There was a significant difference among the groups at the .05 level of confidence.

Of those responding to Scale b, forty-four per cent (44%) of the students, thirty-two per cent (32%) of the student leaders, twenty-seven per cent (27%) of the faculty and fourteen per cent (14%) of the administrators saw no change in practices since the implementation of the Report. The difference in the responses was significant at the .05 level of confidence.

Four (4) student leaders and four (4) students felt that censorship of the State News still existed, therefore, the principle was not being followed. Two (2) student leaders, one (1) student, two (2) faculty, and one (1)

TABLE 34.--Faculty, administrators and students who are not staff members do not exercise any powers of veto or censorship over news or editorial content in the student newspaper.

Scale	a. Undesirable						a. Highly Desirable					
	b. No Change						b. Great Change					
	1		2		3		4		5		TOTAL	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%		
Students	a.	10	13.7	4	5.5	7	9.6	10	13.7	42	57.5	73
	b.	26	44.1	12	20.3	13	22	5	8.5	3	5.1	59
Student Leaders	a.	5	6.8	3	4.1	8	11	14	19.2	43	58.9	73
	b.	23	31.9	15	20.8	17	23.6	13	18.1	4	5.6	72
Faculty	a.	17	22.7	6	8.0	12	16.0	11	14.7	29	38.7	75
	b.	14	27.5	12	23.5	8	15.7	9	17.6	8	15.7	51
Administrators	a.	12	18.2	5	7.6	16	24.2	6	9.1	27	40.9	66
	b.	8	13.6	11	18.6	17	28.8	11	18.6	12	20.3	59
Total	a.	44		18		43		41		141		287
	b.	71		50		55		38		27		241
Mean	a.	3.8										
	b.	2.6										
					Std. Dev.		a.	1.5				
							b.	1.4				
	Scale a.	DF	12	x^2	21.26		Significant at .05 level					
	Scale b.	DF	12	x^2	23.96		Significant at .05 level					

administrator commented that some form of censorship should exist. Four (4) student leaders, two (2) students, seven (7) faculty and eight (8) administrators commented that some check was needed to insure that the editors were responsible to a sterner code of journalistic ethics and higher level of expertise. Two (2) administrators and one (1) faculty member indicated that the State News should be totally independent of the University. Two (2) students and one (1) student leader felt that voluntary subscription would create a more responsible newspaper.

Table 35 shows the response to item number 33. This principle states that students have maximum freedom to express opinions and communicate ideas by writing, publishing and distributing materials. In responding to this principle sixty-three per cent (63%) of the students, and seventy-three per cent (73%) of the student leaders considered it to be highly desirable, whereas, forty-four per cent (44%) of the faculty and fifty-one per cent (51%) of the administrators thought it so. The difference in responses among the four groups was significant at the .05 level of confidence.

No significant difference was found in the responses of the groups to the change in practices.

Two (2) administrators and one (1) faculty person stated that this principle has long been maintained in the University. Three (3) faculty and one (1) administrator

TABLE 35.--Students have maximum freedom to express opinions and communicate ideas by writing, publishing and distributing materials.

Scale	a.	Undesirable								a.	Highly Desirable		
	b.	No Change								b.	Great Change		
		1		2		3		4		5		TOTAL	
		N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%		
Students	a.	3	4.1	4	5.4	8	10.8	12	16.2	47	63.5	74	
	b.	12	19	14	22.2	19	30.2	8	12.7	10	15.9	63	
Student Leaders	a.	0	0.0	3	4.1	7	9.5	10	13.5	54	73	74	
	b.	17	23.3	12	16.4	21	28.8	14	19.2	9	12.3	73	
Faculty	a.	5	6.5	6	7.8	18	23.4	14	18.2	34	44.2	77	
	b.	13	23.6	11	20	18	32.7	7	12.7	6	10.9	55	
Administrators	a.	7	9.9	5	7	13	18.3	10	14.1	36	50.7	71	
	b.	8	12.9	11	17.7	10	16.1	17	27.4	16	25.8	62	
Total	a.	15		18		46		46		171		296	
	b.	50		48		68		46		41		253	
Mean	a.	4.1				Std. Dev.	a.	1.2					
	b.	2.9					b.	1.3					
Scale a. DF 12 χ^2 21.80 Significant at .05 level													

agreed with the principle as long as the opinions and ideas remained in the realm of truth. Three (3) administrators and one (1) faculty member felt that the freedom should be within the legal limit with the usual rules of libel. Four (4) student leaders, two (2) administrators and one (1) faculty person agreed in principle, providing the distribution of such material does not infringe upon the rights of others. Two (2) faculty, two (2) student leaders and one (1) student qualified their response in that the materials should be in good taste.

Responses to the principle stating that the University does not authorize student publication appear in Table 36. Only fifteen per cent (15%) of the students responding and seven per cent (7%) of the student leaders indicated the principle to be undesirable, whereas, twenty-four per cent (24%) of the faculty and thirty-three per cent (33%) of the administrators designated the principle as undesirable. The mean response of the four groups was 3.4 on the 5 point scale. The difference in the responses for the four groups was significant at .01 level of confidence.

In the degree which practices were believed to have changed, administrators perceived the greatest change while students perceived the least change. The difference in the responses of the four groups was significant at the .01 level of confidence.

TABLE 36.--The University does not authorize student publications.

Scale	a. Undesirable						a. Highly Desirable					
	b. No Change						b. Great Change					
	1		2		3		4		5			
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	TOTAL	
Students	a.	11	15.3	6	8.3	17	23.6	10	13.9	28	38.9	72
	b.	22	38.6	8	14	21	36.8	5	8.8	1	1.8	57
Student Leaders	a.	5	6.9	6	8.3	13	18.1	17	23.6	31	43.1	72
	b.	24	33.8	6	8.5	27	38	14	19.7	0	0.0	71
Faculty	a.	16	23.9	7	10.4	15	22.4	3	4.5	26	38.8	67
	b.	14	33.3	8	19	14	33.3	3	7.1	3	7.1	42
Administrators	a.	22	33.3	9	13.6	10	15.2	3	4.5	22	33.3	66
	b.	16	28.6	5	8.9	15	26.8	7	12.5	13	23.2	56
Total	a.	54		28		55		33		107		277
	b.	76		27		77		29		17		226
Mean	a.	3.4						a.	1.5			
	b.	2.5						b.	1.3			
	Scale a.	DF	12	x ²	31.93					Significant at .01 level		
	Scale b.	DF	12	x ²	35.93					Significant at .01 level		

Four (4) student leaders, two (2) administrators, and two (2) faculty agreed with the principle and stated that the University, therefore, should cease to fund the State News by taxing students. Two (2) administrators, two (2) faculty and one (1) student suggested that the University should authorize an official University publication but not restrict student publications.

Item 35 states that the responsibility for editorial or other content, finance and distribution lies with the sponsoring agency, group, or organization. Table 37 summarizes the responses to this principle. Little difference was shown among the groups. The principle was perceived to be desirable. The mean for the four groups was 4.2 on the 5 point scale.

Little variation was shown in the responses of the four groups in their opinion to change in practices. No significant difference among the group responses existed on Scale b.

Four (4) faculty, four (4) student leaders, four (4) students and three (3) administrators commented that the relationship of the State News to the University should be clarified in relation to this principle. Four (4) faculty, two (2) student leaders and two (2) administrators further commented that students are the sponsoring group since they are required to subsidize the State News, yet they have no avenue for expressing approval or disapproval.

TABLE 37.--Responsibility for editorial or other content, finance and distribution lies with the sponsoring agency, group or organization.

Scale	a. Undesirable						a. Highly Desirable						TOTAL
	b. No Change						b. Great Change						
	1		2		3		4		5				
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%			
Students	a.	3	4.1	2	2.7	11	15.1	15	20.5	42	57.5	73	
	b.	20	32.3	13	21	20	32.3	5	8.1	4	6.5	62	
Student Leaders	a.	1	1.4	3	4.1	8	10.8	10	13.5	52	70.3	74	
	b.	18	25	13	18.1	23	31.9	15	20.8	3	4.2	72	
Faculty	a.	5	6.9	5	6.9	8	11.1	14	19.4	40	55.6	72	
	b.	14	33.3	7	16.7	13	31	3	7.1	5	11.9	42	
Adminis- trators	a.	6	8.6	3	4.3	7	10	13	18.6	41	58.6	70	
	b.	11	19.6	12	21.4	23	41.1	5	8.9	5	8.9	56	
Total	a.	15		13		34		52		175		289	
	b.	63		45		79		28		17		232	
Mean	a.	4.2				Std. Dev.	a.	1.1					
	b.	2.5					b.	1.2					

Responses to item 36 were of significant difference at the .05 level of confidence as indicated in Table 38. Students and student leaders indicated that the principle stating that the privilege of distribution which is accorded to any free student publication is equally accorded to all, was more desirable than perceived by faculty and administrators. Seventy-one per cent (71%) of the students and eighty-one per cent (81%) of the student leaders rated the statement as highly desirable. Fifty-nine per cent (59%) of the faculty and sixty-three per cent (63%) of the administrators marked it accordingly.

No significant difference was shown among the groups regarding their opinions in change of practices.

Two (2) administrators, two (2) faculty, two (2) students and two (2) student leaders commented that content should be a factor determining whether a publication should be accorded the privilege of distribution. Two (2) student leaders felt that this principle was practiced before the implementation of the Report. Two (2) student leaders and one (1) student felt that the University discriminated against certain publications in violation of this principle.

Table 39 gives an analysis of the responses to item 37. This principle states that the University neither authorizes nor prohibits the solicitation of advertising by any student publication. Sixty-six per cent (66%) of the students and sixty-seven per cent (67%) of the student

TABLE 38.--The privilege of distribution which is accorded to any free student publication is equally accorded to all.

Scale	a. Undesirable						a. Highly Desirable					
	b. No Change						b. Great Change					
	1		2		3		4		5			
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	TOTAL	
Students	a.	2	2.8	1	1.4	10	13.9	8	11.1	51	70.8	72
	b.	11	19.6	13	23.2	20	35.7	8	14.3	4	7.1	56
Student Leaders	a.	1	1.4	0	0.0	6	8.1	7	9.5	60	81.1	74
	b.	15	20.5	12	16.4	17	23.3	15	20.5	14	19.2	73
Faculty	a.	5	6.8	5	6.8	8	10.8	12	16.2	44	59.5	74
	b.	9	19.1	10	21.3	17	36.2	7	14.9	4	8.5	47
Administrators	a.	8	11.8	1	1.5	7	10.3	9	13.2	43	63.2	68
	b.	12	20.7	9	15.5	14	24.1	10	17.2	13	22.4	58
Total	a.	16		7		31		36		198		288
	b.	47		44		68		40		36		234
Mean	a.	4.4						a.	1.1			
	b.	2.9						b.	1.3			

Scale a. DF 12 χ^2 21.91

Significant at .05 level

TABLE 39.--The University neither authorizes nor prohibits the solicitation of advertising by any student publication.

Scale	a. Undesirable											a. Highly Desirable
	b. No Change											b. Great Change
		1		2		3		4		5		TOTAL
		N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	
Students	a.	2	2.7	3	4.1	11	15.1	9	12.3	48	65.8	73
	b.	13	22	16	27.1	20	33.9	8	13.6	2	3.4	59
Student Leaders	a.	1	1.4	2	2.7	8	11	13	17.8	49	67.1	73
	b.	20	28.6	11	15.7	22	31.4	9	12.9	8	11.4	70
Faculty	a.	3	4.1	7	9.6	12	16.4	11	15.1	40	54.8	73
	b.	12	29.3	9	22	12	29.3	4	9.8	4	9.8	41
Adminis- trators	a.	11	16.2	2	2.9	10	14.7	10	14.7	35	51.5	68
	b.	17	34.7	10	20.4	11	22.4	2	4.1	9	18.4	49
Total	a.	17		14		41		43		172		287
	b.	62		46		65		23		23		219
Mean	a.	4.2				Std. Dev.	a.	1.2				
	b.	2.5					b.	1.3				
Scale a. DF 12 χ^2 24.65 Significant at .05 level												

leaders identified this principle as being highly desirable. Fifty-five per cent (55%) of the faculty and fifty-one per cent (51%) of the administrators rated it in the same category. The difference among the groups in their responses was significant at the .05 level of confidence.

No significant difference was found in the group responses to change in practices.

Two (2) student leaders and two (2) administrators believed this principle to be in practice before the implementation of the Report. One (1) faculty and one (1) administrator felt that student publications should be allowed to succeed or fail in their own way without University guidance or interference. One (1) administrator and one (1) student leader believed the student paper has created a monopoly in the solicitation of advertising.

Item 38 is not a principle contained in the Report but is a principle which is believed to underlie University policies and practices in the areas of student organizations are free to examine and to discuss all questions of interest to them, and to express opinions publicly and privately. The analysis of responses to this principle appears in Table 40.

The principle was perceived to be very desirable by all four groups. The mean rating for the four groups was 4.6 on the 5 point scale. No significant difference was found among the four groups.

TABLE 40.--Students and student organizations are free to examine and to discuss all questions of interest to them, and to express opinions publicly and privately.

Scale	a. Undesirable						a. Highly Desirable						TOTAL
	b. No Change						b. Great Change						
	1		2		3		4		5				
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%			
Students	a.	2	2.7	1	1.4	4	5.5	16	21.9	50	68.5	73	
	b.	9	14.5	15	24.2	18	29	16	25.8	4	6.5	62	
Student Leaders	a.	0	0.0	4	5.4	2	2.7	7	9.5	61	82.4	74	
	b.	8	11	11	15.1	26	35.6	18	24.7	10	13.7	73	
Faculty	a.	1	1.3	3	3.8	7	9	14	17.9	53	67.9	78	
	b.	9	16.7	13	24.1	12	22.2	7	13	13	24.1	54	
Adminis- trators	a.	1	1.4	2	2.8	7	9.7	10	13.9	52	72.2	72	
	b.	7	11.1	14	22.2	17	27	14	22.2	11	17.4	63	
Total	a.	4		10		20		47		216		297	
	b.	33		53		73		55		38		252	
Mean	a.	4.6				Std. Dev.	a.	.9					
	b.	3					b.	1.2					

Three (3) student leaders, three (3) administrators, two (2) faculty and one (1) student qualified their approval of this principle with the comment that certain limitations should exist, such as the topic being appropriate for the academic community and the person or group assuming some responsibility for opinions or views expressed. Three (3) student leaders and one (1) student believed that this principle was not being practiced in all aspects of the University. Two (2) student leaders felt that this concept was not permitted in residence halls.

Table 41 shows the responses to the statement that students are allowed to invite and hear any person of their own choosing. This is not a principle stated in the Report but is an underlying guideline for the development of the speaker's policy at Michigan State University.

Seventy per cent (70%) of the students and eighty per cent (80%) of the student leaders considered this principle to be highly desirable, whereas, fifty-five per cent (55%) of the faculty and fifty-six per cent (56%) of the administrators rated it accordingly. The difference in the responses of the four groups was significant at the .01 level of confidence.

Although the speaker's policy was in effect prior to the Report, student leaders as a group tended to report a greater degree of change in practices within the University in adhering to this principle than the other three groups.

TABLE 41.--Students are allowed to invite and to hear any person of their own choosing.

Scale	a. Undesirable						a. Highly Desirable						
	b. No Change						b. Great Change						
	1		2		3		4		5		TOTAL		
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%			
Students	a.	2	2.7	1	1.4	4	5.4	15	20.3	52	70.3	74	
	b.	12	19.4	13	21	23	37.1	9	14.5	5	8.1	62	
Student Leaders	a.	0	0.0	1	1.4	5	6.8	9	12.2	59	79.7	74	
	b.	10	13.5	13	17.6	15	20.3	19	25.7	17	23	74	
Faculty	a.	7	7.9	7	9.0	9	11.5	12	15.4	43	55.1	78	
	b.	11	21.6	13	25.5	16	31.4	7	13.7	4	7.8	51	
Adminis- trators	a.	9	11.4	5	7.1	10	14.3	8	11.4	39	55.7	70	
	b.	12	22.2	9	16.7	16	29.6	4	7.4	13	24.1	54	
Total	a.	17		14		28		44		193		296	
	b.	45		48		70		39		39		241	
Mean	a.	4.3					Std. Dev.	a.	1.2				
	b.	2.9						b.	1.3				
	Scale a.	DF	12	x^2	29.39	Significant at .01 level							
	Scale b.	DF	12	x^2	22.32	Significant at .05 level							

The difference in the responses was significant at the .05 level of confidence. Four (4) administrators pointed out that this had been the practice in the University since 1962. Three (3) faculty raised the question of using publicly owned buildings and insisted that such speakers should be at the students' expense. Three (3) faculty and one (1) administrator, two (2) student leaders and two (2) students insisted that some limitations should exist. Three (3) faculty and one (1) student leader were in favor of this principle providing all sides of an issue would be presented. Three (3) student leaders and one (1) student mentioned the Great Issues series as evidence of the implementation of this principle. Two (2) faculty and two (2) students wanted the principle qualified so that the sponsoring agent or group would assume responsibility for the relevancy of the topic and the intellectual integrity of the speaker.

Item 40 states that procedures required before a guest speaker is invited to appear on campus are designed only to insure that there is orderly scheduling of the facilities and adequate preparation for the event. This guideline is not a principle contained in the Report but rather is an underlying statement used in the development of the speaker's policy at Michigan State. The responses to this statement have been analyzed in Table 42.

Students and student leaders perceived this principle to be slightly more desirable than did faculty and

TABLE 42.--Procedures required before a guest speaker is invited to appear on campus are designed only to insure that there is orderly scheduling of facilities and adequate preparation for the event.

Scale	a. Undesirable						a. Highly Desirable					
	b. No Change						b. Great Change					
	1		2		3		4		5			
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	TOTAL	
Students	a.	1	1.4	3	4.1	2	2.7	18	24.3	50	67.6	74
	b.	16	25.8	16	25.8	23	37.1	4	6.5	3	4.8	62
Student Leaders	a.	3	4.1	1	1.4	3	4.1	13	17.8	53	72.6	73
	b.	12	16.9	11	15.5	27	38	12	16.9	9	12.7	71
Faculty	a.	7	9.2	9	11.8	8	10.5	11	14.5	41	53.9	76
	b.	14	27.5	13	25.5	14	27.5	5	9.8	5	9.8	51
Administrators	a.	5	7.2	5	7.2	9	13	11	15.9	39	56.5	69
	b.	9	16.7	7	13	19	35.2	7	13	12	22.2	54
Total	a.	16		18		22		53		183		292
	b.	51		47		83		28		29		238
Mean	a.	4.3						a.	1.2			
	b.	2.7						b.	1.3			
Scale a. DF 12 χ^2 24.31 Significant at .05 level												

administrators. Sixty-eight per cent (68%) of the students and seventy-three per cent (73%) of the student leaders rated the principle as highly desirable. Fifty-four per cent (54%) of the faculty and fifty-six per cent (56%) of the administrators rated the statement as highly desirable. The difference in the responses among the groups was significant at the .05 level of confidence.

On the scale judging the change in practices administrators perceived slightly more change than the other three groups. No significant difference existed among the group responses.

Two (2) administrators, one (1) student leader and one (1) faculty person indicated that this principle had been followed by the University for several years. Two (2) student leaders saw this principle as an interpretational loophole for suppression. Four (4) student leaders and two (2) students felt that the procedures for the preparation to bring a speaker to campus were excessive, too involved and simply served to harass. Four (4) faculty, two (2) administrators, one (1) student and one (1) student leader commented that there should exist some selection process before an outside speaker is brought on campus.

Summary

Chapter V has presented an analysis of the responses of the four groups to a forty item questionnaire consisting of statements or principles, which for the most part were

extracted from the report on the "Academic Freedom for Students at Michigan State University." Contingency tables were used to summarize responses of the four groups to each of two scales: Scale a represented the degree to which respondents considered the principle to be desirable; and Scale b represented the degree to which respondents believed practices in the University had changed relative to the implementation of the principle. Percentages were used to analyze responses to each of the five ratings on the two scales, i.e., ranging from undesirable to desirable on Scale a and from no change to great change on Scale b. Chi square, a non-parametric statistic was used to analyze differences among the four groups. Differences in responses have been noted when they were found to be significant at the .05 level of confidence.

Comments were solicited to each statement and in those instances where two or more respondents made essentially the same comment, they have been edited and summarized in the analysis.

A summary of the conclusions drawn from this analysis are found in the next chapter along with a discussion of the implications for further study.

CHAPTER VI

SUMMARY, FINDINGS AND CONCLUSIONS

The Problem

The purpose of this study was to assess the desirability of selected principles contained in the report on the "Academic Freedom for Students at Michigan State University." In the development and subsequent adoption of the Report it was assumed that the principles or guidelines upon which the Report was founded were generally acceptable to the University community. One of the purposes of the study was to determine if this assumption was correct. If in fact the principles put forth in the Report were considered to be desirable and accepted in spirit, changes in practices should have taken place in the University which would be in accord with these principles. Opinions of students, student leaders, faculty and administrators were compared with respect to (a) the desirability of these principles and (b) the degree of change which would move practices in the University toward these principles. Four sample groups of students, student leaders, faculty and administrators were randomly selected to determine whether there was any relationship between membership

in a particular segment of the University community and the desirability of selected principles found in the Report.

Design of the Study

A forty item questionnaire consisting of the fundamental guidelines underlying the Report was mailed to each individual in the sample groups in the fall of 1968. Eighty-three per cent (83%) of the sample groups returned the questionnaire with seventy-six per cent (76%) of those returned being statistically useable. Not all respondents answered all questions, particularly in Scale b which had to do with change in practices. A number of the respondents indicated that they did not feel qualified to express an opinion in an area with which they were unfamiliar. This was especially the case with faculty and administrators.

The questionnaire was divided into four areas of student freedoms: (1) academic and classroom; (2) student records; (3) regulations, rules and student conduct; and (4) freedom of expression. For each principle or item the individual was requested to make two responses: (a) the degree to which he felt the principle to be desirable; and (b) the degree which he felt practices had moved closer to the principle since the implementation of the Report. Responses were indicated on two scales with arbitrary values from one to five. Chi square, a non-parametric statistic was used to analyze the data. The .05 level of confidence was used to determine statistical significance

in differences among the groups. Comments were solicited after each principle. If two or more respondents made essentially the same comment, it was edited and reported.

Desirability of the Principles

Academic and Classroom

Those principles pertaining to academic and classroom rights of students have been well received by all four groups. On only two principles were there significant differences among the four groups. Faculty and administrators perceived the guideline that procedures be established for hearing complaints to reconcile a right of the faculty and the right of a student to be slightly less desirable than did students and student leaders. These groups differed in the same pattern on the principle that membership be provided for students on regular departmental and college committees in which problems are discussed and policies formulated.

Student Records

Significant difference was established on but two principles pertaining to student records. Students and student leaders perceived the principle stating there is a demonstrable need for all records retained which is reasonably related to the basic necessities of the University to be less desirable than did faculty and administrators. On the other hand faculty and administrators indicated the

principle stating that no one outside the faculty or administrative staff should have access to the record of a student's offenses against University regulations without express permission of the student in writing to be less desirable than did students and student leaders.

Regulations, Rules and Student Conduct

Of the fourteen principles relating to regulations, rules and student conduct significant differences among the groups were apparent in the responses for two principles. Faculty perceived the statement that students participate to the maximum extent feasible in formulating and revising regulations governing student conduct to be less desirable than the other three groups. Students and student leaders believed the principle stating that there is a demonstrable need for each regulation which is reasonably related to the basic purposes and necessities of the University to be less desirable than did the faculty and administrators.

Freedom of Expression

Although the section on freedom of expression contained only nine principles, significant differences among the groups in the desirability of the principle were shown in seven of the items.

Students and student leaders considered the statement that faculty, administrators and students who are not staff members do not exercise any powers of veto or censorship

over news or editorial content in the student newspaper to be more desirable than did faculty and administrators. This principle tended to be one of the least accepted in the questionnaire with a mean score of 3.8 for the combined groups. The same difference was found in responses to the principle stating that students have maximum freedom to express opinions and communicate ideas by writing, publishing and distributing materials.

The least accepted principle in the study states that the University does not authorize student publications. The mean score for the four groups was 3.4 on the arbitrary 5 point scale. Although students and student leaders did not perceive this to be very desirable, faculty and administrators considered it to be even less desirable. Students and student leaders considered the statement that the privilege of distribution which is accorded to any free student publication is equally accorded to all to be more desirable than did faculty and administrators. The same was true for the principle stating that the University neither authorizes nor prohibits the solicitation of advertising by any student publication.

The principle stating that students are allowed to invite and to hear any person of their own choosing was not drawn from the report on the "Academic Freedom for Students at Michigan State University" but is considered to be an underlying principle to the speaker's policy

established at Michigan State in 1962. Again students and student leaders considered this principle to be significantly more desirable than did faculty and administrators. Another principle not contained in the Report but one relating to the speaker's policy states that procedures required before a guest speaker is invited to appear on campus are designed only to insure that there is orderly scheduling of facilities and adequate preparation for the event. Again students and student leaders perceived this statement to be significantly more desirable than did faculty and administrators

Change in Practices

Academic and Classroom

In the section on principles relating to academic and classroom rights, faculty and administrators indicated a greater degree in the changes which have moved practices closer to the principle stating that the student receives accurate and clearly stated information which enables him to determine his own academic relationship with the University and any special conditions which apply than did students and student leaders. In the same category faculty and administrators perceived a greater change, which was significantly higher than the students and student leaders, in moving practices closer to the principle stating that departments and colleges have clearly

defined channels for the receipt and consideration of student complaints concerning the quality of instruction.

Student Records

In the category of student records, student leaders and administrators believed a greater change in practices had occurred relative to the following principles: records being based on respect for the privacy of the individual student; not retaining records of students religious or political beliefs without his knowledge; and the right of the student to inspect the official transcript of his own academic record. Administrators sensed a greater degree in change in practices than did the other three groups toward the principles relating to the instruction of persons handling confidential information and the access to the record of a student's offenses against University regulations without the express permission of the student in writing.

Regulations, Rules and Student Conduct

Under those freedoms relating to regulations, rules and student conduct faculty and administrators perceived to a greater degree than students and student leaders that practices had moved closer to the following principles: only where the institution's interests as an academic community are distinct and clearly involved is the special authority of the institution asserted in addition to

penalties prescribed by civil authorities; all regulations governing student conduct are made public in an appropriate manner; and there is a demonstrable need for each regulation which is reasonably related to the basic purposes and necessities of the University.

In the same area of freedoms, students perceived less change in practices than did the other three groups relative to the following principles: clearly defined channels and procedures exist for the appeal and review of the finding of guilt in an alleged violation of a regulation; clearly defined channels and procedures exist for the appeal and review of the reasonableness, under the circumstances, of the penalty imposed for a specific violation; and clearly defined channels and procedures exist for the appeal and review of the substance of a regulation or administrative decision.

Freedom of Expression

Under those principles pertaining to freedom of expression significant differences existed in three of the nine principles. Faculty and administrators indicated greater change in practices toward meeting the principle stating that premises occupied by students and personal possessions of students are not searched unless appropriate authorization has been obtained. Administrators saw greater change in the University which moved practices closer to the principle stating that the University

does not authorize student publications. The third principle in which a significant difference in response existed was the principle stating that students are allowed to invite and to hear any person of their own choosing. Student leaders indicated that practices had moved closer to this principle to a greater degree than perceived by the other three groups.

Conclusions

It may be concluded that the principles or guidelines upon which the Report was founded are considered to be desirable as substantiated by a range in mean scores of the combined samples from 3.4 to 4.9 for each of the forty principles. This supports the assumption that the principles were believed to be desirable and if accepted in spirit, it was assumed that practices in the University would move closer to these desired principles as a result of the implementation of the Report.

Further, it is concluded that the principles underlying certain student freedoms in the University, although generally perceived to be desirable, are not as desirable to all groups which make up the University community. Of the nine principles stated in the section on student rights having to do with freedom of expression, significant difference in the response made by the four groups on seven of the principles was noted. Five of these principles relate to student publications and distribution.

It was this same area of student freedom which was discussed and debated at great length in the Academic Council before the final adoption of the Report, as described in Chapter III of this study.

Caution must be exercised in drawing any conclusions from the data relative to changes in the University which have moved practices closer to the principles embodied in the report on the "Academic Freedom for Students at Michigan State University." Three considerations must be taken into account. First, in Chapter III, which presented a brief historical development of the Report, mention was made several times by those who were instrumental in developing the Report, that many of the guidelines presented had long been implied and practiced in the University and that the Report simply made those principles explicit. This assumption was supported in the questionnaire by many comments made by administrators and faculty. Another consideration is the question of knowledgability of the Report and awareness to change in practices. Student leaders, faculty and administrators tended to be more familiar with the Report as indicated by their responses to having access to the Report and having read the Report. Of those students responding only four out of ten indicated that they had read the Report although eight out of ten responded to having access to the Report. Another consideration which makes one cautious in drawing

conclusions is that many administrators and faculty were hesitant to give an opinion on change in practices if the principle did not fall within the familiarity of their specific duties or responsibilities. On the other hand, student leaders tended to respond to both scales of the questionnaire.

Very pronounced changes in practices were not perceived to have taken place. The most marked changes were believed to have taken place relative to the principle stating that membership is provided for students on departmental and college committees and the statement that students participate to the maximum extent feasible in formulating regulations. The mean score for the responses of the four groups was 3.3 on each of these two scales. Of the forty principles, only eight received mean scores of 3.0 or higher relative to change in practices. Four of the eight were in the area of regulations, rules and student conduct. This section of the Report tended to call for a considerable revision in the judicial structure and procedures in the University, a process in which students were very much involved.

Comments made by some of the respondents pointed out that the Report had brought about an increased awareness in the practices of the University relative to the principles contained in the Report. Although some principles were a restatement of those long implied,

practices were scrutinized and reviewed in relation to the newly stated principles. Comments from administrators stated that in certain instances changes in policies and practices such as student records and student participation on departmental and college committees, were a direct result of the implementation of the Report. Several comments also supported the belief that the University is still undergoing the process of moving practices closer to the principles put forth in the Report.

Implications for Further Study

This study concerned itself with the development of report on the "Academic Freedom for Students at Michigan State University" and the assessment of the acceptance of the Report after it had been implemented for one and a half years. It is assumed that this study will be the first in a series of evaluations of the Report. No attempt was made to evaluate the policies and procedures that have evolved from the Report. This appears to be a necessary task left undone. The brief historical development of the Report is but a beginning and should serve as an incentive and reference for a much more comprehensive study of the concerns and considerations that went into the development of the Report.

Several areas of disagreement exist which merit further study. The entire subject of student publications and their distribution warrants review. Opinions and

concerns were expressed by the various members of the University community which seem to indicate that this matter is yet unsettled. Another area of possible conflict appears to reside in those principles under the section of freedoms in the classroom. The Report has not made it clear just how the rights of the faculty and the rights of a student can be arbitrated. Perhaps the rights of the faculty need to be expanded and clarified beyond those statements appearing in the Report under the professional rights of the faculty.

Beyond these considerations are greater concerns in which comprehensive studies need to be carried out. The whole area of the relationship of the student with the University and the role of the student in academic governance, having to do with such matters as the contributions made by students on the various departmental, college and faculty committees, need to be thoroughly examined.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- "A Looser Rein on Students." Summary of the McGrath Report at Brown University. New York Times, May 14, 1967.
- "Academic Freedom for Students at Michigan State University." East Lansing: Michigan State University, March, 1967.
- American Civil Liberties Union. "Teachers Disclosure of Information About Students to Prospective Employers." New York, 1965
- . "Academic Freedom and Civil Liberties of Students in Colleges and Universities." Rev. ed. New York, 1965.
- Brochure prepared by the Ombudsman. East Lansing: Michigan State University, 1968.
- "Committee on Academic Innovation and Development at the University of California at Los Angeles." Printed in Los Angeles Times, December 6, 1967.
- Culpepper, J. Broward. "All Have Major Roles to Play." Whose Goals for Higher Education? Edited by Charles G. Dobbins and Calvin B. T. Lee, American Council on Education. Washington, D. C., 1968, pp. 133-140.
- Dixon v. Alabama State Board of Education, 294 Federal Reporter, 2nd series, No. 18641, United States Court of Appeals, Circuit 5, 1961.
- Fortas, Abe. Concerning Dissent and Civil Disobedience. New York: Signet Books, 1968.
- Frankel, Charles. "Rights and Responsibilities in the Student-College Relationship." The College and the Student. Edited by Lawrence E. Dennis and Joseph F. Kauffman. Washington, D. C.: American Council on Education, 1967, pp. 232-251.
- Fuchs, Ralph. "Academic Freedom--Its Basic Philosophy, Function and History." Law and Contemporary Problems, XXVIII, No. 3 (Summer, 1963), pp. 431-437.

Gott v. Berea College, 156 Ky., 276, 161 S.W. 204 (1913).

Hofstadter, Richard and Metzger, Walter P. The Development of Academic Freedom in the United States. New York: Columbia University Press, 1965.

Hughes, Sue. "Freedom Report Found Dead." Collage.
Michigan State News. East Lansing, Michigan,
October 4, 1968.

Joint Statement on Rights and Freedoms of Students.
Under the auspices of the American Association of
University Professors. Washington, D. C., 1966.

Jondahl, Lynn H. "The Freedom of Higher Education."
Crossroads. Board of Christian Education, United
Presbyterian Church. April-June, 1968, pp. 4-29.

Kadish, Mortimer R. "Nature of the Problem." Freedom
and Order in the University. Edited by Samuel Gorovitz.
Cleveland: Western Reserve University Press, 1967,
pp. 159-177.

Kish, Leslie. Survey Sampling. New York: Wiley and Sons,
1965.

Kluge, Donald A. and Smith, Jacqueline. "Recent Statements
of Principles, Rights and Procedures in Student
Behavior." Journal of the National Association of
Women Deans and Counselors, Winter, 1968, pp. 64-68.

Konvitz, Milton R. Expanding Liberties. New York:
The Viking Press, 1966.

Kuhn, Madison. Michigan State. The First Hundred Years.
East Lansing: Michigan State University Press,
1955.

Mehrens, William A. and Ebel, Robert L. (eds.). Principles
of Educational and Psychological Measurement.
Chicago: Rand McNally and Co., 1967.

Metzger, Walter P. Academic Freedom in the Age of the
University. New York: Columbia University Press,
1955.

Minutes of the Academic Council at Michigan State Univer-
sity. On file in the Office of the Secretary to
the Faculties, Michigan State University, East
Lansing, Michigan, 1966-1967.

Minutes of the Faculty Committee on Student Arrairs. On file in the Office of the Vice President for Student Affairs at Michigan State University, East Lansing, Michigan, 1965, 1966, 1967.

Money Penny, Phillip. "The Student as a Student." Denver Law Journal, Vol. 45, No. 4 (Special, 1968), pp. 649-662.

"Non-Academic Relationships Between Students and the University." Report and Recommendations of Committee on Student Affairs, University of Kentucky, May, 1967.

Release by the Committee on Student Rights, Michigan State University, East Lansing, Michigan, February, 1965.

"Report of the Ad Hoc Committee on Mode of Response to Obstruction, Interview Policy and Related Matters." University of Wisconsin, Madison, Wisconsin, March, 1968.

"Report of the Commission on the Interdependence of University Regulations and Local, State and Federal Law," Cornell University, Ithaca, New York, September, 1967.

Rudolf, Frederick. The American College and University. New York: Random House, 1962.

Sanford, Nevitt, (ed.). "Higher Education as a Field of Study." The American College. New York: Wiley and Sons, 1966, pp. 31-73.

_____. Where Colleges Fail. San Francisco: Josey-Bass Inc., 1967.

Schwartz, Edward. "Comment," Legal Aspects of Students Institutional Relationships. Denver Law Journal, Vol. 45, No. 4 (1968), pp. 525-532.

Seavey. "Dismissal of Students: Due Process." 70 Harvard Law Review, 1406, 1957.

Siegel, Sidney. Non-parametric Statistics for the Behavioral Sciences. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Co., 1956.

Statement on Confidentiality of Student Records. Washington D. C.: American Council on Education, 1967.

"Statement on Faculty Responsibility for Academic Freedom for Students." Committee S of the American Association of University Professors. A.A.U.P. Bulletin, Autumn, 1964, pp. 254-257.

"Statement on Government of Colleges and Universities." A.A.U.P. Bulletin, Vol. 52 (1966), p. 375.

Student Conduct and Discipline Proceedings in a University Setting. New York: New York University School of Law, August, 1968.

Taylor, Harold. "Freedom and Authority on Campus." The American College. Edited by Nevitt Sanford. New York: Wiley and Sons, 1966, pp. 774-804.

"University of Oregon Student Conduct Program." Eugene: University of Oregon, 1965.

Van Alstyne, William W. "The Student as University Resident." Denver Law Journal, Vol. 45, No. 4 (Special, 1968), pp. 582-613.

_____. "The Demise of the Right-Privilege Distinction in Constitutional Law." 81 Harvard Law Review, 1439, 1968.

_____. Law in Transition Quarterly. Winter, 1965.

Weiss, Donald H. "Freedom of Association for Students." The Journal of Higher Education, XXXVIII, No. 4 (April, 1967), pp. 187-189.

Williamson, E. G. and Cowan, John L. The American Students' Freedom of Expression. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1966.

Wilson, Logan. "Campus Freedom and Order." Denver Law Journal, Vol. 45, No. 4 (Special, 1968), pp. 502-510.

APPENDICES

MICHIGAN STATE UNIVERSITY EAST LANSING • MICHIGAN 48823

OFFICE OF STUDENT AFFAIRS • DEAN OF STUDENTS

As an Assistant to the Vice President for Student Affairs and a doctoral candidate at Michigan State University, I am conducting a study to evaluate the report on the "Academic Freedom for Students at Michigan State University".

The purpose of the study is not to advocate any specific freedoms but to assess the degree of acceptance or rejection of certain principles expressed in the report. All responses will be confidential and no person will be identified in the study.

A tentative deadline has been established for December 6, 1968. Your prompt attention to this project and the return of the questionnaire will be greatly appreciated. Please return your response to this office in the enclosed self-addressed envelope.

Thank you for your cooperation.



Robert R. Fedore
Assistant to the Vice President
for Student Affairs

MICHIGAN STATE UNIVERSITY
Office of the Vice President for Student Affairs

QUESTIONNAIRE ON THE IMPACT OF THE ACADEMIC FREEDOM REPORT

The purpose of this questionnaire is to gain your opinion with respect to the impact of the Academic Freedom Report. It is understood that the responses you make are derived from your own experiences as related to your responsibilities as a faculty member, student or administrator in the University. The results of this study will be confidential and used for research purposes only. At no time will your name appear in relation to this study. Please do not sign the questionnaire.

The Academic Freedom Report states certain principles. These are believed to be desired goals, and the Report provides mechanisms which, hopefully, will move University policies and practices close to these principles. Principles relating to academic and classroom, student records, student conduct and regulations, and student publications and freedom of expression appear in this questionnaire. You are requested to make two responses to each principle:

- (a) the degree to which you feel these principles are desirable;
- (b) the degree to which you feel practices have moved closer to these principles over the past year because of the Academic Freedom Report.

Any comments, criticisms, or suggested revisions or amendments are solicited in the space provided after each question. Additional comments may be made on the back of the page.

(Circle One)

Do you have access to the Academic Freedom Report? Yes No

Have you read the Academic Freedom Report? Yes No

In answering the questionnaire, one response should be selected and circled for each of the two scales.

Academic and Classroom

1. The student is free to take reasoned exception to data and views offered in the classroom, and to reserve judgment about matters of opinion, without fear of penalty.

	Undesirable				Highly desirable
	No change				Great change
	<u>Low</u>				<u>High</u>
a. Desirability of principle	1	2	3	4	5
b. Degree of change in past year	1	2	3	4	5

Comments: _____

2. The student is protected against improper disclosure of information concerning his grades, views, beliefs, political associations, health, or character which an instructor acquires in the course of his professional relations with the student.

	<u>Low</u>			<u>High</u>	
a. Desirability of principle	1	2	3	4	5
b. Degree of change in past year	1	2	3	4	5

Comments: _____

3. The student receives accurate and clearly stated information which enables him to determine his own academic relationship with the University and any special conditions which apply.

	<u>Low</u>			<u>High</u>	
a. Desirability of principle	1	2	3	4	5
b. Degree of change in past year	1	2	3	4	5

Comments: _____

4. The student receives accurate and clearly stated information which enables him to determine the general requirements for establishing and maintaining an acceptable academic standing.

	<u>Low</u>			<u>High</u>	
a. Desirability or principle	1	2	3	4	5
b. Degree of change in past year	1	2	3	4	5

Comments: _____

5. Procedures are established for hearing complaints to reconcile a right of the faculty and the right of a student

	<u>Low</u>			<u>High</u>	
a. Desirability of principle	1	2	3	4	5
b. Degree of change in past year	1	2	3	4	5

Comments: _____

6. Membership is provided for students on regular departmental and college committees in which problems are discussed and policies formulated.

	<u>Low</u>				<u>High</u>
a. Desirability of principle	1	2	3	4	5
b. Degree of change in past year	1	2	3	4	5

Comments: _____

7. Departments and colleges have clearly defined channels for the receipt and consideration of student complaints concerning the quality of instruction.

	<u>Low</u>				<u>High</u>
a. Desirability of principle	1	2	3	4	5
b. Degree of change in past year	1	2	3	4	5

Comments: _____

Student Records

8. All policies and practices concerning records are based on respect for the privacy of the individual student.

	<u>Low</u>				<u>High</u>
a. Desirability of principle	1	2	3	4	5
b. Degree of change in past year	1	2	3	4	5

Comments: _____

9. There is a demonstrable need for all records retained which is reasonably related to the basic necessities and purposes of the institution.

	<u>Low</u>				<u>High</u>
a. Desirability of principle	1	2	3	4	5
b. Degree of change in past year	1	2	3	4	5

Comments: _____

10. Records of a student's religious or political beliefs are not retained without his knowledge or consent.

	<u>Low</u>				<u>High</u>
a. Desirability of principle	1	2	3	4	5
b. Degree of change in past year	1	2	3	4	5

Comments: _____

11. A student has the right to inspect the official transcript of his own academic record.

	<u>Low</u>				<u>High</u>
a. Desirability of principle	1	2	3	4	5
b. Degree of change in past year	1	2	3	4	5

Comments: _____

12. A student has the right to inspect reports and evaluations of his conduct, except letters of recommendation and similar evaluations which are necessarily prepared on a confidential basis.

	<u>Low</u>				<u>High</u>
a. Desirability of principle	1	2	3	4	5
b. Degree of change in past year	1	2	3	4	5

Comments: _____

13. Evaluations of students are made only by persons qualified to make that evaluation

	<u>Low</u>				<u>High</u>
a. Desirability of principle	1	2	3	4	5
b. Degree of change in past year	1	2	3	4	5

Comments: _____

14. All persons handling confidential records are instructed concerning the confidential nature of such information and concerning their responsibilities regarding it.

	<u>Low</u>				<u>High</u>
a. Desirability of principle	1	2	3	4	5
b. Degree of change in past year	1	2	3	4	5

Comments: _____

15. No one outside the faculty or administrative staff has access to the record of a student's offenses against University regulations without the express permission of the student in writing.

	<u>Low</u>				<u>High</u>
a. Desirability of principle	1	2	3	4	5
b. Degree of change in past year	1	2	3	4	5

Comments: _____

16. Transcripts of academic record contain only information about the academic status of the student.

	<u>Low</u>				<u>High</u>
a. Desirability of principle	1	2	3	4	5
b. Degree of change in past year	1	2	3	4	5

Comments: _____

17. Membership lists of student organizations, especially those related to matters of a political belief, or action, are not retained.

	<u>Low</u>				<u>High</u>
a. Desirability of principle	1	2	3	4	5
b. Degree of change in past year	1	2	3	4	5

Comments: _____

18. The enforcement of the students duties to the larger society is left to legal and judicial authorities duly established for that purpose.

	<u>Low</u>					<u>High</u>				
a. Desirability of principle	1	2	3	4	5					
b. Degree of change in past year	1	2	3	4	5					

Comments: _____

19. Only where the institution's interests as an academic community are distinct and clearly involved is the special authority of the institution asserted in addition to penalties prescribed by civil authorities.

	<u>Low</u>					<u>High</u>				
a. Desirability of principle	1	2	3	4	5					
b. Degree of change in past year	1	2	3	4	5					

Comments: _____

20. Students participate to the maximum extent feasible in formulating and revising regulations governing student conduct.

	<u>Low</u>					<u>High</u>				
a. Desirability of principle	1	2	3	4	5					
b. Degree of change in past year	1	2	3	4	5					

Comments: _____

21. All regulations governing student conduct are made public in an appropriate manner.

	<u>Low</u>					<u>High</u>				
a. Desirability of principle	1	2	3	4	5					
b. Degree of change in past year	1	2	3	4	5					

Comments: _____

22. Regulations relating to the communication of ideas encourage the competition of ideas.

	<u>Low</u>					<u>High</u>				
a. Desirability of principle	1	2	3	4	5					
b. Degree of change in past year	1	2	3	4	5					

Comments: _____

23. There is a demonstrable need for each regulation which is reasonably related to the basic purposes and necessities of the University.

	<u>Low</u>					<u>High</u>				
a. Desirability of principle	1	2	3	4	5					
b. Degree of change in past year	1	2	3	4	5					

Comments: _____

24. Procedures and penalties for the violation of regulations are designed for guidance or correction of behavior rather than for retribution.

	<u>Low</u>					<u>High</u>				
a. Desirability of principle	1	2	3	4	5					
b. Degree of change in past year	1	2	3	4	5					

Comments: _____

25. All regulations seek the best possible reconciliation of the principles of maximum freedom and necessary order.

	<u>Low</u>					<u>High</u>				
a. Desirability of principle	1	2	3	4	5					
b. Degree of change in past year	1	2	3	4	5					

Comments: _____

26. Clearly defined channels and procedures exist for the appeal and review of the finding of guilt in an alleged violation of a regulation.

	<u>Low</u>				<u>High</u>
a. Desirability of principle	1	2	3	4	5
b. Degree of change in past year	1	2	3	4	5

Comments: _____

27. Clearly defined channels and procedures exist for the appeal and review of the reasonableness, under the circumstances, of the penalty imposed for a specific violation.

	<u>Low</u>				<u>High</u>
a. Desirability of principle	1	2	3	4	5
b. Degree of change in past year	1	2	3	4	5

Comments: _____

28. Clearly defined channels and procedures exist for the appeal and review of the substance of a regulation or administrative decision.

	<u>Low</u>				<u>High</u>
a. Desirability of principle	1	2	3	4	5
b. Degree of change in past year	1	2	3	4	5

Comments: _____

29. Every regulation specifies to whom it applies and whether responsibility for compliance lies with individuals, groups or both.

	<u>Low</u>				<u>High</u>
a. Desirability of principle	1	2	3	4	5
b. Degree of change in past year	1	2	3	4	5

Comments: _____

30. Any student accused of violating a regulation has the right to appear before one or more members of a duly constituted judicial body.

	<u>Low</u>				<u>High</u>
a. Desirability of principle	1	2	3	4	5
b. Degree of change in past year	1	2	3	4	5

Comments: _____

31. Premises occupied by students and the personal possessions of students are not searched unless appropriate authorization has been obtained.

	<u>Low</u>				<u>High</u>
a. Desirability of principle	1	2	3	4	5
b. Degree of change in past year	1	2	3	4	5

Comments: _____

Freedom of Expression

32. Faculty, administrators and students who are not staff members do not exercise any powers of veto or censorship over news or editorial content in the student newspaper.

	<u>Low</u>				<u>High</u>
a. Desirability of principle	1	2	3	4	5
b. Degree of change in past year	1	2	3	4	5

Comments: _____

33. Students have maximum freedom to express opinions and communicate ideas by writing, publishing and distributing materials.

	<u>Low</u>				<u>High</u>
a. Desirability of principle	1	2	3	4	5
b. Degree of change in past year	1	2	3	4	5

Comments: _____

34. The University does not authorize student publications.

	<u>Low</u>				<u>High</u>
a. Desirability of principle	1	2	3	4	5
b. Degree of change in past year	1	2	3	4	5

Comments: _____

35. Responsibility for editorial or other content, finance and distribution lies with the sponsoring agency group, or organization.

	<u>Low</u>				<u>High</u>
a. Desirability of principle	1	2	3	4	5
b. Degree of change in past year	1	2	3	4	5

Comments: _____

36. The privilege of distribution which is accorded to any free student publication is equally accorded to all.

	<u>Low</u>				<u>High</u>
a. Desirability of principle	1	2	3	4	5
b. Degree of change in past year	1	2	3	4	5

Comments: _____

37. The University neither authorizes nor prohibits the solicitation of advertising by any student publication.

	<u>Low</u>				<u>High</u>
a. Desirability of principle	1	2	3	4	5
b. Degree of change in past year	1	2	3	4	5

Comments: _____

MICHIGAN STATE UNIVERSITY EAST LANSING • MICHIGAN 48823

OFFICE OF THE DEAN OF STUDENTS • STUDENT SERVICES BUILDING

We need your assistance before the close of the term! Recently we mailed you a questionnaire regarding your opinions to the report on the "Academic Freedom for Students at Michigan State University". In order to be of benefit to the student and to the University, your response is needed. Would you kindly fill out and return the duplicate questionnaire which we have enclosed. If you have already done so, please disregard this request. Your cooperation is appreciated.

Sincerely,



Robert R. Fedore
Assistant to the
Dean of Students

Ph. 353-6470