

INFORMATION TO USERS

This material was produced from a microfilm copy of the original document. While the most advanced technological means to photograph and reproduce this document have been used, the quality is heavily dependent upon the quality of the original submitted.

The following explanation of techniques is provided to help you understand markings or patterns which may appear on this reproduction.

1. The sign or "target" for pages apparently lacking from the document photographed is "Missing Page(s)". If it was possible to obtain the missing page(s) or section, they are spliced into the film along with adjacent pages. This may have necessitated cutting thru an image and duplicating adjacent pages to insure you complete continuity.
2. When an image on the film is obliterated with a large round black mark, it is an indication that the photographer suspected that the copy may have moved during exposure and thus cause a blurred image. You will find a good image of the page in the adjacent frame.
3. When a map, drawing or chart, etc., was part of the material being photographed the photographer followed a definite method in "sectioning" the material. It is customary to begin photoing at the upper left hand corner of a large sheet and to continue photoing from left to right in equal sections with a small overlap. If necessary, sectioning is continued again — beginning below the first row and continuing on until complete.
4. The majority of users indicate that the textual content is of greatest value, however, a somewhat higher quality reproduction could be made from "photographs" if essential to the understanding of the dissertation. Silver prints of "photographs" may be ordered at additional charge by writing the Order Department, giving the catalog number, title, author and specific pages you wish reproduced.
5. PLEASE NOTE: Some pages may have indistinct print. Filmed as received.

Xerox University Microfilms

300 North Zeeb Road
Ann Arbor, Michigan 48106

74-13,971

SHIPLEY, Thomas Beecher, Jr., 1944-
A SURVEY OF THE ATTITUDES OF THE 1972-73
MEMBERS OF THE MICHIGAN STATE UNIVERSITY
ACADEMIC COUNCIL WITH RESPECT TO ONE YEAR
OF STUDENT PARTICIPATION IN ACADEMIC
GOVERNANCE.

Michigan State University, Ph.D., 1973
Education, higher

University Microfilms, A XEROX Company , Ann Arbor, Michigan

A SURVEY OF THE ATTITUDES OF THE 1972-73
MEMBERS OF THE MICHIGAN STATE UNIVERSITY
ACADEMIC COUNCIL WITH RESPECT TO ONE YEAR
OF STUDENT PARTICIPATION IN ACADEMIC GOVERNANCE

By

Thomas B. Shipley, Jr.

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

1973

ABSTRACT

A SURVEY OF THE ATTITUDES OF THE 1972-73 MEMBERS OF THE MICHIGAN STATE UNIVERSITY ACADEMIC COUNCIL WITH RESPECT TO ONE YEAR OF STUDENT PARTICIPATION IN ACADEMIC GOVERNANCE

By

Thomas B. Shipley, Jr.

In recent years much has been spoken and written about student participation in the academic governance of American institutions of higher education. Much of this dialogue has focused on the broad question of whether or not students should or should not be granted the authority to be directly involved in the shaping of the educational environments of their colleges and universities. But there has been relatively little literature appearing that deals with specific programs designed to actually incorporate students into the decision-making process.

This investigation was designed to assess the attitudes of the Michigan State University Academic Council with respect to the first year of actual student participation on this body--the primary academic decision-making forum of that large public university. The 134 administrators, faculty members, and students, who are members of the 1972-73 MSU Academic Council and who comprise the population under investigation, were asked to

communicate their feelings regarding the impact of Academic Council student participation in the followings areas:

Academic freedom; whether or not student participation detracts from or strengthens an atmosphere in which the scholarly pursuit of truth can take place.

Administrative efficiency; whether or not the involvement of students has made an impact on the governance process and whether or not the positive aspects of Academic Council student participation outweigh the negative aspects, such as increased time needed to reach decisions, student inexperience, transience, and other factors.

Community cohesion; whether or not the sharing of authority with students contributes to greater communication, cooperation, understanding, and improved interpersonal relationships among the students, faculty, and administrative personnel.

Educational value; to what degree student participation provides valuable new educational opportunities for those students involved in the academic governance process.

A 99 item questionnaire, which included the preceding four scales, was designed to elicit responses from each of the members of the 1972-73 MSU Academic Council on each of these four topics, based upon their experiences with student participation at the Academic Council level. In addition, a series of follow-up interviews were conducted with a random sample of non-responding Council members. These interviews produced additional descriptive information, as well as data for testing the representativeness of questionnaire respondents to the entire Academic Council. More than 69 percent of the Academic Council members eventually responded to the instrument and their representativeness to the entire

Council was verified by the interviews. The 12 interviewees were each asked to respond to 20 questionnaire items, selected from each of the four scales. The one-way analysis of variance test for equality of population means indicated that at the .05 level, there was no difference between the questionnaire respondents and non-respondents.

In addition to the descriptive treatment of the data, the various component groups were compared using the one-way analysis of variance test for equality of population means. Scheffe' post hoc comparisons were used to contrast significantly different group mean scores.

General findings of this study included the following:

1. The 1972-73 MSU Academic Council perceives its student members as not acting in ways detrimental to the concept of academic freedom. The Council has not felt that Academic Council student participation, within the parameters established by the "Taylor Report", has threatened the climate of academic freedom at Michigan State University. The attitudes of the Academic Council, with regard to the proper student role in academic governance, appears to conform closely to the limitations set by the "Taylor Report".

As might be expected, the responses of the student members of the Academic Council tended to advocate a much broader role in academic governance than did the faculty

Thomas B. Shipley, Jr.

or administrators, however, even they tended to feel that voting student authority was inappropriate in matters of primarily faculty concern. The social science faculty representatives were found to be significantly less pessimistic than either the liberal arts faculty representatives or the combined group of liberal arts and natural science faculty representatives with respect to the adverse effects of Academic Council student participation on academic freedom at Michigan State University.

2. The majority of the Academic Council was found to be in general agreement that its student members are capable of making important, responsible contributions, despite the complexity of governance. Most of the administrators, faculty, as well as the student Academic Council members, view student representatives as contributing to the efficiency of governance by supplying new insights and information. However, the Council continued to reaffirm its present proportion of students to non-students by responding that an increase in student involvement would not contribute additional valuable input. The Academic Council tended to agree that the student representatives are not immediately prepared to make major contributions and that some type of orientation or support system is needed to maximize student contributions. Strong disapproval was expressed concerning the granting

of salaries or academic credit to student members of the Academic Council.

The only statistically significant difference detected among the various Academic Council component groups on the Administrative Efficiency scale took place between the liberal arts and social science faculty representatives. The social science faculty group responded significantly more positively with respect to the relationship between Academic Council student participation and administrative efficiency. The largest differences between these groups occurred on statements such as the following: the complexity of academic governance precludes meaningful student contributions; the student representatives generally decide their stand on a given issue on the basis of the evidence rather than on the opinions of influential non-students; and students conscientiously prepare for Academic Council business. In each case, the social science faculty responded much more favorably toward Academic Council student participation than did the liberal arts faculty.

3. The responses of the Council to the individual items of the Community Cohesion scale provide evidence that Academic Council student participation has generally resulted in improvements in intergroup and interpersonal relationships, understanding, and in lines of communication among the administrative, faculty, and student

representatives. While this development indicates that progress has been made in this area, no such development appears to have taken place beyond the Council. The limitations on student authority established in the "Taylor Report" appear to have resulted in some degree of dissatisfaction among the student members.

The differences detected on the Community Cohesion scale were found to lie among those Academic Council component groups classified according to academic affiliation rather than among the groups classified according to academic status. The faculty representatives affiliated with the social sciences were found to be more favorably impressed than their liberal arts counterparts, as well as the combined group of liberal arts and natural science faculty representatives, with respect to the relationship between Academic Council student participation and community cohesion. In addition, significant differences were detected among the affiliated groups, i.e., groups composed of students, faculty, and administrators in each of the broad academic areas. The Council members affiliated with the social sciences viewed Academic Council student participation as significantly more conducive to closer community cohesion than did either the liberal arts affiliates or the combined group of liberal arts and natural science affiliates.

Thomas B. Shipley, Jr.

4. The Academic Council tended to view student participation at this level of governance as a means of developing student maturity and responsibility through the sharing of authority with faculty and administrators. They also perceived the student representatives as willing, ready, and interested in pursuing these opportunities despite drawbacks such as the long separation in time between decisions and consequences, and the massive bureaucratic Council machinery.

A significant difference was detected among the administrative, faculty, and student members of the Academic Council with respect to the student Academic Council experience as an important source of educational experiences. The administrative and faculty representatives were more likely to disagree with statements of this type.

BIOGRAPHICAL DATA

Name: Thomas B. Shipley, Jr.

Date of Birth: July 11, 1944

Marital Status: Married to Helen W.

Children: Two girls, Kristen and Barbara

Education: Mount Union College, Alliance, Ohio
B.S., Chemistry, 1966

Michigan State University, East Lansing,
Mich., M.A., Student Personnel Adminis-
tration, 1967

Michigan State University, East Lansing,
Mich., Ph.D., Administration and Higher
Education, 1973

Professional
Experience: University of Alabama in Huntsville,
Huntsville, Alabama, 1967-1970,
Counselor and Manager of Athletics

Michigan State University, East Lansing,
Mich., 1970-1972, Graduate Assistant,
Office of the Dean of Students

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The author expresses his sincere appreciation to the many individuals on the Michigan State University campus whose advice, support, encouragement, and special competencies have been instrumental in the completion of this investigation. Special thanks go out to Dr. Laurine Fitzgerald, chairman of my doctoral committee, the staff of the Office of Research Consultation, the members of the 1972-73 MSU Academic Council, and those individuals who advised me concerning technical and subtle aspects of this study.

Above all, deepest gratitude is expressed to my wonderful wife, Helen, whose support and assistance have been invaluable during the past three years, particularly during the more difficult times that occasionally arose during my doctoral program.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Chapter	Page
LIST OF TABLES	vi
I. THE PROBLEM	1
Introduction	1
Historical Considerations	3
The Current State of Student Participation	6
Student Participation at Michigan State University	7
Purpose	9
Instrumentation	12
Procedure and Design	13
Need and Significance of the Study	16
Limitations of the Study	18
Definition of Terms	19
Overview	21
II. REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE: STUDENT PARTICIPATION	23
Introduction	23
Present Problems Facing Contemporary American Higher Education	24
Academic Freedom	29
Administrative Efficiency	37
Community Cohesion	49
Educational Value	57
Summary	64
III. A HISTORICAL OVERVIEW OF STUDENT PARTICIPATION IN ACADEMIC GOVERNANCE AT MICHIGAN STATE UNIVERSITY	66
Introduction	66
"The Academic Freedom Report"	67
"The Massey Report"	71
"The McKee Report"	82
"The Taylor Report"	94

Chapter	Page
IV. ANALYSIS OF DATA	111
Introduction	111
Collection of Data	111
Academic Freedom Scale	122
Inter-Group Comparisons	123
Discussion of Individual Items	133
Administrative Efficiency Scale	168
Inter-Group Comparisons	169
Discussion of Individual Items	179
Community Cohesion Scale	191
Inter-Group Comparisons	192
Discussion of Individual Items	202
Educational Value Scale	229
Inter-Group Comparisons	229
Discussion of Individual Items	237
Discussion of the General Items	247
V. SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, DISCUSSION, AND RECOMMENDATIONS	253
Introduction	253
Summary	255
Academic Freedom	255
Administrative Efficiency	259
Community Cohesion	262
Educational Value	264
General Items	266
Conclusions	267
Academic Freedom	267
Administrative Efficiency	271
Community Cohesion	273
Educational Value	276
Discussion	277
Recommendations	285
BIBLIOGRAPHY	290
APPENDIX A	305
APPENDIX B	306
APPENDIX C	307
APPENDIX D	316
APPENDIX E	328
APPENDIX F	347

LIST OF TABLES

Table	Page
1 Academic Affiliation of the 1972-73 Members of the Michigan State University Academic Council	114
2 Academic Status of the 1972-73 Members of the Michigan State University Academic Council	114
3 Observed Cell Means for the Three Waves of Respondents on the Four Scales	116
4 Observed Cell Standard Deviations for the Three Waves of Respondents on the Four Scales	116
5 ANOVA Comparison of Populations for the Three Waves of Respondents on the Four Scales	117
6 Academic Affiliation of the Responding Members of the 1972-73 Academic Council of Michigan State University	118
7 Academic Status of the Responding Members of the 1972-73 Michigan State University Academic Council	119
8 Hoyt's Reliability Estimates for the Student, Faculty, and Administrative Components of the 1972-73 MSU Academic Council on Each of the Four Scales	121
9 Group Frequencies, Means, and Standard Deviations for Administrators, Faculty, and Students on the Academic Freedom Scale	124
10 ANOVA Comparison of Administrators, Faculty, and Students on the Academic Freedom Scale.	124

Table		Page
11	Scheffe' <u>Post Hoc</u> Analysis for Location of Population Mean Differences Among Administrators, Faculty, and Students on the Academic Freedom Scale	125
12	Group Frequencies, Means, and Standard Deviations for Undergraduate and Graduate Students on the Academic Freedom Scale . .	126
13	ANOVA Comparison of Undergraduate Students, and Graduate Students on the Academic Freedom Scale	126
14	Group Frequencies, Means, and Standard Deviations for Long and Short-Term Faculty on the Academic Freedom Scale . . .	128
15	ANOVA Comparison of Long and Short-Term Faculty on the Academic Freedom Scale . . .	128
16	Group Frequencies, Means, and Standard Deviations for Liberal Arts Affiliates, Natural Science Affiliates, Non-Affiliates, and Social Science Affiliates on the Academic Freedom Scale	129
17	ANOVA Comparison of Liberal Arts Affiliates, Natural Science Affiliates, Non-Affiliates, and Social Science Affiliates on the Academic Freedom Scale	129
18	Group Frequencies, Means, and Standard Deviations for Liberal Arts Administrators, Natural Science Administrators, Non-Affiliated Administrators, and Social Science Administrators on the Academic Freedom Scale	130
19	ANOVA Comparison of Liberal Arts Administrators, Natural Science Administrators, Non-Affiliated Administrators, and Social Science Administrators on the Academic Freedom Scale	130
20	Group Frequencies, Means, and Standard Deviations for the Liberal Arts Faculty, Natural Science Faculty, and Social Science Faculty on the Academic Freedom Scale	131

Table		Page
21	ANOVA Comparison of Liberal Arts Faculty, Natural Science Faculty, and Social Science Faculty on the Academic Freedom Scale . . .	131
22	Scheffe' <u>Post Hoc</u> Analysis for Location of Population <u>Mean</u> Differences Among Liberal Arts Faculty, Natural Science Faculty, and Social Science Faculty on the Academic Freedom Scale	133
23	Group Frequencies, Means, and Standard Deviations for Liberal Arts Students, Natural Science Students, and Social Science Students on the Academic Freedom Scale . .	133
24	ANOVA Comparison of Liberal Arts Students, Natural Science Students, and Social Science Students on the Academic Freedom Scale	134
25	Group Means, Frequencies, and Standard Deviations for Administrators, Faculty, and Students of the Administrative Efficiency Scale	169
26	ANOVA Comparison of Administrators, Faculty, and Students on the Administrative Efficiency Scale	170
27	Group Means, Frequencies, and Standard Deviations for Liberal Arts Affiliates, Natural Science Affiliates, Non-Affiliates, and Social Science Affiliates on the Administrative Efficiency Scale	171
28	ANOVA Comparison of Liberal Arts Affiliates, Natural Science Affiliates, Non-Affiliates, and Social Science Affiliates on the Administrative Efficiency Scale	171
29	Group Means, Frequencies, and Standard Deviations for Long-Term and Short-Term Faculty on the Administrative Efficiency Scale	172
30	ANOVA Comparison of Long-Term Faculty and Short-Term Faculty on the Administrative Efficiency Scale	172

Table		Page
31	Group Means, Frequencies, and Standard Deviations for Undergraduate and Graduate Students on the Administrative Efficiency Scale	173
32	ANOVA Comparison of Undergraduate and Graduate Students on the Administrative Efficiency Scale	173
33	Group Means, Frequencies, and Standard Deviations for Liberal Arts Administrators, Natural Science Administrators, Non-Affiliated Administrators, and Social Science Administrators on the Administrative Efficiency Scale	174
34	ANOVA Comparison of Liberal Arts Administrators, Natural Science Administrators, Non-Affiliated Administrators, and Social Science Administrators on the Administrative Efficiency Scale	174
35	Group Frequencies, Means, and Standard Deviations for Liberal Arts Faculty, Natural Science Faculty, and Social Science Faculty on the Administrative Efficiency Scale	175
36	ANOVA Comparison of Liberal Arts Faculty, Natural Science Faculty, and Social Science Faculty on the Administrative Efficiency Scale	175
37	Scheffe' <u>Post Hoc</u> Analysis for Location of Population <u>Mean</u> Differences Among Liberal Arts Faculty, Natural Science Faculty, and Social Science Faculty on the Administrative Efficiency Scale	177
38	Group Means, Frequencies, and Standard Deviations for Liberal Arts Students, Natural Science Students, and Social Science Students on the Administrative Efficiency Scale	178
39	ANOVA Comparison of Liberal Arts Students, Natural Science Students, and Social Science Students on the Administrative Efficiency Scale	178

Table		Page
40	Group Means, Frequencies, and Standard Deviations for Administrators, Faculty, and Students on the Community Cohesion Scale	192
41	ANOVA Comparison of Administrators, Faculty, and Students on the Community Cohesion Scale	193
42	Group Means, Frequencies, and Standard Deviations for Liberal Arts Affiliates, Natural Science Affiliates, Non-Affiliates, and Social Science Affiliates on the Community Cohesion Scale	193
43	ANOVA Comparison of Liberal Arts Affiliates, Natural Science Affiliates, Non-Affiliates, and Social Science Affiliates on the Community Cohesion Scale	194
44	Scheffe' <u>Post Hoc</u> Analysis for Location of Population Mean Differences Among Liberal Arts Affiliates, Natural Science Affiliates, Non-Affiliates, and Social Science Affiliates on the Community Cohesion Scale . . .	195
45	Group Means, Frequencies, and Standard Deviations for Long-Term and Short-Term Faculty on the Community Cohesion Scale . .	196
46	ANOVA Comparison of Long-Term Faculty and Short-Term Faculty on the Community Cohesion Scale	197
47	Group Means, Frequencies, and Standard Deviations for Undergraduate and Graduate Students on the Community Cohesion Scale .	197
48	ANOVA Comparison of Undergraduate and Graduate Students on the Community Cohesion Scale	198
49	Group Means, Frequencies, and Standard Deviations for Liberal Arts Administrators, Natural Science Administrators, Non-Affiliated Administrators, and Social Science Administrators on the Community Cohesion Scale	198

Table		Page
50	ANOVA Comparison of Liberal Arts Adminis- trators, Natural Science Administrators, Non-Affiliated Administrators, and Social Science Administrators on the Community Cohesion Scale	199
51	Group Means, Frequencies, and Standard Deviations for Liberal Arts Faculty, Nat- ural Science Faculty, and Social Science Faculty on the Community Cohesion Scale . .	199
52	ANOVA Comparison of Liberal Arts Faculty, Natural Science Faculty, and Social Science Faculty on the Community Cohesion Scale . .	200
53	Scheffe' <u>Post Hoc</u> Analysis for Location of Population <u>Mean</u> Differences Among Liberal Arts Faculty, Natural Science Faculty, and Social Science Faculty on the Community Cohesion Scale	201
54	Group Means, Frequencies, and Standard Deviations for Liberal Arts Students, Nat- ural Science Students, and Social Science Students on the Community Cohesion Scale . .	202
55	ANOVA Comparison of Liberal Arts Students, Natural Science Students, and Social Science Students on the Community Cohesion Scale	202
56	Group Means, Frequencies, and Standard Deviations for Administrators, Faculty, and Students on the Educational Value Scale	229
57	ANOVA Comparison of Administrators, Faculty, and Students on the Educational Value Scale.	230
58	Scheffe' <u>Post Hoc</u> Analysis for Location of Population <u>Mean</u> Differences Among Adminis- trators, Faculty, and Students on the Educational Value	231
59	Group Means, Frequencies, and Standard Deviations for Long-Term and Short-Term Faculty on the Educational Value Scale . . .	232

Table		Page
60	ANOVA Comparison of Long-Term and Short-Term Faculty on the Educational Value Scale	232
61	Group Means, Frequencies, and Standard Deviations for Undergraduate and Graduate Students on the Educational Value Scale . .	233
62	ANOVA Comparison of Undergraduate and Graduate Students on the Educational Value Scale	233
63	Group Means, Frequencies, and Standard Deviations for Liberal Arts Administrators, Natural Science Administrators, Non-Affiliated Administrators, and Social Science Administrators on the Educational Value Scale	234
64	ANOVA Comparison of Liberal Arts Administrators, Natural Science Administrators, Non-Affiliated Administrators, and Social Science Administrators on the Educational Value Scale	234
65	Group Means, Frequencies, and Standard Deviations for Liberal Arts Faculty, Natural Science Faculty, and Social Science Faculty on the Educational Value Scale	235
66	ANOVA Comparison of Liberal Arts Faculty, Natural Science Faculty, and Social Science Faculty on the Educational Value Scale	236
67	Group Means, Frequencies, and Standard Deviations for Liberal Arts Students, Natural Science Students, and Social Science Students on the Educational Value Scale	236
68	ANOVA Comparison of Liberal Arts Students, Natural Science Students, and Social Science Students on the Educational Value Scale	237

CHAPTER I

THE PROBLEM

Introduction

In recent years, the trend toward greater participation by students in academic governance has become an important issue at Michigan State University (111:1) as well as at many institutions of American higher education. (185) Although the phenomenon of student involvement in academic governance dates back to the thirteenth century, the current movement has just fairly recently commanded attention and incited controversy among educators. (105) The heart of the controversy lies in what, if any, role that undergraduates should play in making decisions on academic matters that previously had been the exclusive responsibility of administrators and faculty members. (106)

This trend toward greater student involvement in academic governance is often discussed in the context of the violent expressions of discontent by American college students, particularly during the middle and late 1960's. The delegation of decision-making authority to students

has often been suggested as a means by which tensions could be reduced and confrontations minimized. (6, 33, 58) Many have described the current atmosphere of American higher education as characterized by greatly increased student attention toward the internal conditions of the college or university. Administrators of contemporary American higher education are being challenged by students as never before to defend institutional postures on controversial issues. It is not uncommon to hear college and university undergraduates demand greater opportunities to participate in the formulation of university decisions which affect their lives. (58, 74, 106) Those aspects of concern to students go beyond the more traditional student concerns to encompass such matters as establishing institutional priorities, curriculum and personnel matters, course and instructor evaluation, admissions policies, and degree requirements. (105:16) A wide variety of reasons have been offered as contributing causes for these changes in student attitudes and behaviors. They include, among others, the impersonal atmosphere prevalent in the large universities, heightened interest and awareness of world and domestic inequities, and unparalleled affluence. Along with student restlessness came an increased desire to express a meaningful voice in the management of American colleges and universities. (82:61)

When questioned regarding their position on greater student involvement in institutional governance, the responses from educators range from enthusiastically positive and encouraging (6, 8, 58, 74, 106) to apprehensive and adamantly negative. (17, 59, 78, 105) Student participation in academic governance is viewed by some as a power motivated tactic directed against the academic freedom of the faculty. Others view students as justified in seeking access to fuller participation in the community of scholars, wishing only to improve decision-making, not control it. (54:2)

Historical Considerations

A review of the history of higher education in the western world reveals that certain periods in the past have been characterized by strong student control and influence over the governance of higher education, both directly (82:50) and indirectly. (106:19-21) At various stages in the evolution of higher education, control at one time or another has been held by students, by faculty, and by laymen with little appreciable difference in results. (106:9-10, 16) The students at the University of Bologna in the twelfth century joined together to form a strong union that held the power to employ professors. But, as Benezet adds, they did so to improve procedures rather than to determine what was to be taught. (11:16)

In the early American colleges, the students, who were considerably younger than more recent student generations, were clearly subordinated to the power of paternalistic faculty members and administrators whose role was one of molding and disciplining the students into mature adults. (106:17)

From the establishing of Harvard in the seventeenth century until the last decade, with only the most atypical exception, the influence of students has been limited to indirect action. (106:16-17) This indirect action, however, has often been of greater significance than generally recognized. For example, the student in his role as a consumer, has the power of forcing departments which have become underenrolled to reassess the type of course offerings available. The increasing tendency of students to work harder and take more advanced courses in high school has had an important influence on the development of new college and university academic programs. (137:35)

In the absence of recognized authority, students have exerted remarkable leadership over the academic climate of American higher education. Frederick Rudolph, in supporting his contention that "...unquestionably the most creative and imaginative force in the shaping of the American college and university has been the students," contends that:

"A glance back across American academic history suggests that students knew how to use a college as an instrument of their maturation. The university has become a less wieldy instrument for that purpose, often a most disappointing instrument. Students have always had to insist that they are human beings. In the old days when their insistence took the form of a most intricate extra-curriculum or of a rebellion against some especially stringent application of the official code of discipline, they were encouraged either by a benevolent neglect or by some common-sense president or professor. Today, neglect takes on new form: neglect has become a function of size and of a shift in professorial commitment rather than that of administrative absentmindedness or blindness." (159:47, 57)

Walter Adams writes that as long as universities were still small, intimate communities where the undergraduate was the focus of much attention and affection, students exercised a form of de facto influence on decisions. Together with their professors and administrators, they were part of an organic, close knit system sensitive to their views. While they lacked the formal authority to participate in formal decision-making, they possessed considerable informal influence over the quality of life and education within the institution. As the universities increased greatly in size and complexity, the faculty tended to allign themselves more with their intellectual discipline than with their institution. This trend was paralleled by the professionalization of administrators and the shifting of priorities to research and graduate education. These factors, which have been characteristic of most of the large universities since

World War II, tended to diminish the de facto power of students. (6:111) Even a passing glance at the history of higher education reveals that students have influenced the development of American colleges and universities to a considerable degree.

The Current State of Student Participation

Although several institutions have a long history of successful student participation in governance, Lunn concluded in 1957 that with a few notable exceptions, formal student representation on faculty committees dealing with curriculum and personnel matters is rare. (98:35) Recent surveys indicate, however, that there is indeed a strong trend toward granting students high degrees of responsibility in the policy-making of American colleges and universities.

In the fall of 1969, McGrath found that 88.3 percent of the 875 institutions supplying usable information had incorporated students into at least one institutional decision-making body. McGrath concluded that, "It is therefore, the atypical institution which has not moved in this direction, and such institutions are now for the most part actively considering doing so." (106:38)

Cited in the Chronicle of Higher Education is a study conducted by the National Association of State Universities and Land Grant Colleges completed in 1970. Between one-third and one-half of the 90 responding institutions

had incorporated students in search committees for high administrative officers, and long-range planning, evaluation, or self-study committees. Twenty-five of these institutions had students on faculty or university councils, and nine had formal student representation at the governing board level. (147:1) In a follow-up study of his 1969 research, McGrath was able to conclude that in 1971, most administrators at institutions where students had participated on academic decision-making bodies were favorably impressed with the contributions students had made or could make to academic discussions. (107:10)

The Higher Education Panel of the American Council on Education found through a survey of 430 representative colleges and universities that while only 14 percent of the institutions have students on their governing boards, almost one-fourth (24.7 percent) of the public four year institutions did. (13)

Student Participation at Michigan State University

A brief historical overview of student involvement at Michigan State University reveals that much effort has been put forth to operationalize an effective scheme for formalizing the student role in academic governance. The first attempt at defining this role was a document entitled the Ad Hoc Committee Report on Student Participation in Academic Government (Appendix D). In October,

1969, however, the Academic Council of Michigan State University, voted to recommit this report for further consideration. Shortly thereafter, a new student-faculty committee was appointed to conduct further discussions on the issue. This group began its work with the understanding that the Academic Council generally supported the concept of student involvement in the academic decision-making processes of the University. The resulting Report of the New Committee on Student Participation in Academic Government (Appendix E) was approved by the Academic Council, but the necessary faculty Bylaw amendments were rejected by the Academic Senate in June, 1970, on the grounds that "ambiguities", "contradictions", and "some questionable provisions" required further clarification and consideration. (54:12)

A third report, Revised Recommendations Concerning Student Participation in the Academic Government (Appendix F) was passed by the Academic Council and the Academic Senate, and after considerable debate, accepted by the Board of Trustees on May 19, 1971. The provisions of this report pertaining to the Academic Council called for the seating of one undergraduate student representative from each of the colleges, plus six graduate student representatives. In addition, ten at-large seats on the Academic Council were created to ensure representation of the views of non-whites and women. (54:12-13)

This document was widely criticized by the student leaders and the student press because it specifically excluded students from participation in certain matters relating to the professional rights and responsibilities of the faculty. Regardless of the criticisms, the passage of this document signified a new era of formal participation by MSU students in academic governance. (54:13)

Purpose

The fundamental purpose of this study is to survey the attitudes of those directly involved in the one year old Michigan State University experiment for involving students in the institutional decision-making structure at the Academic Council level. Students, faculty members, and administrators, who were members of the MSU Academic Council for at least two academic terms between January 1, 1972, and January 1, 1973, comprise the population to be studied.

An extensive questionnaire (Appendix C) has been constructed on the basis of four functionally identified issues that persistently appear in the literature of student participation in institutional governance. These four controversial issues include the following:

1. Academic Freedom: whether or not student participation detracts from or strengthens an atmosphere in which the scholarly pursuit of truth can take place.

2. Administrative efficiency: whether or not the involvement of students has made an impact on the governance process and whether or not the positive aspects of Academic Council student participation outweigh the negative aspects such as increased time needed to reach decisions, student inexperience, transience, and other factors.
3. Community acceptance and cohesion: whether or not the sharing of authority with students contributes to greater communication, cooperation, understanding, and improved interpersonal relationships among students, faculty, and administrative personnel.
4. Educational value: to what degree student participation provides valuable new educational opportunities for those students involved in the academic governance process.

The questionnaire was designed to elicit responses from all of the members of the 1972-73 MSU Academic Council on each of these four issues in relation to their experiences with student participation at the Academic Council level. In addition, a series of follow-up interviews were conducted with a random sample of non-responding Council members. The interview procedure produced additional descriptive information as well as data for testing the representativeness of the questionnaire respondents to the entire Academic Council. Potential interviewees were classified according to their academic status (administrators, faculty, and students) and were chosen randomly. The results of the questionnaire and the subsequent interviews have been treated as an indication of the attitudes of the 1972-73 Academic Council with respect to the following questions:

1. Has student participation at the Academic Council level affected academic freedom at Michigan State University?
2. Has the addition of voting student members made the Academic Council a more efficient academic decision-making body?
3. Has student participation at the Academic Council level contributed to improved cooperation and communication in the university community?
4. Has student participation provided new and significant educational opportunities for the student members of the Academic Council?

In addition, comparisons of response are to be made among the various subgroups that compose the Academic Council. These comparisons should provide insight into the following questions:

1. What, if any, attitudinal differences exist among students, faculty, and administrators who are members of the 1972-73 MSU Academic Council?
2. What, if any, attitudinal differences exist between long term (more than two consecutive years of service) faculty Academic Council members and short term faculty Academic Council members?
3. What, if any, attitudinal differences exist among the student members of the 1972-73 Academic Council who major in the general areas of liberal arts, natural science, and social and behavioral science?
4. What, if any, attitudinal differences exist among the faculty members of the 1972-73 Academic Council members who are affiliated with the general academic areas of liberal arts, natural science, and social and behavioral science?
5. What, if any, attitudinal differences exist among the academic administrators who are members of the 1972-73 Academic Council and are affiliated with the general academic areas of liberal arts, natural science, and social and behavioral science, and those who are not affiliated to an academic discipline?

6. What, if any, attitudinal differences exist between graduate and undergraduate student members of the 1972-73 Academic Council?

The results of these comparisons were essential to the analysis of the overall results. Differences in perspective were found and isolated in certain particular subgroups and, hypotheses concerning the source of various strengths and weaknesses of the present structure were formulated. In other areas the data from the questionnaire indicated significant similarities among the views of council members.

Instrumentation

The development of the instrument which was used in this study took place over a period of four months. Most of the items originated from the literature of student participation and related research. In addition, several suggestions from faculty, students, and administrators at MSU, as well as other institutions of higher education, were developed into items. Following the accumulation of several hundred items, the instrument was refined by eliminating or replacing the repetitious and ambiguous statements. The face validity of the questionnaire was further enhanced with the assistance of three past members of the Michigan State University Academic Council who reviewed and criticized the questionnaire. The comments and suggestions from these men are considered extremely valuable since they had been members of the Academic

Council during the difficult times when the specific details of the MSU experiment in student participation were being decided. The questionnaire consists of 99 Likert style forced choice items (Appendix C).

It was decided that the response options be limited to a four point scale that forces the respondent to take a position on each item. The elimination of an "uncertain" response commits the respondent to a stand on each item, thus providing the maximum amount of data. This course of action was taken because it was felt that the experiences from a full year of student participation have enabled the Council members to make judgements on the great majority of the items.

The final draft of the questionnaire contains a total of 99 items distributed among the issues as follows.

ACADEMIC FREEDOM - 25 items.

ADMINISTRATIVE EFFICIENCY - 22 items.

COMMUNITY COHESION - 19 items.

EDUCATIONAL VALUE - 10 items.

GENERAL - 23 items.

Procedure and Design

Following the completion of an early draft of the instrument, approval for the proposed saturation research project was sought and received from the Chairman of the Steering Committee of the Academic Council, the Director of Institutional Research, and the President of Michigan State University. Each of these gentlemen made several

helpful comments and criticisms as to the adequacy of the questionnaire. With the help of these men, as well as that of others, including three former faculty Academic Council members who completed, criticized, and commented upon an early draft of the instrument, the final version of the instrument was prepared.

The instrument and cover letter (Appendix A) was distributed to each of the members of the 1972-73 Academic Council in the latter part of January. The completed questionnaires were collected shortly thereafter, followed by the analysis of the data with the assistance of the MSU computer facilities. In order to adapt the data to the specific purposes of the study, the computer analysis will include the following statistics compiled for each item:

1. Mean
2. Mode
3. Standard deviation
4. Frequency distribution

In addition, to facilitate comparison of subgroups within the Academic Council, the above statistics are to be calculated on each item for each of the following subgroups:

I. Students

1. All Students (n = 36)
2. Graduate Students (n = 11)
3. Undergraduate Students (n = 25)
4. Liberal Arts Students (n = 7)
5. Natural Science Students (n = 13)
6. Social Science Students (n = 16)

II. Faculty

1. All Faculty (n = 67)
2. Long Term Faculty (n = 19)
3. Short Term Faculty (n = 48)
4. Liberal Arts Faculty (n = 11)
5. Natural Science Faculty (n = 30)
6. Social Science Faculty (n = 25)

III. Administrators

1. All Administrators (n = 31)
2. Liberal Arts Administrators (n = 2)
3. Natural Science Administrators (n = 8)
4. Social Science Administrators (n = 7)
5. Non-affiliated Administrators (n = 15)

Following the analysis of the data from the questionnaire, using appropriate hypothesis testing techniques, a series of follow-up interviews took place. Those Academic Council members interviewed were chosen randomly and representatively from the major component groups, the administrators, faculty, and students. The interview technique is included for the purpose of complementing the data from the questionnaire with information of greater depth and clarity, thus utilizing the advantages of both techniques. The interviews further provide data for the testing the representativeness of the respondents to the non-respondents.

The interviews will be of the semistructured variety, with the focus and tone being set by a series of structured questions. The interviewer will then probe deeply, using open ended questions in order to obtain more complete data on points of special interest. The semistructured interview has the advantage of being reasonably objective

while still permitting a more thorough understanding of the respondents' opinions and reasons behind them than would be possible from using the mailed questionnaire alone.

Need and Significance of the Study

The question of whether or not students should continue to have a voice in academic governance, and probably more importantly, to what degree, is currently one of the important issues facing Michigan State University and American higher education. The problem is complicated because the tendency toward expansion of formal student participation has exceeded the development of a justifiable educational foundation. In 1957, Lunn reported that, "No precise rationale for student participation has gained universal acceptance among educators." (98:4) In 1970, McGrath indicated that little progress has been made in this area when he declared, "Neither experience nor informed opinion has yet definitely established in which bodies students should have membership, what proportion of the total they should be, or how they should be selected." (106:104)

One noted educational researcher notes the significance of survey research in dealing with such problems:

"Survey research is probably best adapted to obtaining personal and social facts, beliefs, and attitudes. It is significant that although hundreds of thousands of words are spoken and written about education and about what people presumably

think about education, there is little dependable information on the subject. We simply do not know what people's attitudes toward education are."
(90:406)

The deficiency in experience and informed opinion and the need for its correction, is also recognized at Michigan State University. The "Introduction" to the MSU Bylaws for Academic Governance (1971) expresses the experimental nature of the current plan for involving students in academic governance:

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

The significance of the proposed study derives from the fact that it is the only post hoc survey of the attitudes of the MSU Academic Council to be conducted prior to the upcoming institutional evaluation. As such, this survey of those directly connected with student participation at the highest academic governance level should prove immediately helpful in focusing attention upon the strengths and weaknesses of the MSU experiment in student involvement in academic governance for the benefit of subsequent researchers.

Further, by comparison of component groups, this study attempts to consider certain attitudinal factors which may prove critical to the success or failure of student participation in the MSU Academic Council. While

structure and guidelines are important, the ultimate success of a governing body may well depend to a great degree upon the subtle feelings, faith, and degree of trust, both exhibited and perceived, by those involved.

Taken in the wider context of American higher education, as a whole, this study represents an important step in the development of a body of research concerning student participation in academic governance. While the conclusions drawn from this survey can technically be inferred no further than the 1972-73 Michigan State University Academic Council, they do provide an indication of how student, faculty, and administrative participants of a high level academic governance body at a large public university view the issues and the impact of student involvement on the institution. As such, the results of this study can be utilized hypothetically by other similar institutions as they seek to determine the governance structure best suited to their needs.

Limitations of the Study

The proposed study, by the nature of its design, has limited application beyond the 1972-73 MSU Academic Council. This limitation is, at the same time, a source of strength. The relatively small population under examination is the body most experienced in the area of investigation and therefore eminently qualified to provide

important insights into the strengths and weaknesses of the MSU experiment in student participation at the Academic Council level.

The study is limited by the deficiencies inherent in all questionnaire studies. Particularly important are concerns about the instrument, such as, validity, and reliability. These dangers hopefully have been minimized through extensive discussions with authorities in the area of MSU student participation, and with experts skilled in survey research and design. These discussions resulted in the elimination or restatement of many ambiguous, confusing, and otherwise inappropriate items.

Another concern arising from the design of the study is the necessity of obtaining a very high percentage of usable responses. This potential obstacle places high priority on instrument development, perceived relevancy and importance of the issue, and the quality of the interaction between the researcher and the respondent.

Definition of Terms

Academic Administrators (or Administrators)

Those persons serving in such positions as president, provost, vice-presidents, deans, associate deans, assistant deans, directors, assistant directors, associate directors, etc.

Academic Council

The Academic Council is composed of the President, the Provost, the elected faculty representatives, the student representatives, the deans of the colleges, and certain administrators designated as ex officio members. The Academic Council acts for and on behalf of the Academic Senate and

advises the President on all matters of educational policy; approves or rejects major changes in the curricula; and considers proposals on matters pertaining to the general welfare of the University.

Academic Freedom

Academic freedom consists of the absence of, or protection from, such restraints or pressures that create in the minds of academic scholars (teachers, research workers, and students) fears and anxieties which may inhibit them from responsibly and freely studying, investigating, discussing, or publishing matters of interest to them.

Academic Governance

Those processes and procedures used in a university to determine policies and practices regarding academic matters. Educational matters are discussed, alternatives identified, and priorities for action or inaction are established.

Liberal Arts

This term refers to students, faculty, and administrators affiliated with the College of Arts and Letters, Justin Morill College, the department of American Thought and Language, and the department of Humanities in the University College at Michigan State University.

Natural Science

This term refers to students, faculty, and administrators affiliated with the colleges of Agriculture and Natural Resources, Engineering, Human Medicine, Natural Science, Osteopathic Medicine, Veterinary Medicine, Lyman Briggs College, and the University College Department of Natural Science at Michigan State University.

Non-Affiliates (or Non-Affiliated Administrators)

This term refers to those administrators whose title prevents classification according to the broad academic areas of liberal arts, natural sciences, or social sciences. Examples of titles falling in this classification include Vice-President for Student Affairs, Director of the Honor's College, and Director of Libraries.

Social and Behavioral Science

This term refers to students, faculty, and administrators affiliated with the colleges of Business Communication Arts, Education, Human Ecology, Social Science, James Madison College, and the University College Department of Social Science at Michigan State University.

Student Involvement (or Participation)

The practice of allowing students an opportunity to express their opinions and vote on academic matters in university, college, or departmental decision-making bodies.

Overview

The present investigation of the attitudes of the members of the Michigan State University Academic Council appears best pursued in terms of the following chapter outline:

- | | |
|-------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Chapter I | The Problem |
| Chapter II | Review of the Literature: Student Participation in Academic Governance |
| Chapter III | A Historical Overview of Student Participation in Academic Governance at Michigan State University |
| Chapter IV | Analysis of the Data |
| Chapter V | Summary, Conclusions, Discussion, and Recommendations |

The initial chapter of the proposed study will begin with an introduction to the issues surrounding formal student participation in Academic governance at Michigan State University and generally, throughout American higher education. Following a concise definition of purpose and design, the chapter will conclude with remarks concerning the need, significance, and the limitations of the study.

The following chapter will deal exclusively with an elucidation of the written opinions and attitudes of commentators on contemporary American higher education. These opinions are to be discussed in terms of the previously mentioned four areas of concern, i.e., academic freedom, administrative efficiency, community cohesion, and educational value. The third chapter will consist of a detailed historical review of the development of the current state of student participation in academic governance at Michigan State University, particularly at the Academic Council level. Special attention is to be given to the attempted resolution of those issues raised in the previous chapter.

The development of the instrument and the analysis of the data will constitute one major portion of the fourth chapter. Also the data from the questionnaire and from the interviews will be examined and analyzed with a view toward developing evidence sufficient to provide illumination concerning the questions raised in the "purpose" section.

The final chapter of the proposed study is to consist of a summary and conclusion section followed by recommendations concerning the future state of student participation in the academic governance of Michigan State University.

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE: STUDENT PARTICIPATION

Introduction

As noted in the previous chapter, the recent literature of higher education contains many variations on many positions concerning student involvement in the academic governance of contemporary American higher education. On most college and university campuses, there is continuing concern and controversy relating to the issue of the role of the student in the governance of the institution. Most of the rhetoric focuses on questions such as the following: What are the rights and responsibilities of students in governance? Are students sufficiently competent to be involved in governance? Should they be involved? If so, what are the appropriate limitations, if any, on their involvement?

The purpose of this chapter is to explore these and other questions with a view toward defining the present state of opinion concerning student involvement in academic governance.

Present Problems Facing Contemporary American
Higher Education

Before launching an exploration of the many positions taken by advocates and opponents of student involvement in academic governance, it is appropriate to consider some of the recent significant changes in American higher education. These are "facts of life" which have consequences for higher education regardless of whether or not there exists a sound rationale for increased student participation in academic governance. These developments will have to be faced and accomodated.

Earl McGrath has indicated that despite the trends toward greater student participation in academic governance, there has been an accompanying and apparently contradictory trend toward reducing, rather than increasing, the influence of students in relation to institutional academic affairs. Those factors which he identifies as limiting student influence include increased institutional size, and the growth of faculty power. (106:45-49)

First among the factors to be considered is the fact that the governance of even a small college or university is a complex undertaking requiring enormous amounts of data and an appropriate organizational structure for dealing with such data. This organizational structure has become increasingly bureaucratic, much like other institutions in our society. The lay boards of trustees have lost much of their power because the

control over information essential to decision-making has been assumed by the bureaucratic structure which even the smaller institutions have created. Boards, do, of course, appoint presidents and assign legitimacy to decisions, but the substance of these decisions lies in recommendations prepared by various offices. (105:16)

Public higher education has seen the development of statewide systems of coordination and control. These agencies have assumed powers over budgets, programs, and processes which are increasingly difficult to influence. Systems of institutions and institutions themselves have moved in the direction of long range planning based on complex bases of data. Decisions to be ratified must be increasingly consistent with the goals generated by long range plans. In most cases this development limits the flexibility of institutions to react independently and immediately to situations in which students, among others, would like to see sweeping, innovative, and immediate changes. The growth of bureaucracy and constitutionalism, or rule by law rather than rule by men, is seen by many as the wave of the future. To insure reasonable working conditions for people in a large scale enterprise, it is necessary for there to be constitutions, by-laws, handbooks, and specific codes of behavior. As the governance of higher education becomes more complex, it is reasonable to assume that

bureaucratic processes will become more significant, requiring many people, each with a specialized skill.

Decisions for complex organizations are made through the bureaucratic structure, where seemingly endless deliberations may often frustrate those who want instant action toward the solutions of complex problems. "If the rights of all are to be preserved, immediate solutions must be subjugated to the slower process of constitutionalism which says, 'before appeal to the highest office to resolve conflicts, recourse must be had to administrative solution and lower courts'." (105:16-17)

Mayhew sees a further source of inflexibility in the successful academic revolution which gave faculties the extensive power that they presently possess. The rise of the faculty relative to other groups in academic governance was made possible by the high demand for professional services during the 1950's and 1960's. Market conditions have changed during the seventies, however, and professors can be expected to be less charitable toward those who would threaten the status quo. (105:14)

In recent years, faculty members, as a group, traditionally have expressed little confidence in the ability of students to make responsible decisions about the academic process. Faculty have, for the most part, ignored the sometimes new and innovative viewpoints of students and have considered their own opinions as more important than those of so-called innovators. They have

often expressed more interest in their own discipline than in their students or their institutions. (8:50)

As a group, administrators traditionally have had little confidence in students and only slightly more confidence in the faculty. They have demanded the right to make all final administrative decisions irrespective of student or faculty opinion. Many administrators have failed to view student involvement as evolutionary and changing. They have often been more concerned with preserving than changing. (8:50)

An additional factor is the steady growth of collective bargaining in American higher education. It appears that faculty, with union contracts dealing with economic matters, will be less amenable to accomodating student requests for services and consultation above and beyond the call of duty. Reduction of impersonality and an increase in receptivity toward student proposals for innovation will not be served by a union contract calling for nine hours of teaching, three office hours per week, and a graduated salary schedule based on tenure. (105:14)

Perhaps the most important development of all is the loss of public regard for higher education. The period from 1957 to approximately 1967 was a high water mark for American higher education. The public viewed education as a means of realizing the "American dream" and offered support in the form of the most favorable legislation, both state and national, in the history of

the nation. But disillusionment soon followed. Higher education did contribute to a number of favorable outcomes, but it also seemed to produce a generation of trouble-makers and revolutionaries. From 1967 to the present, higher education has experienced a curtailment of support, greater political control, and a climate of opinion generally unfavorable to colleges and universities. Reactionary periods are not favorable to the expansion of democratic or egalitarian ideals, particularly when they are accompanied by a generalized public insistence upon reducing governmental expenditures. (105:14-16)

With these limitations in mind, some of the basic issues which complicate the larger question of student participation in academic governance can be placed in perspective. Much of the rhetoric and research concerning student participation focuses upon the following issues:

1. Does student participation in academic governance threaten the climate of Academic Freedom at American colleges and universities?
2. Does student participation in academic governance add to the efficiency of the decision-making process?
3. Does student participation in academic governance contribute to greater community cohesion and identification among students, faculty, and administrators?
4. Does student participation in academic governance provide significant educational opportunities to student policy-makers?

Each of these issues will be discussed at length in terms of the positions taken by different authorities on contemporary American higher education.

Academic Freedom

The history of the development of academic freedom in American colleges and universities is characterized by Rudolph as the development among college teachers of a common respect for the requirements of scholarship. This common sense of respect took the form of a climate that could be described as scientific in the broad sense of the term. It has been shaped by a tolerance for differing views, by a preference for experiment and a respect for the unknown, by an indifference to tradition and inherited truth, and by a need for continuous inquiry and continuous verification. The term academic freedom was based on the spirit of suspended judgement and scholarly pursuit of truth. The American notion of academic freedom was significantly influenced by the great German universities and their distinction between Lernfreiheit and Lehrfreiheit. By Lernfreiheit, the Germans meant the absence of administrative coercion which freed students from policies that restricted or were hostile to an atmosphere of dedicated study and research. The term Lehrfreiheit, or teacher's freedom, referred to the right of the university professor to exercise freedom of inquiry, freedom of teaching, and the

the right to study and to report on his findings in an atmosphere of consent. (158:412)

In current usage, academic freedom basically consists of the absence of, or protection from, those restraints or pressures that create fears and anxieties in the minds of academic scholars (teachers, researchers, and students) and which may inhibit them from responsibly and freely studying, investigating, discussing, or publishing matters of interest to them. (164:57)

The sharing of authority with students in the governance of contemporary American higher education is viewed by many as a serious threat against this climate of free inquiry. Sidney Hook, one of the most outspoken critics of the current trend toward greater student participation in academic governance, declares that the chief enemy of the university is ignorance, and that the practice of giving students voting powers equal to those of faculty members, equates the "immature judgements of students, beginning their careers, with the reasoned judgement of their teachers who have initiated and observed the consequences of curricular changes." (79:69-70)

Hook's view of academic freedom emphasizes the rights of professionally qualified persons to seek, publish, and teach the truth as they see it in their field of expertise, subject to no control other than the methods by which conclusions are established in their discipline and

the canons of professional ethics. Hook concludes that if students are granted the right and power to determine, or to help determine, who shall teach, what shall be taught, and to set standards of what is good and true, then the cause of academic freedom is seriously endangered. (79:40)

Hook's views have much in common with those of Charles Frankel who writes, concerning student involvement in faculty hiring, that:

"...the most important reason why student power cannot extend to the selection of the faculty is that this would be incompatible with academic freedom. It exposes the teacher to intimidation. Students have no common professional perspective or shared occupational interest in academic freedom. Teaching is a professional relationship, not a popularity contest. To invite students to participate in the selection or promotion of their teachers is to create a relationship in the classroom inappropriate to teaching." (59:30-32)

The arguments against granting students greater decision-making authority in academic affairs on the grounds that academic freedom would be threatened deserve consideration. These criticisms generally reflect the idea that students are not qualified to be involved, in part, because they lack continuity, and responsibility.

The most abundant source of rhetoric directed against further increases in student involvement in academic governance is found in the issue of whether or not students are sufficiently qualified to vote on the difficult and sensitive problems facing today's colleges and universities.

Sidney Hook declares that:

"(Giving students voting powers) is to draw an equation between the authority of ignorance and that of knowledge, of inexperience with experience, of immaturity with maturity. To be sure, there are some students who in all of these are precocious and some teachers who have slipped through the professional safeguards against incompetence and are inglorious mediocrities. But it would be absurd to base a general policy on rare and exceptional instances." (78:64)

The lack of any professional experience or orientation on the part of students raises grave doubts in the minds of many critics. Lewy and Rothman see "no reason why these same principles of academic freedom should now be compromised or surrendered to students whose competence to decide questions of educational policy or academic personnel is no greater than that of earlier challengers of academic freedom." (96:280)

Reacting to the differences in competence between students and academic professionals, Sidney Hook responds to the question, "Is it arbitrary to assume that there is a presumptive authority that attaches to the teacher's function?" by saying, "No more so than it is arbitrary to assume that the master craftsman in any field should exercise the authority of superior skills. In what field does the apprentice enjoy the same authority as his teacher to determine the order of studies and the nature of the disciplines required to become a master journeyman?" (78:64)

Included in a 1966 "Statement of Government of Colleges and Universities," endorsed by many of the prestigious higher education organizations, is a section that reads: "Faculty status and related matters are primarily a faculty responsibility; this area includes appointments, reappointments, decisions not to reappoint, promotions, the granting of tenure, and dismissal." (169) Harold Bowen, following a similar train of thought, believes that matters pertaining to course content, degree requirements, research contract decisions, equipment, and book selection are primarily matters for faculty decisions. (16:181) Mayhew contends that the faculty should have almost irrevocable power over its own membership, the curriculum, and the conditions of student admission and graduation. (105:19) Hook declares that the reason that the ultimate decision in these areas should rest with the faculty is by virtue of their greater knowledge, broader experience, and wider perspective over the years. (81:197)

Other similar concerns of those opposed to student participation in academic governance include the following: the balance of power in important academic bodies shifting from the boards, administrators, and faculty to students; the immaturity of students; the limited perspective or commitment to long term policies; and student ignorance of professional values, knowledge, and other skills needed to make these decisions. (106:60-64)

But not all of the commentators on the issue of the impact of student involvement on academic freedom agree with Hook, Frankel, and the others. McGrath views the current generation of college students as possessing an unprecedented awareness of the crucial relationship between education and human destiny. Recognizing the significance and the value of the higher education experience, students have asked and continue to ask for a recognized voice in determining its character. This awareness of students is coupled with a more sophisticated, serious, and informed interest in the social, political, and international problems of their age. They have also become sensitively conscious of the potential therapeutic value of higher education in curing the ills of humanity. Socially conscious as they now are, McGrath finds it not surprising that the personal and social goals of students have raised questions and dissatisfaction with the unrepresentativeness of academic bodies and the inadequacy of the institutional decision-making process. Numerous commentators view this unprecedented intellectual concern and idealistic commitment as an immense resource for the thoughtful reconstruction of American higher education. On the basis of these assertions, McGrath suggests that students are sufficiently sensitive and qualified to make a meaningful contribution to academic freedom through the academic governance

process, by bringing forward new perspectives and insights. (106:52-53)

Other observers take a middle road on the issue of student qualifications for participation in academic governance. These authors contend that while students may be ignorant in some areas, they are knowledgeable in others. Harold Taylor suggests that while they may be lacking in areas generally considered within the domain of the faculty, students are quite knowledgeable about their own education, their own interests, and to an unusual degree among some of them, their own society and their own culture. Taylor further contends that the knowledge and intellectual interests of students should be welcomed and utilized to the full extent in improving the quality of the higher education experience. (177:196, 37:187)

It would appear that the ongoing quest for quality educational experiences should be approached by bringing together the various constituencies to gain the contributions of all to the improvement of the academic program. The development of academic freedom in American colleges and universities has made great strides toward freeing scholars from outside intimidation and interference, but some writers see this development as tending to exclude many potentially contributing voices from the academic process.

The Scranton report contends that while academic institutions must be free from both external and internal interference and intimidation, the first principle of academic freedom is that the pursuit of knowledge cannot continue without the free exchange of ideas. (184:2)

Elliott remarks that,

"In recent years the colleges and universities have been faced with the almost complete surrender of responsibility and authority for subject matter, both its selection and organization, to the individual professor. Under the banner of academic freedom, his authority for his own course has become an almost unchallenged right. He has been, not only free to ignore suggestions for change, but also licensed, it is assumed, to prevent any change he himself does not choose. Even in departments where courses are sequential, the individual professor chooses the degree to which he will accomodate his course to others in the sequence." (53:48)

The concept of academic freedom cannot be regarded as an absolute. John Howard describes the current climate of higher education as restrained by various parameters which operate on every campus, no matter how much scholars might wish otherwise. The discontinuance of Professor Leary of Harvard, because of his work with psychedelic drugs, illustrates the point that academic freedom must operate within a framework endorsed by the larger society. (83) Henderson makes a strong case for this view by declaring that, "Control by any single vested interest-- is a violation of academic freedom and undermines the larger purposes and the integrity of the college." (74:55)

If students do, in fact, have the potential to make positive contributions to the academic governance processes, then it would certainly appear desirable to utilize this resource in improving the educational opportunities at a given institution. At the same time, however, the development and preservation of conditions necessary for free inquiry must be protected. As Sidney Hook reminds us: "Without academic freedom for their teachers, there is no genuine freedom to learn for students." (79:70)

Administrative Efficiency

In this section, those opinions of observers of American higher education that confront the issue of the efficiency of various degrees of student participation in academic governance will be considered. The term "administrative efficiency" is often considered a component of the broader term "administrative effectiveness." By the use of the term "administrative effectiveness," this writer refers to the process by which quality decisions are reached and implemented. This process has a quantitative, as well as a qualitative dimension. Its quantitative or efficiency aspect refers to the amount of time, effort, talent, and information that go into the decision-making process, while the qualitative aspect, considers the degree of satisfaction and harmony which is felt by groups and individuals involved in the actual administrative

deliberations. This distinction is employed primarily for purposes of definition and in actual fact is highly artificial. Without sufficient time, effort, and information, it is doubted that a solution satisfactory and satisfying to those involved can be reached. Similarly, if the decision-making process is not satisfying to those involved, or if the decisions reached are received negatively by the members of the campus community, then it could be assumed that less time, effort, and commitment will be put forth to resolve subsequent problems.

The task of this section is primarily one of reviewing the opinions of those who hold informed views on the issue of whether the inclusion of students on academic decision-making bodies has a quantitative impact on the governance in American higher education, and if so, whether this impact would contribute to the attainment of the purposes of higher education. The following section on community cohesion will complement this aspect by emphasizing the qualitative dimension, particularly that of interpersonal relationships within the academic community resulting from broader student involvement in academic governance.

As previously noted, Hook, Frankel, and others view the continuation of the trend toward greater student participation in the academic governance of American higher education with serious reservations. While their

principle concern seems to be with the potential infringement upon the faculty's academic freedom, they also emphasize what they feel to be a striking difference between the competence of faculty to govern and that of students. Using what he calls the "ontological, epistemological argument," D. Bruce Johnstone expresses this basic position by saying,

"The first basis for objection to greater student participation is both ontological and epistemological: education, we may agree, exists to direct the student toward some cognitive, attitudinal, or vocational goal. Assuming that the student has not yet attained any one of these goals, how can he be in a position to know the knowledge that is of most worth or the means by which this knowledge is to be gained? Would not the student, left entirely to his own devices, tend simply to reinforce his existing interests, inclinations, and prejudices? Thus, while the student's needs and interests are relevant to the goals of education and essential to the process of learning, the ultimate authority must reside with those who are older and wiser."
(87:210)

These positions, along with many similar types of responses to increased student participative trends have a common criticism, i.e., that students lack the specific experiences and competencies necessary for meaningful participation in the academic governance of American higher education. Mayhew contends that any decision-making role must carry with it appropriate information, authority, and responsibility. Applying this principle to the question of student participation in governance, students would first need access to and understanding of highly complex information. Then they

would need to be responsible and accountable so that the exercise of authority does not detract from the educational mission of the institution. (105:18)

Many commentators insist that decisions on personnel, course content, degree requirements, selection of research projects, books and equipment should remain primarily a faculty concern. (16,17) To justify these claims, a great many analogies are presented such as the following: "Do freshmen medical students have the background to plan courses in surgery, or business students to plan their work in accounting, or students in physical or biological sciences to plan sequences of work in physics or bioengineering?" and, "If students could be relied upon to know what it takes to be an educated person, they would not have to be students." (87:78) Another set of opinions express concern about potentially detrimental consequences which accompany formal student involvement in academic governance, i.e., prolonging decisions, wasting time, provoking confrontations, quarreling student groups, over-reactions, and further polarization. (16)

Many authors emphasize the necessity for institutional stability and continuity as an argument against increases in student involvement. One common argument contends that institutions of higher education are formally organized toward a set of goals and can exist only with some degree of stability and some semblance of perpetuity.

Students are members of a campus community for only a short time and are available for service on committees, boards, and councils for an even shorter time. It takes time and commitment before new members are able to contribute efficiently to the decision-making process. The power to severely alter either the goals or the procedures of an institution of higher education should not be placed in the hands of those who would be immune from the consequences of that exercise of power. A student generation of four years, it is said, is far too short to be controlled by this anticipation of consequences. Furthermore, student generations change in their styles and opinions, and sometimes very quickly. Students therefore bring an element of discontinuity and a shortened perspective into the consideration of matters of policy. In increasingly complex institutions, such as colleges and universities, continuity of perspective is essential. (59:56, 87:210)

Another factor to be considered in reaching a decision concerning student involvement is the effectiveness of students when they have been granted some responsibility for academic governance. Mayhew reports that in a half dozen institutions during the fall of 1969 in which students sat as members of committees, students adopted a self imposed role of junior members responsible for the menial tasks of keeping minutes and ordering coffee. Students seem to have been most productive in

matters concerning student life, judicial activities, and promoting cultural events. They seem to be least productive when dealing with critical decisions of institutional life, such as, matters of tuition increases, restrictions on graduate enrollment, changes in tenure policy, or deficit financing. (105:14) Hook concludes that the reason for the lack of interest and hence effectiveness on the part of students in academic governance is a result of an undeveloped sense of the importance of educational questions. (78:63)

On the other hand, advocates of student participation in academic governance claim that today's generation of students is deeply concerned about the educational enterprise and what is taught, that increased sophistication, sensitivity and knowledge does qualify them to participate, and that their unique perspective on the character and quality of instruction could improve higher education. Other perceived benefits include making students less vulnerable to the radical campus element, and encouraging constructive understanding of complex educational questions. (106, 178)

These unique strengths to which advocates point, vary tremendously among institutions. The student population of a community college geographically located to serve primarily a low-income group with poor educational backgrounds, may have a sense of realism concerning social

conditions, a knowledge of political maneuvering, a sensitivity to prejudices, and a clarity of purpose. The students at a leading research university may have superior knowledge and sophistication, understanding of social dynamics, and mastery of the processes of technical inquiry. Both groups have the potential for providing important complementary information and perspective to the academic decision-making process about the gaps between announced objectives of curricula or courses and their actual outcomes. Keeton, McGrath, and others view students as constituting a vast resource in areas such as the utility to students of requirements about the sequence and packaging of courses; the relevance of studies to the life and vocational aims, the selection of faculty who work and communicate effectively with students; the recognition of good or poor faculty performance in instruction and counseling; and the creation of a student peer culture or a campus climate which enhances achievement of institutional goals. "The advantages which students bring to these tasks are in part those of opportunity to observe and experience, in part, those of perspective, and in part, those of acting as a counterforce to special interests of faculty or administrators which are not always in the best interests of the institution." (89:18) "Students today are asking questions that must be studied and answered. There are fresh breezes blowing

across the facade of higher education, but they are having difficulty penetrating the ivy and the ivory." (74:250)

Edward Schwartz, a former president of the National Student Association, claims that students wish to contribute in those areas in which professors have the least claim to professional competence.

"College teachers are not trained to be teachers; they are trained to be political scientists, economists, biologists, and philosophers. If they were trained to teach, and encouraged to teach well, perhaps there would be fewer student complaints about the quality of teaching. That they were not, however, renders foolish their argument that 'professional competence' should be the standard against which student participation should be weighed. Conversely, students are not competent political scientists, economists, biologists, and philosophers, but they are competent judges of good and bad lectures, adequate and inadequate discussions, helpful and deficient comments on papers. Hence, the area in which student critics can be most acute is the area in which the professor's skill is least developed." (163:62)

The need for continued progress toward attaining the goals of higher education is seen by Elliot and others as best fulfilled by bringing together the various constituencies to gain the contributions of all to the evaluation of the adequacy and relevancy of the academic program. (53:48) Beyond the possible advantages and disadvantages of student participation in academic governance, the rising moral sentiment in the world at large is strongly in favor of giving more independence and power to the young. Frankel is convinced that American higher education cannot hold out indefinitely against this trend. (59:28)

The question now to be considered is one of how to most effectively incorporate students in the academic decision-making process in such a way as to obtain the contributions available from student competencies and cooperation and to protect the other constituencies and the institutions against undue effects of the special interests and limitations that apply on a particular campus. (89:19)

Elliott identifies a broad but important focal point for governance structures when he writes:

"In the final analysis the university must be run by the power of truth and logic, and the best governance will be that which provides a fair hearing for all voices. The common objective of all voices is the creation of the best possible educational environment in order that study and search may be carried out with the least interference....And I would suggest that the ultimate test of the structure of an institution is the effectiveness by which the structure aligns the individual to the organization and its goals."
(53:54)

Several writers object to even considering specific decision-making roles until a set of goals or objectives for institutions are created and accepted. (69:6, 105:15) Knock declares that any experiment in student participation, if it is to be successful, must emerge as a product of a planned change in accordance with established institutional objectives. (94:171) The type of structure at a given institution should, and in fact does, vary according to institutional objectives and philosophy.

Given the complexity of the institutional governance problem, it is hazardous to attempt any systematic description of the forms of student participation in university governance. There may be some value in an overview of four possible approaches or models.

Model of Denial. The first model is really a pattern of noninvolvement. In effect, students are denied any role in the decision-making process. Institutional policies and programs are developed for the student rather than either by or with him, and decisions are based on the perception of administrators and faculty of that which best serves the students' needs. Although it is clearly unlikely that many institutions today qualify as fitting this model completely, a careful study might very well document that the actual situation on many campuses still matches this model of participation better than any of the others described. (25)

Sphere of Authority Pattern or Scramble Model. The second form of involvement in governance is perhaps the most common form of institutional decision-making. In some areas, the affairs of the university may be discharged by joint involvement of students, faculty, and administrators. Publications boards, judicial boards, and union boards are common examples where representatives are selected from each of the three groups. In other areas, however, authority is restricted to the one group considered most

competent to perform that particular function. Committees composed entirely of faculty members designed to deal with tenure, salaries of faculty, and selection of deans, exemplify this model. (9:7-24, 25, 25, 65:8-9)

Parallel Government Model. This model is characterized by a separate committee structure for students that is set apart from the faculty-administrative structure. Both may have finance committees, each concerned with different sources of university income; both may have educational policy committees, but the role of students is limited to an advisory function. To the extent that students do have well defined areas in which they enjoy delegated operational authority, the parallel form of government does provide excellent opportunities for educational growth through the acceptance of full responsibility. (189:7-25, 25, 65:8)

The Community Government Model. This model is described by Cole as the most extreme form of government reorganization.

"Community government perceives the college or university as a single unified community and accepts students, faculty, administrators, and trustees as partners in the establishment of goals, policies, and operational practices...

The community government concept initially is very attractive to students. Acceptance as contributing members in all forms of university governance has considerable appeal. However, sometimes, enthusiasm is dulled when students recognize that the new role they acquire in certain coveted areas of university affairs (curriculum, faculty appointments, course

evaluation, planning, etc.) is accompanied usually by a similar loss of autonomy in many aspects of student affairs (publications, residence hall policy, common forms of student government, etc.) (25)

A fourth model for student participation is institutional governance termed by Garner as the Proportional Government Model. In this model, all three interest groups will be represented by at least one member in a ratio according to their respective interests. It is supported by the philosophy of the college president who said, "I believe that there should be no areas of college policy under the sole jurisdiction of students, just as there should be no areas of policy from which students automatically should be excluded." (65:9) The basic rationale for this approach is based on the principle that students deserve an appropriate consideration in educational governance at all levels. (65:9-11)

Clearly the models described do not exhaust the alternatives. Variations on these themes, combinations of these forms, creative responses to problems of institutional governance at institutions of diverse purpose, may prove effective and efficient in a given situation.

Perhaps the secret of responsible student involvement is not dependent on formal structures as it is on informal attitudes. The most elaborately conceived structure will be ineffective unless that structure represents a genuine attitude of recognition, concern, and respect for the well-being of the academic community.

Community Cohesion

One of the reasons most often cited by those advocating expanded opportunities for student participation in academic governance rests on the proposition that in a free society all those affected by a policy have an inalienable right to a voice in its formulation. This argument asserts further that only through emancipation from institutional restrictions imposed by others and through full participation in the academic process can students gain the status of self-determining individuals. (105:51)

Many people believe that the present structure of American higher education, despite greater bureaucratization, is sufficiently flexible to permit wider representation of academic, student, and public interests. According to Henderson, such participation provides for the sort of authentic intercommunication that is so badly needed. Henderson further asserts that the only real security for the academic program lies in the acceptance of goals and roles by all of these interests. (73:253)

The "Draft Statement on Student Participation in College and University Government" emphasizes the importance of a joint effort among all groups in the institution as a prerequisite of sound academic government. Like any other group, students should have a voice in decisions which affect them, and their opinions should be

regularly solicited even in those areas in which they hold a secondary interest. Joint effort, to be effective, must be rooted in the concept of shared authority. The exercise of shared authority in the academic governance in colleges and universities requires tolerance, respect, and a sense of community which arises from participation in a common enterprise. (39)

Concerning the community participative model of governance at Sarah Lawrence College, its president, Harold Taylor, writes,

"...it involves the students in the decisions which affect their lives. Having involved them, it sets up conditions for the release of creative energy which works through the college system out to the community. It gives students access to new ideas. It develops a loyalty to their own community standards and to those values in which educated men and women can believe." (178:66)

Associated with this participative type of governance is a conception of the college or university as a community in which there exists an environment in which "students, faculty, and administrative officers are made to feel that their thinking and interest are important to the overall welfare of the university and for an environment in which they can express their views on pertinent problems." (25) The existence of such a community depends upon shared meaningful experiences. For education, in its highest sense, to take place, faculty, administrators, and students must be involved in activities important and rewarding to all involved. The ideal is a community of

concerned persons who share a common interest in the life of the mind and the quality of human experience in which the genius of the university lies. (178:67) Further, a college or university environment that approaches the ideal of a "community of scholars" can be characterized as one in which the students, faculty, and staff share a deep sense of respect, tolerance, and responsibility for one another. (184:3)

The idea of community in American colleges and universities developed partly as a response to what the Study Commission of University Governance at Berkely termed the interest group model. The Commission states:

"If conflicts are to be resolved...in accordance with our fundamental educational objectives, it is clear that we must eschew the blunt, noneducational methods of antagonistic politics. Certainly these problems cannot be solved by interest groups defined crudely on the basis of status as an administrator, a faculty member, or a student. Such interest groups are the result of our failure to develop means for promoting and sustaining effective debate among conflicting points of view and our failure to develop institutional settings of human dimensions that would provide a focus for loyalties and discussion cutting across the boundaries of status. In the absence of these institutions and other rational means of governance, what have emerged are lowest common denominator interest groups, groups that come to confront one another harshly and fail to recognize the stakes of their own members as well as others in the common university enterprise." (58:20-21)

The notion that American institutions of higher education should move in the direction of a community style organization where all share in the formulation of the policies that affect their lives, has often been mentioned

in relation to student violence. McGrath stresses the importance of increased student participation as a deterrent to violent campus disturbances.

"Those who wish to restore to the campus the conditions indispensable to the achievement of the proper goals of an academic society, and who wish, at the same time, to realize the reforms necessary to correct the present shortcomings of American higher education, will earnestly consider ways to involve students in academic government. Means must be found to formalize the students' participation in academic policy, to regularize their contribution and to involve them as initiators of, rather than protesters against policy." (106:50)

In 1971, McGrath tested this hypothesis by questioning administrators from a sample taken from a population of more than 800 American and Canadian colleges and universities. He concluded that the movement toward student involvement in deliberative and legislative bodies is well established and thus far, it has lessened incidents of campus disorder. With a note of caution, he further adds that..."this trend has not been sufficiently advanced to permit definite judgements concerning the degree and range of its effectiveness. Much experimentation with various structures and functions needs yet to be launched." (98:68)

Regardless of the administrative structure of academic governance, each individual has a stake in the future of the entire academic community. Caffrey argues that if this does not survive, then the stake each member has in the interests of his own group becomes meaningless. If

any group among the students, faculty, administrators or trustees leaves the future of the institution up to the others or neglects his responsibilities, then the entire community will suffer. The primary responsibility of both present and future academic communities is to understand their community of interest and to assert their determination to manage the future in such a way as to minimize occurrences having detrimental effects on other members of the community. (22:4) This interest in granting students greater responsibility in academic decision-making matters is a phenomenon that Frankel describes as a demand for change in climate as much as for a change in mechanisms. It calls for a different and livelier spirit of communication between the different groups that compose our colleges and universities. (59:30)

While virtually all commentators of contemporary American higher education endorse the concept of community cohesion and its emphasis on greater communication and cooperation, there is much disagreement as to whether or not, and to what degree, greater student involvement is an appropriate tool for attaining these ends.

The concept of community in higher education has its roots in democratic social thought. John Dewey, the educator and philosopher, describes democracy as a way of life, a means of achieving the same goals of greater

cooperation, understanding, and communication, but on a scale much broader than a college or university campus.

"The keynote of democracy as a way of life may be expressed, it seems to me, as the necessity for the participation of every mature human being in the formation of the values that regulate the living of men together. This is necessary from the standpoint of both the general social welfare and the full development of human beings as individuals." (37:57)

But Charles Frankel emphasizes a fundamental difference between institutions of higher education and democratic organizations.

"The right of a citizen of the larger society to vote just as the next man, without regard to heirarchy, is based on the premise that where the major policies of the State are concerned, where the nature of what is good for society is at issue, only extreme inadequacies like illiteracy or a criminal record are disqualifying. The basic reason for this view, according to the believer in democracy, is that there are no reasonably defensible general procedures by which the citizenry can be divided into the class of those who know enough to have an opinion worth counting or an interest worth expressing and the class of those who don't. And, in addition, majority rule is accepted in democracies only because its range is restricted. Individuals have rights against majority rule, and all sorts of associations exist which are insulated against majority rule." (59:50)

Frankel then continues by enumerating important differences between democratic organization and colleges and universities.

"In contrast, while universities are democratic organizations in the sense that individuals have a broad array of personal rights within them, and that there is a play of opinion inside them which has a massive effect on their evolution, they are not democratic organizations in the sense that majority rule applies to them. For within a university

there are acceptable procedures by which people can be graded in accordance with their competence, and grading people in this way is essential to the conduct of the university's special business. The egalitarian ideal does not apply across the board in universities any more than it does in any other field where skill is the essence of the issue. To suggest that it should apply is to make hash of the idea of learning. This involves, as the very language of the learned community suggests, the attainment of successive, and increasingly higher degrees of competence. If there is a case to be made for student participation in the higher reaches of university government, it is a case that is not based upon the rights, but upon considerations of good educational and administrative practice." (59:50-51)

This point of view is shared by Sidney Hook, who states in Academic Freedom and Academic Anarchy:

"The university is not a political community. Its business is not government, but primarily the discovery, publication and teaching of truth. Its authority is based, not on numbers or rule of the majority, but on knowledge. Although it can function in a spirit of democracy, it cannot be organized on the principle of one man-one vote--or if it takes its educational mission seriously--of equal vote for student and faculty in the affairs of the mind or even with respect to organizational and curricular continuity." (78:121)

The claim that differences exist between faculty, administrators, and students is real and legitimate. But there is, at the same time, great merit in those measures designed to break down artificial barriers and to insure an equality of respect for all members of the academic community. This is not the same as urging a one man-one vote equality of decision-making roles. Most authorities doubt that the student would gain by an

erasure of the distinctions between himself, faculty members, and administrators with respect to authority and responsibility. (87:210)

A further related line of thought concerns the difficulties involved in establishing a unified academic community, particularly in larger institutions. The authorities of the minority report of the Study Commission on University Governance at Berkeley, observe that at the large state universities, factors such as size; budgetary constraints; the professional attitudes of the faculty; the great range of ability, preparation and interest among the students; the bewildering variety of activity, professional and other; and the existence of basic political strife, stand in the way of community building. They conclude that the vitality of a community attitude depends primarily on intangible qualities such as trust and shared commitment and experience, and that a policy aimed at legislating community has little chance of success. Such attempts inevitably produce a transfer of power that carries with it great potential for exacerbating conflicts. (58:219)

The generalities mentioned earlier in this section concerning relationships among students, faculty, administrators, and trustees, based on the concept of academic community, indicate a direction that appears to be desirable and favorable to progress in realizing the

potential of higher education. It can also be concluded that while these principles indicate direction, they do not define the extent of desirable change nor do they give clear guidance as to whether there are any areas in which expanded student involvement should or should not take place.

Educational Value

Another source for the justification of student participation in academic governance stems from the ubiquitously declared goals of American higher education. Educators and social philosophers consider the preparation of youth for the exacting responsibilities of citizenship in an increasingly complex democratic society to be one of the most important purposes of colleges and universities. (106:53-54)

One objective of the experience element in American higher education should be to provide students with opportunities to develop their capacity for the assumption of these large responsibilities. This is in part the theoretical justification for involving students in the academic decision-making process. Many writers have considered the trend toward greater student participation in terms of opening new possibilities for student development. Drawing from the personality theory of Erik Erikson, the authors of the Hazen report suggest that these types

of opportunities may be fruitful and satisfying avenues for the student seeking to establish his own identity and coping with the crisis of intimacy. (149:43-44)

Morris Keeton declares that students arrive on campus today more mature than did those of a century or a half century ago, and that higher education is expected to contribute further to this maturity, a task that cannot be done unless the students themselves take on major responsibilities. To insist otherwise is demeaning of this maturity and futile in practice. (84:19) Arthur Chickering adds emphasis to this point by declaring that the development of student competence, autonomy, and identity is fostered as the range of experiences, responsibilities, and significant tasks increases. (23:218,219) Newcomb also believes that identity comes through participation in groups by people who mutually recognize each other and who have the same continuing sort of interaction. (138:175-178)

The literature of industrial management and psychology provides further relevant findings which appear to be of significance in examining the issue of student participation in academic governance. One important development in this area is Management by Objectives (MBO), a planning and evaluation technique developed in industry. Fundamentally, MBO is composed of three basic elements:

1) goals and goal setting; 2) performance and involvement

of subordinates; and 3) feedback and performance evaluation. MBO has been described as a general process by which the superior and subordinate jointly define the common goals of the organization, define each individual's major areas of responsibility, and use these measures as guides for operating the unit and assessing the contribution of each of its members. The concepts involved in MBO have been shown to be effective in increasing the participation and involvement of subordinates, while at the same time, increasing motivation and stimulating a higher level of performance. (188)

In a related study, Dill cites Seashore as finding that high group cohesiveness was associated with high productivity if the group members had high confidence in management, and with low productivity if the group members had low confidence in management. (38)

Returning to the realm of education, Dill cites research done by Kurt Lewin in the 1950's which shows that in the public schools, many teachers want greater opportunities to participate in making decisions that affect their day to day activities. Lewin found that by giving these groups an opportunity to participate, administrators not only get more cooperation in implementing the choices that are made, but often times the quality of the decisions is higher and that participative methods can lead to greater individual commitment. (38) One

could reasonably expect that the same result would occur when students are granted a share in decision-making authority.

Sanford writes that many colleges and universities, more frequently the larger ones, exhibit a characteristic lack of coherence or unity. The larger universities attempt to be all things to all men. An unfortunate consequence of this trend is that a loss of a sense of overall purpose and direction usually follows. The practical result of a discoherent college is that students, faculty, and administrators experience themselves as disconnected and out of step with one another. (160)

Newcomb speaks about academic anonymity in the sense that many students lack a clear direction of who they are in relation to the academic structure. This uncertainty of identity and purpose appears directly related to a lack of regular interaction with experienced people sharing important intellectual and academic concerns. (138:176-177) This criticism of American higher education, particularly the multiversity variety, as well as Sanford's criticism, appears to indicate deficiencies that could be minimized in part for some students if the option of regularly interacting with faculty and administrators in both informal and formal nonclassroom settings, such as the academic governance structure, were open.

Looking specifically at student participation in institutional governance, it can be seen that many commentators applaud the educational benefits that student policy-makers receive. Frankel and Johnstone, while advocating rather narrow parameters on student authority, concede that participation stimulates the development of personal maturity and responsibility. (59:28-29, 87:209) Keeton reasons that,

"If the capacity for self-determination in learning and in life is to mature, as it should in students, the conduct of life and instruction on campus must elicit growing autonomy among them. No particular structures of governance are implied by that requirement, but a climate acceptant of students sharing in critical decisions and mechanisms suited to the particular campus will be increasingly essential to effectiveness." (89:19)

The educative value of student participation is apparent to Algo Henderson, former president of Antioch College, the American college with the longest history of student involvement. He affirms that the student learns when he is confronted with ongoing problems and discusses with peers and persons of broader knowledge and experience, the facts relating to those problems and the alternatives for their solution. (74:23) The majority opinion of the Commission on University Governance of the University of California argues that:

"Incorporating students into academic policy-making is essential if today's large university is to create an environment that more successfully promotes the realization of its still unfilled educational ambitions and our apprehension about the

wide gap presently separating our educational performance from the desirable goal of deeply involving students in the direction of their education." (58:82)

While the educational value of student involvement appears to be substantial, three potentially counter-productive elements must be carefully considered. Meaningful participation is essential to success in this area; psuedo involvement or "tokenism" will not satisfy the students' desire to play an important role in governance. Token representation, while politically astute and a potential mechanism for expanded educational experiences through greater student-faculty communication, is not likely to alleviate the fundamental problems which give rise to student disenchantment. The result of token representation may become counterproductive by accentuating the polarization of the students and the academic establishment. Channeling student authority into safe areas of high visibility and emotional impact may momentarily appease the demand for student power, but will continue to exclude the student population from the decision-making processes which most affect its educational experience. (87:206-207)

A second major source of potential difficulty with student participation in academic governance concerns the basic attitude of faculty and administrators toward student decision-makers. Dutton strongly suggests that as long as the conception of the student as a learner, in

the process of developing and growing in capacity to make wise decisions, is held, governance will continue to be a source of tension in higher education. He contends that the value of student involvement can be maximized only when students are perceived as mature responsible persons with the ability to participate on equal terms with others. (40:24) This potential source of difficulty is somewhat paradoxical in that while students involved in the governance process are growing and maturing, the educational value, as well as the administrative value, is not fully realized without a peer or "equal partners" relationship among all participants.

A third criticism concerning the educational value of student involvement concerns institutional priorities. The minority report of the Berkeley Study Commission on University Governance takes the position that: "The main point of a university administration is not to educate; it is to provide the conditions under which members of the university can educate themselves." (58:215-216)

In a 1969 speech, Kingman Brewster, President of Yale emphasized this basic position by saying,

"...there is the very real question of whether it is in the best interest of the students themselves, not only to make their voices heard, but to try to govern the place. Put differently, it is pertinent to ask, 'will the place be better or worse, in terms

of the students' own best interest in the quality of his education, if the responsibility for its direction is assumed by student representatives, or if it resides with the faculty and administration?" (17:2-3)

Summary

The basic purpose of this chapter has been to review many of the opinions held by authorities regarding student participation in the academic governance of American higher education. The review encompassed an examination of the important positions expressed in the educational literature as they related to the four specific issues of academic freedom, administrative efficiency, community cohesion, and the educational value of student participation. It has been shown that despite what appears to be a trend toward wider student participation at all levels of academic governance, there exists considerable disagreement concerning the desirability of various degrees of student participation. The advocates of wider student participation generally point to the advantages of utilizing previously untapped resources for the improvement of the academic environment. Those opposed to further expansion of student involvement foresee inefficiency and the loss of control by those most competent to govern.

While each of these positions have a degree of credibility, it appears that student participation in governance, when roles are clearly defined and carefully

planned, has potential for capitalizing on some of the advantages mentioned by the advocates, while minimizing the losses described by the critics. The criteria for such a governance structure could be described in terms of its effect on the primary mission of the institution--the discovery of learning and understanding of old and new knowledge. (58:235)

The following chapter will deal specifically with the events leading to the establishment of the current structure of the Michigan State University Academic Council and the formulation of the role of students in that body.

CHAPTER III

A HISTORICAL OVERVIEW OF STUDENT PARTICIPATION IN ACADEMIC GOVERNANCE AT MICHIGAN STATE UNIVERSITY

Introduction

A review of the history of Michigan State University from 1968 to 1972 as recorded in the minutes of the Academic Council and the Academic Senate, indicates that a significant amount of time and effort has been devoted to questions concerning the role of the student in the academic decision-making process. The period of the middle and late 1960's marked the emergence of a new student awareness and sensitivity to social, political, and educational issues that often times brought explosive consequences to American colleges and universities, and Michigan State was no exception. This period saw the implementation of the "Academic Freedom Report," (2) a Michigan State University response to difficulties imposed by its own growth over the years to "megaversity" status and the wave of social change sweeping the country. Several of the provisions of this document called for orderly procedures for involving students more fully in institutional affairs. Three subsequent documents,

popularly known as the Massey, McKee and Taylor Reports, (Appendices D, E, and F) dealt specifically with the implementation of an effective student role in institutional decision-making, and at the present time, the results of these efforts are being scrutinized for possible modification. It is the intent of this chapter to provide a brief historical overview of these significant events and expressed attitudes, in such a way as to provide the context for the research presented in subsequent chapters.

The "Academic Freedom Report"

In his 1969 doctoral dissertation, Fedore concluded that the greatest impetus to the development of the "Academic Freedom Report" emerged from the University's relationship with Mr. Paul Schiff, a graduate student. In June, 1965, Mr. Schiff was denied readmission to the University because of actions stemming from his association with an activist group called "The Committee for Student Rights." This organization refused to register with the University and ignored its regulations concerning publication and distribution of the group's periodical. Schiff appealed to a federal district court which subsequently ordered the University to provide him with a hearing. This incident was significant in that it alerted the University to the need for reform in its structures in dealing with student conduct and matters relating to the relationship of students to the institution. (56:33-36)

The December 7, 1965, meeting of the Michigan State University Academic Council adjourned after having approved the following resolution:

The Academic Council recognizes the need for a comprehensive reform of the University's rules and structures dealing with the academic freedom of student, i.e., with the freedom of speech, press, and association on the campus and 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. (56:37)

The task of implementing this resolution eventually became the responsibility of the Faculty Committee on Student Affairs whose members produced a version of the document entitled "Academic Freedom for Students at Michigan State University" for distribution at the June 7, 1966, meeting at the Academic Council. The summer and fall of 1966 saw extensive discussion and study of the report and numerous proposed changes introduced by faculty, students, and administrators alike. From these deliberations, there emerged a basic difference of opinion between students and faculty concerning the academic rights and responsibilities of students.

The student position was advocated vigorously by the officers and student representatives of the Associated Students of Michigan State University, and focused upon broadening the student role in the academic affairs of the University. The conflicting position argued by several faculty members, contended that the report had overcommitted the University in this area and that conditions could easily arise in which the best interests of the institution could be adversely affected. (56:57)

The report was returned to the Faculty Committee on Student Affairs in order to resolve this and other difficulties and develop a revision more acceptable to the campus community. This revision was completed and distributed to the members of the Academic Council on December 6, 1966, at which time a special meeting was called for January 4, 1967. After four days of meetings in which each point was carefully considered, and many were clarified and ammended, the Academic Council approved the report. Shortly thereafter, it was approved by the Academic Senate on February 28, 1967, and adopted by the Board of Trustees on March 16. (56:58-59)

The passage of the "Academic Freedom Report" began a new era at Michigan State University. The report was intended to be a general document, one that would not set down specifics, but would have directions or guidelines for the specific rules that would have to be carefully

considered and followed prior to their implementation.

(60) A number of provisions outlined new guidelines for the protection of basic student rights in the University. These statements reaffirmed principles that were consistent to a great degree with many of the arguments supporting formal student involvement in academic affairs at other colleges and universities, as well as at Michigan State University. Among the concepts and guidelines are the recognition of the right of students to participate in the development of student conduct regulations (Article 1, Section 1.5.03); the need for clearly established procedures and channels for appeal and review of violations and regulations (Article 1, Section 1.5.10); the need for educationally sound regulations (Article 2, Section 2.1.4.7); the protection of designated student rights and responsibilities in academic areas (Article 2, Section 2.1.4.1. and Section 2.1.4.8); the affirmation of freedom from censorship for the Michigan State News (Article 6); and clearly defined judicial guidelines and procedures (Article 4). (2)

Particularly significant to subsequent efforts concerning the broad area of student participation in academic governance were those guidelines designed to clarify and improve student-faculty relationships. These provisions reaffirm the "primacy and centrality of the faculty" in educational concerns, but call upon all

members of the academic community to share in this responsibility (Article 2, Section 2.1.1.). In addition, they asserted that final authority in the classroom is held by the faculty (Article 2, Section 2.1.1.) and that the competence of faculty members can be judged only by professionals (Article 2, Section 2.2.4.). The committee was aware of potential areas of disagreement between students and faculty and emphasized that the rights of students are to be reconciled with the rights of faculty by establishing channels for student complaints (Article 2, Section 2.2.7.) and providing for referral of student recommendations to appropriate departmental agencies (Article 2, Section 2.2.8.2).

Fedore saw the "Academic Freedom Report" as signifying a new dimension in student-University relations. It indicates a strong university commitment to understand student problems and a willingness to successfully resolve them in the future through establishing procedures through which orderly change can be accomplished. (56:59) The responsibilities of the faculty and the administration were not greatly altered by the adoption of the document, but the basic thrust was to more fully incorporate students as party to the social trust of the University.

"The Massey Report"

In addition to the "Academic Freedom Report," the recommendations of the Committee on Undergraduate

Education (CUE) provided impetus to the formalization of the student role in institutional affairs. Appointed on February 8, 1967, by President John A. Hannah, CUE was assigned the task of reviewing the entire undergraduate educational process including topics such as curriculum, teaching, advising, and student involvement in the academic community. Following seven months of study, during which time the "Academic Freedom Report" was formally accepted, the committee released its report which included recommendations on almost every phase of undergraduate student life, including participation in academic decision-making. Much of the emphasis on student participation was directed toward lower level decision-making on departmental committees dealing with teaching assistants, on a system for rewarding good teaching, on increasing departmental communication with majors, and on establishing departmental teaching committees. (191)

At this time the Academic Council was primarily a university-wide, faculty decision-making body composed of approximately 100 members plus one graduate student and two undergraduate student representatives who served without voting privileges. (153:1) On November 5, 1968, the Academic Council approved a motion directing its Committee on Committees to appoint, as soon as possible, an ad hoc committee to study the matter of student participation in the academic government of the University,

notably with respect to the Academic Council and its standing committees. This committee was urged to present its recommendations to the Academic Council in sufficient time for the Council to bring the matter before the Academic Senate at its Spring, 1969, meeting. The ad hoc committee's recommendations were to include the following: number of student representatives, manner of selection, and capacity (e.g. voting or ex officio non-voting). Professor Gerald Massey was elected as committee chairman, and it was decided that the ad hoc committee was to include six faculty members, two administrators, three undergraduates and two graduate students. (111:1-2)

Prior to the deliberations of the Ad Hoc Committee on Student Participation in Academic Government, or the "Massey Committee", beginning in the Fall of 1968, there had been no systematic attempt to involve students in the academic decision-making process at Michigan State University. In an interview in the Michigan State University News, Professor Gerald J. Massey made the following comments:

"There are departments where students sit on every committee except promotion and tenure with vote--and even on that committee they sit to establish criteria and standards for granting promotions and tenure. At the other extreme, there are departments that do absolutely nothing--they consider themselves open and responsive to students, and at the same time, they complain about student apathy. And they feel perfectly satisfied about what they're doing." (191)

The actual work of the committee began in January, 1969, and initially attempted to determine, by means of a questionnaire, the attitudes of Michigan State University deans, department chairmen, directors, and committee chairmen concerning the present role of students, an evaluation of these roles, and plans and opinions concerning the proper role of students in academic governance. A summary of this study was compiled and made available in March of 1969. (54:71-72)

The initial meetings of the committee were primarily informational in nature, focusing on reaching a common understanding of the basic issues involved in the question of student participation in academic governance. In his 1970 dissertation, Enos found that among the initial assumptions of the committee were the following: (1) the ideal to strive for was "the maximum degree of student participation, limited by the legitimate demands of the faculty and administration"; (2) to "avoid suggesting strict guidelines that may not be applicable--(due to) differences among departments in size, existing structures, needs, etc."; and (3) "everyone should work together to best further the educational aims of the University." (54:72)

After several meetings in which general principles and then specific proposals were agreed upon, the Committee's report was presented at the May 27, 1969, meeting

of the Academic Council (for the complete text of the Report, see Appendix D). Professor Massey explained that the report was designed to increase student participation in university government in order to bring fresh perspective and full dialogue without prejudicing the final determination by experienced people in the academic community. The members of the ad hoc committee were present to respond to any questions that might be addressed to them. (112:5)

"The Massey Report" consisted basically of a Preamble and fifteen recommendations. The Preamble stated that the protection of the values of the academic community were the joint responsibility of students, faculty, and administrators and that this responsibility requires that each group have an effective voice in the University's decision-making structures. The first group of three recommendations affirmed the authority of the University's administrative units to extend opportunities to participate to any member of the university community and that, in general, voting privileges should be a part of these opportunities.

Recommendations 4 through 10 dealt with student participation at the university level. The Academic Council was to include one undergraduate representative for each of the colleges with selection procedures to be developed by each college. Also there were to be three undergraduate and two graduate representatives at-large.

One of these student representatives was to be elected by his peers on the Council to serve on the Steering Committee. The Report specified that exact numbers of graduate and undergraduate students be seated on the various standing committees, the Graduate Council and that appropriate student representation be utilized in the selection of principal academic officers and on special committees.

Recommendations 11 through 13 called for meaningful student representation on college-level academic governmental bodies including standing committees, ad hoc committees, and selection committees. Meaningful student participation was also recommended for similar activities on the departmental level in the final two recommendations.

After lengthy discussion, the Council voted to refer the report of the Ad Hoc Committee on Student Participation in Academic Government to the faculties of the various colleges, the Graduate Council, and other educational units of the University for study and discussion, much to the dismay of the members of the ad hoc committee. Although the Council went on record as being in sympathy with the spirit of the recommendations of the ad hoc committee as stated in the Preamble to its report, they felt that the significance of the report merited further discussion and study by the entire academic community. The Council resolved to resume consideration of the report

the following Fall in time for the next scheduled meeting of the Academic Senate. (112:7-9)

The "Massey Report" was returned to the Academic Council on October 14, 1969, to a chorus of objections, reservations, and ammendments. Among the expressed opinions, were endorsements of the report from the representatives of ASMSU and the Council of Graduate Students. Most of the faculty speakers, however, expressed serious doubts concerning specific recommendations found in the report. By the conclusion of the meeting, agreement had been reached on an ammended form of the Preamble which substituted the phrase "appropriate voice" for the "effective voice" with regard to the student role in academic governance. (113:4-6) At this point basic differences appeared among members of the Academic Council concerning the desirability of incorporating students in academic governance according to the Massey Committee recommendations and the probable consequences for the University's educational programs. (54:74)

The October 21, meeting of the Academic Council consisted of a continuation of the debate. The "Massey Report" was criticized for lacking a specific rationale for the recommendations, as well as lacking consistency and logic. A motion to rewrite the document was defeated and the council proceeded to approve recommendations 1 and 2 following extended debate and two ammendments to the first recommendation. (114:2-3) The next day the Council

met and discussed further the first two recommendations and then soundly defeated, by a vote of 3 to 39, the third recommendation, which called for an investigation of the possibility of granting academic credit for student participation. (114:3)

Recommendation 4, which would have provided for one voting student representative to the Academic Council from each of the colleges was debated at the October 27 session of the Council. Among the objections to this recommendation were the following: 1) inefficiency due to the increase in size of the Academic Council; 2) the difficulties involved in conducting elections at the college level; and 3) possible detrimental consequences arising from student participation. (116:1-2)

In the midst of strong opposition the Council adjourned and reconvened the following day, at which time a student representative offered a motion to recommit the report to a committee whose members shall be appointed by the President. Following further debate, the motion was carried with the understanding that the new committee report would come back in two months. (117:1)

It is interesting to note that the motion to recommit came from a student, when the majority of students strongly favored adoption of the "Massey Report." One faculty member, reflecting on this apparently contradictory event, concluded that the philosophy of the report on the "how"

of implementation was obviously unacceptable to a large number of faculty members. The student members of the council felt that if they insisted on the philosophy of the document, it would be thoroughly defeated by faculty majority sentiment. Because they realized this, it was the students who decided that the document better go back to the committee where there existed the possibility of an acceptable compromise. (28:1)

The Council then developed a number of guidelines to assist the new committee. These guidelines consisted of the following points: 1) that the new committee accept the principle of student participation in all university bodies; 2) that it alternatively develop machinery for parallel student structures; 3) that its report be consistent with the philosophy of the present By-laws of the Faculty; and 4) that it not be required to reconcile its recommendations to existing legislation. It was further agreed that the ad hoc committee report, as discussed and ammended by the Academic Council, should serve as one of the working documents for the new committee. The new committee was also permitted to set minimum levels of student participation in college and departmental government and advised to confine its attention to academic government of faculty and students only. (117:2-3)

Many explanations were subsequently offered regarding the demise of the "Massey Report," but the lack of agreement concerning the failure of the report often times

seemed to approach that of the actual Council deliberations during which action was taken on only the Preamble and three of the report's 15 recommendations. Some of the reasons most prominently cited were: the lack of a written rationale for the recommendations; inconsistency with the thinking of the majority of the members of the Academic Council; the lack of a clearly defined statement on roles of students and faculty; and the committee's assumption of certain premises that proved to be unacceptable to the Academic Council. (28:1, 9) In addition, objections were raised during the debate on the grounds that the wording of the report was vague and at times lacked logic and consistency. (117:2)

An informal survey by the MSU Faculty News revealed that Council members from nine colleges shared degrees of dissatisfaction with the "Massey Report" on its rationale, and its attempts to assign specific numbers of students to standing committees. Several faculty members said they endorsed the idea of soliciting student views but they expressed the concern that student participation was being equated with student power in matters for which faculty would be held accountable. (172)

Professor Massey's response to these criticisms were made in absentia from the University of Pittsburgh where he was on sabbatical leave during the final deliberations of the Academic Council. In a letter to the MSU Faculty News, he wrote that, "The charge that the report is

inconsistent and 'illogical' must have been advanced facetiously. As a professional logician, I can offer expert testimony that in none of the many senses of those terms known to logicians is the report either inconsistent or illogical." (101)

In response to the criticism that specific rationales for the recommendations were not included and the report's terminology was overly vague, Professor Massey writes:

"I see this as an inevitable feature of such a report. For each recommendation adopted by the committee, there were probably 13 distinct rationales, one for each member of the committee--Some have criticized the report for using vague terms like 'significant representation' and 'appropriate numbers'. The vagueness was deliberate. The vague language of the report was intended to give the several faculties, acting in good faith, maximum scope and flexibility in applying the report's general recommendations to their particular contexts. (101)

Concerning the charge that the assumption of power by students who cannot be held accountable for their actions, Professor Massey writes:

"Some critics have hinted at a diminution of 'faculty power.' I concur with Acting President Walter Adams ...who openly acknowledged that sharing of power is the basic issue. Adams has himself long preached that sharing of power often leads to an increase rather than to a diminution (of faculty power).

There are even times when power can be lost by a refusal to share it with those who have a plain right to participate. The present, I think, is one of those times. Students do have a right to help shape academic policy, and that right will be exercised (e.g. students will be heard by the Board of Trustees) whether or not we, the faculty, decide to transform faculty government into academic government.

By opening academic government to students, we can enhance the power of our councils which will there often speak, with an authority that must be heeded, for the total academic community. By keeping channels closed, we run the risk of making them increasingly ineffectual and ultimately irrelevant." (101)

The significance of the "Massey Report" lies not in the fact that it was rejected, but that it represented a strong institutional commitment on the part of Michigan State University with regard to student participation in academic governance. The same Academic Council meeting that rejected the Massey Committee's recommendations, saw the urgent reaffirmation of the principle of student involvement. This took the form of setting guidelines and a timetable by the Council for the second attempt to implement a workable scheme for involving students in the academic governance of Michigan State University.

The "McKee Report"

In November, 1969, following extensive deliberations, the Academic Council recommended that the "Massey Report", submitted to the Council in May, 1969, be returned to a new faculty-student committee for revision. Faculty members were chosen from the ranks of the Academic Council by the President, acting on the recommendations of the Council's Steering Committee. The student members were chosen by the President upon recommendation from the non-voting student members and alternate student members of the Academic Council. (150:1)

The New Committee on Student Participation in Academic Government chose James McKee, Professor of Sociology, to serve as its chairman. The "McKee Committee" began its work with the fundamental conviction that the discussions in the Academic Council clearly indicated substantial agreement that students should be involved in the academic decision-making process of the University. The nature of that participation, the numbers of students to be involved, and the methods to be used to select students, were issues left unresolved in the "Massey Report" debate. The "McKee Committee" set as its goal, the resolution of these issues, but deliberately did not always attempt to be as comprehensive or as specific as its predecessor, the "Massey Committee". Having observed the problems experienced as a result of over-specifying procedures, the New Committee chose to suggest some immediate steps toward the goal involvement of students in academic governance. In addition this group proposed establishing the structure through which the system of academic governance could be continuously evaluated and changes made when desirable. (150:1)

This report (Appendix E) made recommendations in five areas: 1) the involvement of students in the academic affairs in the departments, colleges, and centers and institutes in the University; 2) the involvement of students within the Academic Council; 3) the involvement

of students on various standing committees of the Academic Council; 4) the provision for specific minority student representation in academic government; and 5) the establishment of a new Faculty-Student Committee on Academic Governance; the redefinition of the responsibility of the Faculty Affairs Committee; the redefinition and reconstitution of the Student Affairs Committee. (150:2)

Shortly after its formation, the New Committee on Student Participation in Academic Government, like its predecessor, conducted a survey of all departments, colleges, members of the Academic Council, and directors of centers and institutes in order to ascertain the present state of and climate of acceptance concerning student participation. In addition, a general request for opinions and information was issued by the Committee. The results indicated that in late 1969, there were examples of almost every possible type of arrangement of student involvement in the academic decision-making process at the department and college level at Michigan State University. On the basis of these findings, the "McKee Committee" felt it would be unwise to insist on any one model for the involvement of students in the affairs of departments, colleges, centers, and institutes. (150:3)

Following three months of deliberations, the "New Committee on Student Participation in Academic Government" submitted its report to the Academic Council (see appendix for the complete text) on February 17, 1970.

One major group of recommendations called for each department, school, college, center and institute that has academic responsibilities within the University, or whose work concerns students, to develop methods of involving both undergraduate and graduate students in the academic decision-making of that unit, with each unit deciding what makes up its constituency. (150:5)

At the Academic Council level the "McKee Committee" recommended that each college be represented by one voting undergraduate student, and that those colleges with graduate or professional training functions be represented with a total of six voting graduate student representatives. In addition, a total of ten seats on the Academic Council were recommended specifically for the representation of minority groups. The committee further proposed that varying but specific numbers of undergraduate, graduate, and minority student representatives be seated with full voting privileges on the standing committees of the Academic Council. (150:9-13)

In order to avoid one of the strong criticisms of its predecessor, the "McKee Committee" recommended that the Faculty Affairs Committee report to the Elected Faculty Council, the Council's faculty members, rather than to the entire Academic Council, on matters of exclusive concern to the faculty, such as salary, fringe benefits, and insurance. The committee further proposed that the

By-laws of the University be changed to provide that the Elected Faculty Council may, by majority vote, refer matters of exclusive concern to the faculty directly to the Academic Senate. In this way, the Committee felt that these sensitive issues could be dealt with exclusively by faculty.

The necessity of continuous study and evaluation of the governance function at Michigan State University was recognized by the New Committee and accomodated in the form of a recommendation that would establish a University Committee on Academic Governance. The proposed committee was charged with the responsibility for continuing review of the By-laws of the University to assure that they are being observed and with the responsibility for making recommendations to the Council for whatever changes in the By-laws the Committee's investigations indicated. The Committee was to study, on a continuous basis, the steps being taken throughout the University to involve students in academic governance and to make recommendations to the Council when appropriate. (150:16)

Partly in response to criticisms of the "Massey Report", the new committee chose to include a rationale for each of the document's 32 recommendations, as well as its reasons for rejecting alternative courses of action. These statements of rationale indicate that the Committee displayed great faith, not only in the ability of student

members to contribute valuable insights to the decision-making processes, but also in their good will and commitment. These statements in the document, taken as a whole, further suggest that the majority of the New Committee members were philosophically alligned with the concept of the University as a united academic community as advocated by Taylor, Cole, and others in Chapter II.

Most of the student reaction to the "McKee Report" was favorable and enthusiastic to the point of holding residence hall information sessions and making copies of the report available in residence halls and at the ASMSU office. The prospect of having voice and vote on Academic matters, to even a larger extent than recommended in the Massey document, was particularly attractive to students. (152) The editors of the Michigan State News stated that:

"It is our opinion that the McKee Report is the most important document to come out of this university since the Academic Freedom Report. At the very least, this Report would establish officially that students are to be considered co-equal members of the university community, rather than raw fodder for the diploma mill. We urge the Academic Council to pass the McKee report in its entirety....Further, we urge the student body to throw their full support behind the drive for passage of this document. The time is short, but there is still some. Write letters, make phone calls, talk to professors and other students, and, maybe show your interest and thereby invalidate the claim of McKee detractors that the students 'aren't interested'." (46)

Between March 3 and March 12, the Academic Council met four times, spending nearly twelve hours debating the

recommendations and the rationale of the report of the "McKee Committee." These often emotion-packed discussions resulted in the approval of 22 of the committee's recommendations, most of them with little or no change in wording. Four recommendations (No. 28-31) were tabled temporarily while the six recommendations dealing with minority representation on the Academic Council and the standing committees proved extremely controversial and were deferred pending action by a special ad hoc committee (No. 19-23). (97)

This special committee was to investigate the implications of the recommendations concerning minority representation. While the debate indicated that virtually all of the members of the Academic Council agreed with the desirability of assuring adequate representation of minority students on the Academic Council and its committees with full voice and vote, serious reservations were evident concerning the following specific recommendations of the "McKee Report":

1. the inclusivity of the minority groups specified and the adequacy of their definition;
 2. the lack of specificity in the procedures to be employed in the selection of minority student representation;
 3. the possible illegality in the proposed methods for assuring representation of minority students.
- (120)

The Ad Hoc Committee on Minority Student Representation deliberated these points and presented revised

recommendations which were approved at the April 7, 1970, Academic Council meeting. The Committee agreed that inclusion within a specific minority was a matter of self definition and recommended that minority group membership is best decided by the individual. With regard to specific selection procedures, the ad hoc committee chose to authorize the Office of Black Affairs to develop these methods. It was felt that OBA had sufficient existing personnel, resources, and a basic framework sufficient to the task. (121)

In addition, the committee recommended that the Office of Black Affairs report the arrangement for selection of minority representatives to the Committee on Academic Governance by December 1, 1970. The committee further asked each academic unit within the University to ensure adequate minority student representation to the Academic Council. Finally, the Committee on Academic Governance was charged with reviewing the process of minority student representation and report to the council in three years. (121)

Concerning the legal implications of the minority student Academic Council representative recommendations, the University attorney assured the Council that the University would not be in danger of violating the equal protection clause of the Constitution, and that the existence of a reasonable basis for a classification had been

established by the U.S. Supreme Court as meeting constitutional requirements. He documented this claim by quoting the U.S. Supreme Court decision in the Lindsley vs. Natural Gas Company case of 1961, and added that this decision had been cited in recent Michigan Supreme Court cases. The recommendations of the Ad Hoc Committee on Minority Student Representation were then approved with minor changes. (121:5)

Following passage of the remainder of the "McKee Report" recommendations, a new ad hoc committee was appointed and instructed to draft the recommendations of the "McKee Report", as ammended and approved, into by-law ammendments which then could be submitted to the Academic Senate for incorporation into the By-laws of the Faculty. Following approval by the Academic Senate, the ammendments to the By-laws would then go to the Board of Trustees.

The Academic Council met on May 15, to complete its deliberations of by-law revisions necessary for implementation of the recommendations of the New Committee on Student Participation in Academic Government. Although the proposed by-law revisions were approved relatively easily with only minor changes, a major obstacle developed, however, with the necessary ammendments to the "Academic Freedom Report". A motion was introduced to add the Elected Faculty Council to the list of groups having power to approve ammendments to the "Academic Freedom Report".

The motivation for this move derived from the fact that with 31 students added to the Academic Council, the elected faculty members would no longer be a majority, and further there would be no body with a majority of faculty with the power to veto proposed amendments to the "Academic Freedom Report". Although the motion was defeated, the margin was so narrow (30-28) that Professor McKee chose to compromise this point in order to improve the chances of passage of the by-law revisions, necessary for implementation of the entire report, in the Academic Senate. The results of McKee's action was the revision of article 7.1.2. of the "Academic Freedom Report" to ensure that any proposed amendments that specifically refer to faculty professional rights and responsibilities must be approved by the Elected Faculty Council before they go to the Academic Council. (31:4)

Although the "McKee Report" had survived the opposition in the Academic Council, the by-law revisions, upon which the report was contingent, still had to pass the Academic Senate. Prior to the Senate meeting on June 3, 1970, the local chapter of the AAUP went on record as opposing the "McKee Report". The AAUP's position endorsed the principle of student participation in academic governance, but objected to several of the specific points in the McKee document for essentially the same reasons brought to the floor of the Academic Council. (1)

When the faculty arrived for the June 3, Senate vote on the proposed by-law revisions, they were greeted by a memorandum prepared by 12 faculty members. This memorandum reportedly endorsed the value and the objective of student participation but objected to the implementation of the "McKee Report" primarily on the grounds that its passage would mean an end to elected faculty dominance in academic affairs. Concern was also expressed concerning the legality of the provisions for minority student representation, and whether or not students have a right to be involved in decisions concerning faculty matters. Also raised again was the question of granting 30 percent of the student seats on the Academic Council to four percent of the student body. (54:89-90) Following discussion of the memorandum the proposed by-law amendments were soundly defeated by the Academic Senate by a vote of 111 for and 427 against. The Senate then approved a resolution endorsing the objective of student involvement in academic governance but which referred the by-law revisions back to the Council for reconsideration and clarification. The resolution requested that the Council try to complete its by-law recommendations prior to the Fall, 1970, Senate meeting. All of the academic units of the University were asked to continue planning along the general lines indicated by the "McKee" proposals and that January 1, 1971, be made the target date for implementing plans for greater student participation. (165:4)

James B. McKee, chairman of the committee, attributed the defeat of the New Committee's recommendations to the fear that the students would hold greater powers than the faculty. McKee charged that opponents of the report conducted a "fear campaign," hinting that to give students more power meant that the faculty would have to relinquish much of its power. Following the defeat of the recommendations and the return of the issue to the Academic Council, three alternatives were open to the Council. The report could be returned to the McKee Committee for further revisions or a new committee could be formed to revise the document. The third alternative was to revise the report from the floor of the Council. (108:1)

Like the "Massey Report" the "McKee Report" brought formal student participation at Michigan State University a step closer to reality. The principle of student participation was reaffirmed several times throughout the deliberations by various groups including the opponents of the "McKee Report". In addition, the principle of involvement in academic affairs by student members of minority groups was accepted in principle after considerable discussion. The task of the Council now was clearly one of compromise and mediation of the concepts of an effective student role with the preservation of faculty rights.

"The Taylor Report"

The October 6, 1970, meeting of the Michigan State University Academic Council saw the approval of a resolution establishing a special three-man faculty panel for the purpose of developing workable guidelines for implementing student participation in academic governance. This Special Panel was to be chaired by Professor John F.A. Taylor and was instructed to emphasize mediation in its proceedings, and to make every effort to achieve reconciliation and creative compromise of the various points of view that have been expressed concerning those recommendations of the "McKee Committee Report" that were controversial. In areas in which mediation fails to achieve consensus, the Special Panel was given the power to formulate its own recommendations in order to produce a revised document that would have a reasonable chance of approval by the Academic Senate and the Board of Trustees. The Panel was further encouraged to consult with and consider the views of students, student groups and organizations, faculty members and organizations, administrators, and members of the Board of Trustees, and to make every reasonable effort to prepare its report and recommendations for submission to the November, 1970, meeting of the Academic Council. (124:6)

The Special Panel completed their task and at the November 3, 1970, Council meeting, presented their report

entitled Revised Recommendations Concerning Student Participation in the Academic Government (Appendix F).

(156) This report, which came to be known as the "Taylor Report" was presented in the form of ammendments to the By-laws (see appendix for the complete text) and differed from the previous report in that it omitted separate statements of rationale for the specific recommendations.

Among the more significant differences appearing in the "Taylor Report" were a series of rather precise statements which clearly defined the parameters of the authority of students in academic decision-making. As in the McKee and Massey documents, the rights of students selected by their constituents, to participate in Council deliberations with full voice and vote, was strongly affirmed. The Special Panel, undoubtedly influenced by the strong opposition encountered by the "McKee Committee", chose to exclude students from participating in decisions which the faculty conceived to lie within its prerogative domain. The Special Panel was convinced that in these matters, the larger interests of the University would not be advanced by involving students. (156:3) Specifically these matters fall into the following categories:

"Matters of exclusive concern to the faculty, such as their salary, leaves, insurance, and other fringe benefits, health service and housing, retirement;"
(2.5.7.1.)

"Matters affecting the distinctively professional duties of the faculty, namely, the duties that flow from the faculty's obligation to maintain the intellectual authority of the University as a center of detached inquiry and disinterested pursuit of truth;" (2.5.7.2.)

"Matters in which the distinctively professional rights of the faculty are at issue, as in decisions concerning the substantive issues of tenure, that is, the re-appointment, promotion, or dismissal of individual members of the faculty whose appointment places them under the rules of tenure. (2.5.7.3.) (156:6-7)

The Special Panel further elaborated the basis for this separation of authority by stating:

"No useful purpose is served in suggesting, or in allowing students to believe that these matters are, as the faculty views them, negotiable. They are not. And that was in effect what the Senate's rejection of the Council's revisions signified--not a rejection of student participation or a failure of respect, but a simple reminder to all parties, that disciplined capacity implies precedence in the community of scholars." (156:3)

One of the main professional activities of faculty members, namely the teaching function, was clearly affirmed to be a matter of student concern by the Special Panel. While professional competency was described as a necessary condition for teaching in the University, it was not felt to be a sufficient condition. The Panel clearly noted that the "Taylor Report" granted no immunity from legitimate demands for excellence in teaching and that questions concerning general educational policy are matters of legitimate student concern (2.5.9.2.). (156:8) In addition, student input was encouraged at the level of department, school, institute, or residential college by a provision

entitling them to have formal opportunities made available to them for the presentation of their views (2.5.9.4.). Concerning individual tenure decisions, the student voice was to play a significant role (2.5.9.3.), however, the faculty retained the final authority in these matters (2.5.9.5.). (156:9)

The proposed composition of the Academic Council, as recommended by the Special Panel, was similar to that recommended by the "McKee Report," with important exceptions in the area of minority student representation. To ensure a systematic representation of non-whites and of women, ten seats were to be reserved for student representatives at large with the further qualifications that at least two of these seats be reserved for women and at least six for non-whites (4.4.3.08., 4.4.3.08.1.). The Special Panel recommended that these positions be filled by elections-at-large (4.4.3.08.2.), rather than delegating the authority to establish selection procedures to a campus organization as did the "McKee Committee." The basis for the at-large election procedure by the entire student community affirmed the University's intention of placing women and minorities on the Academic Council, "not because women and minorities have put themselves there, but because the University affirms its pluralism in having them there." (156:5) The Special Panel also explained that the wording of the recommendations

concerning the numbers of women and non-whites, (i.e. at least six, at least two) does not imply a quota and therefore is in compliance with the provisions of Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964. (156:5)

The Academic Council deliberations of the specific provisions of the "Taylor Report" began at the November 3, 1970, meeting. The first ammendment approved by the Council affirmed the right of any regularly enrolled full-time student to participate in the affairs in the academic department (or other unit) and in the college in which he is enrolled. Following additional debate, another minor ammendment was approved and several were defeated. One interesting development occurred when a faculty Academic Council representative argued that if the section (2.5.7.2.) in the report outlining exclusive faculty concern with matters affecting the distinctly professional duties means "...excluding students from discussing things like entrance standards and grading, then it is an inappropriate reservation." Professor John F.A. Taylor, chairman of the Special Panel, replied that the section was modeled after the 10th ammendment to the U.S. Constitution which reserves some rights (from the states) to the federal government. (183:1)

Debate on Section 1A of the introductory remarks concerning student representation and the professional rights and responsibilities of the faculty was then brought to the floor in its ammended version and approved. (183:2)

Another faculty representative to the Council expressed concern with the confusion between the concepts of community of scholars and of professional association. He referred to the section reading, "Students have the right to assume their inputs...shall figure significantly in the faculty's judgement...." This faculty member expressed his belief that "there is no such meaningful entity as the right to assume." (29:3)

Section I.C of the introductory remarks was then brought to the floor. This section dealt with the composition of the Academic Council and the methods to be employed for the selection of student representatives. Although the Council adjourned prior to voting on Section I.C, an ammendment was approved eliminating all references to women, and others, attempting to reduce the number of student members at-large, were defeated. (125:3)

The Council reconvened on November 4, and continued discussion of Section I.C of the Revised Recommendations. A proposed ammendment, similar to the "McKee Committee" recommendation to authorize appropriate minority groups to develop procedures for selecting at-large student members of the Academic Council, was defeated. But, a motion to require the Student Committee on Nominations to consult with minority student organizations on at-large selection procedures was approved. Following additional discussion and explanation, two additional minor

ammendments were approved, followed by Council approval of Section I.C. (127:1)

The Council continued its scrutiny of the recommendations of the "Taylor Report". Section 4.4.5.5., which authorized the Elected Faculty Council to refer to matters of exclusively faculty concern directly to the Academic Senate, was found to be inconsistent and was dropped.

(127:2) Another graduate student representative was added to the University Committee on Business Affairs, and the Faculty-Student Affairs Committee became the Student Affairs Committee. The Student Affairs Committee was then denied the power to initiate or veto ammendments to the "Academic Freedom Report." (127:2)

Despite the speech and relative ease of passage of the recommendations of the "Taylor Report", at least one faculty member of the Academic Council expressed personal reservations and uneasiness. The MSU Faculty News quoted a professor as telling the Academic Council: "I get the impression that we are rearranging deck chairs on the Titanic." The basis of this concern related to the procedures employed by the Council. "I felt we had bypassed the rationale of the report and were debating individual points in a vacuum,...scratching the surface of issues that go very deep and need a lot further scrutiny." He said that this feeling related to the accomodation of the report to what would be acceptable to the Academic Senate. (183:1)

The November 17, 1970, meeting of the Academic Council approved changes in the "Academic Freedom Report" consistent with the recommendations of the "Taylor Report." The Council then approved the document of the Special Panel as a whole, adding that it should be reviewed further two years after its implementation. (128:3)

During the deliberations of the Academic Council, there had been little student comment expressed in the State News concerning the provisions of the "Taylor Report." The interval between approval by the Academic Council and consideration by the Academic Senate saw a considerable increase in expressed student concern. (54:98)

One student editorial reacted to the time consuming debate in the Academic Council in which the Special Panel had "their findings almost completely undone," while another advocated ASMSU censure of the Academic Council. (43:4) Much of the editorial output was directed against what the State News staff felt was dillusions of faculty supremacy and University government by faculty cliques. (44:4, 51:4) Another editorial lamented, "The very matters for which students have sought a significant voice will become an illusive fading dream if the 'Taylor Report' is implemented as it is now composed." This same editorial expressed the fear that, "In some departments, students already have a voice in such matters as tenure, curriculum,

the hiring of new faculty, and other areas of academic concern. A strict interpretation of the 'Taylor Report's' Catch 2.5.7. would eliminate such participation." This editorial concluded with the following statement: "If, however, the document (Taylor Report) remains unstrengthened or is weakened from the floor, we must urge its defeat." (48:4)

Not all the students held views in common with the State News editors, however. The vice chairman of ASMSU was quoted as saying, "As dissatisfied as we all are I still hope the Senate will approve it. If it passes, we will have gained because, through action and not just words, there will be a University community." (175:15) Another student noted that, "Taylor defines the professional rights of faculty which were not subject to student consideration in committees. This differs from the 'McKee Report' which left the entire situation incredibly vague." (175:1) In a letter to the editor submitted jointly by three undergraduates, the "Taylor Report" was advocated on the grounds that it "effectively establishes and guarantees student participation in academic matters of which students have direct knowledge as consumers.-- After more than a year of debate, we feel that the report is a realistic and necessary compromise of faculty and student positions." (180:4)

The Academic Senate met on January 19, 1971, to consider the by-law revisions necessary for implementation. Although relatively little debate occurred prior to the important vote, three ammendments were proposed. One professor proposed an addition to the report to the effect that any faculty member who believes that his professional rights have been denied may appeal to the Academic Council. This motion was defeated when it was announced that an ad hoc committee was currently developing grievance procedures. (20:2)

The second ammendment asked that the Senate delete all mention of student participatives at-large on the grounds that statements providing for "at least six" (of ten) non-whites as student representatives at-large implies a racial quota of "not more than four" whites. In reply to arguments against any form of racial discrimination, Professor Taylor responded, "In the best of all possible worlds, I would favor the ammendment. But in our world we have to accomodate some of the cruel errors of our society." (20:2) The ammendment failed.

The third ammendment proposed that the section in the document dealing with the philosophy behind the provisions for minority student representation be deleted. This ammendment also failed, but a substitute motion was accepted, deleting the last sentence in that section which read: "'Not more than six' is the imposition of a quota;

'at least six' is, on the contrary, the acknowledgement of a right." (20:2)

The final vote by the Academic Senate on the Taylor recommendations accepted the document by a strong majority. The president of the local AAUP chapter expressed his pleasure at the passage of the document, but another faculty member felt that the faculty were "voting out of sheer frustration and boredom." (20:2)

Although the "Taylor Report" appeared to be extremely close to implementation, needing only the approval of the Board of Trustees, the issue remained controversial. Shortly following approval by the Academic Senate, the ASMSU Student Board filed suit against President Wharton, the Academic Council and the Academic Senate, charging that the "Taylor Report" was in violation of the "Academic Freedom Report". The ASMSU suit contended that Article 5.4.08.3. of the "Taylor Report" violates sections 7.11, 7.2, and 1.5.03. of the "Academic Freedom Report".

Article 5.4.08.3. of the "Taylor Report" exempts the sections of the "Academic Freedom Report" on faculty responsibilities and professional rights from proposed amendments from action by the Student Affairs Committee. The Student Board of ASMSU claimed that this article was in direct violation of Article 7 of the "Academic Freedom Report." The ASMSU Board also charged that since students were excluded from the Faculty Affairs Committee then

faculty members should likewise be excluded from the Student Affairs Committee. This was felt to be consistent with Section 1.5.03. of the "Academic Freedom Report" that states "to the maximum extent feasible, students shall participate in formulating and revising regulations governing student conduct." (10:1)

Although the Academic Council was unable to resolve this problem at its February 2, 1971, meeting, it authorized its Steering Committee to try to find a workable compromise to the problem. The Steering Committee invited to its meeting for consultation purposes, representatives from the Committee to Study Faculty Rights, Responsibilities, and Grievance Procedures, representatives from ASMSU, representatives from the University Student Affairs Committee and representatives from the Academic Council. This group proposed to alleviate the difficulties by deleting the exception clause in 5.4.08.3. thereby authorizing the University Student Affairs Committee to participate in initiating amendments to the "Academic Freedom Report" regarding faculty rights and responsibilities. The proposal also provided for review by the University Committee on Faculty Affairs and Faculty Compensation and approval by the Elected Faculty Council prior to revisions to the "Academic Freedom Report" sections on faculty rights and responsibilities. (30:3) This amendment was accepted by the Academic Council in its February 9, 1971, meeting. (129:2)

Prior to debate and decision by the Academic Senate on February 23, was the scheduled meeting of the Board of Trustees on February 19. Because of the unresolved issue concerning the possible conflict with the "Academic Freedom Report", the Trustees considered the "Taylor Report" as an informational item only. One trustee is reported by the State News to have commented, "It looks as if the students are getting short changed," (154) while another felt that the report "represents about the distance that the faculty rightly thinks it can go." (141) This meeting also saw the presentation to the Board of a list of 17 weaknesses in the "Taylor Report" by the Chairman of ASMSU. (141) Following the Board of Trustees meeting, the Academic Senate met on February 23, and approved the compromise ammendment to the "Academic Freedom Report."

In the first week of March, three trustees met to determine areas of trustee concern with the "Taylor Report". This group was appointed by the Board in February to identify and report on the important issues. (187) At the regularly scheduled March 19, meeting, the Board, after hearing the report of its subcommittee, asked that a number of recommendations be incorporated into the By-laws along with the proposed Taylor revisions. Of the changes recommended by the Trustees, seven were accepted by the Academic Council on April 20, 1971. There were also

two recommendations which were voted down by the Council. These two defeated ammendments would have:

"Added to section 2.5.8. of the By-laws the sentence: 'In case of dispute concerning the application of this proviso, the final judgement shall rest with the Board of Trustees.' (Section 2.5.8. pertains to the professional rights and duties of the faculty)."

"Added to section 9.2. (on ammendement procedures) of the proposed By-laws the sentence: 'Any ammendment of the By-laws affecting the substance of academic governance shall be referred to the Board of Trustees for its approval'."

A third ammendment, concerning "final authority" in the interpretation was approved, but only after deletion of the Board's recommendation which stated that, "Nothing in these By-laws shall prevent the Board from taking prompt action on urgent financial and personnel matters when such action is in the best interests of the University."
(32:4)

One faculty spokesman gave three reasons for the Council's opposition of the Board's recommendations.

1. The constitutional authority of the Trustees is recognized daily in practice and in section 1.2.5. of the current By-laws.
2. The proposal changes would nullify some of the responsibility the Trustees have delegated to faculty.
3. It would be an intrusion into faculty governance.

Another faculty member commented that this series of proposed ammendments "violates the all-important principle of internal control of the University under the president."

(32) A third Academic Council member added that he was

"horrificed and dismayed" at the April Board meeting by the "response and lack of respect for faculty interests on the part of the Board." (32)

The approved ammendments to the "Taylor Report" accomplished the following:

1. Assigned the responsibility for implementation and finance to the administrative office of each academic unit, and on the University level, to the provost and vice-president for student affairs;
2. Provided for at least five female representatives within the ten-at-large seats on the Academic Council, six of which were also to be reserved for non-whites;
3. Added one undergraduate, one graduate student to the Student Committee on Nominations. At least two women were to fill these seats;
4. Provided procedures for the selection of a temporary chairman and established general working procedures for the Student Committee on Nominations;
5. Reaffirmed the Academic Council as the final authority with regard to the interpretation of the By-laws within the constraints of the constitutional authority of the Board of Trustees.
(32)

Having gone through all appropriate channels, the "Taylor Report" was forwarded to the Board of Trustees for what was hoped to be the final step in the approval process. On the day of the regularly scheduled Board meeting which would decide the fate of the "Taylor Report", the State News called for passage of the document despite its flaws.

"If the trustees do not approve the 'Taylor Report' today, any chance of student participation in academic government will vanish for an indefinite period. The

Academic Council, after reluctantly offering to admit students on a limited basis to its ranks, is simply too tired of working on a report that no one really likes to take another round of ammendment. ...However, there should be no mistake about the nature of the report. It is a working agreement, giving students limited participation until a more equitable system of academic government can be developed." (50:4)

Prior to the Board meeting, some concern was expressed that the Council's rejection of two recommendations proposed by the Trustees might result in further delay, but this was not the case as the Trustees unanimously approved the Report. (190) Shortly thereafter, the Steering Committee of the Faculty directed the revisions to be incorporated into the By-laws and set January 1, 1972, as the deadline for actual implementation by colleges and departments. (54:10)

The intent of this chapter has been one of attempting to focus upon the significant events and dominant attitudes which characterize the context within which the current experiment in student involvement in academic governance has developed at Michigan State University. The development of the "Academic Freedom Report" and its acknowledgement of basic student rights provided a great deal of impetus toward involving students in the University's academic affairs. The "Massey" and "McKee Reports", while differing significantly in several respects, were both defeated by a faculty which, for the record at least, was sympathetic toward the principle of student

participation. An important factor in the failure of both of these efforts to formally incorporate students in academic decision-making was the apparent inability to successfully resolve the conflict between the rights of students and the rights of faculty, particularly in the minds of faculty who have traditionally defended successfully their professional rights and integrity against external influence. The Special Panel that developed the "Taylor Report", after having witnessed the defeats of the two previous attempts, was aware of the necessity of clearly defining the appropriate roles of students and faculty and acted accordingly. Their efforts clearly resulted in a compromise which successfully resolved these differences. Like most compromises the result was not entirely satisfactory to either the faculty or the students, but it did provide a structure within which the University was able to function more representatively. While this structure provides for greater diversity of input in academic decision-making, it does not guarantee any difference in output which to a large degree depends upon attitudes and the willingness to listen and to attempt to understand on the part of all the participants.

CHAPTER IV

ANALYSIS OF THE DATA

Introduction

In the initial chapter of this study, there appeared a number of introductory statements concerning purpose, general design, methodology, and questions to be answered. The present chapter will elaborate on these statements by emphasizing the various procedures used in the collection, the analysis, and the discussion of the data. This information obtained from the questionnaire and from the interviews will be dealt with, in such a way, using appropriate statistical measures, that the conclusions and recommendations that follow will have a firm foundation. The interview data will be used to supplement the questionnaire data.

Collection of the Data

As noted in Chapter I, the questionnaire (Appendix C), the basic source of data for this investigation, contains 99 forced choice Likert style items. These items were designed to measure the attitudes of the 134 individuals who were members of the Academic Council at Michigan State University during the Fall and Winter terms of the

1972-73 academic year. The questionnaire was composed of four basic scales which included the following:

1. Academic Freedom (25 items)
(Items 23, 25, 28, 33, 34, 35, 59, 68, 70, 84, 85, 86, 87, 88, 89, 90, 91, 92, 93, 94, 95, 96, 97, 98, 99)
2. Administrative Efficiency (22 items)
(Items 5, 14, 15, 19, 20, 29, 30, 31, 32, 38, 40, 41, 46, 48, 49, 50, 51, 52, 61, 64, 67, 69)
3. Community Cohesion (19 items)
(Items 3, 6, 10, 11, 12, 13, 16, 17, 22, 36, 43, 44, 45, 72, 73, 74, 75, 76, 79)
4. Educational Value (10 items)
(Items 2, 7, 8, 9, 39, 42, 47, 65, 66, 82)

In addition, 23 items concerning the general issue of student participation in academic governance, and the specific issues concerning student participation at the Academic Council level at Michigan State University were included in the final draft of the instrument. These items included elements of either none or more than one of the four scales. They were included for the purpose of indicating general attitudes of the Academic Council concerning student participation in academic governance.

The final draft of the questionnaire was completed in early February, 1973, following a pilot study and extensive consultations with authorities in both survey research and in the functioning of the Michigan State University Academic Council. One significant addition to the basic research format which developed at this time, was an open-ended invitation for any comments concerning

student participation in the Academic Council deliberations at Michigan State University. These comments, along with the interview data will be presented as supplementary material.

The questionnaire, along with the cover letter, (Appendix A), return envelope, and separate answer sheet was delivered by hand to the departmental mail boxes or to the secretaries of all of the faculty and administrative members of the Academic Council with campus offices. In addition, questionnaires, cover letters, and answer sheets were personally delivered to mail boxes in the reception areas of residence halls, fraternities, and sororities for completion by student members of the Academic Council. Those student members of the Academic Council living in off-campus housing received questionnaires, cover letters, and answer sheets through the U.S. Mail.

The population under investigation consisted of 134 individuals who were voting members of the 1972-73 Academic Council of Michigan State University. To be considered for the purposes of this study, each individual member had to have served on the Academic Council during the Fall and Winter terms of the 1972-73 academic year. The individual breakdown in terms of broad academic affiliation of all members is as follows:

TABLE 1

Academic Affiliation of the 1972-73 Members of
the Michigan State University Academic Council

<u>Affiliation</u>	<u>n</u>
Liberal Arts	20
Natural Science	51
Non-affiliates (Administrators)	15
Social and Behavioral Science	<u>48</u>
Total	134

Viewing the 1972-73 Academic Council in terms of each member's academic status, one finds the following distribution:

TABLE 2

Academic Status of the 1972-73 Members of the
Michigan State University Academic Council

<u>Academic Status</u>	<u>n</u>
Administrators	31
Faculty	67
Long term	19
Short term	48
Students	36
Graduate	11
Undergraduate	<u>25</u>
Total	134

The initial distribution of the instrument was undertaken on Wednesday, February 14, 1973, and was completed the following day. By Wednesday, February 28, two days after the deadline stated in the cover letter, a total of 73 returned completed questionnaires, or 55 percent of the total number delivered had been received. An immediate follow-up was delayed because of the approach of Winter

term final examinations the week of March 12-16, 1973, and the following one week vacation period. On March 28, and March 29, 1973, a second letter (Appendix B) describing the research and asking for cooperation was personally distributed with a duplicate set of materials to those members of the Academic Council who had not responded to the first attempt at data collection. Two weeks later, an additional eight completed questionnaires were received bringing the useable return to 79 or 60.5 percent of the population.

During the next two weeks, most of the remaining non-responding members of the 1972-73 MSU Academic Council were personally contacted by telephone. In several cases, considerable discussion concerning the scope and significance of the study led to the return of additional data. These efforts resulted in the collection of 12 additional completed questionnaires, raising the overall rate of return to 69.5 percent of the population.

The first statistical operation took place in order to determine whether or not there was a significant difference among those Academic Council members who responded immediately (Wave 1), those who responded after receiving the follow-up letter (Wave 2), and those who responded following the telephone request (Wave 3). If a difference was found among these three groups, this difference might be a source of contamination resulting from

a differential procedure used to obtain data from the members of the Academic Council. The actual calculations were accomplished using the M.S.U. CDC 6500 computing system and Finn's prepared program for analysis of variance. (57) The frequencies, means, and standard deviations for each of the waves on each of the scales are presented on the following tables.

TABLE 3

Observed Cell Means for the Three Waves of Respondents on the Four Scales

<u>Group</u>	<u>Freq- uency</u>	<u>Academic Freedom</u>	<u>Administrative Efficiency</u>	<u>Community Cohesion</u>	<u>Educational Value</u>
Wave 1	73	2.46	2.47	2.29	2.28
Wave 2	8	2.69	2.22	2.22	2.12
Wave 3	12	2.59	2.49	2.49	2.40

TABLE 4

Observed Cell Standard Deviations for the Three Waves of Respondents on the Four Scales

<u>Group</u>	<u>Freq- uency</u>	<u>Academic Freedom</u>	<u>Administrative Efficiency</u>	<u>Community Cohesion</u>	<u>Educational Value</u>
Wave 1	73	.45	.32	.33	.31
Wave 2	8	.53	.22	.52	.43
Wave 3	12	.56	.35	.45	.38

Using this data, the analysis of variance operations for differences in population means were performed. The results are recorded in the following table:

TABLE 5

ANOVA Comparison of Populations for the Three
Waves of Respondents on the Four Scales

<u>Variable</u>	<u>Mean Square Between</u>	<u>Univariate F</u>	<u>P less than</u>
A.C. Free.	.2508	1.1092	.3343
A.D. Eff.	.0258	.2580	.7732
Comm. Cohsn.	.2531	1.9262	.1517
Ed. Value	.1824	1.6497	.1979

D.F. Between=2 D.F. Within=90

When alpha was set at .05, it was determined that there were no significant differences among the three waves of respondents on any of the four scales. In addition, a multivariate test was performed resulting in an F ratio of 1.0228. When the values for the degrees of freedom are 8 and 174, the probability of a difference in means was found to be .4207, clearly beyond the alpha value of .05. The conclusion to be drawn is that at the .05 level, there is no difference among the three waves on any of the four scales, or on the four scales taken together. The assumption can be made that there were no differential treatment effects and that the three waves of respondents can be grouped together for analysis.

Most of the 46 Academic Council members who chose not to respond to the questionnaire eventually communicated one or more reasons for their non-response. The most common explanation encountered was a lack of time. Many of the Council members also expressed feelings to the effect that many of the items were overly vague and that

no one response could adequately account for the vast individual differences of Academic Council subgroups.

Another fairly common criticism concerned the lack of a neutral or undecided response alternative to the questionnaire items. These people refused to respond because they felt that many of the individual items called for responses based on non-objective feelings. This type of criticism was particularly distressing because it was felt that the cover letter and the instructions on the instrument clearly expressed the purpose of the research as one of studying the attitudes of the members of the Academic Council with respect to student participation on that body.

The 93 members of the Academic Council that did respond to the instrument were classified into subgroups. In terms of broad academic affiliation, the sample numbers, and the percentages of the respective groups they represent are as follows:

TABLE 6

Academic Affiliation of the Responding Members of the 1972-73 Academic Council of Michigan State University

<u>Academic Affiliation</u>	<u>n</u>	<u>% of the Group in the Sample</u>
Liberal Arts	17	85%
Natural Science	38	75%
Non-Applicable	7	47%
Social and Behavioral Science	<u>31</u>	<u>65%</u>
Total	93	69.5%

The 93 respondents were then classified according to their status in the university. The numbers for each status group and the percentages of the sub-population are as follows:

TABLE 7

Academic Status of the Responding Members of the
1972-73 Michigan State University Academic Council

<u>Academic Status</u>	<u>n</u>	<u>% of the Group in the Sample</u>
Administrators	20	64.5%
Faculty	53	79%
Long Term	17	89.5%
Short Term	36	75%
Students	20	55.5%
Graduate	4	36.5%
Undergraduate	<u>16</u>	<u>64 %</u>
Total	93	69.5%

Prior to proceeding with the analysis of the data, the representativeness of the sample had to be determined. A random sampling produced 12 names of Academic Council members who had not responded to the questionnaire. These six administrators, three faculty, and three students were interviewed. During the course of these interviews, responses were gathered on 20 of the 99 items in the questionnaire. These questions were selected on the basis of their representativeness of the entire questionnaire and included items from each of the four scales, as well as some dealing with general attitudes. The data on the 20 items obtained from these interviews were then compared with the data from the returned questionnaires using the

Michigan State University CDC 6500 computer system and a prepared program designed to calculate multivariate analysis of variance. (57)

The resulting F-Ratio for the multivariate test of equality of mean vectors was found to be 1.2247. When the values for the degrees of freedom are 20 and 84, the probability of a difference between questionnaire respondents and non-respondents was found to be .2557. At the .05 level, the conclusion can be drawn that there is no significant difference between the questionnaire respondents and the non-respondents. The data from the instrument was therefore considered to be unbiased and representative of the entire Council.

In addition to these 20 items, the interview procedure resulted in additional important information. The semi-structured interview procedure encouraged the Council members to elaborate on their responses, producing in many cases, additional insights. This information is presented along with the discussion of the individual items.

An estimate of the reliability was calculated on each of the scales for the administrative, faculty, and student component groups using Hoyt's formula. (168) The preliminary computations of the various mean squares were accomplished using the Jennrich program. (86) The results of these calculations are presented in the following table.

TABLE 8

Hoyt's Reliability Estimates for the Student, Faculty,
and Administrative Components of the 1972-73 MSU Academic
Council on Each of the Four Scales

<u>Group</u>	<u>Scale</u>	<u>Hoyt's Internal Consistency Reli- ability Coefficient</u>
Administrators	Academic Freedom	.74
Faculty	Academic Freedom	.81
Students	Academic Freedom	.91
Administrators	Administrative Efficiency	.92
Faculty	Administrative Efficiency	.90
Students	Administrative Efficiency	.91
Administrators	Community Cohesion	.65
Faculty	Community Cohesion	.78
Students	Community Cohesion	.87
Administrators	Educational Value	.85
Faculty	Educational Value	.66
Students	Educational Value	.74

Beginning with the Academic Freedom scale, the responses of the various component groups were tested for equality of means on the M.S.U. CDC computer system. The selected statistical technique was a one-way analysis of variance and the computations were accomplished using an option in the prepared Fortran IV program entitled "Jeremy D. Finn's Multivariate-Univariate and Multivariate Analysis of Variance and Covariance." (57) This procedure required the adjustment of scores on some items so that low scores and low means consistently indicate a positive relationship between the M.S.U. Academic Council student participation and academic freedom. In addition, mean scores for each individual on each of the four scales were calculated as required for the computer program.

Because the analysis of variance technique indicates only that a difference exists somewhere among the groups, these differences had to be further tested in order to locate the exact source of the differences. For example, while the analysis of variance technique indicates a difference existing somewhere among administrators, students, and faculty on the Academic Freedom scale, it does not give any conclusive information concerning whether students differ from faculty, whether students differ from administrators, or whether students differ from both faculty and administrators.

The exact location of these differences was found by using the Scheffe' post hoc technique prepared Fortran IV program as described by Glendening. (67) When the differences on each of the scales were isolated in two or more of the component groups, the group means for each item in the scale were compared descriptively in order to ascertain those items contributing to differences in attitude. Following this procedure, the views of the entire Academic Council were descriptively considered for each scale along with the additional information acquired through the interviews.

Academic Freedom Scale

The 25 items dealing with the question of the impact of student participation on academic freedom consist of seven general items followed by nine statements describing

specific academic administrative activities. Each of these statements were to be considered first in terms of undergraduate student involvement and secondly, in terms of graduate student involvement.

Inter-Group Comparisons

The first step in the analysis of the data was a determination of differences among groups within the Academic Council. A separate one-way analysis of variance was performed for each of the following group comparisons.

1. Administrators vs. faculty, vs. students.
2. Undergraduate students vs. graduate students.
3. Long-term faculty vs. short-term faculty.
4. Council members affiliated with liberal arts disciplines vs. Council members affiliated with natural science disciplines, vs. Council members affiliated with social science disciplines, vs. Council members not affiliated with an academic discipline.
5. Liberal arts administrators vs. natural science administrators, vs. social science administrators, vs. non-affiliated administrators.
6. Liberal arts faculty vs. natural science faculty, vs. social science faculty.
7. Liberal arts students vs. natural science students, vs. social science students.

Each of these comparisons were accomplished using the M.S.U. CDC 6500 computing system and the prepared Finn program for analysis of variance. (57)

The first comparison on the Academic Freedom scale concerned the administrative, faculty, and student component groups. The analysis of variance calculation requires a preliminary calculation of sample means and

standard deviations. The results of these preliminary calculations are presented in the following table:

TABLE 9

Group Frequencies, Means, and Standard Deviations
for Administrators, Faculty, and Students on
the Academic Freedom Scale

<u>Group</u>	<u>n</u>	<u>Mean</u>	<u>Standard Deviation</u>
Administrators	20	2.57	.37
Faculty	53	2.60	.45
Students	20	2.17	.52

Using this information, the analysis of variance operation was calculated for the purpose of determining whether or not a statistically significant difference at the .05 level exists among the administrators, faculty, and students on the Academic Freedom scale. The results of these calculations are presented in the following table:

TABLE 10

ANOVA Comparison of Administrators, Faculty, and
Students on the Academic Freedom Scale

<u>Source of Variation</u>	<u>DF</u>	<u>Mean Square</u>	<u>F</u>	<u>P less than</u>	<u>Significance</u>
Between Groups	2	.13805	6.8796	.0017	Yes
Within Groups	90	.20010			

The conclusion drawn from these calculations is that there is a significant difference at the .05 level among students, faculty, and administrators with respect to the Academic Freedom scale. After examining the table

containing the administrative, faculty, and student group means, the following hypotheses were developed for additional testing using the Scheffe' post hoc procedures.

1. There is no difference between the students and the administrators on the Academic Freedom Scale.
($\mu_s - \mu_a = 0$)
2. There is no difference between the students and the faculty on the Academic Freedom scale.
($\mu_s - \mu_f = 0$)
3. There is no difference between the students and the combined group of administrators and faculty on the Academic Freedom scale.
($\mu_s - (\frac{\mu_a + \mu_f}{2}) = 0$)

Each of these hypotheses were tested in the null form at the .05 level using the Scheffe' post hoc technique. (3)
The results are presented in the following table:

TABLE 11

Scheffe' Post Hoc Analysis for Location of Population Mean Differences Among Administrators, Faculty, and Students on the Academic Freedom Scale

$\frac{\psi_i}{12}$	$\frac{\hat{\psi}_i}{12}$	$\frac{\hat{\psi}_i}{12}$	95% Confidence Interval Surrounding ψ_i	Significance
$\mu_s - \mu_a$.4000	.1418	.0472 < ψ_i < .7528	Yes
$\mu_s - \mu_f$.4300	.1176	.1372 < ψ_i < .7228	Yes
$\mu_s - (\frac{\mu_a + \mu_f}{2})$.4150	.1162	.1257 < ψ_i < .7043	Yes

The results indicate that at the .05 level, there is a significant difference between students and administrators, between students and faculty, and between students and the combined group of faculty and administrators.

Furthermore, the differences in the group sample means indicate that the student members of the 1972-73 M.S.U. Academic Council were significantly less suspicious of the impact of Council student involvement on academic freedom than were the faculty representatives, the administrative representatives, and the combined group of administrative and faculty representatives.

The graduate and undergraduate student representatives to the 1972-73 M.S.U. Academic Council were then compared with regard to their responses to the items in the Academic Freedom scale. The frequencies, means, and standard deviations are recorded in the following table.

TABLE 12

Group Frequencies, Means, and Standard Deviations
for Undergraduate and Graduate Students on
the Academic Freedom Scale

<u>Group</u>	<u>n</u>	<u>Mean</u>	<u>Standard Deviation</u>
Undergraduate Students	14	2.32	.52
Graduate Students	6	1.82	.33

The calculation of the one-way ANOVA for equality of population means yielded the following data:

TABLE 13

ANOVA Comparison of Undergraduate Students, and
Graduate Students on the Academic Freedom Scale

<u>Source of Variation</u>	<u>DF</u>	<u>Mean Square</u>	<u>F</u>	<u>P less than</u>	<u>Significance</u>
Between groups	1	1.0560	4.7039	.0438	Yes
Within groups	18	.2245			

The results of this test provide statistically significant evidence that there is a difference between undergraduate and graduate members of the 1972-73 M.S.U. Academic Council with respect to their responses to the items on the Academic Freedom scale. This difference does not require the Scheffe' procedure since only two groups were being compared. There exists no statistically significant possibility that differences found in the analysis of variance test could occur anywhere but within these two groups. The comparative mean scores found in Table 12 indicate that the mean for undergraduate representatives was 2.32 while the graduate representatives had a mean of 1.82. The conclusion to be reached from this data is that the graduate students' attitudes toward the Academic Freedom scale and Academic Council student participation were more positive than their undergraduate student counterparts. The magnitude and direction of the difference between the mean scores of the graduate and undergraduate student representatives was somewhat unexpected. Because graduate students have completed undergraduate programs and are approaching educational backgrounds similar to those of faculty members, it was expected that the attitudes of graduate students would fall on the continuum between the undergraduates and the faculty.

The next comparison on the Academic Freedom scale took place between the long-term faculty and the short-

term faculty. It was felt that the experience of compromise which took place among the long-term faculty representatives, might make a difference in their response. The calculation of sample means and standard deviations yielded the following results:

TABLE 14

Group Frequencies, Means, and Standard Deviations for Long and Short-Term Faculty on the Academic Freedom Scale

<u>Group</u>	<u>n</u>	<u>Mean</u>	<u>Standard Deviation</u>
Long-term Faculty	17	2.66	.51
Short-term Faculty	36	2.57	.42

The calculation of the one-way analysis of variance for equality of population means resulted in the following table:

TABLE 15

ANOVA Comparison of Long and Short-Term Faculty on the Academic Freedom Scale

<u>Source of Variation</u>	<u>DF</u>	<u>Mean Square</u>	<u>F</u>	<u>P less than</u>	<u>Significance</u>
Between Groups	1	.1267	.6995	.4072	No
Within Groups	51	.1811			

The difference found between these samples cannot therefore be inferred to the populations on the Academic Council.

The next comparison concerned all members of the 1972-73 M.S.U. Academic Council, classified according to their academic affiliation. The frequencies, means, and standard deviations for each of these groups are presented in the following table:

TABLE 16

Group Frequencies, Means, and Standard Deviations for Liberal Arts Affiliates, Natural Science Affiliates, Non-Affiliates, and Social Science Affiliates on the Academic Freedom Scale

<u>Group</u>	<u>Frequency</u>	<u>Mean</u>	<u>Standard Deviation</u>
Liberal Arts Affiliates	17	2.69	.57
Natural Science Affiliates	38	2.50	.46
Non-Affiliates	7	2.64	.47
Social Science Affiliates	31	2.36	.43

The one-way analysis of variance test for equality of population means was then undertaken. The results of these calculations are summarized in the following table:

TABLE 17

ANOVA Comparison of Liberal Arts Affiliates, Natural Science Affiliates, Non-Affiliates, and Social Science Affiliates on the Academic Freedom Scale

<u>Source of Variation</u>	<u>DF</u>	<u>Mean Square</u>	<u>F</u>	<u>P less than</u>	<u>Significance</u>
Between Groups	2	.4326	.1961	.1458	No
Within Groups	89	.2178			

The differences found among the samples of the four affiliated groups are therefore not statistically significant at the .05 level, and cannot be inferred to their respective populations.

The administrative representatives to the 1972-73 M.S.U. Academic Council were next classified according to their broad academic affiliation and compared with respect to their responses on the Academic Freedom scale. The group means, frequencies, and standard deviations for

each of the affiliated administrative groups are presented in the following table.

TABLE 18

Group Frequencies, Means, and Standard Deviations for Liberal Arts Administrators, Natural Science Administrators, Non-Affiliated Administrators, and Social Science Administrators on the Academic Freedom Scale

<u>Group</u>	<u>Frequency</u>	<u>Mean</u>	<u>Standard Deviation</u>
Liberal Arts Administrators	2	2.64	.17
Natural Science Administrators	6	2.43	.44
Non-Affiliated Administrators	7	2.64	.47
Social Science Administrators	5	2.61	.18

This information was then incorporated into the analysis of variance procedure for testing the equality of population means. The results of that test are presented in the following table.

TABLE 19

ANOVA Comparison of Liberal Arts Administrators, Natural Science Administrators, Non-Affiliated Administrators, and Social Science Administrators on the Academic Freedom Scale

<u>Source of Variation</u>	<u>DF</u>	<u>Mean Square</u>	<u>F</u>	<u>P less than</u>	<u>Significance</u>
Between Groups	2	.0785	.5157	.6067	No
Within Groups	16	.1523			

The one-way analysis of variance test for equality of means shows no significant difference among liberal arts administrators, natural science administrators, non-affiliated administrators, and social science administrators on the Academic Freedom scale.

The next inter-group test for equality of population means was to be carried out among the various faculty groups on the 1972-73 Academic Council affiliated with the liberal arts, the natural sciences, and the social sciences. The frequencies, means, and standard deviations for each of these three groups were found. They appear in the following table.

TABLE 20

Group Frequencies, Means, and Standard Deviations for the Liberal Arts Faculty, Natural Science Faculty, and Social Science Faculty on the Academic Freedom Scale

<u>Group</u>	<u>Frequency</u>	<u>Mean</u>	<u>Standard Deviation</u>
Liberal Arts Faculty	11	2.86	.47
Natural Science Faculty	23	2.63	.42
Social Science Faculty	19	2.40	.40

This information was then incorporated into the analysis of variance test for equality of means. The results of this test are summarized in the following table.

TABLE 21

ANOVA Comparison of Liberal Arts Faculty, Natural Science Faculty, and Social Science Faculty on the Academic Freedom Scale

<u>Source of Variation</u>	<u>DF</u>	<u>Mean Square</u>	<u>F</u>	<u>P less than</u>	<u>Significance</u>
Between Groups	2	.7631	4.3020	.0189	Yes
Within Groups	50	.1774			

The results of this test provide statistically significant evidence that there is a difference at the .05 level among the three faculty groups on the Academic

Freedom scale. Following the examination of group means presented in Table 20, a number of hypotheses were developed for further testing using the Scheffe' post hoc procedures. These hypotheses to be tested included the following:

1. There is no difference between the liberal arts and natural science faculty representatives.
($\mu_{LAF} - \mu_{NSF} = 0$)
2. There is no difference between the liberal arts and social science faculty representatives.
($\mu_{LAF} - \mu_{SSF} = 0$)
3. There is no difference between the natural science and social science faculty representatives.
($\mu_{NSF} - \mu_{SSF} = 0$)
4. There is no difference between the liberal arts faculty representatives and the combined groups of natural science and social science faculty representatives.
($\mu_{LAF} - (\frac{\mu_{NSF} + \mu_{SSF}}{2}) = 0$)
5. There is no difference between the combined group of liberal and natural science faculty representatives and the social science faculty representatives.
($(\frac{\mu_{LAF} + \mu_{NSF}}{2}) - \mu_{SSF} = 0$)

Each of these hypotheses were tested using the Scheffe' post hoc procedures. The results of this testing are presented in Table 22.

The results indicate that statistically significant differences exist between the Academic Council representatives of the liberal arts faculty and the social science faculty. Significant differences were also detected between the combined group of liberal arts and natural science faculty representatives and the social science

TABLE 22

Scheffe' Post Hoc Analysis for Location of Population Mean Differences Among Liberal Arts Faculty, Natural Science Faculty, and Social Science Faculty on the Academic Freedom Scale

ψ_i	$\hat{\psi}_i$	$\frac{\hat{\sigma}_i}{\hat{\psi}_i}$	95% Confidence Interval Surrounding ψ_i	Significance
$\mu_{LAF} - \mu_{NSF}$.2300	.1544	-.1596 < ψ_i < .6196	No
$\mu_{LAF} - \mu_{SSF}$.4600	.1596	.0574 < ψ_i < .8626	Yes
$\mu_{NSF} - \mu_{SSF}$.2300	.1306	-.0995 < ψ_i < .5595	No
$\mu_{LAF} - (\frac{\mu_{NSF} + \mu_{SSF}}{2})$.3450	.1428	-.0153 < ψ_i < .7053	No
$(\frac{\mu_{LAF} + \mu_{NSF}}{2}) - \mu_{SSF}$.3450	.1237	.0329 < ψ_i < .6571	Yes

faculty representatives. In each case, the sample mean score of the social science faculty representatives was lower, and therefore more positive, than the mean of the group to which it was compared.

The final group comparison on the Academic Freedom scale took place among the students affiliated with the liberal arts, the natural sciences, and the social sciences. The group frequencies, means, and standard deviations are presented in the following table.

TABLE 23

Group Frequencies, Means, and Standard Deviations for Liberal Arts Students, Natural Science Students, and Social Science Students on the Academic Freedom Scale

<u>Group</u>	<u>Frequency</u>	<u>Mean</u>	<u>Standard Deviation</u>
Liberal Arts Students	4	2.22	.75
Natural Science Students	9	2.22	.47
Social Science Students	7	2.08	.52

Using this data, the analysis of variance test was performed. The results of that test show that there is no significant difference among the student groups when classified according to academic affiliation.

TABLE 24

ANOVA Comparison of Liberal Arts Students, Natural Science Students, and Social Science Students on the Academic Freedom Scale

<u>Source of Variation</u>	<u>DF</u>	<u>Mean Square</u>	<u>F</u>	<u>P less than</u>	<u>Significance</u>
Between Groups	2	.0405	.1372	.8728	No
Within Groups	17	.2951			

Discussion of Individual Items

When the individual items that comprise the Academic Freedom scale are examined, it becomes clear that most of the differences found in the analyses of variance occurred in the section dealing with specific student representation on selected decision-making bodies.

The first group of items to be considered dealt with academic freedom and the perceptions of the 1972-73 Academic Council members concerning the outcomes of the one year M.S.U. experiment in student participation. There appears to be little, if any, difference among the Academic Council groups with regard to student participation as a means of improving the appraisals of educational practices (Item 23). In all cases, comparison of the group means showed little deviation from 2.500, the mid-point of the continuum ranging from strong agreement to

strong disagreement. Further, each group was approximately equally divided in terms of the numbers of respondents agreeing and disagreeing with the statement.

Item 34 expressed the thought that most students on the Academic Council were more interested in improving programs than in determining what was to be taught. The mean score of the entire Council was 2.317, indicating a moderate degree of agreement. Comparison of distributions of scores for the entire Council and for the groups found to be different showed that for each group, approximately two individuals agreed with the wording of the item for each person who disagreed.

The same general conclusion can be drawn concerning item 35 for the Academic Council as a whole. Slightly more than two-thirds of all of the Academic Council members either agreed or strongly agreed that the student members understood the value of promoting and protecting opportunities for the learning and discovery of truth. While administrators, faculty, and students, graduate students as well as undergraduate students, approximated this same distribution and the mean score of 2.241, a deviation appears among liberal arts faculty, natural science faculty, and social science faculty. The mean score for the liberal arts faculty on this item was 2.636 as compared to 2.238 and 2.056 for the natural science faculty and social science faculty respectively. In terms

of distribution, more than 50 percent of the liberal arts faculty disagreed or strongly disagreed with the statement that the student members understand the value of promoting and protecting opportunities for the learning and discovery of truth. Less than 25 percent of both the natural science faculty and the social science faculty responded in this matter. This item appears to have contributed to the differences among faculty groups discovered and located by the ANOVA and Scheffe' Techniques.

One administrative representative to the Academic Council summarized the majority feeling of the Council by stating that, "The Academic Council student representatives are an exceptional group of young people. They have been sophisticated and responsible, and in many cases, they have done their homework better than the faculty."

Moderate agreement was observed among the Academic Council component groups regarding item 33 which stated that students usually tend to vote in collective blocks. More than 75 percent of the Academic Council disagreed or disagreed strongly leading to the conclusion that students did not usually vote together. As might be expected, the students expressed disagreement or strong disagreement slightly more often than did faculty and administrators. The mean scores for administrators, faculty, and students were 2.850, 3.038, and 3.105 respectively. The mean for the graduate students (3.333) was moderately higher than that of the undergraduate students (3.000).

The mean for the social science faculty (3.263) was also moderately high when compared to that of the liberal arts faculty (2.909) and to that of the natural science faculty (2.913). It should be noted, however, that the mode for each of these differing component groups was the same, the "3" or "disagree" response.

In a comment returned with the completed instrument, a student representative remarked that, "Students tend to divide on issues much in the same way as the faculty-- according to their own specific interests and philosophies rather than age groups or other considerations." Another student representative observed that, "The students seem to get along better with the non-student members of the Academic Council than with themselves. There seems to be distinct factions among the student representatives."

A wide majority of the Academic Council members disagreed or disagreed strongly with items suggesting that further increases in student participation would threaten the academic freedom of the faculty (Item 59) and that the prestige of the faculty had been lowered because of student participation (Item 25).

The mean scores of all responding Academic Council members was 2.809 for Item 59 and 3.187 for Item 25. On both of these items a substantial majority of all responding Academic Council members indicated disagreement or strong disagreement, indicating that according to the

Council members, neither the faculty's prestige was diminished by the present plan, nor would its academic freedom be threatened by incorporating greater numbers of students on the Academic Council.

Moderate differences among the faculty affiliated with different academic fields occurred with respect to the relationship between the perceived threat to the faculty's academic freedom and further increases in Academic Council student participation. The natural science and social science faculty groups exhibited mean scores on Item 59 (2.864 and 2.706 respectively) greater than 2.500, the midpoint between agreement and disagreement, therefore indicating general disagreement with the wording of the item. The liberal arts faculty had a mean score of 2.455 on this item indicating slight differences in attitude with the other two faculty groups which may have contributed to the differences located by the ANOVA and Scheffe' operations. More than 50 percent of each of these three faculty groups responded with a "3" or "disagree" response.

There was considerable difference between the responses of these same faculty groups concerning Item 25 which suggested that Academic Council student participation had lowered the prestige of the faculty. The mean score for the liberal arts faculty group was 2.700 as compared to 2.913 for the natural science faculty group and 3.611 for the social science faculty group. While all three faculty

groups had 75 percent or more disagree or strongly disagree responses, 67 percent of the social science faculty strongly disagreed with the item as compared with 17 percent and 0 percent for the natural science faculty and the liberal arts faculty respectively. This item appears to contribute substantially to the difference found between social science faculty and the combined liberal arts faculty and natural science faculty group discovered by the ANOVA and the Scheffe' procedures.

These two items (No. 25 and 59) also appeared to contribute to the difference found between graduate students and undergraduates who are members of the Academic Council. The mean scores for the graduate student members of the Council were 3.333 and 3.500 for Items 25 and 59, as compared to the corresponding undergraduate mean scores of 3.118 and 3.154. These scores illustrate the trend that indicates that graduate students are consistently more favorable than undergraduates toward Academic Council student participation and its impact on academic freedom.

While the mean scores and the distributions of scores for administrators, faculty, and students (3.350, 3.118, and 3.200) showed little difference with regard to Item 25, the high scores appear to indicate that the prevailing attitude among Academic Council members is that the prestige of the faculty has not been significantly decreased by Academic Council student participation. The conclusion

that student participation has not adversely affected the faculty's academic freedom from the Academic Council's point of view, can also be drawn after examining the overall mean score of 2.809 on Item 59 and the overall mode of 3. Differences which appear to contribute to the discrepancies discovered by the analysis of variance and located by the Scheffe' technique emerged among the administrative, faculty, and student component groups. The respective means for each of these three groups are as follows: Administrators, 2.600, faculty, 2.720, and students, 3.263. An examination of the distributions for these groups reveals that 31.6 percent of the students strongly disagreed with the wording of the item as compared to 20 percent of the administrators and 12 percent of the faculty. At the other end of the continuum, only 5.2 percent of the students agreed or strongly agreed that Academic Council student participation threatened the academic freedom of the faculty. In contrast, 55 percent of the administrators and 32 percent of the faculty agreed with the item. These discrepancies in attitudes appear to contribute to the differences between students and administrators, between students and faculty, and between students and the combined group of administrators and faculty.

The next series of items in the Academic Freedom scale to be considered for purposes of discussion consisted

of nine items dealing with curriculum and personnel matters. Beginning with Items 96 and 97, two items designed to measure attitudes with regard to (96) undergraduates and (97) graduate student participation in matters pertaining to the development of procedures for evaluating faculty teaching effectiveness, it was found that the majority of the Academic Council generally agreed that this was a proper matter of student concern. Approximately one-third of the responding Academic Council members felt that both undergraduates and graduates should be strongly involved, i.e., comprising from one-third to one-half of the membership of the decision-making body, in matters of this type. Approximately another one-third felt that both graduate and undergraduate students should be moderately involved as active participants with voting privileges, but comprising less than one-third of the membership of the decision-making body. Approximately one-fourth of the Council felt that the proper role of both graduate and undergraduate students should be of an advisory nature while 3.3 percent of the Council felt that students should be excluded from this activity.

The response of the student members of the Council indicated that they held the most positive attitudes regarding student participation in the development of procedures for the evaluation of faculty teaching effectiveness. The mean score of the students on Items 96 and 97 were 1.579 and 1.474, referring to undergraduate and

graduate student participation respectively. The comparative group means for the administrative representatives were found to be 2.050 for undergraduates and 2.100 for graduates. The faculty representatives recorded means of 2.059 for undergraduates and 2.039 for graduate students. In both of these cases, moderate differences occurred between students and administrators, and between students and faculty, which appear to contribute to the differences found in the ANOVA and Scheffe' procedures.

The distributions for these two items show that 73.7 percent of the students favor strong undergraduate involvement in developing procedures for evaluating teaching performance as compared to 25.5 percent and 35 percent for faculty and administrators. In terms of graduate student involvement in this same area, 68.4 percent of the students favored strong graduate student involvement as compared to 35 percent and 25.5 percent of the administrators and faculty respectively. While none of the student members of the Council favored moderate involvement for undergraduates in this area, 47.1 percent of the faculty and 25 percent of the administrators felt that this was the appropriate student role. These figures substantiate important differences in attitudes, mentioned earlier in terms of group means, among students, faculty, and administrators.

An examination of the mean scores of the graduate and undergraduate student members of the Academic Council show that on these items, graduate students favored a considerably greater student role than did undergraduate students.

The mean score for the responding Academic Council undergraduate representatives on these two items were 1.846 and 1.474, while the Academic Council graduate representatives unanimously indicated, with a mean score of 1.000, that both undergraduates and graduates should play a strong role in developing faculty teaching evaluation procedures.

Examination of the group means and response distributions with regard to the proper role of students in developing procedures for the evaluation of teaching effectiveness revealed little appreciable difference among the faculty representatives when grouped according to academic affiliation. The liberal arts faculty mean scores of 2.200 on both of these items exceeded those of the natural science faculty (2.091 for undergraduates and 2.045 for graduates) and the social science faculty (1.947 and 1.947). The differences among these groups were relatively small, but consistent with the ANOVA difference. The distributions of scores on these two items indicate that the largest number of respondents from all three groups felt that a moderate involvement

of students, i.e., less than one-third of the voting membership, was the appropriate role for both graduates and undergraduates.

With regard to undergraduate and graduate student involvement in course content and curricular decisions (Items 84 and 85), the Academic Council generally feels that students should be voting members on bodies dealing with these issues. The mean scores of the Academic Council with regard to undergraduate and graduate student involvement were 2.253 and 2.088. There were 17 members or 18.7 percent of the Academic Council who felt that undergraduates should play a strong role in the making of this type of decision as compared to 20 members or 22 percent, the corresponding figure for graduate students. For both undergraduates and graduates, the largest percentage of Academic Council members felt that moderate involvement, or less than one-third of the voting seats should be filled by students. The respective percentages of Council responses favoring moderate involvement for undergraduates and graduate students were found to be 44.0 percent and 49.5 percent. For both undergraduate and graduate students, less than one-third of the Academic Council advocated advisory participation and less than 10 percent felt that students should not be involved in curricular decision-making.

With respect to the three differences on the Academic Freedom scale found among component Academic Council

groups by the analysis of variance, comparison of mean scores found considerable differences among the responses of students, faculty, and administrators, and also among the liberal arts, natural science, and social science faculty groups.

The student members of the Academic Council again advocated a much wider student role in curricular decision-making than did faculty and administrators. The mean response of the student Academic Council representatives was found to be 1.737 with respect to undergraduate involvement and 1.526 with respect to graduate student involvement. The most popular response alternative for both undergraduate and graduate Council members (Items 84 and 85) was "1" or "strong involvement." In comparison, the faculty members had mean scores of 2.404 and 2.250 with respect to undergraduate and graduate student involvement. Corresponding means for administrators were 2.350 and 2.200. The faculty and administrators were in agreement to the degree that the most popular response for both groups was "2", advocating a moderate degree of student participation for both graduate and undergraduate students in these matters. These differences in attitude appear to contribute to the discrepancies as confirmed by the Scheffe' results between the students and the faculty, between the students and the administrators, and between students and the faculty and administrators combined.

A moderate degree of difference appeared between graduate and undergraduate students with respect to the role of graduate students in curricular decision-making matters. The mean score of the graduate students on Item 85 was 1.167 as compared to 1.692 for the undergraduates. With respect to undergraduate student participation, the difference in mean scores was not as large. The mean of the graduate student responses was 1.500 as compared to 1.846 for the undergraduates. The percentages of graduate and undergraduate student representatives advocating a strong role for undergraduates were 50.0 percent and 46.2 percent respectively. The corresponding figures for graduate student involvement were 83.3 percent and 53.8 percent respectively.

The social science faculty group continued to be more amenable to student participation than the liberal arts and natural science faculties. The differences in means was moderate for undergraduate involvement and minimal for graduate student involvement.

The mean scores for the liberal arts faculty and the natural science faculty were 2.636 and 2.500 with regard to undergraduate student involvement as compared to 2.158 for the social science faculty. The social science faculty had a mean response of 2.053 with regard to graduate student involvement in curricular matters. This was considerably lower and therefore more favorable than the liberal arts and natural science faculties mean scores

of 2.455 and 2.318. In each case, the mean response to Item 85 was lower and hence more favorable to graduate student involvement in curricular decision-making.

An examination of the modes of these three faculty groups shows that 44.5 percent of the liberal arts faculty, 50 percent of the natural science faculty, and 52.6 percent of the social science faculty feel that a moderate voice, or less than one-third of the total votes is most appropriate for the graduate student role in curricular matters. The distribution for undergraduate student involvement indicates that 36.4 percent of the liberal arts faculty favor moderate involvement and that another 36.4 percent favor advisory involvement. The natural science faculty also favor a moderate and an advisory role with equal frequency for undergraduates. The percentages in each case was 40.9 percent. Among the social science faculty, 42.1 percent favored a moderate undergraduate role and another 36.8 percent favored an advisory role.

The responses of the Academic Council with respect to student involvement in the curricular and personnel decisions are consistent with the response on Item 28 which asked the respondents to indicate their degree of agreement with the statement that the student members of the Academic Council have important insights and contributions to make to decisions involving faculty teaching competence. The mean score of the Academic Council on

this item was 2.318, indicating a slightly positive overall attitude. There were nine Council members or 10.2 percent who strongly agreed with the wording of the item and 47 or 53.4 percent who agreed. Expressing negative attitudes were 27 members of the Council or 30.7 percent who disagreed and five or 5.7 percent who strongly disagreed.

A comparison of the mean scores of students, faculty, and administrators reveals that the students responded considerably more positively than the faculty but only slightly more positively than did the administrators. The mean for the student members of the Council was 1.947 as compared with 2.529 for the faculty and 2.111 for the administrators. Despite the difference in mean scores, the most popular response for each of the groups of students, faculty, and administrators was a "2" or "agree" response. The percentages of Academic Council members agreeing with this item are 66.7 percent for the administrators, 47.1 percent for the faculty, and 57.9 percent for the students. The difference between students and faculty is most apparent in the distributions of strongly agree and disagree responses. There were 26.3 percent of the students who strongly agreed that students had important insights to contribute to teaching competence decisions while only two members or 3.9 percent of the faculty responded in this manner. At the other end of the continuum, 41.2 percent of the faculty disagreed with the item as compared to only 10.5 percent of the students.

A substantial portion of the differences between students and faculty was contributed by the graduate student members of the Academic Council. Of the six responding graduate students, three or 50 percent strongly agreed and the other three (50 percent) agreed. In comparison, 15.4 percent of the undergraduates strongly agreed with the item, 61.5 percent agreed, 15.4 percent disagreed, and 7.7 percent strongly disagreed. These differences were reflected in the mean scores of the two student groups. The undergraduate mean of 2.154 was considerably higher than the 1.500 for graduate students.

Were it not for the relatively positive attitudes of the social science faculty on this item, the differences between students and faculty might have been even greater. The social science faculty had a mean score of 2.211 as compared with 2.700 for the liberal arts faculty and 2.727 for the natural science faculty. This inter-faculty difference is primarily reflected in the disagree side of the continuum where 60 percent of the liberal arts faculty and 59.1 percent of the natural science faculty either disagreed or strongly disagreed as compared with only 31.6 percent of the social science faculty.

Although the Academic Council generally felt that students had important insights to contribute to decisions involving the teaching competence of faculty members, they did not generally approve of granting voting privileges

to students when guidelines for hiring and promoting faculty are being established or revised. The mean response of the entire Academic Council was 2.850 with respect to undergraduate student representatives and 2.747 with respect to graduate student representatives. These means are reflected in the fact that 70.3 percent of the Academic Council members felt that student representatives should not be voting participants in decisions of this type. This 70.3 percent breaks down to 54.9 percent who felt that undergraduate students should be limited to an advisory role and 15.4 percent who felt that undergraduate students should not be involved in any way. The corresponding percentages for graduate student involvement in this area were 58.2 percent and 12.1 percent respectively.

As might be expected, the mean score for students of 2.158 was considerably lower and hence more favorable toward student involvement in this area than the mean of either the faculty (2.981) or the administrators (2.850). With regard to graduate student involvement, the students continued to hold the most positive attitude as indicated by their mean of 2.263. In comparison, the faculty mean was found to be 2.962 and the administrative mean was found to be 2.650. The distribution of responses shows that 31.6 percent of the student representatives advocate strong involvement by undergraduates and 26.3 percent advocate strong involvement by graduates in developing

guidelines for hiring and promoting faculty. The comparative percentages for faculty and administrators are 1.2 percent and zero percent for undergraduates and 1.9 percent and five percent for graduate students. The proper undergraduate student role in this area according to 55 percent of the administrators and 65.4 percent of the faculty was purely advisory, but only 26.3 percent of the students shared this attitude. In terms of graduate student involvement, 60 percent of the administrators, 63.5 percent of the faculty, and 42.1 percent of the students agreed that an advisory role was most appropriate.

Neither the mean differences between graduate and undergraduate students, nor the mean differences among liberal arts faculty, natural science faculty, and social science faculty were as large as on some of the previous items, but they were consistent with the Scheffe' findings. The graduate students and the social science faculty continued to be consistently more liberal than their respective counterparts. For both undergraduate and graduate student involvement, identical mean scores of 2.842 and 3.273 were observed for the social science faculty and the liberal arts faculty respectively. With reference to graduate and undergraduate involvement, means of the natural science faculty fell between the two extreme groups in each case with mean scores of 2.909 and 2.955 respectively. In each case, more than 50 percent of each

faculty group felt that an advisory role was most appropriate for both graduates and undergraduates in this area. The means of the undergraduate and graduate student representatives showed little deviation from one another. They both continued to indicate a much more positive group attitude than any of the other differing groups.

The final two items dealing with curricular and personnel matters were extreme in that they solicited attitudes concerning student participation in the determination of salaries of individual faculty members (No. 98, and 99). As might be anticipated, the great majority of the Academic Council, as well as that of each of its component groups, strongly indicated that students should not be equal partners in this area. The mean score of the Academic Council was 3.596 for undergraduate student involvement and 3.602 for graduate student involvement. In both cases, approximately two-thirds of the Academic Council indicate that neither undergraduate nor graduate students should be involved in these matters in any way.

There was a relative degree of agreement among students, faculty, and administrators on these two items. The mean scores for administrators, faculty, and students with respect to undergraduate involvement were 3.650, 3.640, and 3.421 respectively, with students being the most liberal. Concerning graduate student involvement in the determination of faculty salaries, the means for the

administrators was 3.600, for faculty, 3.694, and for students, 3.368. The mode for each of these groups for both undergraduate and graduate student representatives was a "4" response indicating that students should have no role whatever in these matters.

The graduate student members of the Academic Council continued to exhibit the most favorable attitudes of all of the differing groups. Compared with the mean (3.538) score of the undergraduate council members on Item 98 regarding undergraduate participation, the graduate students had a considerably lower 3.000 mean score.

The graduate student members of the Academic Council had an identical 3.000 score with regard to graduate student involvement in individual faculty salary decisions while the undergraduate students' mean score dropped to 3.538.

With regard to faculty associated with broad academic areas, the social science faculty held most favorable attitudes toward student participation by undergraduates in faculty salary decisions, but not graduate student participation. The mean score for the social science faculty was 3.528 and 3.667 for undergraduates and graduates respectively. The corresponding mean scores for the natural science faculty was 3.619 on both Items 98 and 99 while the liberal arts faculty had identical 3.900 means on these same items. All three faculty groups

had substantial majorities indicating a "4" or "no involvement" response.

The next group of Academic Freedom scale items to be considered included eight items designed to test attitudes of the Academic Council with respect to university-wide academic decision-making. As in previous discussions of individual items, a statement concerning a specific decision-making area was followed by two numbered items. The first item asked the respondent to indicate for undergraduate students, the scope of student involvement he felt most desirable, and the second asked the same with respect to graduate student involvement.

The first set of these items concerned student participation in the reordering of institutional priorities. The Academic Council as a whole responded in such a way that the mean scores and distributions were quite similar with respect to undergraduate and graduate student participation. The mean scores of 2.427 and 2.393 for undergraduate participation and graduate student participation and distributions indicating approximately equal numbers of Academic Council members in favor of, and not in favor of, voting status for both graduate and undergraduate students, indicated a diversity of attitudes.

Looking at the Academic groups shown to be different on this scale, the student members continued to be most favorable among students, faculty, and administrators,

while the social science faculty again was most positive among the faculty groups. The difference between undergraduate student representatives and the graduate student representatives were minimal on Items 92 and 93.

A comparison of the distributions of the students, faculty, and administrators showed that 36.8 percent of the students favored strong undergraduate student involvement and another 47.4 percent advocated moderate involvement in decisions affecting institutional priorities. The respective figures for faculty Academic Council members were 8.0 percent and 34.0 percent. An advisory role was viewed as most appropriate by 50.0 percent of the responding faculty Academic Council members. Only 30.0 percent of the administrators advocated strong or moderate participation for undergraduates, while 65 percent advocated advisory participation only. The graduate and undergraduate students did not differ appreciably with one another but more than 80 percent of each group advocated either strong or moderate undergraduate voting privileges.

With respect to graduate student participation in the reconsideration of institutional priorities (Item 93), the attitudes of the Academic Council appear to be much the same as those on undergraduate involvement. The mean scores for administrators, faculty, and students were 2.550, 2.580, and 1.737 respectively. As was the case for undergraduate involvement, these differences appeared

to contribute to the overall discrepancies on the Academic Freedom scale as detected by the analysis of variance and Scheffe' operations. The distributions of scores for graduate student involvement were very similar to those relating to undergraduate enrollment.

The mean scores of undergraduate and graduate students for graduate student involvement in the area of developing and reconsidering institutional priorities was slightly lower than the mean scores for undergraduate involvement. The distributions of the two groups showed that more than 80 percent of both student groups favored some type of voting graduate student representation in the making of these decisions.

The liberal arts faculty representatives to the Academic Council were again the most conservative of the faculty groups with a mean score of 3.091 as compared with 2.500 and 2.353 for the natural science faculty representatives and the social science faculty representative respectively. In terms of the distributions, 27.2 percent of the liberal arts faculty approved of voting student representatives on questions concerning institutional priorities compared with 40.9 percent of the natural science faculty and 53.0 percent of the social science faculty. At the other end of the scale, 27.3 percent of the liberal arts faculty felt that students should not be involved in any way in these matters as compared to 4.5

percent of the natural science faculty and zero percent of the social science faculty.

Items 98 and 99 asked Academic Council members to record what they felt was the proper roles for undergraduate and graduate students in the establishing of guidelines for the approval of faculty research tasks. The Academic Council strongly affirmed that this was not a proper matter of either undergraduate or graduate student concern. With respect to undergraduate involvement (Item 88), the mean score of the Academic Council was 3.650 and was reflected in the distribution which showed that 90.0 percent of its members did not feel that voting involvement was appropriate. In terms of graduate student involvement the mean of the Academic Council of 3.256 was lower and hence more favorable than was the case for undergraduates. The distribution showed, however, that 83.4 percent of the Academic Council still felt that students should not be full participants in the making of these decisions.

An examination of the differing groups gives further evidence that in matters of this type, faculty and administrators are considerably more cautious than students with regard to voting student participation. On Item 88 dealing with undergraduate involvement in the development of guidelines for the approval of research tasks, the mean scores for the administrators, faculty, and students were 3.650, 3.745, and 2.789 respectively. The comparative

mean scores on Item 89 concerning graduate student involvement were 3.300 for administrators, 3.529 for faculty, and 2.474 for students.

On both items majorities of greater than 90 percent of faculty and administrators on the Academic Council opposed voting student membership on bodies dealing with faculty research guidelines. While 57.9 percent of the students agreed with their non-student colleagues with respect to undergraduate involvement, this percentage dropped to 39.1 when graduate student involvement was being considered.

The graduate student representatives to the Academic Council continued to be more favorable than undergraduate student representatives. With respect to undergraduate involvement, the mean score of the graduates was 2.000, with 88.3 percent approving of either moderate or strong involvement. In comparison, the undergraduates had a mean score of 2.692 with only 46.2 percent approving a moderate or strong student voice regarding guidelines for approving faculty research.

The social science faculty continues to be the most favorable faculty group with regard to student participation in developing faculty research guidelines, but the mean score and the distribution do not indicate approval of either graduate or undergraduate students' voting privileges. The social science faculty had means of

3.667 and 3.389 with respect to undergraduate and graduate student involvement respectively. The comparative scores for the liberal arts faculty representatives were 3.818 and 3.636, while the natural science mean scores were 3.773 and 3.591. The distributions in both cases indicated that nearly 100 percent of each faculty group opposed voting student involvement in this area.

The next specific decision-making area considered concerns revising admissions criteria. The mean score of the Academic Council with regard to undergraduate student participation in this area (Item 90) was 2.747 while the mean score for graduate student participation (Item 91) was 2.707. The distribution of the Academic Council with respect to undergraduate involvement in matters concerning admissions criteria shows that 38.5 percent felt strong or moderate involvement was appropriate while 61.6 percent felt that undergraduate students should not have voting privileges when these matters are being decided. The mean score and the distribution for graduate student involvement was slightly more positive than the comparative undergraduate statistics. The value of the graduate representatives mean was 2.703, reflecting that 39.6 percent endorsed strong or moderate graduate student participation with regard to revising admissions criteria.

Among the differing groups, the student Academic Council members were shown to be considerably more

positive to both graduate and undergraduate involvement in this area, than faculty and administrators. On both items the graduate students were more liberal than the undergraduates and the social science faculty were slightly more liberal than their natural science and liberal arts counterparts.

The mean scores of student, faculty and administrative Council members were 2.316, 2.808, and 2.316 respectively with regard to undergraduate involvement (Item 90), and 2.211, 2.808, and 2.900 respectively with regard to graduate student involvement (Item 91).

With respect to undergraduate involvement in the revising of admissions criteria, 80 percent of the administrators and 61.6 percent of the faculty disapproved of voting student involvement as compared with only 36.9 percent of the student representatives. The student scores were relatively evenly distributed among the four response alternatives while the scores of the faculty and administrators indicated greater consistency with the majority of responses falling in alternative "3", the advisory involvement alternative.

The distribution of faculty scores with respect to graduate involvement was exactly the same as for undergraduate involvement. The percentage of faculty representatives to the Academic Council registering opposition to strong or moderate graduate student voting involvement in admissions criteria decisions was 61.6 percent. The

percentage of administrative representatives in this same classification was 80 percent while only 36.8 percent of the students responded similarly. The remaining 12 members or 63.2 percent of the student representatives divided themselves equally between the strong involvement and the moderate involvement response alternatives.

With respect to student participation in developing guidelines for assigning credit hours to courses, the responding Academic Council members had highly similar mean scores of 2.467 and 2.444 for undergraduate (Item 94) and graduate student (Item 95) involvement. The distributions of all Academic Council scores showed that for both undergraduates and graduates, exactly half of the respondents approved of voting involvement and the other half were opposed. The only difference between the distributions on the two items was a shift of two individuals from a no involvement response in the case of undergraduate participation, to a "3" or advisory involvement response. In both cases, 15.6 percent approved of strong student involvement and 34.4 approved moderate involvement.

The Academic Council students were substantially more receptive to a voting student role in this area than were administrators and faculty. The mean score with respect to undergraduate involvement for the student representatives was 1.895 as compared to 2.700 and 2.588 for administrators and faculty. In terms of graduate

student participation, the student representatives and faculty did not deviate from their responses concerning undergraduate participation while the administrators' mean of 2.600 was only slightly more favorable.

The distributions for undergraduate and graduate student involvement were exactly the same for the faculty and for the student members while the administrators showed a shift of two individuals from no involvement in the case of undergraduates to advisory involvement in the case of graduate student involvement. For both undergraduate and graduate student involvement, 40.0 percent of the administrators and 45.1 percent of the faculty respondents favored voting representation by students on matters dealing with the assignment of credit hours to courses. The percentage of student Council members favoring either strong or moderate voting student involvement was 73.7, considerably higher than the percentages of the administrators and faculty. This difference, as reflected in the mean scores, appears to contribute to the differences found in the ANOVA and Scheffe' techniques.

The graduate students and the undergraduate students responded in exactly the same way with respect to graduate and undergraduate involvement in credit hour guideline decisions. For Items 94 and 95, the undergraduate mean score was 2.077 as compared with 1.500 for the graduate students. Favoring strong involvement were 66.7 percent

of the graduate students and 30.8 percent of the undergraduate students. The 16.7 percent of the graduate student Academic Council members approved of moderate involvement and another 16.7 percent indicated approval of advisory involvement, while 38.5 percent and 23.1 percent of the undergraduate Council members favored moderate and advisory involvement respectively.

The faculty group comparisons again showed considerable differences between the liberal arts faculty and the social science faculty. The liberal arts faculty had mean scores of 3.100 and 3.200 for undergraduate and graduate student participation while the social science faculty mean scores were 2.316 for both undergraduate and graduate student involvement. The mean score of the natural science faculty fell between these extreme scores with values of 2.591 for undergraduate participation and 2.545 for graduate participation.

The distributions of the various faculty groups showed only 20 percent and zero percent of the liberal arts faculty endorsed moderate student involvement and strong student involvement in decisions involving credit hour guidelines. In contrast, the percentages of the social science faculty representatives and of the natural science faculty representatives endorsing moderate or strong student involvement were 52.6 percent and 50.1 percent for both undergraduate and graduate student involvement.

The final two items where differences contributing to the overall discrepancies were found among the groups on the Academic Freedom scale concerned two statements relating to student involvement and the traditional concept of faculty and administrative authority in academic governance. Both of these items were stated negatively so that scores below 2.500 indicate negative attitudes toward student involvement in academic governance.

The wording of Item 68 reads, "Because students hold the balance of power when the non-student vote is split, students should not have voting privileges." The mean response of the entire Academic Council on this item was 3.330, indicating general disagreement with the statement. The students disagreed most strongly as indicated by their mean score of 3.632. In comparison, the mean scores of the faculty and administrative representatives were 3.269 and 3.200 respectively. The student representative distribution showed that 75.7 percent disagreed strongly with the item and another 15.8 percent expressed moderate disagreement. The comparable percentages of the faculty representatives were 42.3 percent and 44.2 percent. The administrators were the most agreeable with the wording of the item and therefore least amenable to student participation with voting privileges, but none of the administrators disagreed strongly and only 30 percent disagreed.

The graduate student representatives had a mean score of 3.833, slightly higher than the 3.538 for undergraduates. The difference in the means can be attributed for the most part to the fact that 83.3 percent of the graduate students strongly disagreed with the idea that students should not have voting privileges, because they might hold the balance of power when the non-student vote is split. In comparison, only 69.2 percent of the undergraduates responded this way.

Among the differing faculty groups, the liberal arts faculty were considerably less amenable toward student participation than either the natural science faculty or the social science faculty. The mean score for the liberal arts faculty was 2.545 as compared to 3.318 for the natural science faculty and 3.632 for the social science faculty. The majority of the liberal arts and natural science faculty representatives disagreed with the item, but not strongly. Among the social science faculty, 68.4 percent strongly disagreed and for the natural science faculty, the percentage was 40.9. None of the liberal arts faculty responded in this way.

The final item to be considered on the Academic Freedom scale suggested, by way of analogy, that a student has no greater right to a voice in academic governance than does an apprentice in the employ of an expert craftsman. The mean score of 2.989 indicates the Academic Council

was not generally impressed with this line of reasoning. Either disagreeing or disagreeing strongly with the item were a total of 65 members or 72 percent of the responding Academic Council members.

Among the students on the Academic Council, the graduate and undergraduate student representatives had mean scores of 3.833 and 3.308 respectively indicating a substantial difference of opinion. This difference is reflected in the modes of the two groups. There were 83.3 percent of the graduate students indicating strong disagreement with the wording of the item as compared to only 38.5 percent of the undergraduate students. A majority of 53.8 percent of the undergraduate students responded with a disagree or "3" response to the item while the comparable percentage for graduate students was 16.7.

The differing faculty groups continued to differ in a way consistent with the Scheffe' findings. The liberal arts faculty respondents were most favorable toward the wording of the item, followed by the natural science faculty, and the social science faculty respondents respectively. The liberal arts faculty had a mean score of 2.545 while that of the natural science faculty was just slightly higher at 2.632. The social science faculty's mean score of 3.056 was moderately higher than the other two groups and hence more favorable toward student participation.

An additional concern was brought to light during several of the interviews, which have implications for academic freedom. The major reservation to the present plan for student involvement at the Academic Council level, in the minds of those interviewed, concerned the apparent lack of student interest on issues not directly related to their interests. In addition, one administrator perceives the representatives as having an extremely skewed point of view, not at all representative of the student body. While he felt that the current structure was probably reasonable at the present time, he indicated a preference for some type of systematic sampling procedure for making student input available.

Summary. The student representatives, and particularly the graduate student representatives viewed Academic Council student participation as less detrimental to the climate of academic freedom at Michigan State University than did their faculty colleagues and the combined group of administrative and faculty representatives. Likewise, the social science faculty representatives were significantly more positive towards the relationship between academic freedom and Academic Council student participation than were the liberal arts representatives or the combined group of liberal arts and natural science faculty representatives.

In general the Academic Council members felt that the student representatives have important insights to contribute to the evaluation of faculty teaching effectiveness, that they understand and accept the academic values, and that they are more concerned with improving programs than determining what is to be taught.

The Academic Council did not believe that student participation has threatened the faculty's academic freedom nor has it lowered the faculty's prestige. They consistently disagreed with those items suggesting that the student members have irresponsibly exercised their voting privileges.

With respect to the appropriate decision-making role of students, the Academic Council consistently approved voting student representation in matters dealing with general university policy and curriculum. The Council affirmed the limitations of the "Taylor Report" by responding negatively with respect to student involvement in matters of primarily faculty concern.

Administrative Efficiency Scale

The Administrative Efficiency scale on the instrument is composed of 22 individual items. Each of the items asks the respondents to strongly agree, agree, disagree, or strongly disagree with a given statement. The fundamental question in this section is whether or not student

participation makes a quantitative impact on the efficiency of the decision-making process at the Academic Council level at Michigan State University. In addition, the various component groups are compared in order to detect statistically significant inter-group differences. As was the case in the Academic Freedom scale, the specific items will be discussed with respect to the Academic Council as a whole, and when differences in mean scores and distributions on a given item occur among groups determined to be statistically different, these differences will be discussed.

Inter-Group Comparisons

A separate one-way analysis of variance was conducted in order to find any differences that may exist among the groups. The alpha level was set at .05 for each comparison. The comparisons were among the groups, the same as noted in the Academic Freedom scale. The mean scores for the first comparison of students, faculty, and administrators are as follows:

TABLE 25

Group Means, Frequencies, and Standard Deviations for
Administrators, Faculty, and Students on the
Administrative Efficiency Scale

<u>Group</u>	<u>n</u>	<u>Mean</u>	<u>Standard Deviation</u>
Administrators	20	2.45	.22
Faculty	53	2.48	.31
Students	20	2.52	.40

Using this information, the computation of the analysis of variance was undertaken yielding the following results for the administrative, faculty, and student components of the 1972-73 Michigan State University Academic Council.

TABLE 26

ANOVA Comparison of Administrators, Faculty and Students
on the Administrative Efficiency Scale

<u>Source of Variation</u>	<u>DF</u>	<u>Mean Square</u>	<u>F</u>	<u>P less than</u>	<u>Significance</u>
Between Groups	2	.2095	.2095	.8114	No
Within Groups	90	.100235			

Since the differences found among the means of the three sample groups were not found to be significant at the .05 level, there was no need for additional post hoc testing.

The next potential source of difference investigated was among the members of the Academic Council classified according to academic affiliation. The four groups to be compared are liberal arts affiliates, natural science affiliates, non-affiliates, and social science affiliates. Each of these groups, with the exception of the non-affiliates which contains only administrators, includes administrators, faculty, and students affiliated with each broad academic classification. The mean scores for these groups are as follows:

TABLE 27

Group Means, Frequencies, and Standard Deviations for Liberal Arts Affiliates, Natural Science Affiliates, Non-Affiliates, and Social Science Affiliates on the Administrative Efficiency Scale

<u>Group</u>	<u>n</u>	<u>Mean</u>	<u>Standard Deviation</u>
Liberal Arts	17	2.57	.46
Natural Science	38	2.49	.23
Non-Affiliates	7	2.42	.25
Social Science	31	2.44	.32

The computation of the analysis of variance operation for detection of population mean differences resulted in the following table:

TABLE 28

ANOVA Comparison of Liberal Arts Affiliates, Natural Science Affiliates, Non-Affiliates, and Social Science Affiliates on the Administrative Efficiency Scale

<u>Sources of Variation</u>	<u>DF</u>	<u>Mean Square</u>	<u>F</u>	<u>P less than</u>	<u>Significance</u>
Between Groups	2	.1185	1.1950	.3076	No
Within Groups	89	.0991			

This calculation provides evidence that the mean differences of the various samples are not statistically significant with an alpha level of .05.

The next set of differences to be tested concerned potential variation in attitudes between long-term faculty representatives (more than two consecutive years of Academic Council service) and short-term faculty representatives. It was felt that the long-term faculty might show some difference in response on the basis of

the long deliberations and compromises which occurred prior to the incorporation of student participation at the Academic Council level at M.S.U. The mean scores for these groups are as follows:

TABLE 29

Group Means, Frequencies, and Standard Deviations for Long-Term and Short-Term Faculty on the Administrative Efficiency Scale

<u>Group</u>	<u>n</u>	<u>Mean</u>	<u>Standard Deviation</u>
Long-Term	17	2.48	.37
Short-Term	36	2.47	.28

The analysis of variance operation for determination of difference between population means resulted in the following table:

TABLE 30

ANOVA Comparison of Long-Term Faculty and Short-Term Faculty on the Administrative Efficiency Scale

<u>Source of Variation</u>	<u>DF</u>	<u>Mean Square</u>	<u>F</u>	<u>P less than</u>	<u>Significance</u>
Between Groups	1	.0021	.0227	.8808	No
Within Groups	47	.0920			

The results indicate that the differences between the sample means of the long-term and short-term faculty are not statistically significant at an alpha level of .05 and cannot be inferred to their respective populations.

The next set of comparisons involved the undergraduate and graduate student members of the Academic Council. The frequencies, mean scores, and standard deviations for this group are as follows:

TABLE 31

Group Means, Frequencies, and Standard Deviation for Undergraduate and Graduate Students on the Administrative Efficiency Scale

<u>Group</u>	<u>Frequency</u>	<u>Mean</u>	<u>Standard Deviation</u>
Undergraduate Students	14	2.57	.46
Graduate Students	6	2.39	.16

The computation of the analysis of variance operation to test for differences between undergraduate students and graduate students yielded the following information in table form.

TABLE 32

ANOVA Comparison of Undergraduate and Graduate Students on the Administrative Efficiency Scale

<u>Source of Variation</u>	<u>DF</u>	<u>Mean Square</u>	<u>F</u>	<u>P less than</u>	<u>Significance</u>
Between Groups	1	.1300	.8003	.3829	No
Within Groups	18	.1625			

Again, the conclusion can be drawn that with an alpha level of .05, there is no statistically significant difference between graduate and undergraduate students with respect to their responses to items in the Administrative Efficiency scale.

The next consideration was the investigation of Academic Council component groups classified according to academic affiliation, concerning the existence of statistically significant responses to the Administrative Efficiency scale. While previous testing has shown that no difference was present in terms of response to the

Administrative Efficiency scale among all affiliates of the broad academic classifications, the administrators, faculty, and students in each area were also investigated.

The liberal arts administrators, the natural science administrators, the non-affiliated administrators, and the social science administrators were tested for differences of opinion concerning the impact of Academic Council student participation on administrative efficiency. The means, frequencies, and standard deviations of each of the groups are represented in the following table:

TABLE 33

Group Means, Frequencies, and Standard Deviations for Liberal Arts Administrators, Natural Science Administrators, Non-Affiliated Administrators, and Social Science Administrators on the Administrative Efficiency Scale

<u>Group</u>	<u>Frequency</u>	<u>Mean</u>	<u>Standard Deviation</u>
Liberal Arts Administrators	2	2.30	.04
Natural Science Administrators	6	2.53	.24
Non-Affiliated Administrators	7	2.42	.25
Social Science Administrators	5	2.47	.21

From this data, the following analysis of variance operation was performed.

TABLE 34

ANOVA Comparison of Liberal Arts Administrators, Natural Science Administrators, Non-Affiliated Administrators, and Social Science Administrators on the Administrative Efficiency Scale

<u>Source of Variation</u>	<u>DF</u>	<u>Mean Square</u>	<u>F</u>	<u>P less than</u>	<u>Significance</u>
Between Groups	2	.0447	.8639	.4403	No
Within Groups	16	.0517			

Again, the conclusion is that there is no significant difference with regard to the Administrative Efficiency scale among administrators classified according to broadly defined academic affiliations.

The faculty representatives to the 1972-73 M.S.U. Academic Council, when classified according to academic affiliation, were tested for population mean differences. The resulting frequencies, means, and standard deviation on the Administrative Efficiency scale are as follows:

TABLE 35

Group Frequencies, Means, and Standard Deviations for Liberal Arts Faculty, Natural Science Faculty, and Social Science Faculty on the Administrative Efficiency Scale

<u>Group</u>	<u>Frequency</u>	<u>Mean</u>	<u>Standard Deviation</u>
Liberal Arts Faculty	11	2.65	.36
Natural Science Faculty	23	2.49	.24
Social Science Faculty	19	2.36	.32

This data was then incorporated into the analysis of variance technique, resulting in the following table:

TABLE 36

ANOVA Comparison of Liberal Arts Faculty, Natural Science Faculty, and Social Science Faculty on the Administrative Efficiency Scale

<u>Source of Variation</u>	<u>DF</u>	<u>Mean Square</u>	<u>F</u>	<u>P less than</u>	<u>Significance</u>
Between Groups	2	.3062	3.4575	.0393	Yes
Within Groups	50	.0886			

The conclusion to be drawn from the above table is that there is a statistically significant difference at

the .05 level among liberal arts faculty, natural science faculty, and the social science faculty.

The next step was to determine, using the Scheffe' post hoc procedure, the exact location of the differences. An examination of the group means in Table 36 led to the developing of the null hypotheses:

1. There is no difference between liberal arts faculty Academic Council members and social science faculty Academic Council members.
($\mu_{LAF} - \mu_{SSF} = 0$)
2. There is no difference between liberal arts faculty Academic Council members and the combined Academic Council representatives of the natural science faculty and the social science faculty.
($\mu_{LAF} - \frac{(\mu_{NSF} + \mu_{SSF})}{2} = 0$)
3. There is no difference between the combined Academic Council representatives of the liberal arts and natural science faculties, and the social science faculty.
($\frac{(\mu_{LAF} + \mu_{NSF})}{2} - \mu_{SSF} = 0$)
4. There is no difference between the natural science faculty Academic Council members and the social science Academic Council members.
($\mu_{NSF} - \mu_{SSF} = 0$)
5. There is no difference between the natural science faculty Academic Council members and the liberal arts faculty Academic Council members.
($\mu_{NSF} - \mu_{LAF} = 0$)

These hypotheses were tested according to the Scheffe' technique, and the results are presented in the following table:

TABLE 37

Scheffe' Post Hoc Analysis for Location of Population Mean Differences Among Liberal Arts Faculty, Natural Science Faculty, and Social Science Faculty on the Administrative Efficiency Scale

ψ_i	$\hat{\psi}_i$	$\hat{\sigma}_{\hat{\psi}_i}$	95% Confidence Interval Surrounding ψ_i	Significance
$\mu_{LAF} - \mu_{SSF}$.2900	.1127	.0055 < ψ_i < .5745	Yes
$\mu_{LAF} - (\frac{\mu_{NSF} + \mu_{SSF}}{2})$.2250	.1009	-.0296 < ψ_i < .4796	No
$(\frac{\mu_{LAF} + \mu_{NSF}}{2}) - \mu_{SSF}$.2100	.0874	-.0105 < ψ_i < .4305	No
$\mu_{NSF} - \mu_{SSF}$.1300	.0923	-.1028 < ψ_i < .3628	No
$\mu_{NSF} - \mu_{LAF}$.1600	.0947	-.0937 < ψ_i < .4126	No

The results of these calculations show that the hypothesis that there is no difference between the liberal arts faculty representatives and the social science faculty representatives, can be rejected at the .05 level. Further, when the sample means are considered, the difference that exists between these groups warrants the additional conclusion that the social science faculty had a lower score indicating more favorable attitudes toward student participation with regard to administrative efficiency, than did the liberal arts faculty representatives.

The final group comparison for differences was performed on the mean scores of the sample of students affiliated with the three broad academic areas. The mean scores for each student group are presented in the following table:

TABLE 38

Group Means, Frequencies, and Standard Deviations for
Liberal Arts Students, Natural Science Students
and Social Science Students on the
Administrative Efficiency Scale

<u>Group</u>	<u>Frequency</u>	<u>Mean</u>	<u>Standard Deviation</u>
Liberal Arts Students	4	2.50	.78
Natural Science Students	9	2.44	.22
Social Science Students	7	2.62	.35

This data was then used in the analysis of variance procedure to test for equality of means. Those computations resulted in the following table:

TABLE 39

ANOVA Comparison of Liberal Arts Students, Natural Science Students, and Social Science Students on the
Administrative Efficiency Scale

<u>Source of Variation</u>	<u>DF</u>	<u>Mean Square</u>	<u>F</u>	<u>P less than</u>	<u>Significance</u>
Between Groups	2	.0628	.3646	.6998	No
Within Groups	17	.1723			

The student members of the Academic Council affiliated with the three broad academic areas showed no significant differences on the Administrative Efficiency Scale. With the completion of the discussion of the differences among the 1972-73 members of the M.S.U. Academic Council, the focus attention turns to the individual items within the Administrative Efficiency scale.

Discussion of Individual Items

For the purposes of discussion, the 22 items of the Administrative Efficiency scale are divided into the following categories: Student input (Items 5, 14, 15, 19, and 61); Structural aspects of the 1972-73 M.S.U. Academic Council (Items 29, 32, 49, 50, 51, 52, and 69); and Student performance (Items 20, 30, 31, 38, 40, 41, 46, 48, 64, and 67). Each of these items will be discussed first in terms of the Academic Council as a whole and second, with respect to the groups exhibiting significant differences. The only differences detected on the Administrative Efficiency scale occurred between the liberal arts and social science faculty representatives.

In terms of decision-making input, the majority of the entire Academic Council feels that the incorporation of students has brought both insights (Item 5) and information (Item 19) before the Academic Council which might not have otherwise been considered. The percentages of Academic Council respondents agreeing or strongly agreeing was 82.8 percent with regard to new insights (Item 5) and 76.1 percent with regard to new information (Item 19). But 77.9 percent of the Academic Council members disagreed with the idea that further increases in Academic Council student representation would bring additional valuable insights before the Council.

Another valuable addition to the data was the observation of an interviewee to the point that the freshness and vitality of the student representatives outweighed their lack of experience. The minority view was expressed by an administrator who commented that, "Students have had little to contribute in areas solely of interest to the faculty, and very few issues arose that directly concerned students."

The Academic Council members who responded to the questionnaire further tended to disagree, although they did so less decisively than in previous items, with Items 14 and 15 which suggest that the at-large women (Item 14) and minority student representatives (Item 15) often bring unique and productive insights before the Academic Council. The percentages of responding Academic Council members disagreeing or strongly disagreeing with Item 14 was 61.1 percent and for Item 15, 66.2 percent.

Expressing what appears to represent the majority opinion of the Council, one interviewee noted that while minority and women student representatives have had little impact on the Council, by virtue of their race or sex, their incorporation has helped to ease the consciences of some individuals. A student commented that another channel has been provided through the incorporation of at-large student representatives.

Among the items dealing with the student input aspect of the Administrative Efficiency scale, only Item 5

appeared to contribute to the differences discovered between the liberal arts faculty and the social science faculty. This item asked the respondents to indicate their attitude with respect to the statement that Academic Council student participation has brought insights before the Council which otherwise might not have been considered. On this item, the mean of the Academic Council representatives of the liberal arts faculty was 2.364, indicating moderate agreement. The social science faculty representatives recorded a much more favorable mean of 1.737 on this same item. Although both mean scores fell on the positive side of the continuum, the liberal arts faculty were considerably less positive than the social science faculty, and also less positive than the entire Academic Council mean score of 1.946 for this item.

The second group of items to be considered in the Administrative Efficiency scale dealt with the specific structure of the M.S.U. experiment in student participation at the Academic Council level. There were 76.4 percent of the Academic Council respondents disagreeing or disagreeing strongly with Item 69 which stated that the great complexity of academic governance precludes meaningful contributions by student representatives. While this item partially reflects that students are capable of contributing to the governance process, the Council's response to Item 29 showed that 71.9 percent of the Academic Council respondents either agreed or strongly

agreed that the inexperience of students in these matters have resulted in a more time consuming governance process.

A complicating factor was emphasized by many of the interviewees. A student commented that the size of the Academic Council was perceived by many as overwhelming, contributing a major source of frustration and discouragement. An administrator noted that, "It is extremely difficult to evaluate any increase in time of decision-making due to student participation. It has taken longer to reach decisions, but this increase probably is more a function of size than of student participation. In response to this criticism, another administrator felt that the size of the Academic Council is of little concern. The membership must be sufficiently large so that a variety of views can be expressed and taken into account.

Looking at the faculty groups holding different attitudes with respect to student participation and administrative efficiency, consistent differences between the liberal arts faculty and the social science faculty representatives were found on Items 29 and 69. On Item 69 the liberal arts faculty had a mean score of 2.273 as compared to 3.383 for the social science faculty. Agreeing or strongly agreeing with the statement that the complexity of governance precluded meaningful student contributions, were 54.6 percent of the liberal arts faculty representatives. The comparative figure for social science faculty representatives was 5.6 percent.

With respect to Item 29 stating that student inexperience has made the governance process more time-consuming, the liberal arts faculty representative had a mean score of 1.545 as compared to 2.316 for the social science faculty. Although both groups had means below the 2.500 midpoint indicating general agreement with the wording of the item, all of the liberal arts faculty, or 100 percent, agreed or strongly agreed while the comparative figure for the social science faculty was 60.9 percent.

Item 52 suggested that the student representatives are capable of making their maximum contribution to the academic process immediately. The Academic Council did not feel that this was the case, and responded with a mean score of 3.152. Expressing either disagreement or strong disagreement were 82.5 percent of the Academic Council respondents. This item was fairly consistently answered by the liberal arts and the social science faculty representatives. Their respective mean scores were 3.455 and 3.211.

With regard to improving the quality of student participation on the Academic Council, the respondents indicated agreement with Item 49, suggesting that students be required to serve on a lower level decision-making body before becoming eligible for Academic Council service. But Items 50 and 51, proposing salaries and academic credit for student representatives to the Academic

Council met with relatively strong disagreement from the Academic Council respondents.

On Item 49, dealing with prior service as a prerequisite for student Academic Council participation, the Council's mean score was 2.120 with 72.8 percent either agreeing or agreeing strongly. The means for the liberal arts and social science faculty representatives of 2.000 and 2.105 were consistent, but so closely similar as not to be considered a primary contributor to the differences found between these two groups on the Administrative Efficiency scale.

Besides requiring prior service, another alternative for improving the quality of Academic Council student participation was suggested during one of the interviews. An administrator commented that the main problem of the student representatives is a lack of staff support, guidance, information, and backup services. "Without this support, the tendency is for individuals of limited experience to act in an overly cautious and sensitive manner. Students don't need courses or experience as much as they need direction and resources."

Another individual indicated that the creation of the Elected Student Council composed of student Council members meeting together, has brought substantial improvement in the performance of student representatives. A student representative suggested that the Elected

Student Council be expanded to include extensive discussions concerning the goals and philosophy of the institution.

With regard to the payment of salaries (Item 50) and granting academic credit (Item 51), the means for the Council were 3.424 and 3.152 respectively. The percentages of Academic Council respondents disagreeing or strongly disagreeing were 88.0 percent and 71.0 percent for Items 50 and 51 respectively. The mean scores of the liberal arts and social science faculty representatives were 3.727 and 3.421 for each of these two items, indicating somewhat small, but consistent differences with those found by analysis of variance and post hoc procedures.

The next series of items considered, dealt with the attitudes of the Council members with regard to one year of actual student performance in the exercise of their decision-making responsibilities as members of the Academic Council. The members of the Council generally agreed that the student representatives carefully considered the evidence before casting their votes (Items 48 and 46). The majority of the Academic Council respondents feel that the student members have fulfilled the responsibilities that accompany the rights of membership (Item 41), and that they are not easily intimidated by their non-student colleagues (Item 67).

The responses of the Academic Council were inconclusive with respect to items pertaining to student indifference, openness, and preparation. The mean score and the distribution indicates a relatively even split between agreement and disagreement with respect to Item 30 suggesting that the student representatives have often been indifferent on many more of the more important issues brought before the Academic Council. Item 38, which stated that students conscientiously prepare for Academic Council meetings, and Item 40, affirming the openness and flexibility of the student representatives, also elicited a divided response from the Academic Council respondents. The means for Items 30, 38, and 40 were found to be 2.533, 2.524 and 2.511 with approximately equal numbers of the respondents both agreeing and disagreeing with each of these three items.

Close to two-thirds of the Academic Council agreed or strongly agreed, however, that many of the student concerns might better be accommodated at the lower levels of academic governance (Item 31), and that the short-range interests and concerns of students pose difficulties when the long-range interests of the institution are at stake (Item 32). The mean score for Item 31 was found to be 2.233, and the mean for Item 32 was 2.196.

Looking at the means and distributions of representatives of the liberal arts and social science faculties,

groups found to be significantly different on the Administrative Efficiency scale, differences were found on Items 32, 38, and 48. These differences appear to contribute to the discrepancy found between the liberal arts and social science faculty representatives.

On Item 32 more members of both the liberal arts and social science faculties responded with a "2", or agree with the statement that the short-range interests and concerns of students pose difficulties when the long-range institutional interests are at stake, than any of the other three alternatives. The difference between the liberal arts faculty mean of 1.818, and the social science mean of 2.316, is reflected primarily in the fact that 81.9 percent of the liberal arts faculty either agreed or strongly agreed with the item as compared to only 57.9 percent for the social science faculty.

The liberal arts faculty tended to disagree with Item 48 which stated that the student representatives to the Academic Council generally decided their stand on an issue on the basis of the evidence rather than on the opinions of influential non-students. The mean score of the liberal arts faculty was found to be 2.889. In contrast, the social science faculty had a mean score of 2.133, considerably lower than that of the liberal arts faculty. While 80.0 percent of the social science faculty agreed or strongly agreed with Item 48 as stated, the

corresponding figure for the liberal arts faculty was only 22.2 percent.

With respect to Item 38 which stated that most of the students conscientiously prepare for the business to be conducted during Academic Council meetings, the liberal arts faculty disagreed by responding with a group mean score of 2.900. In comparison, the mean for the social science faculty representatives was 2.375 indicating moderate agreement. In terms of the distribution of responses, 62.6 percent of the social science faculty respondents indicated either agreement or strong agreement with the item. The comparable figure for the liberal arts faculty was 30.0 percent.

A student representative to the Academic Council amplified these findings when he commented, "I feel the students have shown themselves to be extremely paralleled with faculty in almost every respect with the major exception that they are a much more transient group. This is particularly manifested in the students' desire for quick action (sometimes at the expense of quality). Paradoxically, as a group, they are somewhat less capable of meeting and discharging obligations with rapidity than are their nonstudent counterparts."

The final two items to be considered in the Administrative Efficiency scale dealt with the consequences of student participation at the level of the Academic Council with respect to decision-making output. Item 20, stated

that student participation at the Academic Council level at M.S.U. has facilitated the implementation of policies and regulations. The mean response of the Academic Council was found to be 2.622 indicating a slight degree of disagreement with the thrust of the item. Disagreeing with the item were 55.6 percent of the Academic Council respondents, with another 4.4 percent expressing strong disagreement.

A comparison of the dissenting faculty groups showed that the social science faculty group mean was 2.529, only slightly more positive toward student involvement than the mean of 2.636 for the liberal arts faculty respondents. While this difference is consistent with the analysis of variance and Scheffe' results, it does not appear to contribute greatly to that conclusion.

Item 64 stated that further increases in student participation at the Academic Council level at M.S.U. would improve the quality of decisions rendered by the Council. The Council responded negatively to this item as indicated by the mean score of 3.068. Disagreeing with this item were 43.2 percent of the Academic Council members and another 36.4 percent strongly disagreed.

Again, the mean difference between the liberal arts and the social science faculty was small, but it was consistent with the statistically significant discrepancy found on the Administrative Efficiency scale. The mean

for the responding liberal arts faculty representatives was 3.455 as compared with 3.059 for the social science respondents. The most popular response for the liberal arts faculty representatives was "strongly disagree" with 54.5 percent so responding. In contrast, the "3" or "disagree" response was most representative of the attitudes of 52.9 percent of the social science faculty. These differences represent not differences in attitude as much as differences in degree, and as such, they appear to contribute somewhat to the differences detected on the Administrative Efficiency scale.

Summary. The question raised in this section was whether or not Academic Council student participation has made a difference in the efficiency of the decision-making process at the Michigan State University Academic Council. The social science faculty representatives to the 1972-73 Academic Council were found to have significantly more positive attitudes toward the relationship between Academic Council student participation and administrative efficiency than did the liberal arts faculty representatives.

The members of the Academic Council agreed that voting student representation has brought new insights and information before the Council which might not otherwise have been considered. At the same time, however, the Council did not feel that additional student representation would add significantly to the quality of decisions

rendered. Further, the Council did not feel that the minority student representatives have made any quantitative impact.

The Academic Council generally agreed that the quality of the student representation has been quite high and that they have cast their votes responsibly on the basis of the evidence. But the Council agreed that the student representatives would be better prepared to contribute if they were required to serve on a lower level decision-making body prior to holding membership on the Council. Suggestions that students should be granted salaries or academic credit for Academic Council service met with strong disapproval.

The members of the Academic Council generally agreed that many of the student concerns could be handled more effectively elsewhere and that the short-range interests of students often take precedence over long-range institutional concerns.

Community Cohesion Scale

The Community Cohesion scale is made up of 19 items dealing with the impact of Academic Council student participation on such qualitative factors as cooperation, communication, satisfaction, and trust, primarily among students, faculty, and administrators. These 19 items, like those in the previous scale, are forced-choice Likert style items with four response alternatives. The

respondent may chose to strongly agree, agree, disagree, or strongly disagree with a given statement by marking 1, 2, 3, or 4 respectively.

As with the previous scale, the group means of the various component groups of the 1972-73 M.S.U. Academic Council will be compared using the one-way analysis of variance technique. Should differences be found, the Scheffe' post hoc procedures will be used to specifically locate the source of the differences. The alpha level for both of these procedures was set at .05.

Intergroup Comparisons

Looking first at the mean scores for the administrators, faculty, and students, on the Community Cohesion scale, the data is presented in the following table:

TABLE 40

Group Means, Frequencies, and Standard Deviations for Administrators, Faculty, and Students on the Community Cohesion Scale

<u>Group</u>	<u>n</u>	<u>Mean</u>	<u>Standard Deviation</u>
Administrators	20	2.22	.19
Faculty	53	2.29	.36
Students	20	2.46	.47

Using this data, a one-way of analysis of variance was performed in order to detect any differences in population means. The results of this operation are presented in the following table:

TABLE 41

ANOVA Comparison of Administrators, Faculty, and Students
on the Community Cohesion Scale

<u>Source of Variation</u>	<u>DF</u>	<u>Mean Square</u>	<u>F</u>	<u>P less than</u>	<u>Significance</u>
Between Groups	2	.3346	2.5826	.0812	No
Within Groups	90	.1296			

The mean differences found among the samples therefore cannot be attributed to the respective populations with a given alpha level of .05.

The members of the 1972-73 M.S.U. Academic Council were next classified and compared on the basis of their academic affiliation. The mean scores, frequencies, and standard deviations of the responding members of the 1972-73 Academic Council, classified according to academic affiliation, are presented in the following table with respect to the Community Cohesion scale.

TABLE 42

Group Means, Frequencies, and Standard Deviations for
Liberal Arts Affiliates, Natural Science Affiliates,
Non-Affiliates, and Social Science Affiliates on
the Community Cohesion Scale

<u>Group</u>	<u>Frequency</u>	<u>Mean</u>	<u>Standard Deviation</u>
Liberal Arts	17	2.52	.44
Natural Science	38	2.33	.32
Non-Affiliates	7	2.26	.24
Social Science	31	2.18	.36

This data was then used to calculate the analysis of variance operation for equality of population means. These calculations resulted in the following table:

TABLE 43

ANOVA Comparison of Liberal Arts Affiliates, Natural Science Affiliates, Non-Affiliates, and Social Science Affiliates on the Community Cohesion Scale

<u>Source of Variation</u>	<u>DF</u>	<u>Mean Square</u>	<u>F</u>	<u>P less than</u>	<u>Significance</u>
Between Groups	2	.6549	5.3053	.0067	Yes
Within Groups	39	.1234			

From this table, the conclusion can be drawn that at the .05 level, a difference occurs among liberal arts affiliates, natural science affiliates, non-affiliates, and social science affiliates. In order to define the exact source of inter-group differences, a series of hypotheses were developed and tested using the Scheffe' post hoc procedure with the alpha level set at .05. The null hypotheses are as follows:

1. There is no difference between liberal arts affiliates and social science affiliates with respect to the Community Cohesion scale.
($\mu_{LA} - \mu_{SS} = 0$)
2. There is no difference between the natural science affiliates and the social science affiliates with respect to the Community Cohesion scale.
($\mu_{NS} - \mu_{SS} = 0$)
3. There is no difference between the non-affiliates and the social science affiliates on the Community Cohesion scale.
($\mu_{NA} - \mu_{SS} = 0$)
4. There is no difference between the combined groups of liberal arts and natural science affiliates, and the social science affiliates on the Community Cohesion scale.
($(\frac{\mu_{LA} + \mu_{NS}}{2}) - \mu_{SS} = 0$)

5. There is no difference between the combined groups of liberal arts and natural science affiliates, and the combined groups of non-affiliates and social science affiliates on the Community Cohesion scale.

$$\left(\frac{\mu_{LA} + \mu_{NS}}{2} - \frac{\mu_{NA} + \mu_{SS}}{2} = 0 \right)$$
6. There is no difference between the liberal arts affiliates and the natural science affiliates on the Community Cohesion scale.

$$(\mu_{LA} - \mu_{NS} = 0)$$
7. There is no difference between the liberal arts affiliates and the combined group of natural science and social science affiliates.

$$(\mu_{LA} - \frac{\mu_{NS} + \mu_{SS}}{2} = 0)$$
8. There is no difference between the liberal arts affiliates and the combined group of non-affiliates and natural science affiliates.

$$(\mu_{LA} - \frac{\mu_{NA} + \mu_{NS}}{2} = 0)$$

Each of these hypotheses were then tested using the Scheffe' post hoc procedure. The results of these tests are presented in the following table:

TABLE 44

Scheffe' Post Hoc Analysis for Location of Population Mean Differences Among Liberal Arts Affiliates, Natural Science Affiliates, Non-Affiliates, and Social Science Affiliates on the Community Cohesion Scale

ψ_i	$\hat{\psi}_i$	$\hat{\hat{\psi}}_i$	95% Confidence Interval Surrounding ψ_i	Significance
$\mu_{LA} - \mu_{SS}$.3400	.1060	.0378 < ψ_i < .6422	Yes
$\mu_{NS} - \mu_{SS}$.1500	.0850	-.0923 < ψ_i < .3923	No
$\mu_{NA} - \mu_{SS}$.0800	.1470	-.3390 < ψ_i < .4990	No
$\left(\frac{\mu_{LA} + \mu_{NS}}{2} \right) - \mu_{SS}$.2450	.0813	.0133 < ψ_i < .4767	Yes
$\left(\frac{\mu_{LA} + \mu_{NS}}{2} \right) - \left(\frac{\mu_{NA} + \mu_{SS}}{2} \right)$.2050	.0896	-.0504 < ψ_i < .4604	No
$\mu_{LA} - \mu_{NS}$.1900	.1205	-.1021 < ψ_i < .4821	No
$\mu_{LA} - \left(\frac{\mu_{NS} + \mu_{SS}}{2} \right)$.3000	.1125	-.0207 < ψ_i < .6207	No
$\mu_{LA} - \left(\frac{\mu_{NA} + \mu_{NS}}{2} \right)$.2250	.1117	-.0933 < ψ_i < .5433	No

These findings indicate that with 95 percent certainty, hypotheses 1 and 4 can be rejected. This information, when considered with the mean scores in Table 43, leads to the two additional conclusions. Since the group mean of the social science affiliates was lower than that of the liberal arts affiliates, it can be said that the social science affiliates are significantly more receptive toward student participation as a means of bringing about greater community cohesion at Michigan State University. The social science affiliates' group mean was also lower and hence more positive, than those of the liberal arts and natural science affiliates. These differences will be pursued further as the items comprising the Community Cohesion scale are examined individually.

The long-term faculty representatives to the Academic Council were then compared with their short-term counterparts, i.e., those with less than three consecutive years of Academic Council service. The group frequencies, means, and standard deviations are presented in the following table:

TABLE 45

Group Means, Frequencies, and Standard Deviations for Long-Term and Short-Term Faculty on the Community Cohesion Scale

<u>Group</u>	<u>Frequency</u>	<u>Mean</u>	<u>Standard Deviation</u>
Long-Term Faculty	17	2.30	.37
Short-Term Faculty	36	2.28	.28

These findings were tested for differences in population means using the one-way analysis of variance technique. The calculation resulted in the following table:

TABLE 46

ANOVA Comparison of Long-Term Faculty and Short-Term Faculty on the Community Cohesion Scale

<u>Source of Variation</u>	<u>DF</u>	<u>Mean Square</u>	<u>F</u>	<u>P less than</u>	<u>Significance</u>
Between Groups	1	.0030	.0259	.8729	No
Within Groups	47	.1144			

The group mean differences between the long-term and short-term faculty representatives were therefore not found to be statistically significant at the .05 level.

The next potential source of differences to be investigated concerned the sample mean differences between undergraduate and graduate students on the Community Cohesion scale. The frequencies, mean scores, and standard deviations are presented in the following table:

TABLE 47

Group Means, Frequencies, and Standard Deviations for Undergraduate and Graduate Students on the Community Cohesion Scale

<u>Group</u>	<u>Frequency</u>	<u>Mean</u>	<u>Standard Deviation</u>
Undergraduate Students	14	2.55	.52
Graduate Students	6	2.26	.25

This data was tested for equality of population means using the one-way analysis of variance procedure.

The alpha level was set at .05. The results of these calculations appear in the following table:

TABLE 48

ANOVA Comparison of Undergraduate and Graduate Students
on the Community Cohesion Scale

<u>Source of Variation</u>	<u>DF</u>	<u>Mean Square</u>	<u>F</u>	<u>P less than</u>	<u>Significance</u>
Between Groups	1	.3377	1.5788	.2250	No
Within Groups	18	.2139			

The information presented in this table indicates that there is no significant difference between the population means of the graduate and undergraduate student members of the 1972-73 M.S.U. Academic Council with respect to the Community Cohesion scale.

The next comparison concerned the administrators affiliated with the broad academic areas. The means, frequencies, and standard deviations for these Academic Council groups are as follows:

TABLE 49

Group Means, Frequencies, and Standard Deviations for
Liberal Arts Administrators, Natural Science
Administrators, Non-Affiliated Administrators,
and Social Science Administrators on the
Community Cohesion Scale

<u>Group</u>	<u>Frequency</u>	<u>Mean</u>	<u>Standard Deviation</u>
Liberal Arts Administrators	2	2.23	.04
Natural Science Administrators	6	2.22	.14
Non-Affiliated Administrators	7	2.26	.24
Social Science Administrators	5	2.16	.24

The calculation for the comparison of population means using the one-way analysis of variance technique resulted in the following table:

TABLE 50

ANOVA Comparison of Liberal Arts Administrators, Natural Science Administrators, Non-Affiliated Administrators, and Social Science Administrators on the Community Cohesion Scale

<u>Source of Variation</u>	<u>DF</u>	<u>Mean Square</u>	<u>F</u>	<u>P less than</u>	<u>Significance</u>
Between Groups	2	.0004	.0087	.9914	No
Within Groups	16	.0429			

The results clearly indicate that these groups are not significantly different at the .05 level.

Continuing with comparisons on the basis of academic affiliation, the various faculty groups were investigated for potential attitudinal differences. The group means, frequencies, and standard deviations were found and are recorded in the following table:

TABLE 51

Group Means, Frequencies, and Standard Deviations for Liberal Arts Faculty, Natural Science Faculty, and Social Science Faculty on the Community Cohesion Scale

<u>Group</u>	<u>Frequency</u>	<u>Mean</u>	<u>Standard Deviation</u>
Liberal Arts Faculty	11	2.56	.30
Natural Science Faculty	23	2.28	.31
Social Science Faculty	19	2.13	.37

These findings provided the basis for the one-way analysis of variance computations for equality of population means which resulted in the following table:

TABLE 52

ANOVA Comparison of Liberal Arts Faculty, Natural Science Faculty, and Social Science Faculty on the Community Cohesion Scale

<u>Source of Variation</u>	<u>DF</u>	<u>Mean Square</u>	<u>F</u>	<u>P less than</u>	<u>Significance</u>
Between Groups	2	.6440	5.8876	.0051	Yes
Within Groups	50	.1094			

On the basis of these calculations, the inference can be made that the differences in sample means indicate a statistically significant difference among the populations of the three Academic Council faculty groups. The precise location of these differences requires the use of the Scheffe' post hoc procedure.

Referring back to the sample means in Table 50, the following null hypotheses were developed for testing:

1. There is no difference between the liberal arts and the natural science faculty representatives on the Community Cohesion scale.
($\mu_{LAF} - \mu_{NSF} = 0$)
2. There is no difference between the liberal arts and the social science faculty representatives on the Community Cohesion scale.
($\mu_{LAF} - \mu_{SSF} = 0$)
3. There is no difference between the liberal arts faculty representatives and the combined group of natural science and social science faculty representatives on the Community Cohesion scale.
($\mu_{LAF} - (\frac{\mu_{NSF} + \mu_{SSF}}{2}) = 0$)

Each of these hypotheses were tested using an alpha level of .05. The results of these three Scheffe' post hoc operations are presented in the following table:

TABLE 53

Scheffe' Post Hoc Analysis for Location of Population Mean Differences Among Liberal Arts Faculty, Natural Science Faculty, and Social Science Faculty on the Community Cohesion Scale

ψ_i	$\hat{\psi}_i$	$\hat{\sigma}_{\hat{\psi}_i}$	95% Confidence Interval Surrounding ψ_i	Significance
$\mu_{LAF} - \mu_{NSF}$.2800	.1212	.0259 < ψ_i < .5859	No
$\mu_{LAF} - \mu_{SSF}$.4300	.1253	.1138 < ψ_i < .7462	Yes
$\mu_{LAF} - (\frac{\mu_{NSF} + \mu_{SSF}}{2})$.3550	.1121	.0721 < ψ_i < .6379	Yes

The results of these operations taken in conjunction with the sample means for each group presented in Table 50 indicate that there is no difference between the liberal arts and natural science faculty representatives. But these calculations do give evidence that the liberal arts faculty are less positive toward Academic Council student participation as a means of promoting greater community cohesion than either the social science faculty representatives or the combined group of social science and natural science representatives.

A comparison among students affiliated with academic disciplines associated with the liberal arts, the natural sciences, and the social sciences comprises the final test for population mean equality on the Community Cohesion scale. The means, frequencies, and standard

deviations of the respondents from these three student groups were determined to have the following values:

TABLE 54

Group Means, Frequencies, and Standard Deviations for Liberal Arts Students, Natural Science Students, and Social Science Students on the Community Cohesion Scale

<u>Group</u>	<u>Frequency</u>	<u>Mean</u>	<u>Standard Deviation</u>
Liberal Arts Students	4	2.57	.81
Natural Science Students	9	2.52	.36
Social Science Students	7	2.33	.40

Using the above statistics from the samples of the student Academic Council representatives, calculations for the one-way analysis of variance for equality of population means were carried out. The results of this operation are presented in the following table:

TABLE 55

ANOVA Comparison of Liberal Arts Students, Natural Science Students, and Social Science Students on the Community Cohesion Scale

<u>Sources of Variation</u>	<u>DF</u>	<u>Mean Square</u>	<u>F</u>	<u>P less than</u>	<u>Significance</u>
Between Groups	2	.1048	.4478	.6464	No
Within Groups	17	.2340			

The one-way analysis of variance test for equality of population means show no statistically significant difference among students affiliated with the liberal arts, natural science, or social science areas on the Community Cohesion scale.

Discussion of Individual Items

Having completed investigating statistically significant differences among various Academic Council groups on the Community Cohesion scale, the focus of discussion turns to the individual items that comprise the scale. As in the earlier scales, the responses for the entire 1972-73 M.S.U. Academic Council to the individual items will be discussed descriptively as well as those items which appear to contribute to the inter-group mean differences detected by the analysis of variance and Scheffe' operations.

As was the case in previous scales, the individual items in the Community Cohesion scale are further classified for purposes of discussion. The three categories of community cohesion items included the following:

1) acceptance of students as equal partners on the Academic Council (Items 3, 16, 22, 36, 44, 72); 2) the quality of the student-faculty administrator relationships on the Academic Council (Items 13, 17, 75, 79); 3) the attitudes of the Academic Council members with respect to the impact of Council student participation on campus communication and understanding (Items 6, 10, 11, 12, 43, 45, 73, 74, and 76).

The first six items of the Community Cohesion scale dealt with the attitudes of the Academic Council with respect to the one-year experiment of incorporation of voting student members.

The majority of the responding Academic Council members agreed that the best hope for continued improvement in academic programs lies in gaining the contributions of all members of the academic community (Item 72). They feel that students generally are not overawed (Item 3) and feel free to express their views on institutional policy (Item 44), and that faculty, student, and administrative representatives work together harmoniously and cooperatively (Item 16). While the majority of the Academic Council respondents disagree with the contention that the present level of student involvement constitutes little more than tokenism (Item 22), they also disagree with Item 36, stating that students are presently satisfied with their role in academic governance. This apparent contradiction probably can be explained by referring to the specific exclusion of student input into matters of exclusive concern of the faculty.

There was also little difference among the responses of the component groups of the Academic Council with regard to Item 72, affirming that the best hope for continued improvement in academic programs lies in gaining the contributions of all members of the academic community. The mean score for the entire Academic Council was found to be 1.747. The liberal arts affiliates, the natural science affiliates, and the social science affiliates had group means of 1.588, 1.730, and 1.833 respectively. In each group, more than 75 percent either agreed or

strongly agreed with the wording of the item. The faculty representatives affiliated with the liberal arts, natural sciences, and social sciences responded with similar mean scores of 1.727, 1.773, and 1.947 respectively on this item. This item did not appear to contribute to the differences detected with the ANOVA and Scheffe' procedure.

With respect to Item 44 regarding students feeling free to express their views on institutional policy, the liberal arts affiliates and the liberal arts faculty recorded the highest group mean scores of the differing groups. The liberal arts and natural science affiliated faculty representatives generally agreed, but less strongly than the social science faculty group, with this item. The mean scores of 1.941 and 1.818 for the liberal arts affiliates and for just the liberal arts faculty respectively were slightly higher and therefore less favorable than the 1.867 and 1.737 means calculated for the social science affiliates and faculty. This indicates that the social science groups perceived the students as slightly more comfortable in the Academic Council setting than the other groups. The fact that the majority of all differing groups, as well as the Academic Council as a whole, either agreed or agreed strongly with the item indicates that students are relatively uninhibited in regard to expressing themselves in Academic Council meetings.

In an interview, an administrator commented that the student Academic Council members are probably more likely to speak their minds than the faculty. He further noted that the quality of the student representatives has been extremely high and that there has been no intimidation of students.

These observations are amplified by the response to Item 3, which stated that the student members of the Academic Council often have difficulty articulating their opinions in Council meetings. The Council's mean response was 2.778 and 63.3 percent of the responding Council members disagreed or strongly disagreed with the statement. With respect to the differing groups, the liberal arts faculty and affiliated representatives responded with mean scores of 2.500 and 2.438 respectively, while the social science faculty and affiliated representatives recorded considerably higher means of 3.167 and 3.000, indicating substantial disagreement with their liberal arts counterparts. The natural science faculty and affiliates fell in between the liberal arts and social science groups with means of 2.565 and 2.676. The natural science groups tended to respond much in the same way as did the liberal arts groups, thus accounting, in part, for some of the differences detected by the ANOVA and Scheffe' procedures.

Item 16 stated that faculty, student, and administrative representatives to the Academic Council work together harmoniously and cooperatively. The majority of the Academic Council, as well as each of the differing groups, either agreed or strongly agreed with the item as stated. The mean for the Council was found to be 2.366.

One faculty member noted that the students have been well received by the faculty and administrators on the Council. However, a student member of the Academic Council commented that there is a lack of credibility of student representatives with administrators and faculty.

The liberal arts affiliates and the natural science affiliates had mean scores of 2.471, and 2.500, slightly higher than the Council's mean of 2.366, and considerably higher than the 2.161 mean of Council respondents affiliated with the social sciences.

The mean response of the liberal arts faculty was found to be 2.364, slightly higher than the 2.261 mean for the natural science faculty and the 2.105 for the social science faculty. These differences are consistent with the differences among the affiliated groups and, like the means for the affiliated groups, probably contribute slightly to the results found in the ANOVA and Scheffe' tables. In both cases, the social science representatives responded more positively regarding student participation at the Academic Council level at M.S.U.

The final two items in this section ask for the attitudes of the Council concerning the student role in the Academic Council. Item 22, which stated that the present plan for student involvement in Academic Council decision-making matters constitutes little more than tokenism, met with disagreement or strong disagreement by most of the respondents in each of the differing groups as well as by the Academic Council as a whole. The Council's mean score for this item was found to be 2.815, slightly higher than the 2.647 for the liberal arts affiliates, and slightly lower than the 2.816 and 2.867 means for the natural science and social science affiliates. This item appeared to have contributed to the differences detected between the liberal arts affiliates and the social science affiliates, who again were slightly more positive.

With regard to the differing faculty groups, the differences were consistent with those of the affiliated groups, but less pronounced. The mean for the liberal arts faculty was 2.647, while the natural science and social science faculty respondents recorded means of 2.090 and 2.913 respectively.

The majority of the Academic Council and the differing affiliated groups disagreed strongly or disagreed with Item 36 which asserted that students are satisfied with their present role in academic governance. More than 50 percent of the liberal arts and natural science faculty

respondents disagreed or disagreed strongly, while the social science faculty representatives were equally divided between agreement and disagreement on this item. One could surmise that the reason for this disagreement stems from the specific exclusion of students from consideration of matters of exclusive concern to the faculty. One student remarked that, "I seriously doubt that there are any matters that do not affect students in some way. I think the students' role should be expanded."

The mean score for the Academic Council was found to be 2.753 on this item and was exceeded by the 3.000 mean for the liberal arts affiliates. The respondents affiliated with the social sciences recorded a mean score of 2.593 while the natural science affiliates' mean of 2.735 was exceedingly similar to that of the entire Academic Council.

Among the differing faculty groups, the liberal arts faculty respondents disagreed most strongly with Item 36 with a group mean of 3.000 as compared with 2.700 for the natural science faculty group and 2.625 for the social science group. For both of these comparisons, the differences in group means appear to contribute to the differences between liberal arts affiliates and liberal arts faculty and social science affiliates and faculty. The social science groups continued to be most positive toward Academic Council student involvement, while the liberal arts groups were least positive.

The second set of items in the Community Cohesion scale contained four items eliciting responses from the members of the Academic Council with respect to the quality of various aspects of administrator-faculty-student relationships in the Academic Council setting.

The members of the Academic Council were evenly split between agreement and disagreement with respect to statements concerning student participation on the Academic Council as promoting higher levels of trust among administrators, faculty, and students. The Council respondents indicated that student involvement has opened new channels of communication by agreeing that many of the differences between students and non-students have been reconciled outside of Council meetings. The selection of student representatives to the Academic Council on the basis of college affiliation received a vote of confidence from the responding Academic Council members.

Items 13 and 17 asked for the reaction of the Academic Council to the statement that formal student involvement has promoted a higher level of trust among students, faculty, and administrators on the Academic Council. The Council's mean responses for Items 13 and 17 were 2.528 and 2.517 respectively. In each case, less than 50 percent of the respondents agreed or strongly agreed with the statement.

Among the affiliated groups found to be significantly different on this scale, the liberal arts affiliates were least positive towards student participation as a means of promoting greater trust among the factions of the M.S.U. academic community. Their mean scores were found to be 2.647 and 2.588 for Items 13 and 17. The comparative means of the natural science and social science affiliates were 2.605 and 2.407 respectively for Item 13 and 2.568 and 2.499 for Item 17.

The differing faculty groups responded to Items 13 and 17 in a manner consistent with the affiliated groups with the social science faculty representatives indicating more positive attitudes than the liberal arts and natural science faculty representatives. The social science faculty had means of 2.407 and 2.429 on Items 13 and 17. The comparable scores of the liberal arts faculty were 2.636 and 2.727. The natural science faculty representatives had means of 2.696 and 2.591 on these items. These differences among both the faculty and affiliated groups were consistent with the ANOVA and Scheffe' results, and even though the differences were relatively small, they appear to contribute somewhat to those results.

The statement that many of the differences between students and non-students have been reconciled outside of Council meetings (Item 75) found agreement or strong agreement among 59.5 percent of the Academic Council. The Council's mean score for this item was 2.354. The

social science affiliates and faculty representatives each had a mean of 2.000, while the comparable means of the liberal arts affiliates and faculty were 2.235 and 2.364. The means of the natural science affiliates and faculty representatives were 2.278 and 2.286, very close to the means of the liberal arts group. Although each of the groups had greater than 60 percent of its respondents indicating a "2" or "agree" response, a greater percentage of the social science groups indicated strong agreement than was the case for either the natural science or liberal arts groups. As is the case in previous items, the actual mean difference among the groups was relatively small, but consistent with the ANOVA and Scheffe' findings.

The final item in this section stated that the selection of student representatives on the basis of their college affiliation rather than by at-large elections, provided for greater academic representation and should be continued. This statement found substantial agreement among the Academic Council members as indicated by the 1.920 mean score and the fact that 88.7 percent of the respondents either agreed or strongly agreed with the item.

The social science affiliates tended to be more agreeable toward the statement than the liberal arts affiliates as indicated by the 2.176 mean score for the

liberal arts group and the 1.759 score for the social science affiliates. The natural science affiliates had a mean score of 1.889 on this item, indicating that they were more similar to the social science affiliates than to the liberal arts affiliates on this item. Therefore, this item appeared to contribute to the statistical difference found between the liberal arts and social science affiliates, but not to the difference detected between the social science affiliates and the combined group of liberal arts and natural science affiliates.

Among the faculty groups found to be statistically different, the social science faculty representatives continued to have the most positive attitudes as indicated by their group mean of 1.833. The natural science faculty was very similar to the social science faculty with a mean of 1.857, slightly lower than the liberal arts faculty mean of 1.909. In each of the faculty groups, more than 90 percent of the respondents either agreed or strongly agreed that representatives should be selected on the basis of their college affiliation rather than by an at-large election.

The third and final set of items to be considered on the Community Cohesion scale dealt with the question of the impact of the Academic Council student participation on campus-wide communication and understanding. The responses of the Academic Council show that, while the

respondents felt that Council student involvement had encouraged constructive student action (Item 6) and made Council decisions more acceptable to students (Item 12), it had not reduced the potential for campus violence (Item 10), nor had it promoted communication among students, faculty, and administrators who are not Council members (Item 11).

The responding Council members felt that the Academic Council has resulted in greater faculty confidence in the judgement of both undergraduates (Item 73), and graduates (Item 74), and that it has resulted in the faculty and administrative members of the Academic Council becoming more knowledgeable about the needs and concerns of the student population (Item 76). The Council members do not feel that the student members of that body represent their constituents better than their non-student colleagues (Item 43), nor do they feel that the students are effective in communicating their Council experiences to their constituents (Item 45). The Council's responses raise the interesting question as to how the non-student members perceive their role in relation to their constituents.

With regard to Item 6, stating that student participation has encouraged constructive student action, the mean score of the Council was a favorable 2.143. Slightly less favorable was the mean score of the natural science

affiliates of 2.289 and that of the liberal arts affiliates of 2.235. The mode, or response of greatest frequency, for the Council and each of the three affiliated groups was a "2" or agreement.

With respect to the faculty groups affiliated with the liberal arts, natural sciences, and social sciences, each of these three groups had, on this item, mean scores that were slightly higher, in contrast with the previous group comparison, with the exception of the social science faculty. The liberal arts faculty were least positive with a mean of 2.455 followed closely by 2.304 for the natural science faculty representatives. The social science faculty continued to be the most favorable faculty group toward Academic Council student participation as a means of promoting constructive student action. Its mean on Item 6 was found to be 1.897, more positive than either of the other faculty groups, and also more positive than the mean response of 2.143 for the entire Council. In each case, the majority of all faculty groups responded with a "2" or "agree" on Item 6.

The mean score of 2.337 and the observation that 66.3 percent of the Academic Council felt that student involvement in Council decision-making has made decisions of that body more acceptable to the student body (Item 12), constitutes substantial evidence in favor of student participation as a means of strengthening the academic

community. As in previous items, those Council members affiliated with the social sciences held the more positive attitude as indicated by their mean score of 2.272. Those affiliated with the natural sciences were only slightly less positive, having a mean score of 2.389, while the least positive were those affiliated with the liberal arts, scoring a mean of 2.588. The majority of the liberal arts affiliates (64 percent) indicated that they disagreed with Item 12, while 72.2 percent of the natural science affiliates indicated agreement as did 62.1 percent of those affiliated with the social sciences.

An examination of the faculty groups shows much the same results. The liberal arts faculty representatives were least positive with a mean score of 2.727, slightly higher than the mean for the liberal arts affiliates. The natural science faculty mean of 2.333 was nearly the same as that of the natural science affiliates, while the 2.059 mean for the social science faculty was lower and hence, more positive, than the social science affiliates' mean. The mean differences between the social science faculty and the liberal arts faculty were relatively substantial and appeared to contribute to the ANOVA and Scheffe' results. The differences between the social science faculty and the natural science faculty was not as large, but it was consistent with the statistical differences.

As a whole, the Academic Council disagreed with Item 10, stating that Academic Council student participation has reduced the potential for violent campus disruption. The mean of the entire Council was 2.689 with 55.6 percent of the respondents either disagreeing or strongly disagreeing.

The liberal arts affiliates continued to be the most skeptical of the three affiliated Council groups, of student participation as a means of reducing the potential for violent campus disruption. This group had a mean score of 2.941 with 70.6 percent of its respondents either disagreeing or disagreeing strongly. The natural science affiliates had a mean score of 2.667 that again placed them between the liberal arts and the social science groups. Disagreeing or strongly disagreeing with Item 10 were 53.7 percent of the respondents affiliated with the natural sciences. The social science affiliates were found to have the most favorable attitudes toward Academic Council student participation as a means of preventing campus disorder. But their mean score of 2.689 and the fact that 50.0 percent either disagreed or disagreed strongly, indicates that even this group did not feel that there was a strong relationship between Academic Council participation and campus disorder. Again, the differences among the groups found to be statistically different were relatively small, although they were consistent with the ANOVA and Scheffe' findings.

The faculty respondents affiliated with the three broad academic areas responded in much the same way. The mean for the liberal arts faculty was found to be 3.182, while the values of the means of the natural science and social science faculties were found to be 2.545 and 2.556 respectively. Among the liberal arts faculty 81.9 percent disagreed or strongly disagreed with the statement that Council student participation has reduced the potential for student violence. The corresponding figures for the natural science and social science faculties were found to be 45.4 percent and 50.0 percent respectively.

The statement that Academic Council student participation has promoted student-faculty-administrative communication among non-Council members (Item 11) was met with substantial disagreement among the entire Academic Council and also among the statistically different component groups. The Council's mean score was 2.784 with 65.8 percent either disagreeing or strongly disagreeing. The mean for the liberal arts affiliates was 3.059 and the corresponding figures for the natural science and social science affiliates were 2.833 and 2.643 respectively. Disagreeing or strongly disagreeing with Item 11 were 82.3 percent of the liberal arts affiliates, 69.5 percent of the natural science affiliates, and 54.2 percent of the social science affiliates.

The statistically different faculty groups continued in the same pattern as in previous items with the liberal arts faculty least positive and the social science faculty most positive. There were 100.0 percent of the liberal arts faculty respondents who either disagreed or strongly disagreed with the item resulting in a rather high group mean of 3.364. The corresponding figures for the natural science and social science faculty representatives were 81.0 percent and 50.0 percent expressing various degrees of disagreement and mean scores of 2.952 and 2.563 respectively.

For both sets of differing affiliated groups, the difference between liberal arts representatives and social science representatives appears substantial enough to have contributed to the significant differences detected among the mean scores of the various groups.

Item 11 stated that Academic Council student participation has promoted communication among members of the Michigan State University community who are not members of the Academic Council. The mean score of 2.784 for the entire Council and the observation that 64.8 percent of all respondents disagreed or strongly disagreed indicate that this generally has not been the feeling of the Academic Council.

The liberal arts affiliates followed the established pattern by disagreeing most strongly with Item 11. Their

group mean was found to be 3.059 and 82.4 percent of the respondents either disagreed or disagreed strongly with the item. The natural science affiliates were midway between the liberal arts and social science affiliates with a mean of 2.833 and 69.5 percent either disagreeing or disagreeing strongly. The social science affiliates continued to have the most positive attitudes among the three groups toward Academic Council student participation and communication outside the Council, but they, too, tended to disagree with a mean of 2.643. Fifty-three percent of its members indicated disagreement or strong disagreement.

Among the faculty groups, the same general trend continued with respect to Item 11. The liberal arts faculty had the highest, and therefore most negative, group mean response of 3.364. All 100 percent of these faculty representatives either disagreed or strongly disagreed with the item. The natural science faculty respondents had a lower mean score of 2.952 with 81.0 percent disagreeing or disagreeing strongly, while the social science respondents continue to hold the most positive attitudes. Their mean was found to be 2.563 with 50.0 percent of their group disagreeing or disagreeing strongly. This item, even though each of the dissenting groups expressed disagreement, appeared to have contributed to the differences found between the social science

affiliates and the liberal arts affiliates, between the social science affiliates and the combined group of natural science and liberal arts affiliates, between the liberal arts faculty and the social science faculty, and between the liberal arts faculty and the combined group of natural science and social science faculties.

There was general agreement among the members of the Academic Council with respect to Academic Council student participation as a means of providing faculty and administrative Academic Council members with greater knowledge concerning the needs and concerns of the student population (Item 76). The Council responded with a mean score of 2.184 with 77.0 percent of the respondents either agreeing or strongly agreeing with the item. This response would seem to indicate that student participation at the Academic Council level has, to a degree, accomplished a step toward bringing the University community together by virtue of providing greater information to faculty and administrators concerning the needs and concerns of the student body.

The majority of the liberal arts affiliates (53.3 percent) disagreed with this statement, while 57.2 percent of the natural science affiliates and 66.7 percent of the social science affiliates expressed either agreement or strong agreement. A comparison of the mean scores reflects this difference in distribution. The liberal arts

associates had a mean of 2.667 as compared with 2.350 for the natural science affiliates and 2.143 for the social science affiliates.

The differences among the faculty groups were slightly more pronounced. Disagreeing with the statement were 66.7 percent of the liberal arts faculty respondents. Among the natural science faculty, 65.0 percent agreed with the statement and 71.4 percent of the social science faculty either agreed or strongly agreed. A comparison of the faculty means on this item shows that the liberal arts group had a mean of 2.667, the natural science group had a 2.350 mean, and the mean of the social science faculty was 2.143. This item also appears to have contributed to the ANOVA and Scheffe' differences detected between the social science and liberal arts affiliates, between the social science affiliates and the combined group of natural science and liberal arts affiliates, between the liberal arts faculty and the social science faculty, and between the liberal arts faculty and the combined group of natural science and social science faculties.

The Council also indicated that it believed that faculty confidence in the judgement of undergraduate students had increased (Item 73) and, in the judgement of graduate students (Item 74), it had also increased. The mean scores for the faculty were 2.282 and 2.298

respectively. Agreeing or strongly agreeing that faculty confidence in student judgement had increased, were 68.2 percent with respect to undergraduate students and 66.7 percent with respect to graduate students. The overall results for these items also indicated a favorable response by the Academic Council with respect to the one-year experiment in student involvement.

The liberal arts affiliates had means of 2.412 with respect to both undergraduates and graduates, and continued to hold the least favorable attitudes. The corresponding means for the natural science affiliates were 2.250 for undergraduates and 2.278 for graduates, while the social science affiliates responded with means of 2.192 for undergraduates and 2.200 for graduates.

An investigation of the distributions shows that 53.0 percent of the liberal arts affiliates agreed or strongly agreed that faculty confidence in the judgement of both undergraduate and graduate students had increased. The corresponding figures for the natural science affiliates were 72.3 percent and 69.5 percent, and for the social science affiliates, 76.9 percent and 76.0 percent with regard to undergraduates and graduates respectively.

The examination of the means and distributions of the differing faculty groups indicated that the liberal arts faculty disagreed with the statements that faculty confidence in student judgement had increased as a result

of Academic Council student participation. The natural science and social science faculty representatives agreed with these statements. The liberal arts faculty responded with means of 2.636 with respect to increased faculty confidence in both undergraduates and graduates. The corresponding means for the natural science faculty were 2.190 and 2.238, and 2.188 and 2.200 for social science faculty.

Disagreeing with both items were 63.6 percent of the liberal arts faculty, while 75.1 percent of the social science faculty agreed or strongly agreed that their confidence in the judgement of undergraduates had increased, and 73.4 percent responded similarly with respect to confidence in graduate students. The natural science faculty fell in between with 70.4 percent agreeing or strongly agreeing with respect to undergraduate students and 66.6 percent for graduate students.

These differences appeared to contribute most to the statistical differences found between the liberal arts faculty and social science faculty representatives, and to a lesser degree, to the differences found between the liberal arts affiliates and the social science affiliates. The statistically significant differences between the social science affiliates and the combined group of liberal arts and natural science affiliates, and between the liberal arts faculty and the combined group of natural science and social science faculty are

consistent with the mean differences on these two items.

The Academic Council is not convinced that the student members of the Council are effective in communicating their Council experience to their constituents (Item 45). The Council had a mean score of 2.720 and 66.7 percent of the respondents disagreed or strongly disagreed with the item.

The liberal arts affiliates had a mean of 2.875 on this item with 81.3 percent expressing either disagreement or strong disagreement. The social science affiliates were considerably more positive with regard to the effectiveness of student Academic Council members in communicating their experiences to their constituents. Their mean response was found to be 2.318 with 63.6 percent of the respondents agreeing or strongly agreeing with the item. The natural science affiliates fell slightly above their liberal arts counterparts with a mean score of 2.879 and with 75.7 percent either disagreeing or strongly disagreeing. This item appears to be an important contributor to the differences found between the social science affiliates and the combined group of liberal arts and natural science affiliates, and also to the difference between the social science and liberal arts affiliates.

The faculty group comparison showed that the social science faculty was evenly divided between agreement

and disagreement and had a mean score of 2.500. Only slightly higher at 2.684 was the group mean of the natural science faculty, 63.2 percent of whom disagreed or strongly disagreed with the statement that the student members are effective in communicating their Council experiences to their constituents. The liberal arts faculty had the highest mean of 2.900 with 80.0 percent either disagreeing or strongly disagreeing with the statement. These differences are consistent with both differences found with the ANOVA and Scheffe' operation. However, this item appeared to contribute more substantially to the difference found between the liberal arts faculty and the social science faculty than to the difference between the liberal arts faculty and the combined group of social science and natural science faculty representatives.

The final item to be considered in the Community Cohesion scale stated that the student members of the 1972-73 M.S.U. Academic Council represented their constituents less well than do the non-student Academic Council members (Item 43). The Academic Council reacted negatively to this item, indicating attitudes favorable to student participation as shown by its mean score of 2.872 and the fact that 76.9 percent of the respondents disagreed or strongly disagreed with the item.

Among the affiliated groups, the social science affiliates had the highest mean score of 2.964, followed

by the natural science affiliates with a mean of 2.889, and the liberal arts affiliates with a mean of 2.706. Disagreeing or strongly disagreeing with Item 43 were 82.2 percent of the social science affiliates, 83.3 percent of the natural science affiliates, and 58.8 percent of the liberal arts affiliates. This item appeared to have had only a minor impact upon the differences found between the affiliated groups on the Community Cohesion scale.

The differences between the faculty groups were more pronounced, ranging from 1.909 for the natural science faculty, to 2.455 for the liberal arts faculty, to 3.000 for the social science faculty. Agreeing or strongly agreeing that the student representatives represented their constituents less well than did the non-student Council members were 90.9 percent of the natural science faculty, 54.6 percent of the liberal arts faculty, but only 11.1 percent of the social science faculty. While this item appeared to have made a substantial contribution to the difference between the liberal arts and social science faculty, it does not appear to have contributed to the difference between the liberal arts faculty and the combined group of natural science and social faculty representatives.

Summary. The Community Cohesion scale attempted to assess the impact of Academic Council student participation on subjective factors such as cooperation,

communication, satisfaction, trust and acceptance among the members of the 1972-73 Academic Council. The social science faculty representatives were found to have significantly more favorable attitudes in this regard than either the liberal arts faculty representatives or the combined group of liberal arts and natural science faculty representatives. These same differences were also found to exist among all those Academic Council members affiliated with the social sciences, the liberal arts, and the natural sciences.

The Academic Council was in general agreement that its administrative, faculty, and student representatives work together harmoniously and that all members feel free to express their views without intimidation. The Council agreed that while its current structure constitutes more than token student representation, its student members are not satisfied with the special exclusions placed upon them by the "Taylor Report". The Academic Council agreed that student participation has encouraged constructive student action and that the Council's decisions have been made more acceptable to the student body. Academic Council student participation has increased faculty confidence in the judgement of students and faculty and administrative representatives have become more aware of the needs and concerns of students. The Academic Council did not feel that student involvement at this level has had much impact outside the Council.

They strongly agreed that the selection of student representatives on the basis of their college affiliation should be continued.

Educational Value Scale

The final scale on the instrument, the Educational Value scale, is made up of ten items designed to measure the attitudes of the 1972-73 M.S.U. Academic Council with regard to Academic Council student participation as an educational opportunity for the students involved. These items are all of the four alternative Likert variety and include the following: Items 2, 7, 8, 9, 39, 42, 47, 65, 66, and 82.

Intergroup Comparisons

The first test for difference in population means on the Educational Value scale took place among administrators, faculty, and students on the 1972-73 M.S.U. Academic Council. The following table contains the group means, frequencies, and standard deviations for each of these three groups:

TABLE 56

Group Means, Frequencies, and Standard Deviations for
Administrators, Faculty, and Students on the
Educational Value Scale

<u>Group</u>	<u>n</u>	<u>Mean</u>	<u>Standard Deviation</u>
Administrators	20	2.27	.22
Faculty	53	2.20	.33
Students	20	2.51	.35

Using this data, the one-way analysis of variance technique was applied in order to detect any statistically significant differences in population means on the ten items that constitute the Educational Value scale. The results of this application are presented in the following table:

TABLE 57

ANOVA Comparison of Administrators, Faculty, and Students
on the Educational Value Scale

<u>Source of Variation</u>	<u>DF</u>	<u>Mean Square</u>	<u>F</u>	<u>P less than</u>	<u>Significance</u>
Between Groups	2	.7126	7.2138	.0013	Yes
Within Groups	90	.0988			

With an alpha level of .05, there is a significance difference found among the administrators, faculty, and students on the Educational Value scale. This difference was further tested using the Scheffe' post hoc procedure in order to locate specifically the source of this difference. Using the sample means recorded in Table 55, the following null hypotheses were developed for testing. The hypotheses to be tested included the following:

1. There is no difference between the administrators and students with respect to the Educational Value scale.
($\mu_A - \mu_S = 0$)
2. There is no difference between the faculty and the students with respect to the Educational Value scale.
($\mu_F - \mu_S = 0$)

3. There is no difference between the combined group of administrators and faculty, and the students with respect to the Educational Value scale.

$$\left(\frac{\mu_A + \mu_F}{2} - \mu_S = 0 \right)$$

Each of these null hypotheses were tested using the Scheffe' technique. The results of these statistical comparisons are presented in the following table:

TABLE 58

Scheffe' Post Hoc Analysis for Location of Population Mean Differences Among Administrators, Faculty, and Students on the Educational Value Scale

ψ_i	$\hat{\psi}_i$	$\hat{\sigma}_{\hat{\psi}_i}^2$	95% Confidence Interval Surrounding ψ_i	Significance
$\mu_A - \mu_S$	-.2400	.0994	-.4874 < ψ_i < .0074	No
$\mu_F - \mu_S$	-.3100	.0825	-.5153 < ψ_i < -.1047	Yes
$\left(\frac{\mu_A + \mu_F}{2} \right) - \mu_S$	-.2750	.0815	-.4778 < ψ_i < -.0722	Yes

These results, taken in conjunction with the sample mean scores yield significant statistical evidence that hypotheses 2 and 3 can be rejected with 95 percent confidence, and that the students are less favorable than either the faculty or the combined group of faculty and administrators. Viewed another way, both the faculty Council members, and the combined group of faculty and administrative Council members viewed Academic Council student involvement more positively than did the student members with regard to its value as an educational resource. This finding tends to indicate that the non-student Academic Council members, to a greater extent than the student members, viewed the students as learners.

The next comparison for population mean differences on the Educational Value scale concerns the long-term faculty Council representatives and their short-term counterparts. The means, frequencies, and standard deviations for these two groups are presented in the following table:

TABLE 59

Group Means, Frequencies, and Standard Deviations for Long-Term and Short-Term Faculty on the Educational Value Scale

<u>Group</u>	<u>Frequency</u>	<u>Mean</u>	<u>Standard Deviation</u>
Long-Term Faculty	17	2.16	.42
Short-Term Faculty	36	2.22	.28

Using this data, the one-way analysis variance test for equality of populations was undertaken yielding the following results in tabular form:

TABLE 60

ANOVA Comparison of Long-Term Faculty and Short-Term Faculty on the Educational Value Scale

<u>Source of Variation</u>	<u>DF</u>	<u>Mean Square</u>	<u>F</u>	<u>P less than</u>	<u>Significance</u>
Between Groups	1	.1858	1.6763	.1981	No
Within Groups	47	.1144			

The results of this test indicate that with 95 percent confidence, it cannot be inferred that a difference exists between long-term and short-term faculty.

The next comparison took place between the graduate and undergraduate student representatives to the 1972-73

M.S.U. Academic Council. The initial comparison of sample means and standard deviations necessary for the computation of the analysis of variance test for equality of population means resulted in the following data:

TABLE 61

Group Means, Frequencies, and Standard Deviations for Undergraduate and Graduate Students on the Educational Value Scale

<u>Group</u>	<u>Frequency</u>	<u>Mean</u>	<u>Standard Deviation</u>
Undergraduate Students	14	2.58	.37
Graduate Students	6	2.35	.26

Using this information, the one-way analysis of variance for equality of population means was performed. The following table summarizes this computation.

TABLE 62

ANOVA Comparison of Undergraduate and Graduate Students on the Educational Value Scale

<u>Source of Variation</u>	<u>DF</u>	<u>Mean Square</u>	<u>F</u>	<u>P less than</u>	<u>Significance</u>
Between Groups	1	.2273	.1787	.1787	No
Within Groups	18	.1160			

The results of this test for equality of population means provides statistically significant evidence that at the .05 level, there is no difference between the means of the undergraduate and graduate student members of the Academic Council.

The next comparison to be investigated concerned the administrators affiliated with the broad academic

areas of liberal arts, natural science, and social science. Also included in this comparison are those administrators on the Academic Council who have titles that are not restricted to any broad academic areas, i.e., Vice President for Student Affairs, Director of Libraries, etc. The data taken from the respondents is presented in the following table:

TABLE 63

Group Means, Frequencies, and Standard Deviations for Liberal Arts Administrators, Natural Science Administrators, Non-Affiliated Administrators, and Social Science Administrators on the Educational Value Scale

<u>Group</u>	<u>Frequency</u>	<u>Mean</u>	<u>Standard Deviation</u>
Liberal Arts Administrators	2	2.35	.21
Natural Science Administrators	6	2.27	.21
Non-Affiliated Administrators	7	2.32	.20
Social Science Administrators	5	2.17	.29

This data was then incorporated into the calculations for the one-way analysis of variance test for equality of means. The results of this test are presented in the following table:

TABLE 64

ANOVA Comparison of Liberal Arts Administrators, Natural Science Administrators, Non-Affiliated Administrators, and Social Science Administrators on the Educational Value Scale

<u>Source of Variation</u>	<u>DF</u>	<u>Mean Square</u>	<u>F</u>	<u>P less than</u>	<u>Significance</u>
Between Groups	2	.0071	.1366	.8734	No
Within Groups	16	.0522			

The results provide a statistically significant basis for the inference that at the .05 level, there is no difference among the administrators on the 1972-73 Academic Council when classified according to broad academic areas, with respect to the educational value of student participation.

The faculty representatives to the 1972-73 Academic Council were similarly classified and compared. The means, frequencies, and standard deviations for each of the faculty groups affiliated with the liberal arts, the natural sciences, and the social sciences were calculated and are recorded in the following table:

TABLE 65

Group Means, Frequencies, and Standard Deviations for Liberal Arts Faculty, Natural Science Faculty, and Social Science Faculty on the Educational Value Scale

<u>Group</u>	<u>Frequency</u>	<u>Mean</u>	<u>Standard Deviation</u>
Liberal Arts Faculty	11	2.33	.23
Natural Science Faculty	23	2.23	.28
Social Science Faculty	19	2.10	.41

The computation of the one-way analysis of variance test for equality of population means resulted in Table 66.

The results of this operation indicate that at the .05 level, there are no statistically significant differences among the three groups of faculty representatives to

TABLE 66

ANOVA Comparison of Liberal Arts Faculty, Natural Science Faculty, and Social Science Faculty on the Educational Value Scale

<u>Source of Variation</u>	<u>DF</u>	<u>Mean Square</u>	<u>F</u>	<u>P less than</u>	<u>Significance</u>
Between Groups	2	.1858	1.7561	.1832	No
Within Groups	50	.1058			

the Academic Council with regard to the mean scores on the Educational Value scale.

The final comparison of mean scores on the Educational Value scale took place among the student members of the 1972-73 M.S.U. Academic Council affiliated with the liberal arts, the natural sciences, and the social sciences. The means, frequencies, and the standard deviation for each group were calculated and recorded in the following table:

TABLE 67

Group Means, Frequencies, and Standard Deviations for Liberal Arts Students, Natural Science Students, and Social Science Students on the Educational Value Scale

<u>Group</u>	<u>Frequency</u>	<u>Mean</u>	<u>Standard Deviation</u>
Liberal Arts Students	4	2.65	.46
Natural Science Students	9	2.43	.36
Social Science Students	7	2.54	.29

The one-way analysis of variance test for equality of means was then conducted, yielding the following results:

TABLE 68

ANOVA Comparison of Liberal Arts Students, Natural Science Students, and Social Science Students on the Educational Value Scale

<u>Source of Variation</u>	<u>DF</u>	<u>Mean Square</u>	<u>F</u>	<u>P less than</u>	<u>Significance</u>
Between Groups	2	.0678	.5289	.5987	No
Within Groups	17	.1283			

The student members of the 1972-73 M.S.U. Academic Council, grouped according to their academic affiliation, did not vary with one another in terms of their responses on the Educational Value scale.

Discussion of Individual Items

As in the previous scales, the individual items, and the responses of the Academic Council to these items, and the responses of the significantly different groups will be descriptively discussed. The items in the Educational Value scale fall into two general groups which will be discussed separately. The first deals with those aspects of the Academic Council environment which either contribute to or detract from its value as an educational resource. The items in this section include the following: Items 2, 8, 9, 39, and 82. An additional set of items deals with the educational aspects of the Academic Council student participation and the student members' responses to these opportunities during the 1972-73 period. This section includes Items 7, 42, 47, 65, and 66.

The Academic Council as a whole agreed that the bureaucratic machinery has discouraged many of the student representatives (Item 2). They also agreed that the student representatives were deeply concerned and sincerely interested in participating in academic governance (Item 39), and that student participation develops student maturity and responsibility through out-of-class contact with faculty and administrators (Item 9).

The members of the Academic Council were indecisive with respect to the statements that Academic Council student participation is best considered in terms of its educational value for the student members (Item 8), and that the long separation in time between decisions and consequences of decisions, works against educational benefits for students (Item 82).

Item 2 related to the question of the bureaucratic nature of the Academic Council and student disillusionment and discouragement. The Academic Council had a mean score of 2.182 on this item indicating that many students have been discouraged. Seventy-five percent of the responding Council members either agreed or strongly agreed with this fact.

Expressing one side of the majority attitude, a faculty member commented that the highly structured procedures in the Academic Council precluded the active

give-and-take necessary for a truly educational experience.

Among the student, faculty, and administrative representatives, the only groups with statistically significant mean score differences, the administrators had the lowest mean of 1.833 followed by the students and the faculty. These means were found to be 2.100 for the student representatives and 2.340 for the faculty. The mode for these three groups was the same, with each group having at least 60.0 percent of its respondents choosing the "2" or "agree" response alternative. In this case, the lower scores indicate more negative attitudes with respect to Academic Council student participation as an educational opportunity. The mean differences of Item 2 were not consistent with the ANOVA and Scheffe' results, and therefore do not contribute to the statistical significance.

The response of the Council to Item 8, stating that Academic Council student participation is best considered in terms of its educational value for the student members, was fairly evenly divided between agreement and disagreement. The mean score was found to be 2.435 with 53.4 percent expressing agreement or strong agreement.

One of the administrators who was interviewed commented that, "Certainly student participation is educational, for the faculty and administrators, as

well as for the students, but providing educational experiences is not the function of the Academic Council."

The student members of the Academic Council had a mean score of 2.600, slightly higher and indicating less agreement than the 2.423 mean of the faculty and the 2.300 of the administrators. Agreeing or strongly agreeing with the item were only 45.0 percent of the student members of the Academic Council as compared to 55.8 percent of the faculty and 60.0 percent of the administrators. This item is consistent with the differences between the three groups as determined by the Scheffe' operation and appears to contribute to those differences.

Most of the responding members of the Academic Council (82.4 percent) agreed or strongly agreed with Item 9 stating that Academic Council student participation develops student maturity and responsibility through out-of-class contact with faculty and administrators. A student interviewee reflected that, "The most rewarding aspect of the academic governance experience has been meeting new people and establishing relationships with those whom I admire. I feel that the faculty are supportive and encouraging."

The mean score on Item 9 for the Academic Council was found to be 2.077. Among the students, faculty, and administrators, there was little difference in group means. The administrators recorded the lowest group mean with a score of 1.950 and 95.0 percent agreeing or strongly

agreeing with Item 9. The student members of the Academic Council were slightly less agreeable with a mean of 2.050 and with 90.0 percent either agreeing or strongly agreeing. The faculty members were least agreeable with a mean of 2.137, but 74.5 percent still agreed or strongly agreed that Academic Council student participation develops student maturity and responsibility. This item was not consistent with the Scheffe' results.

With respect to Item 39 stating that the student members of the Academic Council are deeply concerned and sincerely interested in participating in academic governance, 80.9 percent agreed or strongly agreed. The Council's mean score was found to be 2.257, indicating substantial agreement and a favorable attitude toward student participation at the M.S.U. Academic Council level.

An administrator stated that, "Most of the students have come to understand and accept the sometimes tedious procedures of the Council. Some, however, have become disenchanted, in approximately the same proportion as the faculty. Many are sincerely interested in governance, but some students, like some faculty, love to hear themselves talk."

The differences among the students, faculty, and administrators were not large, but consistent with the ANOVA and Scheffe' results. The students, surprisingly enough, responded most negatively to the statement that

student representatives to the Academic Council are deeply concerned and sincerely interested in participating in academic governance. Their mean on this item was found to be 2.421 with 63.2 percent agreeing or strongly agreeing. The administrative representatives to the Academic Council were more favorable with a mean of 2.211. Agreeing or strongly agreeing with Item 39 were 78.9 percent of the administrative representatives. The most favorable response was made by the faculty. Their mean score was found to be 2.039 and 88.2 percent of this group either agreed or strongly agreed. This item appears to contribute to the statistically significant differences found among the students, faculty, and administrators of the 1972-73 Academic Council.

The final item in this section asked the members of the Academic Council to respond to the statement that the long separation in time between decisions and the consequences of decisions, works against educational benefits for students (Item 82). The M.S.U. Academic Council was fairly divided on this statement. The mean score of the Council was found to be 2.472 with 53.9 percent expressing agreement or strong agreement and 46.1 percent expressing disagreement or strong disagreement.

The response of the student, faculty, and administrative component groups was found to be consistent with the statistically significant differences on the

Educational Value scale. The students were most agreeable with this item with 73.7 percent agreeing or strongly agreeing and a mean score of 2.053. The administrative representatives of the Academic Council had a mean of 2.579 with 52.6 percent agreeing or strongly agreeing, while the faculty representatives had a mean of 2.588 with 47.1 percent agreeing or strongly agreeing.

The second set of five items in the Educational Value scale dealt with the actual response of the student representatives to the Academic Council to these educational opportunities. The responding members of the Academic Council tended to agree that student representatives have developed maturity through being involved in the making of important decisions (Item 65), and that they have acted more responsibly in recent meetings than in initial meetings (Item 47). The Council also felt that the experiences of the student representatives have stimulated appreciation of the complexities of academic governance (Item 7), and that students have become more knowledgeable about the concerns of faculty and administrators (Item 42). The Council was fairly evenly divided, however, with respect to Item 66 stating that students are viewed primarily as learners by their non-student colleagues.

Looking at each of the items in this section individually, with respect to the Council as a whole and to the differing groups of administrative, faculty, and student

representatives, the following observations were made. With respect to Item 7, the Academic Council had a mean score of 1.802 with 85.8 percent of the respondents agreeing or strongly agreeing that the Academic Council has stimulated student appreciation for the complexities of the governance process. The mean scores of the differing groups were extremely similar. The administrators and the students had identical means of 1.800, while the faculty's group mean was only four hundredths higher. Looking at the distributions of these groups, 95.0 percent of the administrators, 84.4 percent of the faculty, and 80.0 percent of the students expressed either agreement or strong agreement with the statement. While this item does not contribute to the statistically significant differences found among the three groups, it does indicate a favorable attitude toward the M.S.U. experiment in student participation at the Academic Council level.

The response to Item 42, stating that the student members have become more knowledgeable about the concerns of faculty and administrators, also indicates a favorable attitude. The mean score of the administrators was found to be 2.053. Responding with a "2" or "agree" response were 94.7 percent of the responding administrators. The faculty were slightly more agreeable with this statement as indicated by their mean score of 1.904 and the observation that 94.2 percent either agreed or strongly agreed

with Item 42. The most positive response was made by the students. Their mean was 1.789 with 94.7 percent either agreeing or strongly agreeing. Again, this item does not appear to contribute to the statistical difference among the groups.

Item 47 asserted that students have acted more responsibly in recent meetings than in the initial meetings. Taken as a whole, the Academic Council leaned toward the agreement side of the scale with respect to this item as indicated by the mean of 2.367 and 63.3 percent of the respondents indicating agreement or strong agreement. There appeared to be substantial difference among the administrative, faculty, and student representatives on this issue. The student mean was found to be 2.889, considerably less agreeable than the faculty mean of 2.178, and the administrative mean of 2.313. This mean difference is accentuated by the observation that, while 68.8 percent of the administrators and 73.3 percent of the faculty agreed or strongly agreed with Item 47, only 33.3 percent of the students responded similarly. These differences appear to contribute substantially to the statistically significant differences found among these three groups.

With respect to Item 65, stating that most student members of the Academic Council have developed maturity by being involved in the making of important decisions, the Academic Council tended to respond favorably. The mean score was found to be 2.262 and the percentage of

respondents expressing agreement or strong agreement was 69.1. The student members of the Academic Council had the least favorable attitude on this item. They had a 2.316 group mean and percentage of either agree or strongly agree responses of 63.1. In comparison, the faculty respondents had a slightly more favorable group mean of 2.298, and the administrative respondents were the most favorable with a mean of 2.111. The percentages of faculty and administrators agreeing or strongly agreeing with Item 65 were found to be 68.1 and 77.8 respectively.

The final item of the Educational Value scale (Item 66) stated that the student members of the 1972-73 M.S.U. Academic Council are viewed primarily as learners by the Academic Council. By a slim margin, the majority of the Council agreed with this item. The Council's mean score was found to be 2.400 and 55.3 percent of the respondents agreed or strongly agreed that students are viewed primarily as learners.

Among the students, faculty, and administrators, the students were found to have the lowest of the three group means, although the differences were small. The student group mean was found to be 2.263 as compared to 2.316 for the administrators and 2.489 for the faculty. Agreeing or strongly agreeing with the item were 57.9 percent of the students and 63.2 percent of the administrators. In comparison, 51.0 percent of the faculty responded in this manner.

Summary. The Educational Value scale was designed to assess the attitudes of the Academic Council with respect to new student educational opportunities resulting from Academic Council student participation. The faculty representatives and the combined group of faculty and administrative representatives viewed student involvement at this level as a significantly greater source of student educational opportunity than did the student representatives.

Strong majorities of the Council agreed that student involvement at this level has contributed to greater student maturity and responsibility and that the student members have developed in this regard during the course of their involvement. The Council viewed Academic Council student involvement as stimulating student appreciation for the complexities of academic governance and for the concerns of faculty and administrators. A strong majority of the Academic Council viewed the student representatives as deeply concerned and sincerely interested in participating in academic governance.

Discussion of the General Items

The final group of items to be considered is not directly related to any of the four scales. These items either contain elements of more than one of the four scales, or were designed to elicit attitudes concerning Academic Council student participation with regard to

specific aspects of the M.S.U. plan which do not readily fall into any of the four scales. Because of the nature of these items, they were not tested for differences among component groups. Instead, they were handled descriptively, concentrating on illuminating the views of the entire Academic Council.

The first set of two items in the final section dealt with general aspects of the broad question of student participation at Michigan State University and in American higher education generally.

The members of the M.S.U. Academic Council tended to lean toward disagreement with regard to the statement that the students of today are much more capable of contributing to the academic decision-making process than those of earlier generations (Item 1). The Council's mean response was a somewhat neutral 2.618 with 57.3 percent of the respondents either disagreeing or strongly disagreeing. The Council was also relatively indecisive concerning Item 83, stating that the ideal form of academic governance is one in which there is a maximum degree of student participation limited only by the legitimate demands of the faculty. The Council's mean score on this item was 2.580 with 59.1 percent disagreeing or strongly disagreeing.

Reflecting upon one year of Academic Council student involvement, the members of the Academic Council tended

to agree, but by a small margin, that the addition of students has had little impact on the decisions reached by the Council (Item 26), and that this participation has had little impact on the priorities of the institution (Item 21). The mean scores for Items 26 and 21 were 2.451 and 2.167 respectively. The Council tended to disagree slightly with Item 24, that Academic Council student participation had made the Council more receptive to innovation. The mean score was found to be 2.589 with 54.4 percent disagreeing or strongly disagreeing with the statement.

In the interviews, the problem of size appeared again to be perceived as a source of difficulty. One Academic Council member stated that any governmental body of 134 people must establish such strict procedures that effective discussion is deterred. Another Council member expressed cynicism of the value of the Academic Council by suggesting that if it disappeared, few would notice and a lot of time would be saved.

In terms of impact on the Academic Council, all of the interviewed representatives agreed that student participation has made a difference, but this difference has been subtle and indirect. Among the comments concerning the student representatives' impact on the Academic Council were the following: "There has been a sensitization of the Council to student concerns."

"The students have gained the perception that they are part of the system."

"The main thrust of the impact of Academic Council student participation has been to sensitize administrators and faculty to student viewpoints. In this regard, the influence of the minority and women students have substantially exceeded the number of seats allotted to them."

"Student positions, at least have been considered, where they might not have been previously."

With respect to the proportion of students to faculty and administrators on the Academic Council, a strong majority of 72.1 percent of the respondents agreed that the present ratio should be maintained (Item 18), and 87.4 percent affirmed that the percentage of students should not be increased (Item 27). When asked to describe the position of the students, faculty, and administrators to an increase in the ratio of students to non-students on the Academic Council, more than 70.0 percent of the Council members felt strongly that such an increase would be opposed by the faculty (Item 62), opposed by the administrators (Item 63), but would be welcomed by the student body (Item 60). This series of items indicates that the Council perceives the students' view on this issue from a much different perspective than do the faculty and administrative representatives. The Council was indecisive with respect to Item 37, stating that the student

representatives would benefit greatly from some form of instruction in the history and philosophy of American higher education.

The next group of items dealt with comparisons of the various component groups of the M.S.U. Academic Council. The majority of the responding members of the Council agreed that the graduate student representatives are more sophisticated than the undergraduate representatives (mean of Item 56 = 2.373), but less so than either the faculty representatives (mean on Item 57 = 2.369), or the administrative representatives (mean on Item 58 = 2.190). The majority of the Academic Council respondents also believe that the faculty members attend meetings more regularly than do the student members (mean on Item 77 = 2.462), and that the administrators do likewise (mean on Item 78 = 2.317).

With regard to the at-large selection of minority and women student representatives to the Academic Council, the responding Council members recorded a mean of 2.293 on Item 4, indicating approval of the selection of student representatives on the basis of college affiliation rather than from the campus at large. The Council reaffirmed this opinion by their responses to Items 80 and 81. The Council's mean scores of 2.707 and 2.889 indicate disagreement with statements that the minority and women student Council members selected from the campus at-large,

represent their constituents better than do those students selected through their academic colleges (Items 80 and 81). An administrator on the Academic Council commented that the fact that the minority and women student representatives have had little impact on the Council should be taken in a complementary way--that race or sex has not been a decisive issue.

CHAPTER 5

SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, DISCUSSION, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Introduction

The 1972-73 academic year was particularly significant at Michigan State University in that it began a new era in the academic governance of that institution. For the first time, students were represented by voting graduates and undergraduates at the highest University decision-making body--the Academic Council.

The purpose of this investigation was to survey the members of the 1972-73 M.S.U. Academic Council in order to attempt to ascertain the attitudes of the Council members with regard to one year of formal student involvement at this level.

The primary source of data was a questionnaire composed of 99 forced choice Likert-type items. The instrument was designed to gather attitudinal information on four broad topics and on some specific aspects of the M.S.U. plan. These four topics included the following: Academic Freedom; Administrative Efficiency; Community Cohesion; and Educational Value. In addition to the

questionnaire data, 12 interviews were held with Academic Council members who did not respond to the instrument. These interviews produced information supplementary to the questionnaire and also provided a means for testing the representativeness of the respondents to the Academic Council as a whole.

The data from the questionnaires was then used to test for differences among the component groups of the 1972-73 M.S.U. Academic Council. On each of the four scales, the members of the Academic Council were classified and compared in the following ways:

1. Administrators vs. faculty vs. students.
2. Undergraduate students vs. graduate students.
3. Long-term faculty (more than two consecutive years of Academic Council membership) vs. short-term faculty.
4. Liberal arts affiliates (all administrators, faculty, and students affiliated with the liberal arts disciplines) vs. natural science affiliates, vs. non-affiliates, vs. social science affiliates.
5. Liberal arts administrators vs. natural science administrators, vs. non-affiliated administrators, vs. social science administrators.
6. Liberal arts faculty vs. natural science faculty, vs. social science faculty.
7. Liberal arts students vs. natural science students, vs. social science students.

The selected statistical techniques used for testing for equality of population means were the one-way analysis of variance followed by the Scheffe' post hoc procedure whenever appropriate. In addition, the group means and

distribution of responses of the entire Academic Council and the differing component groups were descriptively discussed.

Summary

Academic Freedom

A total of 25 items dealt with the impact of Academic Council student participation on the climate of academic freedom at Michigan State University. Academic freedom is here defined as the absence of, or protection from, such restraints or pressures that create, in the minds of the members of the academic community, fears and anxieties which may inhibit free and responsible study, investigation, discussion, or publishing. Stated more positively, academic freedom refers to a climate supportive of free and responsible academic pursuits. (164)

The analysis of variance and Scheffe' operations produced the following significant differences on the Academic Freedom scale:

1. The student representatives to the 1972-73 M.S.U. Academic Council have significantly more positive attitudes toward the relationship between Academic Council student participation and academic freedom than do the faculty representatives, the administrative representatives, and the combined group of faculty and administrative Council representatives.

2. The graduate student members of the 1972-73 M.S.U. Academic Council have significantly more positive attitudes toward the relationship between Academic Council student participation and academic freedom than do the undergraduate student Academic Council members.

3. The social science faculty representatives to the 1972-73 M.S.U. Academic Council have significantly more positive attitudes toward the relationship between Academic Council student participation and academic freedom than do the liberal arts faculty representatives, and the combined group of liberal arts and natural science faculty representatives.

The Academic Freedom scale proved to be the greatest source of differences among the various component groups of the Academic Council. This scale is comprised of nine general statements followed by eight statements, each of a specific decision-making area. With respect to these specific areas, the respondents were asked to express their attitudes concerning the appropriate student role in each of these areas, first for undergraduates and, secondly for graduates.

The Academic Council felt that its student members have important insights to make concerning faculty evaluation, that they understand the academic values of the University, and that they are more interested in improving programs than in determining what is to be

taught. With respect to the question of whether or not Academic Council student participation has resulted in more accurate appraisals of educational practices, the Council was evenly divided.

On each of these items, the social science faculty representatives held more positive attitudes than did their liberal arts and natural science counterparts. The graduate students were more positive than the undergraduates with respect to the ability of students to contribute to the evaluation of faculty teaching competence. The student representatives tend to respond more favorably than the faculty on this same item and more favorably than both the administrative and faculty representatives with regard to their perception that more accurate appraisals of educational practices have taken place as a result of Academic Council student participation.

The Academic Council as a whole disagreed with statements such as, Academic Council student participation has lowered the faculty's prestige and has threatened the academic freedom of the faculty. They further disagreed with those items suggesting that students have not exercised their voting privileges responsibly. The student representatives, generally perceived fewer negative consequences of Academic Council student participation than did either the faculty or the administrators. The responses of the social science faculty representatives to items

of this type were, for the most part, more favorable than the responses of the liberal arts and natural science faculties.

With respect to the appropriate decision-making role of students in specific areas, the Academic Council consistently approved of both graduate and undergraduate voting student representation when matters dealing with curriculum and general University policy are being made. Examples of this type of decision-making include evaluation of faculty teaching effectiveness, reconsideration of institutional priorities, assigning credit hours to courses, and making curriculum and course content decisions. Each of these items showed inter-group differences consistent with the ANOVA and Scheffe' results. In each case, the student representatives advocated wider student involvement than did the faculty and administrative representatives. The graduate students and the social science faculty representatives also consistently advocated a broader student role in these areas than did undergraduate students and liberal arts and natural science faculty representatives respectively.

The Academic Council did not feel that either voting graduate or voting undergraduate student representation was appropriate in a number of areas specifically relating to faculty concern. These areas included establishing and revising faculty hiring and promotion guidelines,

establishing and revising guidelines for approval of faculty research, and determining faculty salaries. In each case, the student representatives, and particularly the graduate student representatives, advocated a much wider student role than did the faculty or administrative representatives. In each case, the student representatives approved of voting student involvement while the faculty and administratives did not. The social science faculty representatives generally were more positive than their liberal arts and natural science counterparts with respect to student involvement in areas of primarily faculty concern, but they too tended to reject voting student representation in these areas.

Administrative Efficiency

The fundamental issue raised in the 22 items comprising the Administrative Efficiency scale was whether or not Academic Council student participation has made a difference in the efficiency of the decision-making process at Michigan State University Academic Council. And if so, has this difference added to or detracted from the Academic Council governance process.

The analysis of variance and Scheffe' procedures for determining and locating differences among population means produced statistically significant evidence concerning the following difference:

The social science faculty representatives to the 1972-73 M.S.U. Academic Council have significantly more positive attitudes toward the relationship between Academic Council student participation and administrative efficiency than do the liberal arts faculty representatives.

The members of the Academic Council felt that the incorporation of voting student representatives has brought new insights and information before the Council which might not otherwise have been considered, but at the same time, they disagreed with the statement that further increases in Council student participation would bring additional insights. The Council further did not feel that productive insights have been contributed by the minority and women student representatives at-large. On each of these items, the social science faculty representatives held more positive attitudes than the liberal arts faculty representatives.

With respect to the present structure of the Academic Council, the members felt that the student representatives would be better prepared to contribute to Academic Council decision-making if they were required to serve on a lower level decision-making body prior to holding membership on the Council. The Council soundly rejected suggestions that students be granted either academic credit or a salary for Council service.

The Council expressed agreement that the quality of the 1972-73 student representatives has been high. The students were perceived as having fulfilled the

responsibilities of Council membership, and as casting their votes on the basis of carefully considered evidence. While the Council felt that the inexperience of students has made governance more time consuming, they disagreed with the statement that the great complexity of academic governance precludes meaningful contributions by student representatives. In general, the social science faculty representatives responded more positively to items of this type than did the liberal arts faculty representatives.

With respect to the performance of the student representatives during 1972-73, the Academic Council felt that many of the student concerns might be handled more effectively at the lower levels of university governance, and that the short-range interests and concerns of students pose difficulties when the long-range interests of the institution are at stake. The Council responded with strong disagreement to a statement that students are easily intimidated. But, they were evenly divided on statements suggesting that the student members have been indifferent on many important issues, that the student members conscientiously prepare for Council meetings, and that student members tend to be open and flexible. The Council also expressed doubt with respect to statements that student participation has facilitated implementation of policies and regulations and that further increases in student representation would improve the quality of

decisions rendered. The social science faculty representatives continued to be more favorable toward Academic Council student participation than the liberal arts faculty representatives.

Community Cohesion

The 19 items of the Community Cohesion scale related primarily to subjective factors such as cooperation, communication, satisfaction, trust, and acceptance among the members of the 1972-73 M.S.U. Academic Council. The major thrust of these items was to assess these subjective factors in relation to the students, faculty, and administrators who held membership on the Academic Council of Michigan State University during the 1972-73 academic year.

A summary of the differences detected on the analysis of variance and Scheffe' procedures is as follows:

1. The members of the 1972-73 Academic Council affiliated with the social sciences (students, faculty, and administrative personnel) had significantly more positive attitudes toward the relationship of Academic Council student participation and community cohesion than did the liberal arts affiliates, and the combined group of liberal arts and natural science affiliates.
2. The social science faculty representatives to the 1972-73 M.S.U. Academic Council had significantly more positive attitudes toward the relationship of Academic Council student participation and community cohesion than did the liberal arts faculty representatives and the combined group of liberal arts and natural science faculty representatives.

The majority of the members of the Academic Council felt that the administrators, faculty, and students who are members of the Council work together harmoniously and cooperatively and that the student members feel free to express their views and do so without difficulty or intimidation. The responding Council members felt that the current plan for Academic Council student participation constitutes more than token representation, but that the student members are not satisfied with their present role in Council decision-making.

The Academic Council further expressed their feelings that student participation at this level has encouraged constructive student action, has made the Council's decisions more acceptable to the student body, and that faculty confidence in the judgement of both undergraduate and graduate students has increased. The Council strongly felt that faculty and administrators have become more aware of the needs and concerns of the student population, and they agreed that many of the differences between students and non-students have been reconciled outside of Council meetings.

The responses of the Council were evenly divided with respect to the question of whether or not greater trust has developed among administrators, students, and faculty as a result of Academic Council student participation. The Council members did not feel that student

involvement at this level has promoted communication among non-member students, faculty, and administrators, nor did they feel that it has reduced the potential for campus violence. They did not feel that the student representatives are effective in communicating their Council experiences to their constituents, but they also disagreed with the statement that the student members represent their constituents less well than do the non-student Council members. The Academic Council members strongly agreed that the selection of student representatives on the basis of their college affiliation rather than by at-large elections, provides for greater academic representation and should be continued.

The responses of the differing Academic Council component groups were generally consistent with the ANOVA and Scheffe' results. The responses of the social science faculty representatives indicated attitudes that were more positive than either the liberal arts faculty representatives or the combined group of liberal arts and natural science faculty representatives. The differing affiliated groups responded similarly.

Educational Value

The ten items comprising the Educational Value scale were designed to measure the attitudes of the Academic Council with regard to the new educational opportunities made available to the student members of the Academic

Council. Only one statistically significant difference was detected on this scale.

The faculty representatives and the combined group of faculty and administrative representatives to the 1972-73 Academic Council had significantly more positive attitudes toward the Academic Council as a source of educational experiences for students than did the student representatives.

The Academic Council was indecisive with regard to a statement that Academic Council student participation is best considered in terms of its educational benefits for its student members. Strong majorities agreed, however, that student participation develops student maturity and responsibility through out-of-class contact with faculty and administrators and, that it has stimulated student appreciation for the complexities of academic governance. The Council also agreed that the student representatives have become more mature by being involved in the making of important decisions, that they have acted more responsibly in recent meetings than in the initial meetings, and that they have become more knowledgeable about the concerns of faculty and administrators. A strong majority of the members of the Academic Council viewed the student representatives as deeply concerned and sincerely interested in participating in academic governance. A smaller majority agreed that the student representatives are viewed primarily as learners by their non-student colleagues.

A strong majority of the Academic Council members agreed that the Council's bureaucratic machinery has discouraged many students on the Academic Council. The Council also agreed, but by a smaller majority, that the long separation in time between decisions and consequences of decisions, works against educational benefits for students. Each of these differences on the individual items were consistent with the ANOVA and Scheffe' results.

General Items

Among these items were a number of statements relating to student participation at the Academic Council level from very broad points of view. Because elements of more than one of the four scales are contained in most of these questions, no testing for population mean differences was undertaken.

The members of the Academic Council tended to disagree slightly with the suggestion that the students of today are much more capable of contributing to the academic decision-making process than those of earlier generations. They were fairly evenly divided between agreement and disagreement with respect to statements that Academic Council student participation has had little impact on the decisions reached by the Council, and that Academic Council student participation has made the Council more receptive to innovation. The Council expressed agreement with the thought that Academic Council student

participation has had little impact on the priorities of the institution.

Concerning the proportion of students to non-students on the Council, the response indicated a favorable attitude to the present structure, adding that further increases in student representation would be applauded by the students, but disapproved by the faculty and administrators. The Council also indicated, by a slight majority, that student representatives would benefit greatly from some form of instruction in the history and philosophy of U.S. higher education.

The Academic Council members tended to perceive the graduate student members of the Council as more sophisticated than their undergraduate counterparts. The Council also agreed that many faculty members tend to vote with the students and against their faculty colleagues. The members of the Academic Council disagreed with statements that the at-large student representatives represent their constituents better than do those student members selected through their academic colleges.

Conclusions

Academic Freedom

As might be expected, the responses of the student members of the Academic Council tended to advocate a much broader role in academic governance than did either

the faculty or administrative representatives. In certain areas, however, which have traditionally been under the authority of the faculty, the students tended to agree, but less emphatically, with their administrative and faculty colleagues, that voting student involvement is inappropriate. Examples of these areas include matters dealing with faculty salaries, promotion, and approval of research tasks.

The social science faculty representatives were found to be significantly less pessimistic than either the liberal arts faculty representatives or the combined group of liberal arts and natural science faculty representatives with respect to the consequences of Academic Council student participation on academic freedom. Since no statistically significant difference was detected between the social science faculty representatives and the natural science faculty, it can be assumed that most of the difference between the social science faculty representatives and the combined group of liberal arts and natural science faculty representatives was contributed by the liberal arts faculty representatives.

The difference between the undergraduate and graduate student representatives proved somewhat surprising. The graduate student representatives consistently advocated greater authority for the student members than did the undergraduate representatives. However, the relatively

small percentage of responses, particularly from the graduate student representatives, may cast doubt as to the validity of these findings. In any event, the differences detected among the students, faculty, and administrative members of the Council appear to be amplified by the extremely positive responses of the graduate student respondents.

One of the conclusions that can be drawn from the individual items is that the quality of participation of the student representatives to the 1972-73 M.S.U. Academic Council has been generally perceived as quite high. The members of the Council feel that the student representatives are capable of making important contributions to the decision-making process at the Academic Council level, although occasionally they do not always do so.

There was little difference among the student, faculty, and administrative members of the 1972-73 Academic Council with respect to perceptions regarding the student members' understanding of academic values and with student interest in improving programs rather than determining what is to be taught.

The Academic Council perceives its student members as not acting in ways detrimental to the concept of academic freedom. The Council has not felt that student participation, within the established parameters, has threatened the climate of academic freedom at Michigan

State University. While these findings can be interpreted as a vote of confidence in the sophistication and responsibility of the student representatives, it could also be viewed, in part, as an indication of the diversity of attitudes among the student members. As indicated in the interviews, many of the student representatives seem to belong to interest groups that occasionally vote as a unit on issues. These student interest groups or factions oppose one another at times, thereby accounting for the Council's perception that the student representatives do not generally vote together in a block.

The items dealing with specific decision-making areas, and the appropriate student role in these areas, appear to be the major source of the statistically significant differences found among the component groups of the Academic Council. There was little difference in Council attitudes with respect to graduate and undergraduate participation in each of the selected decision-making activities. In most cases, the Council's mean score for graduate students was slightly lower than that of the undergraduates, indicating a slightly more positive attitude toward increased decision-making authority for graduates than for undergraduates. For both undergraduates and graduates, the attitudes of the Academic Council with regard to the proper student role in academic

governance appears to conform closely to the parameters set by the "Taylor Report."

Administrative Efficiency

The only statistically significant difference detected among the various Academic Council component groups on the Administrative Efficiency scale took place between the liberal arts and social science faculty representatives. The social science faculty group responded significantly more positively with respect to the relationship between Academic Council student participation and administrative efficiency. The largest differences between these groups occurred on statements such as the following: the complexity of academic governance precludes meaningful student contributions; the student representatives generally decide their stand on a given issue on the basis of the evidence rather than on the opinions of influential non-students; and students conscientiously prepare for Academic Council business. In each case, the social science faculty responded much more favorably toward Academic Council student participation than did the liberal arts faculty.

Perhaps equally significant as the differences with respect to the Administrative Efficiency scale were the lack of differences. There were no significant differences detected among the administrators, faculty, and students who hold membership on the 1972-73 Academic Council, nor

among the long-term and short-term faculty representatives. There were also no significant differences detected among the administrators, affiliates, and students, classified according to their broad academic areas.

The Academic Council agreed that student participation has made academic governance a more time-consuming affair. However, there was also an indication that the increase in time of decision-making may well be more of a function of size than of student participation.

As in the previous section, the majority of the Academic Council was found to be in general agreement that its student members are capable of making important contributions. Most of the administrators, faculty, as well as students, who are members of the 1972-73 M.S.U. Academic Council, view student representatives as contributing to the efficiency of governance by supplying new insights and information. However, the Council continued to reaffirm its present proportion of students to non-students by responding that an increase in student involvement would not contribute additional valuable input. The Academic Council did not feel that the women and minority student representatives have had a major impact on academic governance. Several of those Council members interviewed commented that the at-large student representatives have had a subtle impact and that their very presence often reminds the Council of its obligation to

serve in the best interest of the entire academic community. In addition, the provision of an additional channel for communication and input was considered extremely important by many of those interviewed.

The Academic Council does not believe that the complexity of governance precludes meaningful student contributions, but at the same time, they tended to agree that the student representatives are not immediately prepared to make major contributions. Most of the Council indicated that some prior departmental or college level governance experience should be a prerequisite for student Academic Council participation. Other expressed attitudes included greater staff support and resources for the student members and an expanded Elected Student Council. The Academic Council appears to feel that some type of orientation or support system is needed to maximize student contributions. There was strong disapproval expressed by the Academic Council with respect to granting either salaries or academic credit to students in return for Academic Council service.

Community Cohesion

The differences detected on the Community Cohesion scale were found to lie among those component groups classified according to academic affiliation rather than among the groups classified according to academic status. The faculty representatives affiliated with the social

sciences were found to be more favorably impressed than their liberal arts counterparts with respect to the relationship between Academic Council student participation and community cohesion. The social science faculty representatives were also found to be significantly more positive than the combined group of liberal arts and natural science faculty representatives. The social science faculty representatives were not found significantly different than the natural science faculty representatives. This leads to the assumption that the difference between the social science and liberal arts faculty representatives was the major contribution to the difference detected between the social science faculty representatives and the combined group of liberal arts and natural science faculty representatives.

Significant differences were also detected among the affiliated groups, i.e., groups composed of students, faculty, and administrators in each of the broad academic areas. As was the case in the comparison of faculty groups, those members affiliated with the social sciences had significantly more positive attitudes toward Academic Council student participation and its effect on community cohesion than either the liberal arts affiliates or the combined group of liberal arts and natural science affiliates. Again, there was no difference detected between the social science and natural science affiliates. This

indicates that the major contribution to the significant difference detected between the social science affiliates and the combined group of liberal arts and natural science affiliates was made by the liberal arts affiliates. Equally significant is the fact that students, faculty, and administrators were not found to be different on this scale, and that each group, in general, agreed that Academic Council student participation promotes community cohesion.

The responses of the Council to the individual items provides evidence that Academic Council student participation has generally resulted in improvements in intergroup and interpersonal relationships, understanding, and lines of communication among the administrative, faculty, and student representatives. While this development indicates that progress has been made toward a more closely knit academic community at the Academic Council level, no such development appears to have occurred beyond the Council.

A possible source of contention appears to exist among the student, faculty, and administrative representatives to the Academic Council. The current structure of the Council is generally perceived as going beyond token representation, but at the same time, the student members are not satisfied with their present role in

Council decision-making, presumably due to the limitations established by the "Taylor Report."

The evidence warrants the general conclusion that Academic Council student participation has resulted in greater confidence, communication, and respect among the students, faculty, and administrators who hold membership in the 1972-73 M.S.U. Academic Council.

Educational Value

The analysis of variance and the Scheffe' operations produced statistical evidence that there is a difference among the administrators, faculty, and students with respect to the Educational Value scale. Further, the administrative and faculty representatives perceived the Academic Council experiences as a much more important source of educational experiences than did the student representatives. This was the only significant difference detected among the various component groups of the 1972-73 M.S.U. Academic Council.

The Academic Council tended to view student participation at this level of governance as means of developing student maturity and responsibility through the sharing of responsibility with faculty and administrators. They also perceived the student representatives as ready, willing, and interested in pursuing these opportunities despite drawbacks such as the long separation of time

between decisions and consequences, and the massive bureaucratic Council machinery.

The student representatives tended to disagree more frequently than their non-student colleagues with the statement that Academic Council student participation is best considered in terms of its educational value for the student members. Surprisingly enough, they were also less agreeable with respect to the statement that the student members are deeply concerned and sincerely interested in participating in academic governance. The greatest difference, however, occurred on the statement that the student representatives have acted more responsibly in recent meetings than in initial meetings. The student representatives reacted much more negatively than either the administrative or faculty representatives, indicating perhaps that the students feel that they have acted responsibly from the beginning of their term of office.

Discussion

The results of this study indicate that a number of important differences exist among the members of the 1972-73 M.S.U. Academic Council with respect to student participation at that level. There were significant differences detected among the administrative, faculty, and student representatives on the Academic Freedom scale and on the Educational Value scale. With respect to the

Academic Freedom scale, the student representatives were much more likely to view the current plan for Academic Council student participation as supportive of the concept of academic freedom and, more likely to advocate expansion of student authority than were the faculty and administrative representatives. On the Educational Value scale, the faculty and administrative representatives saw Academic Council student participation as a much more valuable source of educational experiences than did the student representatives.

More surprising, however, were the differences detected among the faculty representatives to the 1972-73 M.S.U. Academic Council affiliated with the liberal arts, the natural sciences, and the social sciences.

The social science faculty representatives were more positive than their liberal arts counterparts with respect to their response on the Academic Freedom scale, on the Administrative Efficiency scale, and on the Community Cohesion scale. The social science faculty representatives were also more favorable than the combined group of liberal arts and natural science faculty representatives on the Academic Freedom and Community Cohesion scales. The inter-faculty differences on the Community Cohesion scale appear to have contributed substantially to the difference on this same scale detected among all members of the Council affiliated with the liberal arts, natural

sciences, and social sciences. These findings contrast sharply with those of Enos, who in 1971 found no difference among the M.S.U. faculty populations affiliated with these same academic areas. (54:211-212)

A number of possible reasons for the differences found in this study could be advanced for further testing by subsequent researchers. It is possible that in relation to the findings of Enos, the social science faculty Council members, for some reason, are less representative of their constituents than are their liberal arts or natural science faculty counterparts. It also could be possible that the social science faculty representatives could have been more favorably impressed with Academic Council student participation than their faculty colleagues, and that they have developed a more positive outlook as a result of their experiences with student involvement in academic decision-making. It could also be noted that the liberal arts related disciplines have the longest history and tradition in American higher education. And for this reason, perhaps the faculty representatives associated with the liberal arts disciplines tend to hold more traditional views toward academic governance than the representatives of the other academic areas.

No differences were found between the long-term and short-term faculty representatives on any of the four scales. It was felt that the experience of being actively

involved in the long hours of discussion and compromise might have affected the attitudes of those participating. The actual findings indicate, however, that this was not the case.

In the Enos study conducted in 1971, the populations of M.S.U. faculty and administrators perceived undergraduates as much better prepared and much better suited for involvement in curricular issues than in faculty personnel concerns. (54:209) The results of this investigation substantiate that the same is true for those faculty and administrators holding membership on the Academic Council. Although the Academic Council rated its graduate student representatives slightly higher than its undergraduate representatives with respect to their ability to contribute to the governance process, this difference is probably not meaningful.

The majority view of the M.S.U. Academic Council, including the faculty representatives, is that the student representatives have contributed to the academic governance process. But this seems to have taken place in a subtle and indirect way. The student representatives have made their faculty and administrative counterparts more aware of the student point of view. They have added new insights and information to the decision-making process along with freshness and vitality. They have opened new channels for constructive student action. From the interviews,

it was learned that very few issues were brought before the Council which directly concerned students, and therefore, in most cases, their special insights and perceptions were not fully utilized. However, the fact that they were voting participants, present during the discussions, and expressing their views, the students appeared to have been a significant, but subtle, factor. The presence of students tended to impart among the faculty and administrative members, an awareness of student concerns, thereby indirectly making the Council atmosphere more student centered.

Aside from Hook's contention that students have an underdeveloped sense of the importance of educational questions (78:63), the 1972-73 M.S.U. Academic Council agreed that its student representatives understand the necessity of promoting and preserving academic values. The processes by which the various M.S.U. academic colleges select their student representatives has been shown to be quite effective. The faculty and administrative representatives have indicated their confidence in the ability of the student representatives to contribute to the academic decision-making process in many areas, with the notable exception of faculty personnel and research decisions.

As a whole, the Academic Council, and most notably its student representatives, tend to agree with Schwarty who contends that the area in which the student critics

can be most effective is that area in which the professional biologists, historians, and economists who comprise the teaching faculty, are least prepared, that is in the area of teaching effectiveness. (163:62) The majority of the Academic Council, and particularly the social science faculty representatives, agree with McGrath's contention that in this area, the student representatives are sufficiently sensitive and qualified to make meaningful contributions by bringing forward new insights and perspectives. (106:52-53). But at the same time, the majority Council opinion closely parallels a section of the 1966 "Statement of Government of Colleges and Universities" which included the following statement: "Faculty status and related matters are primarily a faculty responsibility; this area includes appointments, reappointments, decisions not to reappoint, promotions, the granting of tenure, and dismissal." (169)

It would appear that any attempt at expanding the student role in these areas traditionally reserved for faculty would meet with strong faculty and administrative opposition.

The type of shared meaningful experiences that are necessary to develop a sense of shared purpose appears to have been provided at the Academic Council level by student participation on the Michigan State University Academic Council during 1972-73. The incorporation of

students by the Academic Council has opened channels of communication, understanding, and respect, which have begun to develop an atmosphere in which the academic community can be further developed and strengthened. Student participation at the Academic Council level does not appear to have had the effect on defusing the potential of violent campus disturbance that was reported by McGrath. (107) However, the broader aspects of the relationship between student participation at all levels of academic governance at Michigan State University and student violence were beyond the scope of this investigation and therefore were not considered. In addition, many of the national and international conditions which contributed to student violence during the late 1960's and early 1970's have changed considerably.

The majority of Academic Council members perceived student participation in Council decision-making as a valuable resource for the development of student maturity and responsibility. The Council further views this personal growth among the student representatives as a consequence of their role as participants with faculty and administrators in the making of important decisions. A potential source of difficulty can be identified with respect to the attitudes of the faculty and administrators toward their student colleagues. Dutton contends that the value of student participation can be maximized only

when students are perceived as mature and responsible persons with the ability to participate on equal terms with faculty and administrators (40:24). This is evidently not the case with respect to the 1972-73 M.S.U. Academic Council. Majorities of the Council and majorities of each of the administrative, faculty, and student components viewed the student representatives primarily as learners.

Recommendations

The question of whether students should or should not be permitted to play a significant role in the Academic governance of American colleges and universities has received considerable attention in the recent literature of American higher education. But considerably less has been written concerning implementation of specific programs. This study has attempted to assess the attitudes of those most closely associated with the M.S.U. experiment in Academic Council student participation, the members of the 1972-73 M.S.U. Academic Council.

This study was not designed to produce definite solutions to the problems involved with student participation at the Academic Council level. The nature of the design technically limits all inferences to the 1972-73 Academic Council at Michigan State University. However, if one adheres to the proposition that present events are shaped by those that have occurred in the past, then it follows that the future will be likewise influenced

by the present. An understanding of present problems and trends would prove helpful in the understanding and possible revision of the governance process at Michigan State University. Evidence from the present Academic Council members, those most closely acquainted with student participation at this level, should be an accurate indication of the basic workability of the present structure of the Council. In addition, limited application of these findings could be valuable for other large public institutions considering formal incorporation of students at the highest academic decision-making level.

The primary recommendation concerns the need for continued research. The future Academic Councils of Michigan State University should be continuously studied in order to determine ongoing trends with regard to Academic Council student participation. As one Council member noted, one year is far too short a time to accurately assess long-range effects of any major change in academic decision-making policy. The conclusions derived from this study should be considered as hypothetical rather than absolute, and as such, they require continuous verification as conditions at Michigan State change, and as new members gain seats on the Academic Council. It may prove fruitful to limit some of the future studies to those specific scales where more dramatic differences or similarities were discovered. It might prove

interesting to study further, and with more depth, those components of the Academic Council which were found to be different during 1972-73.

In lieu of further research evidence, the following observations could be hypothetically offered concerning M.S.U. Academic Council student participation. The perception of students as mature and responsible persons with the ability to participate, can develop only through successful and responsible actions of the student representatives. The data indicates that progress has been made in this direction and that the colleges have been effective in sending an exceptional group of student representatives to the Academic Council. Efforts toward maintaining the high quality of student representation should be continued in the future. Such efforts should continue to provide the type of Academic Council experiences conducive to improved decision-making and recognition of a unity of purpose.

While this investigation has provided evidence that the members of the M.S.U. Academic Council have generally been favorably impressed with the one-year experiment in student participation, they firmly rejected increases in student authority in matters pertaining directly to faculty personnel concerns, the exclusions incorporated into the "Taylor Report." It is apparent that no increases in the

student role in this type of decision-making is feasible without evidence of considerably greater faculty and administrative support.

The data indicates that the student representatives are not immediately able to contribute to the decision-making process. This suggests that some type of program be established to provide student representatives with the Academic governance orientation necessary to enable them to contribute more quickly to Academic Council decision-making. The members of the Academic Council tended to be indecisive with respect to providing some form of instruction in the history and philosophy of American higher education, but a strong majority favored requiring students to serve on a college or departmental decision-making body prior to serving on the Council. Another promising approach came to light during the interviews. A number of Council members suggested that some type of additional staff support should be made available to the student representatives. This could take the form of assigning individuals experienced in Academic Council affairs to act as resource people for answering questions, briefing the student representatives, and generally playing a supportive role. Each of these suggestions, as well as others, should be carefully considered as a means of promoting Academic Council efficiency.

The continuing attempt to determine appropriate student roles in academic governance has made progress during the 1972-73 Michigan State University academic year. These efforts must be grounded upon whatever is thought needed to create and maintain an environment within which the goals and objectives of the institution are most likely to be realized.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- 1 "AAUP Balks at Bylaw Flaws." Michigan State News, June 3, 1970, p. 2.
- 2 Academic Freedom for Students at Michigan State University. A report on the Faculty Committee on Student Affairs to the Academic Council. Michigan State University, East Lansing, Michigan, January 10, 1967.
- 3 "Academic Senate OKs Revised Taylor Report." Michigan State News, May 20, 1971, p. 1.
- 4 "Academic Senate to Decide Fate of Participation Report." Michigan State News, January 19, 1971, p. 1.
- 5 "Adams Backs Changes." Michigan State News, November 19, 1969, p. 1.
- 6 Adams, Walter. The Test. New York: The Macmillan Co., 1971.
- 7 Ad Hoc Committee Report on Student Participation in Academic Governance. Gerald J. Massey, Chairman. Michigan State University, East Lansing, Michigan, June 5, 1969, (Mimeographed).
- 8 Antes, Richard. "Involving Students in University Governance." NASPA IX, July, 1971, p. 48-56.
- 9 Armacost, Peter H. "Student Personnel Administration Policies," in the Handbook of College and University Administration, Vol. I. Academic, Knowles, Asa S. (ed.). New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1970, 7-17 - 7-35.
- 10 "ASMSU Sues to Stop Taylor Report Action." Michigan State News, February 5, 1971, p. 1.
- 11 Benezet, Louis T. "Continuity and Change: The Need for Both." The Future Academic Community: Continuity and Change. John Caffrey (ed.): Washington D.C.: American Council on Education, 1969.

- 12 Berdie, Ralph F. "A Note on the Government of Universities." Journal of College Student Personnel, Vol. 10, No. 5, September, 1969, p. 336-337.
- 13 Blandford, Barbara A. "Student Participation on Institutional Governing Boards." Higher Education Panel Report, American Council on Education, Survey No. 11, October 27, 1972.
- 14 "Board Sends Bylaw Proposals Back for More Alterations." MSU News Bulletin, April 1, 1971, p. 1.
- 15 Borg, Walter R. Educational Research: An Introduction. New York: David McKay Co. Inc. 1965.
- 16 Bowen, Harold R. "Governance and Educational Reform," Agony and Promise. G. Kerry Smith (ed.), San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, Inc., 1969.
- 17 Brewster, Kingman, Jr. "The Politics of Academia." A speech by the President of the Yale Political Union, September 24, 1969, (Mimeographed).
- 18 "Buckner Denounces Report." Michigan State News, January 12, 1971, p. 1.
- 19 Butler, William R. "The Meaning of Community--One Point of View." NASPA, January, 1970, p. 131-141.
- 20 "Bylaws Changed; The Next Stop: Trustees." MSU Faculty News, January 26, 1971, p. 2.
- 21 Caffrey, John. "The Future Academic Community?" The Future Academic Community. John Caffrey (ed.), Washington: American Council on Education, 1969, p. 1-15.
- 22 Caffrey, John. "Prediction for Higher Education in the 1970's." The Future Academic Community. John Caffrey, (ed.), Washington: American Council on Education, 1969, p. 261-292.
- 23 Chickering, Arthur. Education and Identity. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Inc., Publishers, 1969.
- 24 "Colby Constitutional Convention." The Chronicle of Higher Education, October 13, 1969, p. 7.
- 25 Cole, Joseph. "Student Involvement in Institutional Governance." Speech given at the 1968 NASPA Convention, (Mimeographed).

- 26 Corson, John J. "A Management Consultant's View:
Social Change and the University." Saturday
Review, January 10, 1970, p. 76.
- 27 Corson, John J. "From Authority to Leadership."
The Journal of Higher Education, XL (March, 1969),
p. 181-192.
- 28 "Council Action Not Expected." MSU Faculty News,
November 4, 1969, p. 1, 9.
- 29 "Council Debates Report." MSU Faculty News, November 10,
1970, p. 1, 3.
- 30 "Council Expected to Act on Proposals." Michigan
State News, February 1, 1971, p. 3.
- 31 "Council OKs Bylaw Changes." MSU Faculty News, May 19,
1970, p. 1, 4.
- 32 "Council Rejects Board 'Intrusion'." MSU Faculty News-
Bulletin, April 22, 1971, p. 4.
- 33 The Cox Commission Report. Crisis at Columbia. New
York: Random House Vintage Books, 1969.
- 34 Cutler, Richard L. "The New Role of the Student in
the Academic Society." An address presented at
the 21st National Conference on Higher Education.
Chicago, March 15, 1966, (Mimeographed).
- 35 Deegan, William L., Drexel, Karl O., Collins, John T.,
and Kerney, Dorothy L. "Student Participation
in Governance." Junior College Journal, Vol. 41,
No. 3, November, 1970, p. 15-22.
- 36 "Delayed Implementation of Report Seen Possible."
Michigan State News, April 22, 1971. p. 1.
- 37 Dewey, John. Problems of Men. New York: Philoso-
phical Library, 1946.
- 38 Dill, William R. "Decision Making." Behavioral
Science and Educational Administration. Griffiths,
Daniel E. (ed.), Chicago: University of Illinois
Press, 1964, p. 199-222.
- 39 "Draft Statement on Student Participation in College
and University Government." AAUP Bulletin,
Spring, 1970, p. 33-35.

- 40 Dutton, Thomas B., et. al. Assumptions and Beliefs of Selected Members of the Academic Community. A Special Report of the NASPA Division of Research and Program Development, April, 1970.
- 41 Dykes, Archie R. Faculty Participation in Academic Decision-Making. Washington, D.C.: American Council on Education, 1968.
- 42 Editorial. "Another Round Begins for the McKee Report." Michigan State News, June 24, 1970, p. 4.
- 43 Editorial. "Council Chicanery Merits Student Censure." Michigan State News, November 23, 1970, p. 4.
- 44 Editorial. "Entrenching the Faculty at Students' Expense." Michigan State News, December 2, 1970, p. 4.
- 45 Editorial. "For Both Our Readers, We Conclude an Editorial." Michigan State News, January 19, 1971, p. 4.
- 46 Editorial. "McKee Report is Back, But Not Emasculated." Michigan State News, February 27, 1970, p. 4.
- 47 Editorial. "Needed: Commission to Revamp the Channels." Michigan State News, January 12, 1971, p. 4.
- 48 Editorial. "Student Participation: Now an Illusive Dream?" Michigan State News, January 18, 1971, p. 4.
- 49 Editorial. "Students Lack Control Over Student Document." Michigan State News, December 1, 1970, p. 4.
- 50 Editorial. "Taylor Not Perfect, But..." Michigan State News, May 21, 1971, p. 4.
- 51 Editorial. "Taylor Report: Lesson in U's Official Channels." Michigan State News, January 6, 1971, p. 4.
- 52 Editorial. "Titanic Council: A Sinking Ship." Michigan State News, December 3, 1970, p. 4.
- 53 Elliott, Lloyd H. "Changing Internal Structures: The Revelance of Democracy." The Future Academic Community, John Caffrey (ed.), Washington, D.C.: American Council on Education, 1969, p. 44-55.

- 54 Enos, Brian Richard. "An Examination of Michigan State University Faculty and Academic Administrators' Opinions Regarding Undergraduate Student Involvement in Selected Academic Decision-Making Matters." An unpublished doctoral dissertation, East Lansing: Michigan State University, 1971.
- 55 Etzioni, Amatai. Modern Organizations. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall Inc., thirteenth printing.
- 56 Fedore, Robert Ryvan. "An Evaluation of the Report on the Academic Freedom for Students at Michigan State University." Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Michigan State University, 1969.
- 57 Finn, Jeremy D. "Jeremy D. Finn's Multivariate-Univariate and Multivariate Analysis of Variance and Covariance: A Fortian IV Program." East Lansing: Office of Research Consultation, College of Education, Michigan State University, March, 1970, (Mimeographed).
- 58 Foote, Caleb, et. al. The Culture of the University: Governance and Education. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Inc., Publishers, 1968.
- 59 Frankel, Charles. Education and the Barricades. New York: W. W. Norton and Company, Inc., 1968.
- 60 "Freedom Report Reviewed." Michigan State News, Welcome Week, September, 1968.
- 61 Friesen, Walter S. "Toward Community in Higher Education." An address given at Michigan State University, July, 1967, (Mimeographed).
- 62 "From Massey to Taylor: Two Views." MSU Faculty News, January 12, 1971, p. 1, 4.
- 63 Gallagher, Buell G. "Who Runs the Institution?" in Order and Freedom on the Campus. Edited by Owen Knorr and W. John Minter. Boulder, Colorado: Western Interstate Commission for Higher Education, October, 1965, p. 89-95.
- 64 Gallagher, Buell G. "Student Unrest." The American Student and His College. Edited by Esther M. Lloyd-Jones and Herman A. Estrin. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Co., 1967, p. 291-298.

- 65 Garner, William Harold. "Student Involvement in Collegiate Governance." The MSU Orient, Vol. 4, No. 3, Spring-Summer, 1969, p. 2-13.
- 66 Glass, Gene V. and Stanley, Julian C. Statistical Methods in Education and Psychology. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1970.
- 67 Glendening, Linda. "Post Hoc: A Fortran IV Program for Generating Confidence Intervals Using Either Tukey or Scheffe' Multiple Comparison Procedures." East Lansing: Office of Research Consultation, College of Education, Michigan State University, January, 1973, (Mimeographed).
- 68 Gross, Edward, and Grambach, Paul O. University Goals and Academic Power. Washington, D.C.: American Council on Education, 1968.
- 69 "Gould Foresees Hope and Accomplishment Arising from Today's Agony of Nation's Universities." The Chronicle of Higher Education, October 6, 1969, p. 6.
- 70 "Governing A College--How Much Should Students Have To Say?" College Management, IV, May, 1969, p. 30-60.
- 71 Haig, Frank R. "Institutional Academic Freedom." Liberal Education, LIV, December, 1968, p. 533-539.
- 72 Hays, William L. Statistics for Psychologists. New York: Holt, Rinehart, and Winston, 1963.
- 73 Henderson, Algo D. "Control in Higher Education: Trends and Issues." The Journal of Higher Education, XL, January, 1969, p. 1-11.
- 74 Henderson, Algo D. The Innovative Spirit. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, Inc., Publishers, 1970.
- 75 Hodgkinson, Harold L. "Students and an Intellectual Community." Educational Record, XLIX, Fall, 1968, p. 398-406.
- 76 Hodgkinson, Harold L. "Who Decides Who Decides?" Agony and Promise. Edited by G. Kerry Smith, San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, Inc., 1969, p. 139-144.

- 77 Hoffman, Stanley. "Participation in Perspective?" Daedalus: The Embattled University, XCIX, Winter, 1970, p. 177-221.
- 78 Hook, Sidney. Academic Freedom and Academic Anarchy. New York: Delta Books, 1969.
- 79 Hook, Sidney. "The Architecture of Educational Chaos." Phi Delta Kappan, LI, 2, October, 1969, p. 68-70.
- 80 Hook, Sidney. "Conflict and Change in the Academic Community." Papers prepared for the NASPA 52nd Annual Conference, Sheraton-Boston Hotel, April 1-4, 1970, p. 5-15.
- 81 Hook, Sidney. "Harold Taylor's Evasions." Phi Delta Kappan, LI, December, 1969, p. 197-198.
- 82 Horner, James T., and Horner, Rosemary L. "Student Involvement in Governance and Administration of Higher Education." NASPA, Vol. 4, No. 2, October, 1966, p. 59-64.
- 83 Howard, John A. "First Lecture." Who Should Run Universities? Rational Debate Seminars, Washington, D.C.: American Enterprise Institute for Public Policy Research, 1969, p. 1-34.
- 84 Ikenberry, Stanley O. "Restructuring the Governance of Higher Education." AAUP Bulletin, Winter, 1970, p. 371-374.
- 85 Jencks, Christopher and Reisman, David. The Academic Revolution. Garden City, New York: Doubleday, 1968.
- 86 Jennrich, Robert I. "1064 Analysis of Variance." Madison: University of Wisconsin Numerical Analysis Department Laboratory Bulletin, May 15, 1961, (Mimeographed).
- 87 Johnstone, D. Bruce. "The Student and His Power." The Journal of Higher Education, XL, No. 3, March, 1969, p. 205-219.
- 88 "Joint Statement on Rights and Freedoms of Students." Liberal Education, LIV, March, 1968, p. 152-158.
- 89 Keeton, Morris. Shared Authority on Campus. Washington, D.C.: American Association for Higher Education, 1971.

- 90 Kerlinger, Fred N. Foundations of Behavioral Research. New York: Holt, Rinehart, and Winston, Inc., 1967.
- 91 Kerlinger, Fred N. "Student Participation in University Education Decision Making." The Record, LXX, October, 1968, p. 45-51.
- 92 Kerr, Clark. "Governance and Functions." Daedalus: The Embattled University, XCIX, Winter, 1970, p. 108-121.
- 93 Keys, Ralph. "Student Involvement: The Why and How." NASPA, VI, October, 1968, p. 77-82.
- 94 Knock, Gary H. "Institutionalizing Student Participation in the Academic Community." Journal of the NAWDC, Summer, 1971, p. 171-175.
- 95 Lewis, Lionel S. "Two Cultures: Some Empirical Findings." Educational Record, XLVIII, Summer, 1967, p. 260-267.
- 96 Lewy, Guenter, and Rothman, Stanley. "On Student Power." AAUP Bulletin, Fall, 1970, p. 279-282.
- 97 "Longest Council Meeting for McKee Report Action." MSU Faculty News, March 10, 1970, p. 1.
- 98 Lunn, Harry H., Jr. The Student's Role in College Policy-Making. Washington: American Council on Education, 1957.
- 99 Mash, Donald J. "Participation in Campus Governance: A Stimulant or Depressant?" NASPA, Vol. 9, No. 4, April, 1972, p. 288-291.
- 100 "Massey Expresses Surprise at Misunderstanding of Report." Michigan State News, November 19, 1969, p. 1.
- 101 "Massey on the Massey Report: The Product of Consensus." MSU Faculty News, January 13, 1970, p. 4.
- 102 "Massey Report Remains Unacceptable to Council." Michigan State News, November 4, 1969, p. 1.
- 103 Mayhew, Lewis B. Colleges Today and Tomorrow. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, Inc., 1969.

- 104 Mayhew, Lewis B. "Faculty in Campus Governance." Agony and Promise. Edited by G. Kerry Smith. San Francisco-Jossey-Bass, Inc., 1969, p. 145-160.
- 105 Mayhew, Louis B. "Students in Governance--A Minority View." Students in the University and in Society. Whiteley, John M. (ed.), Washington, D. C.: Student Personnel Series No. 13, American Personnel and Guidance Association, 1971.
- 106 McGrath, Earl J. Should Students Share the Power? Philadelphia: Temple University Press, 1970.
- 107 McGrath, Earl J. "Student Governance and Disorder." Change, Vol. 3, No. 3, May-June, 1971.
- 108 "McKee: Power Loss Feared." Michigan State News, June 5, 1970, p. 1.
- 109 Miller, T. K. and Pilkey, G. P. "College Student Personnel and Academic Freedom for Students." Personnel and Guidance Journal, XVI, June, 1968, p. 954-960.
- 110 Millet, John D. The Academic Community. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Co., Inc. 1962.
- 111 Minutes of the Academic Council of Michigan State University, November 5, 1968. Office of the Secretary of the Faculties, Michigan State University, East Lansing, Michigan.
- 112 Minutes of the Academic Council of Michigan State University, May 27, 1969.
- 113 Minutes of the Academic Council of Michigan State University, October 14, 1969.
- 114 Minutes of the Academic Council of Michigan State University, October 21, 1969.
- 115 Minutes of the Academic Council of Michigan State University, October 22, 1969.
- 116 Minutes of the Academic Council of Michigan State University, October 27, 1969.
- 117 Minutes of the Academic Council of Michigan State University, October 28, 1969.

- 118 Minutes of the Academic Council of Michigan State University, March 3, 1970.
- 119 Minutes of the Academic Council of Michigan State University, March 5, 1970.
- 120 Minutes of the Academic Council of Michigan State University, March 12, 1970.
- 121 Minutes of the Academic Council of Michigan State University, April 7, 1970.
- 122 Minutes of the Academic Council of Michigan State University, May 12, 1970.
- 123 Minutes of the Academic Council of Michigan State University, May 15, 1970.
- 124 Minutes of the Academic Council of Michigan State University, October 6, 1970.
- 125 Minutes of the Academic Council of Michigan State University, November 3, 1970.
- 126 Minutes of the Academic Council of Michigan State University, November 4, 1970.
- 127 Minutes of the Academic Council of Michigan State University, November 10, 1970.
- 128 Minutes of the Academic Council of Michigan State University, November 17, 1970.
- 129 Minutes of the Academic Council of Michigan State University, February 9, 1971.
- 130 Minutes of the Academic Council of Michigan State University, April 20, 1971.
- 131 Minutes of the Academic Council of Michigan State University, June 1, 1971.
- 132 Minutes of the Academic Senate of Michigan State University, June 3, 1971.
- 133 Minutes of the Ad Hoc Committee on Student Participation in Academic Government, MSU, January 29, 1969.
- 134 Minutes of the Ad Hoc Committee on Student Participation in Academic Government, MSU, February 12, 1969.

- 135 Minutes of the Ad Hoc Committee on Student Participation in Academic Government, MSU, February 19, 1969.
- 136 Minutes of the Ad Hoc Committee on Student Participation in Academic Government, MSU, March 5, 1969.
- 137 Morrison, Robert. The President's Commission on Student Involvement in Decision-Making: The Chairman's Report. Ithaca: Cornell University, June 11, 1965.
- 138 Newcomb, Theodore. "The Contribution of the Interpersonal Environment to Student Learning." NASPA Proceedings, 49th Annual Conference, October, 1967, p. 175-178.
- 139 "Nominating Issue Solved." Michigan State News, April 19, 1971, p. 2.
- 140 "Open Senate Meeting Would Show Good Faith." Michigan State News, January 19, 1971, p. 4.
- 141 "Panel Appointed to Study Taylor Report Conflicts." Michigan State News, February 22, 1971, p. 1, 10.
- 142 "Passage Came Easier Than Some Expected." MSU Faculty News, January 26, 1971, p. 2.
- 143 Pinner, Frank. "The Crisis of the State Universities: Analysis and Remedies." The American College. Sanford, Nevitt (ed.), New York, John Wiley, 1962.
- 144 Powell, Robert S., Jr. "Student Power and the Student Role in Institutional Governance." Liberal Education, LV, March, 1969, p. 24-31.
- 145 "Professionals as a Sacred Cow." Michigan State News, Tuesday Supplement, January 12, 1971.
- 146 "Proposed Resolution for Academic Senate: Six Questions Concerning 'McKee Committee' Recommendations." Mimeographed Statement distributed to the Academic Senate of Michigan State University on June 3, 1970.
- 147 "Public Universities React to Unrest with New Rules, Greater Student Role." The Chronicle of Higher Education, February 9, 1970.
- 148 "Report 'Faculty-Supremacist' Drivel." Michigan State News, December 2, 1970, p. 4.

- 149 "Report of the Committee on the Student in Higher Education." The Student in Higher Education. New Haven: The Hazen Foundation, 1968.
- 150 Report of the New Committee on Student Participation in Academic Government. James B. McKee, Chairman. East Lansing, Michigan: Michigan State University, February 17, 1970, (Mimeographed).
- 151 "Report on Campus Called 'Power Grab'." The State Journal, January 12, 1970, p. 3.
- 152 "Report Provides A Voice." Michigan State News, February 25, 1970, p. 1.
- 153 "Report Reinforces Role of Students in "U" Affairs." Michigan State News, May 2, 1969, p. 1, 15.
- 154 "Report Study Tops List for Trustee Meet." Michigan State News, February 19, 1971, p. 3.
- 155 "Report's Weight Outlined." Michigan State News, January 28, 1970, p. 1.
- 156 Revised Recommendations Concerning Student Participation in the Academic Government: The Report of the Academic Council. East Lansing, Michigan: Michigan State University, Office of the Secretary of the Faculties, December 3, 1970.
- 157 Roth, William M. "A University Trustee's View: The Dilemmas of Leadership." Saturday Review, January 10, 1970, p. 64.
- 158 Rudolph, Frederick. The American College and University: A History. New York: Vintage Books, 1965.
- 159 Rudolph, Frederick. "Neglect of Students as a Historical Tradition." in The College and the Student. Dennis, L. E., and Kauffman, J. F., (eds.), Washington, D.C.: American Council on Education, 1968.
- 160 Sanford, Nevitt. Why Colleges Fail. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1967.
- 161 Sax, Gilbert. Empirical Foundations of Educational Research. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1968.

- 162 Schiff v. Hannah, Civil No. 5147, W. D. Michigan, October 14, 1965.
- 163 Schwartz, Edward. "Student Power--In Response to the Questions." The Future Academic Community: Continuity and Change. John Caffrey (ed.), Washington, D.C.: American Council on Education, 1969, p. 56-57.
- 164 See, Harold W. "Academic Freedom and Tenure." Handbook on College and University Administration--Academic, Knowles, Asa S., (ed.), New York: McGraw-Hill Book Co., p. 6-56, 6-76.
- 165 "Senate Rejects Faculty Bylaw Changes." MSU Faculty News, June 30, 1970, p. 4.
- 166 Sindler, Allan S. "A Case Study in Student-University Relations." The Future Academic Community: Continuity and Change. Edited by John Caffrey. Washington, D.C.: American Council on Education, 1969, p. 119-137.
- 167 Spolyar, Ludwig J. "Student Power: Threat of Challenge for Student Personnel." NASPA, VI, October, 1968, p. 74-77.
- 168 Stanley, Julian C. "Reliability." Educational Measurement. Thorndike, Robert L. (ed.), Washington, D.C.: American Council on Education, 1971, p. 356-443.
- 169 "Statement on Government of Colleges and Universities." Joint statement from the AAUP, ACE, AGBU. Washington, D.C.: AAUP (Reprint from the Winter, 1966 issue of the AAUP Bulletin.)
- 170 Stroup, Herbert. Bureaucracy in Higher Education. New York: The Free Press, 1966.
- 171 "Student Initiated Curricular To Be Adopted at Brown University." The Chronicle of Higher Education, June 16, 1969, p. 1.
- 172 "Student Participation: How Much, How Many?" MSU Faculty News, November 11, 1969, p. 2.
- 173 "Student Participation Report Passes with Some Changes." MSU Faculty News, November 24, 1970, p. 2.

- 174 "Students Are Gaining More Say in Governance, But Yale's Brewster Questions the Trend." The Chronicle of Higher Education, October 6, 1969, p. 3.
- 175 "Students Cite Strengths." Michigan State News, January 15, 1971, p. 1, 15.
- 176 "Students Gain Stronger Voice in Campus Decision Making." The Chronicle of Higher Education, March 24, 1969, p. 1.
- 177 Taylor, Harold. "Students, Universities, and Sidney Hook." Phi Delta Kappan, LI, December, 1969, p. 195-196.
- 178 Taylor, Harold. "The Student Revolution." Phi Delta Kappan, LI, October, 1969, p. 62-67.
- 179 "Taylor Report a Foot in the Door." Michigan State News, January 19, 1971, p. 4.
- 180 "Taylor Report Necessary." Michigan State News, January 25, 1971, p. 4.
- 181 "Taylor Report: No Viable Outlet." Michigan State News, January 19, 1971, p. 4.
- 182 "Taylor Report Under Fire From ASMSU Student Panel." Michigan State News, January 28, 1971, p. 1.
- 183 "The Debate Goes On: Council Passes Two Sections of Taylor Panel Report." MSU Faculty News, November 10, 1970, p. 1.
- 184 "The Scranton Report." The Chronicle of Higher Education, Vol. 2, October, 1970, p. 1-24.
- 185 "The Student's Role Expands..." College Management, January, 1970, p. 12-14.
- 186 "Three Institutions Pick Students As Trustees." The Chronicle of Higher Education, June 16, 1969, p. 12.
- 187 "Three Trustees to Study Report." Michigan State News, March 2, 1971, p. 1.
- 188 Tosi, Henry L., and Carroll, Stephen. "Management by Objectives." Personnel Administration, July-August, 1970, p. 44-48.

- 189 Tripp, Phillip A. "Organization for Student Personnel Administration." Handbook of College and University Administration, Vol. I Academic, Knowles, Asa S. (ed.), New York: McGraw-Hill Book Co., 1970, p. 7-3 - 7-16.
- 190 "Trustees Unanimously OK Student Participation." Michigan State News, March 3, 1967.
- 191 "U Committee Studies Student Participation." Michigan State News, March 3, 1967.
- 192 "USAC Undecided on Plans for Council Representatives." Michigan State News, April 12, 1971, p. 3.
- 193 Vaccaro, Louis C. "Power and Conflict in the University: A Search for Solutions." College and University, XLIV, Fall, 1968, p. 97-107.
- 194 Williamson, E. G., and Cowen, John L. The American Student's Freedom of Expression. Minneapolis: The University of Minnesota Press, 1968.
- 195 Wrenn, Robert L. "The Authority Controversy and Today's Student." Personnel and Guidance Journal, XLVI, June, 1968, p. 549-553.
- 196 Young, Kenneth E. "The Coming Conflict Between Students and Faculty." NASPA, V, January, 1969, p. 277-282.

APPENDIX A

APPENDIX A

Dear

For the past several years, the attention of many of us in the Michigan State University community has been focused on the issue of student participation in the university academic decision-making process. Indeed, this has been an issue receiving critical attention throughout the country. Because of your unique experience in working with students, faculty, and administrators, at the highest level of academic governance at Michigan State University, you are in a position to make a valuable contribution to the existing body of knowledge in this area.

The purpose of this study is to survey the opinions of the members of the 1972-73 MSU Academic Council regarding student participation in academic governance at the Academic Council level. The results of this investigation will serve as the foundation for a Ph.D. dissertation in the Department of Administration and Higher Education. The study has been endorsed by my doctoral committee and approved through the Office of Institutional Research and the Office of the President. While this study is separate and distinct from the institutional evaluation to be conducted after May 19, 1973, the results will be made available to subsequent researchers, and should be helpful in assessing the strengths and weaknesses of certain aspects of the current MSU experiment in student participation in academic governance.

Specifically you are asked to read carefully the instructions preceding each section and indicate your response on the separate answer sheet. Please use a soft lead pencil when responding. Be assured that your opinions will be treated in a confidential manner. The coding number that appears at the top of the answer sheet and questionnaire is to be used in identifying individuals and subgroups for follow-up and comparison purposes. Respondents will not be grouped according to affiliation with any specific university department, college, or discipline. The identity of the respondents will remain completely anonymous.

Your completing and returning the instrument and the answer sheet in the enclosed campus mail envelope by Monday, February 26, 1973 will be greatly appreciated. I would be happy to forward to you a copy of the abstract of the completed study. Should you like such a copy, or should you wish to comment on this study, please use the available space on the back page of the questionnaire.

Thank you for your consideration and cooperation in this matter.

Yours truly,

Thomas B. Shipley

APPENDIX B

155 Student Services Building
Michigan State University

APPENDIX B

Dear

A few weeks ago, I forwarded to you a copy of a questionnaire designed to elicit some of your opinions regarding the present scheme for involving students in the academic governance process at M.S.U. at the Academic Council level. You were selected as a participant on the basis of your first hand experiences in working with students, faculty and administrators on the Academic Council. I am sure you can appreciate how important it is for each council member to complete and return the instrument so that the data will be as complete and representative as possible.

I am currently at a standstill in my dissertation research because of a low rate of return from my first distribution. In the event that you did not receive the original questionnaire through some oversight on my part, or it has been misplaced, a duplicate copy is enclosed. I would be very grateful if you could take a few minutes to complete it and return it to me in the enclosed envelope as soon as possible. If you would like an abstract of the completed study, or should you wish to register additional opinions regarding the study or issue, please use any available space to so indicate.

As pointed out in my previous letter, this study has been cleared through the appropriate university channels and will serve as the foundation of my PhD dissertation in the Department of Administration and Higher Education. The opinions of individual respondents will be treated in a confidential manner and respondents will not be identified or grouped according to their affiliation with any specific department or college.

Thank you for your consideration and cooperation in this matter.

Sincerely,

Thomas B. Shipley

APPENDIX C

A SURVEY OF THE ATTITUDES OF THE 1972-73
MEMBERS OF THE MICHIGAN STATE UNIVERSITY
ACADEMIC COUNCIL WITH RESPECT TO ONE YEAR
OF STUDENT PARTICIPATION IN ACADEMIC GOVERNANCE

Section I: General Statements

Directions:

Listed below are a number of statements that could possibly describe aspects of the MSU Academic Council following one full year of student participation in academic governance. The four response alternatives represent values ranging from 1 to 4 on a numerical scale. Please mark the numerical value of the response alternative which most closely represents the extent to which you agree with that particular statement. The response alternatives with their numerical values are as follows:

- 1 = Strongly Agree with the statement
2 = Agree with the statement
3 = Disagree with the statement
4 = Strongly Disagree with the statement

PLEASE USE A SOFT LEAD PENCIL AND RECORD YOUR RESPONSE ON THE SEPARATE ANSWER SHEET.

- | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|-----|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | (1) | The students of today are much more capable of contributing to the academic decision-making process than those of earlier generations. |
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | (2) | The bureaucratic machinery, which often appears endless, has discouraged many students on the Academic Council. |
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | (3) | The student members of the Academic Council often have difficulty articulating their opinions in council meetings. |
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | (4) | The selection of student representatives on the basis of college affiliation (as opposed to an at-large selection process) makes these student members more accountable to their constituents. |

308

I believe that student participation at the Academic Council level:

S. Agree	Agree	Disagree	S. Disagree	
1	2	3	4	(5) has brought insights before the Council which otherwise would probably not have been considered.
1	2	3	4	(6) has encouraged constructive student action.
1	2	3	4	(7) has stimulated student appreciation for the complexities of academic governance.
1	2	3	4	(8) is best considered in terms of its educational value for the student members.
1	2	3	4	(9) develops student maturity and responsibility through out of class contact with faculty and administrators.
1	2	3	4	(10) has reduced the potential for violent campus disruption.
1	2	3	4	(11) has promoted communication among students, faculty, and administrators who are not Council members.
1	2	3	4	(12) has made the decisions of that body more acceptable to the student body.
1	2	3	4	(13) has promoted greater trust among students, faculty, and administrators.
1	2	3	4	(14) Those women students, selected from the campus at-large, often bring productive insights before the Academic Council which might not otherwise have been considered.
1	2	3	4	(15) Those minority students, selected from the campus at-large, often bring productive insights before the Academic Council which might not otherwise have been considered.
1	2	3	4	(16) At the present time, faculty, students, and administrators who are members of the Academic Council work together harmoniously and cooperatively.
1	2	3	4	(17) Since students have attained voting privileges, a higher level of trust has developed among students, faculty, and administrators.
1	2	3	4	(18) The present proportion of students to non-students on the Academic Council should be maintained.

The present plan for involving students in academic governance at the Academic Council level:

S. Agree	Agree	Disagree	S. Disagree	
1	2	3	4	(19) has brought information before the Council which might not otherwise have been considered.
1	2	3	4	(20) has facilitated implementation of policies and regulations.
1	2	3	4	(21) has had little impact upon the priorities of the institution.
1	2	3	4	(22) constitutes little more than token student representation.
1	2	3	4	(23) has resulted in more accurate appraisals of educational practices.
1	2	3	4	(24) has made the Council more receptive to innovation.
1	2	3	4	(25) has lowered the prestige of the faculty.
1	2	3	4	(26) has had little impact on the decisions reached by the Council.
1	2	3	4	(27) There should be a higher percentage of students on the Academic Council.
1	2	3	4	(28) Student Academic Council members have important insights and contributions to make to decisions involving the teaching competence of faculty members.
1	2	3	4	(29) The inexperience of students in academic decision-making affairs has resulted in a more time-consuming governance process.
1	2	3	4	(30) The student members of the Academic Council have been indifferent on many of the important issues.
1	2	3	4	(31) Many of the student concerns might be better accommodated at the lower levels of academic governance.
1	2	3	4	(32) The short-range interests and concerns of students pose difficulties when the long-range interests of the institution are at stake.
1	2	3	4	(33) Students usually tend to vote on issues in collective blocks.

I believe that most of the student representatives to the Academic Council:

S. Agree	Agree	Disagree	S. Disagree	
1	2	3	4	(34) are more interested in improving programs than in determining what is to be taught.
1	2	3	4	(35) understand the value of promoting and protecting opportunities for the learning and discovery of truth.
1	2	3	4	(36) are satisfied with their present role in academic governance.
1	2	3	4	(37) would benefit greatly from some form of instruction in the history and philosophy of U.S. higher education.
1	2	3	4	(38) conscientiously prepare for the business to be conducted during Academic Council meetings.
1	2	3	4	(39) are deeply concerned and sincerely interested in participating in academic governance.
1	2	3	4	(40) tend to be open and flexible.
1	2	3	4	(41) have fulfilled the responsibilities that accompany the rights of membership.
1	2	3	4	(42) have become more knowledgeable about the concerns of faculty and administrators.
1	2	3	4	(43) represent their constituents less well than do the non-student council members.
1	2	3	4	(44) feel free to express their views on institutional policy.
1	2	3	4	(45) are effective in communicating their council experiences to their constituents.
1	2	3	4	(46) carefully consider the evidence on both sides of an issue before casting their votes.
1	2	3	4	(47) have acted more responsibly in recent meetings than in initial meetings.
1	2	3	4	(48) generally decide their stand on an issue on the basis of the evidence rather than on the opinions of influential non-students.

311

The quality of the governance process at the Academic Council level would significantly improve if:

S. Agree	Agree	Disagree	S. Disagree	
1	2	3	4	(49) students were required to serve on a college or departmental decision-making body prior to serving on the Council.
1	2	3	4	(50) students were paid a small salary for their service to the institution.
1	2	3	4	(51) students were granted Academic credit for service to the institution.

Most of the student members of the Academic Council are able to make major contributions to academic governance:

1	2	3	4	(52) immediately.
1	2	3	4	(53) after a minimum of three months of Academic Council service.
1	2	3	4	(54) after a minimum of six months of Academic Council service.
1	2	3	4	(55) after a minimum of nine months of Academic Council service.

Most of the graduate student representatives to the 1972-73 Academic Council:

1	2	3	4	(56) are more sophisticated than most of the undergraduate representatives.
1	2	3	4	(57) are less sophisticated than most faculty representatives.
1	2	3	4	(58) are less sophisticated than most administrators on the Council.

312

I believe that further increases in student participation at the Academic Council level:

S. Agree	Agree	Disagree	S. Disagree	
1	2	3	4	(59) threaten the academic freedom of the faculty.
1	2	3	4	(60) would be welcomed by the student body.
1	2	3	4	(61) would bring valuable new insights before the Council.
1	2	3	4	(62) would be opposed by the faculty.
1	2	3	4	(63) would be opposed by the administrators.
1	2	3	4	(64) would improve the quality of decisions rendered.

Most student members of the Academic Council:

1	2	3	4	(65) have developed maturity by being involved in the making of important decisions.
1	2	3	4	(66) are viewed primarily as learners by their non-student colleagues.
1	2	3	4	(67) are easily intimidated by their non-student colleagues.
1	2	3	4	(68) Because students hold the balance of power when the non-student vote is split, students should not have voting privileges.
1	2	3	4	(69) The great complexity of academic governance precludes meaningful contributions by student representatives.
1	2	3	4	(70) Students have no greater right to a voice in academic governance than does an apprentice in the field of an expert craftsman.
1	2	3	4	(71) Many of the more student-oriented faculty representatives tend to vote with the students and against their more traditional faculty colleagues.
1	2	3	4	(72) The best hope for continued improvement in academic programs lies in gaining the contributions of all members of the academic community.

313

S. Agree	Agree	Disagree	S. Disagree	
1	2	3	4	(73) Faculty confidence in the judgement of undergraduate students has increased.
1	2	3	4	(74) Faculty confidence in the judgement of graduate students has increased.
1	2	3	4	(75) Many of the differences between students and non-students on the Academic Council have been reconciled outside of Council meetings.
1	2	3	4	(76) Faculty and administrators on the Academic Council have become more knowledgeable about the needs and concerns of the student population.
1	2	3	4	(77) The faculty members on the Academic Council attend council meetings more regularly than do student members.
1	2	3	4	(78) The administrators on the Academic Council attend council meetings more regularly than do student members.
1	2	3	4	(79) The selection of student representatives on the basis of their college affiliation rather than by at-large elections, provides for greater academic representation and should be continued.
1	2	3	4	(80) Those minority student council members selected from the campus at-large, represent their constituents better than do those students selected through their academic colleges.
1	2	3	4	(81) Those women student council members, selected from the campus at-large, represent their constituents better than do those student members selected through their academic colleges.
1	2	3	4	(82) The long separation in time between decisions and consequences of decisions, works against educational benefits for students.
1	2	3	4	(83) The ideal form of academic governance is one in which there is a maximum degree of student participation, limited only by the legitimate demands of the faculty.

314

Section II. Specific University Decision-Making Areas

Directions:

On the basis of your experience with student participation at the Academic Council level, please indicate the role in which students could best contribute to promoting and protecting academic excellence regardless of whether or not they presently participate in that particular activity. The four response alternatives represent possible student roles ranging from 1 to 4 on a numerical scale. Please mark the numerical value of the response alternative which most clearly represents the proper student role in each of the specific decision-making areas indicated below. The response alternatives with their numerical values are as follows:

- 1 = Strong Involvement. At least one-third of the voting members are students.
- 2 = Moderate Involvement. Students actively participate with voting privileges but less than one-third of the members are students.
- 3 = Advisory Involvement. Students are involved in the decision-making process in advisory or consulting capacity without voting privileges.
- 4 = No Involvement. Students are not involved in either an advisory or voting capacity.

Each item represents a specific decision-making area. Please consider each item twice, first as it applies to involvement by undergraduate student representatives, and secondly, to graduate student representatives.

Making decisions concerning curriculum and course content.

- | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|------------------------------|
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | (84) Undergraduate students. |
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | (85) Graduate students. |

Establishing and revising guidelines for hiring and promoting faculty.

- | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|------------------------------|
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | (86) Undergraduate students. |
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | (87) Graduate students. |

315

1 = Strong Involvement

2 = Moderate Involvement

3 = Advisory Involvement

4 = No Involvement

Establishing and revising guidelines for the approval of
faculty research tasks.

1 2 3 4 (88) Undergraduate students.

1 2 3 4 (89) Graduate students.

Revising admissions criteria.

1 2 3 4 (90) Undergraduate students.

1 2 3 4 (91) Graduate students.

Reconsidering institutional priorities.

1 2 3 4 (92) Undergraduate students.

1 2 3 4 (93) Graduate students.

Developing guidelines for assigning credit hours to courses.

1 2 3 4 (94) Undergraduate students.

1 2 3 4 (95) Graduate students.

Developing procedures for evaluating faculty teaching
effectiveness.

1 2 3 4 (96) Undergraduate students.

1 2 3 4 (97) Graduate students.

Determining salaries for individual faculty members.

1 2 3 4 (98) Undergraduate students.

1 2 3 4 (99) Graduate students.

APPENDIX D

APPENDIX D

MICHIGAN STATE UNIVERSITY

AD HOC COMMITTEE REPORT ON
STUDENT PARTICIPATION IN ACADEMIC GOVERNMENT

This report is now before the Academic Council, to be
acted upon by it and by the Academic Senate in Fall, 1969

Distributed by the Office of the Secretary of the Faculties

June 5, 1969

317
MICHIGAN STATE UNIVERSITY

April 23, 1969

TO: Academic Council

FROM: Ad Hoc Committee on Student Participation in Academic Government

SUBJECT: Committee's Report on Student Participation in Academic Government

1. History of the Committee's Report.

On November 5, 1968 the Academic Council directed the Committee on Committees to select an ad hoc committee "to study the matter of student participation in the academic government of the University, notably with respect to the question of the freedom of units of the University to determine whether or not student members will be given the right to vote". The Ad Hoc Committee was called together on January 15, 1969 and was directed to report to the Academic Council in sufficient time for the Council to report on the matter at the Spring Senate meeting. The Ad Hoc Committee was instructed that its recommendations should embrace the following: "number of student representatives, manner of selection, and capacity". (Quotations are taken from the letter of the Chairman of the Steering Committee to the members of the Ad Hoc Committee.) The Ad Hoc Committee consisted of 8 faculty members, 3 undergraduate students, and two graduate students. The Committee elected a chairman on January 15, 1969 and set about its task. The Committee resolved to devote several months to collecting information about the extent, nature, and effectiveness of student participation in academic government at M. S. U. and on other campuses. Letters requesting such information were sent to all deans, department chairmen, chairmen of college advisory committees, etc. The Committee is grateful for the large number of responses it received, and to the Office of Institutional Research for assistance in evaluating them. Simultaneously with collecting information, the Committee reflected on the nature of the university and the role students ought to play therein. The recommendations formulated below represent the Committee's consensus on the role students should have in academic government at Michigan State University.

2. The Committee's Recommendations.

Preamble. It is essential to the well-being of the University that faculty, administrators, and students perceive one another as mature, fellow citizens of an academic community the common good of which it is the joint responsibility of all to seek and promote. We believe that this joint responsibility requires that students, faculty, and administrators all have an effective voice in the formation and adoption of academic policies throughout the University. And we think that both the sense of community and the effectiveness of student participation is best achieved by bringing students, in sufficient numbers, into the existing policy-making and decision-making bodies and committees of departments, schools, colleges and the University, rather than by proliferating parallel student advisory groups.

General Recommendations.

Recommendation 1: Every administrative unit of the University shall have the authority to extend voting privileges on internal matters (Cf. Bylaws of the Faculty, 1.2.1) to any member or members of the university community.

Recommendation 2: Students shall, in general, be given vote on any body or committee on which they sit.

(We believe that the practice of granting voice without vote to students serves no useful purpose, but tends only to create distrust, to weaken the sense of community, and to reduce the effectiveness and value of student participation.)

Recommendation 3: The university learning experience shall be understood broadly enough to encompass participation in academic government. Accordingly, the University Educational Policies Committee shall prepare a report to the Academic Council on whether academic credit should be given for substantial participation in academic government and, if so, on the kind of credit and the manner and conditions under which it shall be awarded.

Recommendations concerning University-level Academic Government

Recommendation 4: In addition to its dean and elected faculty representatives, each college shall be represented on the Academic Council by one voting student representative (one for each college) who is selected by students in accordance with procedures approved

by the voting faculty of the college. The selection procedures should be developed by the College Advisory Council in cooperation with any existing college student organizations.

Recommendation 5: In addition to the college student representatives mentioned in recommendation 4, there shall be three voting undergraduate student representatives-at-large and two voting graduate student representatives-at-large on the Academic Council. The undergraduate representatives-at-large shall be selected in accordance with procedures established by Associated Students of Michigan State University. The graduate representatives-at-large shall be selected in accordance with procedures established by the Council of Graduate Students.

Recommendation 6: One student, to be elected annually by the student members of the Academic Council from among their own number, shall serve as a voting member of the Steering Committee of the University.

Recommendation 7: The appellation "faculty standing committee" shall be changed to "university standing committee". On each university standing committee there shall be voting student members in the numbers prescribed below. Undergraduate student committee members shall be selected in accordance with procedures established by Associated Students of Michigan State University. Graduate student committee members shall be selected in accordance with procedures established by the Council of Graduate Students.

University Curriculum Committee: 3 undergraduates; 2 graduates.

University Educational Policies Committee: 5 undergraduates; 6 graduates.

University Faculty Affairs Committee: 1 undergraduate; 1 graduate.

University Faculty Tenure Committee: 2 undergraduates; 1 graduate.

University Committee on Honors Programs: 2 undergraduates; 1 graduate.

Of the two undergraduate members of the Committee on Honors Programs, one should be a member of the Honors College or enrolled in an honors program, but the other should not be. The graduate member of this Committee should, as an undergraduate, have been enrolled in an honors college or program.

University International Projects Committee: 2 under-graduates; 1 graduate.

University Library Committee: 2 undergraduates; 2 graduates.

University Student Affairs Committee: 2 undergraduates; 2 graduates.

Because of conflicts of responsibilities pursuant to implementation of the Academic Freedom Report, a re-evaluation shall be undertaken of the charge, composition, and functions of the Student Affairs Committee and of the relevant portions of the Academic Freedom Report. The Ad Hoc Committee's recommendation concerning composition of the Student Affairs Committee is predicated on the existing structure and is intended to apply only until such a reevaluation has been completed and implemented.

University Committee on Business Affairs: 1 under-graduate; 1 graduate.

Recommendation 8: The composition and functions of the Graduate Council should be studied and evaluated, and the relationship of the Graduate Council to other academic bodies should be clearly stated in the Bylaws of the Faculty. Three graduate students and one undergraduate student shall sit as voting members of the Graduate Council. The graduate student members shall be selected in accordance with procedures established by the Council of Graduate Students; the undergraduate student member shall be selected in accordance with procedures established by Associated Students of Michigan State University. Working committees appointed by the Graduate Council should contain an equal number of faculty and student representatives. The Ad Hoc Committee's recommendations concerning the Graduate Council are predicated on the existing structure and are intended to apply only until the aforementioned study and evaluation have been completed and implemented.

Recommendation 9: The precedent of meaningful student participation set by the present procedures for the selection of a president of the University shall be followed in the selection of all principal academic officers of the University.

Recommendation 10: Every ad hoc or special committee of the University shall contain an appropriate number of voting student members to provide significant student representation.

Recommendations concerning College-level Academic Government

Recommendation 11: In each college, either the College Advisory Council shall have an appropriate number of voting student members to provide significant student representation, or else there shall be a separate Dean's Student Advisory Committee, or both. In the event that a college establishes a Dean's Student Advisory Committee but does not provide for significant student representation on its College Advisory Council, the Dean's Student Advisory Committee shall select one of its own members to sit ex officio without vote on the College Advisory Council, and the College Advisory Council shall select one of its members to sit ex officio without vote on the Dean's Student Advisory Committee.

Recommendation 12: Each college standing committee or ad hoc committee shall have an appropriate number of voting student members to provide significant student representation.

Recommendation 13: The procedures developed by a college for faculty consultation in the selection of its dean shall also provide for meaningful student participation.

Recommendations concerning Department-level (School-level) Academic Government

Recommendation 14: Each departmental (school) policy-making or decision-making or advisory body or committee shall have an appropriate number of student members to provide for significant student representation. In particular, there shall be a departmental (school) Teaching Committee, to be composed of an equal number of faculty and students. The Teaching Committee shall advise the department (school) on procedures for evaluating teaching, and on ways and means of improving both undergraduate and graduate teaching. The Teaching Committee shall submit to the department (school) an evaluation of the teaching ability of any person being considered for appointment, retention, promotion, or tenure.

Recommendation 15: The procedures developed by a department (school) for faculty consultation in the selection of its chairman (director) shall also provide for meaningful student participation.

April 23, 1968

Page Six

3. Changes to the Bylaws of the Faculty.

Implementation of the above recommendations requires that many changes be made in the Bylaws of the Faculty (1968). The substantial changes are listed in enclosure (1). The remaining changes are editorial in nature.

Respectfully submitted,

Gerald J. Massey

Chairman

Ad Hoc Committee on Student Participation
in Academic Government

Enclosures: (1) Changes to the Bylaws of the Faculty
(2) Roster of the Ad Hoc Committee on Student
Participation in Academic Government

ROSTER OF THE AD HOC COMMITTEE ON STUDENT

PARTICIPATION IN ACADEMIC GOVERNMENT

Bettinghaus, Prof. Erwin P. (Faculty Affairs Committee)
Brooks, Prof. Theodore J. (Student Affairs Committee)
Cummins, Mr. W. Raymond (Council of Graduate Students)
Dickmeyer, Mr. Nathan C. (Student Academic Council)
Grant, Prof. W. Harold (Comm. on Acad. Rts. & Respons.)
Hughes, Miss Susan S. (A.S.M.S.U.)
Keller, Prof. Waldo F. (Comm. on Acad. Rts. & Respons.)
Kelly, Prof. William W. (Director, Honors College)
Mandelstamm, Prof. Allan B. (Student Affairs Committee)
Massey, Prof. Gerald J. (Faculty Affairs Committee)
Nonnamaker, Prof. Eldon R. (Assoc. Dean of Students)
Patterson, Mr. Floyd A. (Council of Graduate Students)
Schack, Miss Gina D. (Undergraduate Student)

Changes to the Bylaws of the Faculty - 1968.

<u>Article</u>	<u>Change</u>
(1) 1.2.2.	Delete last three lines and substitute the following "any member or members of the University community".
(2) 1.2.6.	Substitute "members" for "faculty".
(3) 2.2.4.	Add the following: "Because the department chairman has a special obligation to develop a department strong in teaching capacity, it is appropriate that students be consulted in his selection or appointment".
(4) 2.3.1.	Substitute "school, and of students," for the first occurrence of "school".
(5) 2.3.2.	Add the following: "In particular, there shall be a departmental (school) Teaching Committee composed of an equal number of faculty and students. The Teaching Committee shall advise the department (school) on procedures for evaluating teaching, and on ways and means of improving both undergraduate and graduate teaching. The Teaching Committee shall submit to the department (school) an evaluation of the teaching ability of any person being considered for appointment, retention, promotion, or tenure."
(6) 3.2.3.	Add: "Because of the dean's responsibility to promote good teaching, it is appropriate that students be consulted in his selection or appointment."
(7) 3.5.1.	Delete first occurrence of "faculty". Add the following at the end of 3.5.1.: "Either the College Advisory Council shall have an appropriate number of voting student members to provide significant student representation, or there shall be a separate Dean's Student Advisory Committee, or both."

<u>Article</u>	<u>Change</u>
(8) 3.5.8.	New article: "In the event that a college does not provide for significant student representation on its College Advisory Council, the Dean's Student Advisory Committee shall select one of its members to sit <u>ex officio</u> without vote on the College Advisory Council, and the College Advisory Council shall select one of its members to sit <u>ex officio</u> without vote on the Dean's Student Advisory Committee."
(9) 4.1.3.	Add: "It is appropriate that students be consulted in the selection of the President."
(10) 4.2.1.	Add: "It is appropriate that students also be consulted in the selection of principal academic officers of the University."
(11) 4.4.1.1.	After "Steering Committee" insert "the designated student representatives."
(12) 4.4.1.1.3.	Renumber as 4.4.1.1.4. substitute "fourth" for "third", and delete everything from "two undergraduate" to "Graduate Council" inclusive. Insert the following new article 4.4.1.1.3. "The sub-group consisting of the student representatives shall constitute the <u>Student Council</u> ."
(13) 4.4.1.2.1.	After "Appointed Council (4.4.1.1.2.)", insert "and members of the Student Council (4.4.1.1.3.)".
(14) 4.4.4.	Renumber 4.4.4. as 4.4.5. and insert the following new article 4.4.4.: <u>4.4.4. Number and Selection of Student Representatives</u> 4.4.4.1. Each college shall be represented on the Academic Council by one student. The student shall be selected in accordance with procedures prescribed by the voting faculty of the college.

Article

Change

4.4.4.2. There shall be three undergraduate student representatives-at-large who shall be selected in accordance with procedures established by Associated Students of Michigan State University.

4.4.4.3. There shall be two graduate student representatives-at-large who shall be selected in accordance with procedures established by the Council of Graduate Students.

- (15) 4.4.5.3. Insert "faculty" in front of "members of the Steering Committee."
- (16) 4.4.5.4. Insert "the Student Council", after "Elected Faculty Council".
- (17) 4.5.1.1. Substitute for the first sentence: "The Steering Committee shall be composed of five faculty members elected by the voting faculty of the university for two-year terms, with no more than one faculty member coming from any one college, and of one student elected annually by the members of the Student Council from among their own number."
- (18) 4.5.2.1. Insert after "organizations" the following: "or individual students or student groups and organizations".
- (19) 4.5.2.2. Substitute "faculty member or student" for "member of the Academic Senate".
- (20) 4.6. Throughout 4.6. restrict references to faculty representatives and members.
- (21) 5. Throughout 5., substitute "university standing committee" for "faculty standing committee".
- (22) 5.1.1. Substitute "academic government" for "faculty government".

<u>Article</u>	<u>Change</u>
(23) 5.2.	From 5.2.2. to 5.2.6. make appropriate restrictions to faculty representatives.
(24) 5.2.6.	Delete 5.2.6. and substitute the following new article 5.2.6.: "University standing committees shall have the following number of undergraduate and graduate student representatives: Curriculum Committee (3 undergraduate, 2 graduate); Educational Policies Committee (9 undergraduate, 6 graduate); Faculty Affairs Committee (1 undergraduate, 1 graduate); Faculty Tenure Committee (2 undergraduate, 1 graduate); Committee on Honors Programs (2 undergraduate, 1 graduate); International Projects Committee (2 undergraduate, 1 graduate); Library Committee (2 undergraduate, 2 graduate); Student Affairs Committee (2 undergraduate, 2 graduate); Committee on Business Affairs (1 undergraduate, 1 graduate). Undergraduate representatives shall be selected in accordance with procedures established by Associated Students of Michigan State University. Graduate representatives shall be selected in accordance with procedures established by the Council of Graduate Students".
(25) 5.3.1.	Substitute "colleges" for "college faculties."
(26) 5.4.1.1.	Add at end of first sentence: "and its student representatives."
(27) 5.4.1.2.	Substitute "faculty representatives" for "representatives."
(28) 5.4.2.1.	Same as (26).
(29) 5.4.3.1.	Same as (26).
(30) 5.4.4.1.	Same as (26).
(31) 5.4.5.1.	Same as (26).

<u>Article</u>	<u>Change</u>
(32) 5.4.6.1.	Same as (26).
(33) 5.4.7.1.	Same as (26).
(34) 5.4.8.1.	Same as (26).
(35) 5.4.9.1.	Same as (26).
(36) 6.1.1.	Add at end of sentence: "and the Council of Graduate Students."
(37) 7.3.	New article: "Each <u>ad hoc</u> committee shall contain an appropriate number of students to provide significant student representation."
(38) 8.	Throughout, change "faculty government" to "academic government."
(39) 8.3.	New article: "The University shall recognize a student's participation in academic government as an important and integral part of the university learning experience."

APPENDIX E

Report

of

The New Committee on Student Participation in Academic Government

Introduction

In November, 1969, the Academic Council, after extended debate, recommended that the Report of the Committee on Student Participation in Academic Government, submitted to the Council in May 1969, be returned to a new faculty-student committee for revision. Faculty members were to be chosen from the Council by the President, upon recommendation by the Steering Committee of the University. Student members were to be chosen by the President upon recommendation from student members and alternate student members of the Academic Council. The following report represents the work of this New Committee on Student Participation in Academic Government since receiving its mandate in November, 1969.

This Committee began with the conviction that the discussions in Academic Council clearly indicated substantial agreement that students should be involved in the academic decision-making processes of the University. The nature of that participation, the numbers of students to be involved, and the methods to be used to select students were issues on which the New Committee detected considerable disagreement during the debate. Insofar as possible, this report attempts to suggest a resolution of these issues, but it does not always attempt to be as comprehensive or as specific as the original report. Rather, we hope here to suggest some steps toward the involvement of students in academic government which we believe need to be taken immediately. Beyond that, however, we propose establishing the machinery by which the system of academic government at Michigan State University can be monitored, and changes made when desirable.

This report makes recommendations in five areas: (1) the involvement of

students within the several departments, colleges, centers and institutes of the University; (2) the involvement of students within the Academic Council; (3) the involvement of students on various standing committees of the Academic Council; (4) the provision for specific minority student representation in academic government; and (5) the establishment of a new Faculty-Student Committee on Academic Governance; the redefinition of the responsibility of the Faculty Affairs Committee; the redefinition and reconstitution of the Student Affairs Committee.

Before moving to a discussion and the recommendations in each of these five areas, we should note that we have made no recommendations regarding student participation on the Graduate Council. These recommendations, by motion of the Academic Council, will be made separately by the Graduate Council. We should further note that our report does not make specific recommendations for changes in the Bylaws of the Faculty designed to accomplish the changes proposed in our report. It is the feeling of the Committee that following action by the Academic Council on the present report, that the Council should authorize the Steering Committee of the Council to establish a small committee, including the Secretary of the Faculty, to draft the appropriate changes which will be necessary to accomplish whatever actions are taken by the Academic Council.

Part I

Student Participation in Academic Government within the Several Departments, Colleges, Centers and Institutes.

Shortly after its formation, the New Committee on Student Participation in Academic Government conducted a survey of all departments, colleges, members of the Academic Council, and directors of centers and institutes. In addition, a general request for opinions and information was issued by the Committee.

Our requests were twofold. We wanted to find out how students were currently being involved in the academic decision-making process at Michigan State University. We also wanted to collect opinions from appropriate sources about how students should be involved. The response to our request has been both gratifying and helpful. Without attempting a formal statistical study for the Council, we can state that student involvement on the departmental and college levels runs almost the gamut of possibilities. Some departments have students on all committees. Most departments and colleges have developed some way of formally involving students to some extent in decision making. There are a few, and only a few, departments which have not involved students in any way in their decision-making processes. Some units of the university have developed completely parallel structures, while others have completely integrated structures with approximately equal numbers of students and faculty members. Some student participants serve in their departments and colleges through election by other students. Others have been selected by faculty nominations, while still others serve as a result of their having filed petitions indicating their interest. Some units involve only those students who are majors within the department, while others also make an attempt to involve students who are not necessarily majors in the particular department. Most units have, to date, involved undergraduate students in committee work, while a smaller number have made an attempt to involve both undergraduate and graduate students. In short, at the present time at Michigan State University there are examples of almost every possible type of arrangement of student involvement in the academic decision-making process at the department and college level.

The variety of these approaches being developed throughout the University suggests that it would be unwise to insist now on any one model for the involvement of students in the affairs of departments, colleges, centers and institutes. However, as a result of the information obtained in the surveys, and after

extensive committee deliberations, we would like to indicate a preference for certain arrangements in regard to (A) The setting up of committees and (B) The Selection of students for membership on those committees.

A. The setting up of committees.

1. Integrated committee structures seem to be most frequent throughout the University, and for reasons stated elsewhere, we believe this to be preferable to parallel committees. (See p.6).

2. We consider that the selection of one student for a committee on which there may be, for example, six faculty members is clearly tokenism, and we would argue for more balanced committee structures.

3. Our survey indicated that far more attention has been paid to involving undergraduate students than graduate students, and we would suggest that departments and colleges include graduate students on the various committees of the units involved.

4. We have also noted that most of the developments reported to us seem to be ad hoc arrangements, not reflected in the bylaws of the departments or colleges, and strongly suggest that such arrangement be codified into written bylaws.

B. The selection of students for membership on those committees.

1. We recommend that student members of committees be selected by their peers, although other arrangements seem to be working in a few units.

2. We recommend that all students associated with an academic unit be involved in determining the procedures for student participation in the governance of that unit.

3. We strongly believe that the students selected to participate in a given committee of an academic unit should be chosen from a broad base congruous with the constituency of the unit.

4. We recommend that provision be made for specific minority student representation.

It may indeed be the case that a single model will never fit all departments or colleges; and in any event, until we have more information as to the success of various models, we cannot make extremely specific recommendations for the various academic units of the University. The three recommendations proposed below, thus, are designed to be a beginning, a beginning which will insure that students are involved in academic governance at the department and college level, and that they are involved, where appropriate, within the various centers and institutes of the University. The recommendations all include reporting procedures to a proposed new Faculty-Student Committee on Academic Governance whose duties and charges are detailed in Part V of the report. We suggest the formation of the new committee as the device to monitor efforts at involving students in the academic decision-making process, and to continue to make recommendations in this area.

Recommendation 1. Each academic department or school within the University will develop methods of involving its students, both undergraduate and graduate, in the academic decision-making processes of that unit,

with each unit deciding what makes up its constituency. E.G., it is assumed that all majors of a given department or school must be the constituents of that department or school; but it will remain to be determined by each unit whether it wishes to include major-preference freshmen and sophomores, interested no-preference students, minors, etc. Student constituents of a department or school must be involved in determining the nature of the participation to be effected. All departments or schools will report their arrangements for bringing students into the academic decision-making process to the Faculty-Student Committee on Academic Governance by October 1, 1970.

Recommendation 2. Every college within the University will develop methods of involving students, both graduate and undergraduate, in the academic decision-making processes of that college, with each college deciding what makes up its constituency. Student constituents of a college must be involved in determining the nature of the participation to be effected. All colleges will report their arrangements for bringing students into the academic decision-making process to the Faculty-Student Committee on Academic Governance by October 1, 1970.

Recommendation 3. All centers and institutes within the University that have academic responsibilities, or whose work concerns students, either graduate or undergraduate, will develop methods of involving students in the decision-making processes of the center or institute. Students associated with the center or institute must be involved in determining the nature of the participation to be effected. All centers and institutes, whether affected or not, will report their arrangements, if any, for bringing students into their decision-making processes to the Faculty-Student Committee on Academic Governance by October 1, 1970.

Part II

Student Participation in the Academic Council

In considering student participation in the Academic Council, this Committee had the advantage of the numerous suggestions for such participation made in the discussion of the Massey Report by the Council in the several meetings devoted to this topic during Fall 1969. After extended examination of all of the suggestions offered at that time or subsequently by members of the University community, the Committee proposes the two recommendations presented below. Before turning to those specific proposals, however, it seems advisable first to consider why we rejected the other major suggestions.

1. Completely parallel faculty and student governing bodies. This system at first seemed to us to have merit. But let us consider what a completely parallel academic governing structure would mean. In such a system, there would be departmental student advisory committees separate from the faculty committees. There would be college advisory committees separate from the faculty committees. There would be a student academic council and a student academic senate. In a completely parallel system, there would also be standing student committees similar in nature to the existing faculty committees. Such committees would initiate reports on the same subjects as the current faculty committees and would transmit those reports to the student academic council and the student senate and eventually to the President and the Board of Trustees. Our Committee rejects this model for the following reasons: (a) Many departments and colleges have already set up committees composed of faculty and students, and to adopt such a plan would destroy such progress as has been made to integrate students and faculty into one academic

community. (b) This committee was concerned with what could happen if two separate reports were filed on the same topic by the two governments. Consider the inevitable friction, for example, if the President and the Board chose to accept a student report concerning tenure regulations, or a faculty report on dormitory regulations. In any event, the committee felt that even the possibility of separate decisions would further serve to divide the academic community rather than to unify it, and further serve to hinder the decision-making process rather than to expedite it. For these central reasons, this committee rejects the idea of completely parallel structures. As was seen in Part I, however, colleges and departments would be free, if they individually so choose, to institute parallel structures at the college and departments would be free, if they individually so choose, to institute parallel structures at the college and department level. But we feel strongly that students and faculty ought to come together for decision making regarding mutual concerns at the level of the Academic Council and thus be in a position to present a single report on a given issue to the President and the Board.

2. Selection of undergraduate students at large, chosen from current student government organizations. This procedure would not be consonant with the kinds of academic questions that members of the Academic Council are asked to consider. At present student government at Michigan State University draws its members from the various geographical and living organizations represented on campus. Student government does not concern itself with such matters as grading, curriculum development, establishment of new colleges and programs, etc. These are appropriately academic concerns, and should be dealt with by faculty and students chosen for their connection with academic affairs. A faculty organization organized on the same principle as ASMSU would have its members chosen by virtue of their living in East Lansing, Okemos and Haslett. Surely no one could argue for such a faculty organization, and we would insist,

similarly, that location of a bedroom is not an appropriate basis for establishing eligibility for student membership on the Academic Council.

3. Selection from the various colleges of non-voting student members of the Academic Council. Such an arrangement would answer those who have contended that giving the vote to students would drastically change the nature of the Council, and make it less the voice of the faculty. If the Academic Council concerned itself only with matters affecting the faculty, an argument advocating only faculty voting membership would be tenable. But the Academic Council has concerned itself in recent years with the major grading report, living conditions in the dormitories, control of disruptions, an amelioration of their causes, development and change of the curricula, and participation in the October 15 Moratorium. These are matters clearly affecting students as much as faculty, and to refuse students the opportunity to participate with their vote as well as their voice would lead to a lack of commitment on the part of students to any decisions made by the Council.

4. Formation of a student advisory committee to which the Academic Council would be held "accountable." Presumably, if such a student committee would make a recommendation, the Academic Council would be under the obligation to deal with that recommendation in some manner. The problem here is the definition of "accountability." Does either a negative vote or a positive vote on any given issue mean that the Academic Council has "accounted" for a report? Are students from the advisory committee to be given the right to debate in the Academic Council? If they are, what change do we have from the present situation? If they are not, how will students be able fully to understand a negative vote, effectively to request a reconsideration, effectively to communicate any feeling that their definition of accountability has not been met? This Committee concludes that accountability would not be met by the formation of a student advisory committee.

For these various reasons, then, we have rejected the above suggestions in favor of the following recommendations:

Recommendation 4. There shall be one voting undergraduate student seated on the Academic Council from each of the thirteen colleges whose primary educational task is the education of the undergraduate.

Recommendation 5. There shall be six voting graduate students seated on the Academic Council, selected from among those colleges which have a graduate or professional training function. No college may be represented by more than one representative at any given time. Graduate students shall be selected by the Council of Graduate Students.

It is appropriate now to turn to some specific justifications of these recommendations. The Committee chose the procedure of adding undergraduate students to the Academic Council by virtue of their membership in an academic college. There seems no satisfactory basis on which to eliminate any particular college. We feel sure that the Academic Council would not vote to eliminate the sole faculty representative from a given college on the grounds that we were getting too many members in the council. Accordingly, the committee could not agree to eliminate the student from any given college in calling for undergraduate student representatives on the Academic Council.

To those who assert that the addition of 19 or more students will make the Academic Council an unwieldy body, we would answer that there is no evidence to suggest that the nature of an already large parliamentary body is changed only because the size of the body is increased. To those who contend that the elected faculty can be out-voted by a coalition of all students, all deans, plus a strong minority of faculty members, we suggest that there is no evidence that faculty, deans or students have ever voted together as a group. We agree with those who argue that concerns peculiar to the faculty should be considered by the faculty alone. Part V of this document makes suggestions regarding changes in the elected faculty council to provide a means of dealing with these matters. We also agree with those who argue that concerns peculiar to students should be considered by students alone. Part V of this document

includes proposals to this effect regarding the Student Affairs Committee. However, it seems to this Committee that most of the actions taken by the Academic Council in the past several years concerned students and faculty alike.

Our recommendations regarding the addition of undergraduates to the Academic Council are obvious. We have 13 colleges primarily concerned with the education of undergraduates. We feel that each college should be represented by one undergraduate student, chosen from that college's majors or major preference students by any system agreed upon by the students of that college. The Committee prefers having students elected by their peers, but we realize that elections may not always represent the best way for the selection of students. At the very least, any student selected to the Academic Council must be selected according to procedures agreed upon by a vote of the students within that college.

The recommendation concerning graduate students needs special mention. Our recommendations are made following consultation with the Council of Graduate Students and with the approval of the graduate student representative on this Committee. We believe that the addition of six graduate students selected by the Council of Graduate Students will be a sufficient minimum to present a strong and varied graduate student voice in the Academic Council.

Part III

Student Participation on Standing Committees of the Academic Council

The present several faculty standing committees are a major component of university decision making; their recommendations and reports provide most of the agenda for the Academic Council, and eventually the Senate. It is in these committees that careful, detailed scrutiny is given to suggestions for changes in established programs and to efforts to innovate new programs.

Manifestly, the academic decision-making process to which these committees are

central is as significant for students as for faculty, and if students are to be involved in those decisions that affect their academic careers at MSU, they must have an opportunity to share in the work of these committees. By bringing into committee deliberations their own unique experiences and perspectives, students can make a valuable contribution to the development of academic policy and legislation. Perhaps more than any other unit of the university, the committee process constitutes the "channels" of policy-making. Student access to as well as confidence in the integrity of these channels is best ensured by student representation on these committees.

Since these committees vary in size, and since students have a greater interest in some committees than others there is no possible rationale for having the same number of students on all committees. Therefore, the following recommendations provide for different numbers of voting student members, with a brief rationale provided for these differences.

Recommendation 6. The appellation "faculty standing committee" shall be changed to "Council standing committee."

Recommendation 7. The University Educational Policies Committee shall have six undergraduate students and three graduate students.

Recommendation 8. The University Curriculum Committee shall have six undergraduate students and one graduate student.

Of all the university standing committees, these two--Curriculum and Educational Policies--are those most centrally concerned with the academic interests of all students. Consequently, they should have on the greatest student voice and vote. One graduate student member for the University Curriculum Committee is proposed at the request of COGS.

Recommendation 9. The University Committee on Honors Programs shall have six undergraduates and one graduate student. Three of the undergraduates shall be members of the Honors College, chosen by the students of that College; the other three undergraduates shall not be members of the Honors College. The graduate student shall be one who has completed a baccalaureate degree in an honors program.

We propose three undergraduate student members who are not in Honors College in recognition of the fact that there are honors programs in many colleges and departments not directly tied to the Honors College, and there are honors sections not restricted to Honors College students.

Recommendation 10. The University International Projects Committee and the Library Committee shall have three undergraduates and two graduate students.

These undergraduate members are proposed in keeping with Recommendation 15. Two graduate members are proposed at the request of COGS.

Recommendation 11. The University Faculty Tenure Committee shall have three undergraduate students and one graduate student.

Students on the Faculty Tenure Committee have an appropriate place in that Committee's concern for the making of general policy concerning tenure. Whether students should be involved in the judicial (case appeal) function of the Committee is less apparent. Accordingly, we make the following recommendation:

Recommendation 12. The University Faculty Tenure Committee shall report to the Committee on Academic Governance on their determination concerning the inclusion of students in the deliberations of the Committee.

Recommendation 13. The University Business Affairs Committee shall have three undergraduate students and one graduate student.

The recommendation regarding student membership on the Business Affairs Committee is made while a decision of the Board of Trustees about the responsibilities of that Committee is pending. It is recognized that the Board's ultimate decision may suggest a different pattern of student representation.

Recommendation 14. The University Faculty Affairs Committee shall have no student members.

This recommendation presumes the establishment of a Committee on Academic

Governance (see Part V), which shall assume functions of legitimate concern to students now assigned to the Faculty Affairs Committee. If such a new committee is established, the Faculty Affairs Committee would be responsible for matters of exclusive concern to the faculty: salary, fringe benefits, insurance, etc., as enumerated in the Bylaws (5.4.3.3).

Recommendation 15. Either three or six undergraduate students are to be appointed to the standing committees. The pattern of the University Curriculum Committee of using basic subcommittees in social sciences, natural sciences and liberal arts to reach a decision in matters relating to those areas, is to be followed in the selection of undergraduates for all committees. Either one or two students shall be chosen from each of these areas, and all colleges of the University shall be allocated to an appropriate area for the purpose of selecting students.

Recommendation 16. Initially the thirteen undergraduate members of the Council representing the various colleges primarily concerned with undergraduate education will determine which colleges will provide undergraduate student representation on the several University standing committees. Each college will then be responsible for selecting the student representative(s) to the separate standing committees. Student constituents of a college must be involved in determining the selection procedures.

For purposes of clarification, the colleges as they are assigned in the pattern followed by the Curriculum Committee in setting up basic subcommittees are as follows: LIBERAL ARTS: Arts and Letters, Justin Morrill, University College; SOCIAL SCIENCE: Business, Communication Arts, Education, Home Economics, James Madison, Social Science; NATURAL SCIENCE: Agriculture and Natural Resources, Engineering, Human Medicine, Lyman Briggs, Natural Science, Veterinary Medicine.

It should be noted that although the number of colleges in the respective areas is 3-6-6, the number of students is approximately the same in each of the three areas.

Recommendation 17. The Council of Graduate Students will be responsible for selecting graduate student members of the separate University standing committees.

Part IV

Specific Minority Representation (Blacks, Latin Americans, and Native Americans) in Academic Government.

Recommendation 18. There shall be additional seats for minority student representation on the Academic Council, and all standing committees of the Council. The means of selecting these students will be developed by the appropriate minority groups and reported to the Committee on Academic Governance by October 1, 1970.

Recommendation 19. There shall be 10 seats on the Academic Council in order to provide for specific minority representation.

Recommendation 20. There shall be 3 minority seats on the University Educational Policies Committee, The University Curriculum Committee, the University Committee on Honors Programs, the University International Projects Committee, the University Library Committee, and there shall be 2 minority seats on The University Faculty Tenure Committee and the University Committee on Business Affairs, in order to provide for specific minority representation on these committees.

Recommendation 21. There shall be 7 minority seats on the University Student Affairs Committee in order to provide for specific minority representation.

Recommendation 22. There shall be 5 minority seats on the University Committee on Academic Governance in order to provide for specific minority representation.

Recommendation 23. While there may be no universal model for inclusion of students into the academic departments and colleges of the University, every department and college will develop the necessary methods to insure minority representation wherever possible.

In light of today's realities, our representative structures by their very nature fail to air certain points of view. It is our contention that minority groups defined as Blacks, Latin Americans, and Native Americans have suffered most under these kinds of representative structures within our society. The recommendations set forth are not attempts to negate the predominant white viewpoint, nor for that matter to stalemate a particular vote. It is rather an attempt to negate the inequities and deficiencies so apparent in the representative structure at least until that time when such provisions are no longer necessary.

Our recommendations concerning minority representation on the Academic Council, the standing committees of the Council, the colleges and departments are the result of extensive consultation with the organizations representative of the minority groups as defined above. We believe our recommendations reflect the minimum number of minority student involvement which will insure just representation.

Part V

Additional Recommendations

One of the problems before the New Committee on Student Participation in Academic Government concerned the question of students representation on the Faculty Affairs Committee of the Academic Council. It was argued on the one hand that inasmuch as that committee had in the past concerned itself with bylaw changes and other reforms in academic governance, students should be represented if their ideas and aspirations were to be treated with the seriousness they deserved.

On the other hand, persuasive arguments were offered that the faculty should have a clear and unique voice for the expression of those matters that were of primary concern to faculty qua faculty.

To resolve this dilemma, namely, to create a structure that would enable students to participate in deliberations over future changes in the form of academic governance and to safeguard the faculty voice in matters that are of primary concern to them as faculty, we propose the following:

A. The Faculty Affairs Committee.

Recommendation 24. The Faculty Affairs Committee (See page 13) shall report to the Elected Faculty Council, rather than to the Academic Council, on matters of exclusive concern to the faculty: salary, fringe benefits, insurance, etc. as enumerated in the Bylaws (5.4.3.3). The Bylaws of the University shall be changed to provide that the Elected Faculty Council may by ~~unanimous~~ vote of those present and voting ~~may~~ refer matters of exclusive concern to the faculty directly to the Academic Senate.

Recommendation 25. The Faculty Affairs Committee shall be relieved of its direct responsibility concerning the Bylaws.

As stated on Page 9, we believe that "concerns peculiar to the faculty should be considered by the faculty alone...." Accordingly, we here propose that the Faculty Affairs Committee, composed solely of members of the faculty, deal with faculty problems and report to the Elected Faculty Council.

B. The Faculty-Student Committee on Academic Governance.

Recommendation 26. The Academic Council shall create a University Committee on Academic Governance composed of one faculty member and one student to represent each of the colleges of the University. The mechanism for student inclusion on the Committee shall originate within the colleges. In addition, five faculty members shall be selected by the Committee on Committees to include all three faculty ranks.

Recommendation 27. The University Committee on Academic Governance shall be charged with the responsibility for continuing review of the Bylaws of the University to assure that they are being observed and with the responsibility for making recommendations to the Council for whatever changes in the Bylaws the Committee's investigations indicate. Specifically, this Committee is also charged with the responsibility for continuing study of the steps being taken throughout the University to involve students in academic government in accord with the action taken by the Academic Council on this present report and with the responsibility for making recommendations to the Council as the Committee's investigations indicate.

One would have to be extremely insensitive to the current ethos not to recognize the wide-spread concern over the governance of institutions of higher learning. Regardless of one's philosophic approach, vested interest, or aspiration for change, the fact remains that rarely in the history of higher education have so many questions been raised concerning who should be involved and what form the involvement should take in the governing of colleges and universities.

Institutions that have been lethargic or complacent or have relied upon unexamined out-moded forms of organization or false assumptions have done so to their sorrow. It may have been sufficient in the past to resolve the problems created by new social pressures in ad hoc fashion. It seems likely that

in the future such a policy would result in at least governance by "crisis resolution" and at worst chaos and anarchy.

No committee is likely to offer a panacea for the complex problems of the rapidly changing social system and certainly no such claim is made for the Committee on Academic Governance. It would, however, appear prudent to establish some agency that would be specifically charged with the admittedly difficult, perhaps impossible, task of anticipating changes in academic governance that might be accomplished in rational fashion. It would seem that the likelihood of avoiding precipitate actions under conditions of high tension would be improved.

C. Student Affairs Committee

On Page 9 of this report, we stated our conviction that as faculty concerns should be handled by faculty alone, so "concerns peculiar to the students should be considered by the students alone."

At present, the Student Affairs Committee has two major charges under the Bylaws. (1) "to examine, study and evaluate all policies of the Vice President for Student Affairs as they affect academic achievement in the University and advise the Vice President for Student Affairs, the Associate Dean of Students, and the Academic Council thereupon (5.4.8.2) and (2) to "review and recommend changes in regulations governing student conduct as developed and proposed by living units and governing groups" and to "initiate, review and recommend proposed changes in the procedures through which such regulations are promulgated and ...make appropriate recommendations to the Academic Council" (5.4.8.3).

The second charge, detailed in 5.4.8.3, thus deals with living unit policies. We believe such policies would be more effectively and appropriately handled by a group organized in terms of living units. Accordingly, we propose

the following:

Recommendation 28. Section 5.4.8.3. shall be eliminated from the charge of the Student Affairs Committee.

If this recommendation is approved by the Council, we further propose that, in keeping with this action, ASMSU and/or the Student Affairs Committee initiate amendment of the Academic Freedom Report, sections 5.2 and 5.3 to read as follows:

5.2 It is recommended, however, that regulations developed by living units be reviewed by the appropriate governing group. The governing group, after reviewing the regulations, shall refer the matter back to the living unit, together with any suggestions for change. After review by the living unit, the matter shall be returned to the major governing group which shall forward the regulation, together with any recommendations it cares to make, to the Student Board of ASMSU. The Student Board of ASMSU shall review the regulations and forward them, together with any recommendations they care to make, to the Vice President for Student Affairs. The Vice President for Student Affairs shall make public his decision regarding the regulations.

5.3 A major governing group or the Student Board of ASMSU may originate regulations, but such regulations must be referred directly to the appropriate living units, whereupon the procedure described in the preceding paragraph shall be followed.

Recommendation 29. The Student Affairs Committee shall be composed of one undergraduate student from each college. The Vice President for Student Affairs and the Associate Dean of Students shall serve ex officio without vote.

Recommendation 30. The newly constituted Student Affairs Committee shall be charged to examine, study and evaluate all policies of the Vice President for Student Affairs and advise the Vice President for Student Affairs, the Associate Dean of Students, and the Academic Council thereupon.

Recommendation 31. The newly constituted Student Affairs Committee shall also be charged with the present duties of the Committee on Academic Right and Responsibilities as described in Section 2.3 of the Academic Freedom Report.

If Recommendation ³¹~~30~~ is approved by the Council, we further propose that, in keeping with this action, ASMSU and/or the Student Affairs Committee initiate amendment of the Academic Freedom Report to eliminate section 2.3.

Recommendation 32. One student, either graduate or undergraduate, to be selected from the student members of the Academic Council by those members, will serve on the Steering Committee of the University.

This Committee believes this representation is necessary to insure student voice in determining what matters will be brought before the Academic Council.

Respectfully submitted,

James B. McKee, Chairman
Sam Baskett
Erwin Bettinghaus
Edward Carlin
Michael Harrison
John Masterson
Gina Schaack
Harry Chancey
Michael Freed
Charles McMillan

February 17, 1970

APPENDIX F

APPENDIX F

THE REPORT OF THE ACADEMIC COUNCIL

Revised Recommendations Concerning Student Participation
in the Academic Government

Approved by the Academic Council
November 17 and 24, 1970

Issued by the Office of the Secretary of the Faculties
December 3, 1970

COMPOSITION OF THE ACADEMIC COUNCIL

	<u>Present</u>	<u>Proposed</u>
<u>Presiding Officers:</u>		
President	1**	1*
Provost	1	1
<u>Elected Faculty Council:</u>		
Elected Faculty Representatives	56	56
Steering Committee: Faculty Members	<u>5</u>	<u>5</u>
Subtotal	61	61
<u>Appointed Council:</u>		
Deans (of Colleges; of Students; of Graduate School; of International Programs)	20	20
<u>Ex Officio Members:</u>		
Officers and Directors	6*	6
Chairmen of Standing Committees	9*	12
Ombudsman	<u>1*</u>	<u>1*</u>
Subtotal	16*	19
<u>Student Representatives:</u>		
Undergraduates	2*	15
Graduates	<u>1*</u>	6
Representatives-at-large		<u>10</u>
Subtotal	<u>3*</u>	<u>31</u>
<u>TOTAL</u>	102	133

* Non-voting members

** May vote to break ties

PROPOSED MEMBERSHIP OF THE STANDING COMMITTEES OF THE ACADEMIC COUNCIL

<u>Committee</u> <u>(Total)</u>	<u>Faculty</u> <u>Total</u>	<u>Student</u>			
		<u>Under-</u> <u>graduate</u>	<u>Graduate</u>	<u>Members-</u> <u>at-large</u>	<u>Total</u>
Curriculum (<u>25 members</u>)	<u>16</u>	6	1	2	<u>9</u>
Educational Policies (<u>27</u>)	<u>16</u>	6	3	2	<u>11</u>
*Faculty Affairs, Faculty Compensation, and Academic Budget (<u>14</u>)	<u>14</u>	0	0	0	<u>0</u>
Faculty Tenure (<u>20</u>)	<u>14</u>	3	1	2	<u>6</u>
Honors Programs (<u>23</u>)	<u>14</u>	6	1	2	<u>9</u>
International Projects (<u>21</u>)	<u>14</u>	3	2	2	<u>7</u>
Library (<u>21</u>)	<u>14</u>	3	2	2	<u>7</u>
*Student Affairs (<u>17</u>)	<u>6</u>	5	4	2	<u>11</u>
Business Affairs (<u>21</u>)	<u>14</u>	3	2	2	<u>7</u>
*Academic Governance (<u>36</u>)	<u>18</u>	- 16 -		2	<u>18</u>
*Public Safety (<u>14</u>)	<u>7</u>	4	1	2	<u>7</u>
*Building, Lands & Planning (<u>20</u>)	<u>14</u>	3	1	2	<u>6</u>

* New Committee

1.2.6. Renumber as "1.2.7."

For "voting faculty" read "qualified voting members":
Introduce (preceding the section just treated) a new
section as follows:

"1.2.6. The qualified voting members of a particular
academic unit shall be understood to comprise,
besides the voting faculty, the student repre-
sentatives selected for that unit under these
rules."

2.3. Delete "Department and School Faculty," reading simply
"Organization."

2.3.1. For "voting faculty" read "qualified voting members."

2.3.2. For "voting faculty" read "qualified voting members."

2.3.3. New version:

"2.3.3. Department or school bylaws, and amendments
thereto, shall be published. The qualified
voting members of a department or school shall
review its bylaws at regular intervals not to
exceed five years."

2.5. A new section to be substituted for Council Revisions
2.3.4. and 2.3.4.1.: *

"2.5. Student Representation

"2.5.1. Each department and school and each center
or institute that has academic responsi-
bilities, or whose work concerns students,

* The term "Council Revisions," which recurs throughout this Report
refers to the Report of Professor McKee's committee in the amended
version which was submitted to the Academic Senate.

351

either graduate or undergraduate, shall develop patterns for the significant involvement of its students in the decision-making processes by which policy is formed.

- "2.5.2. Each department, school, center or institute is charged with defining the extent of its student constituency, namely, with deciding the question whether, in addition to its majors, its constituency shall include major-preference freshmen and sophomores, interested no-preference students, etc. However, every regularly enrolled full-time student shall be entitled to participation in the affairs of one unit in the college in which he is enrolled.
- "2.5.3. The students of such a constituency shall be responsible for selecting, according to patterns of their own choice, their representatives in the councils and committees to which they are party.
- "2.5.4. The terms of office for student representatives shall be one year. A student may be elected to serve an additional term of office.

"2.5.5. Membership in a council or committee shall in all cases carry with it, for student representatives, the right to vote.

"2.5.6. Membership carries with it the right to vote on all matters, external as well as internal (1.2.1. and 1.2.3.), that fall within the committee's or council's purview, except for matters that are specifically reserved by these rules.

"2.5.7. The reserved exceptions are of three sorts, namely,

"2.5.7.1. Matters of exclusive concern to the faculty, such as their salary, leaves, insurance and other fringe benefits, health service and housing, retirement;

"2.5.7.2. Matters affecting the distinctively professional duties of the faculty, namely, the duties that flow from the faculty's obligation to maintain the intellectual authority of the University as a center of detached inquiry and disinterested pursuit of truth;

"2.5.7.3. Matters in which the distinctively professional rights of the faculty are at issue, as in decisions concerning the substantive issues of tenure, that is, the re-appointment, promotion, or dismissal of individual members of the faculty whose appointment places them under the rules of tenure.

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

"2.5.9. Professional competency is a necessary condition for teaching in the University: it is not, however, a sufficient condition for teaching and the teaching function remains a just matter of student concern.

"2.5.9.1. Nothing in these rules shall be construed as granting an immunity to the faculty from the legitimate demands for an assiduous, informed and considerate attention to the duties of teaching.

354

- "2.5.9.2. Student representatives may with perfect propriety raise questions of general policy designed (as in the "Code of Teaching Responsibility") to provide remedies for poor teaching or negligent performance, where remedies are needed but not available, or though available are in practice disallowed.
- "2.5.9.3. Student inputs -- especially the evidence regarding the teaching performances which students observe directly -- must figure significantly in the faculty's judgment whenever decisions concerning substantive issues of tenure are in process of being formed.
- "2.5.9.4. All agencies at the level of department, school, institute or residential college (the basic units in which substantive decisions originate) are expressly instructed to provide formal opportunities for students to represent their views, in order that their views may be considered along with other evidence.

"2.5.9.5. If, however, it should chance, for example in a case requiring a decision for re-appointment or dismissal under the rules of tenure, that the students favored the re-appointment of a person whose performance the faculty regarded as below the level of the University, the faculty's judgment would carry.

3.5.6. The Council's revision:

"3.5.6. The College Advisory Council shall publish its minutes."

3.6. A new section to be substituted for Council Revisions 3.6., 3.6.1., and 3.6.2.:

"3.6. Student Representation

- "3.6.1. Each college shall develop patterns for the significant involvement of its students in the decision-making processes by which policy is formed.
- "3.6.2. Each college is charged with defining the extent of its student constituency. Every regularly enrolled full-time student shall be entitled to participate in the affairs of one college in the University.

"3.6.3. The rules laid down in Sections 2.5.3. -

2.5.9.5. shall be understood to govern student representation at the college as well as at the departmental and school level."

4.3.3.3.1. - 4.3.3.3.2. The Council's revision:

"4.3.3.3.1. Business requiring consideration of the Academic Senate shall ordinarily be brought before it in the form of a report or recommendation from the Academic Council. When a recommendation is initially presented, it shall not be subject to amendment. It may be referred back to the originating Council for further consideration or it may be adopted as presented. Matters referred to a Council by the Senate shall in all cases be reported back to it.

"4.3.3.3.2. When a matter has been resubmitted by the Council to the Senate, it may again be returned to the Council as often as the Senate deems necessary. Upon resubmission by the Council to the Senate, a report or recommendation shall be subject

357

to amendment in the Senate;
amendments shall require a
majority vote of those present
and voting. The vote on the main
question of adoption of the report
at the time of the initial or sub-
sequent presentation shall be by
a majority of those present and
voting."

4.4.1.1. The Council's revision ("representatives" has
been substituted for "members" in the phrase
"the student members"):

"4.4.1.1. The Academic Council shall consist of the
President, the Provost, the elected faculty
representatives, the student representatives,
the deans, members of the Steering Committee,
and designated ex officio members.

"4.4.1.1.1. The sub-group consisting of the
President, the Provost, the faculty
representatives, the chairman of
the University Committee on Faculty
Affairs, Faculty Compensation,
and Academic Budget, and the
faculty members of the Steering
Committee shall constitute the
Elected Faculty Council."

4.4.1.1.3.-4.4.1.1.4. The order of Revisions 4.4.1.1.3. and 4.4.1.1.4. is to be reversed: the texts are renumbered accordingly. Editorial change in 4.4.1.1.4.: for "faculty standing committee" read "standing committee of the Council."

"4.4.1.1.3. The third sub-group shall consist of the Student Representatives.

(This term shall be understood to signify both representatives and representatives-at-large.)

"4.4.1.1.4. The Academic Council shall have the following ex officio members: the Vice President for Student Affairs; the administrative officer in charge of admissions, scholarships and registration; the Director of Undergraduate Education; the Director of the Honors College; the Director of Continuing Education; the Director of Libraries; the chairman of each standing committee of the Council; the Ombudsman."

4.4.1.2.1. The Council revision:

"4.4.1.2.1. All members of the Academic Council, with the exception of the presiding officer and the Ombudsman, shall be voting members."

4.4.2. Delete "Number and Election of College Representatives" and read "Faculty Representatives."

Note that the renumbering in the Council revisions for the whole sequence 4.4.2.1. - 4.4.2.1.9. is rescinded.

For	4.4.2.1.	read	4.4.2.01.
"	4.4.2.2.	"	4.4.2.02.
"	4.4.2.3.	"	4.4.2.03.
"	4.4.2.4.	"	4.4.2.04.
"	4.4.2.5.	"	4.4.2.05.
"	4.4.2.6.	"	4.4.2.06.
"	4.4.2.7.	"	4.4.2.07.
"	4.4.2.8.	"	4.4.2.08.
"	4.4.2.9.	"	4.4.2.09.
"	4.4.3.1.	"	4.4.2.10.

4.4.2.4. The Council revision with an editorial rephrasing: "standing committees of the Council" for "Council standing committees."

"4.4.2.04. The election of representatives to the Academic Council and to standing committees of the Council shall be deemed an external matter for a college voting faculty (1.2.3.-1.2.4.).

4.4.2.6. For "college" read "faculty" in the two instances of the phrase "elected college representative."

"4.4.2.06. The term of office of an elected faculty representative shall be two years. No individual may serve more than two consecutive terms as an elected faculty representative. (When a college

360 is first established, half the representatives elected in the first election shall serve a term of only one year, namely, those receiving fewer votes.)

4.4.3. Delete "4.4.3. Number and Election of Non-College Faculty Representatives," and renumber 4.4.3.1. as "4.4.2.10."

4.4.3. Introduce a new section (corresponding to Council Revisions 4.4.2.2. - 4.4.5.4.), as follows:

"4.4.3. Student Representatives

"4.4.3.01. Undergraduate Student Representatives:

Each of the colleges whose primary educational task is the education of undergraduates shall have one undergraduate student representative.

"4.4.3.02. The College of Human Medicine, the College of Osteopathic Medicine, and the College of Veterinary Medicine shall each have one representative, either an undergraduate or a student working toward a professional degree.

"4.4.3.03. These representatives shall be chosen according to procedures established by a vote of the student constituency of the several colleges.

- 361
- "4.4.3.04. The term of office of a student representative shall be one year. A representative may serve an additional term of office. Terms of office shall coincide with the academic year.
- "4.4.3.05. Graduate Student Representatives: The graduate students of the University shall have six representatives selected from among those colleges which have a graduate training function. No college may be represented by more than one representative at a time.
- "4.4.3.06. The graduate student representatives shall be selected by the Council of Graduate Students (COGS).
- "4.4.3.07. The term of office of a graduate student representative shall be one year. A representative may serve an additional term. Terms of office shall coincide with the academic year.
- "4.4.3.08. Student Representatives-at-large: To ensure a systematic representation of the views of non-whites, ten seats shall be reserved on the Academic Council for student representatives-at-large.

362

"4.4.3.08.1. Of these ten positions, at least six shall be reserved for non-whites.

"4.4.3.08.2. These positions shall be filled by elections-at-large, that is, by elections that involve the total student community.

"4.4.3.08.3. The slate of candidates-at-large shall be prepared by a Student Committee on Nominations consisting of the following five persons:

the student member of the Steering Committee (4.5.1.1.2.),

three undergraduates -- at least two of whom shall be non-white -- appointed by the chairman of the Associated Students of Michigan State University (ASMSU), and

three graduate students -- at least two of whom shall be non-white -- appointed by the president of the Council of Graduate Students (COGS).

The student member of the Steering Committee shall be responsible for assembling the Committee and shall preside as chairman at its meetings. The Committee shall report to the student representative of the Council.

"4.4.3.08.4. The slate prepared by the Committee on Nominations shall name at least two candidates for each position to be filled. The Committee is free to set its own rules. It is, however, expressly instructed to consult with the established non-white organizations, to entertain nominating petitions from student groups, and to provide in the ballot for the possibility of write-ins.

"4.4.3.08.5. It shall be understood that these positions for representatives-at-large do not include the seats in the Council alluded to in Sections 4.4.3.01., 4.4.3.02., and 4.4.3.05.

"4.4.3.08.6. A student member of a non-white minority may according to ordinary processes be elected to represent a college, or designated to represent the graduate students, without reference to his minority status. The student then serves not by virtue of his special status as the member of a minority

364 but by virtue of his ordinary status as the member of a college or as a graduate student. Such a student shall not be counted in determining the number of non-white student representatives-at-large that remain on any given occasion to be chosen.

"4.4.3.08.7. The purpose of these provisions is not to dignify our separations or to make permanent our divisions but to affirm the pluralism that is indispensable to our form of community. Our purpose is to institute a guarantee, to ensure a result not certified by the ordinary processes of election, namely, that the voice of the non-white minorities in this University shall on all occasions, irrespective of the results of college and graduate student elections, be positively heard. 'Not more than six' is the imposition of a quota; 'at least six' is, on the contrary, the acknowledgement of a right.

"4.4.3.08.8. The term of office of a student representative-at-large shall be one year. A representative-at-large may serve an additional term. Terms of office shall coincide with the academic year."

4.4.4. - 4.4.5.4. "The renumbering of Sections 4.4.4. - 4.4.5.4. (=4.4.6. - 4.4.7.4. in the Council revisions) is rescinded. The numbers now appearing in the printed Bylaws are to be retained.

4.4.4.1. The Council's revision (Minutes of November 10, 1970, page 3):

"4.4.4.1. The Academic Council acts for and on behalf of the Academic Senate, subject to the provisions of Sections 4.3.2. and 4.3.3.3."

4.4.5.3. The Council's revision (it is assumed that the introduction of a student into the Steering Committee, as provided in the Council revision of Section 4.5.1.1.2., is approved):

"4.4.5.3. The Elected Faculty Council shall meet at regular intervals. The President, or in his absence the Provost, shall preside. The Secretary of the Faculties shall serve as secretary. The voting membership of the Elected Faculty Council shall consist of the elected faculty representatives; the chairman of the University Committee on Faculty Affairs, Faculty Compensation, and Academic Budget; and the faculty members of the Steering Committee. The presiding officer may vote to break ties. Minutes of all

meetings of the Elected Faculty Council shall be circulated to all members of the faculty.

4.4.5.4. The renumbering in the Council revision (=4.4.7.4.) is rescinded. The text remains the same.

4.5.1.1. - 4.5.1.7. The Council revision, editorially modified:

"4.5.1.1. The Steering Committee shall be composed of six members, as follows:

"4.5.1.1.1. Five members shall be elected by the voting faculty of the University for two-year terms. No more than one member may come from any one college.

"4.5.1.1.2. One student, either a graduate or an undergraduate, shall be selected by the student representatives of the Academic Council from among their number for a one-year term.

"4.5.1.1.3. No member is eligible to serve more than two terms consecutively. Steering Committee members shall serve as members of the Academic Council in addition to their college's other representatives. The Steering Committee shall elect its own chairman and secretary.

- "4.5.1.2. Faculty members of the Steering Committee may not serve concurrently as college representatives on the Academic Council (4.4.2.5.).
- "4.5.1.3. Either two or three faculty members of the Steering Committee shall complete their terms each year and be up for re-election or replacement. The Academic Council and the Committee on Committees shall each nominate two candidates for each position to be filled. Thus, the voting faculty will choose among four nominees for each position open.
- "4.5.1.4. The election of faculty members to the Steering Committee shall be deemed an external matter for college voting faculties (1.2.3. - 1.2.4.).
- "4.5.1.5. The election of faculty members to the Steering Committee shall be conducted by the Secretary of the Faculties annually in the second week in May. Election shall be decided by a plurality of votes. Elected members take office July 1. The student representative selected to serve on the Steering Committee (4.5.1.1.2.) shall be named to the Secretary of the Faculties.
- "4.5.1.6. Faculty positions on the Steering Committee vacated during a term of office shall be filled by appointment of the Elected Faculty Council.

"4.5.1.7. The student position, if vacated during a term of office, shall be filled by a student chosen by the student representatives of the Academic Council from among their number."

4.5.2.1. - 4.5.2.2. The Council revisions:

"4.5.2.1. The Steering Committee shall act as an agency through which individual faculty members or students, or faculty or student groups and organizations, may initiate action.

"4.5.2.2. The Steering Committee, in consultation with the President or the Provost, shall prepare the agenda for meetings of the Academic Council and the Academic Senate. Before each regularly scheduled meeting of the Academic Senate or the Academic Council, the Steering Committee shall hold a duly announced meeting open to any member of the Academic Senate or of the University's student body at which suggestions for agenda items will be heard and any proposals, complaints, inquiries, etc., will be duly processed."

4.6.1.1. The Council revision:

"4.6.1.1. The Committee on Committees shall consist of one faculty member from each departmentally organized college, one faculty member from the group of residential colleges, and one faculty

369

member from the non-college faculty group.

The committee shall elect its chairman. Only newly-elected college representatives to the Academic Council are eligible for election to the Committee on Committees. Election to the Committee on Committees shall be by vote of the elected college Academic Council faculty representatives of the respective colleges. The term of office is two years. Provisions shall be made to stagger elections to assure continuity."

5. - 5.2.3. The Council revision (the Council's amended number sequence has been altered):

"5. The Standing Committees of the Academic Council

"5.1. Nature and Establishment of the Standing Committees of the Academic Council

"5.1.1. A Council standing committee is any committee whose function is deemed so important, and the permanent continuity of whose activity is so essential to effective academic government, that the Council establishes it under that title.

"5.1.2. There shall be the following Council standing committees:

University Curriculum Committee

University Educational Policies Committee

University Committee on Faculty Affairs, Faculty Compensation, and Academic Budget

370

University Faculty Tenure Committee

University Committee on Honors Programs

University International Projects Committee

University Library Committee

University Student Affairs Committee

University Committee on Business Affairs

University Committee on Academic Governance

University Committee on Public Safety

University Committee on Building, Lands and
Planning

"5.2. General Rules Governing Standing Committees of the
Academic Council

"5.2.1. Subcommittees or ad hoc committees of Council standing committees shall exist at the discretion of the parent committees. The advisability of the continuance of subcommittees or ad hoc committees shall be raised annually in the parent committees."

5.2.2. The Council Revisions 5.2.2. - 5.2.2.1.2. have been renumbered. The heading "5.2.2. Council Committee Membership" has been expunged. Introduce the new heading:

"5.2.2. Faculty Membership

"5.2.2.1. The term of office of elected faculty members of all Council standing committees shall be three years. Provisions shall be made to stagger elections to assure continuity. Terms

³⁷¹
of office shall begin on January 1,
and terminate on December 31.

"5.2.2.2. No member of the faculty may serve as a voting member of more than one Council standing committee at a time (6.1.3.). No elected faculty member of a Council standing committee shall serve consecutive terms on the same Council standing committee.

5.2.2.3. The Council Revision 5.2.2.1.3. redrafted:

"5.2.2.3. Departmentally Organized Colleges:

The voting faculty of each departmentally organized college shall elect a member to each Council standing committee from two candidates for each position nominated by the College Advisory Council.

"5.2.2.4. Non-College Faculty: The non-college voting faculty shall elect one member to each of the Council standing committees. The pattern of nomination and election shall be determined by the non-college faculty group in consultation with the Office of the Secretary of the Faculties.

"5.2.2.5. Residential Colleges

- "5.2.2.5.1. The voting faculty of each residential college shall elect a member to each of three committees -- the Curriculum Committee, the Educational Policies Committee, and the Committee on Academic Governance. These members shall be elected from two candidates for each position nominated by the College Advisory Council.
- "5.2.2.5.2. In addition, the voting faculty of the group of residential colleges shall jointly elect a member to each Council standing committee except the Curriculum Committee, the Educational Policies Committee, and the Committee on Academic Governance. These members shall be elected from two candidates for each position nominated jointly by the College Advisory Councils of the residential colleges.

"5.2.2.6. ³²³Two committees are excluded from the purview of Sections 5.2.2.3., 5.2.2.4., and 5.2.2.5.2., namely, the Student Affairs Committee and the Committee on Public Safety. The membership of these committees is defined in Sections 5.4.08.1. and 5.4.11.1. respectively.

"5.2.2.7. If an elected faculty member of a Council standing committee is unable to fill his office for a term or longer, a replacement may be appointed by the respective College Advisory Council or group of residential College Advisory Councils."

5.2.3. - 5.2.3.2. The Council Revisions 5.2.2.2. - 5.2.2.2.2., renumbered:

"5.2.3. Student Membership

"5.2.3.1. The term of office of student members of all Council standing committees shall be one year. A student member may serve an additional term of office. Terms of office shall coincide with the academic year.

"5.2.3.2. No student may serve as a voting member of more than one Council standing committee at a time."

5.2.3.3. - 5.2.3.4. The Council Revisions 5.2.2.2.3. - 5.2.2.2.4., reformulated:

"5.2.3.3. Undergraduates: The undergraduate members of a Council standing committee shall be in number

three or six: the number varies according to the rules laid down hereafter for each of the committees.

"5.2.3.3.1. For the purpose of distributing the undergraduate representatives so far as possible according to competency in the several areas of instruction, the colleges primarily concerned with undergraduate education shall be grouped as follows:

the Liberal Arts Group:

College of Arts & Letters

Justin Morrill College

University College

the Social Science Group:

College of Business

College of Communication Arts

College of Education

College of Human Ecology

James Madison College

College of Social Science

the Natural Science Group:

College of Agriculture & Natural
Resources

College of Engineering

College of Human Medicine

375

Lyman Briggs College

College of Natural Science

College of Osteopathic Medicine

College of Veterinary Medicine

"5.2.3.3.2. Each of these groups is to be equally represented in the standing committees of the Council. Thus, if three undergraduate members are to be chosen, one member shall come from each of the groups; if six members, two shall come from each group.

"5.2.3.3.3. The responsibility for establishing the procedures for determining which colleges shall on a given occasion be called upon to elect undergraduate members shall lie with the undergraduate student representatives on the Academic Council (acting together with the student representatives of the Colleges of Human Medicine, Osteopathic Medicine, and Veterinary Medicine). The colleges called upon to name members shall

376be responsible for their own elections according to patterns acceptable to their constituencies.

"5.2.3.3.4. Four committees -- the Committee on Academic Governance; the Committee on Faculty Affairs, Faculty Compensation, and Academic Budget; the Committee on Public Safety; and the Student Affairs Committee -- are excluded from the purview of Sections 5.2.3.3 - 5.2.3.3.3. The membership of these committees is defined in Sections 5.4.10.1., 5.4.03.1., 5.4.11.1., and 5.4.08.1. respectively.

"5.2.3.4. Graduate Students: The membership of graduate students on Council standing committees shall be as indicated in the sections governing membership for each of the standing committees. The Council of Graduate Students (COGS) shall be responsible for selecting these members."

5.2.3.5. A new section to be substituted for Council Revision 5.2.2.2.5.:

"5.2.3.5. Student Members-at-Large: To ensure a systematic representation of the views of non-whites in the Council standing committees, two seats shall be reserved on each committee for members-at-large.

377

- "5.2.3.5.1. At least one of these seats shall be reserved for a non-white.
- "5.2.3.5.2. Members-at-large in the standing committees shall be appointed.
- "5.2.3.5.3. The appointments are to be made by the student members of the Academic Council (representatives and representatives-at-large) acting in the role of a Student Committee on Committees. The Student Committee on Committees shall elect its own chairman. The chairman must be a representative-at-large. The Committee shall invite recommendations from the Council of Graduate Students (COGS) and from the offices of ASMSU especially established for the conduct of minority affairs.
- "5.2.3.5.4. In each committee the seats of members-at-large shall remain to be assigned, whether or not a non-white has been named to the committee independently under the rules set forth in Sections 5.2.3.3. - 5.2.3.4.
- "5.2.3.5.5. The Committee on Faculty Affairs, Faculty Compensation, and Academic Budget is excluded from the purview of Section 5.2.3.5."

5.2.3.6. The Council's Revision 5.2.2.2.6., amended:

"5.2.3.6. If a student member of a Council standing committee is unable to fill his office for a term or longer, a replacement shall be appointed to serve for the remainder of the academic year by the Student Committee on Committees (5.2.3.5.3.)."

5.2.4. - 5.3.3. The Council's Revisions 5.2.3. - 5.3.3., in part renumbered:

"5.2.4. The chairman of each Council standing committee shall submit an annual written report to the Steering Committee by December 31. Summaries of these reports shall be distributed to the Academic Council, and through Council minutes to the entire voting faculty. Each chairman shall keep the Academic Council informed of the work of his committee by means of oral reports at the meetings of the Academic Council.

"5.2.4.1. Elected members of the Council-standing committees shall report quarterly, either orally or in writing, to their respective College Advisory Councils concerning the work of their committees.

"5.2.5. With the exception of the University Curriculum Committee, whose chairman shall be named by the President, and the University Committee on Faculty Affairs, Faculty Compensation, and Academic Budget, whose chairman shall be named as provided in Section 5.2.5.1., all Council standing committees shall elect a chairman annually in January from their own membership.

379

"5.2.5.1. The chairman of the University Committee on Faculty Affairs, Faculty Compensation, and Academic Budget shall be chosen by the voting faculty of the University according to the pattern provided in Section 4.5.1. for the election of the Steering Committee (except that the Elected Faculty Council, instead of the Academic Council, shall select two of the nominees and shall fill by appointment a vacancy occurring during a term of office). The chairman of this committee shall serve as a voting member of the committee in addition to his college's other representative. He shall be elected at the same time as the Steering Committee, shall take office on July 1, and shall be eligible for no more than two consecutive terms of two years each. The chairman of the University Committee on Faculty Affairs, Faculty Compensation, and Academic Budget shall be a voting member of the Elected Faculty Council.

"5.3. General Functions of Council Standing Committees

"5.3.1. The Council standing committees shall represent their constituencies in the interest of the total University.

"5.3.2. The Council standing committees shall advise the Academic Council and appropriate administrative officials on matter within the purview of the committees.

"5.3.3. In the performance of their various duties, Council standing committees must often seek the expertise and assistance of both individuals and administrative units within the University. Accordingly, these committees are both encouraged and authorized to call on such individuals and administrative units for advice and assistance, and individuals and administrative units are asked to render whatever services are reasonably requested."

5.4. - 5.4.12. The Council revisions, together with the institution of a new standing committee in 5.4.12. [minority student representation has been changed from "one to three" (or "one to four") to "two student members-at-large" in each standing committee.] :

"5.4. Nature and Functions of the Several Council Standing Committees

"5.4.01. University Curriculum Committee

"5.4.01.1. The voting membership of the Curriculum Committee shall consist of its elected faculty members, six undergraduate students, one graduate student, and two student members-at-large. The Registrar and a representative of the Provost's Office shall serve ex officio without vote. Additional ex officio non-voting members may be included at the discretion of the committee."

5.4.01.2. The Council Revision 5.4.1.2., renumbered:

"5.4.01.2. College faculty representatives elected to the University Curriculum Committee shall

381

serve as non-voting ex officio members of
their respective college curriculum committees.

[For 5.4.1.3. and 5.4.1.4. read "5.4.01.3." and "5.4.01.4."
respectively.]

"5.4.02. University Educational Policies Committee

"5.4.02.1. The voting membership of the Educational
Policies Committee shall consist of its
elected faculty members, six undergraduate
students, three graduate students, and two
student members-at-large. The Provost and/or
his designate shall serve ex officio without
vote. Additional ex officio non-voting mem-
bers may be included at the discretion of
the committee."

[For 5.4.2.2. and 5.4.2.3. read "5.4.02.2." and "5.4.02.3."
respectively.]

[The whole of Section 5.4.3. (i.e., 5.4.3. - 5.4.3.3., the section
on the University Faculty Affairs Committee in the present Bylaws)
is to be deleted.]

"5.4.03. University Committee on Faculty Affairs, Faculty Com-
pensation, and Academic Budget

"5.4.03.1. The voting membership of the Committee on
Faculty Affairs, Faculty Compensation, and
Academic Budget shall consist of its elected
faculty members. The Provost shall serve as
an ex officio non-voting member. Additional

³⁸²
ex officio non-voting members and consultants from the University may be included at the discretion of the committee."

"5.4.04. University Faculty Tenure Committee

"5.4.04.1. The voting membership of the Faculty Tenure Committee shall consist of its elected faculty members, three undergraduate students, one graduate student, and two student members-at-large. A representative of the Provost's Office shall serve ex officio without vote.

[For 5.4.4.2., 5.4.4.3., 5.4.4.4., 5.4.4.6., and 5.4.4.7. read "5.4.04.2.," "5.4.04.3.," "5.4.04.4.," "5.4.04.5.," and "5.4.04.6." respectively. Council Revision 5.4.4.5., concerning judicial (case appeal) functions, has been deleted.]

[Note that Council Revision 5.4.4.5. concerning the University Faculty Tenure Committee's report to the Academic Council on their determination with respect to the inclusion of students in the judicial (case appeal) function of the committee has been deleted.]

"5.4.04.7. The rules laid down in Sections 2.5.3. - 2.5.9.5. shall be understood to govern representation and voting at the university as well as at the departmental, school, institute and college level.

"5.4.05. University Committee on Honors Programs

"5.4.05.1. The voting membership of the Honors Programs Committee shall consist of its elected faculty members, six undergraduate students, one graduate student, and two student members-

at-large. Three of the undergraduates shall be members of the Honors College, chosen by the students of the college; the other undergraduates shall not be members of the Honors College, but they must be or have been enrolled in Honors courses or programs. The graduate member shall have completed a baccalaureate degree in an Honors Program. The two members-at-large shall be members of the Honors College, or be or have been enrolled in Honors courses or programs, or have completed baccalaureate degrees in Honors programs. The Director of the Honors College shall serve as an ex officio non-voting member. Additional ex officio non-voting members may be included at the discretion of the committee."

{For 5.4.5.2. and 5.4.5.3. read "5.4.05.2." and "5.4.05.3." respectively.}

"5.4.06. University International Projects Committee

"5.4.06.1. The voting membership of the International Projects Committee shall consist of its elected faculty members, three undergraduate students, two graduate students, and two student members-at-large. The Dean of International Programs shall serve as an ex officio non-voting member. Additional

ex officio non-voting members may be

included at the discretion of the committee."

[For 5.4.6.2., 5.4.6.3., and 5.4.6.4. read "5.4.06.2.," "5.4.06.3.," and "5.4.06.4." respectively.]

"5.4.07. University Library Committee

"5.4.07.1. The voting membership of the Library Committee shall consist of its elected faculty members, three undergraduate students, two graduate students, and two student members-at-large. The Director of Libraries shall serve ex officio without vote. Additional ex officio non-voting members may be included at the discretion of the committee."

[For 5.4.7.2. and 5.4.7.3. read "5.4.07.2." and "5.4.07.3." respectively.]

[Sections 5.4.8.1. and 5.4.8.3. of the present Bylaws have been expunged in order to make way for the following Council revisions.]

"5.4.08. University Student Affairs Committee

"5.4.08.1. The University Student Affairs Committee shall be composed of six faculty members to be selected on a rotating basis among the colleges of the University according to the procedures outlined in Section 6.1.4. of the Bylaws; five undergraduate students appointed by the Associated Students of Michigan State University (ASMSU); four graduate students selected by the Council of Graduate Students (COGS), and two student members-at-large.

The Vice President for Student Affairs and the Dean of Students shall serve ex officio without vote. Additional ex officio non-voting members may be included at the discretion of the committee.

"5.4.08.2. The Student Affairs Committee shall examine, study, and evaluate all policies of the Office of the Vice President for Student Affairs as they affect academic achievement in the University and advise the Vice President for Student Affairs, the Dean of Students, and the Academic Council thereupon.

"5.4.08.3. The Student Affairs Committee shall initiate amendments and review proposed amendments to (1) the Academic Freedom Report with the exception of Sections 2.1.4.9 and 2.2; (2) General Student Regulations; and (3) policies relating to the academic rights and responsibilities of students; provided, however, that any amendment affecting the professional rights and responsibilities of the faculty (as the Elected Faculty Council interprets these rights and responsibilities) must be approved by the Elected Faculty Council before consideration by the Academic Council.

386

The Council shall refuse to consider any amendment or revision of Sections 2.1.4.9 and 2.2 of the Academic Freedom Report until the proposed change has received the endorsement of the University Committee on Faculty Affairs, Faculty Compensation, and Academic Budget and the approval of the Elected Faculty Council.

"5.4.08.4. The Student Affairs Committee shall assume the duties of the Committee on Academic Rights and Responsibilities described in Section 2.3 of the Academic Freedom Report.

"5.4.09. University Committee on Business Affairs

"5.4.09.1. The voting membership of the Committee on Business Affairs shall consist of its elected faculty members, three undergraduate students, two graduate students, and two student members-at-large. The Vice President for Business and Finance, together with two other persons from the business and service groups designated by the Vice President for Business and Finance, shall serve as ex officio non-voting members. Additional ex officio non-voting members may be included at the discretion of the committee."

[In 5.4.9.2. and 5.4.9.3. read "5.4.09.2." and "5.4.09.3." respectively.]

"5.4.10. University Committee on Academic Governance

"5.4.10.1. The voting membership of the Committee on Academic Governance shall consist of one faculty member from each college, one faculty member representing the non-college faculty, one student member from each college (selected according to procedures established by the colleges), two student members-at-large, and one additional faculty member selected by the Committee on Committees so as to represent the lower faculty ranks.

"5.4.10.2. The Committee on Academic Governance shall undertake a continuing review of the Bylaws of the Faculty with the responsibility for making recommendations to the Council for whatever changes in the Bylaws the Committee's investigations indicate.

"5.4.10.3. Specifically, the Committee on Academic Governance shall conduct a continuing study of the steps being taken throughout the University to involve students in academic government in accordance with the procedures established by these Bylaws.

"5.4.11. University Committee on Public Safety

"5.4.11.1. The voting membership of the Committee on Public Safety shall consist of seven faculty

members (two from the lower faculty ranks) to be selected on a rotating basis among the colleges of the University according to the procedures outlined in Section 6.1.4. of the Bylaws; four undergraduate students appointed by the Associated Students of Michigan State University (ASMSU); one graduate student selected by the Council of Graduate Students (COGS); and two student members-at-large.

The Director of the School of Criminal Justice and the Director of the Department of Public Safety shall serve as ex officio non-voting members. Other ex officio non-voting members may be included at the discretion of the Committee."

"5.4.11.2. The Committee on Public Safety shall examine policies affecting the public safety of the University community. Specifically, the Committee on Public Safety shall study and evaluate public safety services, facilities, and policies, and shall advise the President, Provost, the Director of Public Safety, and the Academic Council thereupon.

"5.4.11.3. The Committee on Public Safety shall hold regular, open meetings at which members of the academic community may bring to the

389
attention of the committee issues affecting
the public safety of the University.

"5.4.11.4. The Committee on Public Safety shall place
under continuous study current and projected
needs of the University with respect to public
safety, and recommend appropriate action.

"5.4.12. University Committee on Building, Lands, and Planning

"5.4.12.1. The voting membership of the Committee on
Building, Lands, and Planning shall consist of
its elected faculty members, three undergraduate
students, one graduate student, and two student
members-at-large. The Executive Vice President,
the Director of Campus Park and Planning, the
Director of Space Utilization, and the Univer-
sity Architect shall serve ex officio without
vote. Additional ex officio non-voting members
may be added at the discretion of the committee.

"5.4.12.2. The committee shall be charged with the follow-
ing specific responsibilities:

"5.4.12.2.1. Studying and making recommendations
with respect to building priorities
on University property.

"5.4.12.2.2. Studying and making recommendations
with respect to proposals for land
utilization on University property.

390

- "5.4.12.2.3. Studying and making recommendations with respect to the ecological implications of land utilization and building proposals.
- "5.4.12.2.4. Studying and making recommendations with respect to traffic planning.
- "5.4.12.2.5. Studying and making recommendations on the appearance and location of buildings with respect to both functional and aesthetic criteria.
- "5.4.12.2.6. Advising the President of the University concerning the financing, location and appearance of physical facilities on University property, and informing the Academic Council of its recommendations."

6.2.1. - 6.2.1.2. Delete these sections in the present Bylaws, and renumber Sections 6.2.2. - 6.2.2.2. as follows:

for 6.2.2. read 6.2.1.
" 6.2.2.1. " 6.2.1.1.
" 6.2.2.2. " 6.2.1.2.

6.2.3. - 6.2.3.2. Delete these sections in the present Bylaws.

December 3, 1970