



The pesticide paradox: How to control insect pests and protect the environment.

Two veteran scientists recall concern over chemical effects

Neither George J. Wallace nor Ray L. Janes will be among the featured guests or speakers when Michigan State officially dedicates its new Pesticide Research Center this week. Yet both men — in different roles — have long been closely concerned with the pesticide paradox.

U-C provost speaks

Paul Saltman, provost and professor of biology at the University of California at San Diego, will speak Friday at 4 p.m. in the Erickson Kiva. His topic: "Provosts, Protein, Protest and Pöt." His speech is cosponsored by the Honors College and the Department of Botany and Plant Pathology.

Wallace, professor of zoology, attracted wide notice in the late 1950's when he suggested that the DDT-spraying program to control Dutch elm disease at MSU was destroying the robin population on the north campus.

Other ornithologists protested the spraying, and before the controversy died down, some off-campus groups were calling Wallace "hysterical" and an "alarmist," and a few demanded that he be fired.

Wallace recalls that he and a graduate student, John Mehner, verified a depletion of robins here in 1957.

"Normally, there was one pair of robins per acre in the early spring," he says. "This meant about 180 pairs on

(Continued on page 4)

MSU Faculty News

Vol. 1, No. 18

Michigan State University

Feb. 24, 1970

Dedication Thursday

Pesticide Center: A paradox studied

When Michigan State dedicates its new \$2 million Pesticide Research Center Thursday night, it will mark another milestone in the University's nearly 100 years of involvement in problems of pest control and pesticides.

The dedication, set for 7 p.m. in the new facility, is a highlight of an international symposium on pesticides that opens Wednesday and continues through Friday in Kellogg Center.

Scientists at MSU were among the first to contribute to the agricultural revolution through recommendation of crude pesticides and today are among the first to realize the dangers pesticides present to the environment.

The 1870's marked the beginning of pesticide research here. Albert J. Cook, a zoologist on the original Experiment Station staff, discovered that kerosene could be emulsified with soap to provide a cheap, effective spray to destroy plant sucking insects without harming plant foliage.

At about the same time, Cook also became the first scientist in the U.S. to use a crude carbolic acid emulsion against bark lice and probably the first to use Paris Green to control codling moth infestation of apple orchards.

* * *

OTHER EARLY noted MSU scientists, such as Liberty Hyde Bailey,

Robert C. Kedzie and Manly Miles, also played roles in developing chemicals as important agricultural tools. Kedzie and Miles contributed to early understanding of plant nutrients and fertilizers, and Bailey delved into the little-known world of how seed germination is affected by chemicals.

Another agricultural scientist whose efforts are still felt today was Levi Rawson Taft. Taft replaced Liberty Hyde Bailey in 1888 and in 1889 introduced fruit spraying to Michigan, applying some of the first fungicides to apple trees with a pump and pail system.

But pesticides now represent a paradox. Without them, insects would cause severe crop damage and food prices would go soaring. With them, there is the risk of harmful side effects on the environment.

As early as 1950 scientists in the Agricultural Experiment Station were

(Continued on page 4)

NUC to meet again

The local chapter of the New University Conference will meet at 7:30 tonight in the Union's Mural Room to discuss the problems of the radical teacher. The meeting is open to the public.

McKee Report proposes more student representation

Some three months after receiving its charge, the New Committee on Student Participation in Academic Government, chaired by James B. McKee, has submitted its report to the Steering Committee of the Faculty for placement on the agenda for the Academic Council meeting March 3.

The report, reprinted in this issue, differs from the original (Massey) report in several ways, including:

- Recommendations for more student representation on all standing committees except the University Committee on Educational Policies (for which fewer students are recommended than in the original report) and the University Committee on Faculty Affairs, for which no student representation is recommended.

- A recommendation for no faculty representation on the University Committee on Student Affairs.

- No recommendations relating to the Graduate Council or to academic credit for participation in academic government.

- Specific recommendations for minority student representation.

- Establishment of a Faculty - Student Committee on Academic Governance, and abolition of the Standing Committee on the Academic Rights and Responsibilities of Students.

* * *

STUDENTS on McKee committee have met with about 70 undergraduates who volunteered to explain the report's facts, rationale and ramifications to the study body in residence halls and in classrooms.

Any faculty member wanting to devote class time to discussion of the

McKee Report and who would wish one of the 70 students to assist or lead the discussion may call Bob Grossfeld, ASMSU Cabinet President, at 353-8857.

* * *

FACULTY MEMBERS of the New Committee on Student Participation in Academic Government, all members of the Academic Council, are McKee, professor of sociology and in James Madison College; Sam S. Baskett, professor of English; Erwin Bettinghaus, assistant dean of communication arts and professor of communication; Edward A. Carlin, dean of University College; Michael J. Harrison, professor of physics; and John J. Masterson, associate professor of mathematics.

Student members of the committee, appointed by former President Walter Adams to represent undergraduate, graduate and black students, are Gina Schaack, Harry Chancey, Michael Freed and Charles McMillan.

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 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 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. 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

(Continued on page 2)

The McKee Report: More students wo

(Continued from page 1)

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 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.

-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 we strongly suggest that such arrangement be codified into written bylaws.

“... students and faculty should come together for decision making regarding mutual concerns...”

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 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. For example, 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 Oct. 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 Oct. 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 Oct. 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 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 chose, to institute parallel structures at the college and departments would be free, if they individually so chose, 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

“... to refuse students the opportunity to participate with their vote as well as their voice would lead to a lack of commitment...”

from 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 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 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 13 colleges whose primary educational tasks is the education of the undergraduate.

Recommendation 5. There shall be six voting graduate students 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 “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 the greatest

participate in academic government

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)

.....
 " . . . concerns peculiar to faculty should be considered by faculty alone . . . " and "concerns peculiar to students should be considered by students alone."

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 and one graduate students.*

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 13 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 representatives 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 3-6-6, the number of students is approximately the same in each of 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 Oct. 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 three 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 two 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 seven minority seats on the University Student Affairs Committee in order to provide specific minority representation.*

Recommendation 22. *There shall be five 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 models 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 ensure 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 by law 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 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 majority vote of those present and voting 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 earlier, we believe that "concerns peculiar to the faculty should be considered 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

.....
 " . . . our representative structures by their very nature fail to air certain points of view."

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 an 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

Earlier in 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 students alone."

At present, the Student Affairs Committee has two major charges under the by laws: (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 Free 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 to 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 Rights and Responsibilities as described in Section 2.3 of the Academic Freedom Report.*

If Recommendation 31 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.

.....

.....
 " . . . our representative structures by their very nature fail to air certain points of view."

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 ensure student voice in determining what matters will be brought before the Academic Council.

Faculty invited

Faculty "bosses" have been invited to accompany their secretaries to a session of this week's 16th annual Business Women's Club Institute.

The session, from 9 to 11 a.m. Thursday in the Union, is devoted to a discussion of employee - employer relations and attitudes. It will be chaired by Daniel Kruger, professor of labor and industrial relations.

To speak today

Today's speaker at the Faculty Club luncheon in the Union will be John McNeill, assistant professor of pharmacology. His topic is "Drugs and Drug Abuse."

Pesticide Center...

(Continued from page 1)

aware of this paradox. In one of the first efforts to reduce the chances of over - application of fertilizers, they developed a method of leaf analysis that allows fruit growers to make exact applications of fertilizers. Before leaf analysis, most plantings were fertilized by the "shot gun" method which often meant over - application.

* * *

AWAKENED PUBLIC interest and government concern made possible the formation of an MSU interdepartmental pesticide research effort in 1964. As a result, scientists from 17 departments are now conducting an all - out, coordinated research effort on all phases of pest and pesticide - related problems.

The new campus facility that houses these research efforts contains necessary laboratory equipment, controlled environment chambers and greenhouses.

According to Gordon Guyer, director of the new Pesticide Research Center, "Interdisciplinary research is much more important now than it was six years ago when this program was initially planned. Issues now are

involved not only with persistent pesticides and insecticides, but also many other compounds and other types of pollutants."

"It has become very evident that the philosophy of an interdisciplinary approach is absolutely essential if we hope to solve the pesticide problems of today and tomorrow," Guyer said.

"Already, input from the Center has changed the philosophy of pest control in Michigan," he said. "We have gone from programs primarily using pesticides to integrated programs where we are using every conceivable technique to bring pest populations into reasonable bounds."

* * *

NEW INTEGRATED approaches to pest problems include the use of biological controls. By introducing natural predators of insect pests into the environment, scientists can provide help for growers without the danger of contamination from insecticides.

Other integrated control measures often used are cultural methods, such as plowing or planting at a certain time, or the use of a more selective pesticide at a

better time to meet peaks of pest infestation.

Scientists in the Pesticide Research Center are not investigating pest control problems alone. They direct much of their effort toward the study of the long - and short-term environmental effects of pesticides.

"The main objective of our research is to anticipate problems rather than react to them," Guyer said. "We now have a well - balanced program that includes the objectives of meeting the needs of growers, and at the same time intensifying our research efforts on the environmental and possible detrimental effects of pesticides."

Seminar offered

Faculty are invited to remind students of a meeting tonight at 7:30 in the Union Sun Porch at which plans will be announced for an International Seminar in comparative Journalism. The seminar, which consists of two courses, will be June 22 - Aug. 15 in Yugoslavia. Enrollment will be limited to 30 students.

Veteran scientists...

(Continued from page 1)

the north campus. In 1957, Mehner counted only a few pairs and just one young bird."

* * *

WALLACE had theorized that the DDT dropped or was washed from the elms, accumulated in the soil and was absorbed by earthworms. A robin would eat the earthworms and die when DDT buildup in its brain reached lethal levels.

He obtained a grant from the federal Fish and Wildlife Service and had a number of dead robins analyzed in a laboratory in the agricultural chemistry (now biochemistry) department.

"I admit I was scared," Wallace says today. "Everyone told me I was wrong. I had said that DDT was killing the birds before we got the results from the analyses."

Those results supported his contention, and so further efforts were made to minimize effects of DDT spraying on wildlife, particularly on the robins. In 1962, elm spraying with DDT was discontinued on the campus.

Much of the evidence Wallace gathered was cited by the late Rachel Carson in her best-selling book, "Silent Spring."

Wallace says that effects of the chemical are still evident among the birds. Omnivorous species, such as starlings, grackles and sparrows, have replaced those species that feed primarily on insects and worms. The campus robin population is still down, he adds.

"I think this change in species

composition is irreversible," Wallace says. "But I won't live long enough to ever know."

* * *

JANES, professor of entomology and extension entomologist, arrived at Michigan State in 1946, about the time DDT and other chlorinated hydrocarbons were introduced. He recalls waging a long struggle, not to eliminate the chemicals, but to regulate their use.

Trying to control the use of DDT was "a real problem," he says, "because the public was so enthusiastic about its effectiveness." The public climate in the early '50s, Janes says, would not have permitted abolition of DDT.

From about 1946 to 1950, there were no guidelines on DDT use, he says, and many users were led to attempt perfect control of insects, which was "both costly and unfortunately seldom attained."

"These efforts expanded the use of insecticides and in many cases increased

the dosage rates of the chemicals."

Tighter controls on chemical dosage rates and tolerance levels were slow in coming, he says, and even when recommendations were developed, use of DDT and other chemicals spread because "everyone became an expert on pest control."

Janes points out that as early as 1948 MSU scientists warned about possible hazards of DDT to control codling moths in apples. In 1949 they recommended cancellation of DDT where dairy cattle might be exposed, because the chemical was being eliminated in milk.

* * *

BETWEEN 1949 and 1969, University entomologists suggested that DDT be discontinued in six different instances where it presented possible hazard to the environment.

Michigan last year banned all use of DDT.

"Some of our really important improvements in insect control have resulted from a better understanding of insect life histories," Janes explains. "We have spent a lot of time learning the best time to control insects."

"The problems of pesticide environment contamination must be fully realized as a part of total food production, public health and public domain problems," Janes says, "not merely as a part of isolated ecological conditions."

Picture-taking lags

Don't wait until the last minute to be photographed for the new staff and employee identification cards.

That's the plea from officials responsible for updating ID cards. They report that the volume of persons to be photographed for the cards is running about 40 per cent lower than anticipated. They express concern that the operation will become snarled if too many of MSU's more than 8,000 faculty and employees wait until the last week (March 9-13) to be photographed.

Scheduled for pictures this week (in Room 142 Administration Building) are persons from Natural Science, University College, veterinary medicine, James Madison, Justin Morrill, Lyman Briggs, aerospace studies, military science, campus park and planning, public safety and international programs.

WKAR

Tuesday, Feb. 24

6:30 a.m. (FM) MORNING SHOW. (Monday through Friday.)
8 a.m. (AM-FM) MORNING NEWS REPORT. (Monday through Friday.)
9 a.m. (AM-FM) DICK ESTELL READS. "Fire From Heaven" by Renault. (Monday through Friday.)
10 a.m. (FM) ON CAMPUS. (Monday through Friday.)
11 a.m. (AM) TRANSATLANTIC PROFILE.
11:30 a.m. (AM-FM) NEWS. (Monday through Friday.)
1 p.m. (FM) MUSIC THEATRE. "The New Moon."
5 p.m. (AM-FM) NEWS 60. (Monday through Friday.)
8:30 p.m. (FM) BOSTON SYMPHONY.
Wednesday, Feb. 25
11 a.m. (AM) BOOK BEAT.
1 p.m. (FM) MUSIC THEATRE. "Anything Goes."
8 p.m. (FM) THE ART OF GLENN GOULD.

Thursday, Feb. 26

10 a.m. (AM) THE ART OF GLENN GOULD.
11 a.m. (AM) EUROPEAN REVIEW.
1 p.m. (FM) MUSIC THEATRE. "Bajour."
7 p.m. (FM) CINCINNATI SYMPHONY ORCHESTRA.
9 p.m. (FM) JAZZ HORIZONS.
Friday, Feb. 27
10:30 a.m. (AM) THE GOON SHOW.
11 a.m. (AM) A FEDERAL CASE.
1 p.m. (FM) MUSIC THEATRE. "Little Me."
2 p.m. (FM) ALBUM JAZZ.
4:45 p.m. (AM-FM) EDUCATION IN THE NEWS.

Saturday, Feb. 28

9 a.m. (AM-FM) DICK ESTELL READS. "The Establishment is Alive and Well in Washington" by Art Buchwald.
9:30 a.m. (AM) THE WORD AND MUSIC.
10:30 a.m. (AM) VARIEDADES EN ESPANOL.
11:45 p.m. (FM) RECENT ACQUISITIONS.
1:30 p.m. (AM) THE DRUM.
2 p.m. (AM) ALBUM JAZZ.
7 p.m. (FM) LISTENERS' CHOICE. Classics by calling 355-6540.

Sunday, March 1

2 p.m. (AM-FM) CLEVELAND ORCHESTRA.
4 p.m. (AM-FM) FROM THE MIDWAY.
7 p.m. (FM) COLLOQUY.
Monday, March 2
10:30 a.m. (AM) ASIA SOCIETY.
11 a.m. (AM) COLLOQUY.
1 p.m. (FM) MUSIC THEATRE. "Three Penny Opera."
8 p.m. (FM) OPERA FROM RADIO ITALIANA. "Fra Gherardo."
10:30 p.m. (FM) MUSIC OF TODAY.

WMSB

Tuesday, Feb. 24

7 p.m. KUKLA, FRAN AND OLLIE.
Wednesday, Feb. 25
12:30 p.m. BLACK MAN IN THE AMERICAS. James R. Hooker defines Pan - Africanism.
1 p.m. LET'S TAKE PICTURES. How to take holiday pictures.
7 p.m. YOUNG MUSICAL ARTISTS. Pianist Barbara Nissman.

Thursday, Feb. 26

7 p.m. LA REVISTA.
Friday, Feb. 27
12:30 p.m. INSIGHT. Greenwich Village writer's agnosticism carries him to verge of suicide.

1 p.m. LES FLEURS.
7 p.m. ASSIGNMENT 10.

Saturday, Feb. 28

11 a.m. INNOVATIONS.
1 p.m. THE SHOW. Dick Gregory, Raven and Melanie.

Sunday, March 1

11 a.m. NEWS IN PERSPECTIVE. South's attempts to comply with Supreme Court school ruling.
12 noon ASSIGNMENT 10.

1 p.m. NET FESTIVAL. Life of John Philip Sousa.

2:30 p.m. SOUL! Curtis Mayfield, Henry Shed, The Moments, The Honey and Melba Moore.

3:30 p.m. THE FORSYTHE SAGA.
4:30 p.m. NET JOURNAL. U.S. military interventions.

10 p.m. THE ADVOCATES. Do we need our land-based missiles?

11 p.m. NET PLAYHOUSE. "A Generation of Leaves: America, Inc.," premiere of 8-part series rift between generations. (90 minutes)

Monday, March 2
7 p.m. SPARTAN SPORTLITE.

Insurance enrollment to close Friday

This Friday is the final day for open enrollment in the University's accidental death and dismemberment insurance program.

Persons not now covered by the plan may enroll, and those already

enrolled may increase their coverage, which will become effective April 1.

The program covers accidental death, dismemberment or loss of sight and permanent total disability.

Two changes are being introduced during this enrollment period: Maximum amount of insurance available has been raised from \$50,000 to \$150,000 and family coverage is now available (except for the disability provision).

An average policyholder can obtain 50 per cent more in coverage for an increase of 35 per cent in his monthly premium, according to Albert C. Chapman, staff benefits supervisor.

The program is underwritten by Mutual of Omaha.

MSU Faculty News

Editor: Gene Rietfors
Associate Editor: Beverly Twitchell
Editorial Office: 296-G Hannah Administration Building, Michigan State University, East Lansing 48823, Phone 355-2285.
Published weekly during the academic year by the Department of Information Services.
Second-class postage paid at East Lansing, Mich. 48823.