

New Faculty Club dues will begin June 1

Monthly dues for the Faculty Club — whose new building is scheduled for partial use by June 1 — have been set at \$17.50 by the club's Board of Directors.

The dues structure, subject to approval by Faculty Club membership later this spring, will be effective June 1.

The structure calls for \$7.69 of each member's monthly payment to support current club expenses, with the remaining \$9.81 going toward retirement of the club's building debt. The club has a \$1.2 million mortgage (beyond some \$600,000 in gifts that helped start the new building) and about 1,000 members.

* * *

UNDER TERMS of the plan, each member will

accumulate an equity which is refundable when that member leaves the club (provided he finds a new member).

At the present dues rate, a member would have \$27.71 in equity after one year, \$160.94 after five years, \$392.02 after 10 years and \$1,200 after 20 years.

A person joining the club after this June 1 will be required to pay the standard membership deposit of \$225, plus the amount of equity he would have accumulated if he had joined on or before June 1. The plan is designed to enable founding members to build an equity and to assess a share of the debt retirement to future members.

Richard L. Feltner, assistant dean of agriculture and chairman of the membership committee, said that the new dues are payable by monthly payroll deductions. The membership deposit is also payable by deductions, in 10 installments of \$22.50 each.

He said that life members will be assessed only the \$7.69 each month to meet operating expenses. A faculty member on sabbatical leave for more than six months may request a waiver of dues during the period he is gone, Feltner said.

The club's pool, tennis courts, locker rooms and snack facilities will be ready by June 1, and the rest of the building is scheduled for completion in September.



The ED325B steering committee: (From left) Prof. Ray Harper, Cheryl Shapiro, John Russell and Rod Merten. — Photo by Dick Wesley

Revamping a methods course: Freedom without frustration

By GENE RIETFORSS
Editor, Faculty News

Ray Harper overhauled his undergraduate course for elementary education majors because, he says, "I got tired of being told to practice what I preach."

"I had been playing the professor's role to the hilt," he recalls. "I preached freedom and democracy in the classroom, but I taught in a fashion that was generally authoritarian and sometimes oppressive."

"That's what some of my students had told me."

So Harper, an associate professor of elementary and special education, designed a classroom structure that he hoped would emphasize freedom without frustration, structure without suppression.

He set out to promote student involvement last winter in "Language Arts for the Elementary Grades" (ED 325B), part of the 18-credit "methods block" required for the bachelor's degree in elementary education.

Real student participation was a lofty aim, because the class was a large one, with 268 students meeting for two hours each Friday in the Erickson Hall Kiva.

* * *

FIRST, Harper took the "lecture" out of the weekly Kiva session. "It's inefficient for one professor to use all that time just lecturing to so many students," he says. He turned those weekly two-hour meetings into a myriad of experiences: Group discussions that encouraged class interaction and feedback, teaching demonstrations by Harper and local elementary teachers who brought their pupils with them,

presentations by visiting educators, plus slide, tape and film programs.

Agendas for each "lecture" session were drawn up largely by the students themselves through a steering committee of 13 class members who met each Monday with Harper and his two teaching assistants. Any other students were welcome to the meetings, and a number of them attended each week, offering suggested topics or speakers for future sessions and providing feedback to past sessions.

The steering committee established the criteria for final grades in the course. It also heard appeals from fellow students who disagreed with any answers provided to weekly quizzes that were given during the Kiva sessions.

Early in the term, steering committee members voiced concern over their relationships with fellow students, so they decided to make clear that service

(Continued on page 4)

E-QUAL series resumes today

Seminars on ecological problems will be presented by the departments of the College of Agriculture and Natural Resources throughout the months of April and May to complement the student-sponsored E-QUAL teach-in April 22-24.

Today at 4 p.m. James Butcher, assistant dean of natural science, and Herman Koenig, professor and chairman of electrical engineering and systems sciences, will speak on "Aspects of Environmental Control" in 101 Biochemistry, sponsored by the Department of Biochemistry.

MSU Faculty News

Vol. 1, No. 22

Michigan State University

April 7, 1970

Two meetings set

McKee Report still on Council agenda

The first of two scheduled April meetings of the Academic Council will convene at 3:15 p.m. today in the Con Con Room of the International Center. Another meeting is slated for 3:15 p.m. Monday (April 13) at the same location.

Today's Council agenda includes:

- Presentation of eight nominees for two vacancies on the steering committee.

- A report from the Student - Faculty Committee on a Special Convocation for Faculty Awards.

- Resumption of consideration of the McKee Report (of the New Committee on Student Participation in Academic Government).

* * *

IN CONSIDERING unresolved portions of the McKee Report, the Council will hear a report from the Ad Hoc Committee on Minority Student Participation in Academic Government, and it will proceed with action on recommendation 26 and recommendations 28-31.

Recommendation 26 concerns creation of a University Committee on Academic Governance.

Recommendations 28-31, which refer to the University Student Affairs Committee, had been tabled at the Council's March 12 meeting. Substitute proposals to be presented today include renaming the student affairs committee the University Faculty - Student Affairs Committee. It would be composed of five undergraduate and four graduate students (with appropriate minority representation), six faculty members, and the vice president for student affairs and

associate dean of students (both ex officio).

The proposals also call for changed responsibilities of the faculty - student affairs committee, and for revisions and amendments to the Academic Freedom Report.

* * *

NOMINEES FOR two 1970-72 terms on the steering committee include four - candidate slates offered by a nominating committee of the Academic Council and by the Committee on Committees.

Nominated by the Council are: Thomas H. Greer, professor of humanities (incumbent); Michael J. Harrison, professor of physics; Beatrice

Minority representation report, page 2

Paolucci, professor of family and child sciences; and Chitra M. Smith, assistant professor in James Madison College.

Committee on Committee nominees are: Norman Abeles, professor and assistant director, Counseling Center; Martin C. Hawley, associate professor of chemical engineering; Nicolaas G.M. Luykx, associate professor of agricultural economics; and Dozier M. Thornton, associate professor of psychology.

Dale Hathaway, professor and chairman of agricultural economics, is not seeking re-election.

* * *

TENTATIVELY scheduled for the agenda at the Council's April 13 meeting are:

- A report on changes in the faculty bylaws to establish a University Committee on Faculty Compensation and Academic Budget Allocation.

- Discussion of a proposal by the MSU chapter of AAUP to broaden the authority of the faculty tenure committee.

- A report from the faculty affairs committee on recommended faculty salary adjustments for 1970-71.

- Discussion of the status of the ROTC committee (which is not now a faculty standing committee).

The tenure committee's recommendations are slight revisions of ones made earlier by the AAUP. They state that:

- University tenure rules shall be amended to state explicitly that a

(Continued on page 3)

Committee proposes 30 seats for minority representatives

The following report from the Ad Hoc Committee on Minority Student Participation in Academic Governance will be presented at today's Academic Council meeting. The committee was formed to provide substitute recommendations for minority student representation proposals contained in the McKee Committee on Student Participation in Academic Government.

Hidaya Kumata, professor of communication, and director of the International Communication Institute, chaired the committee. Other members included: Erwin Bettinghaus, professor and assistant dean of communication arts; Winston R. Oberg, professor of management; James B. Hamilton, assistant professor of chemistry; Jack M. Bain, professor and dean of communication arts; Peter F. Flynn, president of the Council of Graduate Students; Michael L. Hudson, director of the ASMSU Office of Black Affairs; Alfred J. Rivas, representing Mexican-American Students; Joseph R. Szczeny, an alternate student representative to the Academic Council; and Charles E. McMillan, a member of the McKee Committee.

In making these recommendations, the ad hoc committee started with the assumption that adequate representation of minority students in academic governance was desired by the Academic Council. We addressed ourselves to four major points, namely: (a) Who would be included under the term minority group, (b) where would responsibility lie in selection procedures, (c) what numbers would constitute adequate representation, and (d) the legality of minority representation.

We felt that the addition of minority students to academic governing bodies should be in sufficient numbers to render the Council and standing committees more conscious of the perspectives, problems and varieties of minority students present on our campus. Minority students would bring new challenges, new outlooks on problems to a community relatively homogeneous in outlook and constituency.

Eventually, we hope that minority representation will become procedures established in other parts of the McKee Report. Our last recommendation which stipulates a review of this portion of the McKee Report by the committee on Academic Governance is intended to have an assessment on whether this has become feasible or not.

Although it is possible to list under varying definitions an almost endless list of minorities, the committee made the assumption that minority meant primarily non-white. The significant non-white minorities which MSU now has or will have in the immediately foreseeable future are blacks, Mexican-Americans and native Americans. There is the possibility, however, that other non-white minority groups may emerge in the continuing process of student generations at MSU. Coupled with the problem of how many minority groups to consider is the problem of who would determine membership in these groups.

The committee was agreed that inclusion within a specific minority was one of self definition. Although it may be recognized that self definition may produce instances of apparent questionable inclusion, (e.g. a person who had one great-grandparent who was a Filipino identifying as a Filipino), there seems no better way than using self definition as the main criterion.

We would argue that if a person sees as a primary and significant part of his self conception, identification as a particular racial minority, this is reasonable grounds for inclusion.

One way to get all of the minorities considered for representation would be for some organizations to emerge which could then be named as the agents for producing minority members to academic government. The committee felt that this was a cumbersome and needlessly complicated procedure. It would be much more desirable, as one of the letters to our committee suggested, that a council of minorities, analogous to the Council of Graduate Students (COGS), be established so that this group could produce members in the same

way that COGS would be asked to produce members.

We found that the basic framework for such a procedure already existed in the Office of Black Affairs of ASMSU. We felt that this office, within a structure of a recognized governing body at MSU, could become the focal point through which minority students could discuss and form procedures, and to which the Committee on Academic Governance could turn in its review responsibility in the same way it could turn to COGS or the colleges in examining their procedures.

Further, the Office of Black Affairs has as one of its components the Third World Student Organizations. The function of the Office of Black Affairs includes the services to minority students other than blacks. It includes positions for a Mexican-American and a native American, one of which is filled and the other about to be filled. Any minority group can avail itself of the services of this office. It is designed to be, and works, as a place where representatives of minority organizations can gather for discussion.

The procedures for selection in our view should be left to the minority students working through the Office of Black Affairs. Any question of the numbers of different minority groups of representation can be left to this Office. In making this recommendation, the committee did not want to make the procedures and definition of constituency any more stringent than what had been specified as selection procedures in the other parts of the McKee Report. Further, all plans of procedures must be filed with the Committee on Academic Governance.

It is understood that if voting procedures are established, there will be avoidance of minority students having two votes, one in college selection procedures and one in minority representation election.

* * *

THE QUESTION of adequate numbers became one of our hardest problems. We were faced with question of adequacy. We modified another letter which was sent to our committee in trying to resolve what adequate numbers would be. Instead of taking representation committee by committee, we looked at the total number which would be involved in academic governance.

In the McKee Report, exclusive of specific minority representation, a total of 210 faculty and administrators and 92 students were recommended originally for the Academic Council and all standing committees. Part IV of the McKee Report recommended an additional 41 minority students. The change contemplated in the student affairs committee would reduce the numbers of students by three and increase the faculty by six so that assuming the passage of the revised student affairs committee section, the numbers would be 216 faculty and administrators and 89 students in the Council and standing committees.

The Academic Council in addition passed an amendment giving ex-officio members of the Council the vote which increased the faculty-administrator number to 221. Ten additional votes were also added to the Council by the same amendment which gave chairmen of standing committees the vote. Since those 10 additional votes are not 10 additional persons, the number of faculty-administrators and students involved in academic governance is 221 and 89, respectively, before any minority representation. In the Academic Council, the numbers are 92 faculty and 21 students.

We felt that a significant voice would be at least 25 per cent of the student voices. This would mean 30 seats and would increase the students involved to 119. The 25 per cent figure, one out of every four students (including graduate students) involved in academic governance, is higher than the percentage presently of all minority students at MSU. However, it is not an unrealistic figure from the standpoint of adequate representation given 10 bodies to which persons may be allocated, and from the standpoint of increased enrollment of minority students in light of recruitment attempts at MSU.

In total numbers, however, if we view the entire academic governing process in which 339 faculty, administrators and students including minorities are involved, 30 minority students comprise 8.8 per cent of the total.

What this does, in effect, is to reduce the numbers of minority representatives from 41 as originally recommended in the McKee Report to 30. In that report, every committee had minority students on it and, in addition, seats were reserved on the Academic Council. We propose that the numbers of minority students to serve on the Academic Council and the standing committee be in the pattern

of the McKee Report, but that 30 seats be allocated. This allocation means that some committees may have no minority members at all. The numbers to be allocated are left to the procedures to be worked out through the Office of Black Affairs. We assume that those bodies which are deemed to be most important for minority representation will get their full share of minority members. In order to have efficient groups, we have recommended that the allocation of numbers be reported before the first meeting of any academic year and that such allocation will remain in effect for at least that academic year.

* * *

RECOMMENDATION 1. There shall be additional seats for minority student representation on the Academic Council and its standing committees.

RECOMMENDATION 2. The means of selecting these students will be developed by minority students through the Office of Black Affairs, ASMSU, in consultation with the several colleges. It is recommended that representation will be across all colleges.

RECOMMENDATION 3. There shall be at least 30 seats for minority representatives Academic Council and standing committee membership. The allocation of representatives to these various groups will be determined by procedures set up through the Office of Black Affairs. In so doing, the following guidelines are established. (It is understood that the limits placed on numbers below refer only to minority representation produced through this set of recommendations. There is no allocation guideline in terms of numbers for minority students selected through other procedures.)

a. No more than 10 seats in the Academic Council.

b. No more than three seats to any one of the following committees: educational policies, curriculum, honors, international projects, tenure, business and library.

c. No more than four seats to the following committees: student affairs, academic governance.

Since the number of minority representatives is less than the number of seats allowable, the allocation of numbers to the Academic Council or to standing committees will be determined through the Office of Black Affairs. Such determination will be reported to the Committee on Academic Governance at the start of the academic year and before the meeting of the Academic Council. The plan of allocation will be maintained through the school year in order for standing committees to function efficiently. Change in allocation, if necessary, will take place at the beginning of any school year.

RECOMMENDATION 4. The Office of Black Affairs will report the arrangements for selection of minority representatives to the Committee on Academic Governance by Dec. 1, 1970.

RECOMMENDATION 5. 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. Such methods shall be reported to the Committee on Academic Governance by Dec. 1, 1970.

RECOMMENDATION 6. The Committee on Academic Governance will review the process of minority student representation in three years and report its assessment to the Academic Council.

Insurance available

Faculty and staff under 53 years of age who did not enroll in the University's life insurance program at the time of their employment may now enroll at any time upon evidence of insurability, according to the Staff Benefits Office. And persons now participating in the plan may at anytime increase their coverage (from schedule A to schedule B), with evidence of insurability.

A medical examination is normally not required by the Lincoln National Life Insurance company, underwriters of the plan. Additional information is available from the Staff Benefits Office at 353-4434.

WMSB

Tuesday, April 7

12:30 p.m. UNDERSTANDING OUR WORLD.
1 p.m. THE GREEN THUMB.
7 p.m. MUSIC ON TELEVISION. Pipe organ enthusiasts.

Wednesday, April 8

12:30 p.m. BLACK MAN IN THE AMERICAS. Brown vs. Board of Education cast.
1 p.m. LET'S TAKE PICTURES.
7 p.m. YOUNG MUSICAL ARTISTS. Cellist Stephen Kates and pianist Samuel Sanders.

Thursday, April 9

12:30 p.m. IT'S A DOG'S LIFE.
1 p.m. THE FRENCH CHEF.
7 p.m. LA REVISTA.

Friday, April 10

12:30 p.m. INSIGHT. Two priests are confronted by totalitarian demands of 1920 Russia.
1 p.m. LES FLEURS.
7 p.m. THE SHOW. Robert Lloyd of the American Nazi Party, author Jay Richard Kennedy.

Sunday, April 12

11 a.m. NEWS IN PERSPECTIVE.
12 noon ASSIGNMENT 10.
1 p.m. THE FORSYTE SAGA.
2 p.m. YOUR RIGHT TO SAY IT.
2:30 p.m. SOUL! Joe Tex, Maya Angelou, King Curtis.
3:30 p.m. NEW FESTIVAL. First of three broadcasts from Dubrovnik's 20th annual summer festival.
4:30 p.m. BLACK JOURNAL. Black servicemen.
10 p.m. THE ADVOCATES. Redistricting and bussing: An answer to school segregation.
11 p.m. NET PLAYHOUSE. "Infancy and Childhood," two one-act plays by Thornton Wilder.

Monday, April 13

12:30 p.m. MUSIC ON TELEVISION. Conversation with Rudolf Bing.
1 p.m. MONEY MATTERS.
7 p.m. SPARTAN SPORTLITE.

WKAR

TUESDAY, April 7

6:30 a.m. (FM) MORNING SHOW (Monday through Friday)
8 a.m. (AM-FM) MORNING REPORT
9 a.m. (AM-FM) DICK ESTELL READS - "Iron Coffins" by Herbert A. Werner
1 a.m. (FM) ON CAMPUS (Monday through Friday)
11 a.m. (FM) TRANSATLANTIC PROFILE
11:30 a.m. (AM-FM) NEWS (Monday through Friday)
1 p.m. (FM) MUSIC THEATRE - "You're Own Thing"
5 p.m. (AM-FM) NEWS 60 (Monday through Friday)
8:30 p.m. (FM) BOSTON SYMPHONY

WEDNESDAY, April 8

11 a.m. (AM) BOOK BEAT
1 p.m. (FM) MUSIC THEATRE - "The King and I"
8 p.m. (FM) THE ART OF GLENN GOULD

THURSDAY, April 9

10 a.m. (AM) THE ART OF GLENN GOULD
11 a.m. (AM) EUROPEAN REVIEW
1 p.m. (FM) MUSIC THEATRE - "Jacques Brel Is Alive and Well and Living in Paris"
9 p.m. (FM) JAZZ HORIZONS

FRIDAY, April 10

10:30 a.m. (AM) THE GOON SHOW
11 a.m. (AM) A FEDERAL CASE
1 p.m. (FM) MUSIC THEATRE - "L'Homme De La Mancha" ("The Man From La Mancha")
2 p.m. (FM) ALBUM JAZZ
4:45 p.m. (AM-FM) EDUCATION IN THE NEWS

8 p.m. (FM) WORLD OF OPERA - DONIZETTI - "Roberto Devereux"

SATURDAY, April 11

9 a.m. (AM-FM) DICK ESTELL READS - "My Way Was North" by Frank Dufresne
9:30 a.m. (AM) THE WORD AND MUSIC
10:30 a.m. (AM) VARIETADES EN ESPANOL
11:45 a.m. (FM) RECENT ACQUISITIONS
1:30 p.m. (AM) THE DRUM
2 p.m. (AM) ALBUM JAZZ
7 p.m. (FM) LISTENER'S CHOICE

SUNDAY, April 12

2 p.m. (AM-FM) CLEVELAND ORCHESTRA
4 p.m. (AM-FM) FROM THE MIDWAY
7 p.m. (FM) COLLOQUY

MONDAY, April 13

9 a.m. (AM-FM) DICK ESTELL READS - "Another Part of the House" by Winston Estes
10:30 a.m. (AM) THE ASIA SOCIETY
11 a.m. (AM) COLLOQUY
1 p.m. (FM) MUSIC THEATRE - "West Side Story"
8 p.m. (FM) OPERA - KODALY - "Hary Janos"
10:30 p.m. (FM) MUSIC OF TODAY

Letters

Is rating form appropriate?

To The Editor:

The Student Instructional Rating System Form, which has recently been inflicted on instructors throughout the University (despite the fact that faculty majorities in certain colleges, such as Arts and Letters, decisively rejected the sheet, as it stands) tends to perpetuate the viewpoint prevalent on the MSU campus that any action, no matter how mediocre, is better than no action at all to remedy a situation which may need improving.

There are still many of us who believe that what a student learns in a course may be more important than how much he enjoys going to class; that the degree of interest and attentiveness displayed by a student and the amount of discussion generated by the instructor might reflect something about the attitude of the student as well as the effectiveness of the teaching; and that an instructor who goes into the classroom well - prepared, with a comprehensive knowledge of his subject, should rate at least equal standing with his colleague who is content to provide an hour of recreation by enthusiastically selling himself rather than presenting material which the students need, whether they are mature enough to know it or not.

* * *

TO SPECIFIC criticisms, such as these, which center around a few of the many insubstantial and highly redundant statements on the rating sheet, apologists unfailingly reply that the system allows space for the instructor to insert items of his own. To view this as an argument for validity, however, does not make much sense, for the general focus of the form is such that if it were taken seriously, it could easily influence students, faculty, and administrators into thinking that entertainment in the classroom is more important than scholarship.

The low degree of correlation between items on our evaluation form and the top ten criteria for good teaching published in your Dec. 2 article about the University of Toledo emphasizes the

differences in various schools of thought. As I see it, the Toledo researchers have thought out the matter more clearly and to a much greater depth than have ours.

Considering the diversity in types of instruction from department to department, and school to school, can one realistically state that we need a university - wide standard for faculty evaluation, especially in view of the fact that we do not have one for faculty salaries? It would not seem so, unless of course we feel our individual departments cannot be trusted to formulate appropriate rating sheets and other means of measuring successful teaching. If such is the case, we do not place much value on our human resources at this university.

Theodore Johnson
Assistant professor of music

Council slates two sessions . .

(Continued from page 1)

faculty member may not be transferred to non - tenure status during or immediately after an appointment

under the tenure system (except as approved by the tenure committee upon written petition of both the faculty member and his department. Such an appointment may not exceed one year. The parenthetical phrase is an addition to the AAUP's original recommendation.

- The faculty bylaws shall be amended to provide that decisions of the University Faculty Tenure Committee, on matters involving interpretation of tenure rules and in cases involving deviation from tenure rules, shall be binding on the administration and the faculty member concerned. AAUP's suggestion that this be subject to appeal by the faculty member or the provost to the Academic Council was not accepted by the tenure committee.

- The tenure committee shall report to the Academic Council promptly any case in which the administration acts contrary to the committee's decision on a question involving tenure.

The AAUP recommendations were made to the tenure committee on the basis of its study of the case of Bertram Garskof, former assistant professor of psychology (Faculty News, March 3).

Wharton: Forces building for universal higher education

EDITOR'S NOTE: Following are excerpts from a speech President Clifton R. Wharton Jr. delivered March 30 at the Economic Club of Detroit. It was the first of a series in which he plans to outline his concepts of the "pluralistic university."

I would like to address myself to the first of the challenges facing higher education in the 1970s: The achievement of universal higher education. My concern today is for the forces which are building up for truly universal higher education - a universality which is likely to be broader and more revolutionary than we realize.

The forces underlying the irresistible demand for universal higher education in our society are not difficult to understand. Education has been a major value in our society from the very beginning . . . This belief in the value of education as a part of the American culture is more than the aspiration to achieve a "gentleman's status," for early in our history we learned that education had an economic as well as a social value.

Despite inflationary inroads and minor recessions, per capita incomes in the United States are still surging ahead. Education is a major expenditure out of this income whether viewed as consumption or as an allocation from taxes. Each year the United States spends \$52 billion for all education, which is more than for any other purpose except defense. As incomes go up, so naturally will the demands for higher education.

Moreover, as more and more of the economically and educationally disadvantaged segments of our society are drawn into the wider society, they become increasingly aware of the need to secure access not merely to primary and secondary education, but to higher education as well. As their job opportunities increase, as their incomes go up, and probably most importantly as their contributions to the taxes rise, they demand increased access to the public universities supported by their tax dollars. They recognize that a college diploma is a major key to equal economic opportunity. These men and women in our society realize that to be uneducated is to be disenfranchised from a full life . . .

Today, higher education offers the path to personal economic security and to social acceptance. The concept of an education as a privilege is disappearing and is being replaced by the concept of education as a right.

* * *

ANOTHER FACET of this pressure from newly liberated citizenry is the

recognition that until recently access to higher education was essentially rooted in elitist standards, many of which were highly correlated with the socio-economic indicators of high status and negatively correlated with those of low status. Prestigious universities amply supported by public funds cannot rely upon a meritocratic principle of education. They are being forced into a greater and greater acceptance of an egalitarian one. As so well pointed out by Logan Wilson, "The current racial crisis on many campuses is a reminder of responsibilities thrust upon educational institutions to transform American society from a caste to an open - class system."

At the moment, the greatest pressures for "open admission" or universal access to higher education are coming from the black community because of its new spirit of unity and self - determinism. However, I predict we will shortly see an equal, if not greater, pressure not only from other minority groups - the Mexican - Americans, American Indians, Puerto Ricans - but from similarly disadvantaged white Americans who comprise the largest of these groups.

Minority groups are not the only taxpayers; so are the low income whites. And even among those who are not paying taxes, there is a growing awareness that a major liberating force for their children will be access to the full range of educational resources offered - primary, secondary, and higher education.

Legislation, subsidies, and similar public efforts can only assure a degree of access of equal opportunity. The ultimate liberation of each individual as a viable, contributing member of the society will rest upon his educational attainments and the value of society's investment in him . . .

* * *

THE NEW concept of a "pluralistic university" will require an expanded and additional dimension - the provision of an education throughout the active life span of each citizen. Universities will be increasingly called upon by the alumni and other constituencies to up-date their competencies in a wide array of fields or to introduce them to new areas of knowledge. Meeting this need will require the mobilization of all the resources of the total university.

The pressure of the demand for universal higher education is already being felt at many institutions, including our own. The implications for higher education are far - reaching and complex, and each institutions will respond individually or be forced to respond by the pressure which its own constituents and the electorate bring to bear upon it. Make no mistake, "universal higher education" as I have described it will soon be upon us.

Symposium Thursday

Lewis B. Mayhew, nationally known educator from Stanford University, will lead a symposium on "National Trends in Higher Education" Thursday at 7:30 p.m. in 107 South Kedzie. The symposium is sponsored by the University College.

Expanded benefits sought

The MSU chapter of the American Association of University Professors has requested that immediate participation in the TIAA - CREF retirement program be offered to instructors and specialists.

Persons in both classifications are not now eligible for TIAA - CREF participation until two years of the date of their appointment. Other permanent faculty - research associates, assistant professors, associate professors and professors - may elect participation immediately on appointment.

In a March 26 letter to Provost John E. Cantlon, AAUP President Jack Stieber said that extending TIAA - CREF participation for all faculty was justified in the wake of a recent Board of Trustees action to grant immediate participation to all administrative - professional staff.

Stieber, director of labor and industrial relations, also noted that some librarians are not eligible for TIAA - CREF participation until after a two - year waiting period, and that such categories as assistant instructors, lecturers and graduate assistants are not eligible at all for the program.

Stieber said later that it is "an odd situation" that all faculty don't have the same privileges as all persons in the A - P ranks.

Assistant Provost Herman King said that the criteria for TIAA - CREF participation include permanence of employment, and that A - P personnel are hired "on an assumption of permanence."

The same assumption is not true in

the cases of some of the categories referred to by Stieber, he said.

* * *

CURRENT TIAA - CREF eligibility is also extended to temporary faculty or staff with an appointment of nine months or longer "upon approval of the dean if their rank is above that of an instructor or classification above AP - IV, or if they have participated in the TIAA - CREF retirement program elsewhere."

The rules for eligibility also state that if a faculty or staff member is granted an appointment making him eligible for TIAA - CREF participation, then "any uninterrupted full - time employment immediately prior to such eligible type of appointment will be applied toward fulfilling a required 'waiting period.'"

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.

CMU faculty ratifies one-year contract

By BEVERLY TWITCHELL
Associate Editor, Faculty News

The faculty and administration of Central Michigan University have agreed on a 1970-71 contract, believed to be the first of its kind negotiated at an American four-year college or university.

Agreement from the negotiating teams came March 18. The contract was ratified by the CMU faculty on March 23, and by the Board of Trustees on March 25.

CMU is the only four-year institution of higher education in Michigan whose faculty are represented by a collective bargaining agent, and possibly the only institution of its kind in the country to be so represented. (Four-year institutions in New York and New Jersey are unionized but are part of state systems of education, while CMU is autonomous.)

The CMU faculty voted 239-221 last September in favor of representation by a local district of the Michigan Association for Higher Education (MAHE) for purposes of collective bargaining. Ratification of the contract agreement by the faculty was approved 369 to 82, with about 82 per cent of the 547 eligible voters casting ballots.

Lloyd M. Cofer, professor of higher education and director of the developmental program in the MSU Admissions Office, and a member of the CMU Board of Trustees, said he thought some things were gained in the contract which might not have been gained without collective bargaining.

"It gave both sides an opportunity to sit down and understand the other's problems and viewpoints," he said. "This is not done normally, when you give a flat percentage increase (in salary) across the board."

"The University Senate is interested in some similar things, but because of its bigness and structure, it would have taken longer. Things happen fast under collective bargaining."

* * *

THE CONTRACT covered almost exclusively economic areas, including:

- A minimum salary increase of 7.1 per cent.
- Higher minimum bases for salaries at all academic ranks. (The salary increase is effective with the beginning of the 1970-71 academic year, but those faculty not now at the new base level of salary will have their salaries increased to the base level, effective on the date of faculty ratification of the contract.)
- A more complete hospitalization plan than is currently offered, with the University paying the employee's full share.
- A new sick leave plan, with a "sick leave bank" and a long-term disability insurance policy.
- Individual faculty options to double the present amount of life insurance coverage at current rates.
- Higher per-faculty allowances to be used in budgeting for faculty travel.
- Increases in the amount paid per semester hour to teach off-campus classes, with a limitation of not more than one off-campus class to be taught per semester by any one faculty member.
- Establishment of eight distinguished faculty awards, four at the professor and associate professor levels at \$1,000 each, and four at the assistant professor and instructor levels at \$500 each. A committee was established to study the guidelines for giving the awards; a second committee was formed to set criteria and procedures for establishing a University Distinguished Professorship. Both committees are to consist of one representative of those faculty represented by MAHE, two faculty members appointed by the University Senate, two full-time students appointed by the student senate and one member appointed by the CMU president.
- A new policy of fee remission for bargaining unit members with at least one year of service at CMU, for no more than two courses and no more than six credits of coursework during the fall and spring semesters.

* * *

TEACHING LOAD was vaguely referred to in a section which read: "Faculty shall not be required to teach an excessive number of contact hours, assume an excessive student load, or be assigned an unreasonable schedule. It is also recognized that faculty have such additional obligations as being available to students, assuming normal committee assignments, registration, engaging in research and community service."

The section was left this way, Cofer said, for flexibility and will probably be discussed in more depth next year.

Several committees were established through "letters of agreement" in the contract to study various issues, including office space and equipment availability, sabbatical policy, teaching load policy, fringe benefit programs and salary matters such as internal consistency and relationships to comparable institutions.

All fringe benefit provisions of the contract are effective Aug. 24, 1970, except the disability income benefit, which is effective Sept. 1, 1970. The contract expires June 30, 1971.

* * *

CMU PRESIDENT William B. Boyd said he was "delighted" with the contract, agreement.

"The provisions will help retain and recruit excellent faculty; the result will clearly be a stronger university," he said. "All of us can take pride in the fact that this pioneering endeavor was carried out so responsibly, quickly and successfully. We are in the debt of both teams."

John W. Petras, a member of the bargaining team of the CMU Faculty Association, the bargaining agent of the faculty and a district of MAHE, said: "It is gratifying to report that the completed contract is a result of an earnest and responsible approach to negotiations by both parties. . ."

Agreement on the contract came after six days of intensive bargaining sessions. Cofer said he understood that the sessions were carried out "at a very high level."

The bargaining team for the faculty consisted of eight CMU faculty members. The trustees' bargaining team included five academic deans, the budget director, personnel director for service staff, and David Kerr, a member of the Mt. Pleasant law firm of Lynch, Gallagher, Lynch and Kerr.

The bargaining unit includes all full-time, full-salaried faculty with the rank of lecturer or above who carry at least a one-half load of teaching or research, professional librarians, coaches, counselors, department chairmen and part-time faculty carrying at least a two-thirds teaching load.

Graduate assistants visiting faculty, directors, coordinators, deans, vice presidents and the president are not represented by the bargaining unit.



Toward freedom without frustration. . .

(continued from page 1)

on the committee would not earn them any special considerations in grades.

More than once, the steering committee made a decision that ran counter to Harper's private inclinations. But the group "made better decisions for the course than I could have made independently," he says.

Harper also provided students with a reading list, a suggested textbook (optional), and a guide to other resources. And, to further accommodate student involvement, small group sessions were held, during which Harper encouraged students to "propose your own solutions, argue and seek all possible implications."

* * *

IN A 12-page memo distributed to students at the first class meeting last winter, Harper outlined the objectives,

methods of planning and some of his own philosophy.

"As the course goes on, don't love it or leave it," he wrote. "Work to change it. If you're not happy, have a private talk with me. I think what we are trying to do is worth doing."

Once the students took over, Harper says, he witnessed more learning than "I've ever had before."

By trying to maximize student involvement in shaping the course, Harper says he detected significant changes in some students' outlook to teaching. "Some would tell me that they thought they knew just how they were going to teach, but that as a result of this experience, they had found better ways or were questioning some traditional practices."

* * *

THERE WAS no final exam for the course. The steering committee met

during finals week to weight the class total scores on the weekly tests and set the grading cut-offs. (Completion of the course's basic requirements earned a minimum of 2.0 to prior agreement, although most students earned 3.0 grades or higher.)

That final steering committee meeting — held in the apartment of one of the group's members — underscored what many of the committee had contended earlier in the term: That grading is a practice of questionable merit.

One student vowed to find better means of evaluating her students when she began teaching, and another observed acidly: "This is madness."

* * *

THROUGH THE final student self-evaluations, Harper says he was able to point to both learning and attitude changes.

Said one student who at one point in

the term was rather critical of the course: "I truly believe that people learn best by example, and in this course, I have learned that the best learning takes place in an atmosphere of democratic freedom and approval. Children also have to feel that they are recognized as being individuals and that they are respected as human beings."

There were a few dissenters, of course, including one student whose mid-term evaluation expressed dissatisfaction with "these ridiculous tests and debates each week."

And one student was overcome by the urge for candor. Although she completed nearly all the course requirements, she confessed to falling far short of her own learning expectations. "I ask that you not fail me, as I cannot bear to stay here," she wrote. "A 1.5 (grade) would be a blessing." She earned a 3.0.