

# Dilemmas of academic budgeting

Senate Bill 53, passed by the 75th legislature in 1969 requires that "each institution of higher education shall certify to the legislature not later than April 15, 1970, the schedule of tuition and student fees applicable to Michigan resident students for the fiscal year 1970-71."

The dilemma of a budget. . . .

You figure you need so much. . . and you are collectively some 70 academic departments and so many non - academic departments. . . and you arrive at a figure you want. . . but you don't get it from the money - handlers, the legislature. Or at least you come out some \$10 million short with the governor's recommendations. . . and you really have to figure that you're not going to get all the way back up to that original figuration of your needs with the legislature. . . so what do you do?

Cut a little here, a little there. . . only eight new faculty positions instead of 10, maybe, for that new program. . . a little off some other program. . . but you

see that 80 per cent of your original figure was for salary increases. . . so it looks like you're not going to increase faculty salaries from 10th place in the Big Ten to third place. . . and maybe they'll even have to stay at 10th place. . . and maybe you can raise tuition, which you have had to do more consistently than any other college in the state. . . and you know you don't want to do either. Faculty salaries. . . vs. student fees.

And then the legislators require you by statute to tell them whether you're going to raise tuition before they tell you what other money you're going to have available to you. . . but they ask you only in terms of resident tuition. . . and you, of course, have non-resident students, too. . . whose tuition is lower here than at your sister institutions. . .

It is, says Elliott G. Ballard, assistant to the president, like trying to solve the algebra equation:  $x$  (tuition) plus  $y$  (state appropriations) equals  $z$ . The

legislature wants to know what  $x$  is to be. . . the University is supposed to establish this variable without knowing what the other two variables are. . . so if what MSU is going to have to work with is  $z$  (?), tuition then becomes  $z$  minus  $y$ . . . .

Then, abiding by the statute. . . you say that IF there is going to be a gap between what you figure you need and what someone figures you're going to get. . . but in terms of resident tuition only. . . well, then an extra \$1.50 per credit would help close the gap. . . but what about non - resident tuition? And how much other belt -tightening could you, should you, do?

The dilemma of budgeting for a non-profit institution. . . where there is academic aspiration. . . and just so much money appropriated. . . and seldom, it seems, the twain doth meet. . . .

— BEVERLY TWITCHELL

## MSU Faculty News

Vol. 1, No. 23

Michigan State University

April 14, 1970

### Graduate Council receives draft of rights document

A proposed document on "Graduate Student Rights and Responsibilities at MSU" has been distributed to the Graduate Council for review and recommendations.

The document was prepared by a special committee established by the

#### Rights document, pages 2 - 3

Graduate Council last spring on a suggestion from the Council of Graduate Students. Members of the committee included faculty, staff and graduate students.

Eldon Nonnamaker, dean of students and chairman of the committee, said this document, when final, would not conflict with the Academic Freedom Report approved in 1967, but would, if anything, complement it.

Graduate students are "in a sense" covered by the Academic Freedom Report, Nonnamaker said. They may bring action to the Student - Faculty Judiciary (established in the Academic Freedom Report), he said, but the question of referring graduate students to the judiciary for a violation "has always been in limbo."

The proposed document on Graduate Student Rights and Responsibilities covers academic rights and responsibilities, university - employed graduate students (including graduate assistants) and judicial procedures.

Copies of the document are available from Nonnamaker's office. He said the committee plans to hold several hearings to which faculty and students will be invited.

Nonnamaker said he welcomes suggestions on the report. After suggestions have been received on the document, the committee "will then put it together again," he said. No deadline has been set, but the committee hopes to complete the report this term.

The report would then be submitted for adoption to the Graduate Council, the Academic Council and through the president of the Board of Trustees.

Members of the committee writing the report are: Ted Brooks, assistant dean of the School for Advanced Graduate Studies; James H. Pickering, graduate chairman of English; John E. Jordan, professor of education; Thomas S. Gunnings, assistant professor in the Counseling Center; and graduate students Ann Markusen in economics; Georg Hasenkamp in agriculture and natural resources; Caroline Yan in

education; Daniel Youngdahl in music; and Willie Williams in education.

\* \* \*

ARTICLE 1 in the document, the preamble, will be drafted after preliminary hearings but before final submission to the Graduate Council. The bulk of the report is reprinted on pages 2 and 3. Implementation of the final document is to be 120 days following adoption of the trustees.

Graduate students may contact their COGS representatives regarding hearing dates. Information on hearing dates is also available from Ann Markusen at 5-3434.

### Psychology professors promote different learning approach

By ELIZABETH HARRISON  
Educational Development Program

Students learn more when they actively respond to material, when they themselves set the pace of their learning, and when they master one piece of information before moving on to the next. These tenets of learning theory, applied most often in programmed instruction, are guiding a

teaching experiment in a lecture course here.

The course is Psychology 200 ("Principles of Behavior," 5 credits, recommended for students planning to take more than 12 credits in psychology.) Stanley C. Ratner and M. Ray Denny, both professors of

(Continued on page 4)



Psychologists Stanley Ratner and M. Ray Denny: Letting students set their pace.

—Photo by Dick Wesley

### McKee Report is adopted; student participation near

By GENE RIETFORSS  
Editor, Faculty News

The students are coming. To academic government. And they'll be arriving in greater numbers than many faculty might have expected — or preferred.

If changes in the faculty bylaws are approved by both the Academic Council and the Faculty Senate next month, the student voice in the Council and on the Council (formerly Faculty) Standing Committees will be greatly enhanced. And while the faculty voice won't be lowered quantitatively, it will be diminished proportionally.

The way was cleared for bylaw changes last Tuesday with final Council approval of the McKee Report (of the New Committee on Student

Participation in Academic Governance).

Recommendations in the McKee Report must now be written into the faculty bylaws and submitted to the Council's May meeting. If affirmed by the Council, the bylaw changes will go to the Academic Senate on May 20. Senate approval would mean that implementation of the changes can begin in 1970-71.

Should the Senate reject the bylaw changes, the matter would return to the Council.

\* \* \*

NUMERICALLY, implementation of the McKee Report promises significant changes in the University's academic governance structure.

The present Council makeup gives voting privileges to the 56 elected faculty members, the president or provost (only in case of ties), the five - member steering committee and the 18 appointed members (deans). Elected faculty hold an overwhelming (56-24) voting majority. Only three students now sit on the Council, and none may vote.

If recommendations of the McKee Report become bylaws, the Council will have 126 voting members. Acquiring voting rights will be 15 ex officio members (administrators and standing committee chairmen) and 31 students (including 10 minority representatives). This would place the elected faculty in a voting minority (70-56).

On the standing committees, where students now total 12, they would have as many as 95 voting members. Faculty membership would go from 121 to 129.

\* \* \*

SUCH MAJOR change in academic government hasn't occurred without conflict.

It took a year of committee work — from the Massey Report to the McKee Report and even to the Kumata Report — before the present document was adopted.

The process hit its first snag last fall in the Council when the report of the first committee on student participation, headed by Prof. Gerald Massey (philosophy), was sent back to committee.

The report of the new committee, under Prof. James B. McKee (sociology), stalled in March because of controversy over its section dealing with

(Continued on page 4)

### Hearing set

The University Faculty Tenure Committee's subcommittee on initial appointments will hold an open hearing Thursday beginning at 3 p.m. in 101 S. Kedzie.



# Proposed document outlines grad

## ARTICLE 2 Academic Rights and Responsibilities

### 2.1. Grading and Evaluation

2.1.1. Grading. Students have the right to a course grade that represents the instructor's professional and honest evaluation of the student's performance. Students have the right to expect that all course requirements, including grading criteria and procedures, will be made known early in the course.

2.1.2. Evaluation. All departments shall develop procedures to evaluate the professional capability of students and maintain a cumulative departmental evaluation of each master's, doctoral and prospective doctoral candidate. The methods and criteria for such an evaluation are to be published and made known to students and faculty alike. This departmental evaluation is to be made available to the student upon request and is to be communicated to the student at least once a year through the normal advisement function. In the case where a master's candidate contemplating doctoral work is required to meet certain standards, requirements and prerequisites, such criteria are to be made known at the time of the student's first admission to the master's program. Should a decision be made denying the student's admission to doctoral work, this decision is to be communicated to the student in writing at least one full term prior to his completion of the requirements for the master's degree (except in cases where a master's thesis and/or an oral examination is regarded as definitive evidence).

2.2. Instruction. Students have the right to instruction which is in keeping with the best scholarly and professional standards of the discipline, which encourages the free and open discussion of ideas, and which respects the individual needs and aspirations of the students in accordance with the University's pursuit of knowledge and truth. Students on their part have a responsibility to maintain at all times the kind of classroom decorum and atmosphere which insures that the process of learning can take place.

2.3. Advisement. The quality of graduate education is directly and inevitably related to the quality of academic advisement. For this reason each graduate student, regardless of his degree program, has the right to the best professional advice and counsel that his department can provide in such areas as program planning, selection of courses and professors, and general degree requirements. Moreover, each graduate department has the specific obligation to make known its degree requirements to each student at the time of his first admission to graduate study, and has the responsibility to so structure its curriculum that these requirements can be met. Departments are to maintain advisement records for all students, specifying and/or containing degree requirements to be met, course waivers and substitution, program changes, and other stipulations directly affecting their degree programs. Advisees are to be provided with a suitable copy.

\* \* \*

### 2.4. Academic Program.

2.4.1. Guidance Committee. At the time of a doctoral student's formal admission to degree candidacy a guidance committee shall be formed, with the approval of the student, consisting of at least three members of the faculty (a chairman and two others) to oversee and direct the balance of the program. A guidance committee report, listing all degree requirements, shall be filed with the dean of the college as specified by the graduate school. This guidance committee report, unless changed or amended in full consultation between the student and his committee, shall have the status of a contract binding upon the student and University alike.

2.4.1.1. Once designated, the guidance committee chairman has the responsibility to oversee the progress of a student so long as he continues to meet the academic and professional standards established by the department or until he receives his degree. Chairmen on temporary leave shall provide for the necessary guidance of their students during their absence. The department shall provide an acceptable substitute should a chairman permanently leave the University.

2.4.2. Residency. Residency requirements shall be defined by the individual department and filed with the college and the graduate school. Such requirements shall be functionally related to the nature of the degree program and shall be made known to the student at the time of his admission.

2.4.3. Time Limits. The time limitations for candidates seeking advanced degrees shall be defined by the individual department and filed with the college and the graduate school. Each department shall notify its degree candidates periodically of their time standings. Application for extension shall be submitted to the department for the approval of the dean of the college and the dean of the

graduate school. Such limitations shall be made known to the student at the time of his admission.

2.4.4. Program Changes. Changes in individual doctoral programs after the student's formal admission to degree candidacy shall be made by the guidance committee in consultation with the student as stipulated in 2.4.1 above. Such changes may be initiated by either the guidance committee or the student. Program changes for master's candidates shall be made by the M.A. advisor in consultation with the student.

2.4.5. Dissertations and Thesis. The nature and scope of the doctoral dissertation and master's thesis (or its equivalent) shall be defined by the department and guidance committee according to the professional and scholarly research standards of the discipline. The department shall specify in advance the acceptable style and form of the dissertation (or thesis) in accordance with an agreed upon manual, handbook, or style sheet.

2.4.5.1. Standards for typing, duplication or reproduction and binding of dissertations and theses, as well as the stipulations covering abstracts, numbers of copies, dates and deadlines for acceptance, and regulations for microfilming and publication shall be set by the Graduate School and published in the Graduate Bulletin.

2.4.6. Code of Professional Standards. Each department shall develop a code of professional and academic standards appropriate to its own discipline and which shall cover standards of student and faculty conduct and standards of professional expectation and academic performance. This code shall be made available to all members of the faculty and to each graduate student at the time of his first admission to a degree program. A copy of this code is to be filed with the dean of the college and with the graduate school.

2.4.7. Terminations and Withdrawals. Departments shall establish criteria for the termination or withdrawal of students enrolled in its graduate programs. Such criteria shall be published and made available to students at the time they first begin their graduate programs. Should a decision to terminate a student be made, all information regarding the decision is to be held strictly confidential and be released only with the consent of the student involved. The same privacy is to be accorded the reasons for a student's temporary or permanent withdrawal from the University.

\* \* \*

### 2.5. Instructor Evaluation

2.5.1. Evaluation of Faculty. To aid the faculty in its responsibility for the quality of graduate education, student instructional rating reports shall be used in each graduate course every term. In addition, individual departments are encouraged to devise supplementary means of evaluation tailored to their disciplines and modes of instruction. All such evaluations shall be forwarded to the department chairman or the appropriate departmental committee. Such reports shall be considered carefully when graduate course assignments are made.

2.5.2. Evaluation of Graduate Teaching Assistants. Graduate teaching assistants are expected to be capable of effectively fulfilling their assigned responsibilities as instructors, and shall be evaluated like regular faculty. In order to improve the effectiveness of graduate assistant instruction, the assistant shall use the student instructional rating reports in each course he teaches. These reports shall be submitted to the department chairmen or to the appropriate departmental committee.

2.5.2.1. The coordinator of each course staffed by graduate teaching assistants shall turn in to the department chairman or to the appropriate departmental committee a formal written evaluation of each of his assistants.

2.5.2.2 The student instructional rating reports, formal written evaluations and any supplemental information shall be placed on file.

2.5.2.3. This evaluation material may be used in determining such matters as renewal of assistantships, teaching assignments, recommendations and the need for further training.

2.5.2.4. A cumulative evaluation of his teaching shall be given to the assistant at least once each year and/or at his request.

2.5.3. Training of Graduate Teaching Assistants. Departments are responsible for establishing orientation and in-service training programs for all new assistants. Such programs shall include periodic classroom visitation by appointment, and a thorough introduction to course goals, grading criteria and practice, and classroom procedures. The teaching assistant is held responsible for full and active participation in all such programs.

## ARTICLE 3 University Employed Graduate Students

### 3.1. Definitions

3.1.1. University employed graduate students fall primarily into two classes: graduate assistants and other employees.

### 3.2. The Graduate Assistant

3.2.1. A graduate assistant shall be defined as a candidate for an advanced degree who receives compensation for services rendered.

3.2.2. Each unit employing graduate assistants shall establish job descriptions.

3.2.3. Each unit shall establish criteria for the selection of new graduate assistants. Such criteria shall be published and made available.

3.2.4. Each unit shall establish criteria for retention and renewal of graduate assistantships. Written notification of the retention and renewal of graduate assistantships shall be made by March 31.

3.2.5. The graduate assistant has the right to be treated as a professional member of his employing unit.

3.2.5.1. As a professional, the graduate assistant shall be responsible for adhering to the code of professional standards established by his unit or department (see 2.4.6. above).

3.2.6. The Office of the Provost shall establish a campus - wide policy for graduate assistant stipends, taking into account: 1. the minimum amount of compensation adequate to the current cost of living; 2. the need to be competitive with other university and employment opportunities. Such a policy shall be reviewed by the Graduate Council at least once a year.

3.2.7. Each department shall establish and publish its salary schedule for graduate assistants.

3.2.8. Each department, in consultation with representative graduate assistants, shall establish and publish guidelines for the salary advancement and promotion of its graduate assistants.

3.2.9. Graduate assistants are entitled to all benefits normally accorded to full-time graduate students.

3.2.10. All graduate assistants are entitled to clerical - secretarial help and to supplies commensurate with the carrying out of their assigned responsibilities.

3.2.11. The Office of the Provost shall establish and publish, in consultation with representative graduate assistants, policies for graduate assistants relating to: 1. sick - leave; 2. parking privileges; 3. bus privileges; 4. travel off-campus; 5. insurance. Such policies shall be reviewed by the Graduate Council at least once a year.

### 3.3. Other University - Employed Graduate Students

3.3.1. The following articles are intended to cover all other graduate students employed by the University not formally designated as graduate assistants.

3.3.2. The Office of the Vice President for Business and Finance shall establish and publish minimum and maximum salaries and hourly wages for other University - employed graduate students.

3.3.3. The Vice President for Business and Finance shall have the authority to approve departmental requests for all payments above the established maximums.

3.3.4. All University - employed graduate students, other than graduate assistants, are entitled to the same fringe benefits accorded other University employees who work a similar amount of time at a similar job classification. The University shall not withhold an employee's fringe benefits solely because he is also registered as a student.

3.3.5. Michigan State shall not deliberately adjust hours of student employees in order to deprive them of fringe benefits that they would otherwise be entitled to.

### 3.4. All University - Employed Graduate Students Including Graduate Assistants

3.4.1. Michigan State and all of its departments and units are Equal Opportunity Employees. Therefore: 1. employment discrimination on the basis of race, creed, ethnic origin or sex is expressly prohibited; 2. all hiring and employment policies shall be consistent with anti - discrimination policies of Michigan State.

3.4.2. All University - employed graduate students, including graduate assistants, shall be informed of all relevant employment policies when a position is tendered; including, but not limited to: 1. salary or rate of pay; 2. salary advancement or promotion; 3. procedures for evaluating performance; 4. length of term of appointment including continuance and renewal of graduate assistantships; 5. work load and duties; 6. grievance procedures.

## ARTICLE 4 Judicial Procedure

4.1. Judicial structure. An appropriate judicial structure shall be established for hearing and adjudicating cases brought by and against graduate students in the following areas: 1. academic rights and responsibilities;

2. University regulations; 3. professional standards and responsibilities; 4. employment rights and responsibilities of graduate assistants; 5. employment rights and responsibilities of other University - employed graduate students.

4.1.1. Departmental Graduate Judiciary. Each department (or its equivalent) shall establish a judiciary composed of seven members as follows: The department chairman or his deputy (to act as chairman); three faculty members selected or chosen by rank (one full professor; one associate professor; one assistant professor); three graduate students elected by the departmental graduate students (one masters candidate and two doctoral candidates).

4.1.2. College Graduate Judiciary. Each college shall establish a judiciary as follows: The chairman of the college graduate council or his deputy (to act as chairman); three elected faculty members of the college graduate council; three graduate students. The three graduate students shall be those who normally sit on the college graduate council. If there are no graduate student members, or less than three, the college graduate council shall request that the Council of Graduate Students (COGS) establish a selection process to name the student members.

4.1.3. University Graduate Judiciary. A judiciary shall be established at the University level composed of seven members of the Graduate Council, as follows: The dean of the graduate school or his deputy (to act as chairman); three elected members of the Graduate Council; the three regular representatives of COGS.

4.1.4. Each judiciary shall provide for alternate members.

4.1.4.1. The selection process for regular and alternate graduate student members shall insure that among both regular and alternates there will be a minimum of two graduate assistants.

4.1.5. Term of Office. Judiciary members and alternates at all levels shall be named in the fall of the year and shall serve one year. The one - year term shall not preclude the reappointment of any member the following year.

### 4.2. Judicial Process.

4.2.1. Academic Rights and Responsibilities. Any member of the academic community of Michigan State may initiate a case involving the academic rights or responsibilities of graduate students.

4.2.1.1. The Departmental Graduate Judiciary shall have original jurisdiction in cases involving academic rights and responsibilities.

4.2.1.1.1. The Departmental Graduate Judiciary shall hear cases and hand down decisions, or may, with the consent of all parties involved, refer cases to the College Graduate Judiciary.

4.2.1.1.2. Any of the parties involved may appeal an adverse decision to the College Graduate Judiciary.

4.2.1.2. The College Graduate Judiciary shall have appellate jurisdiction in cases appealed from Departmental Graduate Judiciaries and original jurisdiction in cases waived from Departmental Graduate Judiciaries.

4.2.1.2.1. In cases of appeal the College Graduate Judiciary shall hear the appeal or refer the case to the University Graduate Judiciary.

4.2.1.2.2. Any of the parties involved may appeal an adverse decision to the University Graduate Judiciary.

4.2.1.2.3. In case of a waiver from a Departmental Graduate Judiciary, the College Graduate Judiciary shall either hear the case or refer it back to the department for hearing and adjudication.

4.2.1.3. The University Graduate Judiciary shall hear all appeals brought before it. The decision of the University Graduate Judiciary shall be final.

4.2.1.4. A judiciary hearing a case involving the academic rights and responsibilities of graduate students may decide as follows:

- A. Not proven: 1. There has been no infringement of the academic rights of the graduate student; 2. there has been no neglect on the part of the graduate student of his academic responsibilities.

- B. Proven: 1. There has been a violation of the graduate student's academic rights; 2. the graduate student has neglected his academic responsibilities.

4.2.1.5. Penalties and Redress. In cases of proven violation of a student's academic rights, the judiciary handing down the decision shall direct the chairman or dean of the appropriate academic unit to provide immediate redress. In cases of proven neglect of academic responsibilities, the judiciary may select from the following penalties: 1. warning - an official written reprimand; 2. probation - a period of probation with specific stipulations; 3. dismissal from the program.



# ate student rights and responsibilities

4.2.2. University regulations. Any member of the Michigan State community may initiate a case involving violation of a University regulation by a graduate student.

4.2.2.1. The University Graduate Judiciary shall have original jurisdiction in cases involving violation of a University regulation by a graduate student.

4.2.2.1.1. The University Graduate Judiciary shall hear the case and hand down a decision.

4.2.2.2. In case of an appeal, the office of the Provost shall uphold the decision of the University Graduate Judiciary or shall reverse the decision. The decision of the Provost's Office shall be final.

4.2.2.3. The University Graduate Judiciary or the Provost may decide as follows:

— A. Proven: A violation of University regulations has occurred.

— B. Not proven: No violation of University regulations has occurred.

4.2.2.4. Penalties and Redress. In cases of proven violation of a University regulation by a graduate student, the Office of the Provost or the University Graduate Judiciary, whoever makes the decision, may select from the following penalties: 1. warning — an official written reprimand; 2. probation — a period of probation with specific stipulations; 3. dismissal from the University.

\* \* \*

4.2.3. Professional Standards and Responsibilities. Any member of the academic community of Michigan State may present a case involving professional standards and responsibilities of graduate students. The graduate student may only be brought to charges on those counts of violation of professional standards and responsibilities which are explicitly formulated by the department in which he is enrolled for graduate study or in which he has academic responsibilities.

4.2.3.1. The Departmental Graduate Judiciary shall have original jurisdiction in cases involving professional standards and responsibilities.

4.2.3.1.1. The Departmental Graduate Judiciary shall hear the case and hand down a decision. In cases involving professional standards and responsibilities, the Departmental Graduate Judiciary may not waive jurisdiction and send cases to the College Graduate Judiciary.

4.2.3.1.2. Any of the parties involved may appeal an adverse decision to the College Graduate Judiciary.

4.2.3.2. The College Graduate Judiciary shall have appellate jurisdiction on cases appealed from Departmental Graduate Judiciaries.

4.2.3.2.1. In cases of appeal, the College Graduate Judiciary shall hear the appeal or refer the case to the University Graduate Judiciary.

4.2.3.2.2. Any of the parties involved may appeal an adverse decision to the University Graduate Judiciary.

4.2.3.3. The University Graduate Judiciary shall hear all appeals brought before it. The decision of the University Graduate Judiciary shall be final.

4.2.3.4. The judiciary hearing a case involving professional standards or responsibilities of graduate students may decide as follows:

A. Not proven: There has been no violation of professional standards or responsibilities by the graduate student.

B. Proven: There has been a violation of professional standards or responsibility by the graduate student.

4.2.3.5. Penalties. In cases of proven violation of professional standards and responsibilities, the judiciary may select from the following penalties: 1. warning — an official written reprimand; 2. probation — a period of probation with specific stipulations; 3. dismissal from the program.

\* \* \*

4.2.4. Employment Rights and Responsibilities of Graduate Assistants. Any member of the academic community of Michigan State may present a case involving employment rights and responsibilities of graduate assistants.

4.2.4.1. The Departmental Graduate Judiciary shall have original jurisdiction in cases involving the employment rights and responsibilities of graduate assistants.

4.2.4.1.1. The Departmental Graduate Judiciary shall hear cases and hand down decisions, or may, with the consent of all parties involved, refer cases to the College Graduate Judiciary.

4.2.4.1.2. Any of the parties involved may appeal an adverse decision to the College Graduate Judiciary.

4.2.4.2. The College Graduate Judiciary shall have appellate jurisdiction in cases appealed from Departmental Graduate Judiciaries and original jurisdiction in cases waived from Departmental Graduate Judiciaries.

4.2.4.2.1. In cases of appeal, the College Graduate Judiciary shall hear the appeal or refer the case to the University Graduate Judiciary.

4.2.4.2.2. Any of the parties involved may appeal an adverse decision to the University Graduate Judiciary.

4.2.4.2.3. In case of waiver from a Departmental Graduate Judiciary, the College Graduate Judiciary shall either hear the case or refer it back to the department for hearing and adjudication.

4.2.4.3. The University Graduate Judiciary shall hear all appeals brought before it. The decision of the University Graduate Judiciary shall be final.

4.2.4.4. The judiciary hearing a case involving the employment rights and responsibilities of a graduate assistant shall insure that its membership includes the two graduate assistants provided for under 4.1.4.1.

4.2.4.5. A judiciary hearing a case involving the employment rights or responsibilities of graduate assistants may decide as follows:

A. Not proven: 1. the employment rights of the graduate assistant have not been infringed upon; 2. the graduate assistant has not been negligent in his responsibilities as an employee.

B. Proven: 1. the employment rights of the graduate assistant have been infringed upon; 2. the graduate assistant has been negligent in his responsibilities as an employee.

4.2.4.6. Penalties and Redress. In case of proven violation of a graduate assistant's employment rights, the judiciary handing down the decision shall direct the chairman or dean of the appropriate academic unit to provide immediate redress. In cases of proven

neglect of responsibilities as an employee, the judiciary may select from the following penalties: 1. warning — an official reprimand; 2. probation — a period of probation with specific stipulations; 3. termination of the student's graduate assistantship.

4.2.5. Employment Rights and Responsibilities of Other University - Employed Graduate Students. Any member of the Michigan State community may present a case involving the employment rights and responsibilities of other University - employed graduate students.

4.2.5.1. The University Graduate Judiciary shall have original jurisdiction in cases involving employment rights and responsibilities of other University - employed graduate students as defined in this document.

4.2.5.1.1. The University Graduate Judiciary shall hear the case and hand down a decision.

4.2.5.1.2. Any of the parties involved may appeal an adverse decision to the Office of the Provost.

4.2.5.2. In the case of an appeal, the Office of the Provost shall uphold the decision of the University Graduate Judiciary or shall reverse the decision. The decision of the Office of the Provost shall be final.

4.2.5.3. The University Graduate Judiciary or the Office of the Provost may decide as follows:

A. Not proven: 1. the employment rights of the graduate student have not been infringed upon; 2. the graduate student has not been negligent in his responsibilities as an employee.

B. Proven: 1. the employment rights of the graduate student have been infringed upon; 2.

the graduate student has been negligent in his responsibilities as an employee.

4.2.5.4. Penalties and Redress. In cases of proven infringement of a graduate student's employment rights, the University Graduate Judiciary or the Office of the Provost, whoever is making the decision, shall direct the student employee's superior to redress the grievance immediately. In cases proving the student's neglect of his responsibilities as an employee, the penalty may be selected from the following: 1. warning — an official written reprimand; 2. probation — a period of probation with specific stipulations; 3. termination of the student's employment.

(The remainder of Article 4 concerns due process. It adheres to basic fundamentals expressed in Article VIII of the bylaws of the Board of Trustees. Once a grievance is filed with a judiciary, the chairman must notify all parties in writing within 48 hours. If the party charged denies charges, a hearing shall be held.

(Due process also provides: Written notice to all parties at least 48 hours before a hearing; the right of any party to appear in person to present his case to the judiciary and to call witnesses (but absence shall not be prejudicial to any party's case); all parties are entitled to counsel of their choice (and may receive support and participation from any groups, associations or units to which they belong); parties shall receive a written decision that includes an explanation for it; all parties shall be notified in writing of their right to appeal.

(Article 5 of the report concerns the procedure for amending and revising the document.)

## TIAA-CREF bill proposed

Higher education's major pension system, TIAA-CREF, is faced with potentially significant changes unless federal legislation now pending in both houses of Congress is enacted.

(There are 2,360 TIAA-CREF participants at MSU.)

At stake are the uniformity and tax-exempt nature of the Teachers Insurance Annuity Association and the College Retirement Equities Fund. If Congress fails to pass a bill to federalize TIAA-CREF, the pension system may be "caught up in the network of multi-state insurance regulations," say proponents of the legislation.

A bill (S. 1290) to incorporate the "College Benefit System of America" — thus granting TIAA-CREF a federal charter and assuring its continued regulation by only the state of New York — was introduced more than a year ago by Sen. John L. McClellan of Arkansas. Cosponsors included Sen. Philip A. Hart of Michigan.

The same bill was introduced in the House as H. R. 9010 by Rep. Emanuel Celler of New York.

Senate hearings on the bill were concluded last fall, and hearings from the House Judiciary Committee were scheduled to for four weeks ago. The House committee includes two Michigan representatives, John Conyers of Detroit and Edward Hutchinson of Fennville.

The bill still needs to be reported out of committee, and when that will happen is not certain because of other pressing matters awaiting Congressional action.

\* \* \*

WHILE SOME of the pension plan's features may be threatened if the bill is not enacted, this would by no means be "the end of the world for TIAA-CREF," according to David Carter, assistant vice president at the organization's New York City office.

What could happen, he said, is that some states would exercise their recently enlarged powers and require TIAA-CREF to comply with state regulations. Some of these regulations could be disruptive to the uniformity of the program, Carter said, because

TIAA-CREF conducts its business by mail and is non-profit.

State-by-state regulation could conceivably result in 50 different sets of guidelines for the plan, thus making it difficult for a university faculty member to transfer his benefits from one state to another.

"We're not asking any favors," he said, "We are just trying to maintain the status quo of a plan that has served well for more than 50 years."

Among opponents of the bill is the National Association of Insurance Commissioners, which describes it as a possible wedge to further federal encroachment on the states' rights to regulate insurance companies. Others say that to federalize TIAA-CREF would be to grant it special privilege.

But supporters of the legislation say it would prevent "an unwarranted tax on the benefit plans of private and public higher education while benefit plans covering the vast majority of working Americans are not taxed at all."

Testimony in favor of the bill has come from officials of several educational associations, including the American Council on Education. Science magazine, in a Feb. 6 editorial, said that regulation in each state would turn TIAA-CREF into "an accounting

nightmare, full of inconsequential differences and serious inequities for the participants."

David Carter said that the organization has no current plans to mobilize widespread, write-in support for the federal bill, although it welcomes letters from individual faculty to Congressmen. And at least one national organization (American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education) is actively encouraging its members to "contact your senator in writing and urge his positive support for S-1290."

### Family seminars

Jessie Bernard, honorary research scholar at Pennsylvania State University and a specialist in marriage and family among blacks, will speak Thursday at 12:40 p.m. in Room 300, Home Economics Building, in the weekly colloquy on "The Family: Perspectives for the Future." Her topic is "Family Structure and Function: Alternatives and Predictions."

There will be a reception for Prof. Bernard Thursday, 7 - 9 p.m. in the Green Room of the Union.

### Ecology seminars in third week

Ecology-related seminars will be held every day this week in conjunction with the student-sponsored E-QUAL Teach-In scheduled for April 22-24.

Today at 4 p.m. in 110 Anthony Hall Keith Lewis, director of the Bureau of Science for the U.S. Food and Drug Administration, will speak on "Divergent Views of Food Safety," sponsored by the MSU food science department.

Tomorrow (Wednesday), at 3:30 p.m. in 158 Natural Resources, a panel discussion on "The Red Cedar — Past, Present and Future" will be presented by the fisheries and wildlife department. Panelists will be Robert C. Ball, director of the Institute of Water Resources; Niles R. Keever, chairman of fisheries and wildlife, and Ronald B. Willson of the Michigan Water Resources Commission.

Thursday at 3:30 p.m. in 158 Natural Resources, the Departments of Agricultural Economics, Park and Recreation Resources, Resource Development and Forestry will sponsor Jack Knetsch, director of the Natural Resource Policy Center at George Washington University, speaking on "Non-market values: Environmental Quality in Recreation."

At 3 p.m. Thursday in Conrad Auditorium and at 7 p.m. in 109 Anthony Hall, Ward Allen, assistant deputy secretary of state, will speak on "The Oceans as a Source of Resources and the International Implications."

Friday, at 2 p.m. in 104B Wells Hall, Garrett de Bell, editor of Environmental Handbook and lobbyist for Zero Population Growth, Inc., will speak on "Youth and the Environmental Movement."



# WKAR

TUESDAY, April 14

8 a.m. (AM-FM) MORNING REPORT. 60 minutes of local news and reports from Group W.  
1 p.m. (FM) MUSIC THEATRE. "Oh What a Lovely War."  
5 p.m. (AM-FM) NEWS 60.  
8:30 p.m. (FM) BOSTON SYMPHONY.

WEDNESDAY, April 15

8 a.m. (AM-FM) MORNING REPORT.  
11 a.m. (AM) BOOK BEAT. Robert Cromie with Andrew McNally, author of "An International Atlas."  
1 p.m. (FM) MUSIC THEATRE. "Li'l Abner."  
5 p.m. (AM-FM) NEWS 60.  
8 p.m. (FM) THE ART OF GLENN GOULD.

THURSDAY, April 16

8 a.m. (FM-FM) MORNING REPORT.  
1 p.m. (FM) MUSIC THEATRE. "The Secret Life of Walter Mitty."  
5 p.m. (AM-FM) NEWS 60.  
9 p.m. (FM) JAZZ HORIZONS.

FRIDAY, April 17

8 p.m. (AM-FM) MORNING REPORT.  
10:30 a.m. (AM) THE GOON SHOW. Peter Sellers, Hafry Secombe, Spike Milligan: "The Flea."  
11:45 a.m. (AM) ENVIRONMENT. Environmental news, features.  
1 p.m. (FM) MUSIC THEATRE. "You're a Good Man, Charlie Brown."  
5 p.m. (AM-FM) NEWS 60.

SATURDAY, April 18

8:15 a.m. (AM-FM) THE GOON SHOW. "The Albert Memorial."  
10:30 a.m. VARIETADES EN ESPANOL.  
11:45 a.m. (FM) RECENT ACQUISITIONS.  
1 p.m. (AM) DD2.  
1:30 p.m. (AM) THE DRUM. By, for and about the black community.  
2 p.m. (FM) OPERA. Live from the Met: "Romeo and Juliet."  
7 p.m. (FM) LISTENERS CHOICE. Classics by calling 355-6540.

SUNDAY, April 19

2 p.m. (AM-FM) CLEVELAND ORCHESTRA.  
4 p.m. (AM-FM) FROM THE MIDWAY. Discussion of public interest and political process.

MONDAY, April 20

8 a.m. (AM-FM) MORNING REPORT.  
1 p.m. (FM) MUSIC THEATRE. "Peter Pan."  
5 p.m. (AM-FM) NEWS 60.  
8 p.m. (FM) OPERA. "Rosine" and "The Bear."

# WMSB

Tuesday, April 14

12:30 p.m. UNDERSTANDING OUR WORLD.  
1 p.m. THE GREEN THUMB.  
7 p.m. DRUGS: THE CHILDREN ARE CHOOSING.

Wednesday, April 15

12:30 p.m. BLACK MAN IN THE AMERICAS. Life and philosophy of Martin Luther King.  
1 p.m. LET'S TAKE PICTURES.  
7 p.m. YOUNG MUSICAL ARTISTS. Bass Charles Greenwell.

Thursday, April 16

1 p.m. THE FRENCH CHEF.  
7 p.m. LA REVISTA.

Friday, April 17

12:30 p.m. INSIGHT.  
1 p.m. LES FLEURS.  
7 p.m. ASSIGNMENT 10.

Saturday, April 18

11:00 a.m. INNOVATIONS.  
Sunday, April 19  
11 a.m. INTERNATIONAL MAGAZINE.  
1 p.m. THE FORSYTE SAGA.  
2 p.m. YOUR RIGHT TO SAY IT.  
2:30 p.m. SOUL!  
3:30 p.m. NET FESTIVAL. Music from 20th Dubrovnik Festival.  
4:30 p.m. NET JOURNAL. Economic and political state of Taiwan and Thailand.  
10 p.m. THE ADVOCATES. Redistricting and busing: An answer to school segregation?  
11 p.m. NET PLAYHOUSE. "The Bond,"

Monday, April 20

12:30 p.m. GERMAN PLAYHOUSE. First in a drama series broadcast in German.  
1 p.m. MONEY MATTERS.  
7 p.m. SPARTAN SPORTLITE.

## 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.



Despite appearances, the Faculty Club will be partially ready by June 1. — Photo by Robert B. Brown

## Questions raised on club dues

If I drop out of the Faculty Club, will I get my \$225 deposit back? When husband and wife are both faculty or staff, should both buy memberships in the Faculty Club?

These and more questions are being put to the Faculty Club's membership committee since the group announced last week that new dues for the club (\$17.50 a month) will be effective June 1, the same date new club building is scheduled for partial use.

\* \* \*

RICHARD L. FELTNER, chairman of the Faculty Club membership committee and assistant dean of

agriculture and natural resources, received most of the questions. He explains that:

— A person leaving the Faculty Club will receive refund of his membership deposit, even if he remains at the University. He will receive a refund on equity payments when another person replaces him as a club member, no matter how long it is before the new member joins.

— When both husband and wife are faculty or staff members, only one needs to join the club to receive full family membership privileges.

— Monthly bills will be sent to

members who use the club's bar and dining facilities. No cash transactions will be made.

— A faculty member who is going on sabbatical leave may join the club, pay his membership deposit (or authorize it to be deducted over 10 months) and receive a waiver on dues payments while he is on leave. This applies to faculty on leave for six months or longer. If the same faculty member were to join after he returned from leave, he would have to pay the deposit as well as the equity accumulated since June 1.

— The Faculty Club will have no formal ties with Akers Golf Course.

## Council passes McKee Report . . .

(Continued from page 1)

minority student representation. That question was referred to an ad hoc committee chaired by Prof. Hideya Kumata (communication). Recommendations from the Kumata Committee were adopted by a 39-12 vote at last Tuesday's Council session.

Those recommendations provide for the addition of 30 seats for minority student representatives, no more than 10 of them on the Council and the remaining 20 distributed over the nine standing committees on which students shall sit. Allocation of those numbers would be determined by the Office of Black Affairs of ASMSU. The process will be reviewed in three years by the proposed committee on academic governance.

\* \* \*

COUNCIL ADOPTION of the recommendation from Kumata's ad hoc committee followed more than an hour of debate, marking the fifth consecutive session devoted to the question of student participation.

Charles C. Killingsworth, University professor of labor and industrial relations, said the new recommendations constituted simply "a face - lifted McKee recommendation" with a "little juggling of numbers and an injection of obfuscation."

Herbert Garfinkel, dean of James Madison College, read excerpts from a letter he sent to the Kumata Committee in which he expressed opposition to establishing numbers for minority representation.

Garfinkel said that representation assigned on the basis of race constituted a quota system. "As a practical matter," he added, "it is a poor idea for minority groups to accept a racially discriminatory policy which can benefit them only so long as they possess sufficient political power."

Terry Sullivan, a student member of the Council, said the recommendations would remedy de facto segregation that has occurred here. But she noted that achieving broad representation for minority students would take time, since most of the University's black students — because they are freshmen or

sophomores — are confined to the University College.

Kumata defended the recommendations as an attempt to enhance the patterns of minority representation on the campus.

"This report sets forth a plea for inclusivity," he said. "It is needed so we don't perpetuate an institutional pattern of exclusivity."

\* \* \*

THE ONLY amendment to the recommendations of the ad hoc committee on minority student

representation (Faculty News, April 7) was one concerning the honors programs committee.

Proposed by Robert L. Wright, professor of American Thought and Language, it added to recommendation 3b the stipulation that minority representation on the honors programs committee meet the same requirements as do other student representatives: "They must be members of Honors College or be enrolled in honors courses or programs, or be graduates of an Honors College program."

## Psychology professors . . .

(Continued from page 1)

psychology, have introduced three experimental measures into the course's standard text - lecture format.

They are offering a series of optional non - credit quizzes throughout the term by which students can estimate their mastery of specified blocks of subject matter, and they are permitting students who receive grades below 2.0 on the mid-term examination to take it again (with a maximum grade of 2.0 awarded). And they are making lecture materials available for review through audio tapes and visual materials. They hope, through these measures, to increase student learning in the course.

The optional quizzes are the most elaborate innovation. During winter term, three quizzes were offered over each of six blocks of subject matter.

The first quiz was given during a scheduled Friday class period; students who chose not to take it had a "day off." Grading was done on the spot by the students themselves so "feedback" is immediate and questions on wrong answers may be raised. Students who do not score at least 80-85 are advised to take a second quiz over the same material. If they fail this, they may, if they wish, take home a third quiz. In no case is it obligatory to take the quiz, and whatever the score, it does not count toward the student's final grade.

\* \* \*

GRADUATE TEACHING assistants have worked out the quizzes and

supervise use of the lecture tapes and visual materials for review. Supplies and clerical services for the experiment have been provided under an Educational Development Program grant.

Tallies made fall term show:

1. Fifteen percent of the 350-odd students in the class used the lecture review materials from one to 10 times.  
2. On an announced day, usually Friday, as many as 300 students elected to take the quiz rather than a cut class. Roughly half the students who received final grades of 3.5 or above had taken from seven to 10 of the optional quizzes given that term. Among students who received grades of 1 or below, none had taken from seven to 10 quizzes and 35 percent had taken no quizzes at all.

Preliminary tallies do not indicate whether the quizzes helped indifferent students learn more or whether "good" students are more inclined than others to take quizzes. But winter term a group of students volunteered to take all the quizzes and to pass them before taking the graded mid-term. With the results of their grades, Professors Ratner and Denny are evaluating the effect of the quizzes on learning.

Meanwhile, the professors say they are pleased with the other results of introducing the experimental measures. And they find it gratifying that their students elect in such large numbers to take optional quizzes rather than Friday cuts and that the students seem to feel genuine appreciation for the interest shown in helping them to learn.