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Teaching Code lists six responsibilities

The Code of Teaching Responsibility, submitted by the Educational Policies Committee, was adopted by the Academic Council at its meeting last Tuesday.

The teaching responsibilities of the instructional staff are among those many areas of university life which have for generations been a part of the unwritten code of "scholars and gentlemen." Now, however, along with other formerly unwritten contracts, it seems appropriate to set forth these responsibilities in the form of a code. The provisions of such a code are so reasonable to learned and humane men that it may appear redundant or unnecessary to state them.

However, the University conceives them to be so important that the performance of the instructional staff in meeting the provisions of this code shall be taken into consideration in determining salary increases, tenure, and promotion.

1. Instructional staff members are responsible for stating clearly the instructional objectives that in course they teach at the beginning of each term. It is expected that each instructional staff member will direct his instruction toward the fulfillment of these objectives and that examinations will be consistent with these objectives. Instructional staff members are responsible to enroll the content of the course they are assigned to teach to the course descriptions approved by the University Curriculum Committee and the Academic Council.

2. Instructional staff members are responsible for informing students in their classes of the methods to be employed in determining the final course grade and of any special requirements of attendance which differ from the attendance policy of the University.

3. It is expected that graded examinations and papers will be provided to the student for inspection and discussion. Thus, final examinations will be retained for one term to provide the opportunity for review with the instructor, if the student so desires. It is expected that examinations will be graded within a sufficiently appropriate time to make the examination a part of the student's learning experience.

4. All instructional staff members are expected to meet their classes regularly and at scheduled times. In case of illness or any other emergency, the instructor will notify the department chairman so that appropriate action may be taken.

5. All instructional staff members whose responsibilities involve students will be expected to schedule a reasonable number of office hours for student conferences. Office hours should be scheduled at times convenient to both students and instructors with the additional option of prearranged appointments for students when there is a scheduling conflict. The number of office hours is to be determined at the appropriate administrative level, and office hours should be a matter of common knowledge.

6. Instructional staff members who are responsible for academic advising are expected to be in their office at specified hours during the period of each enrollment. Arrangements may also be made for advising during registration.

Hearing Procedures

1. Students may take complaints relative to instruction directly to the department chairman or his designee. If the chairman is unable to redress the matter to the student's satisfaction, the chairman is obligated to refer unresolved complaints in writing to the departmental committee charged with the responsibility of hearing such complaints.

2. A written report of the action or recommendation of that group will be forwarded to the Ombudsman, to the student, and to the instructional staff member within 10 working days of receipt of the complaint.

3. Students wishing to appeal a departmental action or recommendation may do so as outlined in Provision 2.3.1.8 of "The Academic Freedom Report".

4. Those departmental and college committees shall be the sole agencies for hearing cases of this kind. A student may appeal the ruling of a departmental committee to the college committee; there shall be no appeal beyond the college committee except to the dean of the college who may act, upon a showing, that a given case be reconsidered.

We regret the typographical error.

A great university needs a great library.

'Library is nothing more than reflection of faculty'--Chapin

By BARBARA MCINTOSH
Assistant News Bureau Editor

"The library is nothing more than a reflection of the faculty." This is the view of MSU's director of libraries, Richard E. Chapin. He says that his door is always open to faculty, and he emphasizes that "to meet the faculty's specific curricular and research needs, we must have their cooperation." Chapin adds: "We are able to acquire most important works on current research through the usual bibliographical chains. But we do not get pamphlets, mimeographs and reports from associations or conferences. We have no way of finding out about these materials unless faculty members tell us."

In the past the faculty built the library. But now, because of the vast number of sources, only library officials have the means available to get all current publications, Chapin says. He also holds faculty rank as a professor of journalism.

"We need the faculty's assistance, however, to build a really good, complete library." He explains that it is difficult to get some works immediately because dealers must be found for older books, and publishers often back-order materials in heavy demand.

In order to acquire what is needed for a section of the library that will serve a...
Faculty uncertain

Student participation: How much, how many?

(The following reports were gathered by Mike Bore, Gail Morris and Gene Riefstorf.)

"In spite of the Massey Report's setback in the Academic Council, there is little doubt that most Council members favor some form of student participation in academic governance."

"The rub, I think, comes in trying to prescribe the degree of that participation for the whole University," said Richard E. Sullivan, professor of history and a member of the Steering Committee.

Nearly a year after being called together, the ad hoc Committee on Student Participation in Academic Governance (chaired by Gerald J. Massey), saw its report stalled in the Council. Five sessions produced action on only three of the report's 15 recommendations.

A reconstituted committee, headed by Jane Lackner, professor of psychology, is now to report back to the Council in two months.

It may seem ironical that the motion to refer the Massey Report back to committee came from a student, Gina Schack, an English major and member of the ad hoc committee. The question of student voting rights in the Council prompted formation of the committee in the first place.

But Miss Schack said she had good reason to end debate on the Report.

"I sensed some bad feelings developing," she explained. "A lot of viewpoints were not being raised. It had drowned out. There is a need now to better understand some of these views and challenges raised in the Council."

A Faculty News sampling of Council members from nine colleges reveals degrees of dissatisfaction with the Massey Report on two counts: its rationale (some contend that it lacked a rationale) and its attempts to assign specific numbers of students to standing committees (some felt the committees would be too large and unwieldy).

One member of the group noted that the key issue defining student participation was not squarely faced. Several believed the idea of soliciting student views and opinion, but they expressed concern that student participation was being equated with student power in matters for which faculty would be held responsible.

A new insisted that to consider only student participation is to avoid the total question of university governance.

Elton Nonnamaker, associate dean of students on the Council (and member of the Massey Committee), said that he favors greater student participation as outlined in the Report. But he added: "My contention still is that ... we need to look at the whole problem of university government and develop a structure to deal with the whole thing. The Report was just a stopgap measure." * * *

Most faculty in our sample supported voting privileges for students in the Council, provided that student membership remains at or near its present level of three.

Those tending to favor the student vote included Sullivan; Charles C. Killingsworth, College of Social Science; William E. Sweetland, education; W. Fred Graham, Justin Morrill College; Beatrice Panochi, home economics; and Steven Spees, Lyman Briggs College.

"I would have no difficulty at all agree with the vote for the present number of students on the Council," Killingsworth said. "But if you have, say, 500 students, you shift the balance of power significantly." Spees said: "The Council is supposed to represent faculty opinion. When you start adding students, you are changing its nature."

Swee den favored students voting in the Council, noting, "I know how it is to attend meetings and not be able to vote."

Graham endorsed students' voting: "Wherever students have become involved in serious matters, they have done well."

But M. Wayne Adams, agriculture and natural resources, said students don't need to vote in the Council. He said that the opportunity for representation, the opportunity to speak and to bring other students in to speak. But this is the responsibility, and this goes with voting.

In my department (crop and soil science), there is no disagreement with the principle of student involvement. But I can see why some specialists disagree with student control."

Others expressing reluctance to grant student vote are Dugas Cowen, human medicine, and Martin C. Hawley, engineering.

Cowen, an assistant professor of pathology, said the Massey Report "ignored the differences between faculty and students, and the differences among students." He said that just as there is a disparity of knowledge and responsibility between faculty and students, there is a difference too between a 17-year-old freshman and a 20-year-old graduate student. * * *

"There are many kinds of student participation," said Hawley, an associate professor of chemical engineering.

"I think it is very important to have students feel well-represented ... I want to be more involved, I want to know what the basis for participation is, and then I can agree on the details for implementing it."

Hawley also suggested that further action on the matter should wait until the views of President-elect Clifton B. Wharton are requested.

Miss Paolucci, professor of family and child sciences, observed: "It was never explained why students ought to have a kind of representation they were being asked for. There is also a philosophical question: How much should they have?" "One of the neglected aspects of the question is accountability. Faculty are held accountable ... to the people of Michigan not to students."

Killingsworth pointed out that "we have a very hard job of shifting to identify areas where student participation can have a large role—even control—and where professional competence is required. By definition, students don't yet have professional competence."

Graham, an associate professor, offered this view: "Whenever faculty groups have worked closely with students on significant issues, the faculty has ended up regarding students as partners."

Beyond the matter of student participation, some uncertainty exists as to the extent of faculty participation in university governance.

Sullivan observed: "At this University, historically speaking, the faculty has now had enough participation. But in recent years there have been rapid strides toward a more active role, and now there is more involvement."

Both Graham and Miss Paolucci said that faculty here could be more active than they are in university governance.

But Miss Paolucci said, "I don't think we would probably spend time in their own areas. "And that really bothers me," she added, "we don't have a higher priority among faculty."

Students show gains on many campuses

At campuses across the nation students are steadily gaining more say in academic government. Examples of this larger student range from token gestures to complete restructuring of some institution's governing system.

Generally speaking, these developments take four forms: presidential advisory council composed of students; voting membership on university committees; voting rights in the faculty senate; and all-university representation groups composed equally or proportionally of students, faculty and administration.

The fourth, more radical departure from traditional procedures is now in effect at two universities.

Maryville College in Tennessee has an "Al!-College Council" made up of six students, six faculty members and six administrative officers.

The council is to be the college's chief deliberative and legislative body responsible for long-range planning and directing the activities of the entire college campus.

At the University of New Hampshire a unicameral system of government is being proposed. A revised University Senate includes an equal number of students and faculty all nominated on a "district" basis.

Restructuring at the University of Kansas will result in a Faculty Senate, Student Senate and a joint group to be known as the University Senate.

Such "community government" plans also are being considered or developed at the State University of New York at Binghamton and at Columbia University. At SUNY, a policy-making university assembly with a ratio of five faculty members to three students to two administrators would govern.

Less startling but significant steps toward including students in academic affairs have also been taken on many other campuses. These include:

--In Kentucky, students sought and gained a state law requiring student membership on the boards of trustees of state-supported institutions, including the University of Kentucky.

--At Antioch, an administrative council involving students, six faculty members and the president makes many decisions on curriculum, and on faculty hiring, promotion, and tenure.

--At least one student will be appointed to each of the senate committees of the University of Arkansas this fall.

--Students who serve on an academic planning committee at the University of California, Davis, receive academic credit.

UP: Trend want involvement

Two faculty groups, one long in existence and the other newly formed, are taking a long look at wages and economic benefits.

A resolution calling for creation of a new all-university faculty standing committee on "budget allocation and faculty compensation" will be considered Wednesday at the chapter meeting of the American Association of University Professors.

The meeting is scheduled for 8 p.m. in Rooms 38-39 of the Union.

Prepared by the AAUP executive council, the resolution says that "faculty should participate in decisions affecting budget allocation and faculty compensation."

A faculty bylaws of the faculty do not provide for meaningful faculty participation in such decisions.

Some 20 faculty members expressing their concern over current policies of salary decisions, fringe benefits and grievance procedures have formed an organization to explore the possibility of collective bargaining.

The group, called the Professors' Organizing Committee, last Wednesday elected James Izumi as its president and William Gamble as secretary-treasurer. * * *
Two views of student governing role

Garfinkel: Combination needed

Herbert Garfinkel, professor of political science and dean of James Madison College, wrote a submitside proposal to the president of the University, which was introduced and later withdrawn at the Oct. 14 meeting of the Academic Council. Garfinkel plans to submit it to the reconstituted Committee on Student Participation in Academic Government. Following are excerpts from that preamble.

... It is necessary that the University provide specific and appropriate means whereby student ideas, responses and proposals can be brought to bear upon the policy-making processes of Michigan State University and its constituent parts.

What are appropriate means? These derive from a proper understanding of the distinctive roles of faculty and students as members of an academic community.

The Trustees have delegated to the faculty responsibility for determining and maintaining academic standards and establishing a curriculum from which to recommend awarding of degrees. The reasons for this traditional allocation of authority derive from the nature of a university faculty. They are selected on the basis of professional competency as scholars. And the tenured faculty provide the continuing body of scholars who are entrusted with maintaining the long-run interests of the University.

The appropriate role of students in academic policy deliberations is to bring forward views which are peculiarly those of students and to participate as learners in the processes of educational policy-making.

But it must be observed that student roles are limited by the fact that they are always short-range with limited commitments to the University. Moreover, there are always temptations to satisfy short-run interests; that is, to yield to opportunities to buy diplomas cheaply at the cost of academic standards.

Also, certain decisions entail a special competency, such as determinations of faculty responsibilities, retention promotions, tenure and remuneration. Student advice should be sought with respect to faculty performance, but in a manner which makes clear that this is an advisory role on one aspect of these decisions, and in a private manner which is distinctly personal of the individuals underlying them.

Authoritative decision-making on academic policy for the University as a whole ultimately must be a faculty judgment.

... Questions such as the following need consideration: Students should serve on which committees, exercising which functions, in what way, with or without votes, in what proportion?

What is needed is the right combination of faculty responsibility for academic standards with genuine opportunities for counseling student ideas and proposals into the policy-making processes of the University.

Here, then, are some criteria we might consider in planning a role for students in academic governance.

1. Students ought to be selected through normal academic levels, not current student government channels.

2. Students ought to be selected on the same basis as faculty committees for committees and legislative bodies... If faculty are elected by their peers, so should students be. If students are to meaningfully participate... they must be willing to develop machinery to insure the perpetuation of students on academic bodies.

3. Meaningful numbers of students must be allowed to participate in the academic decision-making process... The more voices that can be effectively added to discussion and consideration of academic matters, the more likely it is that we will arrive at sound decisions.

4. Students should be given privileges on committees of which they are members... We are not seeking responsible behavior from students who have the privilege of talking at all... but who do not have to share the responsibility for the decisions finally made.

5. Students must be given responsibilities in all aspects of academic governance, not merely those they feel strongly about.

6. Students and faculty alike must recognize that they are representatives of an institution that truly belongs to the people of the state, not simply to the students of the moment or to the faculty representatives of a particular discipline or college.

Bettinghaus: Toward a community of scholars

Erwin P. Bettinghaus, professor and assistant dean of communication arts, who is a member of the Maney Committee on Student Participation in Academic Government. He is the only faculty holdover from the Maney Committee to the reconstituted committee chaired by James McKee. Following are excerpts from a Bettinghaus speech, "The Role of the Student in Academic Government," delivered Oct. 24 at the Midwestern Regional Conference of Academic Affairs Administrators at Kellogg Center.

... The very complexity of modern education suggests that the proper student-faculty-academic governing process be carefully examined. Current student participation has frequently been the result of a response to student demands, or as an attempt to "quiet down" a resistive student body.

Institutions have acted without clear guidelines, without knowledge of what contributions students can make, and without setting criteria that might guide an entire institution in developing an effective academic government.

Students, on the other hand, have frequently asked to participate in the academic decision-making process without clear knowledge of how that process works, or where they might most effectively contribute to the process.

If we are not to become a collection of unionized employees with faculty, administrators, graduate students and students all belonging to different unions, we must make moves to strengthen the unity of the University, not to diversify. That can be accomplished by emphasizing development of strong student-faculty-administrator governing bodies at all levels of the University -- bodies charged with the development of a community of scholars.

Community Chest drive needs push

The University has raised 74.2 per cent of its quota in this year's University Community Chest campaign.

But there was a note of cautious optimism from campus chairman Armand L. Hunter in reporting pledges of $137,578.50. "Although we appear to be on schedule, the fact is that we are running out of time if we expect to meet our quota of $185,299," Hunter said.

"Pledges are still coming in, but not at the rate they were the first three weeks."

Hunter urged all faculty and staff who have not contributed, and who wish to do so, to contact their division chairman as soon as possible.

He also announced that seven divisions had reached 100 per cent of their quota: Business, Communication, Arts, Home Economics, Lyman Briggs, Secretary's Office, University Business Office and University Relations.

Erwin Bettinghaus

I do not mean to depreciate the efforts of student governments, but merely to suggest that academic governing bodies ought to be composed of representatives from academic units.
they also present potential dangers and threaten loss of individual liberty.

He said that crucial decisions must be made about these matters rationally and morally and that only a scientifically literate, well-informed public can make such decisions.

The nature of the decisions, he maintained, means that most Supreme Court justices will have to "play God." Earlier this year, Harper and Row published his book, "Come, Let Us Play God.

Many of his speaking engagements were before church groups and, on occasion he preached from the pulpit of Peoples Church. He was featured recently in a series of 26-hour television programs dealing with science and moral and ethical decisions.

Mr. Augenstein was frequently invited to public issues, much scientific matters. He was known as a proponent of sex education and a crusader against drug abuse by juveniles.

Just before the recent moon landing, he initiated a campaign to tighten the planning to prevent contamination by moon viruses or other organisms. He was unable to change previously established procedures, but he said he felt that the campaign would mean better precautions in subsequent flights.

Mr. Augenstein was born March 6, 1928, in Decatur, Ill. He attended James Milliken College, served in the Army as an X-ray technician, and enrolled at the University of Chicago, where he received the B.S. in physics in 1949. He then moved to the University of Illinois and received the M.A. degree in physics in 1954 and a Ph.D. in 1956.

Mr. Augenstein is survived by his widow, Elizabeth; his son David Leroy, 4; a daughter, Kimberly Beth, 1; his parents, Mr. and Mrs. Roy H. Augenstein of Decatur, and a brother, David, also of Decatur.

Private interment will be Wednesday in Evergreen Cemetery in Lansing.

On Augenstein's work at MSU, Richard U. Byerum, dean of natural science, described the late biologist as an "active scientist" who conducted a "very productive research program." He noted that the biophysics department was built by Augenstein into a successful operation that attracted much outside research support.

"It is a big loss," Byerum said.

Said Andrew D. Hunt Jr., dean of humanities:

"Augenstein established a productive and effective Department of Biophysics.

He was a man of extraordinary talent who lent great graces to the University and presented exciting and unusual points of view to students in the health professions."

Norman Abeles, professor of Counseling Center and psychology, is president-elect of the Michigan Psychological Association.


Bernice Borgman, professor of family and child sciences, was on the evaluation team for a national summer training workshop for teachers and their Indian aids in programs for pre-school Indian children held at Arizona State University and on the Navajo Reservation at Greasewood, Ariz.

Herbert G. Boburt, professor of philosophy, wrote an article in "Language and Philosophy," published by the NYU Press.

William J. E. Irby, professor of marketing and hospitality marketing, wrote with Robert J. Haith, instructor in hotel, restaurant and institution management, an article in the September issue of Sales Management magazine.

C. Keith Grotz, professor of labor and industrial relations, had an article on collective bargaining in schools published in the August Labor Law Journal.

Leroy Augenstein... (Continued from page one)

Richard E. Chapin: "To meet the faculty's needs, we must have their cooperation.

Library is reflection...

(Continued from page one)

new curriculum, work starts at least two years before the first classes.

Chapin reports that library officials now are aware of the possibilities in a law library and checking available literature in osteopathy.

The library has been submitted for a 20,000 square-foot medical clinic and life sciences library, and in the main library a bibliographer is exploring the expansion of the holdings on urban affairs.

Approximately 100,000 volumes are added to the library every year, he says.

To promote awareness of specific library holdings, faculty members for the first time this year have access to the printed list of "Serial Holdings in the Michigan State University Library" through their departments.

Chapin predicts three major developments in the next 10 years.

Fourth, the audio library on the fourth floor of the College Library, will be added and the directors of the library will serve as a professor, and two assistant professors would be in addition to their present assignments. All law professors would be full-time with reasonable teaching loads, competitive salaries, and time for some research and public service.

Faculty honors, projects


Michael E. Born, professor of labor and industrial relations, has been appointed an associate of the National Manpower Policy Task Force, which advises the U.S. Department of Labor.

Speakers at the American Agricultural Economics Association included: Dale J. Hathaway, professor; Lester V. Manderscheid, associate professor; David L. Cole, assistant professor; Allan Schmid, professor; and James Shaffer, professor.

John P. Henderson, professor of economics, has been appointed editor of the American Studies Bulletin, annual publication of the African Studies Association. It will be published at Michigan State under Henderson's editorship.

Juan A. Calvo, associate professor of romance languages, wrote an article in the spring issue of Bulletin of the Comediantes.

John R. Hurley, professor of psychology, chairs the National Center of the Wolverine State Group Psychotherapy Society, the state affiliate of the American Group Psychotherapy Association. He is also coauthor, with Shirley J. Taylor, assistant professor, on a book, in the making, of an article for the Journal of Counseling Psychology.

Eugene Jacobson, professor of psychology, was reelected for a second term (1969-72) as secretary-general of the International Council of Psychological Services, at the 19th International Congress of Psychology in London.

George A. Davies, associate professor, lectures at Arizona State University and California State College, Los Angeles.

Part IV: Law school's needs

Part IV of the Proposal for a College of Law at Michigan State discusses one need of a law school here: the faculty.

The final portions of the proposal – discussing library, space and facilities, and students – will be presented in a future Faculty News.

In the Oct. 14 issue which listed members of the committee drafting the proposal, the name of Charles P. Larrowe was inadvertently omitted. He is a professor of economics.)

III. The Basic Needs for Establishing a College of Law

The quality of a new College of Law depends on four factors: (1) the quality of the faculty and, in the initial stages, the time, effort and imagination they are allowed to devote to planning for the College, (2) the quality of the library, (3) the adequacy of the space and facilities for the College, and (4) qualified students committed to public service through law.

A. The Faculty

Recruitment of a dean and an excellent faculty is considered of primary importance. It is understood that the first year the University would appoint a Director of Planning and an Assistant Director, both trained in law and interested in assuming the initial responsibilities for the establishment of a law school

including developing guidelines, designing space, recruiting faculty candidates including candidates for dean, and establishing ties with existing sources of support, academic, financial, and professional.

The second year a dean would be added, as would an admissions counselor, a head librarian who would also serve as a professor, and two professors interested specifically in planning a curriculum in keeping with the guidelines set out in this proposal. The third year, when the first students would be admitted, another professor would be added and the directors of planning shifted to administrative-teaching positions.

In subsequent years faculty would be added as needed for the additional students and additional courses.

The University has on its faculty now a number of persons with law degrees, usually in addition to other advanced degrees. Such persons are assigned to other colleges and would continue in their present assignments. All law professors would be in addition to present faculty. For the most part, new faculty would be full-time with reasonable teaching loads, competitive salaries, and time for some research and public service.

B. The Basic Needs for Establishing a College of Law

The needs of a law school here: the faculty.

Richard E. Chapin, director of MSU Faculty News, is the college faculty member who has written the short article on library needs and the long article on the needs of a law school here. He has been a faculty member at MSU for 11 years.

Richard E. Chapin: "To meet the faculty's needs, we must have their cooperation."
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