Melby concerned for autonomy

Ernest Melby thinks it’s ironic that he has held his present job—going on 15 years as MSU’s distinguished professor of administration and higher education—longer than any other in his career. The irony is that Melby joined the faculty here in 1956 after he had retired from an already-distinguished career that included posts as a school superintendent, college professor, dean and university president.

His present schedule represents some concession to retirement—six months each year in East Lansing, six months in Florida—but Melby’s notion of retirement is far from leisurely. He continues to teach, do research and consult. Even part of his time in the South goes for consulting at Florida Atlantic University in Boca Raton.

FOR A NUMBER of years Melby has been one of education’s most thoughtful and most outspoken critics. He has, for example, repeatedly urged that this nation devote more resources to correcting its educational failures with poor and minority groups.

For higher education, Melby says he is concerned—concerned about what he calls the “standstill” to which hang the freedom and autonomy of the universities.

“The university is its freedom to investigate and to publicize the results of its investigations—no matter where they lead,” he says. “The university is the only place left in society where this can be done.”

But higher education is going through a period of uncertainty, a period that Melby describes as a “very dark time.” It is a time when the debate is on—on the future of the universities and their relationship with the states and federal government.

Panel on Student Participation

The value of that remark, Melby said later, is in whatever it suggests to those who heard it. But several aspects of the deliberations on the report led him to make the remark.

Part of Hurrell’s concern related to the procedures in which the Council was involved at that point. “I felt we had bypassed the rationale of the report,” he said, “and were debating individual points in sort of a vacuum.”

He said that feeling related to gearing the report to what would be acceptable to the Academic Senate, which rejected the original report last June.

And, Hurrell said, “part of my unhappiness was due to discussion of faculty powers, which I find hard to fit into the basically advisory structure of the University, (which) operates without recommendations and approvals all the way up to the Board of Trustees.”

FACULTY PRIVILEGES and minority student representation are the panel report’s two sections which have been passed thus far by the Council after considerable debate in its two meetings last week.

Thomas H. Greer, professor of humanities, moved to delete a section outlining exclusive faculty concern with “matters affecting the distinctive professional duties of the faculty, namely the duties that flow from the faculty’s obligation to maintain the intellectual authority of the University as a center of detached inquiry and disinterested pursuit of truth.”

Council meets today

Discussion of the report of the Panel on Student Participation in Academic Governance will resume today at a special Academic meeting at 3:15 p.m. in the Con Con Room of the International Center.

In order for final Council action on student participation to be considered later in the Academic Senate’s meeting has been postponed until Monday, Nov. 23 at 3 p.m. in Fairchild Theatre.

Group seeks to represent clerical-technical employees

A new organization that seeks to represent one of MSU’s largest groups—the nearly 1,800 clerical, technical and secretarial employees—is moving slowly toward its goal of recognition by the University.

Michigan State University Employees’ Association (MSUEA) currently claims some 450 members, about half of the some 900 (50 percent) clerical and technical employees of official recognition by MSU.

Attaining the 900-member-level will take some time at the present growth rate, according to MSUEA President Rollin V. Dassen.

Dassen, a recording supervisor at WKAR radio, said that membership is now “almost at a standstill.”

A variety of reasons, including apathy, accounts for the lag in new membership, Dassen said. But he emphasized that clerical-technical employees “have everything to gain and nothing to lose” if they join the MSUEA.

He noted that the group has already written its bylaws, elected a slate of officers and established contact with the administration. It has sent two representatives to the new Antidiscrimination Judicial Board.

But its primary goal is “to represent its membership in all conditions of their employment to the University”—a function held by the Administrative-Professional Association for A-P staff.

The MSUEA was formed about a year ago, following attempts by labor union officials to organize persons in the clerical-technical classifications.

Dassen said the union overtures were rejected because the results would have been more restrictive job descriptions for C-T employees and high union dues.

The MSUEA isn’t assessing does now, Dassen explained, “because we’d like to be able to give people something for their dues.”

“In view of the progress made by the A-P Association,” Dassen said, “I can’t understand why the clerical-technical employees don’t move. We’re just about the only group on the campus that doesn’t bargain.”
Council debates report...

(Concluded from page 1)

denial in a matter clearly of foremost concern.""

But, McKee said he "acknowledces the fact that this body has no alternative."

He expressed further with the confusion between the concepts of community of scholars and of professional association. As he referred to a section reading, "students have the right to assume that their inputs...shall figure significantly in the faculty's judgment..."

"There is no such meaningful entity as "the students,"" Killingsworth replied by asking whether "the purpose of our gathering here is to compose a brave and unselfish document that will be embraced by students and rejected by the faculty as a whole, or to compose a document that has a reasonably good chance of being recognized by the faculty as "the students.""

The concern with Senate acceptance was repeated often during Council deliberations. Specifically, the Taylor panel tried to safeguard certain rights and goals of the university relations in the Council of Graduate Students and graduate student representatives in the Academic Council. He is also a graduate assistant in the Department of English.

The Taylor Report attempts to reconcile the spirit of the McKee Report with objections made to that document in earlier Academic Council and Senate deliberations. Specifically, the Council tried to safeguard certain rights and prerogatives that many faculty obviously considered threatened by the McKee Report.

However, in attempting to preserve those rights, the report has inadvertently precluded any meaningful student participation in academic governance. This concern is of three subdivisions of 2.5.7.3 in Part A of these sections. I would like to detail here the specific manner in which these sections, intended only to reserve certain faculty rights, actually undermine both the spirit and the intent of the section.

Item 2.5.7.3.1 denies the graduate student representatives the right to vote on such matters as salary, insurance and other fringe benefits which are held to be of exclusive concern to the faculty. Yet these same graduate representatives are allegedly to be treated as professionals. But they have no present voice in the determination of professional salary schedules or other related matters. This section systemically excludes them from any meaningful future voice. I feel very strongly that this section is not specific concerning to the graduate assistants and that their representatives to this Council and the University committees should have the right and responsibility of voting participation regarding them.

Section 2.5.7.2 is exceedingly vague. Insofar as it concerns the general direction and goals of the University, it is clearly a matter of rightful concern to all academic parties of the University. And insofar as this section's vagueness allows it to be invoked over a wide range of cases, it is a document of general exclusion of student participation.

For instance, if there were another series of political developments such as those last spring, and of the Council to be asked to consider a proposal to suspend and modify classes for a period to allow for discussion of the issues -- as was done last spring -- this clause could be invoked to exclude student participation in that vote. Yet this is a major exclusive concern to the faculty, or of excusory concern to any single group. It concerns the vital academic interest of the University at large and ought to be voted on by all of those interests.

Section 2.5.7.3.3 encompasses a sensitive issue. There is substance in the claim that the competency of professionals can best be judged by other professionals. Yet, ironically, the students who are excluded from participation by this section are the only people who view teaching performance first-hand. But this document averts students only the "right to assume" that the input of this cadre will be considered. In my department both graduates and undergraduates vote on tenure and related decisions. This procedure was established after several months of serious debate, though some faculty actually opposed it. But it has substantially improved the communication and working atmosphere within the department. This document, if passed, would deprive us and other departments with similar procedures of this right of participation. It projects a net loss from our present level of involvement.

What is needed is a re- wording of this section of the report so that the attempt to safeguard faculty rights does not destroy the original purposes of this enterprise. As far as graduate student functions are respectively professional, it should be found included in their professional decisions. To this end, we will again try to amend the report.

"Salvation" from off-Broadway to campus

"Are you ready for 'Salvation'?

That's what student producers of the rock-musical "Salvation" are asking in a statement promoting the six-day run of their production during the next two weekends on the campus. (Nov. 13-15 and Nov. 20-22.)

The question seems based on the musical's advertised ingredients: Music, humor and satire dealing with sex, drugs, politics and religion.

The MSU student production of "Salvation," New Players, points out that the upcoming production is the first on a college campus, following a two-year run in New York by the musical. It is billed as "the son of 'Hair.'"

Students in the production company have been using "their student form" to urge the administration to "attend a performance of the production so as to better understand what the present condition of man's aspirations encompasses."

Friday and Saturday performances will be at 7:30 and 10 p.m. in the Erickson Hall Kiva, and Sunday shows will be at 7:30 p.m., also in the Kiva. Proceeds from the Sunday performances will go to the Listening Ear and the Drug Education Center. Tickets, at $2 each, are available at the Union and at several stores in the area.

One student's view

Grad students denied vote in areas that concern them

The following viewpoint was submitted by David Wright, vice president for undergraduate and graduate affairs and chairman of the Council of Graduate Students. Students and graduate student representatives in the Academic Council. He is also a graduate assistant in the Department of English.

The Taylor Report attempts to reconcile the spirit of the McKee Report with objections made to that document in earlier Academic Council and Senate deliberations. Specifically, the Council tried to safeguard certain rights and prerogatives that many faculty obviously considered threatened by the McKee Report.

However, in attempting to preserve those rights, the report has inadvertently precluded any meaningful student participation in academic governance. This concern is of three subdivisions of 2.5.7.3 in Part A of these sections. I would like to detail here the specific manner in which these sections, intended only to reserve certain faculty rights, actually undermine both the spirit and the intent of the section.

Item 2.5.7.3.1 denies the graduate student representatives the right to vote on such matters as salary, insurance and other fringe benefits which are held to be of exclusive concern to the faculty. Yet these same graduate student representatives are allegedly to be treated as professionals. But they have no present voice in the determination of professional salary schedules or other related matters. This section systemically excludes them from any meaningful future voice. I feel very strongly that this section is not specific concerning to the graduate assistants and that their representatives to this Council and the University committees should have the right and responsibility of voting participation regarding them.

Section 2.5.7.2 is exceedingly vague. Insofar as it concerns the general direction and goals of the University, it is clearly a matter of rightful concern to all academic parties of the University. And insofar as this section's vagueness allows it to be invoked over a wide range of cases, it is a document of general exclusion of student participation.

For instance, if there were another series of political developments such as those last spring, and of the Council to be asked to consider a proposal to suspend and modify classes for a period to allow for discussion of the issues -- as was done last spring -- this clause could be invoked to exclude student participation in that vote. Yet this is a major exclusive concern to the faculty, or of excusory concern to any single group. It concerns the vital academic interest of the University at large and ought to be voted on by all of those interests.

Section 2.5.7.3.3 encompasses a sensitive issue. There is substance in the claim that the competency of professionals can best be judged by other professionals. Yet, ironically, the students who are excluded from participation by this section are the only people who view teaching performance first-hand. But this document averts students only the "right to assume" that the input of this cadre will be considered. In my department both graduates and undergraduates vote on tenure and related decisions. This procedure was established after several months of serious debate, though some faculty actually opposed it. But it has substantially improved the communication and working atmosphere within the department. This document, if passed, would deprive us and other departments with similar procedures of this right of participation. It projects a net loss from our present level of involvement.

What is needed is a re-wording of this section of the report so that the attempt to safeguard faculty rights does not destroy the original purposes of this enterprise. As far as graduate student functions are respectively professional, it should be found included in their professional decisions. To this end, we will again try to amend the report.

Followings are excerpts of a presentation by John F. A. Taylor, professor of philosophy, in introducing his panel's report on student participation in academic governance to the Academic Council last week.

The university is that singular institution in which everyone has his individual voice, but which is internally so ordered that its general policy, its rules and its actions are presumed to be the summation of the community of scholars. The spirit and the letter of the McKee Report are the spirit and in ten t of the report.

While functioning as part of the professional academic community, these assistants are allegedly to be treated as professionals. But they have no present voice in the determination of professional salary schedules or other related matters. This section systemically excludes them from any meaningful future voice. I feel very strongly that this section is not specific concerning to the graduate assistants and that their representatives to this Council and the University committees should have the right and responsibility of voting participation regarding them.

The conflict of interest centers around the three subsections of 2.5.7.3. It is a document of general exclusion of student participation.

That is singular institutions in which everyone has his individual voice, but which is internally so ordered that its general policy, its rules and its actions are presumed to be the summation of the community of scholars. The spirit and the letter of the McKee Report are the spirit and in ten t of the report.

What is needed is a re-wording of this section of the report so that the attempt to safeguard faculty rights does not destroy the original purposes of this enterprise. As far as graduate student functions are respectively professional, it should be found included in their professional decisions. To this end, we will again try to amend the report.

Chest campaign stalls at 93 percent

The University is 7.3 percent short of meeting its quota for the 1970 United Community Chest campaign.

At the final report session last week, division leaders had brought in pledges totaling $574,545, which is 92.7 percent of the University's goal of $588,414.

Campus armchair R. L. Hunter, director of the Continuing Education Service, was optimistic, however, that late returns might be enough to put MSU over the top, as was the case last year.

He congratulated the division leaders and solicitors who have worked on the campaign, and asked that they "leave the campaign" for the faculty and for the University.

He also expressed his appreciation for the overall support of the drive by the majority of the University colleges and divisions.

The final tally showed that 12 of the 26 colleges and divisions had reached their quotas: Agriculture and Natural Resources, Business, Education, Human Ecology, James Madison, Lyman Briggs, Veterinary Medicine, Continuing Education, Dormitories and Food Services, Secretary's Office, University Business Office and University Relations.

Supplied exclusively, by action of the Senate. This report fits a very significant part of the dissenting voice in favor of the principle of student participation in the decision-making power of the university.

In a word, the question is whether there shall be student participation, but what form it shall take if we are to preserve the essential commission of the University as a community of scholars.

It is very easy for us to fall into the modern fashion of conceiving this problem as a problem of power - of the power of the faculty or the administration or of students or of minorities. We shall then, on those terms, judge every proposal according to the competitive advantage it assigns to the special group to which we belong. You may proceed on that pattern; but there is no solution to be found for our University.

In the design of a university it is a fundamental error to assume that every voice is competitive to speak on all questions with equal authority. What design must guarantee is, on the contrary, that in those matters in which some voices are singularly, those voices are heard...That guarantee is not afforded by the numbers of the speakers, but by the consent of all hearers to tend to the competent voices.

Mental health lectures set

Hilda Richards, deputy chief of the Harlem Rehabilitation Center at New York University, will give a class seminar Thursday (Nov. 12).

Mrs. Richards, also research assistant in nursing education at the Columbia University Teachers College, will discuss "Relabilitation in the Black Community: Innovative Treatment Role," at 12:40 p.m. in Room 116, 57th Street building.

Earlier Thursday at 11 a.m., she will discuss "The Nursing Role in Community Mental Health" in Mercy Hall at St. Luke's Hospital. Both seminars are sponsored by the Department of Psychiatry.
Michigan retains its students

Michigan ranks fourth among the 50 states in the number of its students who remain in the state to attend college, and Statistics compiled by the U.S. Office of Education show that Michigan retains 92 percent of its college students. Only California (94 percent), and Utah (93 percent) report higher retention rates.

The survey, reflecting figures for fall of 1968, show that nationally the percentage of students remaining in their home states to attend college went up for the first time in several decades.

The findings cover a total national enrollment of 6,711,158 students, 5,474,165 of whom stayed in their home states.

Most states kept at least three-fourths of their college students, but four states (Alaska, New Jersey, Delaware, and New Hampshire) and the District of Columbia retained less than 60 percent.

The figures show that in Michigan, 255,563 students remained in the state to go to college. Michigan sent 21,572 students to college out of the state and received 38,874 from other states for a net gain of 17,302. The highest net gains were registered in the District of Columbia (37,402), Massachusetts (37,316), Indiana (26,495) and North Carolina (23,556).

Other midwestern states showing gains of students were Wisconsin (16,611), Ohio (10,361), Iowa (5,805) and Minnesota (3,770).

The only neighboring state with a net loss in student migration was Illinois, where the loss was 32,454. Only New Jersey and New York reported higher net losses.

Of the students who leave Michigan to go to college, most choose schools in neighboring states. Indiana (2,681), Ohio (2,481) and Illinois (2,233) claimed most of the Michigan students who migrated, although California (1,353) ranked fourth in attracting the state's college-bound students.

Michigan's students were least likely to go to college in Nevada (6 students), and Alaska and Maine (12 students to each state).

States sending the largest number of students to Michigan colleges were Ohio (5,587), Illinois (4,686), New York (4,372) and Indiana (2,688). The smallest numbers came from Nevada (19), Alaska (35) and Wyoming (36).

MSU's enrollment in the fall of 1968 was 29,949, and Michigan residents reported higher net losses.

Of the 5,985 foreign students enrolled in 1968 in Michigan colleges and universities, 1,176 were at MSU.

Clerical-technical group . . .

(Concluded from page 1)

DASEN SAID he thinks that clerical-technical employees will benefit by having official spokesmen to represent the MSUEA in discussions with the administration.

"All other groups have got higher percentages of benefits (than CT employees) in the past few years," he contended, "and all of our working conditions haven't been improved at the same rate."

He pointed out that A-P employees this year received improved salary equality, formal evaluation procedures and a set of hearing procedures -- features he would like to see for CT employees.

If the MSUEA is not able to get the membership it needs (under terms of the Hatchens Act) for recognition, it has two alternatives.

One would be to attempt to join the A-P Association, a move that would require action by the A-P group. A motion to offer membership to the 200 supervisors who are classified as CT employees was tabled last year by the A-P Association. It remains tabled.

A-P President William Kenney said that while his group hasn't "closed the door on expanded membership," the association is not going "to encourage any groups to join us at present."

A second alternative, Dosen said, is for the MSUEA to petition the state's Labor Mediation Board to conduct a referendum among CT employees. This would be possible when the MSUEA obtains membership of 30 percent of the group it seeks to represent, and when it is ruled to be an appropriate bargaining unit.

The referendum would allow the employees to accept the MSUEA, any other organization, or to reject the idea of any organization. "It would be a sink or swim situation," Dosen said.

Other officers of the MSUEA include: Vice president -- Beverly Oetzel, senior departmental secretary, chemical engineering; corresponding secretary -- Marcia McConnell, senior departmental secretary, registrar's office; recording secretary -- Elva Trimble, office assistant, registrar's office.

Radio show set

A special program dealing with life on a major university campus -- Michigan State -- will be aired Wednesday at 7:30 p.m. on Detroit's WJR radio. The program, "The Heart of the Matter," will be repeated Sunday at 2:30 p.m.

Featured on the program is David Manhotl, a junior majoring in packaging who will reflect on his likes and dislikes about living and learning at MSU.

The program will feature interviews with students about their college experiences, along with discussions of campus issues.
A need to 'live with uncertainty'

(Editor's Note: Following are excerpts for a recent speech — "Is There a Crisis in Science?" — delivered here by George S. Hammond, chairman of chemistry and chemical engineering at California Institute of Technology. His address was one of the distinguished scientists' series, sponsored by MSU's Science Development Program.)

If a crisis is a dangerous turning point, I truly believe that the present situation in the world of science can be so designated. The external evidence is ample. Support of scientific research by public funds has been contracted sharply during the past three years; science graduates are suddenly experiencing severe difficulty in finding jobs; some of the technological industries are experiencing real financial problems; and the wave of anti-intellectualism sweeping our society finds a special target in science. All of these conditions are strikingly changed from those experienced only a few years ago.

Some of the external changes can be associated with change and travail in the society as a whole. Many scientists seize upon this fact to avoid facing self-scrutiny that may well be needed.

There are many who feel that termination of the war in Southeast Asia would be followed automatically by reemergence of the growth pattern of science seen in the mid-sixties. I myself doubt that this would be the case, partly because I see a number of problems within science itself. While our fate is partly controlled by factors over which we have little control, we can at least give attention to the need for change in our own research and teaching.

When we look for problems within science, we see plenty of symptoms. Perusal of the current literature shows an alarming amount of repetitious and redundant results of many experimental and theoretical studies are reported. The work really is new and the methods may show great ingenuity and intellectual perception, yet the answers are often depressingly similar to a number of problems within science itself.

We also see a kind of childish competition among scientists accepted as a reasonable way of life... Finally, we see that the scientific subculture has developed many of the characteristics that are often attributed to existent churches. We have ritual, dogma and a powerful high priesthood. The church of science shows incredible intolerance in defining areas of curiosity which may be regarded as proper scientific work... SOME SAY that science has matured, that its form is fixed, and that we will see only progressive development within the form that is already established. If this is true, the prospect is sobering.

We look for problems within science, we see plenty of symptoms. Perusal of the current literature shows an alarming amount of repetitious and redundant results. To win the battle of the new idea against the old, the present system of rewards and repressions must be overthrown. There are other symptoms as well: the scientific subculture has developed many of the characteristics that are often attributed to existent churches. We have ritual, dogma and a powerful high priesthood. The church of science shows incredible intolerance in defining areas of curiosity which may be regarded as proper scientific work...

Some say that science has matured, that its form is fixed, and that we see only progressive development within the form that is already established. If this is true, the prospect is sobering. We would conclude that scientific discovery will roll on a relatively smooth path.

If the machine has in fact been created in nearly final form, all we will need to do is continue to feed in fuel in the form of new scientists, and to make the works with a reasonable level of financial support.

Personally, I disagree with this analysis and wish to suggest an alternate point of view. When I look at us and the universe around us, I see much more that I do not understand than I understand. Science is, according to my dictionary, systematic understanding of the physical world. If so, my own observation tells me that science must be far from finished.

I further believe that we may have a problem in science at this time because too much of our attention is centered on what we know fairly well and too little on things about which we know very little... entirely unprecedented task. We must find within a single generation a kind of self-regulated and regulated renaissance that has prevailed by its own formation, development and its own strength as a force to make the world a better place. The prospect is frightening, because we all have some fear that the detailed scrutiny of what is new and what is old might negate our finest work to historical musings. Furthermore, the changes involved must face the challenge of defining the new wave of science for themselves, since those of us who teach are so inextricably involved in what has now become history.

... One of the two of our problems is: Failure to adapt to the sensational advances in learning during recent years, and failure to appreciate the need for science devoted to modeling the complex. If there is merit in this view, we can ask what can be done about it. I assure you that I have no final or highly definitive answer.

I believe that a first step is recognition of our problems and acceptance of the cold fact that we are not about to find final solutions. Unless we can live with ambiguity and uncertainty, we will never get out of the box created by our desire to define for all time the style and content of science.

By insisting that we know what science is "pure" and "basic," we generate the rigidity that seems a characteristic of old, decadent societies in general. If we were to now define just one new path out of all the scientific philosophies, we would only initiate a new stage in rigidification...

A common reaction to the overkill we see in some areas of science is to cut down the level of effort. This path is suggested for several years by some of the Philistines outside of science, and has been usually regarded as blasphemy by scientists.

However, during the past 18 months there has been an uncomfortable tightening of the job market and many scientists have suddenly started to speak of reducing the number of students receiving scientific education. The American Medical Association is frequently cited as an example of a wise organization because of its success in maintaining high standards of medical practice and protecting the perquisites of the members of the club.

I believe that the restrictive approach is fundamentally immoral and (1) cannot accept it.

Perhaps the scientists now in the club would be protected, and perhaps the entire course of human events will not be dramatically effected by deceleration of scientific growth. However, I place high value on the needs of all people, not just those who are admitted to the science club, but also those who are kept out. We do not now suffer from a lack of educated people in our society as a whole, so there is no obvious place for young people to go if they are turned away from science by either restrictive policies or by ridiculous curricula designed to make science education prohibitively arduous and boring.

I do see an enormous amount of understanding to be gained through new science, and I believe that many people should be encouraged and helped to share in this quest.

Ernest Melby...

(Concluded from page 1)

a "crisis in confidence," Melby warns. At stake is the confidence of both public and private sources to whom the universities look for support.

Much of the crisis stems from those within higher education who would politicize the university, he says. When the campus becomes a base for political advocates — right, left or center — then the universities will be caught in an "all-out credibility gap."

"If we lose this struggle (to maintain university autonomy)," Melby warns, "the task of regaining it will be at least as difficult as was the job of earning it in the first place..."

As a FORMER campus chief administrator (at the University of Montana in Missoula and later as chancellor of the Montana system), Melby empathizes with today's college presidents and deans as they try to deal with unrest, but it doesn't want power for the president when he comes to the legislature for money or when he has to defend his faculty from outside attacks.

"The people who criticize the universities are usually the same ones who deny them adequate financial support."

Melby maintains that faculty don't always provide sufficient help to presidents in times of campus crisis.

For a long time, he says, faculties have tried to wrest control from administrations. "There has been a kind of cold war going on. This predominates faculty not to be as active as they might be to help the president in times of crisis." As a result, Melby observes, the president is often left virtually alone to defend the campus...

MELBY IS also somewhat skeptical of moves to increase faculty power within the university. "Faculty control doesn't mean that the university will be any freer," he says. "Faculty can be quite autocratic and they would not necessarily be any tighter than the administration does. And the faculty is very good at making lots of rules."

A graduate of St. Olaf College in Minnesota, Melby holds M.A. and Ph.D. degrees from the University of Minnesota. He taught at Minnesota and Northwestern before going to Montana during World War II. He was professor and dean of education at New York University until 1956 when he came to Michigan State — to...
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