

AN HISTORICAL PERSPECTIVE OF FACULTY GOVERNANCE AT  
THE UNIVERSITY OF NORTHERN IOWA  
1968-1998

---

Paul E. Rider  
Professor of Chemistry  
UNI Faculty Chair, 1976-78  
UNI Graduate Faculty Chair, 1985-87

Introduction

This is intended to serve as a reference document for the group of former faculty leaders who are to sit in determination of the directions in which faculty governance at the University of Northern Iowa will take into the 21st Century, particularly in relation to the position of Chair of the University Faculty. It is not exhaustive and there is a wealth of documentation that is available that provides a more detailed description of the events and influences that created the current faculty governance structure.

Faculty governance at the University of Northern Iowa was a work in progress for the first two decades of existence of the latest iteration of the institution, from approximately 1968 to 1986. Prior to becoming UNI, the governance structure reflected the practices of an administration and faculty that were closely intertwined. Typical administrators were faculty members who had been selected for administrative duty from among the ranks of the professorate.

With the advent of university status in 1967 and its implementation in 1968, that began to change. Outside faculty and administrators were being brought in to give substance to the change that had taken place. The administrative structure took on a form more like that of true universities with their traditional collegiate structures.

Factors Leading to Development of Faculty Constitution

The transition of administration occurred more rapidly than that for the faculty and its governance structures. During the second year of university status (1969-70), 37 members of the faculty (ref. 1) petitioned the faculty leadership to form a committee to explore the development of a University Faculty Constitution. This came in response to events of that year in which the faculty met on numerous occasions to deal with two major issues of the 1960s, (1) racial unrest and (2) the Viet Nam War.

There had been sit-ins at the President's home to protest discrimination against blacks. This resulted in the formation of the Committee of Five that examined the situation on campus. It reported to the faculty that year in several long meetings. While such meetings had been the tradition of the institution in previous times, their length and intensity suggested the need for a more structured organizational scheme for faculty deliberation

and decision making. The faculty numbered approximately 500 and the attendance at the meetings was usually substantial.

Another controversial event was the Kent State University shootings on May 4, 1970, involving students protesting the Viet Nam War and the Ohio National Guard. The faculty held several meetings to deal with student and faculty shock and dismay relative to this event. Students were given the option of not taking finals, and this created further tension within the faculty.

On May 19, 1970, (ref. 1) the faculty met and approved a motion to create a committee of 12 members to develop a faculty constitution under which the faculty could operate in an appropriate and effective manner. This eventually was formed and chaired by William Metcalfe from Political Science.

The Metcalfe committee reported to the Faculty Senate on February 8, 1971 (ref. 2). It had suggested a re-organization of the Faculty Senate which was, at the time, a carry-over from the previous governance structure of The State College of Iowa. Discussion involved proposed changes in Senate size and representation as well as perceived problems related to the significant involvement of administrators in faculty governance and decision making.

At a Faculty meeting on March 1, 1971, further discussion took place regarding faculty governance (ref. 3). This discussion is best characterized by the following comment from David Bluhm, from Philosophy and Religion:

" The day of easy informal communication between instructional faculty and administrative staff is gone. The instructional faculty should have an opportunity to develop and express its point of view. The administration needs the voice of the instructional faculty."

Newly appointed Vice President and Provost James Martin addressed the faculty at a meeting on November 1, 1971 (ref. 4) in which he asked for codification of procedures and policies by which the faculty operated. He requested revision and updating of the Faculty Manual, the operational document still in force (P. E. Rider chaired a committee that explored and implemented this revision and updating). Martin sought a working definition of "faculty," asked for better communication between faculty and administrators, and requested that he be allowed to attend Senate meetings on a regular basis.

#### University Faculty Constitution

William Metcalfe presented a preliminary form of the constitution to the faculty at a meeting on February 21, 1972 (ref. 5). Pertinent issues discussed were the size of the quorum, development of a senate that truly represented the University, the areas in which the faculty had proprietary voting rights, the definition of "faculty," and the process by which a faculty "roster" could be identified each year.

In the ensuing months of March, April, May and June (refs. 6 through 10), faculty meetings were held at which the various articles of the University Faculty Constitution were presented, discussed, amended, and adopted.

Issues negotiated and settled included the size of the quorum, the membership requirements for faculty status relative to rank and function, and the method by which faculty could petition to have special faculty meetings.

An important issue that was debated (ref. 8) concerned the status of the Chair of the University Faculty. It was decided that the faculty needed an elected leader, chosen by the entire voting faculty. The Chair of the University Faculty Senate (elected from the Senate membership) would be designated as the Vice Chair of the University Faculty. This individual would facilitate conducting the business of the Senate, much of which would eventually find its way to the floor of the faculty itself. An attempt to combine these two offices into one single leadership position was made, but was defeated (after considerable discussion).

On May 15, 1972 (ref. 9), a special meeting was held at which the Constitution was approved after being amended. The Metcalfe Committee was thanked and dismissed. Professor Howard Jones moved to amend Article V., Section 4.1 to make the Chair of the University Faculty an ex officio, non-voting member of the University Faculty Senate, with rights of motion and debate. This motion passed.

The faculty met on June 26, 1972 (ref. 10) to approve a procedure to implement the Constitution as the official operating document of the faculty. The document was formally accepted and made retroactive to June 1, 1972. The procedures referred to the Faculty Manual, faculty officers, and faculty committees (curriculum, welfare, committee on committees) as well as the election process. The Constitution was to be in full force by Spring semester, 1973.

At the September 11, 1972 Senate meeting (ref. 11), Senate Chair James Blanford called for the appointment of two committees, one to oversee the printing and distribution of the new Constitution, and the other to make the Senate and its by-laws compatible with the Constitution. Further amendment of the Constitution occurred at a faculty meeting on Oct. 2, 1972 (ref. 12) regarding the budget committee.

A special Senate meeting was held on Oct. 30, 1972 (ref. 13) to discuss an administration-faculty conflict regarding a grievance filed by Professor Hiduke that was handled in a way that suggested the faculty's powers and prerogatives were being rendered impotent by the administration. This long discussion touched upon the faculty's role in a university relative to being advisory as opposed to the faculty exercising authoritative decision-making functions.

At a Sept. 10, 1973 Senate meeting (ref. 14), Faculty Chair M. B. Smith requested that he be allowed voting privileges on the Senate. Senate Chair Howard Jones granted them, but was challenged by Senator Charles Quirk, based on Art. V. Sec. 4.1. The Senate upheld the challenge and no rights were granted.



Amendments to the Constitution (from a faculty committee including myself) were approved at a Jan. 13, 1975 meeting (ref. 15) that dealt with faculty powers and prerogatives. Some other matters were discussed, including the size of the quorum and the term of office for the Faculty Chair. This was also a meeting at which concerns on the part of the Board of Regents as to the legitimacy of the Constitution were discussed.

#### Regent Approval of the Constitution

During the Spring and Fall of 1975, attempts were made to get the State Board of Regents to approve the Constitution. This effort culminated in the Board officially rejecting the document at its December, 1975 meeting.

This decision was discussed by the faculty at a Jan. 12, 1976 meeting (ref. 16). Vice President Martin wrote a letter to the faculty that was discussed at a meeting on Feb. 2, 1976 (ref. 17). Martin indicated that he felt that this action made the Constitution "null and void," and that it could only be considered as a set of "by-laws" for the faculty. It was at this meeting that Martin also indicated that the old Faculty Manual was no longer an official source of policy, and that the President's Policies and Procedures Manual was the official operating document of the University of Northern Iowa.

This dilemma eventually resulted in the Senate voting to impose a moratorium on its committees and its functioning in the Spring of 1976, which was brought to the floor of the faculty on February 16, 1970 (ref. 17a). Senate Chair Judith Harrington described the dilemma to the faculty, which gained a great deal of publicity. This became a crisis in confidence between the administration and the faculty.

Attempts were made to conduct a vote of no confidence in the Kameron/Martin administration. This eventually resulted in a faculty evaluation of both administrators conducted in the Fall of 1978 by former Faculty Chair Rider and Senate Chair Harrington. This matter was complicated by the election of the faculty to use collective bargaining in 1976.

The immediate result of the moratorium was the formation of a committee of four faculty and four administrators (upon which I served) to develop a conflict-resolution procedure. The resulting procedures were presented to the faculty at a meeting March 1, 1976 (ref. 18). At a Senate meeting on March 15, 1976 (ref. 19), Vice President Martin recommended that the Faculty Manual be made compatible with the Policies and Procedures Manual, and that a new document called the "University Manual on Policies and Procedures" be formed. This was never implemented after the bargaining election.

When I assumed the Chair in Fall, 1976, I indicated at the first faculty meeting on August 30 (ref. 20) that the faculty would be deciding on collective bargaining that year and that we would need to revise the Constitution. At a Senate meeting on Nov. 8, 1976 (ref. 21), grievance procedures were discussed and concern was expressed by a constitution revision committee that its work was a waste of time, due to collective bargaining.

The faculty met on Feb. 7, 1977 (ref. 22) to revise the Constitution to meet some of the objections of the Regents. Further changes were made in the Policies and Procedures Manual and the Senate by-laws at the March 25, 1977 Senate meeting (ref. 23). At this meeting, the decision to evaluate President Kamerick and Vice President Martin was made.

At a Senate meeting on March 13, 1978 (ref. 24) and a faculty meeting on April 3, 1978 (ref. 25), I offered changes in the faculty governance structure to make it compatible with collective bargaining (from extensive discussions with United Faculty representatives). This involved disbanding of some committees and changes in the charges to others. Discussion also involved grievance procedures, the status of conflict-resolution committees, the status of the Faculty Manual (vis-a-vis the P&P Manual), and the proposed evaluation of administrators in light of collective bargaining.

Some modification of the composition of the Senate was discussed at a faculty meeting on March 3, 1980 (ref. 26). At a faculty meeting on April 28, 1980 (ref. 27), Faculty Chair Judith Harrington offered an assessment of faculty governance (those minutes and her address are included with this document because they capture the prevailing mood at the time).

Other pertinent developments included committees that were formed to re-define the definition of faculty (voting versus non-voting, etc.) (refs. 28 and 29).

On March 25, 1985 (ref. 30), Faculty Chair Jerry Stockdale reported to the Senate that President Curris felt that the Constitution could be amended to be sent to the State Board of Regents for formal approval. The Senate met on Nov. 11, 1985 (ref. 31) to consider revisions to the Constitution with the intent to have it sent to the Regents.

At a faculty meeting on Feb. 3, 1986 (ref. 32) the faculty revised the Constitution and, with the support of President Curris, it was approved by the State Board of Regents that year. It was reprinted in its latest version, and has been available to faculty in that form since that time.

### Personal Comments

My involvement in what is described above is only a part of more extensive involvements I have had through my 30 years at UNI in a wide variety of areas. This has included curriculum issues, tenure and promotion issues, general education programs, graduate education, evaluation and re-organization of minority education programs, athletic and recreational programs and space use, remedial educational programs, and many other areas outside of my extensive involvements in my areas of professional training and expertise.

These commitments express my confidence and belief in UNI as it has matured into a first-rate academic university. The area of faculty governance has been particularly near and dear to my heart. I believe that our role as faculty members is to be more than mere workers in an educational factory. If we are not willing to assume our rightful responsibilities, who will?

The "rush" of excitement as a new and young faculty member when I arrived on campus allowed me the unique opportunity to become involved in the development of a "university" almost from the ground up. While SCI had been impressive, we who were brought in to help implement the transition to university status were allowed to join those who had recently arrived as well as the "old-timers" to make this a even better place than it was. It was especially the old-timers with their knowledge of the institution and their wisdom and insight that provided the foundation for the transition effort.

From an institution of approximately 500 faculty members (those listed in the catalog) and 7900 students in 1969 when I arrived, we have grown to 705 faculty (excluding adjuncts) and 13,500 students. While faculty growth (regular members) has not kept pace with student growth, we have still maintained and improved the quality of what we offer.

In my prejudicial view, the most important element in the continued enhancement and improvement of what we do at UNI is faculty leadership. Administrators serve as partners in our efforts and we owe them our respect and allegiance. They are only "first among equals" in the enterprise of higher education, however. It was that spirit that resulted in the Constitution in the first place, with its proscriptions for leadership.

As you ponder changes in leadership substance and style, I hope the historical information is useful and will be something that you consider in your deliberations. I also stand ready to serve you in useful ways. Like many of you, I am one of those "old-timers". Perhaps I have some wisdom that will be useful.

### Suggestions

The evolution of any organization is always subject to the forces of change that require it to change in ways to that allow it to meet the demands placed on it at a given time.

If it is time to change faculty governance, let the process begin, and let it be bold and creative. If it is time to re-configure the leadership, to re-define the Senate, to form a different committee structure, do it with knowledge of the past and visions of the future.

President Koob has suggested consideration of a "University Senate" to include all components of the institution. That may be worthy of your consideration.

It will not be too surprising to me to see your efforts result in significant changes while certain things are maintained. I urge you to change what needs changing, and keep what seems to work fairly well.

Thanks for bearing with me through this document. Best wishes in your efforts and I will follow what happens with great interest.

### Table of Parenthetical References

FM stands for Faculty Minutes (or records of faculty meetings). FSM stands for Faculty Senate Minutes (or records of senate meetings). The minutes referenced have been filed by the secretaries of the faculty and the senate at the time of their production and all have been supposed to have been transmitted to the university archivist. Dates for these minutes are typically expressed in the body of the document above.

1. FM 995
2. FM 1016
3. FM 1018
4. FM 1042
5. FM 1053
6. FM 1055
7. FM 1062
8. FM 1063
9. FM 1066
10. FM 1068
11. FM 1069
12. FM 1074
13. FM 1079
14. FM 1104
15. FM 1139
16. FM 1168
17. FM 1170
- 17a. FM 1172
18. FM 1173
19. FSM 1174
20. FM 1183
21. FSM 1193
22. FM 1199
23. FSM 1207
24. FSM 1224
25. FM 1226
26. FM 1265
27. FM 1269
28. FM 1275
29. FM 1302
30. FSM 1346
31. FSM 1354
32. FM 1357

APPENDIX

Paul Rider  
Chemistry Department

FACULTY MINUTES  
April 28, 1980  
1269

Topic: Address by Chair Harrington FACULTY GOVERNANCE: An Accounting  (Complete address is addended to these Minutes)
---

The meeting was called to order at 3:10 by the chairperson, Judith Harrington.

Representative of the Cedar Falls Record was present.

To preface her remarks on the topic for the day, Faculty Governance, the chair outlined the sequence she intended to follow:

- Review of where the faculty fits in the organizational structure of the university
- Rights of the faculty
- Responsibilities of the faculty
- Status of Faculty Governance

(A copy of the complete address is addended to these minutes.

Following this presentation, faculty members were invited to offer comments or questions.

Don Wiederanders (Teaching) asked if the concept of the conflict resolution committee of 1976 was judged to be positive.

Chair Harrington explained to the group that in February - March, 1976, following action by the faculty to cease all faculty committee activity, there was real concern evident, and a committee of four administrators and four faculty was named. The committee, chaired by President Kamerick, also included Vice-President Martin, Deans Robert Morin and Clifford McCollum, and Professors Paul Rider, Chuck Quirk, John Tarr and Harrington. This group prepared a document, which among other procedures, was designed to help resolve conflicts by having each group keep the other informed of its deliberations from the beginning.

Paul Rider (Chemistry) amplified this, stating that 3 conflict resolution committees had been named and were beginning their work. However, there was not time to test the effectiveness of this approach, because the administration immediately withdrew after the vote for collective bargaining, in Fall, 1976.

Elaine Kalmar (English Language and Literature) offered that collective bargaining did not change the structure of governance; the structure still exists, but there is a gulf between the traditional structure and collective



bargaining. It is too bad if collective bargaining caused a halt. It may be possible to use collective bargaining to get conflict resolution. She then entered a plea for those concerned to stop being overly polite and to get together. Now, after being literally stomped on by the legislature, is the time to do that.

Harrington agreed that both the faculty and administration have been extremely cautious, to avoid unfair labor practice; and although we do need caution, it need not be so extreme.

Jim Skaine (Speech) expressed his opinion that the problem is concern with process, not principles, standards or guidelines in matters such as hiring practices. We need to revive the faculty as a decision making group. The faculty can have an impact.

Jim Chadney (Sociology, Anthropology & Social Work) stated that Skaine's words ring true, but there is another factor: power. We seldom use or explore it; the administration uses it daily. The key to governance is getting and using power more effectively.

Harrington concurred with the concern about power, and cited two examples when the faculty has exerted its influence: when the Senate refused to accept as presented the statement of mission for the University, and, more recently, on the principle of how decisions are to be made on tenure for department heads and other non-unit faculty.

M. B. Smith (Speech) remarked that the faculty holds a remarkably simplistic attitude on what power is. The faculty DOES have power by moral suasion. An administrator has even stated that no administration can survive without the acquiescence of the faculty. We should use our power.

Rider next commented to Kalmar his hope for ways that something can be worked out, and the need for those who do not support collective bargaining to find an effective way to become involved. United Faculty needs to try to include non-members in better ways, because there are problems; a tremendous vacuum exists.

Augusta Schurrer (Mathematics) pointed out that material is being brought to committees as an accomplished fact. There are pockets of dissent, but no functioning as a faculty. Nothing is done to pull new faculty together. As a faculty group we don't know where the pockets of difficulty are.

Harrington said that department heads need backing. They must cope with administrative decisions such as that made on the summer school budget, apparently without input.

Schurrer added that department heads are subject to periodic review, that they get slammed hard if they haven't toed the (administration) line.

Harrington continued that other divisions are making decisions affecting the academic division. It will take muscle, tightening of belts and assertiveness to create any impact on the decision making.

Schurrer cited the fact that many committees have been asked to agree to documents as presented.

Myra Boots (Communicative Disorders) cited also the incident of the Inter-institutional Affirmative Action Committee's report having been changed by the Presidents, from "UNI must have an affirmative action review officer" to "UNI should consider....(an affirmative action review officer)."

The chair next called for a sense from the group of whether or not this kind of dialogue is productive.

Wideranders stated his belief that collective bargaining did not give an office or effective voice to the faculty as had been hoped by its proponents, but has instead divided and disenfranchised the faculty, and that the faculty needs dignity and unity of purpose or it will slowly die.

Grace Ann Hovet (English Language and Literature) observed that the small size of the group present was one indication of the faculty opinion of how productive such a session is.

Mary Lou McGrew countered with a demurrer, advising that such a session can have a "ripple effect" among the faculty, and that this kind of forum is needed monthly so we can get behind the issues before they are closed and sealed.

Meeting adjourned at 3:58.

These minutes shall stand approved as published unless corrections or protests are filed with the Secretary of the Senate within two weeks of this date, May 8, 1980.

Joan Diamond, Secretary pro tem

FACULTY GOVERNANCE: An Accounting  
Presented by Judith F. Harrington,  
Chair, University Faculty  
to  
University Faculty, April 28, 1980

INTRODUCTION

At the April 1978, University Faculty meeting, then Faculty Chair, Paul Rider, presented a summary of Faculty governance at UNI since the advent of collective bargaining on our campus.

It is timely that we review that status. This afternoon, first I want to review with you where the academic division "fits" in the university structure.

I will then address the questions of responsibilities and rights of faculty within that structure; and conclude with my accounting of the status of governance at this time.

Where do faculty "fit" into the institutional structure? (The organizational structure "flow charts" of UNI, as found in the Policies and Procedure Manual, are presented by use of overhead transparencies. Comment is made that although others at UNI are also educators, the focus of this address is on the faculty.)

Three questions are then posed:

I. Does the faculty have responsibilities within the University structure?

A succinct statement in response to this question is found within the document "Statement on Governance of Colleges and Universities," which was jointly developed by the AAUP, American Council on Education, and the Association of Governing Boards of Universities and Colleges. I quote:

The faculty has primary responsibility for such fundamental areas as curriculum, subject matter and methods of instruction, research, faculty status, and those aspects of student life which relate to the educational process.

The term "faculty status" includes establishing standards for appointment, re-appointment, the granting of tenure and promotion. To quote again:

...scholars in a particular field or activity have the chief competence for judging the work of their colleagues; in such competence it is implicit that responsibility exists for both adverse and favorable judgements.

II. Does the faculty have any rights within this particular structure at this particular time?

We are well aware that we have no statutory role in the governance of this institution. Yet, a definition of "right" includes the power or privilege to which one is justly entitled. Whatever privilege we enjoy results from the long tradition that those who are associated with academe, function as partners, regardless of particular roles. This very body, the University Faculty, is a demonstration of that philosophy and custom. So much for lofty statements!

DO the faculty have any rights at UNI at this time? My response is a strong YES. Certainly the presence of collective bargaining on this campus has altered governance. However, there is nothing inherent in the law to suggest that the faculty can no longer conceive, nurture or-(yes)-even assert their views related to the areas of responsibility I cited earlier. The key difference is that the channels of communication now differ, depending on the matter.

To provide a concrete example: matters of curriculum are channeled as before; any modification of those routes has been deliberated and molded by the faculty, with customary review at appropriate administrative levels. Faculty concerns about insurance, by contrast, are expressed to the agent for consideration and action. What is the problem, then? Am I being too simplistic? One answer may be found in the Minutes of that Faculty meeting two years ago, which reflected the Chair's view. I quote:

The administration...has taken a more restrictive view of its relation to the governance structure. It prefers to relate to the United Faculty...

Let us not jump to the conclusion that the administration's preference was necessarily a deliberate effort to seal off traditional forms of governance. All of us were in confusion at that time regarding who may talk to whom about what-when- and the confusion has not abated! Further, the administration's strategy is not unique to this campus. Quoting from an article in September, 1976, Atlantic Monthly, written by a former University president:

Administration is alienating; in fact, administration may be seen as the art of encouraging other people's alienation. No wonder many university presidents and deans secretly welcome faculty and staff unions. Life is easier if you have principled grounds for not dealing with people face to face. What a comfort to be able to say, 'Please refer your complaint to the appropriate representative.'

Relating this posture to the matter of student evaluations, the Faculty Chair will need to assert to our Vice President that we do, indeed, have "right", responsibility and reason to discuss together the content of student evaluations.

III. What is the current status of governance?



In response to this question, I will attempt to weave my remarks around the propositions stated previously. Let us begin at the beginning: the mission of the University. Nowhere in that statement will you find a phrase: To educate. Yet, surely that is the unwritten basis for all that is written. We may disagree, sometimes vigorously, about the interpretation of "education"; however, there must be a common assumption of purpose, regardless of individual assignment, if the institution is to function at all. HOW the institution goes about its business of educating, is the focus of my concern. The traditional governance structure is a plump target for jokes related to the unending committees, the tediousness of committee assignments, the seeming redundancy of committee efforts, as but a few examples. As one result, those engaged in faculty governance may be chided, or derided, certainly rarely-if ever-rewarded for their efforts.

Why bother, then? Even if we have the right, who needs the headache of the responsibility? I think we need to accept the responsibility. I present just two examples to support my view:

- A. In the area of curriculum, we have been considered competent by the University to have the principle responsibility for development and review. Then, for example, when a forceful cutback in funds is announced for summer school, the faculty also have a responsibility to know to what extent the academic divisions' leaders were able to have a voice in determining the effects of cutbacks on particular curricular missions, such as graduate programs.
- B. Standards for tenure and promotion--always a potentially volatile issue--certainly so now! Standards for excellence must originate with the individual discipline. These standards include those cited earlier under the phrase "faculty status." You must determine the qualifications for appointment, demonstrated scholarships and the like.

Be alerted though, that responsibility carries within its definition "accountability." In both matters of curriculum and standards, I am about to make statements that may be viewed as harsh and probably unpopular.

In terms of curriculum, at times we have shied away from taking hard looks at curricular revisions. Consider the extraordinary torture of revising general education these past few years. Efforts of various faculty study groups were repeatedly maligned as being supportive of one vested interest or another.

Indeed, the action this body took last month to restructure the composition of the University Senate certainly could be viewed as further entrenchment of vested interests, at the risk of attending to concerns of mutual interest to the University as a whole.

And in regards to standards: just as we find ample evidence, we think of administrative decisions that are unsupportable, we, the faculty, are not immune from making judgments that at time may be capricious, arbitrary, or even vindictive.

Thus I do view as important a decision review system to provide safeguards against such conduct.

However, I want to remind you that no matter what the issue, ultimately a decision will be made. You may relinquish your responsibility because governance is cast as unrewarding or treated punitively; but those decisions will be made.

The judgment of the quality of your research or your colleagues credentials will be made.

In that regard, some faculty are attempting at this time to determine how it is that the policy regarding tenure and promotion that appears in the University manual is in a form other than the one presented to and endorsed by the University Senate.

Also, the University Senate will later today receive for consideration items that should be of interest and concern to you.

1. In its report, the ad hoc committee on Interdisciplinary Studies states:

The committee continues its commitment to interdisciplinary studies, and believes that an administrative structure for and an enhancement of such studies are both possible and necessary. However, at this time it does not believe that an appropriate climate exists on this campus to make such a commitment realistic.

2. Professors Macmillan and Rider (co-signed by additional faculty) are requesting that there be an investigation of the feasibility and ramifications of increasing admission standards to UNI.

To conclude: Governance does exist at UNI; and there will be those faculty who will persist in attempting to make it thrive. The faculty must determine the extent of which governance will thrive. If you want to abrogate your rights and responsibilities, then do so knowingly.

CAVEAT EMPTOR