



11-3-1966

November 3, 1966

University of North Dakota

[How does access to this work benefit you? Let us know!](#)

Follow this and additional works at: <https://commons.und.edu/und-senate-minutes>

Recommended Citation

University of North Dakota. "November 3, 1966" (1966). *University Senate Meeting Minutes*. 42.
<https://commons.und.edu/und-senate-minutes/42>

This Minutes is brought to you for free and open access by the Elwyn B. Robinson Department of Special Collections at UND Scholarly Commons. It has been accepted for inclusion in University Senate Meeting Minutes by an authorized administrator of UND Scholarly Commons. For more information, please contact und.common@library.und.edu.

MINUTES OF THE UNIVERSITY SENATE MEETING

November 3, 1966

(NOT TO BE MADE AVAILABLE TO NON-FACULTY MEMBERS)

1.

A meeting of the University Senate was held at 4:00 p.m. on Thursday, November 3, 1966, in Room 415 of Twamley Hall. Mr. Penn presided.

2.

The following members of the Senate were present:

Starcher, George W.	Heyse, Margaret F.	Peterson, Russell A.
Anderson, Donald G.	Holland, F. D., Jr.	Reid, John R.
Barnes, Ronald E.	Isaacson, Peter G.	Robertson, Donald J.
Beck, Robert E.	Koenker, William E.	Robinson, Elwyn B.
Bullard, Charles W.	Kolstoe, Ralph H.	Rognlie, Philip A.
Clifford, Thomas J.	Koth, Arthur W.	Rowe, John L.
Curry, Mabel	Laird, Wilson M.	St. Clair, F. Y.
Curry, Myron	Marti, Leonard R.	Stenberg, Virgil I.
Cushman, Martelle L.	McKenzie, Ruby M.	Thomforde, Clifford J.
Dickens, Nancy M.	Naismith, Donald P.	Thorson, Playford V.
Gustafson, Ben G.	Nelson, Edward O.	Tomasek, Henry J.
Hamre, Christopher J.	O'Kelly, Bernard	Walden, Jerrold
Hankerson, Kenneth L.	Oslund, Valborg	Wheeler, George C.
Harwood, Theodore H.	Pearce, Donald J.	Witmer, Robert B.
Herndon, James F.	Penn, John S.	Wynne, John

The following members of the Senate were absent:

Brumleve, Stanley J.	Larson, Milton B.	Sturges, A. W.
Hedahl, Beulah	Pender, Nola	

3.

There being no corrections, the minutes of the October meeting were ordered approved as submitted.

4.

The Chairman announced the first business to be the election of a Chairman and Vice-chairman of the Senate and called for nominations. Mr. Penn was nominated for Chairman but he requested that his name be withdrawn. Mr. Wheeler, Mr. Kolstoe, and Mr. Tomasek were nominated. It was moved, seconded, voted upon and carried to name the nominee with the highest vote as Chairman and the nominee with the second highest vote as Vice-chairman. Mr. Tomasek was elected Chairman and Mr. Wheeler was elected Vice-chairman. Mr. Tomasek assumed the chair.

5.

Mr. Laird presented the Report of the Committee on Committees and moved its acceptance. The motion was seconded, voted upon and carried. (A copy of this report is included in the Senate minutes of October 6, 1966.)

Mr. Laird presented individually the recommendations which accompanied the Report of the Committee on Committees.

Recommendation 1. The faculty committee structure should be more fully and properly utilized to improve the functioning of the University and its academic program. To this end we recommend:

- a. A clearer delineation of the authority to whom each committee is responsible and should report.
- b. A clearer definition of the functions and responsibilities of the committees.
- c. Expeditious referral to the committees of all matters coming within their purviews.

The recommendation was moved, seconded, voted upon and carried.

Mr. Laird presented the second recommendation and stated that the Graduate and the Tenure Committee be considered in a separate category.

Recommendation 2. Committees should be made directly responsible to the authority selecting them. Committees should be classified as those which should be elected by the Senate and those which should be appointed by the President. We recommend the assignment of all committees into these two categories as follows:

SENATE COMMITTEES

Academic Policies	Library
*Administrative Procedures	Quarterly Journal
*Athletics	Senate Executive
Codification	*Student Academic Standards
Committee on Committees	*Student Activities
Curriculum	Student Policy
Extension (Academic functions only)	*Student Relations
Faculty Research	Summer Session
**Graduate*	**Tenure
Honorary Degrees	University College
#Honors*	University Teacher Education
#Humanities	Board of Publications

PRESIDENT'S COMMITTEES

*Advisory	Governors Day
Buildings and Grounds	Health and Sanitation
Catalogue	History, Government, Citizenship
Commencement	Homecoming
Computer and Data Processing	Honors Day
*Convocations	Housing
Executive (Plant)	Mothers Day
Faculty Lectures	Recruitment for College Teaching
Faculty Staff Memorial	Student Financial Aids
Fine Arts Week	Upson Lecture
Founders Day	

#See amendments to motion.

*Heavy work load committees.

**See change in Mr. Laird's presentation of the recommendation.

Mr. Laird moved that this recommendation be approved. The motion was seconded. Mr. Herndon moved to amend by taking the Honors Committee from the category to be selected by the Committee on Committees and included in the category to be selected by the President. The amendment was seconded. Discussion followed. With unanimous consent the amendment was withdrawn. Mr. Herndon then moved to amend by deleting the Honors Committee from the recommendation for further consideration by the Committee on Committees. The motion to amend was seconded, voted upon and carried. Mr. Koenker moved to amend the motion by deletion of the Humanities Committee. This was seconded, voted upon and carried. The original motion as amended was voted upon and carried.

Recommendation 3. Committee responsibilities of individual faculty members should not be onerous and should be distributed as equitably as possible throughout the faculty. The committees noted by an asterisk in Recommendation 2 are regarded by this Committee on Committees as heavy work load committees and cognizance should be taken on this in committee assignments.

Mr. Laird moved the adoption of this recommendation. This was seconded, voted upon and carried.

Recommendation 4. Consideration should be given to the combination or elimination of some committees.

- a. The Committee on the Recruitment for College Teaching has recommended that it be abolished.
- b. Further study should be made of the following committees dealing with student affairs with a view to reorganizing or combining their functions and duties:

Student Activities
Student Policy
Student Relations

- c. The functions of the Fine Arts Week Committee should be reassessed. The committee itself has so recommended.

Mr. Laird moved the adoption of this recommendation. This was seconded, voted upon and carried.

Recommendation 5. When a committee exists to advise on the operation of an administrative unit, the administrative officer of such unit should serve as a non-voting member of the committee.

Mr. Laird moved the adoption of this recommendation. This was seconded, voted upon and carried.

Recommendation 6. Each committee should submit an annual report in writing by May 15, or such other date as may be specifically authorized, to the authority which constituted it. Such reports should be filed with the Secretary of the Senate and the Office of the President with a copy to the Chairman of the Committee on Committees.

Mr. Laird moved the adoption of this recommendation. This was seconded, voted upon and carried.

Recommendation 7. Ad hoc committees should not be perpetuated indefinitely. If their responsibilities and functions are of a continuing nature they should be converted to standing committees.

Mr. Laird moved the adoption of this recommendation. This was seconded, voted upon and carried.

Recommendation 8. Approved descriptions of the structure and function of all University faculty standing committees should be made a part of the Faculty Handbook. This should be updated regularly.

Mr. Laird moved the adoption of this recommendation. This was seconded, voted upon and carried.

Recommendation 9. This report should be regarded as a starting point for a more complete study of the committee structure of the University and should be referred back to the same committee.

Mr. Laird moved the adoption of this recommendation. The motion was seconded. Mr. O'Kelly moved to amend the motion to include reconsideration of the wording of all recommendations by the committee and where a change of wording seems necessary, it be referred to the Senate for clarification. The amendment was seconded, voted upon and carried. The original motion, as amended, was voted upon and carried.

6.

Mr. Tomasek read the following resolution from the Student Senate:

Resolved, that the Faculty Senate Committee on Curriculum be reconstituted as a Student-Faculty Committee on Curriculum with student representation.

It was moved that this resolution be referred to the Committee on Committees. The motion was seconded. Discussion followed. The motion to refer was voted upon and carried. The secretary was instructed to notify the Student Senate of this action.

7.

Miss Osland presented the attached Report from the Committee on Religion and moved its acceptance. It was seconded, voted upon and carried. (Dean O'Kelly expressed the thanks of the Senate for the work completed.)

8.

Mr. Koenker presented the proposal that the Senate consider the possibility of allowing students to take one course each semester outside their major field with grades to be recorded as either pass or fail. It was moved, seconded and voted to refer the proposal to the Academic Policies Committee.

9.

Mr. Thorson presented the attached report of the Senate sub-committee on Rapid Faculty Turnover and moved 1) the Senate approve this report and submit it to the University administration. This motion was seconded, voted upon and carried. Mr. Thorson moved 2) the Committee continue to collect information as to why UND has a rapid turnover of faculty and bring this information to the attention of the Senate and the Administration. The motion was seconded. Mr. Kolstoe moved to refer the motion to the Committee on Committees for study and recommendations. The motion to refer was seconded, voted upon and carried.

10.

Mr. Pearce moved that:

Section 3 under "Meetings" of the Bylaws of the University Senate be amended to read: "Meetings of the University Senate shall be open to the public, but the Senate reserves the right to go into Executive Session when it deems it necessary. The Senate may also at any meeting invite others to appear before it for special purposes."

The Chair ruled the motion be carried over to the next meeting for discussion and action.

11.

The meeting adjourned at 5:30 p.m.

R. M. McKenzie
Secretary

COMMITTEE ON RELIGION REPORT

The Committee to study and report on the Department of Religion was appointed by the Committee on Committees of the Senate, March 17, 1966, with the following members: Miss Oslund, Dean Clifford, Professor Thomforde, Professor McBride, and Dean Harwood. The group elected Miss Oslund as Chairman and Dean Harwood as Secretary.

Eight meetings were held. At the first meeting on March 21, the Committee was briefed on the organization of the Department and some of the problems encountered in its development. The members of the Religion Department in turn attended the next five weekly meetings. Literature concerning the problems of a Department of Religion in a State University was made available to the Committee members by Dr. Ziemke, Mr. Sheffield and Father Branconnier.

The Committee findings and recommendations are as follows:

1. The Committee believes that the University should continue to have a Department of Religion.
2. The Department must be a strong, independent, academically oriented one with high intellectual content. The criteria set up for a faculty appointment must be followed.
3. The Chairman must have the same duties, responsibilities, and authority as other Department Chairmen.
4. Faculty members in the Department should devote all of their time to departmental functions.
5. A sharp delineation should be made between the function of a Department of Religion, counseling and guidance and pastoral duties. Parochialism should be avoided in course selection and course content. The Department should make every attempt to broaden its offerings to include Judaism and the Oriental Religions, preferably by adding a teacher qualified in these areas.
6. The above aims would be best served if all department members were full-time employees of the University, paid by University funds. If this is not possible, the Chairman should be a full-time employee and funds for the other faculty salaries should be paid through the Business Office of the University. If the University cannot fund any of the positions, the salaries should be paid through the University Business Office. Although there are disadvantages to having the Department teaching staff paid by their respective church organizations, it can work under the present arrangements with cooperation and mutual respect between the members.

Report of the Faculty Senate Committee
on the "Rapid Turnover of Faculty" at the
University of North Dakota

November 3, 1966

The Committee sent questionnaires to twenty-three faculty members who resigned from UND last spring and summer (1966). The list of those resigning was provided by the office of the Academic Vice President. The questionnaires are unsigned and no attempt has been made to identify the respondents. Seventeen forms were returned to the Committee.

This report consists of:

- (1) four charts which summarize the responses to twenty-one questions pertinent to UND and the community. Recipients of the questionnaire were asked to list in order the five most positive and the five most negative features of their stay at UND and in Grand Forks,
- (2) the complete answers to questions which required comment.

The Committee recommends that:

- (1) the Senate approve this report and submit it to the University administration,
- (2) the Committee continue to collect information as to why UND has a rapid turnover of faculty and bring this information to the attention of the Senate and the Administration.

P. V. Thorson, Chairman (History)
Abram Friesen (Modern Languages)
Wilson Laird (Geology)
Donald McCaffrey (Speech)

Chart I

Weighted and Integrated Evaluation of
Positive and Negative Features of
Stay at U.N.D.

Values assigned: Positive 1= +5, 2= +4, 3= +3, 4= +2, 5= +1
Negative 1= -5, 2= -4, 3= -3, 4= -2, 5= -1

(Example: The weighted value of Housing - Positive is "+1". The weighted value of Housing - Negative is "-28"; thus the integrated value of Housing is "-27". (15 responses)

+42	Opportunity to teach your speciality
+37	Freedom in planning and conducting courses
+31	Congeniality of colleagues
+16	Office facilities
+11	Student interest
+ 1	Course load (number of different courses)
-28	Housing
-26	Distance from major urban centers
-25	Weather
-23	Salary
-18	Quality of educational leadership at all levels
-14	Local cost of living
- 6	Cultural events
- 2	Academic preparation of students
- 1	Course load (hours)
- 1	Course load (number of students)
- 1	Library facilities
- 1	Community atmosphere

Chart II

Weighted evaluation of negative features of stay at U.N.D.
(15 responses)

-31	Salary
-29	Housing opportunities
-27	Distance from major urban centers
-26	Quality of educational leadership at all levels
-25	Weather
-16	Research opportunities
-14	Local cost of living
-12	Course load (hours)
- 9	Course load (number of different courses)
- 7	Community atmosphere
- 6	Student interest
- 6	Library facilities
- 6	Cultural events
- 6	Wife's attitude
- 4	Office facilities
- 4	Freedom in planning and conducting courses
- 3	Academic preparation of students
0	Summer employment at U.N.D.
0	Congeniality of colleagues

Chart III

Weighted evaluation of positive features of stay at U.N.D.
(15 responses)

+42	Opportunity to teach your speciality
+41	Freedom in planning and conducting courses
+31	Congeniality of colleagues
+20	Office facilities
+17	Student interest
+13	Research opportunities
+11	Course load (hours)
+10	Course load (number of courses)
+ 8	Salary
+ 8	Course load (number of students)
+ 8	Quality of educational leadership
+ 6	Community atmosphere
+ 6	Your wife's attitude
+ 5	Library facilities
+ 1	Housing opportunities
+ 1	Academic preparation of students
+ 1	Distance from major urban centers
0	Summer employment at U.N.D.
0	Local cost of living
0	Cultural events
0	Weather

Report of the U. of N.D.
 Faculty Senate Committee
 on "Rapid Faculty Turnover"
 November 3, 1966

Chart IV

Number of times items cited as positive or negative (17 replies)

<u>Positive</u>		<u>Negative</u>	
12	Freedom in planning and conducting courses	10	Distance from major urban centers
		9	Weather
11	Opportunity to teach speciality	8	Housing opportunities
10	Congeniality of colleagues	7	Quality of educational leadership at all levels
8	Office facilities		
5	Student interest	7	Salary
4	Quality of educational leadership	5	Research opportunities
		4	Course load (number of different courses)
3	Salary		
3	Course load (hours)	4	Library facilities
3	Course load (number of students)	3	Local cost of living
3	Course load (number of different courses)	3	Course load (hours)
		3	Community atmosphere
3	Research opportunities	2	Office facilities
2	Library facilities	2	Student interest
2	Community atmosphere	2	Cultural events
2	Your wife's attitude	2	Your wife's attitude
1	Housing opportunities	1	Academic preparation of students
1	Academic preparation of students	1	Freedom in planning and conducting courses
		0	Summer employment at U.N.D.
1	Distance from major urban centers	0	Course load (number of students)
		0	Opportunity to teach speciality
0	Summer employment at U.N.D.	0	Congeniality of colleagues
0	Local cost of living		
0	Cultural events		
0	Weather		

	<u>YES</u>	<u>NO</u>
Did you actively seek a position for next year?	6	9
Did you come here with the intention of leaving?	2	12

Report of the U. of N.D. Faculty Senate
Committee on "Rapid Faculty Turnover"
November 3, 1966

1. WHAT DID YOU LIKE MOST ABOUT U.N.D.?

The size of the University.

The atmosphere of freedom for a faculty member to develop particular programs and interests.

The people I accumulated on my staff, namely Mrs. Torvik and John Schultze, and the younger faculty members in Education Department and other departments that I worked with.

Academic freedom.

My colleagues.

Academic freedom; presence of controversial speakers on campus, freedom in planning courses; congeniality of some colleagues (some of whom are leaving); Washington National Insurance; TIAA; employment of wife.

An opportunity to develop my interests. I had freedom largely because no one thought I was doing anything important enough to take notice of. This is a kind of freedom. However, when I touched anything important the institution is less free than most I have been in contact with.

Overall programs at U.N.D. -- cultural, athletic, etc.

Academic freedom in planning and conducting courses.

The professional and personal relationships within my department.

The people and academic interest.

The students.

The opportunity to develop new programs or revise old ones with the consent and encouragement of the administration.

Lack of formality and academic freedom.

2. WHAT DID YOU DISLIKE MOST ABOUT U.N.D.?

The permissiveness as concerns students (by administration).

The feeling among the faculty that they were consigned to purgatory or earth and the inability of many faculty members to appreciate the desirable features of U.N.D.

Conservative attitudes of the administration. Also there seems to be no organized channels in which to do business, too many people seem to go to the Vice-Presidents and pressure them into their pet projects and/or biases.

Limited research opportunities and equipment.

The attitudes of some teaching assistants. The lack of funds for the purchase of books.

Poor preparation of too many students, 12-hour teaching load, academic politicians (student & faculty) who are short on scholarship long on power and prestige, run-down condition of interior of Merrifield Hall.

An absence of goals for the institution. In addition outside of the Academic Policies Committee, there is no opportunity for the faculty to deliberate and choose between alternative programs and goals. The day by day as well as year by year goals, what there are of them, seem to be set by the deans on less than adequate grounds.

The inferiority complex of both faculty and students.

The salary.

Lack of well organized positive leadership.

The conservative power structure and negative and ineffectiveness of administration.

The backstabbing.

No comment is applicable. I never felt an active dislike for U.N.D. or any of its phases of operation.

Apparent deafness of administrators (departmental chairman on down to president)
- I am left with the impression that academic interest of the majority of faculty is superficial or entirely lacking - encouraged by administration?

3. WHAT DO YOU LIKE MOST ABOUT GRAND FORKS?

The people.

Living in a small and essentially college town.

Nothing.

Friendly, dedicated faculty.

The friendly attitude.

Its medium size, friendliness of people (including most merchants, doctors, lawyers, bankers), relatively dry, unpolluted air, absence of much hot weather, absence of salt on streets in winter, good airline service.

Little traffic, an occasional good friend.

The friendly citizens.

The size.

People and community in general.

The friendliness of the people.

Nothing particularly attractive in Grand Forks.

4. WHAT DID YOU DISLIKE MOST ABOUT GRAND FORKS?

Climate!

The failure or apparent failure of the business people to appreciate U.N.D. and to really support U.N.D.

The false pride in a somewhat backward, dusty, muddy town which was looked upon as something great in the state. I'll bet the underpass isn't done yet!

Housing and living costs.

The narrow outlook.

Houses on excessively small lots, surrounding country not very useful for recreation, failure of city to enforce ordinances regarding refuse containers, resulting in much blowing trash and garbage, noisy auto races, no restrictions on small fireworks. Also (though somewhat less important): remoteness from large urban center.

Its provincialism; the small-town characteristics of suspicion, bigotry and a pre-occupation with trying to convince themselves that they are right and the rest of the world is wrong. It often seemed that you either had to adopt the monolithic culture in G.F. or else be tagged as queer - there was little flexibility.

Winter and spring weather, especially the smirt and mud.

Its parochial attitude.

Lack of certain facilities (good theatre, museum, etc.).

The aloofness and coldness of the people in the community and many of the older faculty members.

Cost of living.

Attitude of Grand Forks businessmen - seems like one does them a favor to let them sell you merchandise.

5. WHAT IS YOUR MAIN REASON FOR LEAVING U.N.D.?

Illness in the family. Must be closer to home.

Better position.

The opportunity to teach at a "Big Ten" institution and professional advancement.

Lack of administrative backing to shift my work load and lend support to my AV program, until I told them I was leaving.

Increase in salary, research opportunities.

Money.

To overcome the disadvantages mentioned in answer to questions 2 and 4.

As listed in my letter of resignation: 1) Administrative tolerance of ecclesiastical interference in both courses and administrating department, and no concrete steps taken to guarantee freedom in the future; 2) No clear plan with timed steps for the development of the department and a reluctance by the university to adopt plans suggested to them; 3) Without clear and workable university wide goals, I was frustrated. I never knew if what I was doing was of any importance or not - I suspected not.

Better teaching position, I will be chairman of department - more money.

To live in a more attractive (both culturally and geographically) city.

Low salary.

The internal politics and dissention in certain areas is such that good work is seriously hampered.

The lack of recognition and hard work. The need to brown nose to receive promotion and raises. The inconsistency in applying rules. Rules observed when to advantage of administration and disregarded when to the advantage of the power structure.

I received an unsolicited offer which appeared to offer greater professional opportunity as well as a marked salary increase.

I am going to a school which I feel possesses an academic atmosphere; where teachers and students enjoy the opportunities of learning and studying science rather than only talking about it as is the case at U.N.D. -- lip service is cheap.

6. WHAT COULD BE DONE TO LOWER THE FACULTY TURNOVER RATE AT U.N.D.?

Better salaries primarily.

Better salaries. Better housing.

I think the faculty badly needs faculty spirit and appreciation of the good things which U.N.D. offers. Perhaps some faculty discussion group could be developed which would look at U.N.D. in a positive sense and not digress into a grouping session.

Improve the learning environment for the faculty in their instructional situations.

The inability of staff to appropriately utilize AV materials and equipment in their classrooms has created high frustrations among them. These are the "younger" staff members who want to share the value of the media with the students but are unable to do so because of the inadequate classrooms.

Bring in a larger portion of the faculty at the associate professor level.

Increase salaries. Better living. Allow each faculty member to choose one student as a part-time secretary-grader-preparators, etc. This would amount to about 20 student hours a week, being his choice he would be responsible for liking (sic) the student or firing him.

Allow faculty to remain in University housing longer, help to develop a varied housing area near university, have more carrel space in library, increase library budget, budgets for research, keep promotions based on acknowledged merit in research and teaching, not simply ability to get government grants or alleged loyalty to the university, place more younger faculty on more influential committees, if they so desire, be more candid in admitting errors and past deficiencies, make appearances in procedure count less, realities more. The governor should be encouraged to have a science advisor. The social sciences, psychology, natural sciences, art all belong in one college, not three.

Encourage the Academic Policies Committee to suggest reasonable and attractive short and long term goals for the institution and free them from suppression when they begin to probe sensitive areas. Above all make sure the membership of the committee is not captive to self-seeking (so that it doesn't simply do what it thinks some local power group with patronage to dispense would like). Hire faculty to advance practical goals (not just "academic excellence" - who doesn't want it?) so that the faculty, gets to do something worthwhile and doesn't waste its time.

Improve office facilities. Decrease teaching load, especially number of courses. Increase salaries. Try to improve the morale of the faculty and students, especially the faculty. This might involve vesting more power in those who feel they haven't enough of a voice in policy decisions.

Make a really significant increase in salaries or people in the higher ranks.

Replace the present inbred, incompetent, smug, and unimaginative administration.

Pay more attention to the wants and needs of the faculty.

Give faculty raises and promotions on the basis of merit not petty politics and brown nosing. Raise library allocations - allow time for research.

Faculty turnover rates are a current problem throughout the academic world. I do not know whether U.N.D.'s is significantly higher or not. The reasons for transfer vary with the individual and it is unlikely that the correction of major deficits at a school would stem this turnover trend. My observations at U.N.D. would lead me to emphasize one correctable item: low salaries in the higher ranks. U.N.D. compares favorably, salary wise, at the lower ranks, but the high cost of living in Grand Forks necessitates the expectation of reasonable rewards in the future, consistent with performance. The lack of the higher salaries of the associate and professor ranks fosters the use of U.N.S. as a stepping stone in an individual's career.

Hire strong departmental chairmen (not 2-bit administrators who have unfulfilled desires for politics) who will command respect of their faculty. Educate the board of higher education as to the cost of higher education. Expand library holdings - sadly lacking. Promote faculty on basis of performance; not tenure. This would give academic rank some meaning - it has none now.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS:

Both my wife and I enjoyed our association at U.N.D. and hope someday to return. A serious disadvantage you do not suggest is: Lack of adequate space - classrooms and laboratories. Another is a serious lack of technical equipment, microscopes, darkrooms, etc.

Appearances count for too much at U.N.D.--appearances in procedure. E.g. It was fine having President Kennedy here, but the university has improperly capitalized on this. After all, the public address system did fail during his visit, and very few of us were able to hear what he said.

If you could get to the Academic Policies Committee to report this year's work, including the last few sessions to the Senate.

From what I know about the power structure here, this whole questionnaire represents an exercise in futility. In other words it falls in the file and forget category.

Summer school salaries are extremely low. Deception is practiced in that no mention is made of ceilings when one is hired (one of many deceptions I might add). Although salaries are low (all the time) this had no part in my decision to leave.

I enjoyed my stay at U.N.D. and have often doubted the wisdom of my decision to leave during these past three months.

I have been impressed with the fact that faculty members lacking rank and/or tenure are the ones who demonstrate sincere interest in academic affairs; whereas, our ranked faculty (in general) seem to feel their appointments carry only an "8-5" commitment. P.S. Last spring I asked my chairman why I had not been promoted - the answer was, "that I had not been here for five years!".