The Influence of Campus Protest on Student Conduct Policies: The Case of Indiana University Bloomington

Mahauganee D. Shaw

This article provides a historic view of how student activism influenced campus governance in the 1960s, using Indiana University as a lens. Alongside IU archival documents, publications of the Association of Governing Boards of Universities and Colleges provide the national context of campus administration during this period of student unrest. These documents come together to provide an example of how one institution navigated the task of reconciling institutional need with opinions from different stakeholder groups.

The 1960s was a decade ripe with social movements. Young Americans were incited into activism in numbers larger than ever before (Rhoads, 1998). As this "generation of young people best known for its idealism and impatience" (Association of Governing Boards of Universities and Colleges [AGB], 1968a, p. 6) entered college, they brought with them the spirit of collective action. At Indiana University, student protests and demonstrations were staged in support of different causes, including the anti-war movement, racial discrimination, disagreement with administrative decisions, and the equal treatment of women students. In a 1966 study of student protest, Peterson writes that the "surge of student unrest and active protest must certainly be among the most significant developments in American higher education, perhaps in American society, of the mid-1960s. As a cultural phenomenon, as a social force, it warrants being understood" (p. 1). This article focuses on how Indiana University Bloomington (IUB) administrators handled the responsibility of responding to student protests and demonstrations on campus from 1967 to 1969. These years were selected because of the surge of student demonstrations staged by IUB students, and thus the spike in administrative attention paid to student activism.

Using studies such as Peterson's (1966) in tandem with national publications and primary documents from the archives of Indiana University, this essay describes how one Midwestern university responded to student activism through policy decisions. Over fifty years later, higher education administrators and scholars can still learn from the "social force" that characterized campus culture of the 1960s. For higher education administrators and scholars, this story provides an institutional example of navigating the balance of power between different campus constituencies, developing and implementing new policies and procedures, and responding to the concerns and actions of student activists.

Student Unrest as a National Issue

Across the country, campus administrators were coping with what Peterson (1966) termed "the restiveness of the 'new' college student" (p. 3) under the realization that they were "not able to respond to [student] demands with nearly the speed or the effectiveness that they desire[d]" (AGB, 1968a, p. 6). Roger Heyns,

then chancellor of the University of California Berkeley—home to some of the most often-cited student demonstrations—wrote of his desire for simpler campus issues in the September 1968 edition of *AGB Reports,* the journal of the Association of Governing Boards of Universities and Colleges (AGB):

> I often find myself hoping wistfully that we could have a crisis so simple as a tornado or a flood….I do not mean to minimize the tragedy and suffering that accompanies natural disasters….What I do mean is that while the crisis in higher education is not so immediate, it is immensely more complex than those dramatic situations. (AGB, 1968a, p. 5)

To discuss the complexities of governing campus protests, the AGB planned a special conference in October 1968 with a theme of "Crisis on the Campus." The invitation to the conference "urged" members of "Boards of trustees and regents…to be fully represented at this important conference," noting that "presidents or other representatives" were only welcome to the conference if "accompanied by one or more board members" (AGB, 1968a, back cover). Often misunderstood by bodies of demonstrating students, university presidents provided visible leadership to the campus community but were not ultimate decision makers (AGB, 1968a). Largely controlled by Boards of Trustees, bodies that in turn are influenced by state legislatures, university presidents and other senior administrators housed in campus offices bore both the burden of enforcing policies that were often incongruent with the desires of student masses and the brunt of responsibility for explaining the actions of students not willing to follow those policies. This structure was definitely true of Indiana University: "It is no exaggeration to conclude that in almost every respect, the Board is the final, if not the sole, locus of authority within [Indiana] University" (Travis, 1968, p. 2). In conversations with student activists, IUB President Elvis Stahr attempted to explain this "system of multiple, criss-crossing [*sic*] authority-relations of differing types and strengths" (AGB, 1968a, p. 9) in efforts to alleviate pressure from himself (Wynkoop, 2002).

Public opinion on proper institutional structure and power dynamics varied. UC Berkeley Chancellor Heyns wrote of the necessity for authoritative power and responsibility to be spread amongst administrative levels (AGB, 1968a). He called for campuses to "solidify [their] leadership base" (p. 11) in efforts to maintain order on campus. Conversely, an essay in *Time* noted that "administrators who have permitted students to participate in some policy areas applaud the results, say that it prevents protest and often raises standards" (*Time Essay*, 1968, section Needed: Tolerance & Participation, para. 1). This essay, however, also differentiates between accepting student advice and granting student power, and it cautions against the latter.

In regards to student power, the *Time* (1968) essay suggested taking a proactive approach: "…the way to deal with student power is to anticipate it [and] to initiate changes before the students demand them" (section Needed: Tolerance & Participation, para. 1). Understanding that some student demands and demonstrations could not be anticipated, the October 1968 *AGB Reports* strongly suggested that institutions of higher education stand to benefit from having an organized response plan for campus disturbances and an employee whose responsibility it is to activate and execute the response plan when necessary. This same issue of the journal states that campus policy and the possible sanctions for violating policy

"should be made clear, before any campus demonstration takes place," warning that (a) "vague regulations and lack of consistency give the activist a strong advantage….[and (b)] spokesmen for the university must be persons that students know and trust" (1968b, p. 34). The problems of "vague regulations and lack of consistency" was a prominent concern of IUB students and administrators.

The Late 1960s at Indiana University Bloomington

Herman B Wells, the IUB alumnus who spent twenty-five years as the University president, resigned from the presidency in 1962. His successor, Elvis J. Stahr, assumed the Indiana University presidency on July 1 of that same year (Harrell, 1968b). Stahr's tenure as president continued through the late 1960s, the period which marked the height of student unrest at Indiana University Bloomington. By 1967, IUB was not unlike most U.S. campuses: there was an intense student faction committed to voicing opposition to University and national affairs; student protests and demonstrations, originating from various interest groups, were frequent; and University administrators were consumed with discussions on how to handle the issues posed by these demonstrations.

The fall semester of 1967 saw two of the most well-known campus demonstrations in IUB's history—one on October 30 to protest the presence of Dow Chemical recruiters on campus and the other on October 31 to voice opposition towards then Secretary of State Dean Rusk who was giving a speech on campus. Both demonstrations resulted in unfavorable local and national media coverage for the University; won the attention of other college presidents, parents of IUB students, Indiana residents and state legislators; and generated discussion and many strong opinions amongst IUB faculty, staff, and students. President Stahr himself called these protests "a threat to [IUB's] academic enterprise" (*Remarks from Elvis J. Stahr,* 1967, p. 3), noting that student activists had overstepped the bounds of acceptability in an "[attempt] to assert some presumed right to deny the rights of others, in one case the right of students to explore career opportunities [by interviewing with recruiters from Dow Chemical], in the other not only the right of one to speak, but the right of many others to listen" (p. 5).

The constancy of student uprisings during Stahr's presidency were likely the impetus for his retirement after what he called "six long and busy years" (Harrell, 1968b, p. 2). Never citing specific events, President Stahr noted that the reason for his resignation was "presidential fatigue, the result of 24 straight years of working for unusually long hours in unusually demanding jobs, the last ten years of which have been in positions I can only describe as involving super pressure" (pp. 2-3). At the time of Stahr's resignation, Herman B Wells, who had been serving the University as Chancellor, was named Interim President (Harrell, 1968b). In November 1968, the Board of Trustees unanimously elected Joseph Lee Sutton the 13th President of Indiana University (Harrell, 1968c). Sutton remained in this position until 1971.

Administrative Approaches to Student Protest

David Clark, Dean of the School of Education from 1966-1974, described the responsibility that fatigued President Stahr:

Complexities…arise when one attempts to discuss rules, regulations, and authority in the context of the university—an institution which values and thrives upon freedom from conventional definitions of rules, regulations,

and authority. Actions which are quite appropriate in other settings to combat inefficiency, ineffectiveness, or disruptiveness become useless in the university setting because they are antithetical to the necessary and unique culture of the institution. (Clark, 1967, p.1) By nature, institutions of higher education are places where information, open discussion, and thought should flow freely. Yet, some level of control must be exerted to maintain order and provide guidance. Distinguishing the proper, strategically executed response to student protests was the dilemma that plagued the IUB presidency, the Trustees, and other senior administrators.

AGB Reports (1968a) called for campuses to rethink and revise their focus on student conduct. Writing on "New Grounds for Student Discipline," (AGB, 1968a, p. 21) John McDonough, a law professor at Stanford University, posited that the university's new relationship to student conduct should be that of an educator and proprietor. McDonough argued that, as educator, the university should reduce the focus on citizenship standards and place emphasis on whether a student's behavior "casts doubt upon the student's entitlement to continue as a member of the University community" (p. 22). As proprietor "of the physical complex that constitutes the campus," (p. 22) the university's concern with student conduct should focus specifically on how students interact with and respect campus property. McDonough's call to move away from conventional methods and focus energy on the parameters of student conduct was in stark contrast to the *in loco parentis* regulations—a campus governance approach in which the university-student relationship resembles the parent-child relationship—of previous years. Under *in loco parentis* policies, colleges and universities were heavily regulating student dress codes, residential and automobile privileges, visitation hours and locations, conduct, and increasingly campus politics (Heineman, 2001; Wynkoop, 2002). President Stahr's "super pressure," Dean Clark's recognition of the "complexities" of campus governance, and McDonough's call to focus on the overarching objectives of educating students and protecting campus infrastructure, provide an apt background for examining the evolution of campus policies at IUB.

The Evolution of IUB's Campus Policies on Student Protest

The urgency to institute a policy governing the conduct of student activists at IUB arose after the two previously-described student disruptions in October 1967. The drive to create this policy was initiated by the Faculty Council and supported by President Stahr. Student leaders quickly got involved, offering their own critiques and revisions to the policy. These events are detailed in the subsequent sections. It should be noted that all of the versions of the IUB policies described below also include sections on student conduct issues other than protest and demonstrations (e.g., plagiarism, cheating, traffic violations, housing regulations, and the like); however, the discussion that follows will focus solely on the portions of these policies intended to manage and direct the conduct of student activists.

Regulations Affecting Student Life (Faculty Council, 1967-1968)

The Faculty Council held an informal meeting on the evening of October 31, following the Secretary of State's appearance on campus, to discuss the "wide-spread

concern among the Faculty about the events" (*Notice to members,* 1967, p. 1). In early November 1967, conversations regarding how to best protect the academic integrity of the University while also maintaining the "commitment to freedom of inquiry, freedom of expression and freedom to differ" (p. 1) intrinsic to the University setting permeated IUB's campus. There are archival records from this time filled with hundreds of letters addressed to President Elvis Stahr from people both internal and external to the University expressing either concern for the state of the University, objection to the University's response, or support for University administrators (see Student Demonstrations, n.d.; "The following", 1967). It was with great concern and this range of opinions in mind that the Faculty Council included "consideration of the University Policy with Respect to Student Demonstrations" on their November 7 meeting agenda.

Prior to discussing the policy at the November 7 meeting, the Faculty Council heard from President Stahr. Noting that the number of letters received from faculty helped him understand the importance of the topic at hand, President Stahr made an appeal for support: "For only when faculty and administration find themselves on common ground can the University really expect to cope with such problems" (*Remarks of Elvis J. Stahr,* 1967, p. 1). In his address, President Stahr asked that deliberations over the proper policy for campus demonstrations keep his two basic principles in mind: "the safeguard of orderly dissent, and protection from forcible disruption" (p. 1). Student protests walked a fine line between "orderly dissent" and "forcible disruption." It was the progression from the former to the latter that characterized the events of October 30 and 31 and necessitated a review and possible revision of campus policy regarding these types of events.

The result, *Regulations Affecting Student Life, 1967-1968: Free Speech Policy*, a document outlining general rules of student conduct, noted that students "may be subject to disciplinary action, including suspension" for conduct fitting, but not limited to, the following criteria:

1. Damaging or destroying University property
2. Conducting oneself in a disorderly or disruptive manner
3. Disobeying proper orders of authorized University personnel acting in accordance with University regulations
4. Violating criminal law, [either] on University property [or] while acting on behalf of the University
5. Creating, maintaining, or participating in a situation seriously detrimental to the health, safety, or welfare of the University community; and in so doing being inconsistent with the basic objectives of the University community.

("Excerpt from 'Regulations,'" 1967, p. 1)

These criteria could be interpreted as a ban on organizing and demonstrating. This, however, is not the case; higher education's dilemma stemmed from the fact that students were allowed the freedom of expression, thought, and speech that often resulted in news headlining demonstrations.

As such, the 1967-1968 *Regulations Affecting Student Life* moved past the general rules above to include a section on "Picketing and Other Forms of Demonstration" (p. 2). According to the guidelines provided, picketing and demonstrating: (a) was only allowed outside of buildings, excluding buildings where such activity would interfere

with classes in session, privacy of residential students, or university functions; (b) had to be orderly and safe; (c) could not block building entrances or otherwise obstruct the flow of people or vehicles on campus; or (d) could not be scheduled at an organized meeting or event, which signified intention to disrupt the event and its attendees. To ensure that these rules did not prohibit students from picketing and demonstrating, Dunn Meadow was designated as the University's official "Assembly Ground," and information regarding use of city streets was made available through the Student Activities Office (*Faculty Council Doc. No. 21 1967-68*). Additionally, picketers and demonstrators were expected to: remain peaceful and indifferent towards passersby; include the name of the organizing faction on all printed materials; clean up after themselves; and understand that violation of campus policy would result in disciplinary action or, depending on the severity of the violation, arrest.

Notification that picketing and demonstrating could potentially result in arrest was important given the escalation in campus incidents across the country during this time. IUB student activists were not the only group protesting Dow Chemical or running the risk of arrest. According to a 1967 version of *Higher Education and National Affairs,* the newsletter of the American Council on Education, "a nationwide campaign to exclude Dow Chemical Company people from campuses and a forthcoming meeting solely on the tactics to be employed" (*Remarks of Elvis J. Stahr,* 1967, p. 6) had been instituted by the National Student Association (NSA). The success of this campaign is seen in the results of a 1968 study conducted by the NSA which reported that "the most common reason for student protest was this year's cause célèbre, Dow Chemical Company recruitment" on campus (AGB, 1968b, p. 7). Students on various campuses, including Kent State University in Ohio, the State University of New York at Buffalo, and the University of Wisconsin at Madison had also been involved with such protests (Heineman, 2001). At the University of Wisconsin, the protests began in the spring of 1967 and escalated to a violent head on October 18, less than two weeks prior to the Dow Chemical incident at IUB (Wynkoop, 2002). The Wisconsin protest resulted in the involvement of the local police force, mass arrests, and the injury of at least 175 student activists (Heineman, 2001). The Dow protest at IUB was smaller scale, resulting in the arrest of 35 students and serious injury of two. Occurring on the heels of the Wisconsin incident, IUB's decision to involve local police in campus issues was not well-received by many faculty, administrators, and students. Yet, the students involved in the protest understood when planning the demonstration that "whenever they protested on campus against the war, they were subject to disciplinary action and, perhaps, arrest" (Wynkoop, 2002, p. 55). In fact, IUB's student activists included the possibility of arrest in their strategy. Guy Loftman, then student body president, was one of the student activists who elected to not participate, noting that "if the Dow protests resulted in any arrests, someone had to be free to get everyone else out of jail" (Wynkoop, 2002, p. 56). Even with knowledge of the possibility of arrest and a somewhat detailed list of regulations, the unfavorable response to student arrests and the air of dissatisfaction amongst the campus community was a clear indication that the campus policy was insufficient.

Uniform Student Conduct Code (Student Senate, 1968)

In February 1968, IUB student body president Guy Loftman released an open letter to the campus community stating that "inconsistent and ambiguous student conduct regulations have caused unhappiness for many students, and conflict among faculty, students, and administration" (Loftman, 1968, p. 1). If inconsistent policy was sowing discord amongst the different factions within the campus community, there was a need for a policy that was clear, consistent, and accepted. Guy Loftman's open letter served as an introductory note to a proposal for instituting a *Uniform Student Conduct Code*. The "inconsistent and ambiguous student conduct regulations" referenced by Loftman are representative of the "vague regulations and lack of consistency" of which *AGB Reports* (1968b, p. 34) warned. As the journal cautioned, the vague and inconsistent regulations increased student power. It appears that a clear and consistent policy would have eliminated the catalyst that inspired the 1968 Student Senate to draft and propose a new policy.

The Conduct Code was drafted by the Student Senate in hopes that combining segments of all previous campus documents regarding student behavior into one would "clarify the needs of the University community to protect itself from anti-social behavior, thus removing one cause of conflict and making students more certain of what behavior is legal and what is not" (Loftman, 1968, p. 1). The newly proposed code was presented to the campus community in anticipation that it would be adopted by the Faculty Council and become official IUB policy.

The preamble to the Uniform Student Conduct Code noted that "the student must be recognized and treated as an adult, with the encumbent [*sic*] rights, freedoms, and responsibilities" ("*Uniform Student,"* 1968, p. 1). For the student authors of the *Uniform Student Conduct Code*, these "rights, freedoms, and responsibilities" included the "authority to determine regulations governing their own lives…[and recognition] as *full members* [emphasis added] of the University community in matters affecting its general governance" (p. 1). The call for full membership in the University community is likely a nod to student concerns regarding the impersonal feel of campus procedures and the common belief that administrators treated students as numbers rather than people (Wynkoop, 2002).

Among other violations, the section of the *Uniform Student Conduct Code* devoted to "General Conduct" lists that students should not:

1. …steal, destroy, damage, litter, deface, or impair the usefulness of any property owned or held by the University.
2. ….interfere unreasonably with the conduct of any University activity.
3. ….refuse to display his [*sic*] University identification card or other identification to an employee of the Division of Student Personnel or to a deputized employee of the Safety Division upon reasonable request.
4. ….fail to obey any proper order before any judicial body. (*Uniform Student,* 1968, p. 2)

Each of these rules was followed by a stated maximum penalty for violation, ranging from formal reprimand to monetary obligation. Placed in the context of national and local student movements, these rules of "general conduct" covered many of the actions involved in the demonstrations.

Even though the *Uniform Student Conduct Code* was meant to be an amalgamation of previous policies, it did not

include a specific section on picketing and demonstrating. Based on the proclamation of adulthood in the preamble, it is likely that student leaders simply did not believe there was a need for specific rules guiding demonstration. If protest is a form of free expression, able to be conceptualized and performed in ways befitting the protestor and the protested, how could one logically place parameters on how to protest? Doing so would strip students of the freedoms that are inherent to higher education settings. Beyond simply removing the section on protest and demonstration from the conduct code, the new document contained a statement repealing any previously-enacted regulations that were not included. Thus, the regulations on "Picketing and Other Forms of Demonstration" were to be voted out of existence.

Picketing & Demonstration Regulations (Faculty Council, 1968)

Revisions to *Regulations Affecting Student Life*, submitted by the Faculty Council Committee on Picketing, Demonstrations, and Related Matters, were approved on April 2, 1968. Specific rules on "Picketing and Other Forms of Demonstration" were omitted from this draft of the campus policy. The Committee stood by this omission, noting that a survey of other universities revealed that "the detailed and prescriptive approach [to writing campus policies] invariably [led] to confusion, controversy, and chaos" (*Faculty Council Minutes,* 1968, p. 9). Additionally, the Committee reported that "institutions with the least unfortunate experiences in recent months have been those adopting some form of general standard, rather than a catalogue of campus crimes" (p. 9). Finally, the Committee argued that omitting specific rules on picketing and demonstrations was "the only truly educational approach. [In order] to cultivate in students a sense of responsibility, and a responsible sensitivity, there is no other viable action" (p. 9). Accompanied by these supportive arguments, the Committee presented the new *Regulations*.

In a more condensed and generalized statement of the regulations governing student conduct, the policy outlined the ways in which students should exercise their dissent:

…each student shall have freedom of speech and assembly, and freedom to publish and distribute any material at any time and place, subject only to legal limitations, provided that he does not unreasonably disturb the peace or the good order of any University activity or unreasonably interfere with the movement of vehicular or pedestrian traffic. The penalty for violating the foregoing proviso may be any within the full range of University discipline. (Shaffer, 1968, p. 1)

The revised policy was named "Picketing & Demonstration Regulations." Though the new policy did not include the terms picketing and demonstrations, the authors were careful to name specific activities included in picketing and demonstrating, and the title of the policy clearly stated the reason for its existence.

In late May, after the close of the 1967-1968 academic year, President Stahr presented a statement to the Board of Trustees differentiating between dissent and disruption: "We recognize each individual's right to disagreement, even dissension, but the University and its members must be protected from threat and intimidation….it is vitally important…that the University's activities be subjected to modification only through rational means" (*Statement of the President*, 1968, para. 3). This differentiation became a key point in future versions of IUB student conduct policy. The Board, approving of Stahr's statement, reaffirmed their

"support of the officials of the University in the firm enforcement of University policies and rules relating to picketing, demonstrating and related matters" (Harrell, 1968a, p. 4). Further, the Board affirmed a commitment to immediately expel any student violating the policies and rules. Newspapers across the state of Indiana praised the Indiana University Board for making the rules clear and taking "firm stands" (*Firm Action*, 1968, para. 5).

Guiding Procedures for Handling Disruptive Demonstrations (Dean of Students, 1968)

Heading into the fall 1968 semester, *AGB Reports* published an article titled "Tactics for Handling Campus Disturbances: Planning, restraint more effective than police force." In the article, the authors warn:

Unless a university wants to cancel all its government contracts, revamp its board of trustees to eliminate corporate representatives, admit 15 percent minority students unconditionally, take a firm institutional position against the war in Vietnam, and give the *coup de grace* to *in loco parentis* –unless it decides to do all these things, it is going to have to get down to some serious planning for the disturbances that *are going to come* [emphasis added] this fall, next fall, and the fall after that. (AGB, 1968b, p. 30).

Anticipating the return of student activism to campus for the 1968-1969 academic year, and noting that "there may be some ambiguity surrounding University rules and policies applicable to student demonstrations" (Shaffer, 1968, p. 1), IUB Dean of Students Robert Shaffer released a campus memo revisiting the official campus rules that governed student demonstrations and discipline. In the memo, Dean Shaffer (1968) noted that the standing campus policy was "to permit dissent but not to tolerate disruption" by allowing the "freedom of inquiry and discussion essential to a student's development" (p. 1).

Dean Shaffer's memo was sent to the campus on August 1, prior to the start of the academic year, noting that "indications of the possibility of demonstrations of one sort or another early this fall" existed (p. 1). Dean Shaffer followed his memo with the release of *Guiding Procedures for Handling Disruptive Demonstrations* to all university officials in September. This document, one for wide circulation and one more detailed, confidential version for staff members in the Division of Student Personnel, outlined specific steps to take in the event of a potentially disruptive campus demonstration (Dean of Students, 1968). Rather than targeting student behavior and actions, *Guiding Procedures* provided guidelines and instructions for University employees, explaining how to respond when present at a student demonstration. According to this document, "a demonstration or gathering shall be judged to be unreasonably disruptive if it obstructs or prevents the conduct of business, holding of a scheduled activity or the carrying out of University procedures" ("*Board of Trustees*," 1968, para. 5). In the same month that Roger Heyns' article appeared in the *AGB Reports* (1968a) urging institutions to solidify their leadership base, Dean Shaffer released his memo putting the onus for maintaining order on all campus officials.

Although Shaffer's memo imbued all faculty and staff with the power to mobilize a response to student activists, it also provided contact information for offices to notify and stated that "no off-campus police will be called without the express order of the President or his vice-presidential designate" (Dean of Students, 1968, para. 11). The Office of the Dean of Students is listed as the first

office to contact, with the Safety Division listed second. Given the history of student activists with safety officers, the decision to involve familiar staff members before the campus safety team was a move that aligned with the article from *AGB Reports* advising that "spokesmen for the university must be persons that students know and trust" (1968b, p. 30). The confidential version of the Guiding Procedures lists steps to be taken after the Office of the Dean of Students is contacted. Each office within the Division was assigned a specific task to complete in efforts to dissipate the demonstration. In recognition of the positive influence and cordial relationship many faculty members had with students, the policy states that "any faculty observers present….will be encouraged to talk with the participants in the demonstration to urge compliance with University policy" (*Confidential-For Division*, 1968, para. 5).

Indiana University Student Code (1969)

By March 1969, the rules and regulations included in previous versions of the student conduct code had been combined into one clearly outlined document, the *Indiana University Student Code, Bloomington Campus*. Addressing the dilemma faced by campus administrators and previous concerns raised by members of the student body and others, the preamble to the *Student Code* stated that "the purpose of the code is to protect the rights of the individual student and the needs of the community. It is written to insure fairness and equality by explicitly defining the rules governing student life and disciplinary procedures" (*Indiana University Student Code,* 1969, p. 1). Seemingly in reprimand of student activists' actions the preamble further stated that it was specifically "designed to encourage students themselves to assume the responsibility for their own behavior and discipline" (p. 1). However, showing growth from the lessons of previous years, the new *Student Code* proposal required approval from both the Faculty Council and the Student Senate—representatives of the campus's two largest constituent groups—prior to being referred to the Board of Trustees. In addition, the power to draft amendments to the code was designated to "a faculty-student committee [to] be appointed by the Faculty Council and the Student Senate." Yet, the approval of amendments submitted by the committee was left up to the Faculty Council and the Board of Trustees. Effectively, IUB had found a way to include students in the process of governing their own behavior and disciplinary procedures without relinquishing the discretionary power of final approval.

Summary and Discussion

Responding to student unrest was a difficult task that marked the experiences of 1960s campus administrators across the nation. The responsibility entrusted to campus leaders required the simultaneous preservation of essential elements in the academic environment—freedoms of thought, inquiry, opinion, and speech—and maintenance of campus operations and safety. In order to do this, institutions of higher education had to shift away from the *in loco parentis* management style, permit students to act and exist as adults, and devise a comprehensive policy on student conduct that could be effectively applied to any situation. The different versions of the policy governing student protest at IUB help construct the story of how campus administrators handled this responsibility and which groups influenced the development of the policy.

While campus administrators had the primary responsibility of protecting the integrity of the University, they also had to consider and acknowledge the concerns of campus stakeholders. All campus constituencies—students, staff, faculty, administrators, and trustees—as well as alumni, state residents, and politicians on both the local and state levels held strong opinions regarding how IUB campus administrators should respond to student unrest (see Chavis, 1968; Hillis, 1968; Student Demonstrations, n.d.). Filtering incoming information and opinion and reconciling them with one's own train of thought on an issue can be a time-consuming process for campus leaders. The multiple revisions of IUB's campus policy, continually updated to better address the ever-expanding tactics of student activists and meet the needs of the campus, are testament to this fact. Ironically, it was the actions—unruly demonstrations on behalf of student concerns—of students seeking more authority in campus governance that resulted in the creation of a campus policy and thus increased restrictions on student actions. Student activism of the 1960s was a phenomenon that demanded attention and warranted understanding both then and now. It helped define student culture, delineate the boundaries of relationships between different campus constituent groups, and provided a foundation for many of the communication channels that exist between students and administrative personnel today. The rationale for developing the IUB policy regarding student protests and demonstrations, and the various versions of the policy, are akin to the content and origin of the written emergency management plans that exist on today's campuses. Contemporary campus administrators can use the lessons learned from the process of governing student unrest in the 1960s to help maintain clarity, foresight, and sanity when dealing with campus disruptions today.

References

Association of Governing Boards of Universities and Colleges. (1968a). Crisis on the campus: Import for governance; preliminary program and background materials, special conference for trustees and regents of universities and colleges. *AGB Reports, 11*(1). DC: Author.

Association of Governing Boards of Universities and Colleges. (1968b). Student power in America: An assessment; background materials for AGB Conference "Crisis on the campus: Import for governance. *AGB Reports, 11*(2). DC: Author.

Board of Trustees and Faculty Council actions applicable to participation in disruptive and relevant disciplinary action. (1968, September). Student Demonstrations-Little 500, 1968 Reference File, Office of University Archives and Records Management, Indiana University, Bloomington.

Chavis, P. E. (1968, June 7). *Letter addressed to "Mr. Elvis J. Stahr, President."* Collection number C304, box 160, Student Demonstrations 66-68 file, Office of University Archives and Records Management, Indiana University, Bloomington.

Clark, D. L. (1967). *Interdepartmental communication from Dean Clark regarding student unrest at Indiana University.* Student Demonstrations (1967-68) Reference File, Office of University Archives and Records Management, Indiana University, Bloomington.

Confidential-for Division of Student Personnel staff use only: Procedures for handling disruptive demonstrations. (1968, September). Student Demonstrations 1969 (include. Ballentine lock-in) Reference File, Office of University Archives and Records Management, Indiana University, Bloomington.

Dean of Students. (1968, September). *Guiding procedures for handling disruptive demonstrations.* Student Demonstrations 1969 (include. Ballentine lock-in) Reference File, Office of University Archives and Records Management, Indiana University, Bloomington.

Excerpt from "regulations affecting student life." (1967). Student Demonstrations (1967-68) Reference File, Office of University Archives and Records Management, Indiana University, Bloomington.

Faculty Council doc. No. 21, 1967-68. Faculty Council Collection C181, Circulars, no. 21 (1967-68), A recommendation from the Faculty Council Committee on Picketing, Demonstrations and Related Matters, 19 March 1968 file, Office of University Archives and Records Management, Indiana University, Bloomington.

Faculty Council Minutes. (1968, April 2). Faculty Council Collection number C181, box 9, Minutes, 2 April, 1968 file, Office of University Archives and Records Management, Indiana University, Bloomington.

Firm action at universities. (1968, June 5). In *Logansport Pharos-Tribune & Press.* Collection number C304, box 160, Student Demonstrations 66-68 file, Office of University Archives and Records Management, Indiana University, Bloomington.

Harrell, C. E. (1968a). *The Trustees of Indiana University: Minutes of the meeting of May 24, 1968.* Minutes of the Board of Trustees 1968-1969, Office of University Archives and Records Management, Indiana University, Bloomington.

Harrell, C. E. (1968b). *The Trustees of Indiana University: Minutes of the meeting of July 5-6, 1968.* Minutes of the Board of Trustees 1968-1969, Office of University Archives and Records Management, Indiana University, Bloomington.

Harrell, C. E. (1968c). *The Trustees of Indiana University: Minutes of the meeting of November 15, 1968.* Minutes of the Board of Trustees 1968-1969, Office of University Archives and Records Management, Indiana University, Bloomington.

Heineman, K. J. (2001). *Put your bodies upon the wheels: Student revolt in the 1960s.* Chicago, IL: Ivan R. Dee.

Hillis, E. H. (1968, June 11). *Letter addressed to "The Honorable Elvis J. Stahr."* Collection number C304, box 160, Student Demonstrations 66-68 file, Office of University Archives and Records Management, Indiana University, Bloomington.

Indiana University Student Code, Bloomington Campus. (1969, March 24). Collection number C268, box 42, Student Government, Dec. 1968-May 19, 1969 file, Office of University Archives and Records Management, Indiana University, Bloomington.

Loftman, G. R. (1968). *Indiana University Student Government cover letter for the "Uniform Student Conduct Code."* Student Demonstrations-Little 500, 1968 Reference File, Office of University Archives and Records Management, Indiana University, Bloomington.

Notice to members of the faculty: University policy with respect to student demonstrations. Student Demonstrations (1967-68) Reference File, Office of University Archive and Records Management, Indiana University, Bloomington.

Peterson, R. E. (1966). *The scope of organized student protest in 1964-1965.* Princeton, NJ: Educational Testing Service.

Remarks of Elvis J. Stahr, President, Indiana University Faculty Council meeting, Alumni Hall, Indiana Memorial Union building, Bloomington, Indiana. (1967, November 7). Faculty Council Collection number C181, box 9, Minutes, 7 November 1967 file, Office of University Archives and Records Management, Indiana University, Bloomington.

Rhoads, R. A. (1998). *Freedom's web: Student activism in an age of cultural diversity.* Baltimore, MD: The Johns Hopkins University Press.

Shaffer, R. H. (1968, August 1). *Office of the Dean of Students, Indiana University: Faculty Council actions applicable to demonstrations and discipline.* Student Collection number C304, box 160, Student Demonstrations 66-68 file, Office of University Archives and Records Management, Indiana University, Bloomington.

Statement of President Elvis J. Stahr to the Board of Trustees re: dissent vs. disruption, May 24, 2968. Student Demonstrations (1967-68) Reference File, Office of University Archives and Records Management, Indiana University, Bloomington.

Student Demonstrations 66-68 (n.d.). Reference File, Office of University Archives and Records Management, Indiana University, Bloomington.

Student Demonstrations—1969 (incl. Ballantine Lock-In). (1969). Reference File, Office of University Archives and Records Management, Indiana University, Bloomington.

Time essay: Why those students are protesting. (1968, May 3). New York: Author. Available from Student Demonstrations 66-68 file. Collection number C304, box 160, Office of University Archives and Records Management, Indiana University, Bloomington.

The following are verbatim copies of letters, memoranda and notes received by the President or the Secretary of the Faculty Council from members of the Faculty with respect to campus incidents of October 30 and 31, 1967. Student Demonstrations—1967-1968 (incl. Dow/Rusk) Reference File, Office of University Archives and Records Management, Indiana University, Bloomington.

Travis, C. K. (1968, June 27). *Confidential memorandum: Statutory authority of the trustees and the faculty.* Student Demonstrations-Little 500, 1968 Reference File, Office of University Archives and Records Management, Indiana University, Bloomington.

Uniform Student Conduct Code. (1968). Student Demonstrations-Little 500, 1968 Reference File, Office of University Archives and Records Management, Indiana University, Bloomington.

Wynkoop, M. A. (2002). *Dissent in the heartland: The sixties at Indiana University.* Bloomington, IN: Indiana University Press

Mahauganee Shaw plans to graduate from the HESA doctoral program with a Ph.D. and defend her dissertation on crisis management and its impact on institutional change in the summer of 2012. She received both a M.A. in Educational Leadership and a B.A. in Liberal Arts from the University of Missouri-Kansas City. At Indiana University, Bloomington, Mahauganee is a Project Associate in the Center for Postsecondary Research and consults for the Division of Student Affairs on assessment measures and initiatives.