



even if they do not conform to the rules of the Handbook. Such occasions would presumably be rare, but they do not completely undermine a grievance system administered by the faculty. The problem, however, is that the Provost wants to assert even broader powers. Along with her authority to make final decisions, she also wants the final authority to interpret the rules themselves, whenever she reads them in a different way from the faculty. Combining these two kinds of aut

This is clearly not an acceptable state of affairs. With the backing of the Senate, the Committee on Faculty Rights and Responsibilities, speaking with one voice, has proposed to the Provost and Dean a division of authority that would allow them to fulfill their managerial functions, while still upholding the basic rules of faculty governance. We have come to a standstill, however, until the Dean and Provost tell us their response to the Senate's resolution of May 1. It may be too late to proceed any farther this year, but we hope that eventually the Provost and Dean will consider removing the roadblocks to further discussion, so that the normal systems of faculty governance can be restored.

Richard Gaskins, Chair