

October 2017

The Law of Collegiality: Revisiting Niagara University v. NLRB

Rev. Carl L. Pieber

Follow this and additional works at: <http://scholarship.law.stjohns.edu/tcl>



Part of the [Education Law Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Rev. Carl L. Pieber (2017) "The Law of Collegiality: Revisiting Niagara University v. NLRB," *The Catholic Lawyer*: Vol. 33 : No. 2 , Article 5.

Available at: <http://scholarship.law.stjohns.edu/tcl/vol33/iss2/5>

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by the Journals at St. John's Law Scholarship Repository. It has been accepted for inclusion in The Catholic Lawyer by an authorized editor of St. John's Law Scholarship Repository. For more information, please contact cerjanm@stjohns.edu.

THE LAW OF COLLEGIALITY: REVISITING *NIAGARA UNIVERSITY v. NLRB*

REV. CARL L. PIEBER, C.M.*

Contrary to popular faculty opinion, courts facing academic disputes typically come to the defense of core academic values. Courts, however, by necessity invoke the vocabulary of legal principles. This paper explores a collegial faculty dispute and demonstrates the congruence between the legal and academic values which give rise to collegiality.

I. INTRODUCTION

Faculty members frequently state that courts faced with academic disputes do not champion academic values. Scholars usually perceive judicial decisions as intrusions on their profession. However, courts can and do serve to affirm academe.

This paper investigates the interplay between legal and academic values in a faculty labor dispute. The background of the case is provided and the values underlying the court's decision are examined. Academic values and activities are then identified, and the paper compares the court's values with those of academe and assesses their consistency.

Courts reach decisions based on various criteria which reflect legal values. The criterion in labor cases such as this is the existence of a "community of interest," measured chiefly by remuneration.

Academe, in contrast, expresses its values in such terms as knowledge or collegiality. This paper demonstrates the consistency between legal and academic values by exploring how the court reached a judicial conclusion which resonated with and reinforced the academic values implicit in the collegium.

* Doctoral Candidate, State University of New York at Buffalo; Assistant to the Academic Vice President, Niagara University, New York.

II. THE CASE

On July 21, 1977 the United States Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit granted a petition by Niagara University, a Roman Catholic institution founded by the Congregation of the Mission (the "Vincentians"), seeking review of a decision reached by the National Labor Relations Board ("NLRB").¹ The NLRB had certified a faculty bargaining unit that excluded the Vincentian religious faculty. The Board's rationale depended on three characteristics of the religious faculty: (1) the Vincentians originally founded the University and thus possessed an ownership interest in it; (2) the Vincentians professed a vow of poverty that colored their interest in salary; and (3) since the Vincentian faculty and administration used a common fund for their support the religious faculty effectively returned their income to the University. The University refused to bargain with this unit, insisting instead that the religious faculty be included with the lay faculty since the former were not part of the administration. The court held the exclusion arbitrary and inconsistent with previous NLRB decisions and clarification orders. The court, therefore, set aside the NLRB's decision that the University had violated the National Labor Relations Act by refusing to bargain with the lay faculty unit, and remanded the case to the NLRB for further review which resulted in the inclusion of the Vincentian faculty in the bargaining unit.

A. "Community of Interest and Remuneration"

In its initial certification of the bargaining unit that excluded Vincentian faculty, the NLRB considered its prior decision in *Seton Hill College*² to be controlling. In *Seton Hill*, the Board ruled that the nuns on the faculty of Seton Hill College could not be part of the faculty bargaining unit since they shared a community of interest with the religious order that ran the school. The Board found it dispositive that: the order held legal title to the grounds, buildings and college, whose charter required fifty percent of the members of the Board of Trustees to be from the religious order (ownership); members of the religious order professed a vow of poverty (salary interest); and the order, by contract, returned a substantial part of their nominal wages to the college (disposition of income).

At Niagara, as at Seton Hill, the Vincentian faculty and the University's administration were members of the same order and used a common fund for their livelihood. Therefore, the Vincentian faculty were excluded from the bargaining unit. However, this relationship with the

¹ *Niagara Univ. v. NLRB*, 558 F.2d 1116 (2d Cir. 1977).

² 201 N.L.R.B. 1026 (1973).

order did not preclude the Vincentian faculty from having a relationship with the lay faculty as well. The NLRB did not investigate the latter relationship for commonalities or differences. The importance of this omission is demonstrated later in the paper. The court examined the NLRB's decisions on remuneration within the context of the three bases upon which the Board had excluded Niagara's Vincentian faculty: ownership of the institution, salary interest, and disposition of income. The court then attempted to demonstrate a community of interest between the Vincentian and lay faculty.

1. Ownership

With regard to the ownership of Niagara University, the court found that the Corporate Charter granted by the State of New York stipulated that the Board of Trustees held all legal title and authority for the University, and that Vincentians could comprise no more than one third of the Board of Trustees. The court thus factually distinguished this case from *Seton Hill*, since the Vincentians did not own the University nor did they have control of the Board of Trustees, the body with which the bargaining unit would negotiate.

The court did find a similarity between the instant case and the NLRB decision involving D'Youville College.³ In *D'Youville*, the NLRB ruled that the bargaining unit should include the four religious nuns of the founding order because their only relationship to the institution was their function as faculty members. However, both sides of the dispute had agreed to this determination before the NLRB certification.

2. Salary

The vows by which the Vincentian faculty committed themselves to poverty, chastity and obedience posed three sub-issues in the analysis of salary. The NLRB did not address the vow of chastity, because the bargaining unit included single faculty; marital status provided no basis for distinction. The NLRB had also ruled that the vow of obedience pertained solely to religion, which had no identifiable effect on professional conduct, labor, or organization. The court agreed with the NLRB on both issues.

Because of the vow of poverty, however, the Board had held that salary increases were of no interest to the religious faculty, who contributed their salaries to the order that supported them. This alleged lack of interest in compensation would disassociate the Vincentian faculty from the community of interest of the non-Vincentian faculty. However, the court

³ See *Niagara*, 558 F.2d at 119 (citing *D'Youville College*, 225 N.L.R.B. 792 (1976)).

found this position inconsistent with a previous NLRB decision which indicated that the manner in which religious faculty spend their salary is irrelevant to the determination of a bargaining unit.⁴ The court therefore held that the vow of poverty did not destroy the community of interest for purposes of unit determination.

3. Disposition of Income

Finally, regarding disposition of income, the court noted that the order, whose "province" or headquarters is in Philadelphia, received the Vincentian faculty salaries. The province then used the money as it wished, giving some to the faculty for their living, some to the poor in Philadelphia, and returning some to Niagara University.

The NLRB had held that this contribution of monies to the University by the province was similar to the situation in *Seton Hill*, where the order returned a substantial part of its members' nominal wages to the College. The court disagreed, holding that *Niagara University* was distinguishable in that there was no contract between the University and the order, and concluding that the money given to Niagara must be considered a gift.

B. Community of Interest and Similarities

The court broadened its analysis by quoting from the NLRB's investigation of the community of interest, which demonstrated similarities and dissimilarities between the lay faculty and the Vincentians. The court pointed out that the simple fact that the lay faculty did not wish to

⁴ See *id.* at 1120. The court agreed with that prior NLRB decision:

The alleged pertinence of questions on how money is spent seems in part to rest on an unstated and unproven assumption that a desire for income is somehow related to the particular manner in which it is spent; i.e., on how much it is needed. The whole concept here is at best a morass with which this Board has no special expertise to deal. Furthermore, it is beside the point. To take an example, an independently wealthy lay professor would not be excluded from a unit simply because he or she did not "need" the income or had no interest in pay raise.

Id. (quoting *Niagara Univ. v. Niagara Univ. Lay Teachers Ass'n*, 227 N.L.R.B. 313, 314 n. 6 (1976)). The NLRB also stated:

In these circumstances we fail to see any significant difference at least with respect to unit placement - between Sister Minella [one of the three nuns teaching full-time at Niagara] and an unmarried lay professor who may choose to live an austere life in material terms and to contribute much of his earnings to, for example, charity or scientific research. Certainly, no serious contention would be entertained that such a professor could not properly belong in a lay faculty unit. In short, we do not believe that the way a person chooses to spend his or her money is a relevant consideration with respect to questions of unit placement.

Niagara Univ. v. Niagara Univ. Lay Teachers Ass'n, 227 N.L.R.B. 313, 314 (1976).

include the Vincentians faculty "should hardly be sufficient reason to exclude" the latter. Such an exclusion would deny the Vincentians a meaningful opportunity to exercise their collective bargaining rights.

The court found that lay and religious faculty had similar terms and conditions of employment in the University. They had a common wage scale and similar working conditions, which the court said indicated that the Vincentian faculty did have an interest in parity with their lay colleagues. The University's policies for probation, leave of absence, promotion, and academic freedom applied to all faculty equally. The two groups came in daily contact with each other and temporary interchange took place among them. Additionally, both lay and religious faculty were eligible for participation in the University's life insurance and retirement program.

On the other hand, unlike the lay faculty, the Vincentians did not have written contracts, were not eligible for tenure, and did not in fact participate in the retirement program. However, the NLRB, in a previous clarification proceeding, found these dissimilarities to be "hardly the whole or even an overwhelmingly large part of the employment situation, and they [dissimilarities] indicate little more than a diversity of immediate interests that would be found in any unit, such as one combining young and old employees."⁵

Thus, the court concluded that the Board's reasons for exclusion were arbitrary. Accordingly, the court set aside the NLRB's determination that Vincentian faculty should be excluded from the faculty bargaining unit.

The court's analysis of community of interest followed traditional concepts of remuneration and its correlates, and demonstrated that there was no community of interest between the Vincentian faculty and administration. However, the record did not demonstrate that the Vincentian faculty shared a community of interest with lay faculty, which would serve to counter the NLRB's ruling. Nevertheless, one can detect in the court's analysis an appeal to collegiality, an affirmative argument, as the cement binding the Vincentians to other faculty in a community of interest.

III. VALUES OF ACADEME

The *Niagara* court addressed faculty activities, noting that the Vincentian faculty and the lay faculty had the same or common working conditions, policies of promotion and academic freedom, daily contact and temporary interchange. It did not delineate these activities or analyze them, but affirmed them as the same for both faculties. Academe does

⁵ *Niagara Univ. v. Niagara Univ. Lay Teachers Ass'n*, 227 N.L.R.B. 313, 315 (1976).

delineate these activities and their analysis will demonstrate the values and collegiality which permeate and undergird the academic enterprise.

A. *The Values Exemplified by Faculty Activities*

Faculty activities are as numerous as the faculty members in each institution. A seemingly comprehensive list of 320 faculty activities⁶ lends itself to parsimonious categories which illustrate academe's primary value - knowledge. Knowledge, the understanding and expansion of truth and life, is the prime material of the academic trade.

An analysis of faculty activities shows that they craft knowledge in three ways. Three formal values, the identification, augmentation, and utilization of knowledge pervade faculty activities. Further analysis of these three values specifies two distinctive categories of activity for each value. These are operating values. Thus faculty activities verify, determine, acquire, create, declare and employ knowledge. See Table 1 in the appendix. When faculty, as a collectivity, craft knowledge, they reflect another formal value in academe, collegiality.

The doctoral degree signifies these values and activities because it is attained in the meritocracy of graduate education where faculty learn their craft.⁷ Achieved merit is the standard used for conferral of all academic degrees and recognition.⁸ Thus, inclusion in academe and the faculty activities mentioned by the court means that the person must either possess the doctorate or provide acceptable alternative evidence of all three formal values discussed below. Furthermore, the person must be a practitioner of his or her respective activities.

1. The Identification of Knowledge

In antiquity, scholars identified what was knowledge. Today, the identification of knowledge verifies its content and quality. Through their activities, faculty evaluate peer research and teaching for tenure and promotion, or admit applicants to doctoral programs and candidacy.

Other activities exemplify the identification of knowledge as determining it. Faculty acceptance of peer research identifies what knowledge is considered valid, or "known." Other activities include circumscribing

⁶ See J.L. BESS, *UNIVERSITY ORGANIZATION: A MATRIX ANALYSIS OF THE ACADEMIC PROFESSIONS* 263-82 (1982) (containing survey of faculty activity preferences).

⁷ See F. RUDOLPH, *THE AMERICAN COLLEGE AND UNIVERSITY* 395 (1962). Historically, this has been the perception of the degree. A doctorate is a source of academic respectability, identity, and a mark of competence in a specialization. The doctoral degree assures a certain standard of sameness of training, experience and exposure to the ideals, the rules, the habits of research and scientific scholarship. *Id.*

⁸ See L. LEWIS, *SCALING THE IVORY TOWER* (1975) (brief history and extensive analysis of "merit" and faculty).

the requirements for degrees and programs, and establishing goals and objectives for courses. See Table 2 in the appendix.

2. The Augmentation of Knowledge

The augmentation of knowledge initially involves acquisition. To acquire as an ability, habit or attitude is to learn, the activity of knowledge itself. Knowledge, attained with the doctorate, is not static and demands that more knowledge be acquired for its maintenance. Faculty members read disciplinary journals and attend conferences. They use sabbaticals to stay current in their field of specialization.

The augmentation of knowledge also involves creation. Historically, a person's interest guided the investigation and discovery of knowledge. Today, for many reasons, faculty focus on given topics and ignore others. Thus faculty create knowledge by their research interests, activities, and publications. Discussions or structured presentations to professional groups also create knowledge. See Table 3 in the appendix.

3. The Utilization of Knowledge

Finally, utilization of knowledge declares that knowledge. This declaration is defined by the concept of professor. The Latin origin of professor, *profiteri*, means "to declare publicly." To declare means to avow openly, to own, to acknowledge oneself as being.⁹ In academe, faculty openly profess the context of knowledge within a discipline signified by the degree. Faculty activities declare knowledge when they teach or profess themselves as part of a program or department.

The utilization of knowledge also employs that knowledge. In the past, knowledge was used to improve the quantity and quality of life. Now, faculty employ not only the content but the methodology of a discipline in multiple contexts. Faculty activities exemplify this value in extra-disciplinary domains. Membership on civic committees and boards, or within the university, on senates or executive task committees, allows the faculty member to use his knowledge in multiple ways. See Table 4 in the appendix.

Members of academe exemplify these values through their activities. The activities vary with the nature of the discipline, the level of the degree (e.g. a B.A. or Ph.D.), the diversity of control in each institution, the degree of institutionalization¹⁰, and the emphasis placed on these aca-

⁹ See Czikszenmihalyi, *Intrinsic Motivation and Effective Teaching: a Flow Analysis*, in *MOTIVATING PROFESSORS TO TEACH EFFECTIVELY* 12-37 (J. Bess, ed. 1982).

¹⁰ See P. SELZNICK, *LEADERSHIP IN ADMINISTRATION: A SOCIOLOGICAL INTERPRETATION* 17-22 (1957).

democratic values by the person and university.¹¹ Research indicates that faculty are most influenced by internal standards (values) of professional performance (activities).¹² Faculty perceive their identity and influence in the university community by the university's support of these values. Thus negative perceptions cause ambiguity in institutional role identity, a necessary factor in the *Niagara* court's determination to include Vincenzian faculty in the bargaining unit.

B. The Value of Academic Collegiality

Some faculty activities are performed by two or more faculty members, e.g., collaborative research or research with graduate students. Such activities exemplify another value of academe - collegiality. An analysis of such activities is necessary to an understanding of the reasoning behind a determination of who should be included in a faculty bargaining unit.¹³

Academic collegiality is any academic activity of the three formal values of knowledge performed by two or more faculty members. As a value, it is an encyclopedic genesis and justification for any and all academic activities performed by two or more faculty members. Knowledge, in turn, requires collegiality, for it can be validated, described, and disseminated only collegially.

Academic collegiality has its own authority, dependent on and exemplified in activities which demand mutuality and peership. The mutuality originates in respect for knowledge, the three formal values of knowledge, and faculty activities. The peership merited by an individual attaining a doctorate (or acceptable alternative evidence) requires the performance of academic activities (peership). Those who hold and those who sustain the three formal values share and directly affect the caliber of authority of academic collegiality.

Academic collegiality is neither an individual value nor an authority, but rather is a peer group value with derived authority. Faculty can individually advocate this value, but can define it and demonstrate its authority only within the peer group who respect and possess the three formal values and perform their academic activities.

In summary, the formal values of identification, augmentation, and utilization of knowledge in activities of two or more faculty members imply academic collegiality: knowledge's peer group value, activity and authority. Table 5 in the appendix demonstrates this scheme.

¹¹ See M. FINKELSTEIN, *THE AMERICAN ACADEMIC PROFESSION* 87-142. (1984) (analyzing numerous studies which support the relations of these conditions to activities).

¹² *Id.* at 148-49.

¹³ See Hobbs, *Legal Challenges to Faculty Employment in the United States*, in *THE PROFESSORIAL - OCCUPATION IN CRISIS*, 105-12 (1985) (reviewing cases which mention collegiality as a criterion for renewal and tenure).

By this analysis, we see that academe's word for what the law calls "community of interest" is collegiality. As the shell and heart of academe, collegiality incorporates the values and activities of academe. As a communal construct, collegiality identifies the mutuality and peership founded on the formal and operating values and on the authority which influence and compose a faculty.

In conclusion, knowledge defines academe by its formal values: identification, augmentation, utilization and collegiality. Singularly, these values are definable and observable in operating values, which specify activities. These formal values constitute a counter analysis to the NLRB's decision. When operating in concert, these values are best expressed in the single value of academic collegiality. Table 6 in the appendix illustrates this process.

IV. COMPARISON OF COURT AND ACADEME

Since remuneration is not one of the implied academic values, it is a secondary value in academe. Certainly, faculty, including Vincentian faculty, enter academe with the understanding of receiving remuneration for their activities. Remuneration is a concept which academics use to encourage students to enter the field of study as a livelihood. But the purpose of academic activities is to exemplify the values of knowledge, not to seek remuneration. The theory that remuneration is an insurance in academe, is perhaps unrealized by society, institutions and faculty. The insurance should first promote and reward the performance of activities which exemplify values, and consequently, negate the needs of a livelihood.

Second, the attempt to remunerate every academic activity denies the complexity of exemplifying values. Academic values necessarily designate multiple responsibilities and activities (e.g., recommendations for tenure or service on university committees) which can neither be available to every faculty member nor be fully remunerated by an institution.¹⁴

Remuneration, in *Niagara*, was investigated through the aspects of ownership, salary interest, and disposition of income because of the relationship of some faculty to the religious order. This relationship, outside

¹⁴ In labor law, the basis on which workers are remunerated is one consideration in defining the appropriate bargaining unit. A second consideration is the statutory distinction between supervisory personnel and those who are supervised. A third consideration, similar to the second and crafted by the court, is "managerial confidential" which excludes these personnel from the unit.

The focus of attention in *Niagara Univ.* is the role of remuneration in the community of interest on which determination of the bargaining unit will be decided. Other considerations may arise which are not at play in the instant case, namely, the statutory distinction between supervisor and supervised.

of academe, could affect institutional policy-making. The court clarified this faculty concern when it determined that a group can give the institution money - even under a contractual obligation - and yet not have effective policy control or establish a community of interest between the group and the institution. The court delineated how an academic or group of academics, through membership on the board of trustees and ownership of the institution, can have interests conflicting with the rest of the faculty. These two relations are administrative and not financial. These distinctions enable academe to evaluate faculty's external relations with an institution and allow faculty and administration to delineate practically their respective roles in an institution, including the role of financial support.

Most important, the three values of academe which originate in knowledge are implicit in the considerations of the court. These three values are not as observable to the court as they are to the academics who exemplify them in their activities. The values of the court, in distinction to those of academe, serve a client that does not have to meet certain standards or demonstrate certain legal competencies. Academe, on the other hand, selects qualified clients to meet predetermined standards and perform the activities associated with the three values of knowledge.

The value of identification of knowledge, manifested by the activities of verifying knowledge, is perhaps the value most practiced and most integrated in members of academe. Faculty may perceive judicial decisions as threatening this value. But courts usually do not enter into faculty decisions concerning the knowledge of peers and students.¹⁵ Moreover, this value is not applicable to many matters that confront faculty, such as remuneration. Together, academe and the courts can work to lessen the tension between them by defining those matters which the courts can address without trampling upon faculty values.

Notably, the *Niagara* court's decision resonated with the values of academe - the identification, augmentation, and utilization of knowledge. The court's investigation for similarities lead it to academe's individual or collegial activities. The court recognized the inconsistencies in the NLRB's decisions and decided against the use of a traditional labor criteria to construct an analysis for inclusion of faculty. Instead, the court used common working conditions, policies, and implied peer interactions of the faculty to define the legal community of interest. Likewise, academe includes only those who perform the activities exemplifying its values. Because the similarities addressed by the *Niagara* court constitute

¹⁵ See *Regents of the Univ. of Michigan v. Ewing*, 474 U.S. 214 (1985); *Board of Curators of the Univ. of Missouri v. Horowitz*, 435 U.S. 78 (1975); P. SELDIN, *CHANGING PRACTICES IN FACULTY EVALUATION* (1984); Seldin, *Court Challenges to Tenure, Promotion, and Retention Decisions*, in *IDEA PAPER* No. 12 (Sept. 1984).

academic activities, the court implicitly affirmed the existence of academe's values and their primacy for an analysis that defines a faculty bargaining unit.

Significantly, the court compared the similarities between one group of faculty (Vincentian) and another (lay), not the similarities between individuals. Their common interests were similar terms and conditions of employment. A determination of group identity or inclusion in academe demands an understanding of collegiality. Collegiality necessarily identifies and contains the formal and operational values and authority of all faculty. The court's discovery of the similarity of the groups reinforces the major implication that the value of collegiality is the source or criterion for inclusion in academe. The Vincentian and lay faculty are a community of interest because they both live out the same values of academe and knowledge.

In this case, the court reinforced the inclusion of faculty based on academe's values. The court's opinion clarified the distinction between legal and academic interests. The remuneration-value analysis enables academe to clarify roles and eliminate conflicting non-academic interests. The similarities determination for community of interest implicitly affirmed academe's traditional and collegial values, authority and activities. In *Niagara University v. NLRB*, the court acted to further academe and its role in the university.

APPENDIX

TABLE 1

PRIMARY VALUE	FORMAL VALUES	CATEGORIES OF ACTIVITIES (OPERATIONAL VALUES)
KNOWLEDGE	IDENTIFICATION OF KNOWLEDGE	VERIFY KNOWLEDGE
		DETERMINE KNOWLEDGE
	AUGMENTATION OF KNOWLEDGE	ACQUIRE KNOWLEDGE
		CREATE KNOWLEDGE
	UTILIZATION OF KNOWLEDGE	DECLARE KNOWLEDGE
		EMPLOY KNOWLEDGE

TABLE 2

VALUES	CATEGORY OF ACTIVITY	ACTIVITIES OF FACULTY
K N O W L E D G E	Verify Knowledge	Evaluate knowledge/research/teaching of peers for tenure or promotion in rank Admit into program/candidacy Confirm satisfaction of degree requirements Grade knowledge/research of students Establish/evaluate disciplinary/department/program/course knowledge content Establish admission requirements
	Determine Knowledge	Establish goals/objectives in courses/program Recruit new faculty Assess departmental/peer research Circumscribe degree/program requirements Advise students (curriculum, dissertation)

TABLE 3

	VALUES	CATEGORY OF ACTIVITY	ACTIVITIES OF FACULTY
K N O W L E D G E	Augmentation Of Knowledge	Acquire Knowledge	Read publications of discipline Attend disciplinary conferences/lectures Execute sabbatical for disciplinary currency Use peer research/expertise/opinion Modify/update courses/program/curriculum
		Create Knowledge	Focus research interests Perform research/methodology activities Publish research (editing, rewriting, etc.) Discuss research with peers/students Present in-person at professional conference Develop/create courses/curriculum/programs or departments

TABLE 4

	VALUES	CATEGORY OF ACTIVITY	ACTIVITIES OF FACULTY
K N O W L E D G E	Utilization Of Knowledge	Declare Knowledge	Instruct students in a curricular structure Train students in discipline and method Discuss discipline with peers/students Decide curriculum delivery (person/time/etc.) Determine/recommend department chairperson Meet as department/program for procedures/etc. Organize/participate in conferences, colloquia seminars, etc.
		Employ Knowledge	Perform civic roles of lecture/committee/board Make recommendations to University Consultant for those outside of the discipline Serve on University senate/committees/etc. Participate in extra-disciplinary seminars Represent department to various publics

TABLE 5

	V A L U E S		CATEGORIES OF ACTIVITIES
KNOWLEDGE	IDENTIFICATION OF KNOWLEDGE	ACADEMIC COLLEGIALITY	VERIFY KNOWLEDGE
	AUGMENTATION OF KNOWLEDGE	PEER GROUP VALUE ACTIVITY AND AUTHORITY	DETERMINE KNOWLEDGE
			ACQUIRE KNOWLEDGE
			CREATE KNOWLEDGE
	UTILIZATION OF KNOWLEDGE		DECLARE KNOWLEDGE
			EMPLOY KNOWLEDGE

TABLE 6

VALUES	CATEGORY OF ACTIVITY	ACTIVITIES OF FACULTY	
Identification Of Knowledge	Verify	Evaluate knowledge /research /teaching of peer for tenure or promotion in rank	
		P Admit into program /Ph.D. candiacy	
	E Knowledge	Confirm satisfaction of degree requirements	
		E Grade knowledge /research of students	
	R	Evaluate disciplinary / department / program /course /knowledge content	
		E Establish admission requirements	
	K	G	
		R Advise students (curriculum, dissertation)	
		O Determine	Establish course/program goals/objectives
		A U Recruit new faculty	
C P Knowledge		Assess departmental / peer research	
N	A Circumscribe degree / program requirements		
	D V		
	E A Modify / update courses/ program/ curriculum		
O	M L Acquire	Read publications of discipline	
	I U Attend disciplinary conferences, lectures		
W	C E Knowledge	Execute disciplinary / currency sabbatical	
	A Use peer research / expertise / opinion		
L Augmentation Of	C A		
	O C Focus research interests		
E Knowledge	L T	Perform research/methodology activites	
	L I Create	Publish research (editing, rewriting, etc.)	
D	E V	Discuss research with peers/students	
	G I Knowledge	Present at professional conference	
G	I T	Develop / create courses / curriculum / programs / departments	
	A Y		
Utilization Of Knowledge	L		
	I A Teach students in curricular structure		
	T N Train students in discipline and method		
	Y D Declare	Discuss discipline with peers/students	
		Decide curriculum delivery	
	A Knowledge	Determine/recommend department chairperson	
		Meet as department/program for procedures	
	T	Organize/participate in conferences, colloquia, seminars, etc.	
		H	
	I	O	
R Perform civic roles: lecture/committee/board			
I Employ		Make recommendations to University	
T Consultant for those outside of discipline			
Y Knowledge		Serve on University senate/committees/etc.	
	Participate in extra-disciplinary seminars		
		Represent department to various publics	

