

INFORMATION TO USERS

This material was produced from a microfilm copy of the original document. While the most advanced technological means to photograph and reproduce this document have been used, the quality is heavily dependent upon the quality of the original submitted.

The following explanation of techniques is provided to help you understand markings or patterns which may appear on this reproduction.

- 1. The sign or "target" for pages apparently lacking from the document photographed is "Missing Page(s)". If it was possible to obtain the missing page(s) or section, they are spliced into the film along with adjacent pages. This may have necessitated cutting thru an image and duplicating adjacent pages to insure you complete continuity.**
- 2. When an image on the film is obliterated with a large round black mark, it is an indication that the photographer suspected that the copy may have moved during exposure and thus cause a blurred image. You will find a good image of the page in the adjacent frame.**
- 3. When a map, drawing or chart, etc., was part of the material being photographed the photographer followed a definite method in "sectioning" the material. It is customary to begin photoing at the upper left hand corner of a large sheet and to continue photoing from left to right in equal sections with a small overlap. If necessary, sectioning is continued again — beginning below the first row and continuing on until complete.**
- 4. The majority of users indicate that the textual content is of greatest value, however, a somewhat higher quality reproduction could be made from "photographs" if essential to the understanding of the dissertation. Silver prints of "photographs" may be ordered at additional charge by writing the Order Department, giving the catalog number, title, author and specific pages you wish reproduced.**
- 5. PLEASE NOTE: Some pages may have indistinct print. Filmed as received.**

University Microfilms International

300 North Zeeb Road

Ann Arbor, Michigan 48106 USA

St. John's Road, Tyler's Green

High Wycombe, Bucks, England HP10 8HR

7824311

WELBORNE, SULLIVAN ANTHONY, JR.
A STUDY OF THE STRUCTURE AND FUNCTIONS OF
CAMPUS UNIONS IN FOUR-YEAR PUBLIC AND PRIVATE
INSTITUTIONS IN NORTH CAROLINA.

THE UNIVERSITY OF NORTH CAROLINA AT
GREENSBORO, ED.D., 1978

University
Microfilms
International

300 N. ZEEB ROAD, ANN ARBOR, MI 48106

A STUDY OF THE STRUCTURE AND FUNCTIONS OF CAMPUS UNIONS
IN FOUR-YEAR PUBLIC AND PRIVATE INSTITUTIONS
IN NORTH CAROLINA

by

Sullivan A. Welborne, Jr.

A Dissertation Submitted to
the Faculty of the Graduate School at
The University of North Carolina at Greensboro
in Partial Fulfillment
of the Requirements for the Degree
Doctor of Education

Greensboro
1978

Approved by



Dissertation Adviser

APPROVAL PAGE

This dissertation has been approved by the following committee of the Faculty of the Graduate School at the University of North Carolina at Greensboro.

Dissertation
Adviser

Robert Noh

Committee Members

Marian Franklin
Fritz Menzies
Walter L. Durbaker
J. L. Berry

3-16-78
Date of Acceptance by Committee

3-16-78
Date of Final Oral Examination

WELBORNE, SULLIVAN A., JR. A Study of the Structure and Functions of Campus Unions in Four-Year Public and Private Institutions in North Carolina. (1978) Directed by: Dr. Roland Nelson, Jr. Pp. 128

The study of campus unions was an expository study, the purpose of which was to determine what North Carolina campus unions were doing in terms of the use of facilities, the programs and services, and roles undertaken by the union directors. Because of the somewhat unique racial composition of the North Carolina state system of colleges and universities and of the private institutions of higher learning, attention was given to the similarities and differences which may have existed in the campus unions because of or in spite of the dominant or minority race.

A forty item questionnaire was constructed. Items were selected which asked the campus union directors of four-year public/private colleges/universities in North Carolina to give information about the budget, facilities, program and services, administration and organizations of their unions. Further, the directors were asked to speculate about their roles and state their problems. On-site visits were made to confirm the questionnaire data.

Three sets of techniques were employed in order to get the desired information as effectively as possible: (1) the report of specific data about the individual institution with specific information about the campus union at that institution; (2) the director's opinions and/or judgments

about programs, services and roles of the campus union and its relationship to the institution in which it resided; and (3) the directors' opinions and/or judgments about what ought to have been done in their campus unions and in campus unions in general.

Traditional statistical analysis was inappropriate as the information collected was, in most cases, the campus union director's observation or opinion. Thus, the results of the questionnaire were treated narratively rather than statistically. To illuminate comparative differences and similarities among the categories, tables were constructed and summations were made.

The size of the campus union budgets were categorically smaller for public and private predominantly black campus unions when compared to public and private predominantly white campus unions.

The directors of campus unions in North Carolina colleges and universities included on the questionnaire were 69% male. Over 73% of the campus union directors had master's degrees with none having a doctorate. The campus union directors of public and private predominantly white colleges and universities had a higher percentage of master's degrees (80%) than the campus union directors of public and private predominantly black colleges and universities (54%).

All campus union directors questioned indicated that students should have the most influence on campus union programming, followed by the union director and union staff.

The campus union directors questioned reported that overall 62% (26 of 42) of the campus unions had policy or advisory boards. Only 55% of the public and private predominantly black campus unions had advisory or policy boards. The structure of those boards varied in size and composition.

The directors indicated that 73% (8 of 11) of the public--predominantly white campus unions and 55% (11 of 20) of the private--predominantly white campus unions had minority organization affiliation with the campus union. No minority organizations were reported by public and private predominantly black campus union directors.

The study showed that the size of the institution of which the campus union was a part was the most influential factor in determining the type of union staff, kinds of activities and services provided, size of the budget and total operation of the campus union facility.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The writer wishes to express his sincere appreciation to the number of people who have contributed in many ways to this study.

Appreciation is extended to Dr. Roland Nelson, Jr., for his assistance in the formulation of the problem and the directing of the candidate's doctoral study. Also, to Dr. R. Fritz Mengert many thanks goes for his chapter-by-chapter guidance in the refinement of the dissertation. Appreciation is given to Doctors Dale Brubaker, Joseph Himes, and Marian Franklin for their constructive evaluations and recommendations.

My heartfelt thanks goes to my wife, Gloria, for the love and encouragement that is so necessary if one is to succeed. And, to my mother, who instilled in me the characteristic to always try just a little harder and never give up.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
APPROVAL PAGE	ii
ACKNOWLEDGMENTS	iii
LIST OF TABLES.	v
CHAPTER	
I. INTRODUCTION	1
Statement of the Problem	1
Background of the Study.	1
Methodology	5
The Significance of the Study.	8
Definitions of Terms	10
Limitations of the Study	12
II. REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE	13
Evolution of the College Union	14
Debate Stage (1815-1894)	14
Club Stage (1895-1918)	17
The Campus Democracy Stage (1919-1929)	20
Community Recreation Stage (1930-1946)	22
The Campus Union, 1950-1977.	25
Campus Union Literature--North Carolina.	35
III. DATA AND ANALYSIS.	37
Participants in Profile #1	54
Profile #1 Public--Predominantly Black (5).	55
Participants in Profile #2	61
Profile #2 Private--Predominantly Black (6)	62
Participants in Profile #3	68
Profile #3 Public--Predominantly White-- Small (8).	70
Participants in Profile #4	76
Profile #4 Public--Predominantly White-- Large (3).	77
Participants in Profile #5	83
Profile #5 Private--Predominantly White-- (20)	86

TABLE OF CONTENTS (continued)

	Page
CHAPTER	
IV. SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS . .	93
Summary of the Study	93
Summary of Findings and Conclusions from the Questionnaire	95
General Recommendations	98
Recommendations for Further Study	99
BIBLIOGRAPHY	100
APPENDIX A	108
APPENDIX B	110
APPENDIX C	121
APPENDIX D	125

LIST OF TABLES

	Page
Table	
1 Relationship of Campus Union Directors to Their Academic Communities	40
2 Campus Union Directors' Perception of Students' Relationships with the Academic Community. . .	41
3 Frequency of Occurrence of Minority Organizations	42
4 Administration of Campus Unions.	43
5 Structure of Advisory or Policy Board.	45
6 Campus Union Constituent Group Influence on Activities and Services.	46
7 Directors' Perception of the Composition of an Ideal Policy or Advisory Board	47
8 Services Available in Campus Union Facilities. .	48
9 Activities Available in Campus Union Facilities.	49
10 Reaction to Questions Regarding Role Statements.	50
11 Priority Listing of Problem Areas Perceived by Directors of the Campus Union Facilities. . . .	52

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Statement of the Problem

The purpose of this study was to determine the degree or extent to which campus unions in North Carolina are structured and functioning according to the principles outlined by the Association of College Unions-International. The study was carried out through research of the literature, selected interviews with campus union directors in North Carolina, and through the administration of a questionnaire to campus union directors in four-year public and private institutions in North Carolina.

Background of the Study

One of the principal studies used as background for this paper was an analytic investigation of the purposes of campus unions by Porter Butts in 1955 (1971). This investigation led to the development of the College Union Role Statement eventually adopted by the Association of College Unions (ACU) in 1956 and reaffirmed in 1964. The following are the objectives which were adopted:

1. The Union is the community center of the college, for all the members of the college family--students, faculty, administration, alumni and guests. It is not just a building: it is also an organization and a program. Together they represent a well considered plan for the community life of the college.

2. As the living room or hearthstone of the college, the union provides for the services, conveniences and amenities the members of the college family need in their daily life on the campus and for getting to know and understand one another through informal association outside the classroom.

3. The union is a part of the educational program of the college. As the center of college community life, it serves as a laboratory of citizenship, training students in social responsibility and for leadership in our democracy. Through its various boards, committees and staff, it provides a cultural, social, and recreational program aiming to make free time activity a cooperative factor with study in education. In all its processes it encourages self-directed activity, giving maximum opportunity for self-realization and for growth in individual social competency and group effectiveness. Its goal was the development of persons as well as intellects.

4. The union serves as a unifying force in the life of the college, cultivating enduring regard for and loyalty to the college. (pp. 87-88)

The college union directors faced some new circumstances. The days of unlimited expansion in higher education appeared to be over. Available financial resources had leveled off and in some cases declined. For example, some state legislatures questioned the use of funds for duplication of programs, new facilities, research and curriculum revisions. University administrators were asked to justify, in detail, the needs of the university. Declines in enrollments had resulted in loss of revenue and consequently, losses in public matching funds. This situation had added to the problems of the central university administrators. For the college union director, this loss of funds had magnified budgetary problems. The decrease in

revenues and inflated costs have resulted in decreased programs and services (Bell, 1965).

The pressures on college union directors were coming from many sources. Students were increasingly concerned about student governance and about how their tuition and fees were being spent (Messick, 1970). The legacy of the sixties is the presence of students committed to student control over student concerns. Fiscal affairs officers were requiring directors to submit justifications for programs and services through cost analysis and revenue producing receipts. Deans of student life were continually assessing the effect of union programs on student behavior. Parents and faculty were concerned about the overall atmosphere generated within the union facility. The writer recognized these concerns during the early seventies and attempted to analyze written materials for the primary purpose of identifying concepts, structures and functions that together should form the framework of the college union and found limited writings available on the union organization. (These materials have been confined to the annual Proceedings of the Association of College Unions-International, a few books and some pamphlets and bulletins. Very little research information was available on the union organization and none was based on college unions in North Carolina.)

Preliminary information for this study was the result of the writer's experiences with North Carolina institutions.

It was used in defining and interpreting policies governing organizational structure, programs and services of college unions. Some degree of uniformity existed among the constituent institutions, but each institution also seemed to be distinct from the other in many ways. For example, some college union directors were faculty members with academic tenure and others were staff persons on a 40-hour work week schedule. Some had joint appointments, such as union director--veterans affairs director, union director--placement director, student activities director--union director; others were assigned to academic departments with direct teaching responsibilities. To further illustrate this point, as it pertained to the organizational hierarchy of these institutions, college unions were listed under several divisions including academic affairs, fiscal affairs, student affairs and auxiliary services. In some cases, college union directors were not listed under any separate division but reported directly to the Chancellor or President of the college or university (Jenkins & McQueen, 1973).

Although the college union organization may have often appeared to be loosely structured, in fact, they had an internal structure and were part of an even larger university organization. All elements of the university community, including faculty, staff and students, had access to the unions. Yet, the unions often did not appear to promote cohesiveness among these groups that the word "union" seemed

to imply. It could have suggested that many faculty, students and staff believed that campus unions were just for students and for that reason many universities called these facilities student unions or student centers (Butts, 1973).

However, according to the Association of College Unions-International (Bulletin, December 1975), the college union was a place that should serve the needs of the entire campus community. This article also indicated that campus unions should perform the combined educational and service function through various forms of programs and conferences. Campus unions, generally being large facilities, projected their images as part of yet apart from their campuses because of lack of clarity in objectives and purposes. It has been implied by Butts (1971) that many campus unions are associated with student services and not with academic programs, and as a result, university administrators did not consider union operations as a top priority on the college campus.

In an effort to determine the validity of this writer's assumptions concerning campus unions, a questionnaire was developed and distributed to public and private four-year institutions in North Carolina.

Methodology

To collect information on which to base this study, a questionnaire was developed to obtain certain facts and opinions about campus unions and was mailed to campus union

directors in all four-year, public and private institutions in the state of North Carolina. (See Appendix B.)

A cover letter was enclosed (see Appendix A) which asked the campus union director to respond to the questions. The questionnaire was constructed in three parts: Part I--The background information of the campus union directors and the institution in which they functioned; Part II--A profile of the campus union and its parent institution; Part III--The leadership of the campus union as perceived by the campus union director.

Three sets of techniques were employed in order to obtain the desired information as effectively as possible: (1) the report of specific data about the individual institution with specific information about the campus union at that institution; (2) the director's opinions and/or judgments about programs, services and roles of the campus union and its relationship to the institution in which it resided; and (3) the directors' opinions and/or judgments about what ought to have been done in their campus union and in campus unions in general.

Forty-five copies of the questionnaire were mailed to campus union directors of public and private institutions in North Carolina. After the initial mailing, 28 copies were returned. Follow-up telephone requests and subsequent mailings to those campus unions that had not returned their questionnaires produced an additional 16. As a final result, 44 of the original

mailing of 45 questionnaires were completed and returned. In two cases it was indicated that universities which had no separate facility or program which could be referred to as a campus union did not qualify for the study. The final sample then included 42 of 43 or 97.6% of campus union directors who were originally contacted. Sixteen of the respondents were part of the public North Carolina state university system and 26 were from private colleges or universities.

In order to test responses to the questionnaire, a random sampling of participating campus union directors was selected for personal interviews. Twenty-three percent of the total respondents were interviewed during on-site visits. The interviewer reviewed the questions and invited deletions, modifications and elaborations.

All of the information collected from the questionnaire was compiled categorically into profiles (Whipple, 1977). (See Chapter III--Data and Analysis.) Comparative analysis was conducted within pre-established categories and further comparisons were made among the categories themselves.

Traditional statistical analysis was inappropriate as the information collected was, in most cases, the campus union director's observation or opinion. Thus, the results of the questionnaire were treated narratively rather than statistically. To illuminate comparative differences and similarities among the categories, tables were constructed and summations were made.

The Significance of the Study

This study represented an attempt to analyze campus unions in North Carolina, both structurally and functionally. In the face of increasing costs and diminishing resources, top level administrators, boards of control, and state legislators were especially concerned with spending of monies for non-academic services (Berry, 1974). Students questioned the indiscriminate use of student fees that were limited in quantity (Messick, 1970). Traditionally, academic spending had received top priority in spending, but serious efforts had been made to support ancillary services for the campus community. With inflationary costs it was obvious that service spending was jeopardized in order to protect the academic function of the institutions (Berry, 1974).

There was a possibility that decision makers may have considered campus unions' programs as peripheral to the central mission of the institution and, therefore, reducible. When the program of the campus union did not demonstrate its role as central to the educational process, it may have been financially supported only to the extent of the most pragmatic service it provided or limited to those programs that were self-supporting. However, since most unions were not self-supporting (Berry, 1975), an economic catastrophe might be predicted, since as Butts (1971) implied, the term "self-supporting" was often confused and in fact it could have been easily misinterpreted. Since research

was limited in the campus union field, it was essential that a body of literature be generated which would speak to the clarification of the roles of campus unions. Any work that could add to a body of knowledge had significance to that field of study and could have helped avoid the confusion that had grown up around such issues as the service function and its relationship to an educational function. In fact, there was a controversy that had developed because of the United States Office of Education suggesting that the campus union should be thought of as only a convenience or service facility in the "Auxiliary Services Role" (U. S. Office of Education, "Biennial Survey of Education 1957-58," 1961). Left unchallenged, that view could spell the demise of campus unions because serious questions of priority would be stimulated from such a viewpoint. The Associations of College Unions-International had insisted that Auxiliary Services was but a minor role of the campus union and that the major function was, indeed, educational (Berry, 1975; Butts, 1971).

Though not a major focus of the study, the data collected could have provided college administrators and union directors with a better understanding of semblances and variations between public and private campus unions and between predominantly black and predominantly white campus unions in the state of North Carolina. Thus, this study would supplement the present literature on campus unions.

Definitions of Terms

ACU--The Association of College Unions prior to 1965. The national organization for college unions.

ACUI--The Association of College Unions-International after 1965. The national organization for college unions.

Board of Governors--a group of individuals (32) elected by the legislature of the state of North Carolina to plan and develop a coordinated system of higher education for the 16 constituent institutions.

Board of Trustees (Public)--a group of 12 appointed individuals (8 by the Board of Governors, 4 by the Governor) for each of the 16 constituent institutions in North Carolina to serve as an advisor to the Board of Governors and the Chancellor on matters concerning management and development of their respective institutions.

Board of Trustees (Private)--a group of individuals (no set number) selected by the private institution to assist the President with the development of policies and guidelines that encompass all phases of the educational program.

Campus Union--a term interchangeable with student unions, university unions, college unions, university center and student center: that facility designed as one of the above that provides extracurricular and co-curricular activity for a college or university.

Campus Union Associate or Assistant Director--the individual who shares the administration of the educational programs and the building with the campus union director.

Campus Union Director--the individual in charge of the total educational program and activities of the campus union facility and its personnel.

Campus Union Policy, Advisory or Governing Board--a group of individuals who assist the campus union director in planning and revising the policies that govern the operations and functions of the campus union facility.

Campus Union Program Board--a group of individuals (faculty, students or union staff) who plan, in cooperation with the campus union program director, those programs and activities that are sponsored within the campus union.

Campus Union Program Director--the individual generally responsible for the administration of the program department of a campus union and the advising of program groups.

Campus Union Programs--the events or activities planned and administered by the students and members of a campus union program board and/or by supporting union staff.

COMP--The Committee on Minority Programs--a standing committee of the Association of College Unions-International.

Campus Union staff--all individuals who are a part of the organizational structure of the campus union facility.

ERIC--Educational Resources Information Center--an organization that provides bibliographic references on specific topics for research and study.

Governance--the process by which policy is formulated and controlled by the campus union organization.

Minority organization--an organization for students who are not socially, racially or ethnically related to the dominant population of the college or university campus.

Revenue bond--a bond authorized by the Board of Governors for borrowing monies by state institutions for state student activities facilities. These bonds are repaid by the institutional facilities for which the bonds were purchased.

Limitations of the Study

It was found that there was very little information about campus unions in the literature outside of published information by the Association of College Unions-International. An ERIC search produced a variety of sources in which campus unions were mentioned, but only a few references where they were the sole subject matter being considered. This limited bibliography resulted in an uncomfortably small amount for reference and comparison.

A further difficulty produced by the nature of the survey technique itself was the absence of significant data concerning campus unions in North Carolina for comparison purposes.

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

The purpose of this chapter is to cite literature in the campus union field. The association of College Unions-International has published two annotated bibliographies (Bryson, 1974; Christensen, 1967), citing literature and related information in all areas of the campus union field. These publications were extremely helpful in completing the review.

During the search of the literature on campus unions (aided by an ERIC Search) it became apparent that almost all of the literature came from individuals directly involved in union activities or individuals who, at the request of ACUI, gave keynote addresses or presentations at the regional and national level conferences. ACUI published or republished, whole or in part, almost all literature significant to the campus union field.

Major academic works thought to be necessary tools for use by university administrators made little or no mention of college unions. However, some of the information related to student personnel administration discussed the union director as a member of the student personnel staff. ACUI represented the only agency this writer found that included in its "body of knowledge" a discussion of the role of the campus union.

Evolution of the College Union

According to the early notes of the ACU, the roots of any institution are dependent upon those people who shaped its emergence through history. The roots of the campus union have been enriched by various individuals who devoutly believed in the mission of the campus union. These designers firmly believed that the learning which took place in the campus union program was as important to society as the learning which took place in the classroom. It had been adherence to that ideal throughout union history that had earned the campus union its place in higher education.

Edith Ouzt Humphreys, one of the leading authorities in the college union field, wrote extensively about the historical development of the college union in England and the United States in the early 1940's. Mrs. Humphreys (1946) categorized the union movement into four distinct stages of development:

- (a) The Debate Stage (1815-1894)
- (b) The Club Stage (1895-1918)
- (c) The Campus Democracy Stage (1919-1929)
- (d) The Community Recreation Stage (1930-1946)

Each Humphreys stage will be discussed.

Debate Stage (1815-1894)

The earliest college unions date back to 1815 and were student debating societies in British universities (Berry, 1966a; Butts, 1967a, 1971; Proceedings, 1948, 1975). The first

union was founded at Cambridge University and was a union of three debating societies. Porter Butts (1971), author of many articles and publications that discussed unions, stated that August Hare, Purcurser of the Oxford Union, founded in 1823 a debate society for the University of Oxford. Students, during this period, sought a university-wide society and campus unity through open discussions. The substance of these discussions became the topics for debate. However, Cambridge University authorities believed that debating interfered with studying and thus withdrew all facilities for that purpose (Butts, 1967a). Deprived of university facilities, the new union supporters worked to obtain their own debating hall and in 1857 the Oxford Union was built.

British unions were more than debate centers for self-expression at Oxford and Cambridge. Gradually paintings, reference libraries, dining rooms, meeting rooms, lounges, billiard rooms, and offices were added to the facility. The Prince of Wales donated monies for books, Dante Rossetti painted frescoes and Robert Browning donated a set of his poems and plays. The participation in union debates by these distinguished individuals brought tradition and culture to the union. Thus, unions became known as centers of fellowship and good taste.

The unions became in fact, according to Butts (1967a), symbolic of the two-fold British educational goals: "to promote the art of living and especially of living together--

of civilized behavior, as well as knowledge. Further, to infuse students with the idea that they had a responsibility for the welfare of their country" (p. 3). Butts suggested that students who became identified with British unions were often university defenders and advocates of change through discussion, not by revolution. Through the years British unions, especially those at Oxford and Cambridge, have continued with an emphasis on debate of political and social issues and were recognized as providing a laboratory of training for officials in public life.

Campus unions in the United States. American colleges at the turn of the century saw in the British unions some things they felt were needed in American higher education. American educators recognized that college unions had the potential to facilitate leadership development of individuals and in the process develop student loyalty to their country. That recognition may have been the beginning of the American college union movement (Coffin, 1960).

The first college union in the United States was founded at Harvard University in 1830. It began as a student debate society fashioned in its objectives after the original Oxford union. Early in its history, the Harvard Union developed social features that paralleled the shift in the objectives of the Oxford Union. The importance of the debate function became secondary to the emphasis placed on the need for social interaction among the members. Butts (1971) stated,

in his analysis of this metamorphosis that the need for social interaction caused the unions to replace the debating concept with a more social concept. It was in the atmosphere of complete socialization that early unions developed a framework for survival during the latter 1800's.

Club Stage (1895-1918)

The rise of the college union movement in the United States occurred during this period. The first union building (Houston Hall) to be planned and administered by a university in this country was built in 1896 by the University of Pennsylvania. The Pennsylvania union concept was not that of a debate club, but rather that of a university social center for all students (Butts, 1967a). G. Ray Higgins, Director of the University of Minnesota Union (Proceedings, 1948), indicated that the University of Pennsylvania union concept was the forerunner of a number of present college unions in administration and purpose. Its primary objective was to serve the entire campus population as opposed to the purpose of the Harvard Union, which geared its programs toward one group of individuals whose primary interest was debate.

Chet A. Berry (Executive Secretary of ACUI, 1960) commented further on the development of the campus union at the University of Pennsylvania and its contribution to a new concept of college unions.

Up to this point college unions were independent of their institutions, but in 1896 the University of Pennsylvania, inspired largely by its campus Y.M.C.A.,

erected Houston Hall and administered its operation as an integral part of the institution. . . . Student self-government was established to set operating policies through the House Committee and . . . except for its restriction to male membership, Houston Hall was well on its way towards the modern concept of a college union. (Berry, p. 2)

With the exception of the Harvard University Union, British and American unions began to develop in opposite directions during this period. The primary objectives of the early American union, as stated by R. M. Wendley, a leading British scholar (Butts, 1971), were, in order of importance: (1) a club with dining commons; (2) affiliation of societies; and (3) debating. This order was in direct contrast to the British unions.

The common link between the British unions and the American unions was the belief that involvement in constructive leisure time activities would aid in the overall development of the individual student (Fitzgerald, 1970).

In 1904, Charles Van Hise, President of the University of Wisconsin, supported the union movement as he outlined the direction for American universities in this field:

The communal life of instructors and students in work, in play and in social relations is the very essence of the spirit of Oxford and Cambridge. If Wisconsin is to do for the sons of the state what Oxford and Cambridge are doing for the sons of England, not in producing scholars, but in making men, it must have halls of residence and to these there must be a union. (Butts, 1971, p. 11)

In 1909, President Woodrow Wilson affirmed the British concept in terms that could have largely reshaped the course of education at many institutions:

The mind does not live by instruction. The real intellectual life of a body of undergraduates, if there be any, manifests itself not only in the classroom but in what they do and talk of and set before themselves as their favorite objects between classes and lectures. . . . If you wish to create a college, therefore, and are wise, you will seek to create a life . . . and fill it with the things of the mind and of the spirit. . . . My plea, then is this: that we reorganize our colleges on the lines of this simple conception, that a college is not only a body of studies, but a mode of association. It must become a community of scholars and pupils. (Butts, 1967a, pp. 3-4)

It was in this climate of ideas about what constitutes an education that the American college union grew. It was possible to see why the college union became a place for students to come together and talk among themselves--a place for social interaction.

In 1914, Beanie Drake, Director of the Ohio State Campus Union, emphasized the need to organize student unions into an association (Berry, 1966a). Drake believed that the unions could be a vital force on college campuses with the support of an interorganizational network between campuses, coordinating activities and exchanging ideas and information focusing on the individual director's experiences. On December 4, 1914, at a conference at The Ohio State University, the National Association of Student Unions with seven charter members was formed. A constitution was adopted on May 6, 1916. Two salient parts of the original constitution, as reported by Harold Pride, Association Historian (Berry, 1966a), were (1) the development of an administrative structure that included having a president, vice-president and secretary-treasurer to be elected by unions and not by individual

members. Pride also indicated that the Association of Student Unions in 1920 became the Association of College and University Unions. (2) Membership in the Association was by colleges or universities and not by unions.

In 1922 a new constitution for the association was adopted with the following revisions: (1) membership into the association was to be by union and not by school; and (2) a definition of the union which excluded female participation was altered.

It is of interest that from the beginning of the association in 1914 and until 1931 (Humphreys, 1946), the definition of the word "union" according to the constitution of the association was: "an organization in any college or university whose purpose is to further promote social activities, membership in such organizations open to all male students" (p. 23). That thought was a dominant theme throughout higher education in the United States and the campus union movement would have to deal with the question of involvement of women in union work.

The Campus Democracy Stage (1919-1929)

From the preceding period of the union movement as a club for men now developed an idea of all students belonging to the union. Lloyd Vallely, Director of the Purdue University Union, and Porter Butts (Butts, 1971) noted that an upsurge of interest in unions developed after World War I, primarily due to the post-war need for social interaction.

Butts emphasized this point when he stated:

Along in the 1920's, when women's suffrage appeared and the tradition of education for men only began to dissolve, students saw that it was bad for men and women to eye each other across the campus from their respective strongholds, when they really wanted to be together; so unions turned into social centers for everybody and have with a few exceptions been thoroughly co-educational ever since. The idea of campus unity, of a union for all, became an even stronger motivating force. (Butts, 1971, p. 17)

At that time, as suggested by Porter Butts (1967a), two circumstances came together to launch the massive union development that was observed over the preceding fifty years. First, a great post-war upsurge in enrollment caused university officials to look at the need for recreation centers for constructive use of leisure time. Students who were not members of social fraternities now had a place to relax, study, and meet other students. The union became the campus substitute for the important canteen and recreation centers established for servicemen and women during the war. Second, students and faculty, aware of human sacrifice that becomes a part of any country's war effort, wanted to institute a lasting tribute to honor those who had served in the war. They believed they could serve the cause of democracy by creating a new campus democracy. As a result, ten of the fourteen unions in a survey by Edith Humphreys (1946) were war memorials dedicated to the ideal of a better democratic life that college men and women had fought for on the battlefield.

As the college unions grew in size and number, Foster Coffin, union leader at Cornell University (Proceedings, 1960), noted the significant increase in women participating in union programming. One of the main factors in that growth was the recognition of the value of providing a desirable and common social life for men and women students. Women were needed, according to Humphreys (1946), to aid in fund raising activities. In 1931, Harold Pride (Proceedings, 1964) reported that based on the changing role of women, the Association of College Unions' constitution was revised to reflect the acceptance of women in the overall union program and to recognize the role of women in the union movement.

Humphreys characterized the campus democracy stage as

. . . the period not only in which a social life is enjoyed by both men and women students, but also in which the seeds of a culturally and educationally social life for the entire campus community are being planted--to appear and grow in the community-recreational stage. (p. 23)

Community Recreation Stage (1930-1946)

In the 1930's the leaders of the union effort in the United States, influenced greatly by the concurrent developments and success of general civic recreation and cultural centers, and by their desire to create a truer "community of teachers and students," saw the college union as the campus counterpart of the "community center" with a definite recreational and educational mission to perform. Butts stated

that unions had a "positive recreational and educational mission to perform" and he described the community recreational stage as one which contributed to the present-day character of college unions.

So the union, as a community center serving diverse needs, now embraces a wide range of facilities and has multiple functions to perform.

It is a lounge, dining rooms, information center, student club headquarters, reading room, art gallery, workshop, theater, music room, forum, game room, dance and party center, public relations agency, student office building, outing center, radio studio, ticket bureau, post office, conference headquarters, and book store. It may provide all of these facilities, or part of them, or perhaps still others--but all brought together in one place so that physical proximity does its part in furthering a sense of community. (Butts, 1967a, p. 5)

Humphreys (1946) pointed out that the development of the college union into a community recreation center represents a "sign of the times." It was predictable for the union to evolve from a democratic social club to a common leisure-time center for the entire university community.

During the campus recreational period, the union showed a consciousness for its role in the socialization of the student as a citizen. For example, Christian Goss then Dean of Princeton University, in 1931 delivered the opening address to the 12th annual conference of the Association of Student Unions. He said:

What has been lacking is a socialized attitude toward life. We in the colleges have done too little really to develop it. . . . When you say "my town" you are a part of it. . . but you do not get that feeling out of the study of mathematics or philosophy. . . .

It is the purpose of the union to cultivate that socialized attitude towards life. (Proceedings, 1931, pp. 37-42)

From the point of view of the number of union facilities erected, the period between 1930-1940 represented the zenith in the provision for recreational centers on American college campuses. Though some were only remodeled buildings, the majority were constructed as unions or other types of recreation buildings. The total number of buildings which appeared during this time span were 79, which was a 200% increase over the preceding ten years. The grand total of buildings as of 1940 was 145. The post-war period indicated a period of growth for the Association of College Unions. In 1947 its membership numbered 120 and 240 individuals attended the annual meeting at the Illinois Union, Urbana, Illinois (Proceedings, 1947). Indicative of this growth, the chief concerns of the 1947 meeting were crowded campuses and ways of financing new union buildings or additions to existing facilities. According to Berry (1966b), still less than half of the 120 association members had their own physical facility.

In 1948, 21 regional areas and representatives were established, and this marked the beginnings of the geographical areas for the ACU (Proceedings, 1948).

After World War II a set of circumstances appeared which was similar to that which surfaced after World War I. It created another surge of interest and growth for campus unions.

According to Carolyn Adair, Director of Activities at Texas A & M University, in an unpublished dissertation (1975), as enrollments increased, colleges and universities sought better means of fulfilling the life needs of a diverse student body and faculty. The role of the campus union became central to student life on college and university campuses. Many unions were built or greatly increased in size when a need was felt to memorialize those men and women who died in World War II. The activities and services within unions became greatly expanded and diversified because of the new kind of male student the war produced. He was older, married, more serious, career oriented, and had a family.

The recreation programs for service men during World War II provided great impetus to the campus union movement after the war. Red Cross clubs had demonstrated the usefulness and value of recreation and social centers for young people. The concept of organized recreation and social interaction remained a dominant force in the overall union program.

The Campus Union, 1950-1977

This category was written to be an extension of the Humphrey style, although her categorizations ended with 1946. For the sake of consistency it was felt that the use of the Humphrey format was wise and appropriate.

During the 1950's the Association of College Unions enjoyed an increase in both membership and in the number and

variety of activities and programs of campus unions. In 1951 the Association of College Unions boasted 200 members who met in 13 different regional conferences held around the country. The 1950's were also a time of self-study, evaluation, and goal setting.

According to Berry, the 1950's was a period in which the status of the college union was also difficult to surmise, for "common characteristics of unions are apt to be superficial." Though publications and catalogues of colleges almost universally stress the educational significance of college unions, "the philosophies which guide . . . the unions differ markedly." Following World War II, which was a time when unions provided recreation for military trainees and catered largely to "feminine clientele," the G. I. college boom made further changes on college unions. Some unions became classroom buildings, others largely food commons . . . and there was concern that widespread tendency to use the union building for non-union functions indicated a lack of appreciation of the union's real value.

According to Berry,

The usurpation of many union facilities and functions during post World War II, a symptom of the failure of unions to secure their place in higher education, was to some extent due to the lack of educational leadership they received. A collection of facilities does not assure a program which is educationally sound and it is on this basis that gauging the state of today's union becomes nearly impossible. The philosophies which college and union administrators breathe into their facilities are determining their educational effectiveness. . . . Whether union policies will be determined eventually by professionally prepared educators or fiscally minded business operators is a moot

question. It would appear that the type of building and its finance plan will do much to settle the problem on each individual campus. (Berry, 1960, p. 6)

Ideally, the union director should be a generalist who could "encompass both the educational and financial aspects of the field" and Berry felt that the college or university administration would play an important role in this by demanding the same type of educational leadership from union directors as they do from faculty (Berry, 1960).

Butts also stressed the educational mission of the union and stated that this purpose should be the union's goal if it is to be more than a service center for the campus. Unions should have played a part in educating young people to be the "future leaders of our society" by providing ways of learning leadership. He summarized this objective as follows:

The ultimate mission of the union is, therefore--as it was the original, central mission at Oxford and Cambridge--this one of training students for their responsibilities as citizens--by providing the maximum means and tools for practicing leadership of their corporate life on the campus, thus giving a cutting edge to the foundation work of the classroom. (Butts, 1967a, p. 6)

In 1955, Butts produced the first draft of the role statement for college unions, and at the 33rd Annual Conference in 1956, the role of the college union was adopted (see Chapter I, pp. 1-2).

Throughout the purposes in the Role of the College Union, the union was viewed as a single, centralized element which at that time (1956) and for the next decade, gave impetus

Revenue from the businesses located in the campus union building was greatly reduced and, as a result, staffing had to be decreased. Eudaldo Keyes, Associate Director of the State University of New York Union (Proceedings, 1969), stated that during the time of student unrest on the campus, the college union was the institution that could have initiated change and reform on the college campuses.

In 1961 minority students on major campuses had begun to protest against the types of programs offered on college campuses, especially those that occurred in college unions. Ron Loomis, President of the Association of College Unions-International (1976-77) (Proceedings, 1970), was elected chairman of a committee called the Task Force on Human Resources in 1970. The objective of this committee was to study methods whereby college unions could attack racism and its effects. As one of the outcomes of the work of the committee (in 1972) the Association of College Unions-International appointed a standing committee called the Committee on Minority Programs (COMP). The major objective of the committee was to review minority involvement within the association and continually recommend to the executive board of the Association of College Unions-International, programs and structural changes within the union organization necessary to facilitate interaction among all members in the college union field.

According to Loomis (Proceedings, 1975) the Association of College Unions-International did not have significant

involvement with minorities prior to 1965. However, since that period all the national and regional conferences have alluded to the problems of minority involvement with the campus union (Grant, 1973).

During the last few years campus unions in the United States have rebuilt their images after a difficult period of student dissension. With the decline of the "hippie movement," "black power" organizations and the cultural acceptance of social informality, unions have become the interesting social, recreational and service centers that they used to be. The trends toward the outdoors, physical fitness, environmental concerns (beautification projects) and equal rights for all have found a place in the campus union. Outlets for student expression are often planned as a part of the overall campus union operation (Jackson, 1974).

Another trend that seemed to be implied by the Proceedings of the last decade (1967-1977) has been the decentralization of management of the various functions within the campus union away from the supervision of the union director. Many food service businesses housed in the campus union are now being managed by commercial organizations which specialize in fast food service operations. Some were managed by the institutional food service department which operated campus dining facilities. Also, in some cases, bookstore services, custodial services, guest room services, recreational services, and even student activity programming had been

Campus Union Literature--North Carolina

Beyond the Messick book of 1970 which pertained to the N. C. State union only, the literature search revealed a virtual absence of information about the campus union movement in North Carolina. From time to time references were found to individuals from the state who made presentations at ACUI conventions, regional and national, but nothing was found that directly related to the actual condition of campus unions in the state, per se.

One can speculate as to why nothing appeared in the literature on campus unions directly pertaining to North Carolina. In fact, it was obvious that the leadership of the American campus union movement was posited in the Northeastern industrial states, and therefore the movement might have had some connection to economics. Also, it could have been argued that the southern colleges and universities were influenced by conservative, agrarian state governments and were not quick to adopt the latest social theories and trends.

Accuracy dictated, however, that it simply be reported that little campus union literature was in existence, and therefore, little could be reviewed. Only one ACUI national convention was held in North Carolina and that one was in Chapel Hill in 1935.

It was found that the Association of College Unions-International had 800 institutional members within 15 regions

and over 700 individual members. Among these were 43 institutions from 16 foreign countries. The ACUI Directory (1977-78) showed that North Carolina had 21 institutions which were current members of the Association.

Almost every college or university of higher education had a building or an area established to serve the university community and had an underlying philosophy, the goals of which were reflected in the role of the college union.

CHAPTER III

DATA AND ANALYSIS

To provide a clear view of the information derived from the survey, the writer chose to develop five composite profiles which reflected the categories into which the North Carolina campus unions were fitted. These profiles were based on size, affiliation (public or private) and racial composition of the college or university in which the campus union was found.

The racial factor was considered because traditionally colleges and universities in North Carolina had been designated predominantly white or predominantly black. Further, for the purposes of this study, it was necessary to separate institutions along racial lines because prior to 1972 there was an administrative recognition of the "separate but equal concept" by the state in all educational matters. (See Board of Governors, The Code, 1975.) Thus, the historical evolution of the institutions, black and white, was significantly dissimilar and the student population, for reasons outside the limits of this study, remained racially segregated.

By the presentation of responses to the questions in comparative form, it was determined that the reader could evaluate not only the differences that existed from campus union to campus union, but also could observe the

effect of size, budget, governance and racial composition of the campus union programs and their roles on the various campuses.

An investigation of the financing of higher education in North Carolina revealed that before 1963, the state legislature approved expenditures of state revenue monies for the construction of public campus union facilities in North Carolina. In 1963 the legislature of North Carolina passed a bill authorizing the Boards of Trustees of North Carolina public institutions to issue revenue bonds for the purpose of the construction of public campus unions. In essence, this prohibited the use of North Carolina tax dollars for the construction of these facilities. (See Appendix C.)

In 1973, the legislature of the state of North Carolina modified the role of individual state university Boards of Trustees and created a single state-wide Board of Governors for specific administrative responsibilities. One of their functions was to approve the issuance of revenue bonds for the construction of campus unions and other student related facilities (housing, food, facilities, etc.). (See Appendix D.) A number of financial arrangements have been used for the construction of campus union facilities on private college and university campuses. Usually the alumni were involved in special fund raising projects for the construction of the private campus union facility.

Information from the questionnaire was first compiled in table form (see Tables 1-11) and then a narrative

explanation was developed from the tables for each profile. The reader should be reminded that while the sample was small, it represented 42 of the 43 four-year public and private campus unions which existed (1977) in the state of North Carolina.

A STUDY OF THE STRUCTURE AND FUNCTIONS OF CAMPUS UNIONS
IN FOUR YEAR PUBLIC AND PRIVATE INSTITUTIONS
IN NORTH CAROLINA

Table 1

Relationship of Campus Union Directors
to Their Academic Communities

	Profile #1--Public Predominantly Black (5)	Profile #2--Private Predominantly Black (6)	Profile #3--Public Predominantly White--Small (8)	Profile #4--Public Predominantly White--Large (3)	Profile #5--Private Predominantly White--Small (20)
Degree status: number of directors with masters or advanced degrees	3	3	7	3	15
Number of directors with teaching responsibilities	1	0	3	0	5
Number of directors with dual titles or responsi- bilities	1	3	4	2	18

Relationship of the Use of Campus Union Facilities
to the Academic Community

Number of unions in which academic courses are presently being taught	1	0	3	2	1
---	---	---	---	---	---

Table 2

Campus Union Directors' Perception of Students' Relationships
with the Academic Community

	Profile #1--Public Predominantly Black (5)		Profile #2--Private Predominantly Black (6)		Profile #3--Public Predominantly White---Small (8)		Profile #4--Public Predominantly White---Large (3)		Profile #5--Private Predominantly White---Small (20)	
	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No
Do you think students should be allowed academic credits through participation in union activities?	4	1	6	0	5	3	3	0	11	9
Would you support a program at your college or university which would make available opportunities for organizations and management experience as offered to students by the campus union?	5	0	6	0	6	2	3	0	17	3
Can you think of any activities or programs that your campus union offers that could be used for academic credit?	5	0	0	6	2	6	3	0	9	11

Table 3

Frequency of Occurrence of Minority Organizations

The number of campus unions that had affiliations with minority organizations		
		Yes
0	No	
5		
0	Yes	Profile #2--Private Predominantly Black (6)
6	No	
5		
5	Yes	Profile #3--Public Predominantly White--Small (8)
3	No	
3		
3	Yes	Profile #4--Public Predominantly White--Large (3)
0	No	
11		
11	Yes	Profile #5--Private Predominantly White--Small (20)
9	No	

Table 4

Administration of Campus Unions

	Profile #1--Public Predominantly Black (5)	Profile #2--Private Predominantly Black (6)	Profile #3--Public Predominantly White--Small (8)	Profile #4--Public Predominantly White--Large (3)	Profile #5--Private Predominantly White--Small (20)
In the organizational structure of campus unions in N. C., the union director reports to:					
Vice President-- Academic Affairs					1
Vice-Chancellor-- Student Affairs	3		3	2	
Dean of Students	1	3	5	1	14
Vice-President of the University		1			
Director of Activities	1				
Chancellor or President					2
Vice-President--Student Affairs		2			3
Positions indicated by directors that are a part of campus unions in N. C.:					
Director	4	4	6	3	12
Assistant-Director	1	3	3	2	1
Associate Director	1	1	0	3	0
Program Director	5	1	1	2	1
Business Manager	0	0	2	1	1
Bookstore Manager	1	3	2	0	6
Games Manager	2	1	1	0	3
Assistant Program Director	2	1	0	2	1
Night Manager	1	1	1	1	4

Table 4 (continued)

Administration of Campus Unions

	Profile #1--Public Predominantly Black (5)	Profile #2--Private Predominantly Black (6)	Profile #3--Public Predominantly White--Small (8)	Profile #4--Public Predominantly White--Large (3)	Profile #5--Private Predominantly White--Small (20)
Positions indicated by directors that are a part of campus unions in N. C. (continued):					
Food Service Manager	0	1	1	1	6
Assistant Games Room Manager	1	0	0	0	0
Theater Director	0	0	1	1	1
Director or Coordi- nator of Student Activities*	1	2	2	0	12
Program Advisor	1	1	1	1	2
Operations Manager	0	0	1	1	1
Outing Director	0	0	1	0	0
Art and Gallery Director	0	0	0	0	0
Workshop Director	0	0	0	0	0
Program/Policy Board	5	3	6	3	13
Director of Co-Curric- ular Activities	0	1	1	0	0
Security	2	0	0	0	0
Assistant Director Student Activities	0	0	0	0	1
Craft Director	0	0	1	0	0
Auditorium Manager	0	0	1	0	0

*13 individuals in this position were also campus union directors.

Table 5

Structure of Advisory or Policy Board

	Profile #10--Public Predominantly Black (5)	Profile #2--Private Predominantly Black (6)	Profile #3--Public Predominantly White--Small (8)	Profile #4--Public Predominantly White--Large (3)	Profile #5--Private Predominantly White--Small (20)
Number of campus unions in the category having policy, advisory or gov- erning boards	4	2	4	3	13
Membership of the policy board is:					
1-6 members	0	0	0	0	2
7-10 members	2	0	1	1	4
11-13 members	1	2	3	0	2
14-16 members	0	0	0	1	3
17 or more	1	0	0	1	2
Composition of the policy or advisory board is:					
students only	0	1	0	0	2
faculty only	0	0	0	0	0
students and faculty	1	0	0	0	2
students and union staff	0	1	1	0	3
students, faculty, and staff	3	0	3	3	1
union staff only	0	0	0	0	5

Table 6

**Campus Union Constituent Group Influence
on Activities and Services***

	Profile #1--Public Predominantly Black (5)	Profile #2--Private Predominantly Black (6)	Profile #3--Public Predominantly White--Small (8)	Profile #4--Public Predominantly White--Large (3)	Profile #5--Private Predominantly White--Small (20)
Board of Trustees	2	2	1	2	2
Faculty	2	3	3	3	3
Academic deans	1	3	3	2	3
Student life deans	2	4	3	3	3
Parents	2	2	1	1	1
Alumni	2	2	2	1	1
Union director	5	4	4	4	4
Union staff	5	4	4	4	4
State legislators	1	1	1	1	1
Chancellor or President	3	2	2	3	2
Students	5	5	5	5	5

*Based on median score

Key: 5....very strong
 4....strong
 3....moderately strong
 2....little strength
 1....no strength

Table 7

Directors' Perception of the Composition of an
Ideal Policy or Advisory Board

	Profile #1--Public Predominantly Black (5)	Profile #2--Private Predominantly Black (6)	Profile #3--Public Predominantly White--Small (8)	Profile #4--Public Predominantly White--Large (3)	Profile #5--Private Predominantly White--Small (20)
How would you allocate the number of represen- tatives from the groups listed below to a policy board of 15 members?*					
Students	8	4	10	11	9
Board of Trustees	0	0	0	0	0
Faculty	2	2	3	3	2
Academic deans	0	1	0	0	0
Parents	0	2	0	0	0
Alumni	1	0	0	0	0
Student life deans	1	2	0	0	1
Union director	1	1	1	1	1
State legislators	0	0	0	0	0
Union staff	2	3	1	0	2
Chancellor or President	0	0	0	0	0

*Question taken directly from the questionnaire

Table 8

Services Available in Campus Union Facilities

	Profile #1--Public Predominantly Black (5)	Profile #2--Private Predominantly Black (6)	Profile #3--Public Predominantly White--Small (8)	Profile #4--Public Predominantly White--Large (3)	Profile #5--Private Predominantly White--Small (20)
Bookstore	XX	XX	XX	O	XX
Beauty shop	XX	X	O	O	O
SGA office	XX	XX	XX	XX	XX
Yearbook office	XX	XX	XX	XX	XX
Meditation room	X	XX	X	XX	X
Activities office	XX	XX	XX	XX	XX
Print or sign shop	XX	X	XX	XX	X
Barber shop	XX	O	O	X	O
Study room	XX	X	X	O	X
Snack bar or soda shop	XX	XX	XX	XX	XX
Tutorial room	O	X	X	X	X
Faculty lounge	O	XX	X	O	X
Clothing stores	O	O	O	O	O
Banquets	XX	XX	XX	XX	X
Pay telephones	XX	XX	XX	XX	XX
Ticket office	XX	X	XX	XX	X
T. V. room	XX	XX	XX	XX	XX
Poster room	X	X	X	X	X
Novelty room	O	O	O	O	X
Organizations' meeting rooms	XX	XX	XX	XX	XX
Cafeteria	X	XX	XX	X	X

Key: XX - majority provided these services
 X - some provided these services
 O - none provided these services

Table 9

Activities Available in Campus Union Facilities

	Profile #1--Public Predominantly Black (5)	Profile #2--Private Predominantly Black (6)	Profile #3--Public Predominantly White--Small (8)	Profile #4--Public Predominantly White--Large (3)	Profile #5--Private Predominantly White--Small (20)
Bowling	XX	X	X	XX	O
Billiards	XX	XX	XX	XX	XX
Dances	XX	XX	XX	XX	XX
Lectures	XX	XX	XX	XX	XX
Ping pong	XX	XX	XX	XX	XX
Movies	XX	XX	XX	XX	XX
Debates	XX	X	XX	XX	X
Seminars	XX	XX	XX	XX	XX
Conferences	XX	XX	XX	XX	XX
Video filming	X	X	XX	XX	X
Leadership workshops	XX	XX	XX	XX	XX
Political meetings	XX	XX	XX	XX	X
Arts and crafts	XX	X	XX	XX	XX
Novelty shops	O	O	O	O	X
Coffee houses	X	XX	XX	XX	XX
Art exhibits	XX	X	XX	XX	XX
Fashion shops	O	O	O	O	X
Plays or drama	XX	X	XX	XX	X
Music listening room	XX	X	XX	X	X
Games room (pinball, t.v., tennis)	XX	X	XX	XX	XX
Clothing shop	O	O	X	O	O

Key: XX - majority provided these activities
 X - some provided these activities
 O - none provided these activities

Table 10

Reaction to Questions Regarding Role Statements

	Profile #1--Public Predominantly Black (5)	Profile #2--Private Predominantly Black (6)	Profile #3--Public Predominantly White--Small (8)	Profile #4--Public Predominantly White--Large (3)	Profile #5--Private Predominantly White--Small (20)
Provide a well-rounded recreational program for the college community	X	X	X	X	X
Act as a leadership laboratory for those students interested in developing management skills	X	X	X	X	O
Be a place where faculty can meet colleagues away from the academic atmosphere	O	X	O	O	O
Facilitate activities for small groups with specialized interests	X	X	X	O	X
Encourage a feeling of cohesion between various parts and departments of the institution	X	X	X	X	O
Provide part-time employment for students	X	X	X	X	X

Key: X - Of importance or of top importance
O - Of little or no importance

Table 10 (continued)

Reaction to Questions Regarding Role Statements

	Profile #1--Public Predominantly Black (5)	Profile #2--Private Predominantly Black (6)	Profile #3--Public Predominantly White--Small (8)	Profile #4--Public Predominantly White--Large (3)	Profile #5--Private Predominantly White--Small (20)
Provide shopping center conveniences such as books, clothes, food, supplies, and postal services	X	X	O	O	O
Provide students with a chance to organize and administer an activity for personal experiences	X	X	X	X	X
Teach students social responsibility	X	X	X	X	X
Act as a social and cultural center of the university community	X	X	X	X	X
Enlighten the institution culturally through programming	X	X	X	X	X
Provide activities which offer practical aspects of academic teaching	X	X	O	X	O

Key: X - Of importance or of top importance
O - Of little or no importance

Table 11

Priority Listing of Problem Areas Perceived by Directors
of the Campus Union Facilities

	Profile #1--Public Predominantly Black (5)	Profile #2--Private Predominantly Black (6)	Profile #3--Public Predominantly White--Small (8)	Profile #4--Public Predominantly White--Large (3)	Profile #5--Private Predominantly White--Small (20)
List of Problems Reported:					
Personnel or staffing	2nd	2nd		4th	3rd
Vandalism		4th			
Security		5th			8th
Budgeting	1st	1st	1st	1st	1st
Programming		3rd	3rd		
Staff development	6th		2nd		2nd
Student apathy			7th	3rd	
Communication			5th		
Faculty involvement			6th	5th	6th
Freedom from administra- tion control				2nd	
Space problems	4th				7th
Student controlled programs				6th	
Accountability					5th
Understanding the role of the union	5th				
Management	3rd				
Student development			4th		4th

Table 11 (Continued)

Priority Listing of Problem Areas Perceived by Directors
of the Campus Union Facilities

	Profile #1--Public Predominantly Black (5)	Profile #2--Private Predominantly Black (6)	Profile #3--Public Predominantly White--Small (8)	Profile #4--Public Predominantly White--Large (3)	Profile #5--Private Predominantly White--Small (20)
List of Problems Reported:					
Acceptance by State Legislators and Board of Governors			8th		
Lack of intellectual content in programming			9th		
Meeting needs of commuting students					9th
The need to integrate programs into academic affairs of the institution				7th	10th
Attracting quality volunteer support	7th				
Understanding Federal guidelines and regulations (Handicapped, Title IX)				8th	
Defining our educational niche			10th		

Participants in Profile #1
Public--Predominantly Black--Small

Colleges or universities which were included in Profile #1 were (given with city, student population [1976-77], and completion date of campus union facility):

1. Elizabeth City State University, Elizabeth City, N. C.; student population 1,651; original campus union facility completed 1968.
- *2. Fayetteville State University, Fayetteville, N. C.; student population 1,940; original campus union facility completed 1972.
- *3. North Carolina Agricultural and Technical State University, Greensboro, N. C.; student population 5,515; original campus union facility completed 1967.
- *4. North Carolina Central University, Durham, N. C.; student population 4,569; original campus union facility completed 1968.
- *5. Winston-Salem State University, Winston-Salem, N. C.; student population 2,094; original campus union facility completed 1970.

*Currently (1977-78) affiliated with the Association of College Unions-International

Profile #1

Public--Predominantly Black (5)

The student population of the public--predominantly black state university campus ranged from 1,000 to 6,000. Of that number, the percentage of minorities (Caucasians and others) was approximately 6 to 7 percent. One of the five schools studied was a land grant institution. All were created by the state.

Campus student union facilities were not found on public--predominantly black campuses before 1967 and all were completed between 1967 and 1972. These unions were not funded by state revenues and had annual operating budgets which ranged from \$10,000 to \$340,000. Sixty percent of the unions had budgets that ranged between \$70,000 and \$340,000.

On public--predominantly black state university campuses, union budgets were based on projected yearly receipts from student fees and other income from union operations and services. Union monies were budgeted by the institution from the auxiliary fund, and all expenditures by and for the union programs had to be repaid to the auxiliary fund from monies generated by the union program itself, including campus union fees.

The questionnaire indicated that four of the five campus union directors in public--predominantly black institutions were black males who ranged in age from 34 to 46. Of that number three of five had achieved the master's degree with the balance

having a bachelor's degree (Table 1). It was important to note that all of the union directors in this category were supervised by either Deans of Students or Vice-Chancellors for Student Affairs. It was found that four of the five respondents in this category had full-time managerial responsibilities and were covered by the North Carolina State Personnel Act which limits their work week to 40 hours. One director had teaching responsibilities beyond his union directorship and therefore was not covered by the North Carolina State Personnel Act.

All of the union directors in this profile reported having program directors (Table 4). Some of the program directors had assistants who managed game rooms and other union activities. Further, it was reported that each union studied in this category had policy, program or advisory boards which operated independently from the Student Government Association. These people could all be considered as part of the union director's staff.

The union directors of public--predominantly black institutions were not expected to make all decisions regarding programs and activities within their unions. The organizational structures were comprised of a program, advisory, or policy board to assist or advise the director on programs and activities (Table 5). These boards were composed of students, faculty and staff and ranged in membership from seven to 13 members.

Although public--predominantly black institutions had between 6%-7% minority enrollment, the organizational structure of the union did not make special provisions for input from minorities. In fact, there appeared to be no minority organizations on these campuses.

Also, campus union directors reported their concern about inter-institutional groups and groups beyond the institution which influenced programs and services of the union. The directors indicated that persons working directly with union programs and services should have strong influence on decisions affecting the campus union. As a result, union directors pointed out that student members of union boards, union staff, and union directors should have the most influence on union programs and services with very little direction needed from Student Life Deans and Chancellors. According to the questionnaire, other individuals such as trustees, faculty members, academic deans, parents, alumni, and state legislators should not be deeply involved with program decisions within the union organization (Table 6).

The directors and their staffs supervised the programs and activities of the campus unions, but the Program, Advisory or Policy boards provided insight and oversight for directors' and staffs' decision-making. These boards were composed of students, faculty and staff and ranged from seven to 13 members (Table 7). The campus directors indicated that the ideal program board based on

15 representatives should be composed of eight students, two faculty, two union staff, one union director, one alumnus and one student life dean.

The questionnaire reported some confusion regarding the union's role in the academic community (Table 2). Union directors noted that they would support programs and courses that allow academic credit to be earned by student participants such as internships, practicums, crafts, bowling classes, and food management. Most university curricula in this profile did not offer union-related courses or programs for academic credit (Table 1). The campus union directors, however, would support programs that made available opportunities for organization and management experiences for students offered by the campus union. Yet, such programs did not exist on these campuses.

According to the questionnaire, public--predominantly black unions provided bookstores, beauty shops, barber shops, student government association offices, yearbook offices, study rooms, snack bar, t.v. room, ticket office, activities offices, banks of public telephones, meeting rooms, and banquet rooms. Other spaces were provided such as meditation rooms, poster rooms, cafeterias and print shops (Table 8).

These services were accompanied by numerous activities that enhanced student life experiences within the campus union (Table 9). Campus union activities on public--predominantly black campuses included bowling, billiards, dancing,

debating, movies, leadership workshops, games, political meetings, art and crafts, art exhibits, music listening, conferences, lectures and in several cases, video filming and coffeehouses. Attention was given programs and services in the campus union that created an atmosphere for the effective use of leisure time. Union directors reported that their union programs generated an atmosphere that was accommodating, exciting, entertaining, progressive, inviting, clean, fun, functional, cooperative and active.

The campus union directors had the responsibility for interpreting and implementing various campus-wide activities through programs and services in the union facility. Among the directors there was a difference of interpretation of the role statements, often based on specific procedures and policies of their respective universities. The directors put the following roles in the important or of top importance category on the questionnaire (Table 10):

- (1) provide a well-rounded recreational program for the college community;
- (2) act as a leadership laboratory for those students interested in developing management skills;
- (3) facilitate activities for small groups with specialized interests;
- (4) provide shopping center convenience such as books, clothes, food, supplies, and postal service;
- (5) encourage a feeling of cohesion between various parts and departments of the institution;

- (6) provide part-time employment for students;
- (7) provide students with a chance to organize and administer an activity for personal experiences;
- (8) enlighten the institution culturally through programming;
- (9) provide activities that will offer practical aspects of academic teaching;
- (10) teach students social responsibility; and
- (11) act as a social and cultural center of the university community.

Also, the directors put the following role in the of little or of no importance category on the questionnaire:

- (1) be a place where faculty can meet colleagues away from the academic atmosphere.¹

In the section of the questionnaire where union directors were asked to rate problem areas according to their individual priorities, budgeting was rated highest, followed by staffing, management, space shortage, understanding the role of the union, staff development, and attracting quality volunteer support (Table 11).

¹Taken directly from text of the questionnaire.

Participants in Profile #2

Private--Predominantly Black--Small

Colleges or universities which were included in Profile #2 were (given with city, student population [1976-77], and completion date of campus union facility):

1. Barber-Scotia College, Concord, N. C.; student population 526; original campus union facility completed 1971.
- *2. Bennett College, Greensboro, N. C.; student population 618; original campus union facility completed 1950.
- *3. Johnson C. Smith University, Charlotte, N. C.; student population 1,599; original campus union facility completed 1965.
4. Livingstone College, Salisbury, N. C.; student population 909; original campus union facility completed 1962.
5. Shaw University, Raleigh, N. C.; student population 1,411; original campus union facility completed 1967.
- *6. St. Augustine College, Raleigh, N. C.; student population 1,641; original campus union facility completed 1940.

*Currently (1977-78) affiliated with the Association of College Unions-International.

Profile #2

Private--Predominantly Black (6)

The student population of the private--predominantly black university campus ranged from 1,000 to 3,000. Of that number, the percentage of minorities (Caucasians and others) was approximately 1 to 2 percent. All of the six schools studied were established by religious organizations.

Campus union facilities were not found on these campuses prior to 1950. All were completed between 1950 and 1971. These campus unions were funded by church and private sources and had annual operating budgets ranging from \$10,000 to \$250,000. The amount \$10,000 was allocated to the campus union for program costs on a yearly basis. The actual operating funds were handled by other administrative procedures on campus. From the questionnaire it was reported that only one of six had budgets above \$30,000.

On private--predominantly black campuses, monies were allocated to the union based on student activity fees. However, some funds were generated directly from activities held within the union facility and remained as part of union funds.

Response to the questionnaire indicated that four of the six campus union directors in private--predominantly black institutions were black females. They ranged in age from 29 to 71 years. Half of the directors had achieved master's degrees and half bachelor's degrees (Table 1). Five of the six union

directors in this profile were supervised by deans of students or Vice-Presidents for Student Affairs. None of the union directors in this category had teaching responsibilities; however, three of them had dual titles within the university structure.

Only one union director in this profile had a program director. Four of them reported having an assistant or associate director on their staff (Table 4). Others on the director's staff were book store managers, directors of student activities, food service managers and one reported having a night manager.

The union directors of private--predominantly black institutions were responsible for major decision-making regarding programs and services within the union. Three of the unions in this profile had organizational structures comprised of a program, advisory or policy board which had the responsibility of advising and assisting the director on union programs and services. Those boards were composed of students and union staff and ranged in membership from 11 to 13 members (Table 5).

Although private--predominantly black institutions had between one and two percent minority enrollment, the organizational structure did not make any special provision for this group (Table 3). There were no minority organizations on these campuses, according to the survey (Table 3).

Also, campus union directors were concerned about inter-institutional groups and groups beyond the institution which

influenced programs and services of the union. It was felt that people working directly with union programs and services should have the most influence on decisions affecting the campus union. As a result, union directors pointed out that students, union staff, union directors, and student life deans should have the most influence on programs and services with very little direction needed from faculty, academic deans, alumni, trustees, and chancellors or presidents. According to the questionnaire other individuals such as church organizations or parents should not have strong influence on program decisions in the campus union (Table 6).

The directors and their staffs supervised the programs and activities of the campus union but the program, advisory, or policy boards had significant influence on director and staff decision-making. The boards were composed of students and union staff and ranged from 11 to 13 members. The campus union directors indicated the ideal program board based on 15 representatives would be composed of four students, three union staff, two student life deans, two parents, two faculty, and one academic dean.

The questionnaire reported some confusion regarding the union's role in the academic community (Table 2). Union directors indicated that they would support programs and courses that allowed academic credits to be earned by student participants such as electives, internships and union problems. However, most university curricula do not offer union-related courses

or programs for academic credit (Table 1). It appeared that the campus union directors would further support programs that made available opportunities for organization and management experiences for students to be offered by the campus union. Yet, such programs did not exist on these campuses.

According to the questionnaire, private--predominantly black campus unions provided bookstores, yearbook offices, meditation rooms, faculty lounges, t.v. rooms, meeting rooms, cafeterias, snack bars, banquets, activities offices, banks of public telephones, and Student Government Association offices. Other spaces were provided such as print or sign shops, study rooms, tutorial rooms, poster rooms, beauty shops, and ticket offices (Table 8).

Services were accompanied by numerous activities that enhanced student life experiences within the campus union facility (Table 9). Campus union activities on private--predominantly black campuses included dancing, billiards, movies, seminars, coffeehouses, leadership workshops, games, conferences, lectures and in some cases, bowling, video filming, music listening rooms, plays, arts and crafts, debates and art exhibits. According to the questionnaire, some attention was given programs and services in the campus union that created an atmosphere for the effective use of leisure time. Union directors reported that their union program generated an atmosphere that was accommodating, clean, entertaining, functional, stimulating, inviting and exciting.

The campus union directors had the responsibility for interpreting and implementing various campus-wide activities through programs and services in the union facility. Among the directors there was a difference of interpretation of the role statements, often based on specific procedures and policies of their respective universities. The director put the following roles in the important or of top importance category on the questionnaire (Table 10):

- (1) provide a well-rounded recreational program for college community;
- (2) act as a leadership laboratory for those students interested in developing management skills;
- (3) be a place where faculty can meet colleagues away from the academic atmosphere;
- (4) facilitate activities for small groups with specialized interests;
- (5) encourage a feeling of cohesion between various parts and departments of the institution;
- (6) provide part-time employment for students;
- (7) provide shopping center conveniences such as books, clothes, food, supplies and postal service;
- (8) provide students with a chance to organize and administer an activity for personal experiences;
- (9) teach students social responsibility;
- (10) act as social and cultural center of the university community;

- (11) enlighten the institution culturally through programming; and
- (12) provide activities which will offer practical aspects of academic teaching.¹

In the section of the questionnaire in which union directors were asked to rate problem areas according to their individual priorities, budgeting was rated highest followed by staffing, programming, vandalism and security (Table 11).

¹Taken directly from text of the questionnaire.

Participants in Profile #3

Public--Predominantly White--Small

Colleges or universities which were included in Profile #3 were (given with city, student population [1976-77], and completion date of original campus union facility):

- *1. Appalachian State University, Boone, N. C.; student population 8,561; original campus union facility completed 1967.
- *2. North Carolina School of the Arts, Winston-Salem, N. C.; student population 402; original campus union facility completed 1971.
3. Pembroke State University, Pembroke, N. C.; student population 2,187; original campus union facility completed 1965.
4. University of North Carolina at Asheville, Asheville, N. C.; student population 1,499; original campus union facility completed 1964.
- *5. University of North Carolina at Charlotte, Charlotte, N. C.; student population 7,815; original campus union facility completed 1963.
- *6. University of North Carolina at Greensboro, Greensboro, N. C.; student population 9,733; original campus union facility completed 1953.

*Currently (1977-78) affiliated with the Association of College Unions-International

7. University of North Carolina at Wilmington, Wilmington, N. C.; student population 3,373; original campus union facility completed 1961.
- *8. Western Carolina University, Cullowhee, N. C.; student population 6,380; original campus union facility completed 1939.

*Currently (1977-78) affiliated with the Association of College Unions-International

Profile #3

Public--Predominantly White--Small (8)

The student population of the small public--predominantly white university campus ranged from below 1,000 to 10,000. Of that number, the percentage of minorities (blacks and others) was between 2% and 40%. All of these schools were a part of the state university system of North Carolina.

Campus student union facilities did not exist on these campuses before 1939 and all were completed between 1939 and 1977. These unions were not funded by state revenues and had annual operating budgets between \$10,000 and \$500,000. In the questionnaire it was reported that four of the eight campuses had budgets that ranged from \$30,000 to \$500,000.

On state university campuses, unions' budgets were based on projected yearly receipts from student fees and other income from union operations and services. In effect, union monies were budgeted by the institution's auxiliary fund, and all expenditures by and for the union programs were repaid to the auxiliary fund from monies generated by the union program itself, including student union fees.

The questionnaire indicated that the campus union directors in small public--predominantly white institutions were primarily white males who ranged in age from 23 to 57 years. Of the eight surveyed, seven had achieved a master's degree and one had a bachelor's degree (Table 1). All of the union directors in this profile were supervised by either Deans of Students

or Vice-Chancellors for Student Affairs. It was found that five of eight respondents in this category had full-time managerial responsibilities and were covered by the North Carolina State Personnel Act which limited their work week to 40 hours. Three directors had teaching responsibilities beyond the union directorships. Four of the eight union directors in this profile had dual titles that included two Assistant to Deans and one Director of Finance (Table 4).

Only one director in this category had a program director (Table 4). Three of the union directors reported having assistant directors on their staffs. Others on the directors' staffs were business managers, bookstore managers, game manager, night manager, food service manager, crafts director, auditorium manager, outing director, operations manager, theater director, director and coordinator of student activities. Further, it was reported that only four of the unions studied in this category had policy boards which operated independently from the Student Government Association.

The union directors of small public--predominantly white institutions were responsible for major decisions regarding programs and services within the union area. Four of the eight campus union directors in this profile had organizational structures comprised of a policy, advisory or governing board that had the responsibility of advising and assisting the director on union programs and services. These boards

were composed of students, faculty, and union staff and ranged in membership from seven to 13 members (Table 5).

Since small public--predominantly white institutions had between 2% and 40% minority enrollment, 62.5% of these organizational structures included minority groups on campus (Table 3).

Also, campus union directors were concerned about inter-institutional groups and groups beyond the institution which influenced programs and services within the union. The directors felt that persons working directly with campus union programs and services should have the most influence on decisions affecting the campus union (Table 6). Union directors pointed out that students, union directors and union staffs should have the most influence on programs and services with only moderate influence desired from faculty and student life deans. According to the questionnaire, other individuals such as trustees, parents, alumni, state legislators, and chancellors or presidents should have little or no influence on program decisions within the union.

Campus union directors and their staffs supervised the programs and activities of the campus union, but the program, advisory or policy boards had some influence on the director's and staff's decision-making. The boards were composed of students, faculty and union staff and ranged from seven to 13 members. The campus union directors indicated the "ideal" program board based on 15 representatives

would be composed of ten students, three faculty, one union director, and one union staff (Table 7).

The questionnaire reported some confusion regarding the union's role in the academic community (Table 2). While most union directors indicated that they would support union programs and courses that allowed academic credits to be earned by student participants such as internships, independent studies, crafts, and practicums, only 37.5% of the university curricula in this profile offered union-related courses or programs (Table 1). Most of the campus union directors would further support programs that made available opportunities for organizations and management experiences for students to be offered by the campus union.

According to the questionnaire, small public--predominantly white campus unions provided bookstores, Student Government Association offices, yearbook offices, activities offices, snack bars, cafeterias, banks of public telephones, and t.v. rooms. Other spaces were also provided such as print or sign shops, tutorial rooms, meeting rooms, ticket offices, poster rooms, study rooms, meditation rooms, and faculty lounges (Table 8).

These services were accompanied by numerous activities that enhanced student-life experiences within the campus union. Campus union activities on public--predominantly white small campuses included dancing, movies, debating, coffeehouses, arts and crafts, games, political meetings,

game rooms, art exhibits, seminars, conferences, leadership workshops, lectures and, in some cases, bowling, fashion shows, clothing shops, and music listening rooms. Attention was given to programs and services in the campus union that created an atmosphere for the effective use of leisure time (Table 9). Union directors reported that their union programs generated an atmosphere that was accommodating, exciting, educational, entertaining, inviting, progressive, clean, fun, functional, cooperative, stimulating, interesting, cheerful, and active.

The campus union directors had the responsibility for interpreting and implementing various campus-wide activities through programs and services in the union facility. Among the directors there was a difference of interpretation of the role statements, often based on specific procedures and policies of their respective universities. The directors put the following roles in the important or of top importance category on the questionnaire (Table 10):

- (1) provide a well-rounded recreational program for the college community;
- (2) act as a leadership laboratory for those students interested in developing management skills;
- (3) facilitate activities for small groups with specialized interests;
- (4) encourage a feeling of cohesion between various parts and departments of the institution;

- (5) provide part-time employment for students;
- (6) provide students with a chance to organize and administer an activity for personal experiences;
- (7) teach students social responsibility;
- (8) act as a social and cultural center of the university community; and
- (9) enlighten the institution culturally through programming.

Also, the directors put the following roles in the of little or of no importance category on the questionnaire:

- (1) be a place where faculty can meet colleagues away from the academic atmosphere;
- (2) provide shopping center conveniences such as books, clothes, food, supplies, and postal service; and
- (3) provide activities which will offer practical aspects of academic teaching.

In the section of the questionnaire in which union directors were asked to rate problem areas according to their individual priorities, budgeting was rated highest, followed by staff development, programming, student development, communication, faculty involvement, student apathy, acceptance by state legislators and boards of governors, lack of intellectual content in programming, and defining our educational niche (Table 11).

¹Taken directly from text of the questionnaire.

Participants in Profile #4
Public--Predominantly White--Large

Colleges or universities which were included in Profile #4 were (given with city, student population [1976-77], completion date of campus union facility):

- *1. East Carolina University, Greenville, N. C.; student population 11,696; original campus union facility completed 1958.
- *2. North Carolina State University, Raleigh, N. C.; student population 16,903; original campus union facility completed 1954.
- *3. University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill, Chapel Hill, N. C.; student population, 18,748; original campus union facility completed 1931.

*Currently (1977-78) affiliated with the Association of College Unions-International.

Profile #4

Public--Predominantly White--Large (3)

The student population of the large public--predominantly white university campus was over 10,000. Of that number, the percentage of minority students (blacks and others) was between 5% and 6%. All of these schools were a part of the North Carolina University system. One school in this profile was a land grant institution.

Campus student union facilities were not found on these campuses before 1931 and all were completed with additions from 1931 to 1974. These unions were not funded by state revenues and had annual operating budgets over \$500,000.

On state university campuses, union budgets were based on projected yearly receipts from student fees and other income from union operations and services. In effect, union monies were budgeted by the institution's auxiliary fund, and all expenditures by and for the union programs had to be repaid to the auxiliary fund from monies generated by the union program itself, including student union fees.

The questionnaire indicated that the campus union directors on large public--predominantly white institutions were white males who ranged in age from 41 to 46 years. All had achieved a master's degree (Table 1). It is important to note that all of the union directors in this category were supervised by either Deans of Students or Vice-Chancellors for Student Affairs. It was found that all respondents in this category

had full-time managerial responsibilities. None of the respondents in this category had teaching responsibilities beyond his union directorship. However, two of the three union directors had dual titles and in those cases both were Associate Dean of Students (Table 1).

Two of three union directors in this category had program directors. One had a program advisor (Table 4). All of the union directors reported that they had associate directors, while two also had assistant directors. Others on the directors' staff were business managers, assistant program directors, operations managers, theater directors, food service managers, and night managers. Further, it was reported that, of the unions studied in this category, all had policy, advisory, or governing boards which operated independently from the Student Government Association.

The union directors of large public--predominantly white universities were not expected to make all decisions regarding programs and activities within the union. The organizational structures were comprised of a program, advisory, or policy board to assist or advise the director on programs and activities. These boards were composed of students, faculty and staff and ranged in membership from seven to more than 17 members (Table 5).

Large public--predominantly white institutions had between 5% and 6% minority enrollments. All union directors in this profile reported having minority organizations on campus (Table 3).

Campus union directors were concerned about inter-institutional groups and groups beyond the institution which influenced programs and services within the union. They felt that persons working directly with union programs and services should have the most influence on decisions affecting the campus union. As a result, union directors pointed out that student members of union boards, union directors, and union staff should have the most influence on programs and services with very little direction needed from faculty, academic deans, chancellors or presidents, student-life deans and parents (Table 6). According to the questionnaire, other individuals such as trustees, alumni, and state legislators should not have any influence on program decisions within the union.

The union directors and their staffs supervised the program and activities of the campus union, but the program, advisory or policy boards provided insight and oversight for director and staff decision-making. These boards were composed of students, faculty, and staff and ranged from seven to more than 17 members (Table 7). The campus union directors indicated that the ideal program board based on 15 representatives would be composed of 11 students, three faculty, and one union director.

Union directors reporting in this category appeared to have had a direct relationship with the academic community (Table 2). All of the union directors indicated that they would support programs and courses that allowed academic

credits to be earned by student participants such as electives, internships, independent study, seminars, and practicums. It was reported that two of the three university curricula offered union-related courses and programs (Table 1). It appeared that all of the campus union directors would support programs that made available opportunities for organization and management experiences for students to be offered by the campus union.

According to the questionnaire, large public--predominantly white campus unions provided Student Government Association offices, yearbook offices, activities offices, snack bars, meeting rooms, banquets, t.v. rooms, ticket offices, banks of public telephones, meditation rooms, and print or sign shop. Other spaces were provided such as cafeteria, barber shop, and poster room (Table 8).

There were numerous activities that enhanced student life experiences within the campus union. Campus union activities on public--predominantly white large campuses included dancing, video filming, leadership workshops, plays, coffeehouses, political meetings, games (ping pong), game rooms, arts and crafts, art exhibits, debating, conferences, seminars, lectures, and in some cases, bowling, billiards and a music listening room. Some attention was given to programs and services in the campus unions that created an atmosphere for the effective use of leisure time (Table 9). Union directors reported that their union program generated an atmosphere

which was accommodating, exciting, educational, entertaining, inviting, clean, fun, functional, stimulating, cooperative, interesting, active, cheerful, progressive and flexible.

The campus union directors appeared to have the responsibility for interpreting and implementing various campus-wide activities through programs and services in the union facility. Among the directors there was a difference of interpretation of the role statements, often based on specific procedures and policies of their respective universities. The director put the following roles in the important or of top importance category of the questionnaire (Table 10):

- (1) provide a well-rounded recreational program for the college community;
- (2) act as a leadership laboratory for those students interested in developing management skills;
- (3) encourage a feeling of cohesion between various parts and departments of the institution;
- (4) provide part-time employment for students;
- (5) provide students with a chance to organize and administer an activity for personal experiences;
- (6) teach students social responsibility;
- (7) act as a social and cultural center of the university community;
- (8) enlighten the institution culturally through programming; and
- (9) provide activities which will offer practical aspects of teaching.

Also, the union directors put the following roles in the of little or of no importance category on the questionnaire:

- (1) be a place where faculty can meet colleagues away from the academic atmosphere;
- (2) facilitate activities for small groups with specialized interests; and
- (3) provide shopping center conveniences such as books, clothes, food, supplies, and postal service.¹

In the section of the questionnaire where union directors were asked to rate problem areas according to their individual priorities, budgeting was rated highest, followed by freedom from administrative control, student apathy, staffing, faculty involvement, student control programs, the need to integrate programs into academic goals of the institution, and understanding federal guidelines and regulations (Handicapped, Title IX) (Table 11).

¹Taken directly from text of the questionnaire.

Participants in Profile #5
Private--Predominantly White--Small

Colleges or universities which are included in Profile #5 were (given with city, student population [1976-77], and completion date of campus union facility):

1. Atlantic Christian, Wilson, N. C.; student population 1,688; original campus union facility completed 1969.
- *2. Belmont-Abbey, Belmont, N. C.; student population 762; original campus union facility completed 1968.
3. Campbell College, Buies Creek, N. C.; student population 1,913; original campus union facility completed 1977.
4. Catawba College, Salisbury, N. C.; student population 935; original campus union facility completed 1971.
- *5. Davidson College, Davidson, N. C.; student population 1,356; original campus union facility completed 1952.
- *6. Duke University, Durham, N. C.; student population 8,146; campus union facility used for union programming 1954.
- *7. Elon College, Burlington, N. C.; student population 2,150; original campus union facility completed 1966.

*Currently (1977-78) affiliated with the Association of College Unions-International.

8. Gardner Webb College, Boiling Springs, N. C.; student population 1,354; original campus union facility completed 1968.
9. Greensboro College, Greensboro, N. C.; student population 619; original campus union facility completed 1963.
10. Guilford College, Greensboro, N. C.; student population 1,646; original campus union facility completed 1950.
11. High Point College, High Point, N. C.; student population 1,088; original campus union facility completed 1972.
- *12. Mars Hill College, Mars Hill, N. C.; student population 1,756; original campus union facility completed 1973.
13. Meredith College, Raleigh, N. C.; student population 1,542; original campus union facility completed 1972.
- *14. Methodist College, Fayetteville, N. C.; student population 708; original campus union facility completed 1968.
15. N. C. Wesleyan College, Rocky Mount, N. C.; student population 453; original campus union facility completed 1963.

*Currently (1977-78) affiliated with the Association of College Unions-International.

16. Pfeiffer College, Misenheimer, N. C.; student population 998; original campus union facility completed 1964.
17. Queens College, Charlotte, N. C.; student population 624; original campus union facility completed 1954.
18. St. Andrews Presbyterian College, Laurinburg, N. C.; student population 568; original campus union facility completed 1961.
19. Wake Forest University, Winston-Salem, N. C.; student population 4,456; campus facility used for union programs 1956-57.
20. Warren Wilson College, Swannanoa, N. C.; student population 505; original campus union facility completed 1958.

Profile #5

Private--Predominantly White--(20)

The student population of the private--predominantly white university ranged from below 1,000 to 10,000. However, 90% of these campuses had student populations below 3,000. Of that number, the percentage of minorities (blacks and others) was between 8% and 9%. All of the private schools studied were affiliated with religious organizations.

Campus union facilities were not found on these campuses before 1950. All facilities were completed between 1950 and 1977. These unions were funded by church and private sources and had operating budgets that ranged from \$10,000 to \$500,000. In the questionnaire it was reported that only 35% had budgets above \$30,000.

On private--predominantly white campuses monies were allocated to the union based on student activity fees or through institutional appropriations. In some cases, combinations of student activity fees and institutional appropriations were used. It was important to note that the questionnaire indicated that no funds for budgeting were based solely on self-generated revenue.

The questionnaire indicated that the campus union directors on private--predominantly white institutions were all white, 65% male, who ranged from 23 to 60 years of age. Of number, 75% had achieved a master's degree with the balance having a bachelor's degree (Table 1). Eighty-five percent (17 of 20) of the union directors were supervised by Deans

of Students or Vice-Presidents for Student Affairs. The balance of the union directors were supervised by either a Vice-Chancellor for Academic Affairs or chancellors or presidents. Five of the union directors surveyed had teaching responsibilities that included courses in Art, Physical Education, Psychology, and General Education. It was reported that 90% (18 of 20) of the union directors surveyed had dual titles that included director of activities, art gallery director, residence director, golf coach, bookstore manager, vice-president for student life and, in one case, the president of the college.

Only one union director in this category had a program director or an assistant director on his staff. However, 12 reported that they had directors of activities on their staffs (Table 4). Others on the directors' staff were bookstore managers, business manager, games managers, night managers, program advisors, operation manager, food service managers, and a theater manager. It was reported that 55% (11 of 20) of the union directors surveyed in this category had policy, advisory or governing boards that operated independently from the Student Government Association.

The union directors of private--predominantly white institutions were not expected to make all decisions regarding programs and activities with the union. The questionnaire indicated that 65% of the unions surveyed had organizational structures comprised of a program, advisory, and a policy board that

had the responsibility of advising and assisting the director on union programs and services (Table 5). These boards were composed of students, union staff, and faculty and ranged in membership from more than one to above 17 members.

Private--predominantly white institutions had between 9% and 10% minorities (blacks and others). Fifty-five percent (11 of 20) reported having minority organizations on campus (Table 3).

Campus union directors were concerned about inter-institutional groups and groups beyond the institution which influenced programs and services within the union. It was felt that people working directly with union programs and services should have the most influence on decisions affecting the campus union. As a result, union directors pointed out that student members of union boards, union staff, union directors, and Student Life Deans should have the most influence with little direction needed from faculty, academic deans, chancellors, and trustees. According to the questionnaire, other individuals such as parents and alumni should not have any influence on program decisions within the union (Table 6).

The campus union directors and their staffs supervised the programs and activities of the campus union, but the program, advisory, or policy board provided some insight and oversight for director and staff decision-making. These boards were composed of students, union staff, and faculty and ranged in membership from more than one to above

17 members. The campus union directors indicated that the ideal program board based on 15 representatives would be composed of nine students, one union director, two faculty, two union staff, and one student life dean (Table 7).

The questionnaire reported some confusion regarding the union's role in the academic community (Table 2). Union directors indicated that they would support programs and courses that allow academic credits to be earned by student participants such as electives, internships, and union problems. However, most university curricula in this profile did not offer union-related courses or programs for academic credit (Table 1). It appeared that campus union directors would support programs that made available opportunities for organization and management experiences for students to be offered by the campus union, yet such programs did not exist on these campuses.

According to the questionnaire, most private--predominantly white campus unions provided bookstores, Student Government Association offices, yearbook offices, activities offices, snack bars, meeting rooms, banks of public telephones, and t.v. rooms. Other spaces were provided such as tutorial rooms, print shops, study rooms, ticket offices, faculty lounges, banquet rooms, poster rooms, novelty room, meditation room, and cafeterias. These were found in some unions, but not in all of them (Table 8).

These services were accompanied by numerous activities that enhanced student life experiences within the campus

union. Campus union activities on private--predominantly white campuses included billiards, dancing, movies, games, coffee houses, art exhibits, arts and crafts, conferences, game rooms, political meetings, lectures, seminars and in some cases, video filming, leadership workshops, plays, music listening, debating, and fashion shows. Bowling was an activity not found to be on any of the private--predominantly white campuses studied (Table 9). Attention was given programs and services in the campus union that created an atmosphere for the effective use of leisure time. Most union directors reported that their union program generated an atmosphere that was accommodating, entertaining, inviting, clean, and cooperative, and in a few cases, exciting, progressive, fun, expensive, interesting, cultured, cheerful active, musical, stimulating, junky and permissive.

The campus union directors appeared to have the responsibility for interpreting various campus-wide activities through programs and services in the union facility. Among the directors there was a difference of interpretation of the role statements, often based on specific procedures and policies of their respective universities. The director put the following roles in the important or of top importance category on the questionnaire (Table 10):

- (1) provide a well-rounded recreational program for the college community;
- (2) facilitate activities for small groups with specialized interests;

- (3) provide part-time employment for students;
- (4) provide students with a chance to organize and administer an activity for personal experiences;
- (5) teach students social responsibility;
- (6) act as the social and cultural center of the university community; and
- (7) enlighten the institution culturally through programming.

The union director put the following roles in the of little or of no importance category on the questionnaire:

- (1) be a place where faculty can meet colleagues away from the academic atmosphere;
- (2) act as a leadership laboratory for those students interested in developing management skills;
- (3) encourage a feeling of cohesion between various parts of the institution;
- (4) provide shopping center conveniences such as books, clothes, food, supplies, and postal service; and
- (5) provide activities which will offer practical aspects of academic teaching.¹

In the section of the questionnaire where union directors were asked to rate problem areas according to their individual priorities, budgeting was rated highest, followed by staff development, personnel, student development, accountability,

¹Taken directly from the text of the questionnaire.

faculty involvement, space problems, security, meeting the needs of the commuting student, and the need to integrate programs into academic goals of the institution (Table 11).

CHAPTER IV
SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Summary of the Study

The study of campus unions was an expository study, the purpose of which was to determine what North Carolina campus unions were doing in terms of the use of facilities, the programs and services, and roles undertaken by the union directors. Because of the somewhat unique racial composition of the North Carolina state system of colleges and universities and of the private institutions of higher learning, attention was given to the similarities and differences which may have existed in the campus unions because of or in spite of the dominant or minority race.

The literature search and review revealed the fact that little direct information was available about campus unions nationally and even less existed regarding the unions in North Carolina. Thus, most of what was found and reported was historical information about the evolution and refinement of the concept of what was now called the campus or student union. Even this general information was written with a national perspective and was found, for the most part, in the early proceedings of the ACU.

When the questionnaire was constructed to gather information concerning the function and roles of the campus unions in

North Carolina it was already known that there would be no criteria or standard available with which to compare or judge the data the union directors of North Carolina would provide through the questionnaire. Thus, an effort was made to collect information which would give the most complete view possible of the functioning and roles of the North Carolina campus unions located on four-year public and private college and university campuses.

It was assumed that there was little value in making an intra-university comparative analysis of campus unions since any results of such a study would be meaningless without standards or criteria. Therefore, the information was presented to demonstrate, as comprehensively as possible, a reality as to the functions and roles of the North Carolina campus unions. Further, it was thought that this collection of information and expression of opinions from the campus union directors might serve as a first step in formulating some evaluative process with which to measure the effectiveness of campus union policies and programs.

A forty item questionnaire was constructed (see Appendix B). Items were selected which asked the campus union directors of four-year public/private colleges/universities in North Carolina to give information about the budget, facilities, program and services, administration and organizations of their unions. Further, the directors were asked to speculate about their roles and state their problems. On-site visits were made to confirm the survey data.

Surveys were mailed to 45 campus union directors. Forty-four were returned, of which 42 qualified for use in this study. That was a 97.6% return rate which was well above the lower limits of acceptable expectancy.

Summary of Findings and Conclusions
from the Questionnaire

The following summary and conclusion statements were distilled from the campus union directors' responses to the questionnaire:

(1) Campus union facilities were not constructed on North Carolina campuses studied until 1931. Sixty-seven percent of these facilities were built after 1958.

(2) Campus unions first appeared on public--predominantly black campuses in 1967.

(3) The size of the campus union budgets were categorically smaller for public and private predominantly black campus unions when compared to public and private predominantly white campus unions.

(4) The directors of campus unions in North Carolina colleges and universities included on the questionnaire were 69% male.

(5) Over 73% of the campus union directors had master's degrees with none having a doctorate. The campus union directors of public and private predominantly white colleges and universities had a higher percentage of master's degrees (80%) than the campus union directors of public and private predominantly black colleges and universities (54%).

(6) Of the campus unions surveyed, 67% (28 of 42) of the campus union directors had dual titles or dual responsibilities.

(7) Only 22% (9 of 42) of the campus union directors questioned had teaching responsibilities. In the predominantly public and private black campus unions, only nine percent (1 of 11) of the campus union directors had teaching responsibilities.

(8) Although most campus union directors questioned indicated a desire for involvement with the academic community, only 17% (7 of 42) of the campus unions had courses being offered with campus union affiliation or participation.

(9) The organizational structure of campus unions did not indicate any consistency of existing positions except those of the director and the union policy advisory or governing board.

(10) Over 73% (32 of 42) of the campus union directors answered to either Deans of Students or Vice-Chancellors for Student Affairs.

(11) The directors indicated that 73% (8 of 11) of the public--predominantly white campus unions and 55% (11 of 20) of the private--predominantly white campus unions had minority organization affiliation with the campus union. No minority organizations were reported by public and private predominantly black campus union directors.

(12) All campus union directors questioned indicated that students should have the most influence on campus union programming, followed by the union director and union staff.

(13) The campus union directors questioned reported that overall 62% (26 of 42) of the campus unions had policy or advisory boards. Only 55% of the public and private predominantly black campus unions had advisory or policy boards. The structure of those boards varied in size and composition.

(14) In the composition of an ideal policy or advisory board of 15 members as perceived by campus union directors, 56% of the members would be students. The remaining 44% would be composed of faculty, student life deans, union directors, and union staff.

(15) The main elements of union programs and activities were billiards, dances, lectures, conferences, leadership workshops, seminars, plays or dramas, arts and crafts, political meetings, ping pong, art exhibits, debates, and games room (pinball, t.v. tennis).

(16) Campus union directors indicated the service provided by campus unions included bookstores, student government offices, yearbook offices, snack bars, banquets, pay telephones, ticket offices, t.v. rooms, activities offices, print shops, and organizations' meeting rooms.

(17) Campus union directors generally agreed that all role statements (Table 10) listed in the survey were

in the of importance or of top importance category, except those role statements that pertained to faculty involvement and academic teaching.

(18) Campus union directors in all profiles indicated that the budget was the top priority problem.

(19) Fifty percent (21 of 42) of the campus unions studied did not hold current membership (July, 1977) in the Association of College Unions-International.

(20) The study showed that the size of the institution of which the campus union was a part was the most influential factor in determining the type of union staff, kinds of activities and services provided, size of the budget and total operation of the campus union facility.

General Recommendations

(1) A set of minimum standards should be developed to aid local union directors in measuring the effectiveness of their campus union operation. It would be most appropriate for these standards to be cast on the national level and then modified, if necessary, for local, state or regional needs.

(2) Campus unions located on campuses where no separate lounge and recreational facilities are provided for faculty should consider setting aside such space. This could bring faculty to and involve them in union programs and provide them with a better sense of the union operation.

(3) Predominantly black campus union programs should be expanded to include minority organizations and minority participation.

(4) Campus union budgets should be clearly designated for union operations and not "hidden" in or among other college or university budget items. This clarity would give a more accurate view of the actual cost of the campus union program for the directors and others.

(5) In states where there is segregation of the races, intentional or unintentional, studies should be done to assure the equalization of resources. Consideration of needs must be given on criteria other than simply student population. This would be most applicable to state university systems.

Recommendations for Further Study

(1) Steps should be taken to bring the campus union concept closer to the academic community. An examination should be undertaken to determine the possibility of a direct relationship between the college or university curricula and the campus union program.

(2) A study of the campus union directorship should be undertaken. From the data collected in this study it was clear that there were few qualification requirements for directors and no real common agreement about the role. One area of specific interest for consideration should be the union director's position on the academic faculty.

(3) A study should be done of top level college and university administrators' attitudes toward the campus union concept. This study could yield a view of the philosophical role and relative importance of campus unions.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Adair, C. Faculty attitudes toward the goals and objectives of college unions in American higher education. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Texas A & M University, 1975.
- Association of College Unions. Standards of training, experience and compensation in college union work. Ithaca, New York: Cornell University, 1958.
- Association of College Unions. These are our best: A collection of outstanding union programs. Ithaca, New York: Cornell University, 1965.
- Association of College Unions. Standards: For professional staff preparation and compensation in college union work. Stanford, California: Association of College Unions-International, 1973-74.
- Association of College Unions-International. College unions: Fifty facts. Stanford, California: Association of College Unions-International, March 1975.
- Association of College Unions. Directory 1977-78. Stanford, California: Association of College Unions-International, July 1977.
- Barclay, K. Higher education and college unions--an issue for today. The Bulletin of the Association of College Unions-International, 1975, 43 (3), 12-13.
- Bebb, E., Rion, W., Reynolds, R., & Rodzen, R. The role of the college union. Dialogue 68, Proceedings of the 45th Annual Conference of the Association of College Unions-International, 1968, 66-69.
- Bell, B. Administration and operation of the college union. Ithaca, New York: Association of College Unions, Cornell University, 1965.
- Berry, C. Activities and citizenship. The Bulletin of the Association of College Unions, 1954, 22, 4.
- Berry, C. Planning a college union building. New York: Columbia University (Teachers College) Bureau of Publications, 1960.

- Berry, C. The next fifty years of college unions. Proceedings of the 41st Annual Conference of the Association of College Unions-International, 1964, 48-47.
- Berry, C. Future of the union--fact or fiction. Region 13 Conference of the Association of College Unions-International. Salt Lake City, Utah, Nov. 1964, 5-15.
- Berry, C. (Ed.). College unions--year fifty. Ithaca, New York: Association of College Unions-International, 1966. (a)
- Berry, C. Planning college union facilities for multiple-use. Madison, Wisconsin: Association of College Unions-International, 1966. (b)
- Berry, C. Open doors--both ways. The Bulletin of the Association of College Unions, 1969, 37, 8-10.
- Berry, C. The union and two cultures. Reachout, Proceedings of the 48th Annual Conference of the Association of College Unions-International, 1971, 1, 1-11.
- Berry, C. The unions of the seventies. The Bulletin of the Association of College Unions-International, February 1974, 42, 1, 2, 10.
- Berry, C. From a minus to a plus. The Bulletin of the Association of College Unions-International, March 1974, 42, 2, 8-11.
- Berry, C. Integral or auxiliary. The Bulletin of the Association of College Unions-International, December 1975, 43, 2, 5, 4-6.
- Berry, C. State of the union. The Bulletin of the Association of College Unions-International, February 1977, 45, 1, 2.
- Bickerstath, J. B. The role of the college union. Proceedings of the 8th Annual Conference of the Association of College Unions, 1931, 37-42.
- Board of Governors. The Code. Chapel Hill, North Carolina: University of North Carolina General Administration 1975.
- Braden, S. The academic community--the faculty member. Proceedings of the 42nd Annual Conference of the Association of College Unions-International, 1965, 263-267.

- Brubaker, D., & Nelson, R., Jr. Creative survival in educational bureaucracies. Berkeley, California: McCutchen Publishing Corp., 1974.
- Bryson, S. College unions at work, an annotated bibliography of the College Union (Vol. II). Ithaca, New York: Association of College Unions-International, 1974.
- Butts, P. The union as a university division of social education. Proceedings of the 24th Annual Convention of the Association of College Unions, 1947, 46-54.
- Butts, P. State of the union, 1961: College unions, 1961. Ithaca, New York: Association of College Unions-International, 1961.
- Butts, P. The college union story. American Institute of Architects Journal, March 1964, 41, 59-66.
- Butts, P. Planning and operating college union buildings. Ithaca, New York: Association of College Unions-International, 1967. (a)
- Butts, P. College unions around the world. Ithaca, New York: Association of College Unions-International, 1967. (b)
- Butts, P. Crisis on the campus and the college union. The Bulletin of the Association of College Unions, 1969, 37, 28-31.
- Butts, P. The college union idea. Stanford, California: Association of College Unions-International, 1971.
- Butts, P. College unions--not student unions. College and University Business, (Letter to the Editor), 1973, 55, 7.
- Butts, P. Throw them out, a letter to the Editor. The Bulletin of the Association of College Unions-International, June, 1976, 44, 2, 3.
- Butts, R. F. The college charts its course. New York: McGraw Hill Book Co., 1939.
- Carnegie Commission on Higher Education. Reform on campus: Changing students, changing academic programs, report and recommendations. New York: McGraw Hill Book Co., 1972.

- Chickering, A. Potential contributions of college unions to student development. Synergy, Proceedings of the 57th Annual Conference of the Association of College Unions-International, 1977, 23-27.
- Christensen, E. M. College unions at work, an annotated bibliography of the college union. Ithaca, New York: Association of College Unions, 1967.
- Coffin, F. History of the college union movement. Proceedings of the 37th Annual Conference of the Association of College Unions, 1960, 42-47.
- Coulter, S. Role of the union. Proceedings of the 12th Annual Convention of the Association of College Unions, 1935, 16.
- Cowan, J. Toward a research approach to student union operation. Unpublished manuscript, 1968 (Available from University of Minnesota, c/o John Cowan).
- Day, L. DeV. The union--an integral part of college education. Proceedings of the 37th Annual Conference of the Association of College Unions, 1960, 54-57.
- Durett, P., & Robinson, R. Governance of the college union. Stanford, California: Association of College Unions-International, 1972.
- Erdahl, G. Of what value are college union standard operating procedures. Proceedings of the 34th Annual Conference of the Association of College Unions, 1957, 49-51.
- Farnsworth, D. Social values in college and university. The Bulletin of the Association of College Unions-International, March 1976, 44, 2, 12-13.
- Fitzgerald, L., Johnson, W., & Norris, W. College student personnel: Reading and bibliographies. Boston: Houghton-Mifflin, 1970.
- Fitzgerald, R. The union as a part of the educational program. Proceedings of the 17th Annual Convention of the Association of College Unions, 1940, 25-30.
- Furman, D. Social programs in institutions of higher learning. Proceedings of the 27th Annual Convention of the Association of College Unions, 1950, 54-59.

- Grant, C. A will to change. Interaction, Proceedings of the 50th Annual Conference of the Association of College Unions-International, 1973, 1, 6-8.
- Haenle, T. The effect of decentralization by residential college on the role of the college union at selected collegiate universities. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, State University of New York at Buffalo, 1969.
- Harper, E. A union credo. Ithaca, New York: Association of College Unions, 1963.
- Harrold, R., Nelson, C., & Raush, C. Effective management through research and evaluation. Pre-Conference Seminar of the Association of College Unions-International. Unpublished manuscript, 1977.
- Herron, O. New dimensions in student personnel administration. Scranton, Pennsylvania: International Textbook Co., 1970.
- Hesser, A. How do unions operate. Proceedings of the 35th Annual Conference of the Association of College Unions, 1958, 82-95.
- Higgins, G. R., Humphreys, E., & Valley, L. Student unions--past, present and future. Proceedings of the 25th Annual Conference of the Association of College Unions, 1948, 8-10.
- Himes, J. Racial conflict in American society. Columbus, Ohio: Charles Merrill Publishing Co., 1973.
- Humphreys, E. O. College unions: A handbook on campus community centers. Ithaca, New York: Cornell University, 1946.
- Jackson, E. Blackness-whiteness in the union concept. Proceedings of the 54th Annual Conference of the Association of College Unions-International, 1974, 27-29.
- Jenkins, J., & McQueen, S. Administration and operation of the college union. Stanford, California: Association of College Unions-International, 1973.
- Jordon, H., Brattain, W., & Shaffer, R. The Journal of the National Association of Student Personnel Administration, 1969, 7, 3-6.
- Keyes, E. P. Program priorities: Tradition and innovation. Proceedings of the 47th Annual Conference of the Association of College Unions-International, 1970, 5, 3-6.

- Koile, E. College union--an integral part of the curriculum. Proceedings of the 43rd Annual Conference of the Association of College Unions-International, 1966, 93-96.
- Loomis, R. A review of ACU-I's involvement with minority affairs. The Eye of the Storm, Proceedings of the 55th Annual Conference of the Association of College Unions-International, 1975, 94-97.
- Luthi, R. Programming with academic credit. The Bulletin of the Association of College Unions-International, No. 3, June 1977, 45, 3, 6.
- Martin, T. The director of the small college union: His duties, his problems. The Bulletin of the Association of College Unions-International, October 1973, 41, 4, 5-6.
- McKay, R. Student rights. Dialogue 68, Proceedings of the 45th Annual Conference of the Association of College Unions-International, 1968, 2-6.
- McWhorter, R. A study of the cooperative relationships of college unions with academic departments. Proceedings of the 37th Annual Conference of the Association of College Unions, 1960, 61-67.
- Messick, G. Death of a union. Raleigh, North Carolina: Sterling Quicksilver Press, 1970.
- Nelson, R., Jr., & Brubaker, D. Introduction to decision-making. Dubuque, Iowa: Kendall/Hunt Publishing Co., 1972.
- Peace, J. Rising incidence of campus socio-political pressure groups. Proceedings of the 39th Annual Conference of the Association of College Unions, 1962, 191-197.
- Phillips, D. The director in today's college union. Focus on the future, Proceedings of the 49th Annual Conference of the Association of College Unions-International, 1972, 2, 5-11.
- Pride, H. For unions a growing dilemma. College and University Business, 1960, 28, 40-42.
- Pride, H. Future of the college unions. Proceedings of the 36th Annual Conference of the Association of College Unions, 1959, 192-199.

- Pride, H. Highlights of the history of the Association of College Unions. Proceedings of the 41st Annual Conference of the Association of College Unions, 1964, 40-47.
- Pride, H. History of the Association of College Unions. In C. Berry (Ed.), College unions--year fifty. Ithaca, New York: Association of College Unions, 1966. (a)
- Rausch, C. Measuring campus attitudes toward the union. Proceedings of the 54th Annual Conference of the Association of College Unions-International, 1974, 103-105.
- Reynolds, J. Pathology of racism. Communiversitry, Proceedings of the 46th Annual Conference of the Association of College Unions-International, 1969, 78-80.
- Siggelkow, E. The tyranny of freedom. Proceedings of the 41st Annual Conference of the Association of College Unions, 1964, 261-62.
- Siggelkow, E. ACUI: Priorities for effectiveness. An assessment of its past--a plan for its future. Stanford, California: Association of College Unions-International, 1975.
- Smith, C. S. Immutable elements of management. Proceedings of the 44th Annual Conference of the Association of College Unions-International, 1967, 5-12.
- Spence, J. Elementary statistics. New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, 1968.
- Sponker, H. The stream-lined student. Proceedings of the 28th Annual Convention of the Association of College Unions, 1951, 73-75.
- State of North Carolina. Session laws and resolutions. North Carolina General Assembly, Regular Session. Winston-Salem, N. C.: Winston Printing Co., 1963.
- Student Government. Due to circumstances beyond our control. A report on student non-academic fees at N. C. State University. Raleigh, N. C.: N. C. State Press, 1971.
- The General Statutes of North Carolina, State Government and Agencies. Vol. 3A. Section 106-1 to 115A-11. Charlottesville, Va.: Michie Co., 1975.
- Tinney, H. Educational role of the union. The Bulletin of the Association of College Unions, November 1955, 22, 4, 9-12.

United States Office of Education. College and university--
facilities survey. Washington, D. C., 1960.

University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill. Statistical
abstract of higher education in North Carolina
1976-1977. Research. Unpublished report, Chapel
Hill, N. C., April 1977.

Walters, J. F. The idea of the university union. Proceed-
ings of the 6th Annual Convention of the Association
of College Unions, 1925, 10-11.

Whipple, G. Programs and services offered in campus unions
of four year colleges and universities with a student
population of less than five thousand. The Bulletin
of the Association of College Unions-International,
No. 6, December 1977, 45, 2, 6, 15.

Wilson, G. Minority students and staff in a white univer-
sity. Renewal--76. Proceedings of the 56th Annual
Conference of the Association of College Unions-
International, 1976, 75-77.

Winkler, W. W. Student attitudes towards the union and what
determines them. Proceedings of the 17th Annual Con-
vention of the Association of College Unions, 1936,
33-40.

Woodruff, D. How the union serves the minority groups on
campus. Proceedings of the 21st Annual Convention of
the Association of College Unions, 1940, 31-35.

APPENDIX A
LETTER REGARDING "CAMPUS UNION QUESTIONNAIRE"



NORTH CAROLINA AGRICULTURAL AND TECHNICAL
STATE UNIVERSITY
GREENSBORO 27411

MEMORIAL UNION

July 5, 1977

Dear Colleague:

I am a doctoral candidate in the Department of Educational Administration at the University of North Carolina at Greensboro. I am requesting your assistance in the completion of the attached questionnaire on Campus Unions. The purpose of this questionnaire is to study the structures and functions of Campus Unions in public and private four-year institutions in North Carolina.

This questionnaire is moderate in length. My pretesting shows that Union Directors require on the average about 20 minutes to complete it. The questionnaire could have been shortened only by excluding important substantive areas thereby making the ultimate results less valuable. The success of this study depends completely upon the kindness and generosity of each respondent.

While this questionnaire has been numbered in order to enable me to follow up the initial mailings, I want to assure you that the use of this data will preclude the identification of any individual or institution.

It is my intention to share the results of this study with all who assist me through their participation. Your cooperation and prompt reply will be greatly appreciated. Please use the self-addressed stamped envelope to return this information once you have completed it. Please return the "Campus Union Questionnaire" by July 25, 1977.

Thank you in advance for your time and effort.

Sincerely,

Sullivan A. Welborne, Jr.
Director, Memorial Union

APPENDIX B

A STUDY OF THE STRUCTURE AND FUNCTIONS OF CAMPUS UNIONS
IN FOUR YEAR PUBLIC AND PRIVATE INSTITUTIONS
IN NORTH CAROLINA

A Study Conducted by
Sullivan A. Welborne, Jr.

Department of Educational Administration
School of Education
University of North Carolina at Greensboro

Part I - Background Information

Please Check the Appropriate Blank or fill in the Appropriate Space.

Age _____, Sex: Male _____, Female _____, Race _____

Educational Background: B.S. _____, B.A., _____, M.S. _____,
M.A. _____ Ph.D., _____, Ed.D. _____, Other _____.

If this space is checked, please indicate type of
degree. _____

Part II--Profile of The Campus Union and Its Parent Institution

Please Check the Appropriate Blanks or Fill in the Appropriate Spaces.

1. Please indicate the date of completion of the original campus union facility on your campus: _____.
If you do not have a Campus Union facility, please check this space _____.
2. Your Campus Union is located at an institution that is:
 - (a) public--predominantly white _____
 - (b) public--predominantly black _____
 - (c) private--predominantly white _____
 - (d) private--predominantly black _____
3. Please indicate the approximate range of students enrolled at your institution:
 - (a) 0 - 1,000 _____
 - (b) 1,001 - 3,000 _____
 - (c) 3,001 - 6,000 _____
 - (d) 6,001 -10,000 _____
 - (e) Over 10,001 _____

4. What per cent of the students in number (3) represent minorities? _____
5. Are there minority organizations affiliated with your Campus Union? Yes _____ No _____
If Yes, please name the organization _____.
6. What is the source of funds for your college or university?
(a) state _____
(b) church _____
(c) city or county _____
(d) private _____
7. What is the source of funds for your union budget?
(a) student activities fee _____
(b) institutional appropriation _____
(c) completely self supporting or self-generated revenue _____
(d) combination of two or more of the above _____
If this space is checked, please put per cent by the letter.
(e) other _____. If this space is checked, please indicate source of funding _____.
8. Please check the range of monies below that represent your operations and program budget.
(a) \$ 1,000 - \$ 10,000 _____
(b) \$ 10,001 - \$ 30,000 _____
(c) \$ 30,001 - \$ 70,000 _____
(d) \$ 70,001 - \$125,000 _____
(e) \$125,001 - \$250,000 _____
(f) \$250,001 - \$500,000 _____
(g) \$500,001 - over _____
9. Please check the positions that are a part of the organizational structure of your campus union.
- a. Director _____
 - b. Assist. Director _____
 - c. Assoc. Director _____
 - d. Program Director _____
 - e. Business Manager _____
 - f. Bookstore Manager _____
 - g. Games Manager _____
 - h. Asst. Program Dir. _____
 - i. Asst. Games Dir. _____
 - j. Night Manager _____
 - k. Food Service Manager _____
 - l. Theater Director _____
 - m. Dir. of Student Activities _____
 - n. Program Advisor _____
 - o. Operations Manager _____

- p. Outing Director _____
 q. Art and Gallery Director _____
 r. Workshop Director _____
 s. Union Program, Policy or Advisory Board _____
 t. Additional Positions not named _____
-

10. In the organizational structure of your college or university does the director of the campus union report to:
 a. Vice-Chancellor-Academic Affairs _____
 b. Vice-President-Academic Affairs _____
 c. Vice-Chancellor-Fiscal Affairs _____
 d. Business Manager of the University _____
 e. Director of Auxiliary Services _____
 f. Vice-Chancellor-Student Affairs _____
 g. Vice-President-Student Affairs _____
 h. Dean of Students _____
 i. Chancellor or President of the University _____
 j. Provost of the University _____
 k. Combination of two or more of the above _____.
 If this space is checked, please indicate by letters.
- l. None of the above. _____ If this space is checked, please indicate to whom you report _____
11. Does your campus union have a program board? Yes _____
 No _____.
12. Does your campus union have a policy, advisory or governing board? Yes _____ No _____. (If yes, answer questions 13-15).
13. The Policy Board operates independently from the Student Government Association. Yes _____ No _____
14. What is the total membership of your Policy Board?
 a. 1 - 6 _____
 b. 7 - 10 _____
 c. 11 - 13 _____
 d. 14 - 16 _____
 e. 17 or more _____
15. Is your policy or governing board composed of:
 a. Students only _____
 b. Faculty only _____
 c. Students and faculty _____
 d. Students and union staff _____
 e. Union staff only _____
 f. Students, faculty and staff _____
 g. Other _____. Please indicate _____

16. Below is a list of constituents of an institution of higher education. Please indicate by the choices below which group or groups should have the most influence on student union programming and service policies.

Indicate strength of influence by assigning each group one of the following numbers:

5--very strong 4--strong 3--moderate
2--little 1--none

Board of Trustees _____
Faculty _____
Academic Deans _____
Student Life Deans _____
Parents _____
Alumni _____
Union Director _____
Union Staff _____
State Legislators _____
Chancellor or Pres. _____
Students _____
Other _____

17. How would you allocate the number of representatives from the groups listed above to a union policy board of fifteen (15) members? Place the number of representatives which you would allocate from each group in the blank beside that group and circle the number to distinguish it from the answer to question (16).

Part III - Leadership of the Campus Union--A Personal Perspective

18. Please indicate the type of position or appointment you have from the university:
- Faculty _____
 - E P A _____
 - Staff S P A _____
 - Staff--E P A _____
 - Dual appointment of the above _____.
 - Other _____ If this space is checked please name the type of appointment _____.
19. Do you have teaching responsibilities as the union director? Yes _____ No _____. If yes, what academic area _____.

20. As Director of the Campus Union, is your appointment or title a combination of responsibilities, such as Union Director-Veteran Affairs, Union Director-Placement or Union Director-Athletic Director? Yes _____ No _____
If Yes, please name other titles _____
21. Do you think students should be allowed to earn academic credits through participation in union activities? Yes _____ No _____. If yes, to which of the following categories would you award credit:
Electives _____
Internship _____
Problems _____
Independent study _____
Seminars _____
Practicum _____
Others _____
22. Would you support a program at your college or university which would make available opportunities for organizations and management experiences as offered to students by the campus union? Yes _____ No _____
23. Do you presently have students earning academic credits for courses in your union program? Yes _____ No _____
If yes, approximate number _____.
24. Can you think of any activities or programs your campus union offers that could be used for academic credit? Yes _____ No _____. If yes, please name _____
25. The following services could be provided by a campus union. Please indicate by a check if these services are provided by your campus union.
- a. Bookstore _____
 - b. Beauty Shop _____
 - c. SGA office _____
 - d. Yearbook office _____
 - e. Meditations room _____
 - f. Activities office _____
 - g. Print or sign shop _____
 - h. Barber shop _____
 - i. Study room _____
 - j. SnackBar or soda shop or canteen _____
 - k. Tutorial rooms _____
 - l. Faculty lounge _____
 - m. Clothing stores _____
 - n. Banquets _____
 - o. Pay telephones _____
 - p. Ticket office _____
 - q. Television room _____

- r. Poster room _____
- s. Novelty room _____
- t. Organizations (Fraternities, sororities, meeting rooms, etc.) _____
- u. Cafeteria _____

26. The following is a list of activities that could occur in campus unions. Please check those activities that are offered in your union. Add additional activities if desired.

- a. Bowling _____
- b. Billiards _____
- c. Dances _____
- d. Lectures _____
- e. Ping pong _____
- f. Movies _____
- g. Debates _____
- h. Seminars _____
- i. Conferences _____
- j. Video filming _____
- k. Leadership workshops _____
- l. Political meetings _____
- m. Arts & crafts _____
- n. Novelty shops _____
- o. Clothing shops _____
- p. Coffee houses _____
- q. Art exhibits _____
- r. Fashion shops _____
- s. Plays or drama _____
- t. Music listening room _____
- u. Game room (pin ball, TV tennis, etc.) _____
- v. _____
- w. _____

27. Check the terms below which best describe your view of the general atmosphere of the union facility on your campus.

- | | |
|---------------------|---------------------|
| _____ Accommodating | _____ Expensive |
| _____ Exciting | _____ Functional |
| _____ Educational | _____ Stimulating |
| _____ Entertaining | _____ Cooperative |
| _____ Stagnating | _____ Interesting |
| _____ Inviting | _____ Cluttered |
| _____ Progressive | _____ Cheerful |
| _____ Depressing | _____ Misused |
| _____ Indifferent | _____ Uncooperative |
| _____ Inactive | _____ Permissive |
| _____ Irresponsive | _____ Active |
| _____ Uninviting | _____ Hang out |
| _____ Clean | _____ Dirty |
| _____ Junky | _____ Others _____ |
| _____ Fun | |

Now please circle the one term above which best describes what you think the general atmosphere of a campus union should be.

The following is a list of roles generally considered to be part of the college union mission. Please read carefully the different role statements printed below and react to them in two ways: Place an "X" by the statement which best describes:

- a. How important the role is for the union on your campus, and
- b. How important the role ought to be for the union on your campus.

Please refer to the example below for the proper procedure.

Role: Bring to the campus popular entertainment which the institution could not otherwise afford. This role:

<u>IS</u>	<u>OUGHT TO BE</u>	
_____	_____	Of top importance
<u>X</u>	<u>X</u>	Of importance
_____	_____	Of little importance
_____	_____	Of no importance
_____	_____	Don't know, can't say

28. Role: Provide a well-rounded recreational program for the college community. This role:

<u>IS</u>	<u>OUGHT TO BE</u>	
_____	_____	Of top importance
_____	_____	Of importance
_____	_____	Of little importance
_____	_____	Of no importance
_____	_____	Don't know, can't say

29. Role: Act as a leadership laboratory for those students interested in developing management skills. This role:

<u>IS</u>	<u>OUGHT TO BE</u>	
_____	_____	Of top importance
_____	_____	Of importance
_____	_____	Of little importance
_____	_____	Of no importance
_____	_____	Don't know, can't say

30. Role: Be a place where faculty can meet colleagues away from the academic atmosphere. This role:

IS OUGHT TO BE

_____ _____ Of top importance
 _____ _____ Of importance
 _____ _____ Of little importance
 _____ _____ Of no importance
 _____ _____ Don't know, can't say

31. Role: Facilitate activities for small groups with specialized interests. This role:

IS OUGHT TO BE

_____ _____ Of top importance
 _____ _____ Of importance
 _____ _____ Of little importance
 _____ _____ Of no importance
 _____ _____ Don't know, can't say

32. Role: Encourage a feeling of cohesion between various parts and departments of the institution. This role:

IS OUGHT TO BE

_____ _____ Of top importance
 _____ _____ Of importance
 _____ _____ Of little importance
 _____ _____ Of no importance
 _____ _____ Don't know, can't say

33. Role: Provide part-time employment for students. This role:

IS OUGHT TO BE

_____ _____ Of top importance
 _____ _____ Of importance
 _____ _____ Of little importance
 _____ _____ Of no importance
 _____ _____ Don't know, can't say

34. Role: Provide shopping center conveniences such as books, clothes, food, supplies, and postal service. This role:

IS OUGHT TO BE

_____ _____ Of top importance
 _____ _____ Of importance
 _____ _____ Of little importance
 _____ _____ Of no importance
 _____ _____ Don't know, can't say

35. Role: Provide students with a chance to organize and administer an activity for personal experiences. This role:

IS OUGHT TO BE

_____ _____ Of top importance
 _____ _____ Of importance
 _____ _____ Of little importance
 _____ _____ Of no importance
 _____ _____ Don't know, can't say

36. Role: Teach students social responsibility. This role:

IS OUGHT TO BE

_____ _____ Of top importance
 _____ _____ Of importance
 _____ _____ Of little importance
 _____ _____ Of no importance
 _____ _____ Don't know, can't say

37. Role: Act as the social and cultural center of the university community. This role:

IS OUGHT TO BE

_____ _____ Of top importance
 _____ _____ Of importance
 _____ _____ Of little importance
 _____ _____ Of no importance
 _____ _____ Don't know, can't say

38. Role: Enlighten the institution culturally through programming. This role:

IS OUGHT TO BE

- _____ Of top importance
- _____ Of importance
- _____ Of little importance
- _____ Of no importance
- _____ Don't know, can't say

39. Role: Provide activities which will offer practical aspects of academic teaching. This role:

IS OUGHT TO BE

- _____ Of top importance
- _____ Of importance
- _____ Of little importance
- _____ Of no importance
- _____ Don't know, can't say

40. Role: As Director of the Campus Union, please list four problem areas that you feel are top priorities for union administrators today. If there are none, please check this blank _____.

- a. _____
- b. _____
- c. _____
- d. _____

If you have additional comments concerning this questionnaire, please use this space.

NOTE: If you lose the self-addressed envelope, this questionnaire should be returned to:

Mr. Sullivan A. Welborne, Jr.
N. C. A & T State University
Memorial Union
312 North Dudley Street
Greensboro, North Carolina 27411

APPENDIX C

1963--SESSION LAWS

S. B. 413

CHAPTER 847

AN ACT TO AUTHORIZE THE ISSUANCE OF REVENUE BONDS BY THE BOARDS OF TRUSTEES OF THE UNIVERSITY OF NORTH CAROLINA, AGRICULTURAL AND TECHNICAL COLLEGE OF NORTH CAROLINA, APPALACHIAN STATE TEACHERS COLLEGE, EAST CAROLINA COLLEGE, ELIZABETH CITY STATE COLLEGE, FAYETTEVILLE STATE COLLEGE, NORTH CAROLINA COLLEGE AT DURHAM, PEMBROKE STATE COLLEGE, WESTERN CAROLINA COLLEGE AND WINSTON-SALEM STATE COLLEGE FOR THE ACQUISITION AND CONSTRUCTION OF BUILDINGS AND FACILITIES FOR STUDENT HOUSING, STUDENT ACTIVITIES, PHYSICAL EDUCATION AND RECREATION.

The General Assembly of North Carolina do enact:

Section 1. Purpose. The purpose of this Act is to authorize the boards of trustees of the educational institutions designated herein to issue revenue bonds, payable from rentals, charges, fees (including student fees) and other revenues but with no pledge of taxes or the faith and credit of the State or any agency or political subdivision thereof, to pay the cost, in whole or in part, of buildings and other facilities for the housing, health, welfare, recreation and convenience of students enrolled at said institutions.

Sec. 2. Credit of State Not Pledged. Revenue bonds issued as in this Act provided shall not be deemed to constitute a debt or liability of the State or of any political subdivision thereof or a pledge of the faith and credit of the State or of any such political subdivision, but shall be payable solely from the funds herein provided therefor from revenues. All such revenue bonds shall contain on the face thereof a statement to the effect that neither the State nor the board (herein mentioned) shall be obligated to pay the same or the interest thereon except from revenues as herein defined and that neither the faith and credit nor the taxing power of the State or of any political subdivision or instrumentality thereof is pledged to the payment of the principal of or the interest on such bonds. The issuance of revenue bonds hereunder shall not directly or indirectly or contingently obligate the State or any political subdivision thereof to levy or to pledge any taxes whatsoever therefor.

Sec. 3. Definitions. As used in this Act, the following words and terms shall have the following meanings, unless the context shall indicate another or different meaning or intent:

(a) The word "board" shall mean the board of trustees of any of the following: The University of North Carolina, Agricultural and Technical College of North Carolina, Appalachian State Teachers College, Asheville-Biltmore College, Charlotte College, East Carolina College, Elizabeth City State College, Fayetteville State College, North Carolina College at Durham, Pembroke State College, Western Carolina College, Wilmington College, and Winston-Salem State College, or such above-referred to institution regardless of whatever name it may be called, or any additional State-supported institutions of higher learning that may be provided by the General Assembly of North Carolina or, if any such board shall be abolished, the board, body, commission, department or officer succeeding to the principal functions thereof or to whom the powers vested under this Act in the board shall be given by law.

(b) The word "cost", as applied to any project, shall include the cost of acquisition or construction, the cost of acquisition of all property, both real and personal, or interests therein, the cost of demolishing, removing or relocating any buildings or structures on land so acquired, including the cost of acquiring any lands to which such buildings or structures may be moved or relocated, the cost of all labor, materials, equipment and furnishings, financing charges, interest prior to and during construction and, if deemed advisable by the board, for a period not exceeding one (1) year after completion of such construction, provisions for working capital, reserves for interest and for extensions, enlargements, additions and improvements, cost of engineering, financial and legal services, plans, specifications, studies, surveys, estimates of cost and of revenues, administrative expenses, expenses necessary or incident to determining the feasibility or practicability of constructing the project, and such other expenses as may be necessary or incident to the acquisition or construction of the project, the financing of such acquisition or construction, and the placing of the project in operation. Any obligation or expense incurred by the board prior to the issuance of bonds under the provisions of this Act in connection with any of the foregoing items of cost may be regarded as a part of such cost.

(c) The word "institution" shall mean the University of North Carolina or any one or more of the three institutions comprising the University of North Carolina, namely, the University of North Carolina (at Chapel Hill), North Carolina State College of Agriculture and Engineering of the University of North Carolina and the Woman's College of the University of North Carolina; Agricultural and Technical College of North Carolina; Appalachian State Teachers College; Asheville-Biltmore College; Charlotte College; East Carolina

College; Elizabeth City State College; Fayetteville State College; North Carolina College at Durham; Pembroke State College; Western Carolina College; Wilmington College; and Winston-Salem State College, or such above-referred to institution regardless of whatever name it may be called.

(d) The term "existing facilities" shall mean buildings and facilities then existing any part of the revenues of which are pledged under the provisions of any resolution authorizing the issuance of revenue bonds hereunder to the payment of such bonds.

(e) The word "project" shall mean and shall include any one or more buildings or facilities for student housing, student activities, physical education or recreation of any size or type approved by the board and the Advisory Budget Commission and any enlargements, improvements or additions so approved of or to any such buildings or facilities now or hereafter existing, including, but without limiting the generality thereof, dormitories and other student housing, dining facilities, student centers, gymnasiums, field houses and other physical education and recreation buildings, structures and facilities, and necessary land and interests in land, furnishings, equipment and parking facilities. Any project comprising a building or buildings for student activities or any enlargement or improvement thereof or addition thereto may include, without limiting the generality thereof, facilities for student services such as lounges, rest rooms, lockers, offices, stores for books and supplies, snack bars, cafeterias, restaurants, laundries, cleaning, postal, banking and similar student services, offices, rooms and other facilities for guests and visitors and facilities for meetings and for recreational, cultural and entertainment activities.

(f) The word "revenues" shall mean all or any part of the rents, charges, fees (including student fees) and other income and revenues derived from or in connection with any project or projects and existing facilities, and may include receipts and other income derived from athletic games and public events. (pp. 1021-1023)

Sec. 7. Fees, Rents, Charges. For the purpose of aiding in the acquisition, construction, or provision of any project and the maintenance, repair and operation of any project or any existing facilities, the board is authorized to fix, revise from time to time, charge and collect from students enrolled at the institution under its jurisdiction such student fee or fees for such privileges and services and in such amount or amounts as the board shall determine, and to fix, revise from time to time, charge and collect other fees, rents and charges for the use of and for the services furnished or to be furnished by any project or projects and

any existing facilities, or any portion thereof, and admission fees for athletic games and other public events, and to contract with any person, partnership, association or corporation for the lease, use, occupancy or operation of, or for concessions in, any project or projects and any existing facilities, or any part thereof, and to fix the terms, conditions, fees, rents and charges for any such lease, use, occupancy, operation or concession. So long as bonds issued hereunder and payable therefrom are outstanding, such fees, rents and charges shall be so fixed and adjusted, with relation to other revenues available therefor, as to provide funds pursuant to the requirements of the resolution or trust agreement authorizing or securing such bonds at least sufficient with such other revenues, if any, (a) to pay the cost of maintaining, repairing and operating any project or projects and any existing facilities any part of the revenues of which are pledged to the payment of the bonds issued for such project or projects, (b) to pay the principal of and the interest on such bonds as the same shall become due and payable, and (c) to create and maintain reserves for such purposes. Such fees, rents and charges shall not be subject to supervision or regulation by any other commission, board, bureau or agency of the State. A sufficient amount of the revenues, except such part thereof as may be necessary to pay such cost of maintenance, repair and operation and to provide such reserves therefor and for renewals, replacements, extensions, enlargements and improvements as may be provided for in the resolution authorizing the issuance of such bonds or in the trust agreement securing the same, shall be set aside at such regular intervals as may be provided in such resolution or such trust agreement in a sinking fund which is hereby pledged to, and charged with, the payment of the principal of and the interest on such bonds as the same shall become due and the redemption price or the purchase price of bonds retired by call or purchase as therein provided. Such pledge shall be valid and binding from the time when the pledge is made, the fees, rents and charges and other revenues or other moneys so pledged and thereafter received by the board shall immediately be subject to the lien of such pledge without any physical delivery thereof or further act, and the lien of any such pledge shall be valid and binding as against all parties having claims of any kind in tort, contract or otherwise against the board, irrespective of whether such parties have notice thereof. Neither the resolution nor any trust agreement by which a pledge is created need be filed or recorded except in the records of the board. The use and disposition of moneys to the credit of such sinking fund shall be subject to the provisions of the resolution authorizing the issuance of such bonds or of the trust agreement securing the same. (pp. 1027-1028)

APPENDIX D

General Statutes of North Carolina. State Government and Agencies. 1973.

Article 21.

Revenue Bonds for Student Housing, Student Activities,
Physical Education and Recreation.

§ 116-187. Purpose of Article.--The purpose of this Article is to authorize the Board of Governors of the University of North Carolina to issue revenue bonds, payable from rentals, charges, fees (including student fees) and other revenues but with no pledge of taxes or the faith and credit of the State or any agency or political subdivision thereof, to pay the cost, in whole or in part, of buildings and other facilities for the housing, health, welfare, recreation and convenience of students enrolled at the institutions hereinafter designated, housing of faculty, adult or continuing education programs and for revenue-producing parking decks or structures. (1963, c. 847, s. 1; 1967, c. 1148, s. 1; 1971, c. 1061, s. 1; c. 1244, s. 16.)

§ 116-188. Credit and taxing power of State not pledged; statement on face of bonds.--Revenue bonds issued as in this Article provided shall not be deemed to constitute a debt or liability of the State or any political subdivision thereof or a pledge of the faith and credit of the State or of any such political subdivision, but shall be payable solely from the funds herein provided therefor from revenues. All such revenue bonds shall contain on the face thereof a statement to the effect that neither the State nor the Board (herein mentioned) shall be obligated to pay the same or the interest thereon except from revenues as herein defined and that neither the faith and credit nor the taxing power of the State or of any political subdivision or instrumentality thereof is pledged to the payment of the principal of or the interest on such bonds. The issuance of revenue bonds hereunder shall not directly or indirectly or contingently obligate the State or any political subdivision thereof to levy or to pledge any taxes whatsoever therefor. (1963, c. 847, s. 2.)

§ 116-189. Definitions.--As used in this Article, the following words and terms shall have the following meanings, unless the context shall indicate another or different meaning or intent:

- (1) The word "Board" shall mean the Board of Governors of the University of North Carolina.
- (2) The word "cost," as applied to any project, shall include the cost of acquisition or construction, the cost of acquisition of all property, both real and personal, or interests therein, the cost of demolishing, removing or relocating any buildings or structures on land so acquired, including the cost of acquiring any lands to which such buildings or structures may be moved or relocated, the cost of all labor, materials, equipment and furnishings, financing charges, interest prior to and during construction and, if deemed advisable by the Board, for a period not exceeding one year after completion of such construction, provisions for working capital, reserves for debt service and for extensions, enlargements, additions and improvements, cost of engineering, financial and legal services, plans, specifications, studies, surveys, estimates of cost and of revenues, administrative expenses, expenses necessary or incident to determining the feasibility or practicability of constructing the project, and such other expenses as may be necessary or incident to the acquisition or construction of the project, the financing of such acquisition or construction, and the placing of the project in operation. Any obligation or expense incurred by the Board prior to the issuance of bonds under the provisions of this Article in connection with any of the foregoing items of cost may be regarded as a part of such cost.
- (3) The term "existing facilities" shall mean buildings and facilities then existing any part of the revenues of which are pledged under the provisions of any resolution authorizing the issuance of revenue bonds hereunder to the payment of such bonds.
- (4) The word "institution" shall mean each of the institutions enumerated in G.S. 116-2.
- (5) The word "project" shall mean and shall include any one or more buildings or facilities for (i) the housing, health, welfare, recreation and convenience of students, (ii) the housing of faculty, (iii) adult or continuing education, and (iv) revenue-producing parking decks or structures, of any size or type approved by the Board and the Advisory Budget Commission and any enlargements, improvements or additions so approved of or to any such buildings or facilities now or hereafter existing, including, but without limiting the generality thereof, dormitories and other student, faculty and adult or continuing education housing, dining facilities, student centers, gymnasiums, field houses and other physical education and recreation buildings, structures and

facilities, infirmaries and other health care buildings, structures and facilities, academic facilities for adult or continuing education, and necessary land and interests in land, furnishings, equipment and parking facilities. Any project comprising a building or buildings for student activities or adult or continuing education or any enlargement or improvement thereof or addition thereto may include, without limiting the generality thereof, facilities for services such as lounges, restrooms, lockers, offices, stores for books and supplies, snack bars, cafeterias, restaurants, laundries, cleaning, postal, banking and similar services, offices, rooms and other facilities for guests and visitors and facilities for meetings and for recreational, cultural and entertainment activities.

- (6) The word "revenues" shall mean all or any part of the rents, charges, fees (including student fees) and other income revenues derived from or in connection with any project or projects and existing facilities, and may include receipts and other income derived from athletic games and public events. (1963, c. 847, s. 3; 1965, c. 31, s. 3; 1967, c. 1038; c. 1148, s. 2; 1969, c. 297, s. 8; c. 388; c. 608, s. 1; c. 801, ss. 2-4; 1971, c. 1061, s. 2; c. 1244, s. 16.) (pp. 930-931)

§ 116-193. Fixing fees, rents and charges; sinking fund.-- For the purpose of aiding in the acquisition, construction or provision of any project and the maintenance, repair and operation of any project or any existing facilities, the Board is authorized to fix, revise from time to time, charge and collect from students enrolled at the institution under its jurisdiction such student fee or fees for such privileges and services and in such amount or amounts as the Board shall determine, and to fix, revise from time to time, charge and collect other fees, rents and charges for the use of and for the services furnished or to be furnished by any project or projects and any existing facilities, or any portion thereof, and admission fees for athletic games and other public events, and to contract with any person, partnership, association or corporation for the lease, use, occupancy or operation of, or for concessions in, any project or projects and any existing facilities, or any part thereof, and to fix the terms, conditions, fees, rents and charges for any such lease, use, occupancy, operation or concession. So long as bonds issued hereunder and payable therefrom are outstanding, such fees, rents and charges shall be so fixed and adjusted, with relation to other revenues available therefor, as to provide funds pursuant to the requirements of the resolution or trust agreement authorizing or securing such bonds at least sufficient with such other revenues, if any, (i) to

pay the cost of maintaining, repairing and operating any project or projects and any existing facilities any part of the revenues of which are pledged to the payment of the bonds issued for such project or projects, (ii) to pay the principal of and the interest on such bonds as the same shall become due and payable, and (iii) to create and maintain reserves for such purposes. Such fees, rents and charges shall not be subject to supervision or regulation by any other commission, board, bureau or agency of the State. A sufficient amount of the revenues, except such part thereof as may be necessary to pay such cost of maintenance, repair and operation and to provide such reserves therefor and for renewals, replacements, extensions, enlargements and improvements as may be provided for in the resolution authorizing the issuance of such bonds or in the trust agreement securing the same, shall be set aside at such regular intervals as may be provided in such resolution or such trust agreement in a sinking fund which is hereby pledged to, and charged with, the payment of the principal of and the interest on such bonds as the same shall become due and the redemption price or the purchase price of bonds retired by call or purchase as therein provided. Such pledge shall be valid and binding from the time when the pledge is made, the fees, rents and charges and other revenues or other moneys so pledged and thereafter received by the Board shall immediately be subject to the lien of any such pledge shall be valid and binding as against all parties having claims of any kind in tort, contract or otherwise against the Board, irrespective of whether such parties have notice thereof. Neither the resolution nor any trust agreement by which a pledge is created need be filed or recorded except in the records of the Board. The use and disposition of moneys to the credit of such sinking fund shall be subject to the provisions of the resolution authorizing the issuance of such bonds or of the trust agreement securing the same. (1963, c. 847, s. 7.) (pp. 935-936)