

SENATE FORUM

DECEMBER, 1987

VOLUME 2, NUMBER 2

The Culture of the Campus

The Important Questions:

From the Faculty Perspective. . .

Do we share goals with our students?
With administrators?
Would we invite them home?

From the President's Perspective. . .

How do we keep the classroom alive?

From the staff perspective. . .

The challenge of the 'different student'

***Also
Inside***

The Disciplinary Procedure

Letters to the Editor

The Culture of the Campus: A report on faculty perceptions

Keith Boyum
Department of Political Science

In Spring, 1986, the Long Range Planning Committee sponsored a survey of the Academic Senate electorate which duplicated some of the questions posed to a sample of nation-wide faculty by the Carnegie Foundation in 1984. The Carnegie data were reported in "Who Faculty Members Are, and What They Think" (*The Chronicle of Higher Education*, December 18, 1985, pp. 25-28). Among the items which appeared in both surveys were those assessing faculty opinions about the goals of undergraduate education, faculty interaction with students, and faculty perceptions about governance of their institutions.

Goals for Undergraduate Education

Like our colleagues nation-wide, faculty at CSUF overwhelmingly support the propositions that undergraduate education goals include career preparation, attainment of knowledge and cultural appreciation. However, a similar survey of entering freshmen nation-wide showed a significant difference between their perceptions and those of the faculty. Table 1 presents the findings.

Interaction with Students

Like their colleagues nation-wide, CSUF faculty indicate that they are very interested in interacting with their students in an informal context, but, again like their nation-wide colleagues, they infrequently invite students into their homes. Table 2 presents the results of the surveys.

Faculty Governance

Table 3 displays data that suggest that faculty at CSUF believe that governance in their departments is relatively open and democratic. With respect to views about governance of the institution, however, CSUF faculty appear no different from faculty nationwide when it comes to perceptions about their relative ineffectiveness in influencing administrators. Table 3 also presents data which show that faculty at CSUF are modestly more militant and pro-union in their opinions about union issues though less pro-union when questioned directly about their union.

Conclusions

This brief data-oriented note surely amounts only to a small contribution to the larger question of the nature

of CSUF's faculty culture. But perhaps the data suggest some ideas. Let me sharpen the ideas by posing "propositions," which readers are invited to evaluate on the basis of their own insights about the culture of the faculty at our institution.

Like students and colleagues nationwide, CSUF faculty agree overwhelmingly that career preparation and the attainment of depth of knowledge are important goals. But when it comes to the place of high culture in college education, faculty and students are far apart. I suggest that:

Proposition A: Students' relative disinterest in cultural appreciation is a major source of frustration for faculty over the perceived "quality" of their students.

Typical of faculty nationwide, we confess considerable interest in informal interactions with our students but, again typically, we don't invite them to our homes very frequently. There seems to be an interesting disparity between faculty assertions of interest and the actions faculty take (or fail to take). If this disparity between attitude and behavior is real, and especially if it extends to other kinds of informal student-faculty interaction, it may suggest that faculty would be open to encouragement and incentives to interact with their students outside classrooms. On that basis, let me hazard

Proposition B: Programs for encouraging informal student-faculty interactions are likely to succeed.

Finally, there is the matter of reactions to the faculty union. Though some observers of our campus would argue that CSUF faculty do *not* support our union very strongly, the comparative data with other institutions nationwide seem to suggest the opposite: that CSUF faculty are more pro-union than are faculty across the nation. We are, after all, more likely to see circumstances where a strike is legitimate. We think, by a somewhat impressive margin of difference, that the only basis for salary differentiation should be age or seniority. How then can seasoned observers conclude that CSUF faculty are not very pro-union?

First, these observers may just be wrong.

Second, the observers may have sister CSU campuses in mind for their comparison, rather than faculty nationwide. It may be that CSUF faculty are more pro-union than faculty across the United States, but somewhat less pro-union than is common at CSU campuses.

Third, there may be some indication in these data that CSUF faculty are not sanguine about *this* bargaining situation's resulting in the achievement of the goals of the

campus faculty. This system management, or this systemwide union, or the combination of them, may not be regarded as effective. A union leadership that communicated successes even more clearly than it now does, or perhaps in fact achieved more successes (here leaving open the definition of success), might generate more pro-union views than now seem to prevail.

A fourth idea may be the most intriguing. Let me suggest that:

Proposition C: The difference between faculty attitudes (sympathetic to collective bargaining) and apparent faculty behaviors (not very union-oriented) is a product of local faculty leadership preferences for a collegial governance system.

If true, that would amount to a challenge to local Academic Senate and other collegial faculty leadership. Perhaps it would also suggest broad strategies to local union leadership, featuring collegiality and consensus-building rather than hard bargaining and conflict as means to faculty ends.

Still more broadly, and finally, there may be in these data some opportunities for creative leadership that would feature collegial and informal networks where, at the margin, governance choices are made. Networks that link faculty and students, and in fact networks that foster links all directions among faculty, students, staff, and administrators, may result in greater professional satisfaction on all parts. All else equal, that should result in an effective institution, one that achieves institutional goals.

Editor's note: Keith Boyum asserts that he is a member in good standing of the California Faculty Association (the faculty union), and of both the Statewide and the CSUF Academic Senates. He has had students to his home, though not very often, and he thinks that appreciation of literature and art are important objectives of an undergraduate education.

*Faculty responses drawn from 1984 Carnegie Foundation survey of American Faculty. *The Chronicle of Higher Education*, Dec. 18, 1985, pp. 25-28. CSUF responses drawn from Spring, 1986 survey of Academic Senate electorate. Proportions shown are ratings of "very important" or "fairly important" to item.

**Student responses drawn from Alexander W. Astin, "The American Freshman: National Norms for Fall, 1986," *The Chronicle of Higher Education*, Jan. 14, 1987, pp. 39-40. Proportions shown are ratings of "very important" in deciding to go to college.

TABLE 1
GOALS FOR AN UNDERGRADUATE EDUCATION

Item	Faculty* At CSUF	Students** Nation- wide
To be able to get a better job		83.1 %
To be able to make more money.		70.6
Preparation for a career	78.8%	78.5%
To learn about things		74.1
Knowledge of a subject in depth	80.7	81.7
To become a more cultured person		32.2

TABLE 2
FACULTY-STUDENT INTERACTIONS

Item	Faculty At CSUF	Students Nation- wide
Enjoy opportunities for informal interaction out- side classroom	92.1%	90.5%
Invite students to home	21.1	29.3
Guest in teacher's home		32.9%

TABLE 3
ATTITUDES TOWARD FACULTY GOVERNANCE

Item	CSUF	Nationwide
1. Influence own department	65.3%	59.9%
2. Influence institution	12.2	13.3
3. Is department autocratic?	21.6	30.3
4. Is institution autocratic?	61.2	66.7
5. Collective bargaining equals higher pay	55.2	62.2
6. Salary differentials should be based on age/seniority	38.0	21.7
7. Faculty shld be more militant	67.4	57.7
8. Strikes can be legitimate	59.7	51.8

Faculty and Administrators: Allies or Adversaries?

Julian Foster

Department of Political Science

Under the traditional business model of governance, matters are rather simply arranged: the managers manage, and the employees do what they are told. When the traditional business model is used in an academic institution, a sharp line is drawn between administrators, who make the decisions, and faculty, who perhaps may offer a little low key advice. The more enlightened businesses are now abandoning the business model, but it can still be found operating in community colleges and the poorer four-year institutions. In large and complex universities of high quality, however, and where faculty are simply not willing to be regarded as 'employees' to be 'managed', the model has been replaced by another, generally called 'collegiality'. Fundamental to the collegial model is the realization that faculty can bring points of view to decision-making that administrators cannot, and can make some kinds of decisions better than administrators can.

In the collegial model, faculty and administrators share in the running of the campus. Faculty are most effective in areas closest to the teaching and research functions: curriculum, academic standards, advisement, faculty personnel policy and departmental organization. Buildings, student health and other services, admissions and records, non-academic counseling and alumni relations are more the purview of administrators. However, because there are no hard and fast lines, if faculty want to be involved in these areas (as at CSUF, where they have participated in resource allocation and appointment of administrators) there is no great barrier. Administrators play roles in curriculum development, RTP decisions and other primarily faculty areas. The underlying principle is that decisions should rest predominantly with those best qualified to make them.

All this breeds role ambiguities. Whether department chairs are administrators (managers) or faculty (employees) is a problem which drives the business-minded up the wall. The answer — perfectly intelligible if the collegial model is understood — is that they are faculty members who perform managerial functions. Many faculty spend some time on administrative matters, and some years being more managers than teachers. Most top administrators have been faculty, and continue to think of themselves as such.

Faculty and administrators share a common background: they once made a career decision to seek an advanced degree, forget about big money, and devote themselves to teaching and scholarship. A faculty post once attained, however, differences based on personalities and values appear. Some faculty avoid committee work and administrative tasks like poison; others show so little managerial talent that their colleagues try not to elect them to anything significant. Many, however, welcome the chance to have a say in the rules and circumstances governing their professional lives. It is fashionable for professors to complain about committee work or having to chair a department, but I believe that most who are reasonably good at such tasks quite enjoy them, if only as a change of pace from the classroom, the library and the lab. Administrators are a self-selected subset of faculty with somewhat different traits and values from the mainstream. It is therefore predictable that they should see common problems in ways a bit different from the majority of the faculty.

Such differences are magnified by the roles that administrators and faculty find themselves playing. The administration is run in a fundamentally hierarchical fashion, with each level "reporting" to the one above, at whose pleasure they serve. Responsibilities are (in theory) clearly defined. Administrators like organizational charts. They work during the summer, and may be mildly irritated when faculty committees do not. They earn career advancement and status by displaying innovative dynamism, and by being associated with enterprises which enjoy excellent repute.

The faculty approach to campus governance is different: more democratic, more individualistic, more disorganized. Leaders are chosen by election rather by merit (though hopefully the latter contributes to the former). Their rewards for outstanding achievements in managerial roles are psychic, not material. Faculty make collective decisions in democratic fashion, which lends itself to deferring and referring and avoidance of tough choices, but also ensures that all points of view are properly considered. No one can order a faculty committee around or fire it for incompetence; the ultimate sanction is that the administration will quietly take control of the matter in question.

"Creative" and "constructive" are words beloved of administrators, not least when applied to themselves. They are paid, generally on a more handsome scale than faculty, not merely to keep the old routines turning, but to initiate change. They enjoy looking ahead. "The Chal-

lenges as We Approach the Year 2000" is the sort of topic they like. Faculty may get increasingly sick of hearing about this particular chronological accident. "If it ain't broke," they may be heard muttering, "why fix it?"

Administrators like "Plans." Planning is an activity involving creative, constructive, future-oriented thought, which is seldom content to leave anything untouched, no matter how excellent its present condition. Plans can offer an ideal forum for displaying managerial expertise, because while every possible innovative idea can be included, they are seldom actually carried out; the disastrous nature of some of these inspirations is thus never revealed. Faculty by contrast, though often politically liberal, tend to be academic conservatives. Changes must come, no doubt, but they should be viewed as Edmund Burke viewed them: small, necessary, incremental adjustments to changing circumstances. Faculty tend to be skeptical of planning, even when they are coopted into groups which are supposed to do it. They prefer changes that emerge from the grass roots, rather than ones imposed from the top as part of a grand design.

Being with a covey of administrators in pursuit of some shining goal — "educational equity," or "excellence" or "outreach," for example — can be an invigorating experience. Ideas and optimism abound, the sky is (so long as the meeting lasts) the limit. When the product of such sessions ultimately hits the floor of the Academic Senate, the atmosphere may be quite different — suspicious, cynical, sometimes just plain reactionary. The faculty have no stake in change per se; they may feel they have property rights in the status quo. It is part of their function in the governance process to ask the questions that administrators sometimes fail to ask one another, and to inject a little realistic pessimism into ambitious schemes of improvement.

The administration and the faculty need one another. When one comes to dominate — and in the nature of things, that will almost always be the administrative side — the community will be less healthy. Fortune magazine once said admiringly of President Ed Litchfield, an executive with absolutely no use for faculty opinion, that he ran the University of Pittsburg "as though it was a major corporation." He did indeed. A couple of years after that article appeared, the university buckled under the weight of Litchfield's grandiose schemes, and declared bankruptcy.

The collegial model has only recently been reflected in the law. California's Higher Education Employee Relations Act (1979) spells out some areas where faculty involvement is required. Ultimate responsibility for all that happens on the campus still lies with the president.

In the short run, when administrators and faculty conflict, the administrators can have the last word. Administrators know this. Most of them also know the value of collegiality, but when faculty seem to be dithering or uncooperative, the temptation to short circuit the collegial process by fiat often presents itself. Occasionally, someone yields to this. If they get away with it, they and their cohorts will yield more readily to the next such temptation.

It is therefore the faculty who bear the onus of ensuring that collegiality survives; first, by performing their part in it conscientiously and with reasonable promptness, and second by resisting any diminution of their role. Such resistance should be mounted quietly and behind the scenes at first — don't force anyone into a humiliating public reversal if it can be avoided — but if this proves ineffective, some degree of open confrontation may be inevitable. The guarantee of continued collegiality is a willingness on the part of the faculty, or more specifically the academic senates which represent them, to defend it in time of need. So long as their readiness to do this is understood, such times may never come.

The ideal faculty-administrative relationship is cooperative. Since both must be interested in the welfare of the university, there is no reason in principle why this should not be attained. The Academic Senate at CSUF is a predominantly faculty body, but it contains administrators and receives administrative proposals, and it also has student members. It should not be thought of as simply the mouthpiece of the faculty — rather it is a key element in collegial governance in which the faculty have the predominant voice. For it to see itself as non-managerial, or as adversarial to the administration would lead towards the destruction of collegial governance. But collegiality will be equally threatened if the Academic Senate loses the confidence of the faculty or allows itself to drift into a subordinate role. Finding the right balance is not always easy, but that is the Senate's task.

Julian Foster is feeling fine, thank you, as his two contributions to this issue of the *Forum* demonstrate.

*The
undergraduate
experience
can only
be enriched
by a scholarly
active faculty*

Jewel Plummer Cobb
President

There are three reasons why research is important for undergraduate education. They are:

1. A teacher involved in research is stimulating for the students who in many cases can be active participants.
2. Active involvement in research in one's discipline can prevent burnout and boredom that often develop in the mid-career crisis period.
3. Active teacher/researchers with a reputation in the discipline expand the scholarly visibility of the campus and so attract the "best and the brightest" faculty recruits.

The main goal in the teaching of undergraduates is to instruct students in how to ask questions. Learning begins when motivation produces questions and the answers to those questions are internalized. The teacher who is performing research is a person asking himself/herself searching questions. The teacher/researcher who is excited about gaining new insights has asked the right questions in his/her discipline. That teacher, involved in research, is a far more exciting role model for students than one who uses notes years and sometimes decades old, which parrot information discovered by someone else.

Involvement in research makes a better teacher. The activity transforms the professor into an active, dynamic scholar seeking answers, who can excite and stimulate classes whether they be in geography, literature or chemistry. An ally in the research activity can easily be the student, and in such a relationship the learning curve is steeper. A search for the answer to a question begins with a logical development based on definitive steps of value to the student for the rest of his/her life. The steps are:

1. Framing the question in a specific and precise way so that the answer will be unambiguous;
2. determining the facts already known that point the way to the current research enterprise;
3. selecting and developing a methodology and preparing for the activity, i.e., library holdings (research in literature); or instruments (research in biology or physics); or material needed (research in chemistry),

4. carrying out the inquiry (experiment, library search)
5. describing the results and reaching the conclusions.

These five steps fit the process of "searching," "re-searching," learning—regardless of the discipline. I am describing a way of looking for the answer. A process that calls for the initial question (preceded by the motivation to ask) has careful steps toward solution. The result is involvement. A faculty member who regularly uses this process, shares the search with students when possible and finally shares the enthusiasm of discovering the answer is truly an exciting teacher. Exciting teachers lead a class to ask more questions, to develop critical analyses, to develop clarity of thinking and to be excited about the results.

One of the serious problems for faculty members ten to fifteen years after the Ph.D. is that they often feel "locked" in the institution. Of course, the sabbatical after six years or so provides a rest and refresher period for new scholarship. Now back in the classroom, the syllabus revised and the committee work in place, one can normally look forward to 15-20 more years of teaching with a few breaks. Burnout, a "trapped" sense, can easily and understandably develop *unless* one is active in one's discipline. Activity means research, asking questions, searching for answers, working with colleagues, and establishing new scholarly vistas. Research then is a healthy and revitalizing venture for the scholar in mid-life career crisis.

A re-energized faculty member transmits this positive attitude in the classroom. It is contagious, and undergraduates can "catch it." The challenge for all faculty members can be greatest when one is teaching sophomores, for example, who have come down from the freshmen anxiety/euphoria and have not yet begun to feel "special" as a major in a chosen discipline. The challenge is to so excite the class that you win some converts to your field. Then the thrill is mutual—the teacher is inspired because he/she has shared the research perspective in the discipline, and the student is excited by the information and involvement that follows in class.

Our goal on each campus is to attract the best and

the brightest new, young scholars who want to teach to fill the permanent, tenure-track positions that will become increasingly available in the years immediately ahead. Recruitment in the nineties will be highly competitive. Good people are most likely to be attracted by prospective colleagues who are vibrant, involved in scholarly work in their own disciplines and who love to teach. The message to a new Ph.D. must be that a campus already has faculty well known in their field, due to publications and professional meeting attendance. We all recruit nationally and unless the scholarly reputation of our campus is known by the applicant pool, our chances of attracting good teacher/scholars are mediocre at best. A new candidate should come to know us as a system where the highest priority is on teaching buttressed by a solid research and scholarly reputation. Our CSU system's reputation of teaching and research activity carries with it an understanding that our research is conducted to support our teaching rather than as in the UC system where teaching would appear to be conducted to support research.

Many campuses in the CSU system have increased the number of master's degree programs in recent years. At CSUF, 41 graduate programs are offered and 650 graduates earned their masters last year. Graduate courses are usually taught by professors well known in their fields. A master's candidate will be guided by a faculty versed in the research in the field. The importance of research to graduate teaching is clear and is expected. Research in the arts may be original, creative activity of a different type than that expected in sociology or mathematics. But the advanced degree at the master's level requires a level of depth and expertise by the faculty teaching the courses. Scholarly work or research in the discipline is essential.

Some have argued that teaching and research compete for faculty time, and that too much attention to one may result in skimping on the other. Certainly some balance between the activities is necessary. The complete faculty member does both, and the two activities reinforce one another.

The problem of retaining students on campus

Dolores Vura

Director of Analytical Studies

Which students are most likely to graduate from CSUF, first-time freshmen or junior college transfers? Are retention rates higher for women or men? Do students who enter with high GPA's have a higher retention rate than those with lower GPA's? How different are retention rates for ethnic minority students compared with Anglos?

As part of the CSU system's emphasis on issues of educational equity (defined primarily as promoting opportunities for under-represented groups), CSUF has been collecting data to uncover patterns in student retention. There are no major surprises in the findings. We are representative of nationwide trends in most areas. Nevertheless, the data are interesting and informative about the scope of the student retention problem.

One of the highlights from the findings show that the majority of students graduate after seven years of enrollment, not the "traditional" four. Other analyses which have been widely publicized in the press imply a criticism of higher education systems because a majority of students take longer than five years to complete what the public apparently expects to be a four year program. The fact is that this public perception is and has been erroneous for some time. Some students do still graduate in four years but the majority take longer. Nevertheless, students are graduating even if the traditional four-year stint is a phenomenon of the past.

The data we have collected is divided into three major areas: recruitment, preparedness and performance, and retention and graduation. Data are analyzed by dividing the student population into categories of sex, ethnic identity, and status at time of admission (first-time freshmen or transfer students). There are, unsurprisingly, some significant differences within the student groups.

Recruitment: The admission rates for under-represented ethnic groups who are first-time freshmen are lower than those of Anglos; however, once admitted, more ethnic minorities actually do enroll. For Blacks, the percentages are 42% admitted and 68% enroll. For Chicanos, 57% are admitted and 65% enroll. For Anglos, 71% are admitted but only 58% enroll. For transfer students, both the rates of admission and the percentage who enroll are higher, regardless of ethnicity. Also, more women than men are accepted as transfers and enroll.

For special admissions, more men than women apply and are enrolled, and more under-represented eth-

nic minorities than Anglos apply and enroll. For first time freshmen, the percentages are 4.5% Anglo who are special admits, 63.5% of Blacks and 23.2% of Chicanos. More complete details of recruitment and admission are shown in Table 1.

Preparedness and Performance: In Table 2, "Preparedness" is defined as the high school grade-point average (GPA) and SAT scores. "Performance" is defined as the GPA at the end of the first year. As the table shows, women enter CSUF with higher GPAs than do men (3.26 to 3.16), although their mean SAT scores are lower (881 to 953). Mean SAT scores for all groups parallel the national averages with Blacks at 824, Chicanos at 862 and Anglos at 940. The mean GPA for transfer students is lower than for first-time freshmen (2.79 to 3.22) with women outscoring men, 2.88 to 2.69.

Special admits for all ethnic groups enter with lower GPAs and SAT scores, although the difference between GPAs of transfer special admits and regular admits is very small (those data are not presented here). At the end of the first year, there is little variation by ethnic group or sex with respect to completion rates (that is, the number of students who completed their first year), with 86% of Blacks and Chicanos and 87% of Anglos completing. The completion rate for transfer students at 80% is lower than for first-time freshmen at 88%.

Performance, as measured by GPA at the end of the first year, is higher for women than men for both first-time freshmen and transfer students. Among ethnic minority groups, the range of GPAs is narrow, with Asian, Anglo and "other Hispanic" groups higher than others. Transfer students, also, have higher GPAs than the first-time freshmen (2.54 to 2.47).

Retention and Graduation: It is in the retention rates that the significant differences among the various groups begin to emerge. Continuation into the second year is less likely for Chicano first-time freshmen than for any other ethnic group, 62.3% to 72.5% for all others. The critical attrition rate for Blacks is in their third year continuation rate which drops to 46.7% compared to 59.5% overall.

Graduation rates of course are dependent upon continuation rates, but graduation rates after four years are remarkably diverse among the various groups. Graduation after four years is rare among first-time freshmen with only 8.4% of the total achieving that goal. Regular-admit Blacks exceed the regular-admit Anglo rate (10% compared to 8.4%) and Chicanos are lowest at 3.5%. How-

ever, when rates are tracked for two more years, the Chicano graduation rate of 28.1% approaches the Black graduation rate of 30% although the Anglo graduation rate in six years is higher at 42.3%. More women graduate in four years than do men (9.8% to 6.6%) but after that, graduation rates between the sexes is close.

For transfer students the pattern is different. In any year, community college transfer students are 40% to 42% of all new undergraduate students at CSUF. However, lower division transfer students are less likely to graduate than either first-time freshmen or upper-division transfer students. Table 4 presents these data which show that at the end of seven years, 50.5% of first time freshmen have graduated compared to 40.6% of lower-division transfers and 58.8% of upper-division transfers.

Conclusion: The concern for retention among under-represented ethnic minority groups is especially acute when focusing upon graduation rates for Chicanos.

Contin. on next page

TABLE 1
RECRUITMENT

First-time Freshmen	Admit Rate	Enroll	Special Admits
American Indian	70	63 %	5.0%
Black	42	68	63.5
Chicano	57	65	23.2
Other Hispanic	57	63	21.1
Asian	58	55	13.9
Pacific Islander	59	54	14.3
Filipino	58	50	6.5
Anglo	71	58	4.5
Unknown	69	53	8.9
Women	66	59	9.0
Men	63	57	11.8
Transfers	75	76	2.9
Total	64	58	10.3

TABLE 2
PREPAREDNESS AND PERFORMANCE

First-time Freshmen	Mean Entrance GPA		Mean SAT		Mean 1st Yr. GPA	
	A	B	A	B	A	B
American Ind.	3.08	3.11	833	839	2.25	2.23
Black	2.61	3.01	710	824	1.99	2.24
Chicano	2.97	3.13	827	862	2.17	2.27
Other Hispanic	2.99	3.11	828	856	2.34	2.45
Asian	3.25	3.32	821	845	2.48	2.53
Pacific Islander	3.27	3.31	948	958	2.33	2.30
Filipino	3.12	3.19	872	884	2.21	2.31
Anglo	3.19	3.22	932	940	2.48	2.49
Unknown	3.20	3.26	931	950	2.47	2.55
Women	3.20	3.26	863	881	2.51	2.56
Men	3.09	3.16	926	953	2.34	2.38
Transfers	2.78	2.79	884	897	2.53	2.54
Total	3.15	3.22	892	914	2.43	2.47

"A" : total group, regardless of basis of admission

"B" : regular and alternative admits only; no special admits

Campus culture

Continuation and graduation rates for this group are lower for first-time freshmen and transfer students. As a total group, under-represented ethnic minorities are less likely to be admitted but more likely to attend CSUF than are Anglos, and on the whole, they are also less likely to graduate within four years. However, their continuation rates beyond four years are relatively high.

Transfering from a junior college as an upper-division student appears to be an advantage for both under-represented groups and Anglos where both continuation and graduation rates are higher. While more

data will continue to be collected to track student cohorts, the current pattern indicates that a concern for ethnic minority second and third-year retention rates and graduation rates is well-placed.

Dolores Vura has been director of Analytical Studies for a year and a half, coming to CSUF from the University of Arizona where she was a research specialist in Academic Affairs.

TABLE 3
RETENTION AND GRADUATION

First-time Freshman	Completing 1st year (in percent)	Continuation Rates			Graduation Rates		
		2nd year (in percent)	3rd year	4th year	4 years	5 years	6 years
American Indian	.95	75.0	62.5	37.5	12.5	25.0	25.0
Black	.89	73.3	46.7	43.3	10.0	26.7	30.0
Chicano	.86	62.3	56.1	49.1	3.5	19.3	15.0
Other Hispanic	.86	73.5	57.4	54.4	5.9	23.5	32.4
Asian	.90	78.4	63.1	56.8	5.4	27.9	17.6
Pacific Islander	.83	75.0	75.0	75.0	25.0	50.0	50.0
Filipino	.79	73.7	73.7	63.2	21.1	21.1	21.1
Anglo	.87	71.5	59.3	54.6	8.4	31.7	42.3
Unknown	.87	70.8	60.7	54.5	11.8	34.3	41.6
Women	.87	70.1	57.4	51.6	9.8	30.3	39.9
Men	.88	73.2	62.1	57.6	6.6	30.8	41.6
Total	.87	71.5	59.5	54.2	8.4	30.5	40.6

TABLE 4
TRANSFER STUDENT RETENTION RATES

	Continuing and Graduating in				Total
	1 yr	2 yrs	4 yrs	6 yrs	
Total Community College Transfers	1.3	13.5	42.0	48.8	55.0 %
Lower Division	0.0	3.0	24.3	33.4	40.6
Upper Division	1.7	16.3	46.7	52.9	58.8
First time freshmen (1980 cohort)					50.5

Adult reentry students change campus profile

Barbara McDowell
Adult Reentry Center

By definition, an adult reentry student is anyone, 25 years of age or older, who has had a break in education and is now returning to campus to begin, continue or complete his/her educational experience. Currently, CSUF has 9,000 reentry students in a student population of 23,500. More than one-third of our students bring to campus their life experience, their ability to balance home, spouse, children, job and community commitments. They bring to the classroom a new challenge to professors, an empathy for the traditional-aged college student and a more pervasive desire to learn and grow.

The truly courageous reentry student is the one who dropped out of high school and somewhere along the line passed the G. E. D. or High School Proficiency Exam and is now seeking a college education. They face the educational task with the courage and excitement of a first-grader entering school for the first time — and it can be just as anxiety producing. In addition, they face a societal stigma which asks "Why aren't you at home taking care of your family or maintaining a full time job?" Certainly from our enlightened 1980's perspective, one would like to believe such a stigma does not exist. From our working with students in reentry support groups we know that the stigma does indeed exist and functions to create two separate realities for the student: 1) the suburban ethic and 2) the academic ethic. It is, for some, as if they are living a dual existence. The tasks faced in the students' personal life occasionally become diametrically opposed to the tasks required in their intellectual life and it is difficult to merge the two.

From an evolutionary standpoint, the reentry student of today is considerably different from the reentry student of some 20 years ago. Not only is today's reentry student balancing any number of outside responsibilities, but he/she is also returning to school for much more diverse reasons than the reentry student of the past. For example, enlightenment and curiosity as the student approaches midlife are stronger motivations than what is often called the "midlife crisis. Perhaps the original motive in entering school was one of retribution ("evening the score"), but as the individual evolves with a heightened level of self-esteem and accomplishment, the reentry student forgets the original premise of "getting even." Once the need for retribution is forgotten, the student is able to

get on with the task of developing as a more holistic individual, accomplishing any number of goals and dreams.

As we look at the profile of the reentry male and reentry female of 20 years ago, we have been able to identify two distinctly different phenomena. Reentry men of 20 years ago returned to school, attempting to reach higher vocational goals. They were almost apologetic for not having finished school in the first place. They started over bravely as they faced what society had to say to them regarding their ability to be the traditional "breadwinner." Reentry women of 20 years ago basically met their new educational goals as an "experience," a curiosity, a means of finding themselves as their children left home and their spouses moved up the corporate ladder. While these are stereotypes, and certainly many returned to school for different reasons, basically this was the norm 20 years ago.

Today we see only shadows of these separate profiles. On any given day in the Reentry Center, we see men coming back to school for experience and enlightenment and women who find themselves stuck in their careers who can go no further without an education. The gender-specific motives of 20 years ago for reentering school have crossed gender boundaries and we find a more heterogeneous mix of motives between sexes. While certainly we see some of the traditional profile students, we are seeing more women returning to school to enhance careers and more men returning to school for intellectual enhancement and expanded life-long learning skills.

All or most reentry students initially enter the academic world with a great deal of apprehension as they attempt to mainstream into the traditional student world of 18 to 22 year olds. What develops for most reentry students over time is a "connectedness" to the traditional-aged student, perhaps as mentors or study partners and friends. In the Reentry Center one of our primary goals is to break down the stereotypes about reentry students and to help them mainstream into the traditional population. While we have reentry support groups, the group's function is not to establish a "separatist" attitude with regard to finding a niche for themselves, but to foster an environment of commonality between reentry and traditional-aged students.

Theoretically, the reentry student is becoming less and less of an exception to the age rule. Children born in the early seventies, when birth rates were low, are now

Contin. on p. 15

Letters to the Editor

The **Senate Forum** is pleased to announce that it has received its first piece of hate mail. Sadly, as hate mail goes, it wasn't much, consisting of the cover of the last issue of the **Forum**, embellished with editorial (and other) suggestions, mailed anonymously to the editor from Santa Ana. Because of the nature of the editorial suggestions (severe criticism of academic "jargon") and, because we know where he lives, the editor called Tom Klammer and inquired if someone (perhaps Tom?) in the English Department was responsible. Tom assured us that no one in his department would stoop to callow anonymity. "They'd come right out and tell you," said he, "in person."

Our hate mail, while not exactly civilized, contained the mildest of obscenities and only a single violent suggestion—at least we think it may be violent—to place "slugs in [our] grey matter." On the other hand, perhaps this is only some ecological reference to a common garden pest.

The following piece is a real "letter to the editor" by Vince Buck and is very civilized indeed. The editor is grateful for both communications, but really prefers the signed kind from Dr. Buck. As they say, keep those cards and letters coming. . .

To the editor:

I am getting more than a little tired of reading items in the national media about how uninformed Cal State Fullerton students are about geography or literature or what have you. What is the point? Is it to gain the university some national attention in some area other than sports? Is it to increase enrollment in a particular academic department? Whatever it is, the story that comes through is that only dummies go to CSUF. Those of us who teach here know better than that. We should not contribute to an erroneous impression in others. We do not need that kind of publicity.

It would be nice if all of our students could locate Sumatra on a map or identify Virgil. Relative to other educational needs, however, I am not sure how important it is to acquire these bits of information or realistic to expect that most students will acquire them.

There are lots of facts that students should know. Were I to suggest what I think they are, few would agree with my list. This century has witnessed a phenomenal growth in knowledge. The items that we should know far exceed our ability to know them. Even the idea of a common core of knowledge may be outdated as we come to identify more and more items that should be in that core. Given more information and less agreement on what constitutes a manageable core it must be expected that students will be less knowledgeable in any given area.

What then is the point of such quizzes? What is the impact? Perhaps it will shame some students

into taking a geography course instead of a course in Economics. Is this a gain? Perhaps it will in time lead education officials to believe that more geography should be taught in high school. At the cost of what? Less math or history? Again there may be no gain. Such quizzes may even have a negative impact leading to an emphasis on the acquisition of facts to the detriment of such things as writing, analysis, creativity or just plain old thinking.

I am sure the quality of secondary education in California can be improved, but more fundamental questions are involved than the possession of geographic or literary facts and these issues cannot be resolved here.

We as faculty should accept that our students are not as well informed as we might like them to be, nor even as well informed as we ourselves may be. That is why we are the teachers and they are the students. But these students at least know enough geography to find their way to Cal State Fullerton, and they are not at the end of their educational journeys. We would be better served if we focused not on what they lack when they enter our university, but rather on what they do know when they leave. Why not publicize what students know after completing a particular course in geography or after completing four years of study? Why not publicize what our students accomplish after they leave here? These should be more positive stories and, if not, then we might want to worry about the educational process in our own classrooms

J. Vincent Buck
Political Science

Rough Justice

Julian Foster
Department of Political Science

Why are the disciplinary procedures like a nuclear bomb? Because no sane government would use either of them if it could possibly help it. Because both are intended to raise possibilities so alarming that people become anxious to find more peaceful forms of conflict resolution. Because both are attention-getting devices, raising dark possibilities if you aren't willing to compromise.

CSUF has actually disciplined less than half-a-dozen faculty during its entire history, and none since the present procedures were enshrined in the MOU. There have, however, been quite a few incidents of wrongdoing, and quite a number of punishments imposed. What happens is what is known in the courts as plea bargaining. It is not hard to see why.

Professor X is suspected of some lapse -- sexual harassment, failure to meet class, keep office hours, misuse of funds, fraudulent scholarship, stealing elections, or whatever. A complaint is made. The University investigates and decides the complaint is well-grounded. It invokes the disciplinary proceedings by writing to Professor X, accusing him of whatever it is, pronouncing him guilty, and assessing a penalty, all at once. The only penalties provided for are suspension without pay, demotion and dismissal. The University now has Professor X's attention, and proceedings can commence.

Professor X may proclaim his innocence, or he may insist that whatever he did has been grossly exaggerated and miscategorized, or he may even admit guilt. Whatever he does, he is unlikely to acquiesce in his own suspension, demotion or dismissal. His representative has the task of negotiating a settlement less damaging to Professor X. Very often this takes the form of agreeing on some lesser penalty. Letters of reprimand and pay docks are among the commoner sanctions, even though neither can, strictly speaking, result from disciplinary proceedings.

The University is often just as willing to compromise. First, it may know that suspension, demotion or termination is too harsh a penalty, yet it cannot impose anything less. Second, there may be some doubt about the guilt of the accused; more importantly, some doubt about whether his guilt can be proved. If it pursued the case through formal channels, the University might lose. Third, the disciplinary procedure is terribly demanding in terms of everyone's time and energy. Even when the University

has an unshakeable case involving a serious violation, as it did not long ago in a sexual harassment incident, it will still compromise; the faculty member surely could have been terminated, but why go to such lengths when his resignation was forthcoming?

For faculty accused of unprofessional conduct, "justice" has little to do with rules of evidence, due process or impartial judgment. Instead, it depends essentially on two people: the relevant university administrator and the accused's representative. How familiar are these two with all the evidence? How seriously do they view the offense? Which is the more skillful negotiator? How much does each of them care about driving the best possible bargain for their side? These are the imponderables on which the faculty member's fate depends.

It may be that this system works reasonably well. Probably the innocent do not get punished. The penalties agreed to usually seem commensurate with the crimes. Yet, a system which on the one hand provides the trappings of due process and on the other ensures that due process won't be used can hardly be an object of admiration.

In the absence of more basic reforms, we need some rules governing these informal operations. First, the investigation stage. As things stand, while normally fair, this could be terribly one-sided, an effort to find evidence of guilt and to ignore anything that points the other way. At the very least, the accused should be notified of the charges and made aware that an investigation is taking place. An early opportunity to confront the accuser is surely proper. The accused also should be able to name witnesses who may give evidence on his side of the case. It might be better if investigations were carried out by more than one individual.

When plea bargaining begins, both sides have the right to know the precedents. If, for example, the usual penalty in the CSU for falsely claiming sick time is a dock in pay, how can justice be served if one defendant escapes with a letter of reprimand while another finds himself suspended for a semester? Yet so long as all previous cases are shrouded in confidentiality, there is no way to know what the norms are. Justice involves consistent treatment.

Since both investigation and plea bargaining take place outside the strict framework of the disciplinary procedures as described in the Memorandum of Understanding (the contract), there is no reason why they must be left to the bargaining process. The Academic Senate can and should address these problems.

Faculty discipline process is fair

Jim Semelroth
California Faculty Association

Background

In 1983 the California Faculty Association and the California State University negotiated the first collective bargaining agreement for faculty in the history of the university. Among the many working conditions and procedures which needed to be negotiated was the disciplinary action provision. Prior to collective bargaining disciplinary procedures were required under the Education Code 89452.5, which mandated a discipline procedure for faculty and which included a faculty peer committee chosen from an elected panel to hear discipline cases. The peer review committee heard the case in an open hearing and made a non-binding recommendation to the president of the university. The faculty member facing discipline could have counsel in the proceedings. If the president disagreed with the committee and disciplined the faculty member, the case could be taken to the State Personnel Board for final determination.

The aim of the initial contract negotiation was to bargain for an effective and accessible disciplinary procedure which contained adequate due process for faculty facing disciplinary action. The CFA demanded a process with binding arbitration provided at no cost to the faculty member, maintaining that management was the moving party in discipline and they should be willing to pay the costs. The union also demanded adequate safeguards so that management could not discipline at the whims of individuals or administrations. The procedure also had to contain "Skelly rights." Requiring adequate notice and a chance to respond before the imposition of discipline, rights originating from a California court ruling on administrative due process. Above all the CFA demanded that in all discipline cases the faculty member be presumed innocent until proven guilty.

The Procedures

Article 19, which has been used a handful of times since its adoption in 1983, is the current disciplinary action article. While some administrators believe the procedures are cumbersome and inhibit the imposition of discipline, those who believe in due process have no problem moving through the procedures. Disciplinary action includes only suspension without pay, demotion or dismissal. It does not include personnel actions such as denial of promotion, tenure or reappointment. When the university wishes to discipline a faculty member it first must notify the person in

writing of the proposed discipline, the reasons, rights to appeal with representation, and the proposed date of the discipline. The faculty member may accept the discipline or ask for an informal meeting to discuss the charges. He/she may respond orally or in writing.

The president must appoint someone to investigate and to make a report. After receiving the report, the President may modify, reaffirm or drop the proposed discipline. These actions take several weeks which allows the faculty member to seek union representation and to prepare a defense. If the president chooses to impose the discipline, the faculty member then has the right to request arbitration or a State Personnel Board hearing of the case. In arbitration, which is free to the faculty member, the CFA represents the accused. At the State Personnel Board, CFA or private counsel may represent the faculty member. In either case the decision of the neutral hearing officer is binding on the university and the faculty member. The neutral hearing officers have the power to fashion remedies short of the proposed discipline or to dismiss the case. The university is the moving party and presents its case first, and carries the burden of proof. If arbitration chosen the university may not impose the discipline prior to the final binding award of the arbitrator. In other words the arbitrator imposes the discipline, if any, but only after a fair hearing in which the burden of proof is on the administration and the standard of proof is high.

How might the procedure be improved?

While Article 19 of the Agreement provides adequate due process to faculty members accused of unprofessional conduct by the CSU administration and threatened with discipline, the article could be improved. The provision which provides a Skelly hearing, that is a chance to hear the charges and proposed discipline before the discipline is imposed, is generally a meaningless step. Most frequently, the president appoints a dean or higher administrator to conduct this review. This administrator is untrained to investigate the legalities of disciplinary actions. In no case since 1983 has the administrator so appointed reduced or dropped the proposed discipline. These administrators are not likely to reverse a decision of a university president.

Knowing that this step in the discipline procedure is meaningless, the representative of the accused faculty member will not provide the administration with all the details of defense. This step then becomes a game, another hoop to go through.

At this step in the process, the accused is not made aware of the recommendations of the investigator. Nor is the accused made aware of the extent of the review by the administrator.

Another problem frequently encountered is the lack of confidentiality. CFA has found that in discipline cases rumors of the charges are rapidly spread around the campus. These rumors are not spread by the accused or his representative; quite the contrary. In one case when the faculty member was accused of plagiarism the rumors were that the faculty member had embezzled money from the university. One such rumor was traced to a vice president. Of course, this is not a fault of the disciplinary action procedure. No amount of policy could stop rumors from being spread by the administrator who wants to convict before due process has occurred.

In its Policy Statements of the AAUP, The American Association of University Professors states that in disciplinary cases a committee of peers should be involved in the investigatory process before discipline is imposed on a faculty member. The Education Code of California, which required grievance and disciplinary action procedures in the CSU, also required a faculty committee to hear grievances and discipline cases. This step was not negotiated into the first contractual procedures in 1983. Many academic unionists, this writer included, do not believe that a faculty committee should bear the burden of determining the standard of proof (beyond a reasonable doubt, preponderance of evidence, etc.) in the dismissal of a colleague. Moreover, an arbitration before a neutral arbitrator and with professional representation eliminates the political nature of a discipline case.

The procedure could be improved by providing a peer review committee to investigate unprofessional conduct charges before the administration decided to impose discipline on a faculty member. This could be accomplished with a faculty ethics committee. Several campuses already have such a committee under their Academic Senates. When the university believes a faculty member is involved in unprofessional conduct the matter could be referred to the faculty ethics committee. For example, in a charge of plagiarism, the committee could investigate the charge. The faculty member might have the opportunity to present evidence in defense. The faculty ethics committee would issue a finding to the administration which would then decide to propose disciplinary action or not based on the finding. This procedure could replace the meaningless "Skelly" hearing by an administrator. After the administra-

tion determined to impose discipline, the faculty member could then go to arbitration or to the State Personnel Board as provided in the current procedure.

This writer and several CFA leaders have talked to the General Secretary of the national AAUP and have considered asking campus faculty senates to establish such investigative committees which would act on charges of unprofessional conduct procedures prior to an administrative decision to discipline a faculty member. This procedure would bring the discipline procedure into line with AAUP guidelines. It would also make a very good disciplinary action procedure which provides due process an excellent one.

Jim Semelroth has been involved in college unions in both Michigan and California. He has been the CFA staff person assigned to CSUF.

Cont. from page 11, ADULT REENTRY

entering college. This means a lower number of first-time freshmen for the next five years or so and since colleges and universities will need to pull students from somewhere, we will be seeing more reentry students. As reentry centers gear up for this influx, preparedness will take the form of increased campus child care, extended hours for admissions and other campus student services, and greater availability of staff on campus in evening and weekend hours. If we are not prepared to increase services, we will lose that target population to those universities who are able to provide services to the older, non-traditional student.

The reentry students bring life experiences, crises overcome, and growth-producing tests to their campus lives. As a result, these students are prepared not only to obtain a degree but to become involved in the process of education. The reentry student is more apt to utilize campus facilities, on-campus programming, student organization and student services. It is the goal of the Adult Reentry Center, therefore, to heighten the students' awareness of these services on campus and help bridge the gap between the student and the holistic educational experience. We applaud the reentry student for reaching career goals, for balancing all of life's responsibilities, for developing and actualizing their individuality and for facing a complicated existence undreamed of before.

SENATE FORUM

The Senate Forum is a publication of the Academic Senate at California State University, Fullerton. It is designed to stimulate discussion, debate, and understanding of a variety of important issues which the Senate addresses. Individuals are encouraged to respond to the materials contained in the Forum or to submit their own contributions.

Editor

Sandra Sutphen, Political Science

Editorial Board

Julian Foster, Chair of the Academic Senate
and Professor of Political Science

Leland Bellot, History

Ed Trotter, Communications