WHAT FACTORS INFLUENCE ATTITUDES OF FACULTY?

How does the OSU faculty feel about situations involving administration-faculty relationships, economic factors, community, working conditions, ..? As many are well aware, these and other factors can play a large role toward attracting new faculty and retaining present faculty members at OSU.

In an attempt to learn more about faculty attitudes regarding the above items, the Committee on the Profession of the OSU Chapter, American Association of University Professors, undertook a survey of faculty reactions to factors which were felt might contribute to satisfaction or dissatisfaction. To accomplish its objective, a questionnaire containing 91 questions on working conditions, community, faculty-administration relations, economic, personal and family, student, appreciation and rewards, and miscellaneous items was sent to 1300 OSU faculty members near the end of spring term, 1968, with a covering letter by Dean Nicodemus. Faculty members were not identified except as to age, number of years at OSU, tenure, school, rank, and highest degree. One set of responses dealt with intensity of feeling about staying or leaving OSU. Five hundred sixty-six faculty members returned the forms; this sample was representative of the total except that a higher proportion of tenured faculty responded.

The Committee on the Profession wishes to acknowledge both the AAUP and OSEA who contributed to the project financially. We also are appreciative of the assistance given by Dean of Faculty, David Nicodemus. Further, appreciation is extended to the OSU Counseling Center clerical staff.

Of the eight sections, the order of importance was: working conditions, economic items, faculty-administration items, student items, personal and family, other, appreciation and rewards, and community. The three most important questions under working conditions were: (1) intellectual satisfaction of job, (2) intellectual challenge of job, and (3) teacher morale. Regarding economic items, rating of OSU's salary schedule with other universities, salary and retirement benefits rated as the first three. Under faculty-administration, the most important three questions were: (1) cooperative and competent administration of department, (2) competent teaching staff in department, and (3) competent university administration. Other important questions were: motivation of students (student section), and personal satisfaction of job (personal and family).

Over all 91 questions, the most important were: (1) personal satisfaction of job, (2) intellectual satisfaction of job, (3) intellectual challenge of job, (4) cooperative and competent departmental administration, (5) motivation of students, (6) library facilities, and (7) freedom to work and study in one's own field.

Several of the questions were significantly related to whether a faculty member intended to stay or leave OSU employment. The top five attitude items having a significant relationship to "leaving" responses were: (1) low satis-
faction with academic rank, (2) inadequate opportunity to participate in University affairs, (3) slow promotions, (4) autocratic departmental administration, and (5) poor quality of advice of department head on instructional problems.

An analysis of the 91 items was made on the basis of "favorable, unfavorable, or neutral" responses. An item was indicated as having an unfavorable or a favorable effect if 40 percent or more of the respondents so designated. On the other hand, if 60 percent or more of the respondents indicated an item as unimportant or neutral, the Committee considered that item to have little import on faculty.

Only 11 of 91 items elicited unfavorable responses, whereas 27 items elicited favorable responses. In the unimportant category were 18 items. The remaining 35 items could not be categorized into favorable, unfavorable or unimportant but had response splits such as 50% neutral, 25% favorable, and 25% unfavorable.

Greatly different types of questions provoked unfavorable and favorable reactions. All but three of the 11 unfavorables related directly to financial consideration while only one of 27 favorable items (cost of living) was of a financial nature. Faculty opinion seems to be more weighted toward favorable than unfavorable responses and higher percentages of faculty were willing to check more favorable than unfavorable items as important to them.

The following 11 items were those selected by 40% or more of the respondents as unfavorable: (1) rating of salary schedule with other universities, (2) faculty work load, (3) ranking of retirement program with other universities, (4) adequacy of research funds, (5) salary level, (6) adequacy of retirement benefits, (7) financial provisions for study leaves, (8) opportunities to attend professional meetings, (9) amount of research time available, (10) adequacy of funds for purchasing recent publications, and (11) adequacy of opportunities for travel. Interestingly, there was no difference between faculty designated as stayers or leavers with respect to checking these items as "unfavorable".

On all 27 "favorable" items a higher percentage of tenured faculty than non-tenured faculty indicated greater importance and a higher degree of adequacy. Also, on most items, about 10-15% more of the faculty indicating they were staying or planning to stay gave "favorable" responses than those who indicated they had accepted another job or were planning to leave. Difference tended to range even higher regarding such questions as competency of departmental administrators, favorableness of work atmosphere, departmental reputation and prestige, intra-faculty relations, satisfaction with academic work and degree of teacher morale.

The top ten "favorable" items were: (1) personal satisfaction of job, (2) intellectual challenge of job, (3) adequacy of schools for children, (4) cooperativeness of departmental teaching staff, and (5) of departmental administrators, (6) competency of departmental teaching staff and (7) departmental administrators, (8) degree of academic freedom, (9) favorableness
of work atmosphere, and (10) competence of university administrators. Although these items plus 17 others were checked as important and "favorable" by 40 or more percent of all responding faculty, they drew 4-10 times as many "unfavorable" responses from leavers as faculty intending to stay. On these 27 items, less than 10% of staying faculty gave "unfavorable" responses while 15-35% of leavers gave "unfavorable" responses.

On the whole, unfavorable responses were almost entirely related to financial factors while favorable responses were indicated for job satisfaction and related working conditions. Interestingly enough, community items including politics, size and recreational opportunities were of least importance to the responding faculty.

Should any faculty member wish more complete information on this faculty attitude survey, a summary will be made available upon request, phone 3341. Suggestions as to further surveys and studies regarding the profession, its status and responsibilities will be welcome. AAUP Committee on the Profession taking part in this project were T. E. Bedell, W. A. Foster, R. O. McMahon, and H. L. Wilson under chairmanship of C. F. Warnath, 1967-69.

Thomas E. Bedell
Assistant Professor of Range Management
October 27, 1969
Effect of Class Cancellation on Multiple Section Courses

There are many courses with multiple lecture sections, each of which may have numerous subsections of recitation, laboratory, etc. Freshman chemistry, in which I participate, is an example. Each section is expected to cover the same material in the course of a term. It is especially important in sequence courses that this is accomplished, as student registration in subsequent terms is scrambled among the different sections.

Because a term may not begin on a Monday, and because of holidays such as Thanksgiving, it often happens that some sections have fewer meetings than others. This problem is compounded by Administrative cancellation of classes.

We are all engaged in a consideration of University goals. A paramount goal should be the uninterrupted meeting of courses of instruction.

Convocation programs should have enough intrinsic merit to attract a respectable audience during evening hours. Other occasions of Administrative authorization to students to skip classes suggest a high level confusion as to priority of goals.

John T. Yoke
October 29, 1969
The Study of Education at Stanford

I would like to bring to your attention the Study of Education at Stanford, especially since we are engaged presently in a similar study through the Commission on University Goals. This "major and thorough study of Stanford's educational programs and objectives" (as President Sterling characterized it) was carried out under the direction of a steering committee composed of students, faculty, and administrators. Numerous subcommittees and hundreds of people were involved. In November, 1968, nearly two years from the inception of the study, the steering committee issued the first of its Reports to the University. Thus far nine of ten reports have been issued. These reports present the committee's conclusions and specific recommendations for strengthening the university as well as the basic premises and much of the information on which they were based. Most of the reports are more than 100 pages in length; about half of this consists of appendixes. These are the titles:

I. The Study & Its Purposes
II. Undergraduate Education
III. University Residences and Campus Life
IV. Undergraduate Admissions and Financial Aid
V. Advising and Counseling
VI. The Extra-Curriculum
VII. Graduate Education
VIII. Teaching, Research, and the Faculty (not issued)
IX. International Education
X. Government of the University

Although this study is directed at one university, it has, I think, much wider significance and great importance. Stanford is one of the finer universities in this country. It is very likely, therefore, that its problems and weaknesses are to be found or will emerge at many other universities. Moreover, a great deal of useful general information is presented in the reports. But, most importantly, their conclusions and recommendations can provide a stimulus and basis, if not a model, for our own thinking. They were intended to be far-reaching and to stimulate discussion. As the committee put it at one point: "The most important of our recommendations are ground-clearing in character; they are designed to free both teacher and student of trammels that restrain the freedom to teach and to learn that ought to characterize the university." (II, p.3) We may find that we disagree with many of their recommendations or that they are not applicable here, but they are well worth consideration.

It would be impossible and, I think, inappropriate for me to try to present a comprehensive description or evaluation of the Stanford Study. Consequently, I shall merely present (largely in its own words) what I take to be the essential ideas of the first report (I), which attempts to state the basic premises that underlie the more specific conclusions and recommendations of the committee; then
I shall simply list a number of the more important or striking recommendations made in reports II and X—as many as space permits. Hopefully, this will provide enough ideas and acquaintance with the Study to stimulate your thinking and your desire to read these and the other reports in full.

First, let me point out that copies of these reports are available from:

Study of Education at Stanford  
Room 107, Building 10A  
Stanford University  
Stanford, California 94305

They are free to students and faculty of Stanford and, perhaps, to alumni and friends of the University. I understand that there is a charge of $10.00 per set to others. At least one set will be available on reserve in the Reserve Book Room of our library, under my name I was told.

Even on a cursory reading of The Study and Its Purposes it becomes clear immediately that one idea or premise is paramount. I think that it is best stated in an appendix:

If this study has succeeded in identifying any code or ethos for Stanford, it is that academic freedom—the freedom to discover, teach, and learn—takes precedence over nearly every other right and prerogative in the University. This assertion, simple as it is, may provide a reference whereby we may adjudicate future differences and make hard choices. (p.35)

This principle is repeatedly enunciated throughout the reports in the motto that the university is a place to learn to "think freely and to think well." This idea is held to be a crucial part of the general conception of education which underlies essentially everything in the first report and, thereby, essentially everything in the entire Study. In fact, the very first point made by the committee in the first report is that freedom is part of the very meaning of "education": "The word "education" comes from the Latin verb *educere* meaning 'to lead forth.' To lead does not mean to compel, or to push, or to pull." (p.10) More generally, education is conceived as a continuous, life-long process of discovery. Thus, education not only cannot be compelled but it cannot be limited to the classroom or reduced to units of credit.

On the basis of this fundamental premise and related conception of education the committee concludes or maintains:

First, that "the university can never educate in the true sense of the word;" it can only "supply the environment and the means necessary to insure that those
who have come here may educate each other and themselves." (p.10)

Second, that the university should neither be the indentured servant of the social order nor committed to promoting social change. "Neither of these views can be accepted if the university is to maintain for its members the capacity to think freely and well." (p.11) The university "can serve society best only when its members are left free to pursue the scholarly interests that are vital to them." They also reject the notion that the university must be directly useful to society, i.e., "relevant." They argue that this is a limited and mistaken conception of what is useful or relevant and that such activities should arise from the intellectual and social ambience which the university fosters rather than be incorporated into the curriculum. (p.12)

Third, that students (Stanford's students, at least) should be as free and independent as possible in pursuing their educations.

This freedom to choose what knowledge and what disciplines to learn may be Stanford's greatest gift to the student. For to choose he must think about himself and about the world in which he is involved. And this process of thought may contribute more to the student's educational development than any number of required university courses. His education is not imposed; it is his own. (p.13)

This does not mean that the University should blithely let the student "do his own thing," and then react with indifference when he falters or fails. Instead the University should offer the student every means of assistance it can to help him make his decisions: its wisdom and advice, but not its compulsion. The University should also help the student to discover new interests, lead him to analyze his old objectives, and to explore the many fields and endeavors open to him. He should be able to learn above all how one goes about acquiring knowledge. The freedom that we seek to promote includes the freedom from the crippling constraints of easy self-indulgence, a freedom that comes only when standards of excellence are recognized and emulated. (p.15)

Finally, the committee relies heavily on this premise in its attempt to reconcile the demands on faculty to specialize and to provide "general education" to undergraduates. (We might add that undergraduates also are faced with analogous demands.)

We suggest that the demands of specialism and generalism are not irreconcilable. Within almost every specialist there lurks a generalist who can be coaxed to emerge. What it takes to coax him, however, is precisely what the traditional academic curriculum denies
him: the opportunity to help a beginner comprehend, not his field as a whole, but those aspects of his field about which he cares most deeply. Let the objective of curricular planning be to encourage the faculty member to teach what he likes to teach and the student to learn what seems vital to him—the Intellectual History of Europe in the Nineteenth Century rather than the History of Western Civilization, Modern Consciousness rather than Freshman English, ... and from this common freedom may emerge a form of general education far better suited to the characteristics of a university than that to which we pay lip service now. (p.14)

The University cannot in any event impress on its students the total content of present knowledge, and it is impossible to choose what exactly it is that every student should know without imposing arbitrary constraints on the range of free inquiry. Instead, we believe that the important thing is for students to learn to find out what they do not know and then learn how to find out about it: to think freely and to think well. And the generalities can proceed from the specific, for the teacher at his best is concerned with the range as well as the depth of his discipline. (p.14)

The report concludes with a recommendation which the committee regards as its single most important one:

The University should seek to sustain a spirit of self-examination and self-renewal, which can be supported by a variety of institutional devices including: (a) A standing committee of the Senate, with student membership, to concern itself with identifying institutional problems and seeing to it that they receive attention. The first task of this committee should be to monitor the progress of SES recommendations. (b) An Academic Planning Office to assist faculty, student, and administration efforts to obtain the data upon which rational planning must depend. (p.16)

(Note that in the following list of recommendations they are numbered as they are in the Stanford reports. In some instances only portions of a recommendation are listed.)

II. Undergraduate Education

1. The University curricular policies and requirements for the freshman year should be as follows:
   a. For each student, a one semester writing experience integrated with a course, which may but need not be Freshman English.
   c. For as many students as possible, a first-semester Freshman Tutorial taught by a regular faculty member and directed either toward conveying
the style of intellectual inquiry in his field of knowledge or toward illuminating the relationships between his and other fields of knowledge, or toward both.

5. Each school or department should be permitted to prescribe not more than one-half of the undergraduate major's total program, including courses required to be taken in fields other than the field of concentration.

6. The School of Engineering should provide optional degree programs that meet the limitation expressed in Recommendation 5.

12. Areas that call for early attention in new course development include: science and technology for the non-specialists; mathematics and computer science for the non-specialists; interdisciplinary and problem-oriented studies in the humanities and the social sciences; professional school offerings for the undergraduate; and the practicing arts.

17. Both faculty and students should look upon the class schedule not as a commitment but as a reservation of time and space for use as needed. The number of times a class will meet and the length of each session should be determined by the instructor in accordance with the nature of the course material and the needs of the students.

18. The academic calendar should be modified to include a two-week reading period, free of scheduled academic obligations, prior to the examination period at the end of each term.

19. The University should adopt a semester calendar, in which the academic year begins immediately after Labor Day and ends in late May.

20. The unit-credit system should be replaced by a course-credit system. A "course" should not be quantitatively determined by contact hours, number of days per week, etc., but should be determined by the individual instructor, subject to departmental approval. Four courses per semester (or three per quarter) should represent the standard academic load. The maximum regular load should be five courses (four under the quarter system); the minimum, three courses (two under the quarter system). Thirty-two courses (36 under the quarter system) should be required for the bachelor's degree.

23. Faculty members should be urged to employ essay examinations wherever appropriate. In order to encourage such examinations, a minimum of two weeks should be allowed between a final exam and the date on which course grades must be filed with the Registrar.

29. (b) The present "D" and "F" grades should be eliminated, and the sole penalty for failing to complete a course satisfactorily should be the loss of credit toward graduation.

   (d) The "pass" option should be extended to include any course, subject only to the consent of the instructor and the department concerned. No limit should be placed on the number of pass courses that a student may take.
X. **Government of the University**

4. The Board of Trustees should seek to increase the diversity of its membership with respect to such factors as age, occupation, cultural and racial background, and place of residence. This effort should give a high priority to adding members who are actively engaged in teaching and scholarship at other universities and colleges.

7. Membership on Board committees should include Stanford faculty members and students as well as trustees.

14. Part-time service by faculty members on the presidential staff should be strongly encouraged.

20. Deans of schools and other university-wide officers of academic administration should ordinarily serve a term of five years, renewable once.

21. Heads of departments should ordinarily serve a term of five years, renewable once.

26. Consecutive membership on a standing committee should be limited to two three-year terms. A person should be eligible for further appointment only after an absence from the committee of three years.

32. No faculty member should serve on more than one standing committee. In order to enforce that rule and to reduce scheduling problems, a special time should be set aside weekly for meetings of standing committees. This two-hour period should be kept free of scheduled classes and major campus events.

37. The University should officially recognize the need for enhanced and better focused faculty and administrative attention to the problems of undergraduate education.

*Robert Dale*

**Department of Philosophy**

**October 29, 1969**