

SENATE FORUM

Volume XXI, Number 2, Spring 2006

A publication of the Academic Senate, California State University, Fullerton

The Student Gender Gap at CSUF

Colleges and universities across the country are grappling with the case of the mysteriously vanishing male. Where men once dominated, they now make up no more than 43 percent of students at American institutions of higher learning, according to 2003 statistics, and this downward trend shows every sign of continuing unabated. If we don't reverse it soon, we will gradually diminish the male identity, and thus the productivity and the mission, of the next generation of young men, and all the ones that follow.

Michael Gurian

In a recent article appearing in *The Washington Post*, Gurian claimed that the declining percentage of males pursuing higher education must be addressed immediately. Is this national trend reflected at CSUF? If so, should the campus respond? The first two articles of this issue address the gender gap at CSUF; additional perspectives will follow in the next issue of the *Forum*.

INSIDE THIS ISSUE...

- 2** **The Student Gender Gap at CSUF: Identifying the Patterns in Enrollment and Performance**
Dolores Vura and Ed Sullivan
- 8** **Feminism and the Gender Gap in College Enrollment**
Barbara McDowell
- 13** **Current Work of the CSUF Academic Senate**
John W. Bedell
- 14** **Top-Down "Leadership" Fails Again**
Vince Buck
- 16** **Statewide Academic Senate (ASCSU) Activities**
Barry Pasternack

The Student Gender Gap at CSUF: Identifying the Patterns in Enrollment and Performance

Dolores Vura and Ed Sullivan


As noted in the Call for Submissions to the *Senate Forum* for papers on the student gender gap, men comprise a significant minority of students engaged in higher education. Our campus statistics are in line with those reported by Gurian; in fall 2005 men comprised 40.9% of student enrollment. In the following article, we review the status of men at CSUF with respect to their enrollment and performance using data across several decades to provide a foundation for discussions about the gender gap and exploration of potential campus interventions.

Is the Student Gender Gap a Recent Phenomenon?

No. Although data are incomplete, from 1957 through the early 1960s men were in the minority (33.2% in fall 1959), probably due to the predominance of teacher education.

Men became the majority in academic year 1962 (56.5%) and continued to grow in representation into the 1970s. Their 15-year majority was probably associated with two factors: (a) the growth of more male-typed academic programs, and (b) college attendance as a means of avoiding the draft during the Viet Nam War era.

As shown in Figure 1, men's majority at CSUF ended in 1978-79; men have been in the minority at CSU Fullerton for 28 consecutive fall semesters starting in fall 1978 (49.8% male). Since fall 1989 (when enrollment was 44.8% male), men have been less than 45% of the student enrollment. In spring 2001 (when enrollment was 39.6% male), the percentage of men was less than 40%.




Is the Gender Gap Related to Ethnicity?

Yes and no. The answer depends on the index selected: *headcount* or *percent* of men. The percent of men decreased in all ethnic groups from 1980 to 2005, as shown in Figure 2 for undergraduates (upper panel) and graduate students (lower panel). However, in terms of headcount the pattern is different for Black,

Hispanic, and Asian/Pacific Islander versus White men. Although the headcount of the former three ethnic groups increased between 1980 and 2005 (from 2787 to 15,614), the headcount of the latter group declined between 1980 and 2005 (from 11,966 to 9,568). Both of these trends are a function of the diversification of both our region and our campus.

Figure 2
Percent of Men at CSUF by Ethnic Group, 1980-2005



How much of the student gender gap on campus is related to our mix of disciplines?


The mix of disciplines and the distribution of men and women are inextricably intertwined. The relationship is complicated and without a clear causal direction.

As shown in Figure 3, part of the decline in the percent of men over the long sweep is associated with academic program change.

Notice the growth in Computer Science as an alternative to Engineering as well as the advent of Child and Adolescent Studies, Counseling, Human Services, and Nursing.

Another important part of the decline in the percent of men over 35 years is women’s long march toward parity in formerly male-dominated disciplines. As shown in Figure 3, this trend is evident in several programs, including those in areas of business, the natural sciences, communications, and even educational administration.

Figure 3
Percent Men by College of Major (Total Students)



Dolores H. Vura, Assistant Vice President for Institutional Research and Analytical Studies, came to CSUF in 1986. She is an active member of the University Planning Committee.



Ed Sullivan is the Director of Institutional Research and Analytical Studies. He is part of the Facilitating Graduation committee and provides contextualized data for that committee and others enhancing ongoing university conversations. Ed joined the university in 2003.

Change in the distribution of majors across colleges is related to the decline in men. As shown in Figure 4, the Colleges of Engineering and Computer Science and Business and

Economics peaked in the early 1990s and then declined; the Colleges of Communications and Health and Human Development are currently at historic peaks.

Figure 4
Percent Distribution by College of Major (Total Students)

	Fall 1971	Fall 1980	Fall 1990	Fall 2000	Fall 2005
ECS	3%	8%	9%	6%	5%
CBE	19%	27%	29%	24%	23%
NSM	9%	6%	6%	5%	5%
ARTS	9%	7%	6%	6%	7%
H&SS	36%	17%	20%	21%	22%
Other	13%	16%	9%	16%	13%
COMM	5%	9%	10%	9%	10%
HHD	3%	8%	9%	10%	12%
EDUC	3%	2%	2%	3%	3%
TOTAL	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

Finally, colleges with the steepest growth across 25 years all had minority men in 1980 and currently. Colleges with former or current majorities of men have experienced below average growth during this period. These data are shown in Figure 5.

Figure 5
Percent Growth of Colleges
Fall 1980-Fall 2005

College	% Growth
ECS	9%
CBE	33%
NSM	47%
ARTS	51%
Other	28%
H & SS	102%
COMM	73%
HHD	115%
EDUC	85%
Total	56%

How does our freshman gender gap compare with the representation of men in our local CSU eligible pool?

As shown in Figure 6, the percent of men in our freshman class replicates fairly closely the percent of men of CSU-eligible high school graduates in our region, both within ethnic group and in total. Thus, helping K-12 to produce more CSU-eligible men may increase the percent of men on our campus.

First-time freshmen, total undergraduates, and total students are all very similar: Men are in the minority within each ethnic group, as well as in total.

How is the percent of men related to ethnicity and type of admit?

Fifteen years ago, Black and Hispanic freshman males were closer to parity with women than Asian and White men, *but* it was only because of the high percentages of special admits (students admitted on alternative criteria such as athletic/ fine arts talents or economic disadvantage) within these two categories. Figure 7 shows the percent of specially-admitted men, 1990-2005.

With the decline in special admits and the increase in regular admits within all ethnic categories, by 2000 the percent of Black and Hispanic men fell below that of Asian men, close to the percent of White men.

Does high school GPA vary between freshman men and women?

Yes. Year of admit, sex, and type of admit have direct and statistically significant effects on high school GPA.

Fall 2000 through 2005 cohorts are combined to produce data shown in Figure 8. Although high school GPA has risen over time, the effects of type of admit and sex remained consistent.

Figure 6
Percent Men By Ethnicity (First-Time Freshmen)

	2003-04 OC Eligible HS Grads	Fall '04 FTF	Difference Eligible vs FTF	Fall '05
Black	36%	40%	+4%	39%
Hispanic	39%	37%	-2%	38%
Asian	45%	46%	+1%	48%
White	44%	40%	-4%	41%
Total (All)	43%	41%	-2%	41%

Figure 7
Percent Specially Admitted Men by Ethnicity, 1990-2005, First-Time Freshmen





Figure 8
First-Time Freshman High School GPAs

	Average HS GPA	Median HS GPA
Special Admit:		
Men	2.72	2.68
Women	2.80	2.76
Regular Admit:		
Men	3.14	3.10
Women	3.28	3.25
Total	3.20	3.17

Special admits have significantly lower high school GPAs than regular admits. Within type of admit (regular or special), men enter with significantly lower high school GPAs than women.

Does gender relate to academic performance?

Yes. Overall, men are less likely than women to avoid probation at the end of their first term at CSUF. As shown in Figure 9, seven to ten percentage points separate the percent of men and women achieving first-term GPAs at or above 2.0. In fall 2005, only 70% of the men (compared to 77% of the women) achieved a 2.0 or better GPA.



Is gender associated with graduation rates?

Yes. Figure 10 shows the persistence and graduation rates for first-time freshman cohorts combined across 1996-99 by gender and first-term GPA. Men do less well than women, and the gender gap increases as one moves from retention to graduation.

Fitting the model of no three-way interaction for eventual graduation (“success”) produces the following statistically significant relationships:

- The likelihood of success for those who avoid end of first term probation is increased by a factor of 4.2, independent of sex.

- The likelihood of success for women is increased by a factor of 1.6, independent of first term GPA.

Figure 10
First-Time Freshman Outcomes Differ by Sex and First-Term GPA
Combined Cohorts, 1996-1999

	Total Number	% Retained 2 nd Yr	% Retained 3 rd Yr	% Graduated w/in 6 Yrs	% Eventual Grads
Women, Under 2.0	1,036	64%	51%	28%	38%
Men, Under 2.0	980	57%	43%	18%	29%
Men - Women		-7%	-8%	-10%	-9%
Women, 2.0+	4,007	89%	82%	65%	72%
Men, 2.0+	2,494	89%	78%	49%	62%
Men - Women		0%	-4%	-16%	-10%

Concluding Comments

The student gender gap on campus is not new; the last time men were a majority was 28 years ago. The gender gap is pervasive across all ethnic groups. It changes over time as academic program mix and gender stereotypes of academic programs change. The student gender gap on campus is a natural outcome of the gender gap that starts in K-12 and reaches its widest point in our pool of prospective students—high school graduates who are CSU-eligible. We may want to work with K-12 to produce more CSU-eligible men and to ensure that more men enter CSUF with stronger records of high school achievement.

Both early (end of first-term GPA) and long-term (retention and graduation) performance are statistically significantly different for men and women on campus. Men are more likely to go on probation by the end of the first term. Among those on probation after one term, 38% of women but only 29% of men graduate eventually. Among those who avoided probation their first term, 72% of women but only 62% of men graduate eventually. The persistence of the gender gap in long-term outcomes even when early outcomes are controlled raises questions for both further research and for conversations about campus programs. ☞

Feminism and the Gender Gap in College Enrollment

Barbara McDowell


National statistics indicate that there is a consistent and persistent gap in enrollment, retention, and graduation rates between men and women on college campuses. As shown in Figure 1 below, this gap impacts all races and ethnicities except for Asian-Pacific Islanders.

In the past 12 months, the campus has engaged in an active discussion about how this trend affects our campus. Thanks to Mark Shapiro, Vince Buck, Sandra Sutphen, and data provided by the Office of Research and Analytical Studies, many of us have reviewed the literature and are prepared to engage in discussions aimed at describing the gender gap, establishing if this gap is detrimental to men and/or women, and implementing a series of interventions at several levels to respond to this gap.

Figure 1

College Participation Rates – by Gender and Ethnicity (1967-2000)

Source: U.S. Census Bureau, population division, Education and Social Stratification




In this article, I review national and campus statistics and provide commentary on possible approaches to responding to this gender gap, drawing specifically from a feminist and gender role perspective.

Data presented in Figure 2 provide clarification on the gender gap. Since 1967, the population of men going to college has decreased marginally (.5%). However, the proportion of women has doubled. The spike in male enrollments from 1967-1975 probably represents the effect of the draft exemption given to men who enrolled in college during the Viet Nam War. From Figure 2, it is clear that the gender gap in college is not due to fewer men going to college; rather, the gap is due to more women going to college.

Figure 2

Percent of Population Enrolled in College by Gender

Source: U.S. Census Bureau, Population Division, Education & Social Stratification Branch



CSUF Statistics

The CSU-eligible pool of students reflects approximately the same ratio as campus enrollment with respect to gender, namely 2:3 (40 percent men; 60 percent women). More specifically, the pool of eligible students in Orange and Los Angeles counties is predominantly female at 57% and 58%, respectively. Statewide, the pool is 57% women (CSUF Research & Analytical Studies).

Additionally, data from the Office of Research and Analytical Studies tell us that men have long been in the minority at CSUF: in fall 1978, men were 49.8%; in fall 1989, they were 44.8%; in

spring 2001, men were 39.6%; and in fall 2005, men were 40.9%.

The conclusion is clear and dispels the common belief that enrollment of men in colleges and universities is on the decline. Additional data from our Office of Research and Analytical Studies show that male and female first-time freshman *headcount* has consistently increased (except fall 2003 when a smaller entering class resulted in declines in both groups). Since 1994, first-time freshman males have had higher year-to-year growth than females in seven out of eleven fall semesters. In reality at CSUF, return rates and graduation rates for males have improved in the last 20 years. However, even with the improvement, male return and graduation rates continue to lag behind female rates.

Thus, the *gender gap* is the problem; not the *decline* in enrollment of men. Many of us at the university are justifiably concerned about this gap. The reason for the concern is clear: a gap of this proportion raises the possibility of gender inequity on our campus.

Feminism can address this concern of gender inequity. Feminism provided many opportunities for women in higher education, which may have inadvertently left men behind. Women worked hard for equity and education, so the gap is probably a natural outcome that needs to be addressed.

The Feminist Connection

A recent Newsweek article (“The Trouble with Boys” by Peg Tyre, January 30, 2006) on the gender gap in higher education suggested several possible causes. The result was a large backlash of letters to the editor the following week.

I collected comments from those letters to the editor, reviewed a number of articles currently available on the issues of the gender gap in higher

education, and compiled a list of who and what our society believes is to “blame” for the gender gap in higher education. Here is the list:

feminists, single parents, society, the feminist classroom, high schools, outreach strategies, disproportionate number of female teachers, the selection of high school literature required for high school students; lack of fathers; lack of male role models; Title IX; standardized tests that make boys sit still; elimination of recess in grade schools, divorce, fear boys have of appearing weak, too many boys don't like school.

“...the gender gap is the problem; not the decline of enrollment of men. Many of us at the university are justifiably concerned about this gap.”

This seemingly random list and all of its implications will do little to close the gap for women and men in higher education. The list may be partially correct, but the prime cause is probably of a more global nature.

Reviewing the recent rash of articles on the gender gap in education reminds me of October 1991 when Anita Hill and Clarence Thomas squared off in front of the Senate Judiciary Committee. Ms. Hill asserted that Mr. Thomas was unfit to be a Supreme Court

Justice because he had engaged in persistent sexual harassing behaviors. Seemingly overnight, a large number of pop psychology books appeared in bookstores in reaction to this incident that was so titillating to the public. These books blamed the socialization of men for perpetuating sexual harassment, the socialization of women for not speaking up against it, as well as corporations for ignoring it. Nothing was solved with these books. Most of the books written on the issue were out of print nearly as quickly as they were published. “Blaming” was the immediate response to a much more complicated issue. We see the same reaction to the gender gap phenomenon. Although a variety of social phenomena are blamed for the gender gap in

enrollment, the knee-jerk reaction is to blame feminism, women, and Title IX.

Instead of blaming feminism, we would do well to build on what we have learned from 40 years of modern feminist thought and research:

Discover the changes that can occur if we work collaboratively to address the gap.

In 1991, Susan Faludi wrote a lengthy book entitled *BACKLASH*. In this book, Faludi suggested that women's rights and feminism had such a strong impact on equity and choice issues for women that men, fearful of what that might mean, began creating and institutionalizing strategies, morals, attitudes, and beliefs that would counteract the so-called "feminist" trends. I believe this "backlash," if indeed it happened, was based on fear (fear of what, I am not certain). The result is a society that seems to focus on the detrimental effects of feminism on men.

Feminism is not concerned with women out-excelling, controlling, and otherwise overpowering men. It is now, and always has been, concerned that women and men have equal access to opportunities and choices in society. We do our institutions and our nation a disservice when we blame feminism for all of our woes, and thus begin to dismantle a paradigm that provided equal rights and many opportunities to excel for a population who had been oppressed for so many decades (i.e., women). It is paramount to what happened when affirmative action regulations and policies were dismantled. It solved nothing.

We need to ask the question, "What have we learned from feminism that might be useful as part of the solution for the emergent gap between women and men in higher education?" Surely there could be a relevant solution in our feminist teachings. Let's look at some.

Feminism and What We Know About Men

On the surface, one would think linking experts on men's issues and feminists would be divisive. Such is not the case. Experts on men and feminist sociologists and psychologists agree on many issues. William Pollack coined the phrase "Gender Straightjackets" to describe the gender template superimposed on women and men in

society. The price both women and men pay for this "straightjacket" is a loss of potential in their choices and goals. Pollack goes on to tell us that "gender straightjackets" are detrimental to potential, success, and happiness for both genders.

Joseph Pleck used the "masculine specific gender role strain" paradigm to address the stresses and pressures of being a man in today's society. Feminists would agree with that and concur with most of the experts on boys' and men's

issues today (e.g., William Pollack, Michael Kimmel, Ronald Levant, Joseph Pleck) that both women and men suffer when societal stereotypes create gender straightjackets for boys and girls.

The past 40 years has eased many of the stereotypes imposed on women, but the pressure for men to be men and the stereotypes of what it means to be men persist. Perhaps the most persistent and consistent stressor for men is that men need to *succeed* and *achieve*. If men cannot succeed and achieve, the message is that somehow they are less than men.

Consequently, if boys experience pressure to succeed and if they enter college under-prepared and without a mentor or leader to pave the way (which is the case many times for Black and Latino men), they of course will turn away from an opportunity in which they cannot succeed. On the other hand, girls feel the pressure to succeed,

"The past 40 years has eased many of the stereotypes imposed on women, but the pressure for men to be men and the stereotypes of what it means to be men persist."

“We train men to believe that failure is not an option. We tell them to ‘disconnect,’ assert their independence, and achieve.”

but they balance their need to succeed with the need to connect and relate. Their development is not solely driven by society's pressure to succeed.

We train men to believe that failure is not an option. We tell them to “disconnect,” assert their independence, and achieve (Miller, 1993).

Consequently, men learn to avoid those challenges that present a possibility of failing. School represents, for some cohorts of boys, a possibility of failing. They turn away, finding opportunities in which they can succeed. Success and economic security can be found quickly in many vocations. Those vocations are attractive to men and promise them instant success and resources. Such vocations are not as readily available to women, or, at least, women have chosen not to pursue vocations such as skilled labor, building trades, etc. Instead, women persist in school. There would be nothing wrong with this if the vocational choices many men quickly choose offered something more than immediate gratification and high salaries that hit the ceiling very quickly.

Conclusion

Feminists would heartily agree that men need better role models and stronger connections. If we ask why women are so successful in their pursuit of higher education compared to men, it is probably because their role models have been nurtured by the feminist movement. Young women today are encouraged and pushed by their

peers and parents, especially their mothers, to be successful and persist. Men, by nature or nurture, may find that “connecting” and collaborating is a different vehicle than it is for women. But the outcome would be the same: perseverance, persistence, and linking to the masculine community to ensure that boys make choices that yield success, satisfaction, rewards, and meaning for them across their lifespan.

Men at CSUF will, of course, take a leading role in addressing the gender gap concern. Women at CSUF will undoubtedly provide a positive and constructive voice in addressing the gender gap in retention and graduation rates as well. Our combined voices in the next several years will yield comprehensive, well-reasoned strategies involving partners from all parts of the campus and the community. This is just the beginning.

We believe that simply creating a “Men’s Center” is not the solution. We need a more pervasive and collaborative solution, keeping in mind that this gap does not emerge when men and women first enter college. It started long ago.

The awareness of this issue alone may yield constructive change on a local level. For example, the stellar Women’s Center Advisory Board recently had a lively and constructive discussion on this issue. The comprehensive ideas we discussed were possible and practical. The discussion covered ideas such as partnering with

community men's organizations (100 Black Men; YMCA, etc.) in creating effective and consistent mentoring programs and workshops that should begin long before men enter our university. We believe that simply creating a "Men's Center" is not the solution. We need a more pervasive and collaborative solution, keeping in mind that this gap does not emerge when men and women first enter college. It started long ago.

I am aware that Student Affairs is having many discussions and investigating a number of grant opportunities, collaborations, and programs to address this issue. Don Castro is raising this issue throughout Southern California with organizations such as the Southern California Consortium of Hispanic Serving Institutions, the Summit Consortium of the UC, CSU and Community Colleges in the Los Angeles Basin, and the Fullerton Collaborative, specifically in conversation with the Fullerton Joint Union High School District. Additionally, the Counseling Department and the Women's Center are hoping to sponsor a two-day conference on contemporary men and women's issues with a special focus on challenges and barriers to men's development. ☺

References

Faludi, S. (1991). *Backlash*. NY: Anchor Books, Doubleday.
Miller, J.B. (1993). Relational approach to understanding women's lives and problems. *Psychiatric Annals*, 23, 424-431.
Pleck, J. (1981). *The myth of masculinity*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
Levant, R. & Pollack, W. (Eds.). (1995). *A new psychology of men*. NY: Basic Books.



Barbara McDowell has served as Director of the Women's Center/ Adult Reentry Center since 1988. She also teaches part-time in the Human Services Department.



Current Work of the CSUF Academic Senate

John W. Bedell

The Academic Senate continues its review of over 80 UPS (university policy statement) documents this semester, and we expect to begin a review of UPS 210.000, Faculty Personnel Policy and Procedures, immediately after spring break. The committee appointed to address faculty views on academic quality has worked on a survey instrument for all full- and part-time faculty members, and that survey will be submitted electronically in the next few weeks. Representatives of that committee met with the Associated Students Board of Directors to get the viewpoints of elected student leaders on academic quality, and we will meet with the Alumni Council in April.

Please review the draft statement, “A Commitment to Civility at CSUF.” You have seen an earlier version or versions; this one reflects a consultative process that involved meeting with the President’s Advisory Board, the Associated Students elected leadership, and management in the Division of Student Affairs. Our senate colleague Sandra Rhoten, Associate Dean of Judicial Affairs, has done an extraordinary job pulling things together. I expect to bring this statement to the Executive Committee of the Academic Senate in March and then to the Academic Senate. Hopefully, this draft or some version of it will be adopted by the Academic Senate. The commitment could then be put in the catalogue and circulated widely throughout campus.



*John W. Bedell,
Professor of
Sociology, is Chair
of the campus
Academic Senate.*

DRAFT # 6, 2/1/06 ***A Commitment to Civility at CSUF***

As members of the University community, we are committed to ensuring an environment where learning and the creation of knowledge are foundational goals and where freedom of speech and expression is viewed as an essential characteristic of a community of scholars. To reach these goals it is imperative that we foster a climate where civility is valued, appreciated, and expected and where all members of the community are treated with dignity, respect, and care.

“Civility” comes from the Latin word civitas, meaning city and community and is equated with courtesy--a style and manner that elevates human interaction and discourse. Civility is apparent when we are aware of the impact that our communications, practices, and behaviors have on others and when we acknowledge each person’s worth, cultural perspective and unique contributions to the community.

Establishing a civil climate is a shared responsibility of all community members - students, faculty, staff, and administrators. Civility is the expression of respect for others and for the tasks we share. It is best modeled through a willingness to listen to alternative views, respecting diversity and encouraging ideas. It is

our belief that differences of opinion should reside within a framework of respectful discourse and lead to mutual understanding.

Therefore, we believe that civility is a cornerstone of our university mission and values, and we reaffirm our commitment to civility on the campus--both inside and outside the classroom. We will both individually and collectively strive to treat each other with dignity, respect, and care in all of our interactions.

Sandra and I have been struck by the strong support for such a statement to date. We'll keep you posted as it works its way through the process.

On behalf of the faculty, I submitted a Mission and Goals initiative proposal for a sabbatical leaves augmentation. Given that we are going to have a larger group eligible for sabbaticals, it only seems reasonable to increase the pool of monies for their funding. We should know within the next 6 months or so if the proposal is funded. ☺

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 that the Senate addresses. Individuals are encouraged to respond to the materials contained in the Forum or to submit their own contributions.

Editor

Diana Wright Guerin, Child & Adolescent Studies

Editorial Board

John W. Bedell, Sociology, Academic Senate Chair

Kathy Brzovic, Business Communication

Joanne Gass, English, Comparative Literature, & Linguistics

Dana Loewy, Business Communication

Top-Down “Leadership” Fails Again

Vince Buck

Larry Summers failed as president of Harvard not because of his often inept comments, but largely because he failed to understand the nature of universities. He tried to lead without first engaging his needed followers. That style of leadership may suffice in hierarchical organizations, but it is a recipe for failure in collegial institutions.

Some editorialists in major papers blamed his failure on the faculty. John Tierney in the *New York Times* (March 4) referred to the incident as a faculty *coup d’etat*. The *Wall Street Journal* referred to the faculty running the “academic asylum” (Feb 22). The general thrust was that universities are not well served by shared governance where faculty members have a major role in determining the direction of the institution. Ignoring the success of American higher education and the unique nature of the educational enterprise, these writers – and many other opinion makers – prefer a one-size-fits-all “corporate model” for running institutions. John Tierney, ignoring any irony, suggested that universities should be run like newspapers.

Those who were at this institution a decade ago will recall the efforts of Barry Munitz – strongly supported by trustee Bill Hauck – to impose a “corporate model” on the CSU, including pay for performance. These efforts were more ideological than practical, based not on an understanding of the institution but rather a commitment to the corporate-hierarchical model as a way of doing things. They did not make the CSU operate better in any measurable way, and they created many internal tensions.

The vast problems and many scandals facing American corporations today have reduced the

“Attempts to impose a top-down management style undermine academic excellence.”

calls to restructure academia in the mold of large businesses, but the academy remains under attack. Some want to achieve greater cost savings in order to solve state budget problems; others want to make coddled faculty work harder (at least an 8-5, five-day week, plus other responsibilities); still others want to rein in a left-wing faculty that they believe is out of touch with mainstream American values.

These attacks should serve as a warning to those of us inside the academy who know the critical importance of shared governance in achieving academic excellence. Although a college education is valued for economic purposes, the academy and its mission are not well understood in the wider world. The institutions themselves are not on most people’s radar screens. But those who do pay attention often resent the influence of the faculty and want to reduce it by making the faculty members more “accountable” through imposition of a hierarchical-corporate model.

Attempts to impose a top-down management style undermine academic excellence. Yet this approach is not uncommon with university administrators. Larry Summers is a prime example, and because of the exceptional influence of the Harvard faculty, this led to his downfall. The *Chronicle of Higher Education* (March 8) ran an article, more thoughtful than most, by Warren Bennis and Hallam Movius.

They reflected on Summers’ failure and what it takes to be a successful university administrator today. They concluded:

The successful university president knows that faculty members expect to be consulted on everything that affects them. They demand a voice in all significant decision making. They expect to be heard and not talked down to. It is essential that the process of university decision making be perceived as fair by all.

Transparency is a necessary part of that process. ... Universities rightly expect candor in their leaders. ...And no matter how brilliant the president’s vision is for the university, he or she must listen to people across the campus and elicit a collective vision for the future.

If the academy is to withstand attacks from the outside, it needs internal unity about its mission and other important issues. That unity can only be achieved with the style of collegial leadership described by Bennis and Movius, whether at Harvard or in the CSU. ☞

Vince Buck, Professor of Political Science, and former chair of the Academic Senate, is a representative of CSUF on the system-wide Academic Senate.



Statewide Academic Senate (ASCSU) Activities

Barry Pasternack

Last year the Statewide Academic Senate had an extremely full agenda, the results of which were the continued work on the Lower Division Transfer Pattern (LDTP) program, the applied Doctorate in Education, and the efforts to facilitate graduation. Much of this work has continued this year, but there are several new issues that the Statewide Senate has undertaken.

September Plenary

In September 2005 we passed resolutions affirming our support to victims of Hurricane Katrina, urging a speedy conclusion to bargaining (with at least a 3.5% increase in faculty compensation), reaffirming the Senate's position that any proposed merit pay system be carefully considered before implementation, opposing Proposition 76 (The California Live Within Our Means Act – subsequently defeated by the voters), and establishing a committee to oversee the development of applied doctoral programs.

November Plenary

In November 2005 we passed several resolutions related to graduation. One recommended to the Chancellor that students completing the requirements for two baccalaureate degree programs receive recognition for both degrees on their diplomas. Another urged campuses to reexamine their policies regarding the repetition of courses for grade forgiveness. We also passed a resolution continuing our support for joint doctorates with the UC in areas other than education as well as supporting campus autonomy in the establishment of their academic calendars.

January Plenary

In January 2006 we passed a resolution reaffirming the Senate's support for the AAUP's 1940 Statement on Academic Freedom (some documents are timeless in scope). This resolution also voiced objections to recent actions by outside groups to impose standards and/or to change or insert content into the curriculum of some courses. We also passed a resolution calling on the CSU to provide newly-recruited faculty with necessary physical (e.g. office space) and technological support as well as providing such faculty with any salary advances needed to cover the cost of health care during their first month on the job. We passed a resolution commending the efforts of the early assessment program (the program that tests students in the eleventh grade to advise them whether they are deficient in math or English skills), and a resolution supporting the California Science and Mathematics Teacher Preparation Initiative.

Much of the time spent at the January plenary meeting was devoted to addressing the anticipated budget shortfall of the Statewide Senate. There were several remedies discussed, but no consensus emerged. This topic is back on the agenda for the March plenary. Also to be acted on in March is a resolution addressing the needs of disabled students to obtain alternate text and supplemental course materials. This resolution, if adopted, will ask faculty to consider if electronic versions of the text and other reading materials are available at the time such materials are adopted. The resolution also calls on the Chancellor, as the leader of the largest system of higher education in the country, to work with publishers to make such materials routinely available. ☞

Barry Pasternack is a campus representative to the Statewide Academic Senate. In 2002, he was recipient of *the CSUF Faculty Leadership in Collegial Governance Award* and is currently chair of the Department of Information Systems and Decision Sciences.

