

***Journal of the Indiana University
Student Personnel Association***

2001 Edition

Contents

Indiana University Student Personnel Association Officers.....	2
<i>Journal of the Indiana Student Personnel Association</i> Editors.....	3
Awards and Honors & Call for Nominations	4
Editors' Comments	5
Valerie Sarma, Kelly Kish	
State of the Program	7
Jillian Kinzie	
Herman B. Wells: Champion for Racial Equality at Indiana University	10
Sara E. Hinkle	
Satisfaction Among College Students Living in Traditionally Staffed and Alternatively Staffed Residence Centers.....	32
Carolyn Jones, Minda Heyman, Valerie Sarma, Kimberly Sluis, Michele Starzyk	
Campus Alcohol and Drug Abuse in Higher Education.....	51
Kimberly Anne Sluis	
Preparing a Teaching Professorate: Emphasizing the Scholarship of Teaching to Graduate Students	62
Shaun R. Harper	
Making Headlines: The National Survey of Student Engagement.....	72
Kelly A. Kish, Valerie A. Sarma	

INDIANA UNIVERSITY STUDENT PERSONNEL ASSOCIATION

Department of Higher Education and Student Affairs
School of Education
W.W. Wright Education Building, Suite 4228
Bloomington, Indiana 47405
(812) 856-8362/8364

2001 Journal Editors

Valerie Sarma, Kelly Kish

Review Board

Joanna Adler, Drew Griffin, Shaun Harper,
Sara Hinkle, Donald Petkus, Mindy Sutton, Ontario Wooden

IUSPA Officers 1999-2000

President: J. J. Story
Vice President: Dayna Baker
Secretary: Drew Morgan
Treasurer: Loreal Reuille
Dir./Development: Matt Stillman
Dir./Programs: Minda Heyman
Dir./Relations: Anna Burkhalter
Professional, Dev.: Valerie Sarma
Kimberly Sluis
Dir./Outreach: Jenn Haney
Carolyn Jones
Mark Manderino
Josh Skillman
GSO Representative: Valerie Sarma
Advisor: Stacy Jacob
Eric Love

IUSPA Officers 2000-2001

President: Aaron Krudwig
Vice President: Mindy Sutton
Secretary: Steve Weiland
Treasurer: Ontario Wooden
Dir./Development: Tiana Williams
Dir./Programming: Joe Testani
Dir./Relations: Christine Jones
Professional Dev.: Helen Grace Correll
Dir./Outreach: JaNay Queen
Jack Voorhees
Outreach Committee: Pam Balder
Allison Ragon
Ande Redford
Jamie Smith
Sacha Thieme
Steve Weiland
Katie Wilburn
GSO Representative: Joanna Adler
Advisor: Jillian Kinzie

Journal Editors

1967: Ann Paloney & Michael J. Wiener
1968: Marily Liechty
1969: Dallas Bauman
1971: George C. Dehne
1972: Jane A. Lundahl
1973: Helen Mamarchev & Winnifred Weeks
1974: Elizabeth Brannon, Robert Ciesliki, Barbara Moudy, David Stacy & Dann Lobsinger
1975: Dann Lobsinger & Deborah Ann Alter
1976: Dianne Burnside & Richard Scott
1977: Susan Hopp, Frank Araiolo & Vince Carunchia
1978: Elizabeth A. Zavodny, Marc Kaplan & Jim Scroth
1989: Jim Scroth
1980: L. E. Wegryn
1981: B. J. Bischoff & Brian Pisaro
1982: Rodney P. Kirsch & Janet J. Wright
1983: Nedra Hartzell & Daniel Salter
1984: Susan Buffington & Diane Ledger
1985: Margaret O'Brien & David Stewart
1986: Lora Burnett & James Vander Putten
1987: James J. Holmen & James J. Hurley
1988: David J. Strauss & J. J. Thorp
1989: J. J. Thorp & Patricia Harned
1990: Patricia Harned & Diane Robinson
1991: Diane Robinson & Anne E. Spitler
1992: Anne Spitler & Lisa K. Mitchell
1993: Lisa K. Mitchell & Allison Block
1994: Allison Block & Melody M. Snyder
1995: Melody M. Snyder, Lisa P. Lourden, Kelli Kputska Smith & John Bean
1996: John Bean & Kelli Kaputska Smith
1997: Suzanne J. Mendoza, Jennifer Forbes & Alan Rose
1998: Jennifer Forbes & Ryan A. Forsythe
1999: Naraiah S. Broadus & Christopher R. Turner
2000: Brent Ericson & Jason Pontius
2001: Valerie A. Sarma & Kelly A. Kish

2001 Awards and Honors

Congratulations to these members of the Indiana University family on the following recognitions:

Myra Morgan	Elizabeth A. Greenleaf Distinguished Alumni
Jill Carnaghi	Robert H. Shaffer Distinguished Alumni Award
Richard McKaig	Robert H. Shaffer Distinguished Alumni Award
Christine Jones	Elizabeth A. Greenleaf Fellowship Award
Sacha Thieme	Elizabeth A. Greenleaf Fellowship Award
Brian Bridges	August and Ann Eberle Fellowship Award
Shaun Harper	August and Ann Eberle Fellowship Award
Robson Marinho	August and Ann Eberle Fellowship Award
Richard Muthiah	Robert H. Wade II Fellowship
Kandance Hinton	Holmstedt Fellowship
Ricardo Montelongo	Holmstedt Fellowship
Gerald Olson	Kate Hevner Mueller Award

Call for Nominations

Nominations of individuals for the 2002 Elizabeth A. Greenleaf and Robert H. Shaffer Awards are now being accepted. The Greenleaf Award is presented annually to the graduate of the master's degree program in Higher Education and Student Affairs who exemplifies "the sincere commitment, professional leadership and personal warmth" of Betty Greenleaf, for whom the award is named. Previous Greenleaf Award recipients include Louis Stamatakos, Phyllis Mable, James Lyons, Paula Rooney, Joanne Trow, Carol Cummins-Collier, Thomas Miller, Frank Ardaiole, Deborah Hunter, Vernon Wall, William Bryan, Terry Williams, Marilyn McEwen, Gregory Blimling, Lawrence Miltenberger, and Jamie Washington.

The Robert H. Shaffer Award is presented to the graduate of the Indiana University Higher Education doctoral program who exemplifies outstanding service to the student affairs profession. Previous Shaffer Award recipients include L. "Sandy" McLean, Thomas Hennessy, Jimmy Lewis Ross, Robert Ackerman, Don G. Creamer, Nell Bailey, Alice Manicur, Rodger Summers, Caryl Smith, and Donald Mikesell.

Nominations for both awards close February 1, 2002. The awards will be presented at the 2002 NASPA and ACPA conferences. Please direct your nominations and supporting materials (e.g., vita) to Jillian Kinzie, W.W. Wright Education Building, Room 4228, 201 N. Rose Avenue, Indiana University, Bloomington, IN 47405. Thank you.

Editors' Comments

Valerie A. Sarma, Kelly A. Kish

Welcome to the 2001 edition of the *Journal of the Indiana University Student Personnel Association*. This year marks the one-year anniversary of the passing of former IU President (1938-1962) and Chancellor (1962-2000) Herman B. Wells. Wells' work has influenced racial equality, student housing patterns, and student discipline, and has placed an emphasis on excellence in teaching, among many other areas on the Bloomington campus. This collection of master's and doctoral student work explores similar issues in higher education.

The articles in this year's edition of the *Journal* provide insight into different aspects of faculty and student affairs work. Our first article highlights Herman B. Wells' efforts and accomplishments on the road to racial equality at Indiana University. The next piece discusses the current legal context of student behavior and parental notification on college campuses. Our third entry takes us into the residence halls by comparing how staffing practices influence student satisfaction in undergraduate on-campus housing. The fourth article calls for an examination of teaching preparation and training practices for future faculty members. Finally, our last piece offers some insight into George D. Kuh's current research initiative examining student engagement on campus. We feel fortunate that we can present such a wide range of current topics in this edition of the *Journal*.

The publication of the *Journal of the Indiana University Student Personnel Association* is a collaborative effort between current students, faculty, staff, alumni, and friends of the Higher Education and Student Affairs program. Therefore, we would like to begin by thanking the Journal Review Board members for their time, dedication, and investment in making the 2001 edition the benchmark for the next millennium.

Financial support is essential for the continued success of this publication. We would like to offer our sincere gratitude to friends and alumni for their contributions to the *Journal*. We would like to acknowledge the special contribution from the Center for Postsecondary

Research and Planning. Additionally, the Higher Education and Student Affairs department and the Indiana University Student Personnel Association have supported the *Journal* through their financial contributions as well as their continued encouragement of the scholarship of HESA students. Without the leadership of Jillian Kinzie, Master's Program Coordinator and Journal Advisor, the production of this edition would not be possible.

Lastly, we would like to recognize and appreciate the research, scholarship, and writing of the authors that have contributed to this edition. Creating a body of knowledge that will inspire and teach others is the greatest contribution you can make to the field of education.

We hope that this *Journal* can serve as an annual reminder of your past experiences at Indiana University and we hope that you will keep the Program updated on your current experiences as well.

Valerie A. Sarma graduated from Indiana University with a Master's in Higher Education and Student Affairs in May 2001. While at IU, she served as a Graduate Supervisor for Residential Programs and Services in Read Center. She graduated from Loyola University with a B.S. in Psychology in 1999.

Kelly A. Kish is a current Master's student in Higher Education and Student Affairs at Indiana University. She has served as a Graduate Supervisor for Residential Programs and Services and is currently a graduate assistant in the Center for Postsecondary Research and Planning. She graduated from the University of Maryland with a B.A. in Government and Politics in 2000.

State of the Program

Jillian Kinzie

Master's Program Coordinator

Greetings from Indiana University! It's been another exciting year in Bloomington and I am delighted to offer you a glimpse of the happenings of the HESA program via the 2001 edition of the *Journal of the Indiana University Student Personnel Association*.

The production of the *Journal* continues to be one of the hallmarks of our program. It makes a unique contribution to the professional development of our students as they take on roles as scholars and leaders in higher education. This year, the editors and the team of students involved in the review and editing of submissions were exceptionally dedicated. Most importantly, the authors of these articles valued the opportunity to share their ideas with a broader audience. However, this opportunity is only made possible through the generous contributions of alumni and friends who designated that their donations to the annual fund drive go towards the IUSPA Journal. I encourage you to pledge your support to sustain this valuable professional development experience.

I have had a wonderful first year as coordinator of the master's program. Recently, it has been particularly exciting to talk with our graduating students as they accept positions in the field. Many share great stories about the support they experienced through the strong IU alumni network. This network has also provided assistance to a number of the first year students in their search for summer internships. I am especially pleased with the increased number of students who took advantage of formal internship programs available through ACPA, NODA and ACUHO-I, and with those who took the initiative to simply contact institutions or to utilize the IU alumni connections to seek out interesting summer assignments. In other positive news, a trio of first year students — Andrea McDowell, Mindy Sutton, and Joe Testani, — triumphed in the NASPA graduate student case study competition this year!

Interest in the master's program in Student Affairs remains high as we continue to attract talented students from all across the nation. The IUSPA Outreach team worked exceptionally hard again this year to introduce prospective students to the program via the two Outreach recruitment sessions in February. We expect a full class of talented students to join us in the fall. However, like many graduate preparation programs across the country, we are also seeing a slight decline in the number of inquiries. As a result, we intend to extend our outreach efforts and hope to involve alumni as representatives at the "grad prep program fairs" that are cropping up across the country. If you are interested in volunteering to represent the program at a fair please let me know. As you well know, our alumni are really the most convincing recruiters for the program.

The ACPA and NASPA conferences provided opportunities to reconnect with alumni and friends of the program and to announce news from IU. Most of you are aware that Dr. Gerardo Gonzales is the new Dean of the School of Education. Dr. Gonzalez has roots in student affairs (he founded the largest collegiate organization for the prevention of alcohol abuse - BACCHUS) and has been a great support to the program. In other faculty news, Don Hossler continues in his appointment as Vice Chancellor for Enrollment Services; Fran Stage is currently on leave from IU; Ed St. John, Vic Borden (IUPUI), and George Kuh recently received a planning grant from the Association for Institutional Research to develop a post master's certificate program in institutional research; George Kuh is rivaling actor Tom Hanks for the number of awards received. This year George was recognized by colleagues in the Association for the Study of Higher Education (ASHE) for his achievements in research, was recently named Chancellors' Professor, and won the Tracy M. Sonneborn Award at IU; To underscore the important link between theory and practice, Bruce Jacobs and I co-instructed the College and University Administration course. Bruce's practical administrative experience helped enliven our discussions about higher education history and organizational theory; We are also thrilled that beginning in the fall, Dr. Mary Howard Hamilton will join the HESA faculty as a tenured professor; Deborah

Faye Carter has been a member of the ACPA Emerging Scholars program since January 2000 and has a book coming out this year from Garland press entitled, *A Dream Deferred? Examining the Degree Aspirations of African American and White College Students*. More news of the program is available via our website at: <http://education.indiana.edu/~hesa/>.

On behalf of the faculty, students and staff of the program, I thank you for your faithful contributions to the master's program through the financial gifts that make possible the publication of this Journal and through the referrals of talented prospective students that keep our program strong.

Faculty Advisors

Dr. Elizabeth Greenleaf	1960-1977
Ms. Wanda Deutsch	1970-1971
Dr. David Decoster	1972-1976
Dr. George Kuh	1977-1982
Dr. John Schuh	1983-1987
Dr. Don Hossler	1987-1988
Dr. Frances Stage	1988-1989
Dr. Don Hossler	1989-1990
Dr. George Kuh	1990-1996
Dr. Bruce Jacobs	1996-1997
Dr. Teresa Hall	1997-1998
Dr. Ada Simmons	1998-2000
Ms. Jillian Kinzie	2000-2001

Herman B. Wells:
Champion for Racial Equality at Indiana University
 Sara E. Hinkle

Herman B. Wells, President of Indiana University for 25 years, was instrumental in promoting racial equality on the campus. Driven by the ideals of democracy and blessed with a unique and effective style of leadership, Wells was the driving force behind the desegregation of the campus. The following paper provides a historical account of Wells' efforts in desegregating the Indiana Memorial Union, athletic teams, campus housing, and local restaurants.

The state university is the crown of the public school system, and as *such* should both by precept and by example vitalize the democratic way of life. In its own organization and operation [the university] must set a dramatic example of democracy in action inspiring to all citizens of the state (Clark, 1977b, p. 382).

So spoke Herman B. Wells on December 1, 1938 when he was inaugurated as the eleventh president of Indiana University, a position he would hold for the next 24 years. In his speech, Wells articulated his firm belief in the ideals of democracy, a principle which would guide him throughout his years of leadership at the university. According to Indiana faculty member, Henry Remak:

Wells believed, with all his heart and mind, the access to education was absolutely fundamental to democracy. Giving the African American more access, and ultimately, complete access, both socially and residentially as well as academically, was something that was simply part of his belief in democracy that was practical rather than talked about. (Brancolini & Metz, 1993)

Indeed, over fifteen years before the 1954 *Brown vs. Board of Education* court decision legally mandated racial desegregation, the campus of

Indiana University was already making great progress towards integration under the guiding hand of Wells. However, in order to grasp the vision that Wells possessed, it is necessary to understand that he was living in a world that had not yet adapted the idea of racial equality.

Background

Educational policy of the day was shaped by the "separate but equal" doctrine which was endorsed in the *Plessy v. Ferguson* (1896) decision (Pilgrim, 1985; Stefkovich & Leas, 1994). Reflecting the social mores of the time, the decision maintained that "such separation does not imply inferiority of either race, that there were time when and places where the races preferred separation, and that it was within the police power of the states to pass legislation requiring separate facilities" (Stefkovich & Leas, 1994, p. 408). Unfortunately, the equality promised by *Plessy* was never realized. This was especially true with regard to the treatment of Blacks at colleges, where they were confronted with racism in nearly every aspect of their experience (Pilgrim, 1985).

Indiana University proved to be no exception. According to Frank O. Beck, former curator of the Beck Chapel, "In the year 1920, when the University entered upon its second century of history, the highly difficult field of race relations was undoubtedly its most insistent and unsolved problem" (Beck, 1959, p. 29). Unfortunately, at this time, "Little if any efforts of the administration to correct the situation were made public" (Beck, 1959, p. 33). However, it is important to keep in mind that this was a time when racial discrimination was commonplace throughout the United States (Stauffer, 1966), including the state of Indiana (Clark, 1977). According to Madison, "Racism and segregation were common experiences for most blacks in Indiana. . . It was nearly impossible to find in Indiana a public place, institution, or group where whites accorded blacks an equal and open reception" (1982, p. 8). Furthermore, the Ku Klux Klan had a strong presence in the state, and "By 1925, the Klan controlled the governorship, the legislature, and the Hoosier mind" (Gilliam, 1985, p. 42).

Despite the forces that kept racism part of the status quo, "Important changes in race relations occurred as institutions of higher education were forced to reconcile their own traditions with the national

and international struggles against nazism, anti-Semitism, and racism" (Cobb, 1998, p.1). Indeed, Indiana University was poised and ready for a change with regard to issues of racial equality on campus. Soon the "University was to have a new President, and with him, as it proved, a new approach to the problem at hand" (Beck, 1959, p. 35).

The Rise of Herman B. Wells

In 1902, seven years after Indiana University graduated its first black student (Beck, 1959), Herman B. Wells was born in Jamestown, Indiana (Wells, 1980). Young Herman's character and values were shaped to a large degree by his parents, both educators, who placed a premium on education, hard work, and integrity. Early in Wells' life he received a lesson from his father in the importance in holding fast to your beliefs. As Wells recalls, the Ku Klux Klan offered his father an ultimatum to dismiss a schoolteacher whose views were contrary to their own. When the senior Wells refused to dismiss the teacher on those grounds, the Klan began a rumor, which closed down his bank. "Nevertheless, [according to the younger Wells] my father did not think of yielding to that kind of immoral pressure" (Wells, 1980, p. 23). This incident in his young life foreshadowed Wells' leadership style.

With the lessons and values of his parents and a sound education firmly in place, Wells quickly worked his way up the ranks of the banking industry in the state of Indiana and then the administrative ladder at Indiana University (Bantin & Capshew, 2000; Brancolini & Metz, 1993; Wells, 1980). After serving for one year as the acting president of the university, Wells was elected, by a unanimous vote of the board of trustees, the youngest president ever to serve IU.

With the Wells administration began a new era for the university, and a new era with regard to racial relations on campus. According to IU historian, Thomas Clark,

Acting President Herman B. Wells came into office at one of the most dramatic moments in Indiana and American educational history. From 1937 to 1946 the United States and the world would make the heaviest calls on capable human resources in the history of civilization. These demands would shatter the old

objectives and ideals of the Bryan period and destroy complacency in academia in Bloomington. Herman B. Wells proved alert to the signals of the time and determined not to allow his institution to dawdle. (1977a, p. 3)

Wells immediately dove into the role of the presidency and began setting an agenda to make positive changes for Indiana University. According to Wells, "One of the most time-consuming and important responsibilities relating to students that occurred during my administration involved the effort to shake off our previous university practices that discriminated against Black students..." (Wells, 1980, p. 214).

While some of his contemporaries were content to let *Plessy's* "separate but equal" philosophy govern their campuses, Wells saw that this doctrine was against his fundamental beliefs and would not be sufficient or acceptable for his university. As declared by Wells:

We must renounce prejudice of color, class, and race... Where? In England? In China? In Palestine? No! We must renounce prejudice of color, class and race in Bloomington, Monroe County, Indiana. (Thornbrough, 1962, p. 68)

The young visionary had the insight to see that racial inequality had no place in a country that espoused freedom and equality.

Unity for the Union

Today the Indiana Memorial Union is a place where the entire campus community is encouraged to congregate. However, in the late 1930's, many restrictions existed which limited the use of this facility for black students. One of the first successes of the Wells administration with regard to integrating the campus was in eliminating segregation from the Union (Wells, 1980).

One method of restricting students of color from the Union was through the use of "reserved" signs which were placed at a limited number of tables within the Union Commons (Beck, 1959; Wells, 1980; Yancey, 1989). Black students were only allowed to eat their meals at the designated tables; if the tables were full, the black students

were forced to stand or eat elsewhere. Furthermore, the Commons was one of their few dining options, since people of color were banned from eating in the local restaurants at that time.

A letter to Wells from Charles Stewart, a local high school teacher, expresses his concern about the Union policies after he and some members of the Kappa Alpha Psi fraternity, a black fraternity on campus, were prevented from eating in the Men's Grille. The men were informed that "it was the policy of the University not to serve colored people in the Grille" (April 22, 1942). In response to Stewart's letter, Wells made an inquiry into the current Grille policies. The Union director informed Wells of the following:

At the present the policy stands that the colored people are to have access to the cafeteria and soda shop service, but not in the remainder of the building except the bookstore. I am sure that the colored students are given more freedom in the Food Department than they received a few years back, and I presume that one could say that they have received considerable ground. (James Patrick to Wells, May 5, 1942)

Indeed, Wells took the appeals of Stewart and the students to heart and quietly took action about the situation. According to Wells, one day as he walked through the Union Commons with the director, he turned to him and said, "Pat, I want you to remove all those [reserved] signs. Do it unobtrusively and make no mention of what you've done" (Wells, 1980, p. 216). Because Wells conducted this matter without fanfare, it was two weeks before anyone realized that the signs were gone, and by that time "the absurdity of the previous situation was apparent" (Wells, 1980, p. 216).

According to Wells' longtime assistant, Dorothy Collins, the manner in which he handled the Union situation was very typical of his leadership style. "[Wells'] way of rectifying problems was to work backstage, work in the back of the scene.... He's probably the most liberal president we ever had and yet he didn't take the protest method; he had the back of the scene way" (1994).

Wells often had to fight this battle toward integration in the face

of opposition from his administration and staff. In one example, the Union director wrote to Wells regarding an unfortunate incident that occurred in the Union Grille (H.W. Jordan, July 19, 1945). While a "well-mannered" black boy quietly sat eating his meal, a white couple loudly expressed their displeasure at his being there, asked the waitress not to serve him, and offered her a large tip if she would throw water in his face. The director's point in writing to Wells was to emphasize that "Such actions are a challenge to the race to push their way into the building. We have had very few negroes ever come into the Grill, but I feel if such actions between white citizens are continued that it will make it a challenge to them and that they will shove themselves upon us more and more."

Others expressed concerns that the business in the Union was decreasing because Blacks were now allowed to use the facilities. In a memo from W.G. Biddle to Wells, the comptroller cites a report which shows a decrease in the number of meals served in the Union cafeteria over a six month period. Biddle states, "I am told that the decrease has been among the white people, and that the number of Negroes has increased some. I am not sure what the future holds for the Indiana Union" (April 11, 1945). Wells responds to Biddle's rather dramatic statement with a matter-of-fact response in which he points out the fact while the cafeteria has declined 16% in the number of its customers from the previous year, the enrollment records show a 25% decrease for the comparable period (April 20, 1945). Clearly, Wells was unfazed by the concerns of his colleagues.

Wells' efforts on the Union front did not go unnoticed by the black community. On May 28, 1942 he received a letter from Walter C. Bailey, president of the Negro Student Council, expressing appreciation on the council's behalf for "the clear-cut stand taken by the administration concerning the Negro Student Union problem" and for the administration's efforts in "promoting mutual understanding and harmony between all campus groups." According to Bailey, "The timely solution of this problem, provides a welcomed illustration of the spiritual lead which the University has traditionally taken in both national and community affairs, strikes another blow at those crippled Fascist forces of Hate and Prejudice which still struggle for survival in our Democracy."

Athletic Victories

Although there were black football players at Indiana University before the turn of the century, a "gentleman's agreement" existed between the Big Ten coaches which prevented students of color from participating in other sports, such as basketball. According to Wells, "There was some kind of mumbo jumbo about the fact that the sport included too much bodily contact to make it feasible to mix the races" (1980, p. 217). That is, until the president stepped in.

In 1947 the Hoosier's basketball coach, Branch McCracken, was interested in recruiting a star basketball player, a black student by the name of Bill Garrett, to play for the team (Beck, 1959; Wells, 1980). However, due to this "gentleman's agreement" Coach McCracken was concerned about being ostracized by the other coaches within the Big Ten conference. President Wells, offering his support and encouragement, urged the coach to proceed in recruiting Garrett. Wells stated, "if there's any conference backlash against it, then I'll take responsibility for handling it" (Wells, 1980, p. 217). Wells was a member of the Council of Ten, an organization of the Big Ten university presidents, and knew that he could use his influence with his colleagues to put pressure on the other Big Ten coaches. With this action came success. "Despite the openly voiced disapproval of the Western Conference, Coach McCracken—with the full backing of President Wells—stood his ground and put Bill Garrett in his first string" (Beck, 1959, p. 52). Garrett became the first black student to receive a scholarship in basketball from IU and was the only black student to play in the Big Ten at that time (Garrett, 1970).

As a result of Garrett's victories both on and off the court, other coaches began to recruit qualified black players. As stated by Wells, "It just took one school to break that vicious circle" (Wells, 1980, p. 218). "[Garrett] won good will for Negroes worth half his value and—with the wise and courageous support of the administration—lowered the barrier for them to intercollegiate sports" (Beck, 1959, p. 52). Other sports at Indiana were successfully integrated in a similar fashion, and the university led the Big Ten in being the first to have Blacks play golf and baseball, in addition to basketball (Wells, 1980).

However, in 1956 the good will created during Garrett's day hit a snag as a controversy over another black athlete, Eddie Whitehead, came to the forefront. Whitehead was the first black student to play on Indiana's baseball team and traveled with his fellow Hoosiers to the South where the team was scheduled to play six games in Florida and Georgia (Hudson, 1997; Kress, 1999). Unfortunately, the southern schools abided by a "gentleman's agreement" just as the Big Ten coaches had during Garrett's day, which did not allow students of color to play intercollegiate sports alongside white players. As a result, Whitehead was prevented from playing with his teammates. Adding insult to injury, Whitehead was not permitted to eat in certain restaurants or stay in the dormitories with his white teammates. On one occasion, Whitehead and his coach were forced to take their meals to the coach's car where the two could eat without hassle.

Upon the team's return to Bloomington, Wells was appalled to learn of the treatment of Whitehead during his trip down South, and headlines in and out of the state proclaimed his indignation. For example, *The Indianapolis Times* exclaimed, "Dr. Wells calls treatment of Negro outrage" (1956), while the *Courier-Journal* in Louisville announced "Wells is outraged by Negro's abuse" (1956). The *Courier-Journal* went on to quote Wells: "It's outrageous the indignities now being suffered in the South by Eddie Whitehead... I'm opposed to segregation in any form. IU is the leader in the nation against segregation in school as well as in athletics". The *Times* article stated that Indiana University would no longer schedule athletic contests against schools which discriminate against black students.

Wells' strong and public stance on the Whitehead incident was followed by a barrage of criticism and hate mail from all over the Midwest and the South (Hudson, 1997). These critics had some very harsh words for the IU president:

so the great white father is mad because his loving nigger had to eat dinner in the kitchen... Yes I.U. is the leader in the nation against segregation. They are also the leader in the destruction of mankind and human happiness... just go to hell and don't worry about the South. Jim Dumas (undated)

You so-call [sic] professors why don't you keep your Niggers away from the South... You are a disgrace to the white race. Segregation will return to all America some day, and I do hope it will be real soon. America will wake some day soon. a real American (June 9, 1956)

Herman: You cheap negro loving son of a bitch- only way you can get your name in paper- heartbreak over baseball team in Fla- Keep your team out of South- learn how many tears we shed. K K Kean (March 29, 1956)

On the local front, Wells was criticized for allowing the team to travel to the South in the first place if Whitehead would not be allowed to play.

Never one to bend under pressure, Wells responded to his critics with a swift plan of action. On April 7, 1956, an article in the *Gary Post Tribune* ("Hoosiers answer Dixie's curbs") reported that Indiana University, Notre Dame, Butler, and Purdue had agreed on a policy of refusing to play any teams which require racial or religious segregation. According to the policy, none of their teams would play unless all players were permitted to participate. The article went on to say:

Some southern lawmakers, as in Florida and Georgia, have been sponsoring laws to bar games between amateur teams of mixed races. They would require other teams to withdraw Negro players if they want to play Dixie squads. The answer should be the one made by the Hoosier schools- no contest. If it is made generally, throughout the college sports world, we can predict the reaction in the South Colleges and their students will tell the lawmakers to keep their hands off college sports. They will not like to be segregated.

Clearly, this proved to be another victory for Wells, the university, and all the students who reaped the benefits of the policy.

University Housing for One and All

When Wells took over the presidency in 1937, the university did not provide housing and it was the custom of both black and white students to secure residency in the homes of families within the Bloomington community. However, as black families became more segregated on the west side of town, a far distance from campus, the issue of housing for black students became problematic (Beck, 1959).

The first to move toward a solution to this problem was Sam Dargan, a black entrepreneur and IU graduate, who acquired several houses near campus which became the main source of housing for black women (Gilliam, 1985). However, as the enrollments continued to rise, the housing for black students became more and more congested (Beck, 1959). In addition, many black students expressed great dissatisfaction with the Dargan House, referring to it as "shabby," "run-down," and "inadequate" (Yancey, 1989). Alarmed at the situation, Wells began the uphill battle toward the goal of integrated university housing facilities for all students, a battle which would last for the next fifteen years (Beck, 1959).

A letter from Wells to W.G. Biddle in May of 1940 shows the advent of an idea forming in the mind of the president, a first step toward the goal of integration:

I am of the opinion that we cannot depend on Sam [Dargan] to furnish complete facilities for colored girls... I believe we should develop in one of our houses, either owned or rented, facilities for a few girls which would be similar in furnishings and appearance, considering the number of persons to be housed, to the best we have to offer in our dormitories. I am likewise of the opinion that this house should be a part of our dormitory system and that we should have it ready for occupancy beginning next fall... This is only a quick reaction of mine and the plan may not be feasible.

Wells' proposal, as it turned out, did seem to be feasible and quickly began to take shape. Only a few weeks later, Wells wrote to Dargan (May 24, 1940) to inform him that the university would begin to

provide housing facilities for black women as early as that fall. According to Wells, "It is solely because the University has decided that there must be comparable facilities available to students of both races that the project is being undertaken to supplement the facilities which you have provided in the past."

In August this plan continued to progress and dean of women, Kate Mueller, sent out letters to black women in order to assess their interest in a new housing facility. "If there is sufficient demand, Indiana University hopes to make arrangements to provide better housing for colored women either on the campus or one street removed from the campus for September 1940...." Mueller assured the women that the house "will be furnished in the same style and quality as the new dormitories for women...for girls of cultivated tastes" (August 1, 1940). The costs would also be identical to those that the white women paid for the dormitories. The efforts of Wells and Mueller resulted in two new off-campus housing facilities for black women (Beck, 1959).

Reactions were mixed regarding this expansion of housing for black women. One complimentary letter was sent to Wells from a representative of the Alpha Kappa Alpha sorority (Blanche Patterson, February 10, 1944) in which she states: "The improvement that has been made in housing...for Negro women in general impressed me so favorably that I want to express to you my deep appreciation." On the other hand, some Bloomington community members submitted a petition to the Indiana board of trustees in which they proposed that the university vacate the properties that were occupied by black students and lease them to white people instead, to which Wells gave a firm response:

Indiana University is a tax-supported institution. Both State and Federal constitutions charge it with the responsibility for serving all the youth of the State without regard to their color, race, or religion. If the Trustees were to grant this petition, they would do so in direct violation of the basic laws of the land. Therefore, since there is no legal, ethical, or economic justification for the demand of the petitioners, their request was not granted. (Wells to Harley Skirvin, October 1, 1942)

While other campus and community members were impressed with the amount of progress the Wells administration had made in providing housing for black women, they stressed that there was still a need for more housing for these women on campus. However, on numerous occasions Wells was quick to clarify the responsibility of the university with regard to providing housing, as in a letter he wrote to the NAACP, which stated:

[T]here is some misunderstanding with regard to this whole housing matter. Neither the state nor the University has or can assume total responsibility for the housing of students [because the state has a policy of not appropriating money for dormitories]. Such facilities as we are able to develop can only be supplementary to those provided by private means (to Robert Starms, August 22, 1945).

Wells emphasized that it was important for the black leadership of the state to interest itself in the development of housing for students of color.

Although the university did not have a responsibility to provide housing for all students, the Wells administration soon began making efforts to move toward that goal. On January 6, 1947, the concept of having black women living in the regular Halls of Residence began to take fruition when it appeared on the agenda of the Halls of Residence Committee Meeting Agenda. After a lengthy discussion of the issue, the Committee voted six to one in favor of the following:

The Halls of Residence Committee recommends to the Board of Trustees of Indiana University that Negro girls be permitted to live in the Hall of Residences and that their applications should be considered on the same basis as all others. (J.A. Franklin to H.W. Jordan, June 6, 1947).

While Wells' ultimate goal was the integration of the residence halls, he also recognized the apprehensions of the housing administrators who anticipated a backlash from the parents of white students. This

concern regarding the reactions of parents seemed to be more of an issue for the female students than the male students. According to Wells:

The pressure from that direction against having Black students in the residence halls was sufficient for the trustees to become fearful that integration could not work just then. As a consequence, in order to achieve our goals, we had to take an intermediate step, which was to create a residence hall for Black women that was nevertheless a university facility (Wells, 1980, p. 218).

With the assistance of the only female board member, Mary Maurer, Wells recommended to the Board of Trustees that the Lincoln House "be completely redecorated and refurnished comparable to our best equipped dormitory, for colored girls" (Wells and Maurer to Board of Trustees, August 16, 1948) and made a request for their authorization of this proposal. However, he still met with some resistance from the board.

In an interview conducted with Maurer (1969) she discusses Wells' handling of the board during the housing situation. According to Maurer, "The colored housing was very bad... and some of the trustees couldn't care less." Maurer went on to elaborate about Wells' power of persuasion with the board: "[Y]ou might go into the meeting and know what [Wells] was going to say, know what he was going to propose, and think you opposed it. But he had a way of making you know that you were just dead wrong." On August 26, 1948, a telegram sent to all the board members from Wells and Maurer announced: "We are happy to inform you that we now have unanimous approval to proceed with the Lincoln House."

One week after this telegram was sent the *Indianapolis Recorder* featured a story about the Lincoln House. The headline proclaimed, "Girls enjoy 'home life' while attending Ind. U." (September 6, 1948). According to the article, which was prominently displayed on the front page, "Officials of Indiana University believe they have gone a long way toward solving the housing problem for colored female students by opening up and allotting to them one of the choice dormitories on the

campus known as the Lincoln House."

While this seemed to be a success for the administration, there were still those people who felt that the university did not go far enough. The NAACP was especially vocal in expressing their concerns about the "separate but equal" housing policies of the university (William Ransom to Wells, August 30, 1948).

In 1948, "separate but equal" facilities were provided for black men (Beck, 1959), and by 1952 there was no longer a need for segregated housing at Indiana University (Wells, 1980). Despite opposition from the community, parents, trustees, and others within the administration, Wells won the long and hard fought battle towards integration of the residence halls on campus. But in the typical Wells style, his battle was fought behind the scenes and without fanfare.

Wells attained results without blowing any trumpets or seeking recognition for himself, but others did not let his actions go unnoticed. In October of 1949, Wells received a letter from the NAACP, an organization that had at times been critical of Wells' handling of the housing situation. However, in this letter, the group praised the president:

[T]he members voted unanimously to express to you our sincere thanks for the efforts you have made on the behalf of the successful achievement of attaining democracy in the Women's Residence Halls with the elimination of segregation. It is indeed heartening to know that we can always depend upon your assistance in our attempts toward achieving those principles to which our organization is dedicated. (Hazel Lockett, October 2, 1949)

Beyond the Campus Borders- Restaurant Desegregation

In the spring of 1937, a sign at a local Bloomington restaurant on Tenth Street proclaimed, "We serve white customers only" (Beck, 1959), thus sparking an issue which would become much debated in Bloomington and on the Indiana campus for over ten years. A letter published in the *IDS* on February 15, 1939 revealed that, "There exists only one eating establishment, outside of the colored cafeteria, in the entire city where Negro students can secure food" (cited in Beck, 1959, p. 48). These conditions existed despite the fact that there was a

statute that made it illegal for public restaurants to discriminate on the basis of race (Wells, 1980).

Although these restaurants were not under the jurisdiction of the university, there is evidence that work was occurring behind the scenes on behalf of the Wells administration to remedy the restaurant situation. A letter from Charles Brown to Wells' assistant, Fenwick Reed on October 6, 1947 offers a list of local restaurants that Brown visited "in reference to our proposal for solving the immediate racial problem on campus." Among the eleven restaurants listed, Brown indicated that six of them would be "more hesitant about okaying serving of colored people," but would most likely cooperate if the majority of the other restaurants did. From the communication, it appears that they planned to have Wells address the group of restaurant owners, with the goal of attempting to sway them from their policy of refusing service to Blacks.

Meanwhile, a black student athlete by the name of George Taliaferro decided to take action about the situation. Taliaferro, with little time to eat lunch between classes, was frustrated at having to hustle to the west side of campus where the special black cafeteria was located (Strong, 1984). Adding to his frustration was the fact that a life-sized picture depicting him as a university athlete hung in the Book Nook, a restaurant that he was not permitted to enter (Gilliam, 1985).

As such, in the spring of 1948, Taliaferro paid a visit to Wells and expressed his concerns regarding the policies of the downtown establishments (Gilliam, 1985; Pratter, 1994; Strong, 1984; George Taliaferro, personal communication, December 5, 2000). Wells was sympathetic to his concerns, and together the two of them worked out a low-key strategy. First, Wells placed a call to the owner of the Book Nook, who expressed concern that serving Blacks might upset his regular customers and cause him to lose business. Using his finely tuned powers of persuasion, Wells convinced the owner to permit Taliaferro, a popular football player who was well-known among the student body, to bring some friends and dine at the establishment in order to test the reaction of integration. Within two week's time, Blacks were eating in the Book Nook with no resulting problems (Brown, 1997; Gilliam, 1985). Taliaferro, sung the praises of his president: "Herman Wells smoothed the way with the faculty and with the staff and the integration

of the facilities came about without anyone raising their hackles... He was there and he was a force when called upon" (Brancolini & Metz, 1993).

Despite this success in integrating the Book Nook, by 1950 segregation still existed amongst the downtown restaurants. In March of that year, the failure of these establishments to serve students of color was a hot topic and the headlines from the *IDS* chronicled the events like a soap opera. The March 16, 1950 edition of the *IDS* ignited the issue with a headline on page one, which read, "We got no hamburgers; City cafes close early". According to the article, the restaurants closed after a mixed-race group of students entered the facilities and were served. Two days later the *IDS* informed the campus that "Restaurateurs to meet students," an event to be held at an unspecified time the following week in response to student action. A few weeks later on March 24, the issue seemed to be losing some of its steam. The topic was now relegated to page two of the *IDS* where the headline read, "Café parley fails to agree." Apparently the meeting between students and restaurant owners to discuss the relaxation of customs in serving Blacks did not produce the desired results.

The issue climaxed in May of 1950 when eight of the downtown restaurants closed "due to a forced movement of the colored students on the University campus" ("Eight restaurants close", 1950, p. 1). According to the article, the participating restaurant owners feared violence from the organized students, although no violent actions were reported. The article stated that Wells and the mayor had met with representatives from both sides and had urged them to get together and work towards a solution.

Wells (1980) recounts such a meeting, during which he was issued an ultimatum from the representatives of the local restaurant association with regard to the restaurant situation. The restaurant owners informed Wells that if he did not persuade the students and their faculty supporters to back off on their demands for service, they were prepared to permanently close all the downtown restaurants, thus depriving many students and community members of their customary places to eat. Undaunted, Wells pointed out that their actions were not just immoral, but also illegal. He was prepared to expand the facilities

in the Union, now desegregated, to feed all of their displaced customers. This unexpected response on behalf of the university was startling to the restaurant owners and, according to Wells, "Our ultimatum in response to theirs resulted in the evaporation of the whole issue..." (Wells, 1980, p. 220).

This was one of the few examples where the president used a confrontational approach to achieve his desired results. In fact, Wells relates a time when he was accused by a young minister of being a "traitor to the cause of equality" because of the non-confrontational methods that he used (Wells, 1980, p. 220). In contrast to Wells, the minister believed that "the greatest progress would be made only by bringing all issues to a state of confrontation" (Wells, 1980, p. 220). Wells' response was that he wanted to win each issue and not lose one. As such, he felt his subtle, non-confrontational approach was the most effective one, as it would prove to be time and time again, and he did not intend to alter it.

On May 18, 1950, the front page of the *IDS* proclaimed, "Cafes reopen today, say they will observe the law! State law requires equal enjoyment for all in restaurants." Clearly, this was a triumph for the black community and another feather in Wells' cap in terms of his successes in integrating the community.

Indeed, the efforts of Wells did not go unnoticed. The very day this *IDS* article was published, Wells received a letter of appreciation from Valjean Dickinson, president of the Indiana chapter of the NAACP, a group that had been openly active with the restaurant issue. Dickinson expressed his thanks to Wells for the "forthright stand which you took," as well as for Wells' efforts in initiating the series of conferences with the downtown restaurant owners. According to Dickinson, "It is our belief that those conferences contributed materially to the achievement of a favorable solution to the problem" (May 18, 1950). Similarly, Louis Greenberg, executive director of the Indiana Jewish Community Relations Council, praised Wells' leadership on this issue. He said:

It is reassuring to know that you, in your official capacity, played so constructive a role in the recent negotiations with

some of the Bloomington restaurant owners... We want to extend heartfelt congratulations upon the leadership you have given in the successful solution of a recurrent violation of Indiana laws, and in the fulfillment of the principle of equal opportunity and treatment for all citizens (May 25, 1950).

It is clear that Wells' leadership in ending segregation reached beyond the Indiana campus and into the Bloomington community. However, evidence exists that suggests Wells' influence reached even further. In an interview with George Johnson (1969), a 1915 IU graduate, he relates a tale told to him by a black football coach. This coach was denied service at a restaurant in Oklahoma, when a portly man approached him and asked, "Did I understand that you were turned down for an eating place?" When the coach responded affirmatively, the portly man said, "Wait until I do some telephoning." Shortly, the restaurant manager returned and invited the coach to eat in the restaurant. When the coach made an inquiry as to the identity of the portly man, he was informed that it was Herman B. Wells. The coach never knew to whom Wells made that phone call, but from this example, it appears that the bounds of Wells' influence were far reaching.

Conclusion

Slowly and steadily, under the guiding hand of President Wells, racial integration came to Indiana University. "Reserved" signs were removed from the tables in the Union and eventually all students could dine and congregate together under the same roof. Black athletes, once barred from sporting competitions, could now play alongside their white teammates. Where at one time black students were forced to live in inadequate facilities on the outskirts of town, they now lived in university residence halls with their white classmates. However, Wells' influence did not stop at the campus borders. When he saw the injustice of Blacks being refused service in the downtown restaurants, he took action and got results. Bloomington restaurant owners no longer closed their doors to black customers.

In 1954, seventeen years after Wells began his presidential responsibilities at Indiana, the Supreme Court made the landmark

decision, *Brown v. Board of Education*, which discarded the "separate but equal" philosophy that had been established by *Plessy* some 58 years before. The Supreme Court had finally concluded and legalized what Wells had believed and fought for all along, the ideal of equality for the races. Wells placed the concept of racial equality high on his priority list because he felt it was his moral obligation based on his deep rooted belief in the concept of democracy.

Not only did Wells himself strive for the goal of democracy, but challenged his students to work toward this ideal as well. In a commencement address delivered to the class of 1952, Wells posed the following question to the graduates, "What are you for?":

You are against communism; but are you for a true democracy which strives to provide equal opportunity and justice for every citizen regardless of race, color, creed, social and economic status, a society where there are no second class citizens?... We hope that you will... work always to build a more perfect democracy characterized by brotherhood and justice. ("What are you for?," 1952)

Wells delivered these words 100 years after the statute providing for the operation of Indiana University was enacted. Clearly, the university had come a long way since 1852.

In 1962, after over 25 years of service to the university, Wells stepped down from his role as president. In honor of his retirement, Wells was chosen by the campus chapter of the NAACP to receive its Brotherhood Award. The citation reads:

We consider that we have been partners with you over the years in the task of lessening prejudice and unreason, and that both you and we can feel satisfaction in the result. Both Indiana University and Bloomington are far better places, in terms of race relations, than they were a quarter-century ago. We gladly acknowledge the support, usually quiet and unobtrusive, which you have given to our organization at various critical stages in the struggle; and we are happy to attest the

various initiatives of yours to purge official University policy of all discrimination. ("Wells receives", 1962)

Epilogue

Herman B. Wells died on March 18, 2000. However, his leadership has made a lasting impact on the university, particularly in the area of racial equality. While racial prejudice continues to be an issue at Indiana University and throughout the world, Wells was instrumental in setting a standard and building the foundations for a campus where diversity is espoused and promoted.

References

- Bantin, P. C. & Capshaw, J. H. (2000). *The Wells archive: Exploring the world of higher education*. Privately published.
- Beck, F. O. (1959). *Some aspects of race relations at Indiana University: My alma mater*. Privately published.
- Brancolini, E. (Producer/Director) & Metz, P. (Executive Producer). (1993). *The vision of Herman B Wells*. [Video]. (Available from Radio & TV Educational Services, Radio & TV Center 215, Indiana University, Bloomington, IN 47405)
- Brown, T. J. (1997, April 16). Breaking barriers: Football hero Taliaferro lived through racism, earned degree. *Indiana Daily Student*.
- Café parley fails to agree. (1950, March 24). *Indiana Daily Student*, pp. 2.
- Cafes reopen today, Say they will observe law! State law requires equal enjoyment for all in restaurant. (1950, May 18). *Indiana Daily Student*, pp. 1-3.
- Clark, T. D. (1977a). *Indiana University: Midwestern pioneer, Vol. III*. Bloomington, IN: Indiana University Press.
- Clark, T. D. (1977b). *Indiana University: Midwestern pioneer, Vol. IV*. Bloomington, IN: Indiana University Press.
- Cobb, D. L. (1998). *Race and higher education at the University of Illinois, 1945-1955*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign.
- Collins, Dorothy Craig. (1994, May 16). Interview conducted by Jean Freedman, Bloomington, Indiana. Indiana University Oral History Research Center, #91-254.
- Dr. Wells calls treatment of Negro outrage. (1956, March 27).

The Indianapolis Times.

Eight restaurants close in student service dispute. (1950, May 16). *Indiana Daily Student*, pp. 1-2.

Garrett, William L. (1970, June 5). Interview conducted by William B. Pickett and Barbara E. Benson, Bloomington, IN. Indiana University Oral History Research Center, #70-16.

Gilliam, F. V. H. (1985). *A time to speak: A brief history of the Afro-Americans of Bloomington, Indiana 1865-1965*. Bloomington, IN: Pinus Strobilus Press.

Girls enjoy "home life" while attending Ind. U. (1948, September 6). *Indianapolis Recorder*, pp. 1.

Hoosiers answer Dixie's curbs. (1956, April 7). *Gary Post Tribune*.

Hudson, H. (1997, April 18). Spring break 1956: Sun and racism. *Indiana Daily Student*. pp. 7 & 14.

Johnson, George A. (1969, June 7). Interview conducted by William Pickett, Bloomington, IN. Indiana University Oral History Research Center, #69-14.

Kress, S. (1999, March 1). Crossing the color lines: Bias against black students inked in IU's history. *Indiana Daily Student*.

Madison, J. H. (1982). *Indiana through tradition and change: A history of the Hoosier state and its people, 1920-1945*. Indianapolis: Indiana Historical Society.

Maurer, Mary Rieman. (1969, June 7). Interview conducted by Victoria Cuffel and William Pickett, Bloomington, IN. Indiana University Oral History Research Center, #69-13.

Pilgrim, D. (1985). *Deception by stratagem: Segregation in public higher education*. Bristol, IN: Wyndham Hall Press.

Pratter, Harry. (1994, May 23). Interview conducted by Jean Freedman, Bloomington, IN. Indiana University Oral History Research Center, #91-262.

Restaurateurs to meet students. (1950, May 18). *Indiana Daily Student*, pp. 1.

Stauffer, S. (1966, January 5). Treatment of Negroes at I.U. has changed since early 1900's. *Indiana Daily Student*.

Stauffer, S. (1966, January 6). Chancellor Wells started work for racial equality on campus. *Indiana Daily Student*.

Stefkovich, J. A. & Leas, T. (1994). A legal history of desegregation in higher education. *Journal of Negro Education*, 63 (3), pp. 406-419.

Strong, M. (1984, February 24). Wells worked to subtly integrate campus. *Indiana Daily Student*, p. 17, 21.

Thornbrough, E. L. (1962). *Since emancipation: A short history of Indiana Negroes, 1863-1963*. Indianapolis: Indiana Division American Negro Emancipation Centennial Authority.

We got no hamburgers; City cafes close early. (1950, March). *Indiana Daily Student*, p. 1.

Wells is outraged by Negro's abuse. (1956, March 29). *The Courier-Journal*, Louisville.

Wells receives local NAACP award. (1962, May 18). *Indiana Daily Student*.

Wells, H. B. (1980). *Being lucky*. Bloomington, IN: Indiana University Press.

What are you for? (1952, October). *Indiana Alumni Magazine*, pp. 6-7.

Yancey, M. E. (1989). *Rocked in the cradle of the deep*. Privately published.

Archival Resources

Indiana University Archives, Bloomington, Indiana

Dean of Women Records, 1905-1945 (collection #165).

Indiana University clippings files.

Indiana University reference files.

Records of the President, Herman B Wells, 1937-1962 (Accession # 1117).

Sara E. Hinkle is a doctoral student in the department of Higher Education and Student Affairs at Indiana University Bloomington. She earned her B.A. in psychology from Gettysburg College and her M.S. in counseling from Georgia State University. Prior to attending IU she worked for four years as a student affairs professional in the areas of residence life and student activities. Correspondence regarding this paper may be sent to the author at sahinkle@indiana.edu.

Satisfaction Among College Students Living in Traditionally Staffed and Alternatively Staffed Residence Centers

Carolyn Jones, Minda Heyman, Valerie Sarma, Kimberly Sluis, and Michele Starzyk

This study compares satisfaction among students living in a residence center with a traditional staffing structure and students living in a residence center with an alternative staffing pattern. The satisfaction of students is assessed in relationship to community, independence and accountability, policy enforcement, and safety. The researchers also assess the level of importance students place on different aspects of their living environment in an effort to determine how different hall environments meet student needs.

Institutions of higher education have long been involved in the process of creating environments that foster student satisfaction.

Given the considerable investment of time and energy that most students make in attending college, the student's perception of value should be given substantial weight. Indeed, it is difficult to argue that student satisfaction can be legitimately subordinated to any other educational outcome. (Astin, 1977, p.164)

Generating environments that satisfy a diverse population of students has become especially important with regard to student housing. "Students increasingly are bringing to higher education exactly the same consumer expectations they have for every other commercial establishments with which they deal" (Levine & Cureton, 1997, p. 14). In an increasingly consumer-based system with growing competition from private housing developers, colleges and universities must address issues of student satisfaction with regard to the housing environments offered on their respective campuses.

In examining student satisfaction with residence hall environments, researchers have discovered that "variety in styles and types of accommodations increases the appeal of residence hall living to a

greater number of students" (Grimm, 1993, p.249). Responding to the changing needs of students, such as privacy, is necessary for the success of residence life programs on university campuses (Grimm, 1993).

It is clear that in an effort to increase student satisfaction, and thus increase student housing retention rates, residence life programs must make adjustments in both the type of services they provide and the ways in which they provide these services. This study compares satisfaction among students living in a residence center with a traditional staffing structure and students living in a residence center with an alternative staffing pattern. For the purpose of this research traditional staffing is defined as a building in which Resident Assistants supervised by graduate and professional staff live on individual floors. Understanding how these environments are related to student satisfaction will assist residence life professionals as they look to generate living environments that will best meet the needs and demands of a changing student population.

Literature Review

Facility and Staff Structure Components

Literature focusing on the staffing structure in residence halls is limited. The emphasis of prior research is on programming design (Schroeder and Freesh, 1977), academic performance within unique program designs (Delucchi, 1993) and student satisfaction with differing programs (Floyd, 1987). It is therefore necessary to utilize a historical approach to analyze the trends in residential facility design and staffing structure.

Greenleaf (1969) outlines predictions for residence halls in the following areas: construction, programs, regulations and staffing. Structurally, the trend was to modify halls from long corridors to a grouping of rooms that allows for privacy (Greenleaf, 1969). Greenleaf points to the growing desire of students, particularly upperclassmen, to have "the privacy of a single room" (Greenleaf, 1969, p. 67).

Rules and regulations were also prevalent issues in the 1970s. Greenleaf's 1969 writings suggest, "Administrators must take the lead in involving students in a thorough and objective reexamination of current rules and regulations....As young adults, students are gaining support

for greater freedom, self-responsibility and individual determination of behavior" (p. 69). It was thought that if student input was not considered when drafting rules and regulations then campuses would have difficulty in retaining students (Greenleaf, 1969).

Literature on staffing structure has focused on how departments of residence life have emphasized the importance for staff "to place emphasis upon student self-discipline, self-responsibility and educational interaction" (Greenleaf, 1969, p. 69). Greenleaf's (1969) belief is that staff size will decrease while training and preparation of staff will increase. Greenleaf (1969) further posits, residence halls need to change to fit the students' needs of the future.

Interestingly, while the nature of students' needs have changed, the trends that Greenleaf postulates for the 1970s are still relevant today. Blimling (1993) submits that it is expected that more students will want private rooms and will seek to live in residence halls that have more services. In order to meet the changing needs, student housing facilities at many universities will require renovation (Blimling, 1993). Moving towards more privacy-based facilities has "the potential to fundamentally change the way residence life staff interact with students and the magnitude of the influence that residence halls can have on students" (Blimling, 1993, p. 12).

Finally, Grimm (1993) discusses the multitude of on-campus living arrangements. While providing several options from apartment-style with minimal supervision to traditional high-rise corridor housing, each have been found to provide both benefits and challenges for students; there is no agreement as to a single design or combination of concepts for creating a residential hall hybrid (Grimm, 1993).

Satisfaction with Residence Center Environment

Research focusing on satisfaction with residence environments is not widely available, therefore the research presented in this portion of the literature review focuses on general research relating to the following areas: community, independence, accountability, policy enforcement, and personal safety. Astin (1985) asserts that student satisfaction with campus services is a measure of institutional effectiveness. In response to this finding, institutions should seek student input in order to increase effectiveness of services. However Boyer's (1987) research has found

that "almost without exception, the role of students in campus decision-making is not taken seriously in higher education" (p.235).

Residence hall environments have the ability to enhance students' personal and educational experiences (Anchors, Douglas & Kasper, 1993). According to Anchors, et al. (1993) a residential community "aims at promoting the common good, imparts a sense of belonging, and supports the ultimate goals of encouraging students' personal development" (p.461). A sense of caring, trust, teamwork, involvement, and shared leadership by students can be used as criteria to determine the health of the community (Anchors et al., 1993).

Supportive communities have the ability to provide students with opportunities to explore their personal identity and interdependence with others (Anchors et al., 1993). Residence life programs, which value student development, should promote responsibility and positive contributions to communities among students (Winston & Anchors, 1993). According to Magolda (1993), residence halls are environments in which students have the opportunity to evaluate their morals. Resident Assistants play an integral role in this process as they educate residents about the center policies and help residents to understand why the policies exist and why enforcement of policies is necessary (Winston & Fitch, 1993).

Winston and Anchors (1993) advocate that residence halls should be "endorsing the cultivation of a healthy lifestyle, both physically and psychologically" (p.41). Students are seeking more independence in their residence communities and expect to be safe and secure in the residence halls (Schuh, 1996). Schuh (1996) suggests that there is a relationship between lack of supervision and presence of safety in residence halls.

Methods

Participants

The study was conducted at a large, public, Research I institution in the Midwest during the fall semester of 2000. First-year students are not required to live on the campus. Students who are interested in living in a residence hall must apply through the residence life office to live in one of the 11 residence halls or campus apartments.

The staffing structure of Smith Hall consists of undergraduate

Residence Assistants who are supervised by three Graduate Supervisors. Resident Assistants live on each floor where they supervise thirty-five to seventy-five students. They are responsible for community building, extensive programming, and providing on-call duty coverage for weeknights and weekends. During on-call duty, Resident Assistants are responsible for hall safety by locking center doors and enforcing policy.

In contrast, the residents of each floor in Brown Hall elect their own Floor President who serves as a student government representative and also implements programs for approximately thirty-three floor residents. Three graduate students in Brown Hall serve as Resident Leadership Specialists who supervise the Floor Presidents. On-call weeknight and weekend duty is rotated between the Resident Leadership Specialists and two uniformed and armed staff police officers that live and work in the center.

The researchers limited the participant pool to sophomores, juniors and seniors for two reasons. First, researchers wanted to focus specifically on the undergraduate experience. While there is a small population of graduate students who reside in Brown Hall, the vast majority of students living in Smith Hall are undergraduates. Second, first-year student residents were excluded from the sample. The researchers felt this exclusion was necessary because the university does not allow first-year students to select a residence hall, and first-year students would therefore be unable to complete the section of the instrument that asks the participant to disclose the reasons for choosing to live in your residence hall. In addition, the study examined students' experiences in the residence halls. First-year students did not have as much experience living in the residence halls, because they are newcomers to their living environments. The researchers gathered 60 surveys from Brown Hall and 42 from Smith Hall to make the total sample 102 participants.

Instrumentation

Based on the literature reviewed, the survey was constructed to measure the students' feelings of importance, comfort and satisfaction with various aspects of their campus residential living environment. The main difference between the halls, staffing structure, was a focus when

constructing questions for the survey. The survey consists of five sections: 1) demographic information, 2) importance of hall characteristics in selection of residence, 3) comfort level with personal safety, 4) satisfaction with community, independence/accountability, policy enforcement and physical safety, and 5) open ended response questions. The demographic information section solicited information through multiple choice and fill in the blank questions. The next four sections utilized a five point Likert scale to measure the importance, comfort, and satisfaction that students have with various aspects of residential living. A "no basis for judgment" option was also included in both the comfort and satisfaction sections. The final section consisted of two open-ended response questions regarding overall satisfaction and dissatisfaction.

Surveys were color-coded to distinguish between each residence hall. The two survey instruments contained identical questions, except for questions pertaining to police staffing. The Smith Hall survey contained questions regarding the "idea" of police officers in the building. The Brown Hall survey contained questions regarding the "presence" of police officers in the building. This difference was necessary due to the fact that Smith Hall does not currently have police officers on staff, while Brown Hall does.

Prior to its actual distribution, the survey was given to a group of undergraduate men and women as a pretest. Once an application was approved by the Committee for the Protection of Human Subjects, researchers set up tables to distribute surveys in the first floor lobby of both Smith and Brown residence halls.

Analysis

After 102 usable surveys were collected, the data were analyzed with the Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS). Means were calculated for each variable. T-tests were then utilized to determine the difference between means for Smith and Brown respondents. In addition, open-ended responses for questions were hand coded by four researchers. Two questions asked participants for self-reported responses of the best aspect of their residence hall and what they were most dissatisfied with in their residence hall. For the best aspect, the

responses are divided into the following categories: privacy/independence, facilities, location, RA/residents, cost and other. Dissatisfaction responses are separated into the following categories: facilities, parking, food, RA/staff, noise, social interaction, policies, cost, none, and other. For both open ended questions, responses that were only given once were placed in the "other" category.

Limitations

Due to the nature of our study, several limitations need to be noted. One limitation is that the sample size is relatively small. Sample size was limited due to time and the number of available participants. A second limitation resulted from the uneven breakdown of gender in each residence hall tower. In addition, the large number of first-year students living in Smith Hall resulted in a restricted number of eligible participants from that residence hall. Since the majority of Smith's residents are first-year students and graduate students reside in Brown Hall, this may also impact the environments in each residence hall. Finally, the sample is not representative of the population because residents self-selected to participate in the study.

Results

Demographics

Demographic information for participants is located in Table 1.

Table 1. Demographic Frequencies for Brown and Smith

Variable	Brown Frequency (%)	n	Smith Frequency (%)	n
Gender				
Female	55	33	38.1	16
Male	45	27	61.9	26
Academic Class				
Sophomore	46.7	28	61.9	26
Junior	43.3	26	23.8	10
Senior	10.0	6	14.3	6
Race/Ethnicity				
African American/Black	13.3	8	23.8	10
Hispanic/Latino	1.7	1	0.0	0
American Indian	0.0	0	2.4	1
White/Non-Hispanic	80.0	48	71.4	30
Asian/Pacific Islander	5.0	3	2.4	1
GPA				
3.5-4.0	16.7	10	31.0	13
3.0-3.4	38.3	23	35.7	15
2.5-2.9	35.0	21	19.0	8
2.0-2.4	5.0	3	9.5	4
1.5-1.9	3.3	2	0.0	0

Level of Importance

Table 2 contains significant findings regarding level of importance, comfort, and satisfaction as reported by participants. The residents of the two centers differ on a number of variables related to the level of importance they place on certain aspects of their living environment. At the $p < .001$ significance level, cost is more important to residents living in Smith ($M=3.68$) than it is to residents living in Brown ($M=2.58$). There is a significant difference ($p < .001$) between the importance of the residence hall proximity to other services used by participants in Brown ($M=3.52$) and Smith ($M=4.36$). Another significant difference within the importance category is indicated between the means of Brown ($M=3.88$) and Smith ($M=2.86$) with regard to the attractiveness of the residence facility. There is a significant difference ($p < .01$) between the importance of the hall being recommended by friends for Brown ($M=3.02$) and Smith ($M=2.29$) participants. At the $p < .05$ significance level, limited staff supervision is more important to participants in Brown ($M=3.35$) than to participants in Smith ($M=2.69$).

Level of Comfort

There are differences in the mean comfort levels of Brown and Smith participants. Respondents in Smith ($M=3.79$) report a greater degree of comfort with their knowledge of what to do if a tornado siren sounds in their residence hall than do their counterparts in Brown ($M=2.95$). This finding is significant at the $p < .01$ level. At the $p < .05$ level, there is a significant difference between the comfort respondents of Brown ($M=4.23$) and Smith ($M=4.69$) report having with their knowledge of what to do if a fire alarm sounds in their building. When asked about their level of comfort with the "presence" of armed police officers living in their building, Brown respondents report a mean of 3.80. When asked about their level of comfort with the "idea" of armed police officers living in their building Smith respondents report a mean of 3.26. When compared, the difference between these two means is found to be significant at the $p < .05$ level.

Level of Satisfaction

Community. The only significant finding within the satisfaction with community variables is the satisfaction participants report regarding the

level of trust they have for other residents living in their community. Brown ($M=3.83$) respondents report a higher level of trust for community members than do their counterparts in Smith ($M=3.20$). This is significant at the $p < .05$ level.

Independence and Accountability. Brown participants are more satisfied with the degree of independence and accountability provided in their current residence hall. The differences between participant satisfaction with the level of privacy and with the building alcohol policy are significant at the $p < .001$ level. For the variable of privacy, participants from Brown ($M=4.63$) are more satisfied than are participants from Smith ($M=3.88$). The alcohol policy measure yields a mean of 4.25 for Brown and a mean of 3.18 for Smith. Brown ($M=4.63$) participants have a higher level of satisfaction with the feelings of independence they have in their residence hall than do participants from Smith ($M=4.05$). This difference is significant at the $p < .01$ level. Brown ($M=4.32$) participants also report a higher level of satisfaction than do their counterparts in Smith ($M=3.77$) with regard to the level of respect that the Residence Life staff in their building have for resident privacy. This is significant at the $p < .05$ level.

Policy enforcement. Brown residents report higher levels of satisfaction with policy enforcement in their residence hall. At the significance level of $p < .01$, Brown ($M=3.92$) participants are more satisfied with the enforcement of quiet hours than are Smith ($M=3.00$) participants. Brown ($M=3.60$) participants also report a higher level of satisfaction with the consistency with which residence life staff members confront policy violations than their counterparts in Smith ($M=2.89$). This difference is significant at the $p < .05$ level. Brown ($M=3.92$) participants are more satisfied with the consideration of their opinion in the creation of residence hall policies and procedures than are Smith ($M=3.00$) participants. This is significant at the $p < .05$ level.

Safety. The most significant finding within the safety variables is the ability of security staff to create an environment where the participant feels safe. This finding is significant at the $p < .001$ level with a mean of 4.42 for Brown and a mean of 3.71 for Smith. At the $p < .01$ level, participant satisfaction with building locking procedures and the safety that the residence hall provides in comparison to off-campus housing

are significant. Brown ($M=4.19$) participants are more satisfied with building locking procedures than are Smith ($M=3.43$) participants. Brown ($M=4.40$) participants also report a higher level of satisfaction with the safety that their hall provides in comparison to off-campus housing than do Smith participants ($M=3.68$). Smith ($M=4.05$) participants report a higher level of satisfaction with their knowledge of what to do in an emergency situation than do Brown ($M=3.47$) participants. This is significant at the $p < .05$ level. Participants in Brown ($M=4.50$) have a greater level of satisfaction with the degree of physical safety they feel their residence hall provides than do participants from Smith ($M=4.05$). This is significant at the $p < .05$ level.

Table 2. Significant Differences in Importance and Satisfaction Variables Between Brown and Smith

Variable	Brown Mean	Brown SD	Smith Mean	Smith SD	Significance
Importance Variables					
Cost of Hall is Lower	2.58	1.21	3.68	1.42	***
Staff Supervision is Limited	3.35	1.33	2.69	1.24	*
Hall Recommended	3.02	1.32	2.29	1.15	**
Location on Campus	3.52	1.30	4.36	.98	***
Building is Attractive	3.88	1.09	2.86	1.51	***
Comfort Variables					
Fire Protocol	4.23	1.11	4.69	.90	*
Tornado Protocol	2.95	1.36	3.79	1.46	**
Armed Live-in Police	3.80	1.12	3.26	1.45	*
Satisfaction Variables: Community					
Trust for Other Residents	3.83	1.13	3.20	1.32	*
Satisfaction Variables: Independence and Accountability					
Privacy	4.63	.80	3.88	1.25	***
Independence	4.63	.74	4.05	.99	**
Staff Respect for Privacy	4.32	.98	3.77	1.42	*
Alcohol Policy	4.25	1.18	3.18	1.64	***
Satisfaction Variables: Policy Enforcement					
Opinion Considered	3.44	1.20	2.81	1.17	*
Quiet Hours	3.92	1.28	3.00	1.60	**
Staff Consistency	3.60	1.07	2.89	1.37	*
Satisfaction Variables: Safety					
Emergency Knowledge	3.47	1.24	4.05	1.03	*
Building Locking Procedures	4.19	1.10	3.43	1.50	**
Safety Provided by Security Staff	4.42	.81	3.71	1.07	***
Physical Safety	4.50	.71	4.05	1.08	*
Safety vs. Off-campus	4.40	.77	3.68	1.19	**

* $p = .05$; ** $p = .01$; *** $p = .001$ for t test analyses

Self-Reported Satisfaction and Dissatisfaction. When asked open-ended questions about the features in their current residence hall that are

most satisfying and dissatisfying, respondents indicated responses that were coded into general categories. Forty-three percent of the participants from Brown indicated that privacy is the best feature of their current residence hall. Another 32% of Brown respondents rated facilities as the best component of their residence hall. Location was the best feature for 15% of the Brown participants. Ten percent of Brown participants contributed answers that were coded as "other."

When responding to the same question, 41% of Smith respondents rated location as the best feature of their current residence hall. Twenty-seven percent of Smith respondents indicated that the building staff and residents of their building are the most positive aspect of living in Smith hall. Another 20% of participants felt that cost is the best feature of their current residence hall. Twelve percent of the Smith respondents contributed answers that were coded as "other." Brown participants were most dissatisfied with: the social interaction provided by their community (37%), facilities in their residence hall (14%), food available in their residence hall (12%), building policies (7%), cost (5%) and parking (4%). Nine percent of participants from Brown felt that nothing was most dissatisfying about their current living environment. Thirty-five percent of the Brown responses were coded as "other."

Smith respondents felt most dissatisfied with the food (58%) available in their residence center. Another 15% rated the building staff as the most dissatisfying aspect of Smith. Noise (12%) was also an area of dissatisfaction for Smith participants. Ten percent of Smith respondents indicated that they were most dissatisfied with the building policies. Five percent of the responses given by Smith participants were coded as "other."

Discussion

The findings related to importance, comfort, and satisfaction provide insight into the impact of residential environments on campus. This raises practical and theoretical implications divided into three subcategories: level of importance, comfort and satisfaction.

Level of Importance

Several variables show significant differences between Brown and Smith. Smith participants reported the cost of the residence hall and

the location of the hall to be more important than Brown participants. Brown participants reported limited supervision, recommendation of the hall by friends, and attractiveness of the appearance to be more important than Smith participants.

Several reasons may have caused residents of Smith to report a mean that was almost one point higher than the mean of Brown participants for cost. The Smith mean response is described in between important and very important and the Brown mean can be characterized as in between unimportant and neutral. Obtained through a Residence Life publication, the cost for a double room at Brown is \$3,276 while Smith residents pay \$2,641, a difference of \$635 for the academic year. There are also several living options available at Brown that are considerably more expensive, that are not available at Smith. These options include suites and apartments that range in price from \$4,306 - \$4,399. Additionally, 24% of students surveyed at Smith participant in a Cooperative Community. The Smith Cooperative Community allow residents to reduce their annual room rates by \$878 - \$1,301 in exchange for the responsibility of sharing floor cleaning. This finding suggests that the option of differing levels of cost, as well as programs to subsidize cost, enable some students to afford to live on campus. An additional implication may be that providing new options on campus might not truly be options for all students, but rather options for students who can afford to pay higher housing fees. Additional research may examine how students are paying for college and how the method of payment affects their housing selection.

When examining responses to location, responses from participants living in Brown can be described as between neutral and important and responses from participants in Smith can be characterized as between important and very important. This finding suggests benefits of on-campus versus off-campus housing may be related to location of the residence hall. As the Residence Life department builds and renovates new campus housing, it may be useful for them to consider the ways in which new housing can be designed to provide the benefits of off-campus living and while maintaining the proximity of the residence hall to campus.

A significant difference exists between the importance respon-

dents of Smith and Brown place on limited supervision from staff. For Brown participants, this variable is more important than it is for Smith participants. This finding is particularly insightful considering that the difference in staffing structure in Brown varies from the traditional staffing structure model. Brown utilizes elected floor presidents who serve as student government representatives and perform limited staff functions. This suggests that students who rate this variable as important are more likely to live in an alternatively staffed structure with less supervision.

The variable that addresses the issue of hall recommendation indicates that students surveyed at Brown consider peer influence when selecting their residence. It is possible that because Brown Hall is a newly renovated residence center, participants may be more apt to recommend the facility to their friends. It would be interesting to examine why friends recommended the hall. Additionally, the findings imply that Smith participants' response can be described as unimportant ($M=2.29$).

Finally, the importance of appearance of the facility is significant between Brown and Smith respondents. The Brown mean suggests that attractiveness of the residence hall appearance is of importance to Brown participants, while the Smith mean suggests indifference with response to the importance of attractiveness of the residence hall appearance. This suggests that students considered Brown's newly renovated structure when deciding to live in this facility. Self-reported data from the open-ended survey questions of Brown participants emphasizes the importance residents place on living in a new facility.

Level of Comfort

Only three variables show significance related to level of comfort reported by participants. Comfort with participants' knowledge of what to do when a fire alarm sounds, knowledge of what to do when a tornado alarm sounds, and the presence or idea of armed police living in the building yielded significant differences between Brown and Smith respondents. Because of their nature, the questions related to knowledge of emergency procedures are discussed together. Based on mean scores, Smith respondents are very comfortable with their

knowledge of fire procedures and comfortable with knowledge of tornado procedures. In comparison, Brown respondents are comfortable with knowledge of fire procedures and neutral in regard to their comfort with tornado procedures.

These findings may have several implications. First, participants from both halls are more comfortable with the fire procedures than the tornado procedures for their buildings. Fire drills are conducted each semester in both Brown and Smith halls. This may result in higher levels of comfort with fire procedures for participants. It may be useful for the staff of each building to consider conducting tornado drills in an effort to better educate all residents about the tornado procedures. Residents in Smith express an overall comfort while residents in Brown express neutrality about their knowledge of tornado procedures in their hall. It is important to consider whether the staff structure at Brown, which allows for limited supervision, impedes the process of preparing students for emergency situations. Residence Life staff should consider how emergency information is disseminated to students. If Resident Assistants are used to distribute this information, then adjustments must be made to ensure the residents in non-traditionally staffed residence centers are made familiar with emergency procedures in their hall. The lower levels of comfort with emergency procedures among Brown participants when compared to Smith participants may create a liability for Residence Life staff at this institution.

The third variable that shows significance pertains to the issue of live-in police officers. Because Brown actually has live-in armed police and Smith does not, this question differed on the surveys for each hall. The Brown survey asked about the "presence" of armed police while the Smith survey asked about the "idea" of armed police living in the hall. The difference in response could imply that a comfort level is gained through personal contact and interaction with police officers. The police officers living and working in Brown are residents who are introduced to their peers at hall meetings. It is interesting to note that while this variable is significant, there is no significant difference in the means with regard to armed police walking the halls at night. The use of armed police is a relatively new phenomenon and it may be instructive to further examine student response to this staffing approach.

Level of Satisfaction

The satisfaction level that participants report having with the trust for other students in their residence hall is significant between Brown and Smith. The mean response from students in Brown Hall is higher than the mean response in Smith Hall. This could be in part due to the difference in populations in each of the halls. Brown Hall does not house first-year students, while a large percentage of residents in Smith Hall are first-year students. The majority of residents in Brown are returning students, who may be more likely to know and trust their neighbors and roommates than Smith residents whose neighbors and roommates are composed of a majority of first-year students.

Additionally, this higher level of satisfaction reported from students in Brown Hall may also suggest that residents of Brown perceive their fellow residents to have a higher level of maturity. These findings have interesting implications for residence hall professionals who are trying to build and promote a sense of community and trust in an environment that is primarily first-year students.

Respondents from Brown Hall are significantly more satisfied than respondents from Smith Hall with the variables of privacy, independence, staff respect for privacy, and the alcohol policy. These findings are congruent with Greenleaf (1969) and Blimling (1993), whose research stated that students are satisfied with the privacy single rooms offer and the opportunities for freedom and independence. In this section, the two questions that yielded the most significant results were "the level of privacy I have in my residence hall" and "the alcohol policy in my hall." These results are not surprising given the fact that the majority of rooms in Brown Hall are single-occupancy rooms and the alcohol policy in Brown Hall is more liberal than the policy in Smith Hall. No alcohol is allowed in Smith, whereas residents who are twenty-one in Brown Hall may have alcohol in their residence.

Satisfaction varies between Brown and Smith participants regarding issues of policy enforcement. Brown participants believe that their opinions are taken into consideration when policies and procedures are created for their residence hall. In addition, Brown participants are more satisfied than Smith participants with the enforcement of

quiet hours in their building. Lastly, residents in Brown Hall are more satisfied with their residence hall staff's consistency with confronting policy infractions. Winston & Fitch (1993) believe that staff play a vital role in educating residents regarding the need for policies in the residence hall. These findings provide a practical starting point from which residence hall staff may make improvements in their efforts to educate students about building policies. Staff may also review their procedures regarding policy enforcement to ensure a greater deal of consistency in the future. Specific attention should be paid to the enforcement of quiet hours. The difference in satisfaction of the consideration of opinions of Brown and Smith residents may be due to the differences between the staffing structures in the two buildings. In addition, Brown's renovations included marketing research conducted by an outside agency, which used student focus groups. Students were asked for their opinions about facilities and staffing. The fact that the building renovations, policies, and staffing structures reflect the earlier input of students may impact the level of satisfaction reported by Brown participants. As Greenleaf (1969) asserted, administrators need to take the opinions of students into account when establishing policies in an effort to ensure student satisfaction.

Schuh (1996) suggests that students desire a feeling of safety in their residence hall. Brown Hall respondents report that they are more satisfied in the areas of procedures for locking their building, the ability of security staff to provide a safe environment, the degree to which residents feel physically safe, and the degree of safety living in the hall provides as opposed to off-campus living. Smith Hall respondents are only more satisfied with their knowledge of what to do in an emergency. In order to increase the level of safety for residents, staff may need to look to other residence halls for differences in safety protocol. For example, the rooms in Brown Hall require a card key swipe to gain entrance, as opposed to Smith's traditional key system. Residence hall staff may look into the benefits and costs associated with a different room locking method. In addition, staff may need additional programming efforts to ensure that their residents are knowledgeable on what to do in emergency situations.

Conclusion

The purpose of this study was to compare levels of importance, comfort, and satisfaction between residents living in traditionally and non-traditionally staffed residence halls. When participants in these two different types of halls were compared, significant findings occurred within the category of satisfaction with safety. The importance variables of cost, limited supervision, hall recommendation, location, and appearance were found to be significant between halls. Lastly, significant differences in satisfaction were determined in regard to independence and accountability.

As cited in the literature review, prior research has indicated that student needs and demands are changing. Students are entering institutions of higher education with consumer-based expectations (Levine & Cureton, 1997). The responsibility of meeting these demands with regard to living environments is now in the hands of residence life professionals. As student affairs professionals seek to understand the impact of different living environments, this research provides a basis for future inquiry regarding staffing structure in residence halls.

References

- Anchors, S., Douglas, K. B., and Kasper, M. K. (1993). Developing and enhancing communities. In R. B. Winston, S. Anchors, & Associates (Eds.), *Student housing and residential life: A handbook for professionals committed to student development goals* (pp. 461-480) San Francisco, CA: Jossey Bass.
- Astin, A. (1985). *Achieving educational excellence*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Astin, A. W. (1977). *Four critical years: Effects of college on beliefs, attitudes, and knowledge*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Blimling, G. S. (1993). New challenges and goals for residential life programs. In R. B. Winston, Jr., S. Anchors, & Associates (Eds.), *Student housing and residential life: A handbook for professionals committed to student development* (pp. 1-20). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Boyer, E. L. (1987). *College: The undergraduate experience in America* (pp. 177). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Delucchi, M. (1993). Academic performance in college town. *Education*, 114, 96-100.

Floyd, N. E. (1987). College student living group satisfaction in an innovative residential community. *College Student Journal*, 21, 241-248.

Greenleaf, E. A. (1969). Residential Halls 1970's. *National Association of Student Personnel Administration*, 7(2), 65-71.

Grimm, J. C. (1993). Residential alternatives. In R. B. Winston, Jr., S. Anchors, & Associates (Eds.), *Student housing and residential life: A handbook for professionals committed to student development goals* (pp. 248-268). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Levine, A. & Cureton, J. S. (1998). Collegiate life: An obituary. *Change*, 30, (3), 12-17, 51.

Magolda, M. B. (1993). Intellectual, ethical, and moral development. In R. B. Winston, S. Anchors, & Associates (Eds.), *Student housing and residential life: A handbook for professional committed to student development goals* (pp. 95-133). San Francisco, CA: Jossey Bass.

Schroeder, C. C. and Freesh, N. (1977). Applying environmental management strategies in residential halls. *National Association of Student Personnel Administration*, 15(1), 51-56.

Schuh, J. H. (1996). Residence halls. In A. L. Rentz & Associates (Eds.), *Student affairs practice in higher education* (pp. 269-279). Springfield, IL: Charles C. Thomas.

Grimm, J. C. (1993). Residential alternatives. In R. B. Winston, S. Anchors, & Associates (Eds.), *Student housing and residential life: A handbook for professionals committed to student development goals* (pp. 248-268) San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Winston, R. B. & Anchors, S. (1993). Student development in the residential environment. In R. B. Winston, S. Anchors, & Associates (Eds.), *Student housing and residential life: A handbook for professionals committed to student development goals* (pp. 25-64) San Francisco, CA: Jossey Bass.

Winston, R. B. & Fitch, T. R. (1993). Paraprofessional staffing. In R. B. Winston, S. Anchors, & Associates (Eds.), *Student housing and residential life: A handbook for professionals committed to student development goals* (pp. 269-291). San Francisco, CA: Jossey Bass.

Minda Heyman graduated from Indiana University Bloomington in May 2001 with a M.S. in Student Affairs Administration. She received her undergraduate degree in Journalism from the University of Maryland. During her time at IU, Minda worked with the Internship Opportunities Program at the Career Development Center.

Carolyn Jones graduated from the Higher Education and Student Affairs program at Indiana University with a M.S. in 2001. She received a B.A. in Journalism from Iowa State University in 1999. While at IU, Carolyn served as a member of the Greek Advising Team in the Office of Student Activities.

Valerie Sarma is 2001 graduate of the Higher Education and Student Affairs program at Indiana University Bloomington. She received a B.S. in Psychology from Loyola University Chicago in 1999. At IU, Valerie served as a Graduate Supervisor in Read Residence Center.

Kimberly Sluis graduated from Indiana University Bloomington in May 2001 with a M.S. in Student Affairs Administration. She received her undergraduate degree in Sociology from North Central College. During her time at IU, she served as a Graduate Supervisor in Read Residence Center.

Michele Starzyk graduated from the Higher Education and Student Affairs program at Indiana University Bloomington in May 2001. She received a B.A. in International Relations from Drake University in 1999. Michele worked with Kappa Kappa Gamma sorority at DePauw University and as a Resident Leadership Specialist in Willkie Residence Center at Indiana University.

Campus Alcohol and Drug Abuse and the Higher Education Amendments of 1998

By: Kimberly A. Sluis

Alcohol abuse among college students poses a major challenge for university administrators across the country. Many studies have documented the high levels of alcohol abuse and the severity of problems associated with college drinking. More than 85% of students surveyed by the Core Institute in 1999 reported having consumed alcohol in the year prior to participating in the research (Core Institute, 2000). The Harvard School of Public Health College Alcohol Study found that "nationally one in five college students is a frequent drinker" (Wechsler, Molnar, Davenport, & Baer, 1999, p. 247). Often times college student alcohol consumption is not only frequent but also heavy. Binge drinking is a common activity for a significant percentage of college students. For the purposes of the Harvard Study, binge drinking was defined as the consumption of five or more drinks in a row for men and four or more consecutive drinks for women (Wechsler, et al., 1999). Wechsler, et al. (1999) reported a 42.7% binge-drinking rate among college students. In addition, the Core Institute (2000) reported that 46.9% of students surveyed had consumed five or more drinks in one sitting at least once during the two weeks prior to completing the 1999 Core alcohol and drug survey.

Many student problems have been linked to excessive alcohol consumption. According to data from the 1999 Core Survey, 62.8% of students had experienced a hangover in the year prior to their participation in the survey. The Harvard study found that a large percentage of students who identified as frequent binge drinkers also reported having experienced various problems related to their drinking (Wechsler, et al, 1999). Many of these students missed class, fell behind with studies, did something they later regretted, experienced blackouts, argued with friends, engaged in unplanned or unprotected sex, damaged property, had trouble with the police, were injured, overdosed on alcohol, and drove after drinking or bingeing (Wechsler, et al., 1999). Fifty-four percent of the frequent binge drinkers reported having experienced five or more of the above mentioned problems related to

their drinking (Wechsler, et al., 1999).

Heavy drinking has had deleterious effects on both the students who are abusing alcohol and those students who choose to abstain or to drink in moderation. The secondary effects of alcohol misuse can be significant. Students who choose not to engage in binge drinking activities must live along side and attend classes with those students who do binge drink. Student health and the many other issues related to campus binge drinking have become problems that university administrators must confront.

Although alcohol is certainly the most prevalent drug on college campuses, the use of other drugs has also surfaced as an issue that must be addressed on campuses in the United States. The Core Institute's 1999 statistics indicate that 33% of college students surveyed had used marijuana in the year prior to completing the survey. The same research concluded that six percent of students reported using amphetamines, seven percent reported using hallucinogens, and four percent had used cocaine in the year prior to the survey (Core Institute, 2000). According to the National Institute on Drug Abuse, 61 % of high school students have experimented with illegal drugs (Bachman, et al., 1996). These percentages have remained relatively steady over the past few years. An increase in the use of designer drugs such as ecstasy on college campuses in the United States has also been noted (Core Institute, 2000). The use of illegal drugs has proven a consistent problem for colleges and universities.

As with alcohol abuse, students report negative consequences associated with their drug use. Over 22% of students associated alcohol or drugs with poor performance on a test or project with in the year prior to participating in the Core Survey (Core Institute, 2000). When asked about the negative consequences of their alcohol or drug use, 53.8% of students responding to the 1999 Core Survey reported that they had become nauseated or vomited after using alcohol or drugs (Core Institute, 2000). Another 30.4% reported being criticized by someone they know for their alcohol or drug use (Core Institute, 2000). Ten percent of respondents admitted to thinking that they might have an alcohol or drug problem (Core Institute, 2000).

The severity of alcohol abuse and drug use on college campuses

has been recognized on both the individual campus level and the national level. Individual campuses and administrators have tried to curb the effects of student alcohol and drug abuse through campus-based education initiatives, tougher disciplinary sanctioning, and alternative programming efforts. Wechsler, Kelley, Weitzman, Giovanni, and Seibring (2000) surveyed campus administrators regarding the response to student binge drinking on different campuses. Of the universities surveyed, 97% provide some form of education program related to alcohol, 98% prohibit keg delivery to residence halls, and 87% reported that keg delivery to fraternities and sororities is also prohibited (Wechsler, et al., 2000). In addition, many institutions reported that alcohol was not allowed at tailgating and home sporting events on their campuses (Wechsler, et al., 2000).

Wechsler et al. (2000) found that a number of universities have placed restrictions on alcohol advertising on their campuses in an effort to combat student binge drinking. Restrictions on this type of advertising are made at home sporting events (90%) and in campus newspapers or on-campus bulletin boards (51%) (Wechsler, et al., 2000). Seventy-seven percent of the institutions surveyed also reported that they employ a staff member to target issues of alcohol and drug abuse on their campuses (Wechsler, et al., 2000).

Although many universities have utilized a variety of the aforementioned tactics, substance abuse still remains an overwhelming problem on many campuses. In 1998, the federal government passed legislation in an effort to increase the resources available to university administrators in confronting issues of alcohol and drug abuse. This legislation, passed by the United States Congress as part of the Higher Education Amendments of 1998, altered the Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act (FERPA) regarding the release of educational records. This amendment, section 444 of the General Education Provisions Act, includes a specification that grants colleges and universities the permission to notify parents and guardians of college students under the age of 21 when a student is found responsible for violating university alcohol or drug policy. The new law allows universities to actively notify parents and guardians, but it does not require that they do so (Gehring, 1999). This policy was passed by the federal legislature in October of 1998

and went into effect January 1, 1999.

Institutional reaction to this legislation has varied. A few institutions eagerly adopted guidelines for notifying parents. Other institutions have consciously decided not to implement such a policy. The majority of colleges and universities either delayed a decision on parent notification policy or chose not to respond to the amendments. According to research conducted at Bowling Green State University, 56.7% of public universities had not drafted a parent notification policy as of January 2000 (Palmer, Lohman, Gehring, Carlson, & Garrett, 2001). Both institutions that immediately enacted policies to notify parents and those who did not exercise this authority anxiously awaited the federal guidelines, which were made public in July of 2000.

The FERPA guidelines were generated after the Department of Education solicited questions and comments from higher education administrators and the public. The guidelines have been used to clarify several areas of confusion within the Higher Education Amendments. The new guidelines have specified that students whose parents are notified must be under the age of 21 at the time of parental notification (United States Department of Education, 2000). In addition, the federal regulations have determined that no parent notification should be made for disciplinary misconduct that occurred prior to October 7, 1998 (the date the amendments were passed) (United States Department of Education, 2000). The federal government also made clear its expectation that colleges and universities keep accurate and up to date records of all notifications (United States Department of Education, 2000). Despite confusion among university officials, the government chose not to define the term "disciplinary violation" in the recently published guidelines. According to the United States Department of Education (2000), imposing a universal definition for this term would "be placing a large burden on institutions to conform their codes of conduct to our regulatory definition" (p. 33).

The decision to wait for the federal guidelines gave many institutions the opportunity to examine the effects of parent notification policy as implemented by the institutions that were early adopters of parent notification policies. The institutions that adopted policies to notify parents prior to the publishing of the federal regulations con-

structed their own institutional guidelines to be used until the publishing of the official guidelines. After the federal government drafted and distributed the official regulations, some universities have adjusted their policies to meet the criteria established by the Department of Education.

In order to fully understand the impact of the 1998 FERPA amendments and subsequent policies drafted by universities, a historical perspective on the relationship between universities and students must be explored. This relationship has evolved and changed throughout the history of higher education. In its early years, the university played an integral role in both the academic and moral development of each student (Rudolph, 1990). College faculty served not only as mentors, instructors and administrators, but also assumed a paternalistic role with the students at their respective universities. "Conduct was dictated by rule and monitored by the close attention of the president, the teachers, and the tutors" (Dannells, 1997, p. 4). This philosophy of *in loco parentis* persisted through the 1700s and into the 1800s on college campuses. "Students' lives were regulated in every way—when they arose and retired, when and what they ate, what they wore, and how they behaved in and out of class" (Dannells, 1997, p. 3). "Discipline became paternalistic during the late 1700s and into the 1800s with the rise of the public university, the broadening of the university's mission, the increasing secularization and pluralism of higher education in general, and increasing enrollments" (Dannells, 1996, p. 176). In the 1800s, students began to resist the intrusive behavior of university administrators. In a society with an increasingly strong democratic influence, colleges and universities were made to reconsider the authoritarian and paternalistic methods for the regulation of student behavior (Dannells, 1997).

After the Civil War, the relationship between the college and its students again changed. This period marked the beginnings of "shifting some of the disciplinary and regulatory burden from the faculty and administration to the students" (Rudolph, 1990, p. 369). This movement personified the transition from institutions treating students as children to treating them as adults. The post-Civil War period marked the "disinclination on the part of the new professors with their Ph. D. degrees and scholarly orientation to have anything to do with such trivial matters as

discipline and the extracurriculum" (Rudolph, 1990, p.369). Colleges and universities began to delegate the responsibility of discipline to specialists who were later titled Deans of Men and Deans of Women (Dannells, 1997). "These early deans expanded both the philosophy and the programs of discipline in higher education" (Dannells, 1996, p. 176). They approached discipline with the ultimate goal of self-control or self-discipline, and used more individualized, humanistic, and preventative methods" (Dannells, 1996, p. 176).

The Civil Rights movement in the 1960s proved to be another time of transition for the relationship between institutions of higher education and their students. "College and university administrators began to rethink their orientation towards students and the nature of the student-institutional relationship" (Rentz, 1996, p. 45). "The 1960s and '70s were characterized by increased student input into disciplinary codes and processes, broadened legal and educational conceptions of students' rights and responsibilities, and the introduction of due process safeguards in the hearing of misconduct cases" (Dannells, 1996, p. 177). The roles of college administrators changed to meet the needs of a changing student population with new demands and needs. The 1960s marked "a dramatic increase in student input into rules, procedures, and the adjudication of misconduct" (Dannells, 1997, p. 60). During this period "concepts of confrontation, *in loco parentis*, and meritocracy were replaced by encounter, collaboration, and egalitarianism" (Rentz, 1996, p. 46).

More recently, the National Association of Student Personnel Administrators (NASPA, 1990) endorsed a set of standards for professional practice. Published in December of 1990, these professional standards address many areas of student affairs work including the area of student behavior. The NASPA standards address student behavior and establish an expectation that "members foster conditions designed to ensure a student's acceptance of responsibility for his/her own behavior" (NASPA, 1990). The NASPA standards have helped to focus the efforts of student affairs professionals on the area of student responsibility. This focus is particularly important when constructing campus judicial policies.

Two historic law cases have also significantly influenced the way

that colleges and universities approach student discipline. *Dixon v. Alabama State Board of Education* (1961) was one such monumental case. This case resulted from a lawsuit filed by several black students who were expelled from Alabama State College during a period of intense civil rights activism in Montgomery, Alabama (Kaplan, 1997). Questions related to the amount of notice required to legitimately secure the due process rights of students were raised by *Dixon* (Kaplan, 1997). The final decision in *Dixon v. Alabama State Board of Education* clarified the requirement that colleges must give notice and an opportunity for a hearing to students prior to their expulsion from a tax-supported institution (Kaplan, 1997). This case reaffirmed the responsibility of colleges and universities to uphold student rights when approaching issues of student misconduct.

Another landmark legal case, *Bradshaw v. Rawlings* (1979), confronted issues of the duty of care that colleges and universities are required to provide to students. Specifically, *Bradshaw v. Rawlings* is said to address the issues of *in loco parentis* and the scope of institutional responsibility for protecting students from potential harm. In this case, a student who "was seriously injured in an automobile accident following an annual sophomore picnic held off campus" brought action against the university and suggested "that the college owed him a duty of care to protect him from harm resulting from the beer drinking at the picnic" (Kaplan, 1997, p. 98). The university in this case prevailed in the appeal process and the court decision emphasized the change in the nature of the relationship between students and university. The courts suggested that throughout recent decades, the duty of protection that universities once owed to their students has lessened. "At one time by exercising their rights and duties *in loco parentis*, colleges were able to impose strict regulations. But today, students vigorously claim the right to define and regulate their own lives" (Bradshaw v. Rawlings, 1979). "The doctrine of *in loco parentis* as a legal description of the student-institutional relationship is generally considered to be inappropriate, untenable, intolerable, or simply dead" (Dannells, 1996, p. 180).

The Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act (FERPA, 1974) specifically defines the relationship between a university and its students with regard to student records. FERPA (1974) and its regulations (34

C. F. R. Part 99) establish requirements with regard to the right of students to access their own individual education records, the rights of students to challenge the content of those records, and the procedures for disclosure of "personally identifiable" information from these records (Kaplan & Lee, 1997). FERPA also defines the institution's obligation to notify students of their rights and the recourse for students when an institution may have violated this legislation (Kaplan & Lee, 1997). The records protected under the FERPA legislation include those records that are directly related to a student and maintained by the institution or by a third party on behalf of the institution (Kaplan & Lee, 1997).

In 1986 the relationship between the university and its students was again altered. This transition was spurred by the death of a female college student at Lehigh University in Pennsylvania. Jeanne Clery was a 19-year-old freshman when she was assaulted and murdered by another student while in her residence hall room (Jeanne Clery Act Information Page). The murder of Jeanne Clery and the activism of her parents encouraged legislators to pass the Student Right-to-Know and Campus Security Act that was signed into law by President George Bush in 1990. This act requires all universities that participate in any student aid programs "to publicly disclose three years of campus crime statistics and basic security policies" (Jeanne Clery Act Information Page). The Right-to-Know and Campus Security Act (1990) requires that colleges disclose information from disciplinary proceedings. This act began a more significant series of changes in the area of privacy with regard to student misconduct.

The Campus Security Act began the legislative movement that eventually led to the 1998 FERPA amendments. The alcohol related death of a Radford University student also encouraged lawmakers to take action with regard to issues of alcohol and drug use at colleges. Again, the activism of a parent initiated legislative action. "The parental notification amendment came about largely as the result of the efforts of Jeffrey Levy," the father of the Radford University student killed while riding in a vehicle operated by a drunk driver (Epstein, 1999).

Throughout the history of higher education, colleges and universities have gone through many transitions with regard to how they relate to their students. This relationship has been reconsidered and

redefined to best meet the needs of both institutions and students. The severity of alcohol and drug abuse and the recently granted authority to notify parents and guardians of alcohol and drug related offenses has caused college and university administrators to once again consider the relationship that exists between institutions and students.

Some would suggest that the choice to notify parents and guardians is a revisiting the doctrine of *in loco parentis*. Elizabeth Nuss disagrees. She writes, "the concern about the changing nature of the relationship between students and their institutions offers an important challenge for higher education, but it should not be interpreted as a pendulum swing back to *in loco parentis*" (Nuss, 1998, p. 185). Mike Dannells (personal communication, December 1, 2000) offers an analogy to explain the difference between *in loco parentis* and the current practice of notifying parents and guardians. *In loco parentis* was a doctrine that suggested that the university stand in place of the parents. Notifying parents of student misconduct is something quite different. It is analogous to calling the parent of one of your children's friends to notify them about their own child's misbehavior (Dannells, personal communication, December 1, 2000). Institutions who have adopted parental notification policies are giving the information and thus some of the responsibility back to the parents or guardians of the students who are violating conduct expectations.

The federal government has granted institutions of higher education an additional resource for confronting issues of alcohol and drug abuse on their campuses. This is certainly not the only resource available to colleges and universities. Choosing best tactics to employ to combat the abuse of alcohol and drug violations on individual campuses requires careful consideration of the relationship a university has with its students. Examining the historical roots, legal precedents, and current trends in higher education is necessary in understanding the potential implications of any policy decision.

As mentioned earlier, administrators have been employing a variety of tactics to combat alcohol and drug problems on their campuses for many years. As with any policy or program, the effectiveness is not known immediately. It will be increasingly important, as decisions are made regarding the 1998 Higher Education Amendments, for

universities to evaluate the effectiveness of their individual campus responses and to adjust their policies accordingly. Dannells (Personal Communication, December 1, 2000) suggests that an "ongoing dialogue" occur regarding issues of parental notification. When a policy is in its infancy stages, it seems logical to engage in such discussions about its impact.

References

- Bachman, J. G., Johnson, L. D., and O'Malley, P. M. (1996). *Drug use among American high school students, college students, and other young adults: National trends through 1985*. Rockville, MD: National Institute on Drug Abuse.
- Bradshaw v. Rawlings, 612 F.2d 135 (3d Cir. 1979), cert. denied, 100 S. Ct. 1836 (1980).
- Core Institute (2000). *1999 statistics on alcohol and other drug use on American campuses*. [On-line]. Available: http://www.siu.edu/departments/coreinst/publc_html/recent.html.
- Dixon v. Alabama State Board of Education, 294 F.2d 150 (5th Cir. 1961).
- Dannells, M. (1996) Discipline and judicial affairs. In A.L. Rentz & Associates (Ed.), *Student affairs practice in higher education*. (pp. 175-213). Springfield, IL: Charles C. Thomas, Ltd.
- Dannells, M. (1997). *From discipline to development: Rethinking student conduct in higher education*. Washington, DC: The George Washington University.
- Epstein, Joel C. (October 6, 1999). Parental notification: Fact or fiction. Higher Education Center [On-line]. Available at http://www.edc.org/hec/pubs/articles/parental_notification.html.
- Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act, 20 U.S.C 1232g, 1974.
- General Education Provisions Act, 20 U.S.C 1092f, 1998.
- Gehring, D. D. (2000). Understanding the legal implications of student affairs practice. In Barr, M. J., Desler, M. K. & Associates (Eds.), *The handbook of student affairs administration*. (pp. 347-375) San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Jeanne Clery Act Information Page (Federal Campus Security Act of 1990). [On-line]. Available: <http://campussafey.org/publicpolicy/cleryact/index.html>.
- Kaplan, W. A. & Lee, B. A. (1997). *A legal guide for student*

affairs professionals. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

National Association of Student Personal Administrators. (1991). *Mission Statement of Association (Rev. ed)*. Washington, D.C.: National Association of Student Personnel Administrators.

Nuss, E. M. (Spring 1998). Redefining college and university relationships with students. *NASPA Journal*, 35, (3), 183-192.

Palmer, C. J., Lohman, G., Gehring, D. D., Carlson, S., & Garrett, O. (February 7, 2001). Parental notification: A new strategy to reduce alcohol abuse on campus. *Net Results: NASPA's E-Zine for Student Affairs Professionals*. [On-line]. Available at www.naspa.org/netresults.

Rentz, A. L. & Associates. (1996). *Student affairs practice in higher education*. Springfield, IL: Charles C. Thomas.

Right-to-Know and Campus Security Act, 20 U.S.C § 1092f (1990).

Rudolph, F. (1990). *The American college and university: A history*. Athens: The University of Georgia Press.

United States Department of Education (2000). *FERPA Final Rule*. [On-line]. Available: <http://www.ed.gov/legislation/FedRegister/fnrule/2000-3/070600a.html>.

Wechsler, H., Molnar, B. E., Davenport, A. E., & Baer, J. S. (1999). College alcohol use: A full or empty glass?. *Journal of American College Health*, 47, 247-252.

Wechsler, H., Kelley, K., Weitzman, E. R., Giovanni, J. P. S., Seibring, M. (March 2000). What colleges are doing about binge drinking: A survey of college administrators. *Journal of American Health*, 48, (5), 219-226.

Kimberly Sluis graduated from Indiana University Bloomington in May 2001 with a M.S. in Student Affairs Administration. She received her undergraduate degree in Sociology from North Central College. During her time at IU, she served as a Graduate Supervisor in Read Residence Center.

Preparing a Teaching Professorate: Emphasizing the Scholarship of Teaching to Graduate Students

By: Shaun R. Harper

This paper discusses and examines existing literature on the scholarship of teaching in higher education. It focuses on the preparation and socialization of graduate students to roles as teaching scholars and facilitators of learning. The competing interests of teaching and research; importance of student learning; and rewards of effective teaching are all discussed. Finally, implications and recommendations for institutions of higher education, particularly those responsible for graduate education, are presented.

The scholarly work of those who are likely to occupy professorial roles on college and university faculties will be tremendously impacted by the values they acquire as graduate students. During the time when students are immersed in post-baccalaureate learning activities—enrolling in graduate courses, developing research agendas, preparing for qualifying exams, and composing dissertations—a set of philosophies and values regarding their future careers as educators in academe are developed. These values are greatly influenced by the scholars currently occupying the positions that graduate students someday hope to fill. That is, pre-professorial attitudes and behaviors are shaped by the ways in which graduate students see the faculty in their graduate departments approach the traditional duties of teaching, research, and service. Furthermore, the experiences and formal training afforded to graduate students will undoubtedly influence the manner in which they prioritize their values as faculty scholars.

Given that today's graduate students will ultimately make up a sizable proportion of the intellectual elite in this country, more attention must be paid to their socialization and training experiences. Hence, they must be taught to become well-rounded scholars, who can effectively engage in a variety of scholarly activities that contribute to the advancement of their academic disciplines and society at large. At most

institutions of higher education the tasks of scholarly inquiry and research, undergraduate teaching, and service to the university and to one's profession encompass the faculty portfolio of scholarly activities. A great deal of literature suggests a substantial neglect in one of these areas. Katz & Hartnett (1976), Boyer (1990), and Lambert & Tice (1993) all contend that graduate students are inadequately prepared for the teaching portion of their faculty careers and are often socialized to treat teaching as the stepchild of collegiate scholarship.

In his 1990 report from the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching *Scholarship Reconsidered*, Ernest Boyer argues for a perception of scholarship that encompasses not only research but a range of activities, including teaching; he maintains that teaching is and should be considered a scholarly activity. According to Katz & Hartnett, "...evidence indicates that many students would like to teach. Many of them start out with such a desire and have it 'socialized' out of them during their graduate years" (p. 273). Therefore, greater attention must be devoted to the manner by which the values of the scholarship of teaching are imparted to graduate students. The purpose of this paper is to examine existing literature regarding the scholarship of teaching and the dilemmas confronting it, and to demonstrate the need to make known the value of collegiate teaching for those seeking professorships at institutions of higher education.

The first section addresses the competing interests of teaching and research. Its focus then shifts to emphasizing student learning in collegiate teaching. Next, some rewards of good, effective teaching are identified. Finally, implications and recommendations for institutions of higher education, particularly those responsible for graduate education, are presented. The overall goal of this paper is to demonstrate a need for a future generation of collegiate instructors who have been trained to teach well and value teaching as a scholarly, meaningful, and rewarding activity. Although most of the recommendations in this paper are posed for faculties at research universities with large representations of doctoral students, the suggestions may also apply to other types of institutions with graduate programs.

Competition Between Teaching and Research

"[Graduate] students are socialized to think and feel that the only life worth living is that of research" (Katz & Hartnett, 1976). This perception is often validated before students even begin their graduate education. For example, competitions for financially handsome graduate research fellowships and assistantships are often extremely competitive and are used to attract the brightest graduate students to certain institutions; decisions regarding these awards are typically made several months in advance. Teaching assistantships, on the other hand, can be given on the eve of the first day of class or even during the first week of the fall semester and usually do not carry the same amount of prestige, compensation, or faculty supervision as research-based awards. Therefore, new graduate students are afforded an early glimpse at the priorities of their departments, schools, and ultimately the academy.

These values are also reflected in faculty recruiting and incentive structures. "Research, not teaching, is valued more today than in the past, especially by individuals who make decisions involving personnel" (Tack & Patitu, 1992, p. 10). Gist (1996) contends that a mediocre teaching record coupled with excellence in research is more favorably accepted than a poor research record coupled with excellent teaching. In other words, it is tolerable for faculty to be a disservice to the students they teach; however, being an ineffective contributors to their academic disciplines is an intolerable disgrace. Terenzini & Pascarella (1994) posit:

One of the most frequent criticisms of undergraduate education today is that faculty spend too much time on research at the expense of good teaching. The typical defense against this charge is that faculty members must do research in order to be good teachers. Faculty members who are researchers, so the argument goes, are more likely to be 'on the cutting edge' in their disciplines; they pass their enthusiasm for learning on to their students (p. 30).

To dispel this myth, Feldman (1987) concluded after reviewing approximately 40 studies on the relationship between faculty productivity and teaching effectiveness (as defined by students), that the two areas of scholarship are virtually independent and unrelated. In his study, he

found that nearly 98 percent of the variability measures of instructional effectiveness are due to something other than research productivity.

In spite of these findings, graduate students are still socialized to model their scholarly agendas after those on the faculty in their departments. On many campuses, especially large, research universities, doctoral students are exposed to faculty who are tenured, promoted, and rewarded for excellence in research. Very little attention is paid to the teaching effectiveness of these "scholars". Many graduate students recognize early on that teaching simply does not count at some institutions. It is research that faculty and institutions care most about, research that brings in external money to the university, research that brings about reputational rankings, and research that is rewarded in tenure and promotion decisions.

It is not unusual for stellar research faculty to abandon undergraduate teaching altogether. That is, they only teach graduate-level classes and work tirelessly on grant-supported research projects. That doctoral students are exposed to faculty with active research agendas and subordinate teaching obligations is potentially destructive. Sometimes these faculty members will take doctoral students under their wings and invite them to collaborate on research projects. In this regard, faculty members serve as role models and research mentors. Graduate students partnered with excellent teachers to learn how to become better instructors less often. In result, many students matriculate through graduate programs without the proper training to effectively facilitate learning for the undergraduates they will teach as faculty members upon completion of their doctoral programs (Lambert & Tice, 1993).

With a Focus on Student Learning

Due to the disproportionate emphasis placed on research in graduate school, many students earn their doctorates having had only one course in pedagogy—that's if they are lucky (Katz & Hartnett, 1976). Throughout their 90+ hours of doctoral study, many graduate students are required to take a wide-range of research methodology courses—quantitative, qualitative, historical, etc. Plus, they are typically allowed to devote 12-20 of those credit hours to writing the research

thesis or doctoral dissertation. The remainder of one's program of study is devoted to content in her/his academic discipline and minor areas of study. Very rarely is a wide range of courses offered to train students to become effective collegiate teachers. Although courses may be taught here and there throughout the university, the breadth of courses on teaching is oftentimes pitiful when compared to number concentrating on research methodology. As a result, some future faculty members remain unclear about the learning styles, pet theories and naive misconceptions, cultural needs and biases, and motivational requirements of contemporary undergraduates.

One study (Pollio, 1984) found that professors in a typical university classroom spent about 80 percent of their time lecturing to students who were attentive to what was being said only about 50 percent of the time. This evidence does not suggest that the traditional lecture mode of information delivery is entirely ineffective; but rather, other pedagogical methods are needed to garner the attention and stimulate learning among undergraduate students. It is somewhat inconceivable that graduate students would know how to employ such strategies without the proper training and exposure to theories on student learning. In addition to using inappropriate and ineffective instructional techniques, new faculty members may also struggle with making the distinction between teaching and learning. Quite often there is a myth that "to know one's subject is to be able to teach it well". Even in the few cases where this is true, a distinction is still warranted on how well information is taught and how well students learn.

Barr & Tagg (1995) advocate a paradigmatic shift from teaching to learning. That is, universities should no longer strive to provide instruction, but should exist to produce learning. The authors contend that the instructional paradigm, under which the traditional 50-minute lecture exists, is no longer effective or appropriate for undergraduate education. They recommend that universities and its faculties redirect their energies toward a learning paradigm by which environments and experiences are created to assist undergraduate students in discovering and constructing knowledge for themselves, thus making them members of the communities of learners who make discoveries and solve problems. In short, under the learning paradigm,

less emphasis is placed on the traditional modes of teaching, while the greatest attention is devoted to how much students learn and how active they are in the discovery and construction of their own knowledge. Mastering the skill of learning facilitation instead of teaching—along with several other factors—could make collegiate teaching rewarding and enjoyable for aspiring professors.

The Rewards of Teaching

In a study conducted by Wissman (1981) (cited in Tack & Patitu, 1992), when faculty members were asked from where they received the greatest satisfaction in their work, an overwhelming majority said teaching. In spite of the lack of compensation and recognition for effective teaching, imparting knowledge and facilitating learning opportunities for undergraduate students is still enjoyed by many who are engaged in the scholarship of teaching. As mentioned earlier, many graduate students are socialized against their teaching orientations early on in their graduate careers. Given this, it is somewhat surprising that the majority still enjoys and receives greater satisfaction from teaching than anything else. At research universities, most junior faculty are actively engaged and completely immersed in research because they have to be for tenure-earning purposes (Gist, 1996). Therefore, they are among the least likely to derive complete fulfillment from teaching.

Given the "baby steps" taken by the academy and individual institutions to uniformly develop standards to recognize and applaud good teaching, faculty in graduate programs must enact efforts to expose graduate students to the rewards of pedagogy. For several collegiate instructors, student interaction and development is usually at the heart of their work. According to Wilson, Woods, and Gaff (1974) (cited in Tack & Patitu, 1992), "faculty-student interaction is important for faculty members; 'faculty who have more contact with students also are more likely to be very satisfied with the stimulation they receive from students'" (p. 13). Also, Diener (1984) (as cited in Tack & Patitu, 1992) found that eight out of ten faculty members identified interaction with students and having the opportunity to have some impact on their lives as their principle joy.

Witnessing undergraduates demonstrate a comprehension of information; apply knowledge and concepts properly; and excel in careers are also among the joys of teaching. Additionally, being responsible for the intellectual preparation of a learned citizenry is an exciting task for any teacher on any level of instruction—primary, secondary, or post-secondary. Student transition from college to careers and graduate school serve as affirmations of the impact collegiate instructors have made. Almost unanimously throughout society, everyone can recall and identify at least one teacher who has been extremely influential in their lives; only this type of influence can be exerted through teaching. Graduate programs should afford opportunities for graduate students to witness and enjoy these rewards.

Implications and Recommendations

The discussions throughout this paper, coupled with the literature reviewed and cited, suggest the need to restructure the socialization and preparation of graduate students for careers on college and university faculties. First, academic schools and departments must sincerely communicate their commitment to the scholarship of teaching when recruiting students to attend their institutions. An equal amount to seriousness, competitiveness and luster should be given to teaching and research fellowships assistantships. That is, teaching assistants should be attracted in the same manner as the “bright” students who are channeled into research assistantships; “bright” students can also be good teachers. Although research award packages are typically funded through external research grants, institutions with graduate programs must find similar ways to support teaching assistants.

Another way in which professorial preparation may be strengthened is through the nurturing, mentoring, and modeling attitudes and behaviors of current faculty scholars. Just as students pick up on good research techniques from faculty who are good researchers, they will acquire good teaching techniques from good teachers. Aspiring and junior faculty normally replicate what they see senior scholars do and measure their success by those who have achieved their marks in the academy. If faculties exclusively emphasize research instead of teaching, chances are that graduate students will pattern their approaches to

scholarship in a similar manner. Likewise, if faculty are always discussing, demonstrating, and promoting good teaching, it is highly likely that graduate students will perceive teaching to be as important or even more scholarly than research. Doctoral advisors, along with other graduate faculty, should emphasize gaining both pedagogical and research methodological skills in their conversations with graduate students. Furthermore, faculty should expect graduate students to somehow demonstrate an understanding of, and passion for teaching; especially those students who intend to pursue careers in academia upon completion of the doctorate. However, faculty members cannot expect such enthusiasm about teaching if they are not enthusiastic themselves.

A commitment to the scholarship of teaching also needs to be reflected in the curricula of graduate programs. Although discipline-specific content classes and research methodological courses are essential to graduate education, courses focusing on strengthening the pedagogical talents of future faculty should also be required components of any graduate program curriculum. No longer is it appropriate or even accurate to assume that students who are good researchers and knowledgeable in their content areas will automatically become effective facilitators of learning. Furthermore, it is also unsafe to posit that one course on “how to teach this subject” will give graduate students the necessary skills to effectively teach undergraduates. Hence, a variety of pedagogical courses are needed to teach professorial potentials how to organize, chunk, and anchor information; identify and employ strategies that respond to diverse learning styles; confront classroom incivility; motivate uninspired and under-prepared learners; and respond to the demographic diversity of today’s undergraduates, just to name a few. Just as it is implausible that a little fairy will wave the wand of information on content and research methodology, it is also unrealistic to expect graduate students to stumble across a bag of magic teaching tricks. Courses must be offered to afford these students the opportunity to develop their own philosophies of collegiate teaching; engage in meaningful dialogue with others regarding the scholarship of teaching; and improve their pedagogy through practice and in-class micro-teaching experiences.

One final recommendation applies to faculty members,

administrators, and policy makers in higher education—applaud, encourage, demand, and reward good teaching! Those who will occupy positions on college and university faculties in the future will be better because of it. The rewards of teaching should be vocalized as frequently as possible. Graduate students should be trained to think that teaching is exciting, worthwhile, and appreciated. Awards should be given to stellar graduate students who serve as teaching assistants or instructors—for example, an Assistant Instructor of the Year Award or departmental-specific Graduate Student Instructor of the Year Awards. Likewise, graduate students should see that current faculty members are justly compensated and awarded for effective teaching. As many opportunities as possible should be facilitated for these students to discover first-hand how they may permanently impact the lives of hundreds of undergraduate students through good teaching.

Conclusion

Just as the attitudes and behaviors of a child are shaped during the few months of its life, so are the values and perceptions of graduate students regarding the scholarship of teaching. In many regards, these students are newborns to their careers as scholars in academe; therefore, they must inherit and acquire the skills and training that will make them productive, effective, and handsomely compensated adults in their professions. They must grow up knowing that teaching is as important and scholarly as research. They must be taught how to walk the path of an effective learning facilitator. Most importantly—they must mature to a level where their scholarship, in all its forms, leaves a permanent impact on people's lives, the academy, and society.

References

- Barr, R. B., & Tagg, J. (1995, November/December). From teaching to learning: A new paradigm for undergraduate education. *Change*, 13-25.
- Boyer, E. L. (1990). *Scholarship reconsidered: Priorities of the professoriate*. Princeton, NJ: The Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching.
- Gist, M. E. (1996). Getting tenure. In P. J. Frost & M.S. Taylor

(Eds.) *Rhythms of Academic Life*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Feldman, K. A. (1987). Research productivity and scholarly accomplishment of college teachers as related to their instructional effectiveness: A review and exploration. *Research in higher education*, 27, 227-298.

Lambert, L. M., & Tice, S. L. (Eds.). (1993). *Preparing graduate students to teach: A guide to programs that improve undergraduate education and develop tomorrow's faculty*. Washington, DC: American Association for Higher Education.

Katz, J., & Hartnett, R. T. (1976). *Scholars in the making: The development of graduate and professional students*. Cambridge, MA: Ballinger.

Terenzini, P. T., & Pascarella, E. T. (1994, January/February). Living with myths: Undergraduate education in America. *Change*, 28-32.

Pollio, H. (1984). *What students think about and do in college lecture classes*. Teaching-Learning Issues, No. 53. Knoxville, TN: University of Tennessee, Learning Research Center.

Tack, M. W., & Patitu, C. L. (1992). *Faculty job satisfaction: Women and minorities in peril*. ASHE-ERIC Higher Education Report, No. 4. Washington, DC: The George Washington University, School of Education and Human Development.

Shaun R. Harper is a doctoral student in Higher Education Administration at Indiana University-Bloomington, where he serves as the Assistant Director of MBA Admissions for the Kelley School of Business and a course instructor for the School of Education. Correspondence regarding this article may be sent to: vaharper@indiana.edu

Making Headlines: The National Survey of Student Engagement

Kelly A. Kish and Valerie A. Sarma

The National Survey of Student Engagement received wide recognition this past year after going public with its first annual report. Because the survey is housed at Indiana University, we wanted to offer our readers an opportunity for an inside look at the project. The following are excerpts from an interview with George D. Kuh, Director of the National Survey of Student Engagement. Dr. Kuh has been a faculty member at IU since 1976 and was recently named Chancellors' Professor, a title that is bestowed upon people who have demonstrated evidence of outstanding teaching and scholarship. Dr. Kuh is also the Director of the College Student Experiences Questionnaire (CSEQ) program, which transferred to Dr. Kuh and IU in 1994 at the request of UCLA professor C. Robert Pace who originally developed the CSEQ.

What is the National Survey of Student Engagement?

We call it NSSE (pronounced "nessie"). It's an effort to inform the public, as well as participating institutions, about the level at which students are taking advantage of an institution's resources for learning. We call this engagement, a concept that has a long history in the literature of higher education. It probably goes back 350 years; but at least in the literature engagement started showing up in the 1940s and 1950s and took off in the 1970s and 1980s. Engagement means the extent to which students are actively engaged in things that we know matter to their learning; whether it's reading or writing or interacting with peers on a substantive level about things that are meaningful, complicated, or related to their careers, studies, or out-of-class activities- whatever it might be- there's a wide array of things that can be educationally purposeful.

So NSSE is an attempt to measure the amount of time and energy students expend in these activities. In this important regard it's similar to the College Student Experiences Questionnaire. But the distinctive twist of NSSE is that the data institutions are given are also to be used to inform the public about what constitutes quality or excellence in the undergraduate experience. And, while there have been a lot of studies, (Sandy Astin's work is best known, and Bob Pace, myself and others have also done a lot with the CSEQ), the findings have been largely restricted to the research community and there has been little

leakage into the popular press and media about these things. The popular press knows about the CIRP data. This information is more about who students are when they start college, not about what students in college actually do with their time. That's what NSSE is designed to do: focus on that aspect of collegiate quality and to that degree, shift the conversation from college rankings, to what students are actually doing. To help us get NSSE off the ground we've been fortunate to have the strong financial backing of The Pew Charitable Trusts (\$3.3 million for three years) and the guidance of national experts on our National Advisory Board and Technical Advisory Panel. Also, the project is cosponsored by the prestigious Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching (where former IU president Tom Ehrlich is a senior scholar and serves as vice chair of the NSSE Advisory Board).

How is the NSSE administered?

We started with field testing in 1999, close to 70 schools with two cycles, one in the spring with 12 schools and one in the fall with 56 schools. Looking back on it, I don't know how we thought we could move that quickly and run that fast and have so many plates spinning in the air without having a bunch of them fall. We actually did though, and 2000 was the inaugural administration of NSSE. We had 276 four-year colleges and universities. So, 276 schools and about 150,000 students in the sample. We have data from 63,000 in the national norms, overall a 42% response rate. This spring (2001), we're surveying 227,000 students at about 320 schools. We thought, based on our budget with Pew and institutional fees, we would have enough resources to work with 250 schools in year 2000 and maybe 275-300 schools in 2001. We've actually gone beyond what we originally proposed we thought or could do. Our goal is to have as many four-year schools in the national database as possible. Realistically, if we get 1000 different four-year colleges and universities we'll be happy campers. That's a lot of schools and we have about 475 different schools in the first two years. Close to 125 are "overlap" schools, institutions that used the NSSE survey both in 2000 and 2001. This will be very helpful to use in order to estimate the stability of the results. That is, will the findings from the same colleges change from year to year? That could mean the survey is not as reliable as we'd like, so people want to know if they can trust what the results are saying. Fortunately we'll know soon about this, almost to everyone's satisfaction.

We rely on the good offices of the Center for Survey Research

at Indiana University to physically conduct the survey; as I say, they do all the heavy lifting. They do all the sampling; they randomly identify the students from the participating schools and they prepare the survey packets. Of course, my NSSE project team does plenty on our end — we're busy all the time as well. But the prospect of mailing 227,000 packets...no one does surveys this big. Even the large national survey organizations and the social science survey institutes — nobody comes close to what we are doing at IU with NSSE in terms of collecting data directly from several hundred thousand randomly sampled students. That is, the participating institutions don't know who we're surveying. We can tell them, and sometimes do, if they can help boost response rates. The point is the schools don't determine who gets the survey, NSSE does. This puts everybody on a level playing field, which is why the data are viewed as highly credible and useful for comparison purposes.

What are some uses for NSSE data?

In addition to some level of public reporting, institutions are encouraged to compare their performance with peer institutions (institutions that they consider to be like them in some way) and this has predictably leveraged some state interest. A lot of states have performance indicators as part of their accountability systems. They use information about student behavior, for example, to demonstrate to an oversight board that state-funded institutions are performing at high levels. One of the best ways to do that is with comparative data and there is very little comparative data about the student experience. This was very obvious in *Measuring Up*, the national state-by-state report card on higher education performance that came out last November, about two weeks after our first NSSE national report came out. We actually staged the release of our NSSE report so that the two documents would be complementary and be helpful to the larger accountability agenda.

Measuring Up evaluated all states in six areas, giving a grade in five areas. The one that wasn't graded was student learning. This is because there simply was not common data or indicators that states had related to how much students were learning in postsecondary education. NSSE doesn't measure student learning, per se, but it serves as a proxy by pointing to the activities that predict desired student learning outcomes. That is, NSSE isn't an outcomes instrument; rather, it measures process indicators. Even when we get better outcome measures, we'll still need a NSSE-like instrument so institutions can

figure out where they ought to be investing their own energy in order to improve.

One surprise so far was that a group of about 15 NSSE 2000 public research universities have decided to exchange student-level data. The reason this is so surprising is that something quite like this has not been done before. Many schools might share some average scores or student characteristics, but they almost never allow data to be shared at the level of the individual student record — directly compare student performance at the University of Colorado-Boulder, IU Bloomington, Ohio State or Michigan State. The people doing this have a common understanding that they will not publish or report this information publicly. Their analysis is strictly for internal purposes to help their faculty and other people understand the nature and quality of student performance. What's very gratifying is the level of trust that has been established there because of the potential of the NSSE data to help their schools improve.

How can NSSE be used with other national surveys?

Some schools are already linking NSSE data to other institutional data, like results from the CIRP freshman year survey. Several of us (Sandy Astin and Linda Sax from UCLA, myself, Peter Ewell from NCHEMS) are talking about ways that we might link our data at the institutional level, which would serve a couple of purposes. It would provide institutions with a sort of "cradle to grave" look at their students — from the first week of college using CIRP, the end of first year with the NSSE, the CIRP follow up survey that can be given at different times, and NSSE data from the senior year. In other words, it's possible to link, at the institutional level, these different data sets so that a school could see how their students are performing at different points — from the beginning of college to the end. Also, we could use one another's data for cross-validity purposes. That is, are similar items on each survey measuring the same thing and, if so we can argue more convincingly the validity, reliability and stability of these measures.

The American Council of Education along with the Association for Institutional Research commission, and Vic Borden from IUPUI has been identifying, objective, low-threat ways of comparing the various national instruments available. All this will be helpful and useful because I often get questions like, which instrument should we use? You should use the survey that best determines your needs. These surveys don't all measure the same things. There's some overlap between the items on the

UCLA surveys and the CSEQ and NSSE, but not as much as many people think. Comparing NSSE and CSEQ, if you're looking for robust peer comparison and you want to be in a national database and you want to be sure you've got data that will serve your state requirements for performance indicators than NSSE is a pretty good choice. On another hand, if you want to dig a little deeper into the student experience then the CSEQ is probably a preferred instrument; it's longer, it goes into more detail about many aspects of student behavior covered on the NSSE.

What institutional initiatives have emerged from NSSE results?

George Tech, for example, was immediately disappointed with the number of students engaged with faculty on research projects. Research universities like Tech say that one of their strengths is this type of activity. So they set aside \$250,000 to encourage faculty to apply for small grants that would involve undergraduates in research activities. Another institution has established \$3000 grants to support faculty members who are modifying courses or creating some other kind of activity to engage their students in one or more of the educationally effective practices from the NSSE. So institutions are starting to move money around to emphasize the things that the NSSE features, the activities that our research says are important. So, again, this is meeting one of NSSE's purposes — getting folks to talk about these kinds of measures, but mostly what the measures are saying, more seriously and focus people on why it's important to do these kinds of things.

There are other examples too. I was doing a panel discussion at a meeting a couple of weeks ago, sitting next to a university president. And he begins to tell me how his school's NSSE data has got his campus talking and how they were really delighted with their senior results, but their freshman data stunk. And so he's charged a task force to figure out how to improve the first year experience. It's not like the first year has been ignored, thanks to people like John Gardner, formerly of the University of South Carolina and now the policy center at Brevard College — that's his life's work. But NSSE data gives an empirical basis, a frame of reference.

I've been working with a small liberal arts college that has a deep commitment to diversity. Even so, students are not satisfied, complaining that the institution has failed to live up to its diversity commitments. Ironically, by every kind of objective measure, you'd say it's more diverse than most places. But diversity brings its own challenges. The more diverse a campus becomes, the more difficult it is for people to figure out

how to get along with one another. Remember that 30-35% of this group is new every year. Many have moved half way around the world to come to this place. I asked them about their NSSE data related to diversity. The response was that the NSSE data has not been made public. The president's cabinet has seen it but no one else. "Too bad," I said, "because your NSSE results affirm what you've been trying to do." That is, students' perceptions of the college's emphasis on creating an environment that respects and appreciates diversity scored in the top decile nationally. Students say that they frequently interact with student of different backgrounds political, social, racial/ethnic. In other words, this school was among the highest performing in the diversity category. Knowing this doesn't "fix" or solve all the diversity challenges — it doesn't make this little college a satisfying, congenial place for all people. But it does affirm that what they've been trying to do has been pretty successful. They are dealing with a by-product of their success — they've got lots of students and faculty members who want more to be happening in terms of diversity on campus.

The results can be used for accreditation purposes, because all the accreditation agencies are asking for evidence of student engagement. In fact, about three-quarters of NSSE schools say they have or will use NSSE results in their self-studies for accreditation. For student affairs staff looking to make connections with faculty these data can be analyzed in different ways at the campus level, especially if schools survey enough students to make such comparisons meaningful.

I got a call from a public institution on the east coast where the provost thinks the NSSE data are correct, but his faculty do not like the results because it doesn't say very positive things about the institution. To get faculty to take it seriously, he said, he needs to tell them about sampling and then get support to talk with faculty openly about the data and the issues. I haven't been to a place where somebody hasn't whispered in my ear, "the results are accurate, this is pretty much the way we are."

The big challenge for American higher education is finding a way to talk to one another, first internally, which is tough enough, and then to external audiences about the quality of our performance. We don't do that very well, so in order for NSSE to be successful across the board we're all going to have to learn to think and talk differently about our performance. One of those first things is how to talk about data openly with one another without becoming defensive and without shutting down conversations. The whole point of this exercise is to show people things

that they wouldn't ordinarily find out about their students themselves.

Can the NSSE database be used for research?

Well, yes and no. No, because our advisory board wants us to maintain the integrity of the instrument and database for some period of time in order to insure that the data from participating institutions is not released and used in unintended ways. I agree with this personally, because there is still some apprehension on the part of institutions about how NSSE data might be used. Indeed, the initial intent was to make NSSE data public. But we've decided to hold fast to a non-disclosure policy and to not release any data for research purposes at this point. My guess is that we'll end up evolving into something akin to the CSEQ policy where we do allow people to use slices of the CSEQ dataset with institutional identifiers removed and the understanding that people cannot name institutions. I'm sure we'll get to something similar with NSSE data.

How has NSSE leaked into the public sphere?

That's a little hard to judge because it's a bit early and also hard to know exactly who to ask. We've intentionally cultivated people at key media outlets because it's a very noisy world, and it's hard to get the attention of the New York Times or the Wall Street Journal for a higher education project. In order to get the public to understand this it has to be explained in a way that will be understandable and interesting. This is why we report only 5 educational benchmarks, not 67 discrete items. People can remember 5 concepts, not dozens of numbers. We're trying to appeal to a number of different audiences at the same time. But just having 5 numbers isn't going to get you into the Christian Science Monitor or the Washington Post, there also has to be a story behind the numbers, and someone has to draw the attention of the reporter to what the story is. Fortunately, many schools allowed us to name them as high performers in our NSSE report which generated considerable media coverage.

We can't do everything in one year. Ten years from now we'll be able to say a lot more about how schools are using NSSE data. Right now, we're still cultivating interest on the part of the larger public. The good news is that so far, the national and local media really seem to get it, to see why this information is so much more important for assessing collegiate quality than what we usually talk about – resources and reputation – which mean very little in terms of what students get out of their college experience.

Indiana University Higher Education and Student Affairs Gift Form

As members of the Indiana University Student Personnel Association, we thank you for your contribution to the organization! Your continued support is crucial to the financial health of the Journal. We hope you consider sending a gift this year as you enjoy the 2001 edition of this high-quality student publication.

Please accept my gift of \$ _____

For: _____ IU Student Personnel Association (32-E009-15-7)
 _____ Other _____ (38-E009-02-2)

Name: _____

Address: _____

City/State/Zip: _____

Please make checks payable to the Indiana University Foundation, the designated fundraising agent of Indiana University.

***Please be sure to note on your donation that the gift should be directed to the Indiana University Student Personnel Association (32-E009-15-7). All donations marked "Education" will be directed to the School of Education general account.

I/we wish to make my/our gift by (please check one):

_____ Mastercard _____ Visa _____ Check Enclosed
 Card # _____ Exp. Date _____

Signature _____

The Indiana University Fund supports new and ongoing projects and special initiatives by providing funds for immediate use throughout the University. A portion of funds and/or income therefrom may be used to defray costs of raising and/or administering the funds.

Mail To: IU Foundation/School of Education
 PO Box 2298
 Bloomington, IN 47402-2298