Faculty concerns: The 'human' campus

Faculty satisfactions and dissatisfactions with Michigan State University have a lot of ground, but both praise and criticism tend to focus on the size of the University and the kinds of personal relationships it fosters.

This is revealed in a survey of attitudes among new faculty, second-year faculty and a random sample of faculty at MSU two years or longer.

The survey was made for the provost by the Office of the Vice President for Special Programs. It was directed by Bradley S. Greenberg, associate professor of communication. Associate director was Mary L. Larson.

Their findings are based on questionnaires sent to a thousand members of the 98 first-year faculty (59 per cent of whom responded), the 54 second-year faculty (51 per cent responded), and to a random sample of 300 "old" faculty (58 per cent responded).

Also surveyed were 35 of 80 first-year faculty wives.

Greenberg reported that among the three faculty groups, respondents were generally impressed by the University's physical facilities, its interdepartmental cooperation and its willingness to experiment, its concern for social problems and its growing reputation for high quality.

**AT THE SAME TIME, faculty expressed dissatisfaction with such things as the Library ("needs much help for more acquisitions") and its "mode of operation"), a lack of parking privileges, the area's high cost of living, administrative emphasis on quantity rather than quality, and inadequate salaries and benefits.

And a large number of second-year and "old" faculty criticized the Board of Trustees "for its political practices in running the University."

MSU's size was seen as both good (it afforded a "cosmopolitan" setting and a variety of opportunities) and bad (too large, too bureaucratic and too impersonal).

Greenberg invited faculty respondents to express their satisfactions and dissatisfaction, to list things they would tell high school students about the campus, and to rate the departments and the University in terms of modernity, academic standards, friendliness, pleasantness, research standards, student restrictions, and use of resources.

Here is a summary of the study:

**FIRST-YEAR FACULTY**

"It is the department and the favorable impression created which evoked the largest number of responses and most diverse variety of topics from the new faculty," the report said.

Respondents most often listed the friendliness, competence and sincerity of colleagues as sources of satisfaction.

(Continued on page 4)

Setting building priorities is complex job

Determining priorities in the planning of a university and the implications of funding on that determination comprise a complex function involving virtually all of a university's administrators.

While he is quick to point out that planning is by no means a one-man job, a key role at MSU is played by Harold L. Dahnke, director of space utilization. Dahnke's office coordinates an analysis of existing and projected needs of physical facilities.

"The whole planning effort," Dahnke says, "is not really related to buildings in the first instance. The question is: At any point in time, will there be sufficient space for classroom and laboratory instruction, office space for faculty and staff, library facilities for students and staff, and space for academic and research programs?"

Two assumptions are made — on the number of students to be associated with the University and on the nature of the academic program. This must all be in tune with the hopes and aspirations of the University," Dahnke said, in terms of purposes, goals, new programs, abandoned or changed programs.

Once there is a fix on the students and programs, and thus on the number of staff required, need and cost of facilities is determined.

Rule number one, Dahnke said, is that space is not the determiner of the academic program. Planners also strive for flexibility in facilities.

Various assumptions complicate the analysis. For example, it is assumed that classrooms are open and available 60 hours a week, but some of this time is...
TTT: Professors seek more relevance through teaching in Lansing public schools

For most faculty members—even those directly involved with teacher training—the high school classroom is something to teach about, not teach in. Result: More ammunition for students who accuse higher education of irrelevancy.

Now that may be changing, thanks in part to a program which this year is sending 15 Michigan State professors into the classrooms of two Lansing schools, Eastern High and Hartington Junior High.

Working with both the public school teachers and selected lay persons called "community consultants," the MSU faculty are seeing indications of the strengths and weaknesses of their efforts to turn out first-rate secondary school teachers.

The new program is called "Triple-T" (Trainers of Teachers of Teachers Project), supported in part by the U. S. Office of Education through the Education Professions Development Act.

Its goals emphasize moving MSU "teachers of teachers"—

—toward modifying their teaching and graduate programs to make them more relevant to the needs of public school students and the people in the community.

—toward involving local educational agencies and communities in attaining that relevance.

A major premise of the project is that teacher preparation is not solely the responsibility of the College of Education.

"Many faculty don't realize they are teacher trainers," William B. Hawley, associate dean of education and project director, said. "Thirty-five percent of MSU's graduates are prepared as teachers.

J. Bruce Burke, associate professor of education and director of the Humanities Teaching Institute, reported that nearly 85 percent of the coursework for an average secondary teacher graduate takes place outside the College of Education.

"Triple-T" involves faculty in the four colleges—arts and letters, natural sciences, social sciences and educational technology—that produce the bulk of MSU's certified secondary teachers.

Drawn from those colleges and from the University College are members of an advisory board for the program.

ONE PARTICIPANT, Professor of English Joseph J. Waldmeir, spent last fall at Eastern High School and came away emphasizing not what he had taught, but what he had learned.

"Many teachers at Eastern felt that their methods courses had been too abstract, too theoretical to prepare them adequately in their subject matter area. And many of them would have appreciated some sort of pre-practice teaching in a classroom—not merely as visitors, but in some participating capacity."

The Department of English is now starting a program to help meet both those needs, Waldmeir said.

Waldmeir said he found a number of contrasts between the high school classroom and the MSU classroom, but he was most struck by the differences in student-teacher relationships.

"It's much more personal in the high school," he said. "College teachers tend to stand more aloof from their students."

The teams are headquartered in the Eastern High-Pattengill Junior High complex.

EACH FACULTY participant receives a fellowship equal to his full salary and fringe benefits. Up to $3000 a month is exempt from a participant's federal income tax.

Further information is available from Bruce Burke (355-1903), William Hawley (355-1737), Daniel Jacobson, director of the Social Science Teaching Institute (355-2367), or Julian Brandou, director of the Science and Mathematics Teaching Center (355-1725).

Other faculty participants include:

Humanities team—Vingo J. Scott, professor of English, and Clinton C. Burhans, associate professor of English.

Social science team—Amer Bader, assistant professor; hygiene and James Madison College; Sam Reuclahn, associate professor, health, physical education and recreation; and Stanley Wronski, professor, secondary education and curriculum.

Natural science team—Sherwood Haynes, professor, physics; N. Jean Enochi, assistant professor, Science and Mathematics Teaching Center; and Don Freeman, assistant professor, teacher education.
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Faculty survey reveals attitudes

(Continued from page 1)

Twenty - one of the new faculty found no particular disappointments in their job, and fifteen of those who were critical tended to cite insufficient involvement in "key decisions" in the department as the source of dissatisfaction.

MSU's chief attraction to first - year faculty seemed to be its size and reputation as a "State University of a part of an institution of high academic standing ". The 1st - year faculty suggested more advanced information on area housing and living costs, and better handling of all the "Michigan State of" process of Payroll forms, staff benefits, ID cards, etc. About 75 per cent regarded their departments high in academic standards. ** **

SECOND - YEAR FACULTY Freedom, innovativeness, openness and freedom were the chief departmental assets cited by second - year faculty. Most of their complaints about their departments affirmed those of first - year faculty ("lack of faculty participation in decision - making "), but they also complained that some "older" colleagues had outdated research programs and inadequate motivation.

Viewing the University itself, second - year faculty respondents both approved and disapproved of MSU's size. Some indicated that they would view size negatively and ange to talk to students about the University to high school students ("as you near graduation, you will have been treated to the "suffuse, space characteristic of a large university ").

But others cited advantages of size, describing the University as "big, but concerned about individual students." Some said the "range of opportunities is virtually unlimited." Second - year faculty also singled out the Auditorium ("an abomination and unif for: the presentation of any of the fine arts") for special mention. ** **

"OLD" FACULTY Respondents who had completed two or more years at Michigan State were more specific and varied in their comments, according to the survey. At the departmental level, they expressed satisfaction with personal opportunities available and with interpersonal relationships.

They also raised problems with their colleagues, resulting from a "generation gap." Their comments included: "unwillingness of tenure faculty to carry out assignments to take the load off assistant prof s" and "there is little interaction between those who were at Michigan State prior to 1966 and those who have joined since." Looking at the University in general, the "old" faculty cited advantages of its facilities and its atmosphere of experimentation.

Dahake said a "significant complaint" of the older faculty group concerned MSU's efforts with minority students. Comments included: "Like the news media, it's overemphasizing and outpumping the noisy, small, atypical minority which seeks all good things but accomplishes no good things ", "disproportionate allocation of funds to satisfy certain pressure groups ", "permissiveness with some of our militant students."

But other faculty in the "old" group lauded MSU for its willingness "to commit itself to doing something about the education of minority groups" and for its "attitude regarding social problems, i.e., let's not swing our swords, but let's do something."

FIRST - YEAR FACULTY WIVES

The wives reported that they were interested in participation in the activities encountered both inside and outside the University, in terms of hospitality and interaction.

Money matters were of most concern to the wives. They criticized the generally high cost of living, the housing and even some faculty - related costs ("everytime one turns around, MSU is charging us for some other service.").

GENE RIFTERS

Budget's course is not simple

The road the MSU budget request takes is not simple. The request is submitted to the Senate Appropriations Committee of the Budget in mid - November, after Board of Trustees approval. It is reviewed there, and University officials must testify for it.

Ten legislative days after the legislature convenes - probably sometime in October, Dahnke submits his budget recommendations for all agencies. These take the form of executive summaries - which are introduced to the Senate chamber and assigned to committees.

The Senate Appropriations Committee receives all higher education budget requests, and the University representatives appear before the committee to defend MSU's request. The Senate then usually passes a substitute budget bill, or actually two bills - one on appropriations which

Setting building priorities 

used for activities not directly related to the formal teaching of courses such as colloquia, seminars, study halls and faculty meetings. The goal, Dahake says, is to use classrooms 30 hours a week for scheduled teaching and 30 hours a week for other activities.

** **

TWO OTHER assumptions are made: - That on the average, 60 percent of the seats in a classroom are filled when the room is in use. This may seem low, but is caused by the varying sizes of section enrollments. It is about as well as could be done. Dahake says. - That to put one seat in a classroom takes 15 square feet of space. This varies with the type of academic programs, for example, laboratory facilities require more space per student than the normal classroom situation.

The result is a mathematical "space planning factor" in square feet per student class hour, which is used in determining physical faculty needs.

"We continuously project needs of the University on these bases," Dahake said. "That kind of study is part of the

 internal operations for recommendations within the University, and it is reflected in the capital outlay program referred to the legislature.

Throughout the analysis, the provost, vice president for business affairs and executive vice president advise and counsel. Needs are presented to the president and to the Board of Trustees for their consideration.

MSU's LONG - RANGE capital outlay needs are now before the Michigan Legislature, including proposed projects through 1975.

These capital outlay needs are listed in three categories: Medical school facilities, remodeling and additions, and new construction.

In presenting these needs to the State's Bureau of the Budget, MSU does not state particular preferences among the projects. Priority is determined in the order of listing within each category.

Sometimes a priority item is an outgrowth of immediate need. Dahake said. Other requests are a result of the economic study. These included need for "new construction" - the first five priorities after the power plant are the Administration Building, a water quality management facility, Physics and Astronomy Building, business, and law school facilities.

Other facility priorities, in order are: social science, arts and letters, biophysics, music hall and auditorium, electrical and electronic engineering and development center, science library, greenhouse and herbarium, agricultural sciences and, agriculture - economy centers.

All of the top academic building priorities are based on existing space needs, Dahake said. The reason a music hall is 10th in priority is because there is more public space available in an academic facility, Dahake explained.

An example of how a building can be prioritized is the Social Science Building, which had second priority for some time. But since that building was

planned, Breslin said, there is a new dean whose thinking differs from that of the dean during the planning; many areas have been reassigned or renovated so that space is now adequate; and the medical school has been approved since then.

** **

BUILDINGS ARE funded in various ways, some, such as the Kresge Art Center and Eppley Center were built completely from gifts. Others, all non - academic buildings which would not be funded by the legislature, such as the Student Union, Student Services Building, Glinn Health Center and the intramural facilities, have been built with student funds.

One was funded partly by grants. The Pesticide Research Center, the first portion of the Plant Biology Laboratory, Life Sciences Building, Biochemistry, Wells Hall, National Resources, Food Science and Biology Research all were funded about one - third by federal funds. But federal funds must nearly always be matched by the institution, the state or by a gift.

No federal agency grants construction money in the fields of humanities or fine arts because these are not national priorities, Dahake said.

Wells Hall was built partly by federal funds because the Higher Education Facilities Act of 1963 provided federal funds to construct facilities supporting the natural sciences, math and foreign languages.

Wells Hall is thus an example of how funds help determine priorities. It is possible that Wells Hall would not have been a building priority had the federal funds not been available.

EARLY SWITCHELL

Mortar Board seeks nominations

Mortar Board, senior women's honorary, has asked faculty members to help it in identifying candidates for 1970-71 membership in the organization.

Nominations form are available from Judy King (351-0491) or 353-2936, 513 S. Kedzie.