INSTITUTIONAL SERVICE:

FACULTY ENGAGEMENT IN STUDENT AFFAIRS

By

CHRISTIAN KEVIN WUTHRICH

A dissertation submitted in partial fulfillment of

the requirements for the degree of

DOCTOR of PHILOSOPHY

WASHINGTON STATE UNIVERSITY

College of Education

MAY 2008

To the Faculty of Washington State University:

The members of the Committee appointed to examine the dissertation of CHRISTIAN KEVIN WUTHRICH find it satisfactory and recommend that it be accepted.

_____

Chair

_____

_____

ACKNOWLEDGMENT

I am very grateful to my academic and career mentors who both shaped my thoughts around this study and propelled my interest in this subject. First, to my committee members Eric Anctil and Willie Heggins who provided support and an opportunity to witness their research, teaching, and service work. To my Chair Kelly Ward, who provided invaluable advice at all stages of this study and particularly sage career advice, I will always be indebted. I particularly enjoyed our conversations about work, your confidence in my abilities and the high standards which you exemplify.

I have been fortunate to have had several career mentors and specifically would like to acknowledge Bruce Pitman and Elaine Voss who guided me during the many trials and tribulations that accompany student affair work. I am especially thankful to Elaine and my other WSU colleagues who allowed me time away from the office to complete my coursework and this study.

To my spouse Jill, I appreciate your grace, support, proof reading skills and willingness to listen to my thoughts. Lastly, big thanks to my children Jacob, Madeline, and Evan who were motivating factors in the completion of “my paper”.

INSTITUTIONAL SERVICE:

FACULTY ENGAGEMENT IN STUDENT AFFAIRS

Abstract

by Christian Kevin Wuthrich, Ph.D.
Washington State University
May 2008

Chair: Kelly A. Ward

The purpose of this qualitative study is to examine cognitive and organizational factors affecting faculty service to student affairs. In recent years, the accountability movement has called for greater out of class faculty student contact, some of which could be in the form of service. Examples of faculty involvement in student affairs service include: participating in student conduct boards; residence life programs; or, oversight activities sponsored by a registrar's office. Significant descriptive and theoretical focus has been given to faculty service during the past two decades. Yet, the literature fails to define service consistently so that research findings vary. While there is extant empirical work that focuses on a wide range of faculty work issues there is little emphasis on service and service in the student affairs realm in practice. The goal of this study is to explore how faculty opperationalize and conceptualize service at three comprehensive research universities.

The study uses findings from interviews, document analysis, and observation to gain a better understanding of the campus environment and individual faculty member's conception of

the service role. Three campuses and 18 faculty members are included in this study. The findings include an overview and analysis of faculty service roles in student affairs at each university case as well as a cross-case analysis and synthesis. The findings suggest that faculty ability and motivation to engage in service to student affairs is contingent on campus environmental factors related to institutional culture. Further, faculty hold integrated or compartmentalized views of their work roles that affect service participation. This study draws on cultural perspectives to explain that organizational attributes detracts from or supports service. The study concludes with a discussion of recommendations for policy, practice, and further research.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

CHAPTER 1: INTRODUCTION

Almost 20 years ago as an undergraduate fraternity member I first recognized the challenge of faculty participation in service roles. As a college student, student affairs practitioners admonished me to socialize with faculty over meals, to obtain a faculty advisor for clubs and organizations, and to include faculty in decision making bodies in student government. As hard as I tried I was unable to diversify or increase faculty participation, I simply did not have access to faculty members in the cocurricular context. Similarly, as a student affairs administrator I have struggled to obtain commitment from faculty of all ranks and disciplines for participation on student affairs governance boards, as advisors to student groups and ad hoc committees for special purpose programs or government grants.

The challenge of faculty participation in service to student affairs is not new. Faculty have resisted assuming responsibility for out of class activities since the advent of the research university in the mid nineteenth century (Brubacher & Rudy, 2003). "The many demands on their time require faculty members to set stringent priorities, and at most institutions faculty are not encouraged to place students' moral and civic development high on this list" (Colby, Beaumont, & Stephens, 2003, p. 200). However, the call for campuses to be more responsive to student needs persists. The gap between faculty and student contact is illustrated in findings from the 2006 National Survey on Student Engagement (NSSE) that reported only 11 percent of students at Carnegie doctorate granting institutions had satisfying relationships with faculty out of class (Jorgensen, 2006).

One view of faculty service is through the lens of shared governance. Birnbaum (2004) argues shared governance is expanding. Shared governance in decision making about institutional priorities has grown to encompass the traditional cadre of senior administrators,

faculty, trustees, and boards, and is now responsive to market elements. Institutional priorities the shared governance system reflects on include the concerns of students, student affairs units, parents, and external stakeholders. This expansion of the shared governance framework brings added concerns to the table to compete with an already long list of priorities calling for faculty engagement.

Examples of how faculty provide service include as advisors to student organizations, service on university committees such as conduct boards or academic reinstatement panels, and participation in educational communities in the residence halls. Faculty service can be generally described as external or internal institutional activity defined as contributions to committees, the discipline or community (Ward, 2003). Institutional service is part of a larger governance framework relied on by institutions to meet goals concerning students, policy, curriculum and community member expectations. Faculty service plays an important role in shared governance and decision making and is part of the core role that faculty play on most campuses. The triumvirate of faculty work includes teaching, research, and service.

Faculty service is receiving increased attention by provosts, deans and student affairs practitioners in light of the nationwide accountability movement exerting pressure on accrediting commissions and driving research into best practices for engaging students (Eaton, 2003). Motivated, in part by federal government pressure, significant changes have been made to accrediting standards that call to improve student learning outcomes and prepare students for the twenty-first century (Eaton, 2003). Old accrediting standards such as library holdings, endowment size, student faculty ratios and course offerings have been replaced with evaluations based on learning outcomes or "what evidence does the institution have that ensures it's worth the student's investment" (CRAC, 2003).

In an acknowledgement of the profound change sweeping higher education, policy makers and institutions have been quick to cite the work of higher education researchers when they report longitudinal data indicating student learning outcomes are improved and students develop more holistically when there is in and out of class contact with faculty (Kuh, Douglas, Lund, & Ramin-Gyurnek, 1994; Pascarella & Terenzini, 1991, 2005). In fact, Einarson and Clarkberg (2004) postulate research "institutions may play an important role in providing and otherwise brokering information flows concerning opportunities for engagement and the actual 'how to's' of making it work" (p. 29). Part of the "how to's" is determining who is responsible on campus for carrying out this work. Although learning is the focus under this new higher education agenda it is the student affairs unit that is called on to help improve student retention and engagement in academic work. The stark reality is that at large research institutions, in practice, calls for faculty service are overshadowed by the reality of the tenure process, full-time faculty to student ratios, socialization of new faculty and the overall reward structure often overlooks service and in particular service that supports student affairs functions.

This renewed demand requires research into current faculty service practices on college campuses. Published studies focusing on faculty service roles in student service areas are limited. While scholars understand student concerns related to retention, engagement, and psychosocial issues, little attention has been given to faculty beliefs and perceptions about service to student affairs, which is significant since faculty members are key to the success of any campus initiative. The importance of this study is the inquiry of faculty about their knowledge, perceptions, and beliefs of the proposed roles or work changes policy makers are suggesting.

Research and practice is replete with the important role faculty play in student engagement (Kuh, Douglas, Lund, & Ramin-Gyurnek, 1994; Pascarella & Terenzini, 2005). Examples abound as to how colleges and universities have responded to the call for greater involvement of faculty in student life beyond the classroom. Yet research universities, in particular, have been slow to answer the call for increased participation in student life leaving one to wonder if systemic change is really on the horizon. There is an apparent gap between what some administrators, accrediting agencies, and parents see as the faculty roles associated with supporting student success, which includes faculty playing an active role in supporting student affairs functions, and what the faculty themselves see as important to success at a research university. The research presented in this dissertation seeks to more fully understand the faculty perspective on involvement in student service.

Study Overview

To more fully understand faculty service to student affairs I use the example of faculty involvement in the conduct process at research universities. The choice to study faculty at research institutions is threefold. First, the apparent conflict between the research, teaching, and service mission presents an important issue to examine. Second, research universities are organizationally complex and as suggested earlier have been slow to change in the face of increased calls for service. A better understanding of faculty service to student affairs at research institutions could assist university administrators and faculty by elucidating factors that may improve working conditions and increase student learning outcomes.

The choice to student conduct is also influenced by the historical role of faculty participation in student conduct matters dating to the founding of higher education in the United States (Brubacher & Rudy, 2003; Kaplin, 1985; Stoner & Lowery, 2004). More importantly,

however, student conduct matters are an educational process and faculty members as educators have a stake in the academic community. Conduct boards make rulings concerning student academic integrity violations, matters of free speech, and behavior all of which affect the integrity of the institution (Dannells, 1997). The viewpoint of the uninvolved or uninformed would consider student conduct outcomes to be punitive; however, at their heart they are educational in nature. For example, federal and state court rulings demand that the student conduct process not conflict with a student's basic Constitutional Rights and require proceedings conform with the mission and purposes of the educational enterprise to be valid (Stoner & Lowery, 2004).

This study examines the experiences of faculty participants in student affairs directed conduct boards as a proxy for the larger service in student affairs phenomenon. Not only are conduct boards common on university campuses, they tend to serve similar functions across institutions. The choice to examine faculty perspectives, and specifically student affairs service though the lens of conduct board members, is threefold. First, faculty in this area are an accessible group with longstanding institutional history (Dannells, 1997). By design, conduct boards have a diverse membership that represents the mix of faculty types, disciplines, race, and gender at the institution to afford student participants with the opportunity for a non biased panel (Stoner & Lowery, 2004). Second, faculty participants are able to provide rich data for analysis of the faculty service to student affairs phenomenon since the boards meet frequently to consider cases. Third, due to the relationships and group dynamics listed above faculty in this group have likely given thought to their service role to student affairs and experienced service from a dimension that can address answers to this study's research questions.

Research Questions

Researchers and practitioners have examined the value of faculty contact with students and consistently report its importance in student learning and engagement (Kuh, Kinzie, Buckley, Bridges, & Hayek, 2006). The literature on service and faculty roles addresses the many limitations for faculty who engage in service over research and teaching obligations at research universities (Tierney & Bensimon, 1996). Yet, calls for accountability have illuminated the importance of service obligations in the lives of students. At large research institutions, faculty report difficulties in meeting the many demands placed on them and as a result service work can be a low to nonexistent priority.

Nonetheless, some faculty at research universities schedule time to participate in service that supports student affairs. By studying the faculty view on service juxtaposed with contemporary work demands the service phenomenon can be documented. Once faculty service to student affairs is better understood it can inform practice. A comprehensive examination of the faculty service to student affairs phenomenon via the proxy of student conduct boards provides a critical faculty perspective currently missing from the literature. This study is guided by the following research questions:

1. What role do faculty play in student affairs service?
2. How is student affairs service reflected in faculty roles and rewards?
3. What motivates faculty to be involved?
4. What role does service play in the larger context of faculty work?
5. How does faculty involvement in service shape faculty perception about the institution?

The study uses qualitative methods to conduct a multiple-case examination of faculty currently involved in service to student affairs at three public research universities on the West Coast. This multiple-case study was conducted using a naturalistic framework that is concerned with the context of the setting and relationships in the work place (Bogdan & Biklen, 2003).

Faculty at selected campuses serving on student conduct boards were chosen to participate. The initial group of participants was identified through student affairs officers and then snowball sampling was used to provide varied perspectives. Additional data collection consisted of documents, observations, and review of campus artifacts which included the organization and composition of the conduct board, institutional research material describing demographics of faculty and students, material on governance structure of the campus, and the respondents vitas (Bogdan & Biklen, 2003; Denzin & Lincoln, 2000).

Conclusion

As the pressure for accountability increases, faculty are asked to contribute to their institution in ways that can conflict with teaching and research. A faculty members' expected contribution may be described in contract language, university policy for tenure and promotion or be part of their position description. Yet, faculty work structure and compensation tends not to reward service especially in the research university context. This study examines current service activities related to student affairs and illuminates the efforts against the backdrop of faculty work. These results can be used for further research and applied in student affairs practice, or faculty service engagement, policy development, and decision making about reward structures.

Chapter 2 is a review of relevant literature related to the discussion of faculty service, history of the professoriate, and work roles at research institutions and the theoretical framework guiding the study. Chapter 3, Research Design and Methodology, describes the qualitative research design, data collection, trustworthiness, confidentiality, and limitations. Chapters 4, 5 and 6 discuss the institutions and faculty included in the study, along with an analysis of faculty service to student affairs unique to each university. Chapter 7 consists of a cross-case analysis of

the findings indentified from each campus. Finally, Chapter 8 incorporates discussion of the theoretical framework elucidated by the research findings, implications for further research and practice, and overall conclusions.

CHAPTER 2: REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

Campus violence in the form of mass homicide and responding to psychologically distressed students has called into question how institutions respond to students in need. In particular it's brought to light the role faculty play in student life beyond the classroom a domain generally aligned with student affairs. As institutions grapple with a proper response to students in crisis they are placing faculty at the forefront of indentifying students to not only help keep the campus safe, but to meet expectations of campus stakeholders beyond the campus. To place this study in its proper context an understanding of the professoriate as a group is necessary. The historical and contemporary perspectives that define faculty work and inform student affairs service are complex.

Most scholarly activity has discussed faculty service to student affairs areas primarily from a student engagement and educational outcome perspective. For example, current research by Kuh, Kinzie, Schuh and Whitt (2005) focuses on creating institutional culture or developing programs designed to increase student engagement at all levels of the institution. Engagement equates to more successful students and increased graduation rates. Since the literature on student engagement and development are large bodies of work the literature review in this chapter details only components involving faculty service. Faculty work roles have been sporadically analyzed and described in the literature for more than 20 years. While higher education research describes in detail the expectations placed on faculty at research institutions (Tierney & Bensimon, 1996), less is understood about faculty involvement in service to student affairs. Generally, literature on service is included as a component in larger research efforts addressing work roles, faculty reward structures, race/ethnicity and gender, governance or theoretical papers related to a broad array of faulty issues. Because higher education in the

United States continually evolves, the focus of this study is to clarify the current faculty service environment as it relates to student affairs.

This review describes relevant literature related to the history of the professoriate, the service construct to include level of faculty service engagement at research universities and the impact of work roles on service activity. Because this study examines student affairs service a description of the history and philosophical foundations of the student affairs profession is provided as context for the relationship between faculty and student services functions. To understand the cultural backdrop in which service occurs on the college campus a discussion of organizational theory related to higher education institutions is presented. This chapter concludes with a description of the conceptual framework guiding data collection and analysis.

History of the Professoriate

The intent of examining the history of the professoriate is to understand the roots of the profession and the developmental process influencing faculty work. For the purpose of this discussion the history of the faculty role is divided into five eras; colonial, early, industrial, modern and contemporary (Brubacher & Rudy, 2003; Finkelstein, 1984; Finkelstein, 2003). These eras provide descriptive frames of the course taken by the professoriate as it emerged as a professional group in the mid twentieth century.

The faculty-student relationship construct has always vexed the higher education system in the United States. In the first two centuries of higher education the level of faculty control over the lives of students was continuously debated among college presidents and students were prone to riot in an expression of their discontent with campus culture (Brubacher & Rudy, 2003; Stoner & Lowery, 2004). During the 1800's the insertion of the research mission changed the character of higher education and the relationships between students and faculty. Both faculty

and students were generally pleased with the new freedoms the expanded focus brought to the campus, and while the exact role of faculty varies from campus to campus the distance between students and faculty at research universities continues to grow (Dannells, 1997).

Colonial Era

In the Colonial Era (1646 to 1789) faculty functioned as educators, mentors and disciplinarians (Brubacher & Rudy, 2003). At its inception, higher education institutions functioned as civilizing and socializing influences in order to prepare young men for civil, church and family life. This thrust was due to religious influences in the colonies and is exemplified by the fact that eight of the nine colonial colleges were religiously affiliated (Brubacher & Rudy). The Calvinistic structure and expectations placed on tutors, or faculty as they would come to be called, established unique roles that still bear an imprint on higher education today.

Liberal education curriculum in the colonies mirrored the Trivium and Quadrivium of the middle ages and "constituted absolute and immutable truth, and it was important that it be absorbed – not criticized or questioned – by every student" (Brubacher & Rudy, 2003, p. 29). As a rule faculty, or tutors as they were called, in this era were recent graduates waiting for positions to open in the clergy, law or medicine (Finkelstein, 1984). The colonial model placed students and faculty in a position to form close associations. Tutors provided instruction for a class cohort in a given year and the men spent their days from sunrise to sundown engaged in intellectual pursuits. Unique to this period was the practice of students' rooming and boarding with tutors. Since most students were of high school age and a long distance from home this scenario met the practical need for housing before the establishment of residence halls and the need to monitor or control pupils.

Early Era

During the Early Era (1790 to 1870) faculty roles solidified and the professoriate emerged as a recognizable group. Long running struggles at Harvard between faculty and the Corporation were settled in 1826 giving faculty control over internal affairs of the institution such as student conduct and instruction, while removing influence over external affairs such as budgets and policy formation (Brubacher & Rudy, 2003; Finkelstien, 1984). In the early nineteenth century pious control over some aspects of a student's life shifted and punishments were milder and counseling emerged for small infractions (Dannells, 1997). During this same period, growing enrollments meant college presidents disposed of day to day discipline and a member of the faculty was appointed as a dean of students. A marked shift in the reduction of faculty roles in the lives of students was the 1870 appointment of Ephriam Gurney Harvard's first Dean of Students whose main role other than teaching was to "take the burden of discipline off President Eliot's shoulders" (Brubacher & Rudy, 2003, p. 335).

The professor movement gained steam between 1800 and 1820 and faculty outnumbered tutors by a large margin. Employment trends in this period signaled the recognition of faculty employment as a career field and the professoriate was comprised of a homogeneous group of New England born Protestant white men (Finkelstein, 1984). The professionalization of the faculty role is significant because for the first time in American higher education a distinction was being made between the various roles on the campus. For example, the differences between the role of a tutor and faculty meant faculty occupied permanent positions, had control over subject areas as opposed to offering instruction and had post baccalaureate experience in medicine, theology or law (Finkelstein, 1984).

Industrial Era

In the Industrial Era, marked as 1870 to 1944, faculty engaged in specialized training and disciplines emerged out of what was classical education roles. By the 1870's the proportion of faculty holding a second job outside academe, as often was the case due to a desire to serve as a member of the clergy or to practice law, shrank to only 15 percent of the total professoriate (Finkelstein, 1984). This change meant faculty employment was a full time occupation unlike in the Colonial and Early Eras when positions paid little or had no prospects for permanency. In the period immediately following the Civil War, faculty trained at German universities began a retreat from non-intellectual matters (Brubacher & Rudy, 2003). "Faculty trained in the German tradition found the approach of faculty monitors of student behaviors demeaning to their role as research scholars" (Dannells, 1997, p 7).

During the first half of the twentieth century faculty, presidents and governing boards struggled to define academic freedom. Brubacher and Rudy (2003) describe the transition of faculty over the decades: "Time had been when professors were not on contract but enjoyed the status of guild scholars. It was painful for them to be reminded that as guild control had given way to control by lay governing boards, professors had settled into this subordinate position" (p. 313). The conflict that arose which ultimately gave rise to the principles of tenure centered on social positions that pitted presidents, benefactors, or control boards against faculty. With the concept of academic freedom came tenure as a guide to establishing the faculty role identifiable today. Early demands for academic freedom gave rise to the formation of the American Association of University Professors (AAUP) who advocated a new relationship between faculty and institutions. Discussions on the tenure process lasted nearly 40 years and bridged the 19th and 20th centuries before being adopted in 1940 (AAUP 1940 Statement of Principles on

Academic Freedom and Tenure). Tenured faculty would gain significant rights and freedoms but had to tailor teaching and public comments to fit the frame of their academic specialization. These freedoms also allowed faculty to control their workday and to choose the type and extent of extramural activities including service.

Modern Era

The Modern Era (1945 to 1990) was a period of fast growth marked by high research productivity, significant federal funding of research and large student enrollments. Institutional growth meant faculty ranks swelled and for the first time the term shared governance took on real meaning. Shared governance was important to institutions because the ranks of staff support had not grown to support the enterprise. It was during this period that higher education moved from a social institution to the core business of the economy (Finkelstein, 1984). The transition Finkelstein refers to is the transfer of knowledge gained at institutions to the private sector in the form of consumer goods and high tech equipment.

Modern Era growth also changed the character of university campuses. Bureaucratic models employed to manage growth challenged the collegial system, which had bound students and faculty together to form a community. Clark Kerr described research institutions during the period as "multiversities" due to the complex structures resulting from increased federal funding and state oversight (Kezar & Eckel, 2004). Change was so complex that in 1966 the AAUP, American Council on Education and the Association of Governing Boards for Universities and Colleges formulated a statement clarifying faculty governance roles (AAUP, 1990). In the ensuing decades faculty would grapple with a dizzying number of issues such as diversity, the role of women and faculty of color, curriculum demands, and pressures to publish or perish. In the late 1980's shrinking state support for higher education made the pursuit of grant funding

paramount and negotiating with administrators and students over the division of funds to support divergent goals.

Contemporary Era

The Contemporary Era (1990 to present) marks a significant shift in the concept of higher education. In this period the perception of higher education shifts from a public to a private good. The accountability movement advances from k-12 to higher education, and in this milieu faculty are critiqued for not working hard enough to change the higher education system so that it meets the needs of a diverse society (Rice, 1996).

Today the academic world is restructuring in face of global competition with calls for high productivity of faculty members. The high cost of employing tenure-track faculty has been evaluated, resulting in some institutions adopting to employ high numbers of contract faculty (Finkelstein, 2003). The concept of "state funded" institutions has been replaced by "state assisted" universities and marketing mantras designed to attract a declining student population have resulted in the growth of a new group of institutional employees working in enrollment management. Against this confusing backdrop, faculty at research institutions are expected to do more with less and be fully engaged in the research, teaching, and service mission of their institution.

The historical roots of the professoriate influence institution policy and work expectations of faculty members. University policies affect employment decisions as well as tenure and promotion practices. The next section of this chapter describes more thoroughly the service role of faculty as they navigate through their professional lives.

Faculty Service

Despite many descriptive and theoretical treatments of service in journals and texts, few empirical studies have been conducted related to faculty service roles. This section discusses the impact service has on the lives of faculty and the challenge faculty face determining a common definition for service work at research institutions. Lastly, this section describes outcomes of structural and cultural collaborative models of student affairs and faculty affairs service efforts and scholarly arguments for faculty service.

Service Participation

Most research efforts have imbedded service in larger studies on faculty work that seeks to explain some of the stresses, preferences, and scholarly productivity of the professoriate. Research has been conducted focusing on shared governance (Birnbaum, 1988; Kezar, 2004), gender and racial impact of compensation, performance and work life spillover (August, 2004; Cooper & Stevens, 2002; Fairweather & Beach, 2002), and the impact of socialization on the professoriate explain who is providing service and why (Tierney, 1997; Tierney & Bensimon, 1996). To date, research results are mixed and outcomes appear to be tied to a variety of factors such as institutional support, faculty self efficacy, personal agency, and research methods used.

The argument that follows frames the challenges to any type of service. The results discussed come from both qualitative and quantitative research. The research in this section explains potential limits to faculty service to student affairs.

Blackburn, Lawrence, Bieber and Trautvetter (1991) surveyed 4,400 faculty members across nine Carnegie Institutional Classification types except private two-year schools using a survey titled Faculty at Work. The survey was limited to eight disciplines, history, English, biology, chemistry, math, political science, psychology, and sociology. The purpose of the

survey was to gather faculty perceptions of their work environment. The authors theorized, "People differentially assess their personal abilities and interests interacts with their perception of the organizations priorities and causes them to engage extensively in some activities and less frequently in other activities" (p. 388). The results indicate faculty at Carnegie Research II (R2) institutions engaged in service activities that were statistically significant at the $p < .01$ level. Blackburn, Bieber, Lawrence and Trautvetter state: "The R2s for service on campus are all significant and larger than anticipated for such an unvalued activity" (p. 411). Analysis also determined being a full professor was a predictor factor for significant professional service at Carnegie types R1 to DII. The researchers postulate that this high level of service could be due to campus demographics indicating more senior faculty at these institutions and newly appointed full professors are prevailed on to continue service work.

Tierney and Bensimon (1996) conducted one of the largest qualitative studies to date examining the promotion and tenure process of faculty. The authors and research assistants conducted more than 300 interviews over a 24 month period at twelve diverse institutions. The study was broadly conceived and covered the entire aspect of faculty socialization, and portions of the narrative discuss service and the role of women and minority faculty. The authors concluded that research productivity was rewarded by college deans and peers, while teaching assignments and committee work are perceived as impediments to research productivity or not valued as part of the tenure and promotion process. The authors also concluded women and minority faculty are overtaxed in service assignments and expected to occupy stereotypical or sexist roles. Finally, Tierney and Bensimon declared it is unclear to faculty whether service is valued and participatory expectations vary widely from campus to campus. The findings of the study which have been replicated elsewhere indicate that faculty socialization and senior scholar

mentoring discourages service work (August, 2004; Fairweather & Beach, 2002; Laden & Hagedorn, 2000).

Kezar and Eckel (2004) in a review of governance literature argue current faculty work trends exerts pressure against wide spread service participation. For example, employment trends such as the growth of part-time and contract faculty that has reduced the number of full-time professionals available for service roles. Finkelstein (2003) reports part time faculty ranks have increased 20 percent since 1970. Finkelstein also found more than half of new hires are non-tenure or fixed term hires, and in 2001 only 25 percent of new appointments were full time tenure track. Fixed term faculty have a contracted role which describes their work duties and if often does not include service responsibilities.

Research on faculty work roles demonstrates that expectations remain unclear. However, service duties remain as a critical part of faculty duties relied on by institutions to resolve problems or advance the institutional mission. The next section illuminates service traits based on institution type and examines what constitutes successful service collaborations.

Who Participates in Service

Institutional service is an important part of the functioning of many campuses and without faculty service, many governance or oversight functions recognized today would stop. For example, institutional size, location and public or private status is often a harbinger of faculty service. At small colleges and universities faculty perception is that service is valuable or part of the fabric of campus life, while at research institutions service is primarily at the college or departmental level (Braskamp, Trautvetter, & Ward, 2006; Tierney & Bensimon, 1996; Ward, 2003). The prominent differences between liberal arts colleges and research institutions suggests

work role expectations, tradition, and interests in larger campus life issues impact faculty socialization (Tierney & Bensimon, 1996).

Service is not only shaped by institutional context, but individual faculty characteristics as well. Choices to provide service vary with individual faculty. Generally, faculty who enjoy service are those who take pleasure in interactions with colleagues and students (Tierney & Bensimon, 1996; Ward, 2003). Blackburn, Bieber, Lawrence and Trautvetter, (1991) discovered tenured faculty provide more service than non-tenured faculty because they are more comfortable in their research agenda and other obligations. There is also research that suggests that women and faculty of color are more likely to be involved in service than their male or white counterparts (Tierney & Bensimon). It's important to consider the characteristics of who participates in services as well as the context in which service takes place.

One main faculty and student affairs service collaboration is between academic affairs and student affairs units. These collaborative efforts have significant administrative support from academic vice presidents and provosts offices, which in turn generate some faculty support. These efforts tend to recognizable in through research symposiums, new student convocation events, and mentoring programs. Another quality of these programmatic collaborations is the reliance on full professors who seem to embody balance in the research, teaching, and service rubric.

Kezar (2001) in an analysis of the 1999-2000 Educational Resources Information Center (ERIC) Clearinghouse of Higher Education, National Association of Student Personnel Administrators, and American College Personnel Association survey of senior student affairs administrators found that across all institutions surveyed a combination of cultural and structural

factors contribute to academic and student affairs collaborations. Survey respondents were senior student affairs officers at 260 diverse institutions.

Structural collaborations are established through reporting lines and co-location of academic and student affairs offices, funding, incentives such as changes to promotion and tenure requirements, and managerial efforts in supervision or accountability. Cultural efforts are dependent on matching faculty scholarly interests with service needs such as community service learning, developing a standard language between academic and student affairs units, and staff training (Kezar 2001). "Analysis showed a statistically significant relationship between structural strategies and the number of successful collaborations. The more structural strategies used, the greater the number of successful collaborations" (p. 45). Kezar was unable to test the cultural relationships because all respondents reported using these strategies and "there was no variation in usage. . . Thus it appears that both structural and cultural strategies are critical for creating changes on campus" (p. 45). Bear in mind that these results are from student affairs respondents and not from faculty or academic administrators.

Kezar (2001) described the types of collaborations elucidated in the ERIC survey. The most successful collaborations were in "counseling, first year experience programs, orientation, and recruitment" (Kezar, p. 41). Kezar further elaborated that "institutions were moderately successful with academic advising, community service learning, diversity programs, leadership development, retention plans, and student conduct. The common ground for this set of activities is that they are mostly cocurricular" (p. 41). At public four year institutions and comprehensive universities the most successful collaborations were in "assessment of learning, athletics, community service, diversity, financial aid, and first year experience" (p. 42). Kezar concluded

that institutions emphasizing student learning were slightly more successful in their overall collaboration efforts.

Another perspective on collaborative efforts as it relates to faculty service to student affairs is through the lens of cultural studies. Kezar (2001) noted in the 1999-2000 ERIC data analysis that the cultural results were inconclusive and appears to have continued her line of inquiry on governance and the human response. Kezar and Eckel (2004) completed a survey of university governance literature and concluded more study was needed in order to understand the challenges posed by human interaction in the process. Kezar and Eckel state in thesis of their article that "previous scholarship focused almost exclusively on structural theories and to a lesser extent on political theories and provided limited explanation of, or few ideas for improving governance" (p. 373). Specifically they note that "human dynamics have remained under investigated" and most work has focused on small units of the governance process such as faculty senates (Kezar and Eckel, p. 373). Kezar and Eckel suggest conducting human relations and cultural studies to help determine motivators or importance placed on service by faculty in the shared governance framework. For the purposes of my work and interest in the cultural impacts on governance, I am taking up Kezar and Eckel's charge to understand cultural influences. Specifically, Kezar and Eckel's review of the literature suggests little understanding of the interaction between larger governance units and microscopic level service activities at institutions, which include involvement with student government, subcommittee work, and student affairs.

Examples of the structural-cultural interaction at work can be found at institutions identified through the National Survey on Student Engagement (NSSE). A recent comprehensive look at student engagement also explored faculty involvement with students

outside the classroom. As part of the NSSE Kuh, Kinzie, Schuh and Whitt (2005) documented institutions that created ideal conditions for learning described as Documenting Effective Educational Practices (DEEP). NSSE is a instrument used by colleges and universities that measures "level of academic challenge, active collaborative learning, student interaction with faculty members, enriching educational experiences and supportive campus environment" (Kuh, Kinzie, Schuh, & Whitt, 2005, p. 10). In a brief discussion of what constitutes engagement, the authors state: "That is, if faculty and administrators use principles of good practice to arrange curriculum and other aspects of the college experience, students would ostensibly put forth more effort" (Kuh, Kinzie, Schuh, & Whitt, 2005, p. 9). Considering the effort in such an educational endeavor, DEEP schools promote and program for faculty engagement with students both in and outside the classroom. Some examples are striking considering what research suggests is an overburden faculty. At Evergreen State College in Washington State "faculty members often behave in ways that resemble student affairs professionals, offering support and advice on personal issues as well as academic matters" (Kuh, Kinzie, Schuh, & Whitt, 2005, p. 165). At University of Texas El Paso, University of Michigan and Miami University faculty-student affairs collaborations were cited as sufficiently diverse and horizontally spread across academic affairs and student affairs units so that they were both sustainable and effective. At Michigan, for example, the institution funds a series of programs ranging from faculty fellows in the residence halls to facility enhancements that place students and faculty in proximate contact as they engage in research and creative scholarly activity (Kuh, Kinzie, Schuh, & Whitt, 2005). In the examples cited here, the Evergreen model is cultural, while the El Paso, Michigan and Miami efforts are structural.

DEEP efforts stress faculty service without mentioning it as such. The discussion on practices outlined in the DEEP study centers on student engagement and outcomes of the collegiate experience. "These principles include student-faculty contact, cooperation among students, active learning, prompt feedback, time on task, high expectations, and respect for diverse talents and ways of learning" (Kuh, Kinzie, Schuh, & Whitt, 2005, p. 8). In the list just cited more than half of the examples call for "high touch" practices by faculty members and service efforts outside the discipline.

The argument has been made for faculty service to student affairs as it impacts student learning outcomes which are a significant component of the higher education enterprise. But, research indicates faculty are cautious about devoting significant amounts of time that could distract from what institutions reward through the promotion and tenure process. The following sections frame important components of the campus environment related to service. The next section discusses the student personnel movement and historical roots of student affairs practitioners followed by the argument for faculty service.

Student Personnel Movement

Every college campus has a student affairs unit. Some units are aligned with academic affairs, while others operate as stand-alone units. Generally, student affairs units are concerned with cocurricular lives of students and manage such areas as housing, student activities, recreation, student conduct, and health and wellness (Dungy, 2003). The student personnel (student affairs) movement has its roots in the diversification of higher education occurring in the post Civil War era. "Growing demands on college presidents, changing faculty roles and expectations, and the increase in coeducation and women's colleges are among the most frequently cited" (Nuss, 2003, p. 67). Considering the role faculty had played up until the Civil

War, the German influence on American higher education impacted institutions in many ways. Faculty acceptance of extracurricular activities and the emphasis placed on the whole student required basic staffing levels. Student affairs grew slowly at first, due to lack of funding, and encompassed health services, job placement centers, intramural sports and a dean of students who often was both a disciplinarian and counselor (Brubacher & Rudy, 2003).

Early in the twentieth century as colleges continued to develop the student personnel movement kept pace. Recognizing a need to describe core values the American Council on Education sponsored a report titled *Student Personnel Point of View* (ACE, 1937) . This report was updated in 1949 and other scholarly work followed modernizing the concepts that guide the profession. The 1937 report "emphasized the importance of understanding the individual student, the importance of coordinating the major functions of instruction and management, and the notion that student services should be offered and organized in ways that support the unique mission of each college" (Nuss, 2003, p. 72).

The expansion of student affairs units on campuses signaled the retreat of faculty from the interpersonal and cocurricular lives of students. Faculty "had little interest in how students spent their time outside of class" (Nuss, 2003, p. 68). Change was so profound that "there was a diminished interest in residence halls . . . and the reduced involvement of faculty in student discipline" (Nuss, 2003. p 68).

Whether it can be argued that changing faculty interests and professional obligations began the student affairs profession, or that enrollment growth and complexity of student needs demanded a class of employees suited for specialized work, the changing nature of higher education once again stresses a holistic educational setting. Philosophically the holistic setting brings faculty into contact with students reminiscent with the colonial period or in the modern

setting an educational experience found at small liberal arts and religiously affiliated colleges (Braskamp, Trautvetter, & Ward, 2006)

The Argument for Service

As this literature review demonstrates faculty roles continually evolve and there can be confusion about the relative importance of roles in the research, teaching, and service in evaluation rubrics. Since the context of this study is faculty service to student affairs, what follows provides descriptors and context for the environment that describes theoretical perspectives informing service decisions and the obstacles faced by the professoriate.

When Boyer's (1990) seminal work *Scholarship Reconsidered: The Priorities of the Professoriate* was written it was seized as groundbreaking work. Boyer was concerned that the scope of scholarship had narrowed to the point where only published research findings were considered legitimate scholarship. Boyer wrote: "Basic research has come to be viewed as the first and most essential form of scholarly activity, with other functions flowing from it" (p. 15). Boyer suggested a balanced approach to academic life which was a "shift from the linear notion of teaching and research to an equilateral triangle including service" (Bucher & Patton, 2004). The four areas of scholarship that Boyer believed had separate yet overlapping functions were "the scholarship of discovery; the scholarship of integration; the scholarship of application; and the scholarship of teaching" (p. 16).

Specifically related to service in the scholarship of application, Boyer delineated differences between citizenship service and scholarly service. "To be considered scholarship, service activities must be tied directly to one's special field of knowledge and related to, and flow directly out of, this professional activity" (Boyer, 1990) p. 22). Boyer's work draws a clear distinction between institutional and scholarly service. Clearly, Boyer was not making an

argument for greater institutional service but for a holistic work effort on the part of faculty. Boyer states:

> The process we have in mind is far more dynamic. New intellectual understandings can arise out of the very act of application –whether in medical diagnosis, serving clients in psychotherapy, shaping public policy, creating architectural design, or working with the public schools (p.23).

An extension of this argument could be that institutional service to student affairs functions like the conduct board, whether or not it is related to the faculty member's discipline, is part of the intellectual service Boyer advocates. As documented in the NSSE data, service is an exemplary practice for student engagement purposes. Service to student affairs engages faculty in the life of the institution, around student issues, and in application of policy affecting campus community members.

There are faculty whose participation in student affairs service is related to their academic discipline and therefore considered professional service. Such areas as they relate to student conduct could be undergraduate programs sociology, political science, and psychology or graduate programs in student affairs and law. In *Making the Case for Professional Service,* Lynton (1995) described service roles as wide ranging and encompassing traditional citizenship roles and scholarly activities. "To consider the concept of professional service, it is useful to consider some of the many forms it can take: technology transfer, technical assistance, policy analysis, organizational development, public information, program development, and expert testimony" (Lynton, p. 17). Lynton believed application of knowledge should be an institutional priority going beyond public relations efforts so that research is made available to the public for problem solving. Professional service provides an opportunity to "enhance the overall capability of higher education to meet challenges" (Lynton, p. 17). According to the Lynton, higher education needs to reevaluate expectations and rewards structure before service can legitimated.

Key to Lynton's argument is the assertion that the traditional research, teaching, and service triad is obsolete and therefore has limited utility in the current higher education environment. Lynton went on to argue that research, teaching, and service are interdependent; to be considered as a range of linked activities and not as stand-alone practices.

A book that provides a comprehensive description of faculty service that builds on Boyer's and Lynton's earlier work is *Faculty Service Roles and the Scholarship of Engagement* (Ward, 2003), which traces the history of faculty roles, describes current challenges, explanations, expectations and influences of service based on campus type, and recommendations for research and practice. Reflecting on the importance of studying service and faculty perspectives, Ward uses "engagement to encompass and expand on the new conversations current in higher education that seek to elevate and acknowledge faculty service roles and their connections to scholarship, faculty disciplinary expertise, and campus missions" (p. 4). Unlike Lynton (1995), Ward broadens the concept of service to include students and recognizes the challenges of meeting competing demands. For example, Ward describes how teaching responsibilities and service merge in connection with students:

> Advising is a role that transcends both teaching and service. It can be viewed as part of the out-of-classroom teaching responsibilities (as when meeting with a student in office hours and ending up giving career advice), but it is also part of service responsibilities in that it is typically not paid and only ambiguously rewarded (p. 58).

Like Lynton (1995), Ward (2003) discusses methods for linking scholarship to service rather than being "an add on to the already consuming workload of faculty" (p. 3). Without faculty service to student affairs, college campuses would be hollow. Whether mentoring and advising students, serving on decision making boards impacting collegians, or as speakers during

new student orientation faculty perform many valuable educational tasks related to student learning and institutional mission through their participation in service related to student affairs.

This study is an effort to build on the work of Boyer (1990), Lynton (1995), and Ward (2003) in consideration of a balanced faculty work effort and engagement in the education of students through service to student affairs. The final section of this chapter provides an overview of the higher education organizational theories and the conceptual framework. The conceptual framework grounds the data collection and analysis.

Conceptual Framework

A theoretical framework "is a tentative theory of what is happening and why" (Maxwell, 1996, p. 25). This study explores the perspective of faculty members who provide service to student affairs. Institutional culture, governance models, location, and structural organization of student affairs and academic affairs units all influence how faculty constructs their work role, as well as influence decisions to provide service to student affairs (Birnbaum, 1988; Kezar, 2003; Williams, Berger, & McClendon, 2005).

The literature review highlights factors and circumstances that shape faculty involvement in service. A complete understanding of the service phenomenon also calls for a theoretical grounding. Given the importance of organization and systemic milieus, I call upon Berger's (2002) conceptualization of university environments which are classified as systemic and symbolic. The symbolic and systemic designation describes organizational and cultural attributes unique to the campus.

Observers of any organization soon determine how organizational constructs, political struggles, and personalities influence decision making of individuals, which is a social construction (Pfeffer, 1982). In short, while faculty members develop a cognitive map to create

an understanding of the university environment. Social constructivist views of individual behavior are informed by two broad theories. First the interactionist approach, which is focused "on the emergent properties of the interaction and the process by which individuals create and attribute meanings to events of the action and interaction occurring around them" (Pfeffer, 1982). The second is structural theory. Structural processes focus on socially given facts. Pfeffer suggests that all human interaction is situational and related to a given interaction. In other words, people make meaning through the lens of roles and shared experiences that either expands or restricts their interpretation of relationships. Organizational participants, as is the case in this study, create cognitive maps to make meaning of their service participation.

Earlier work on social construction and the impact of organizational actors are coalesced into the governance theory's described in *How Colleges Work* (Birnbaum 1988). Birnbaum's structural paradigms, which he defined as bureaucratic, collegial, political, and anarchical, reflect his understanding of social construction and cognitive theories applied to governance systems. Birnbaum's five-year study of college and university organizational models reflects his view that academic organizational links between subunits, or cybernetics, play a vital role in governance. *How Colleges Work* also describe how organizational actors, such as presidents, governing bodies, faculty and staff work based on the governance perception they have with their employing institution. The entire model in operation, described as cybernetics, recognizes all types of governance at work each automatically exerting pressure or contracting to control and govern.

Berger (2002) offers two dimensions of governance theory in a study of student learning and engagement outcomes in an adaptation of Birnbaum's (1988) model. Berger suggested academic governance embodies symbolic and systemic factors that influence organizational

decision making. Symbolic models exemplify ceremonies, ritual, and history as significant artifacts influencing organizational decisions. At symbolic institutions a distinctive ethos is apparent on campus that signals or provides cues to suggest parameters to individual behavior. The systemic model can be characterized by the college's reputation among external constituencies that influences program and policy development. Systemic organizations identify competitors that compete for the same students, the administrative leadership looks beyond the campus for solutions and disciplinary affiliation is more important than college loyalty to most faculty. Table 2.0-1 below is an adaption of Berger's model as it relates to faculty understanding of campus culture.

Table 2.0 -1. Organizational culture as described by symbolic or systemic attributes

	Symbolic Institution	Systemic Institution
Cultural Attributes	1. Shared Governance 2. Highly talented faculty 3. Prominent themes and academic traditions are protected 4. Stable fiscal picture 5. Inter/national ranked academic programs 6. Competitive student enrollment	1. Top down administrative focus 2. Sensitive to stakeholder demands 3. Striving to improve faculty quality 4. Concerned with superficial external rankings 5. Few prominent academic programs 6. Persistent fiscal Issues 7. Student recruitment and retention challenges

While Berger's model of organizational culture focused on students it has direct application to faculty work because the same factors affecting student learning can influence faculty behavior. Even a parsimonious acceptance of environmental and organizational factors influencing students developed by Pascarella and Terenzini's (1991; 2005) in *How College Affects Student,* Astin's (1977) theory of involvement in *Four Critical Years,* or Tinto's (1993)

widely cited retention research it would be logical to conclude institutional environments also impact faculty behavior.

The conceptual framework guiding this study proposes that the cognitive maps faculty develop through interaction with their environment (symbolic or systemic) influences their decisions to make service contributions. A faculty member's interpretation of the university environment is a social construction, meaning that their lived experiences contributes to decision making about work roles (Pfeffer, 1982). Service does not take place in a vacuum, and in the macroscopic environment of a campus various systems attempt to influence faculty behavior. Macroscopic systems include the tenure and promotion process, campus policies, and general campus funding. However, faculty members also make decisions about how to organize their time and spend their days mindful of microscopic perspectives. Such microscopic faculty thoughts could be how much time do I have to prepare for class or participate in service activities. Faculty service to student affairs is dependent on conceptions of university environments which organizational behavior helps to reify.

The development of this research, analysis, and findings relies on an adaption of Berger's (2002) model as previously discussed. The conceptual framework guided the development of the research questions and data collection. During analysis and interpretation of findings, I compared institutional descriptions and aggregate respondent data to classify and define university environments. Finally, the symbolic or systemic institutional environments provide the basis of conclusions, recommendation for further study and practice.

Conclusion

Today's faculty are an autonomous professional group that evolved from humble beginnings. While it has been more than 100 years since faculty began separation into

disciplines following the growth of the Ph.D. and corresponding research specialization, stakeholders still expect faculty to engage in a balance of research, teaching, and service.

A review of the history of higher education reveals a service component born out of necessity of income and desire for fulltime professional employment rather than generosity or scholarship. Faculty at research institutions have consistently resisted the call to provide service. The literature, while sparse, indicates faculty are unsure of the professional role service should play in their work life. Yet, given the important role faculty play in providing service to student affairs understanding the dimensions of this work is vital.

While several studies describe faculty service role attitudes and attainment, they are quantitative in nature and do not provide a holistic picture of activities in the 21st century. Further, these studies do not look at faculty involvement in student affairs service and the call for faculty engagement that suggests the holistic learning environment is dependent on faculty involvement. The literature is also dated and does not consider the impact of changing faculty demographics, or the growing acceptance of diverse research agendas. While the research to date clearly shows service roles a distant third place on the list of faculty priorities, research must be conducted to understand how the professoriate is navigating new calls for accountability and role expectations that demand purposive out of class contact with students. Scholars need to understand the faculty perspective on this work role, as well as motivators, incentives, and detractors from service. Lastly, this study considers campus organizational factors that communicate the importance of service to student affairs.

This study adds to the limited body of research on faculty service to student affairs. The importance of giving voice to faculty cannot be understated in an era where institutional focus is on student learning outcomes and consumer driven aspects of higher education. The study

examines faculty service through the lens of participants on student conduct boards. Not only is student conduct a historical role for faculty, the parameters for participation are common across institutions, making this form of service ideal for understanding faculty participation in service related to student affairs.

Chapter 3 further describes the study parameters and research design. Chapters 4 through 6 discuss the participating institutions and their faculty. Chapters 7 and 8 are the results of data analysis, overall conclusions, and recommendations for further research and practice.

CHAPTER 3: METHODOLOGY

To more fully understand the faculty service to student affairs I use the example of faculty involvement in the conduct process. As described in Chapter 1 faculty involvement in the student conduct process is often policy driven and in line with court rulings requiring decision making and sanctions to be aligned with an educational mission. Further, this study examines faculty at research universities because of the multiple challenges they face in meeting the complex research, teaching, and service mission.

Researchers and practitioners understand the value of faculty contact with students, but the phenomenon of faculty service to student affairs requires additional study to gain a comprehensive knowledge of the faculty perspective. A comprehensive understanding is necessary to understand a portion of faculty service expectations in the complex higher education environment. This study examines the following questions:

1. What role do faculty play in student affairs service?
2. How is student affairs service reflected in faculty roles and rewards?
3. What motivates faculty to be involved?
4. What role does service play in larger faculty work?
5. How does faculty involvement in service shape faculty perception about the institution?

Research Design

This study uses qualitative methods to conduct a multiple-case examination of faculty currently providing service to student affairs at three public research universities on the West Coast. Because there are multiple definitions and genres of qualitative research Denzin and Lincoln (2005) provide a guide:

> Qualitative research is a situated activity that locates the observer in the world. It consists of a set of interpretive, material practices that make the world visible. These practices transform the world. They turn the world into a series of representations, including field notes, interviews, conversations, photographs, recordings and memos to the self. At this level, qualitative research involves an interpretive, naturalistic approach to the world. This means that qualitative researchers study things in their natural settings, attempting to make sense of, or interpret, phenomena in terms of the meanings people bring to them (p. 3).

This multiple-case study was conducted using a naturalistic framework concerned with the context of the setting and relationships being studied (Bogdan & Biklen, 2003). To guide data collection and analysis the naturalistic method considers the following: (1) The setting under study because "researchers assume that human behavior is significantly influenced by the setting in which it occurs, and whenever possible, they go to that location" (Bogdan & Biklen, p. 5); (2) the researcher as the instrument of data collection; (3) rich descriptive data such as interview transcripts, artifacts, memos, official records and personal documents that can exemplify and substantiate the phenomena under study; (4) concern with the research process and perspectives of respondents over the outcome or product; (5) naturalistic inquiry is inductive and theory emerges from and is grounded in the data collected; (6) and researchers explore meaning by examining the participant perspective and are concerned with capturing these perspectives accurately (Bogdan & Biklen, 2003).

This study uses qualitative methods to conduct a multiple-case examination of individual faculty currently providing service to student affairs units. "A case study is a form of empirical inquiry that: Investigates a contemporary phenomenon with its real life context; when the boundaries between the phenomenon and context are not clearly evident; and in which multiple sources of evidence are used" (Yin, 2003, p. 11). This study relies on the principles of naturalistic inquiry and consists of site visits, semi-structured interviews, and artifact analysis of faculty service to the student conduct function of student affairs.

The multiple-case study method is built on the instrumental case study process (Stake, 2005). In the "instrumental case study if a particular case is examined [it is] mainly to provide insight into an issue or to redraw a generalization. The case is of secondary interest, it plays a supportive role, and it facilitates our understanding of something else" (Stake, p. 444). Multiple-case studies are concerned with choosing sites to show transferability and illustrate settings and subjects from which theoretical observations may be applicable (Bogdan & Biklen, 2003).

The advantages to this form of data collection are many. Respondents are able to describe in-depth their responses and clarify the meaning of questions as the interview unfolds. Due to the busy schedules of faculty, interviews can be initiated or stopped and restarted at times convenient to participants increasing the likelihood of involvement and follow through with the data gathering session. Finally, interviews allow for interpretation of affective as well as cognitive responses to questions which can be recorded as field notes and used during analysis.

I also conducted observations of my interaction with student affairs practitioners, academic affairs administrators, or staff members. Observations consisted of interactions between faculty members or support staff to more fully understand the campus environment. During site visits documents, memos, letters or other artifacts were collected and stored for later use (Bogdan & Biklen, 2003). Observations and artifacts kept in my notebook were incorporated into my analysis.

Research Methods

Site Selection

Three institutions selected for this study represented the spectrum of public research universities on the West Coast. Overall these institutions are diverse and at different stages of academic and research program development. The institutions given the pseudonyms Tradition

University (TU), Green State University (GSU), Flagship University (Flagship) and respondents are described in detail in the Chapters four through six. TU is a comprehensive research institution and a member of Association of American Universities. GSU offers a focused undergraduate and graduate education program and is ranked as a top 100 research university, while Flagship is struggling to define its instructional mission, bolster enrollment, and is attempting to ramp up research efforts. These institutions and their faculty provide sufficient data to make knowledge claims and transferability to similarity situated institutions (Yin, 2003) . According to Bailey (2007), "such generalizations occur when the researcher identifies concepts and social processes that have theoretical implications or significance beyond a specific setting" (p. 183).

Two institutions were located in a rural area and one was in an urban setting. Two institutions met the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching criteria for having Very High (CVH) research productivity and the third was rated High (CH) research productivity. CVH and CH categories represent doctorate granting institutions determined by correlating science and engineering (SE) research and development (RD) expenditures, non RD SE expenditures, SE staff with terminal degrees, doctorates awarded in humanities, social sciences, science technology engineering and mathematics (STEM), and miscellaneous fields. CVH institutions represent the highest level of research productivity in post secondary education in the United States, while the CH universities lag slightly behind based on performance the aforementioned indicators.

The selection of multiple campuses provides diversity of faculty responses, enhances reliability, and ensures project feasibility. In multiple-case research "selection by sampling attributes should not be the highest priority. Balance and variety are important; opportunity to

learn is often more important" (Stake, 2005, p. 451). Criteria for selection were: (1) Agreement by the conduct officer to assist in research efforts; (2) enrollment and urban or rural location; (3) variation in grant and contract funding, and (4) a majority of faculty comprise hearing panels.

Participant Selection

A total of 18 faculty members and 7 staff participated in this study. University staff members were vice presidents, three were unit directors for student conduct, and one was the director of housing and dining. Faculty participants came from all ranks, however, most were full and associate professors. The breakdown of faculty by rank for each institution appears in table 3.0-1 below.

Table 3.0-1. Faculty rank or position classification of respondents.

	TU	GSU	Flagship	
Professor	4	1	1	
Associate Professor	1	1	4	
Assistant Professor		3	1	
Emeriti	1	1		
Administrative	2	3	2	
Total	8	9	8	25

The primary focus of the study and case examination is to learn about faculty involvement in student affairs service. To paint this picture required interviews of faculty members given they are the primary focus of the study. However, faculty service usually involves others and therefore at two of the sites I interviewed the chair of the faculty senate and at all three sites the senior student affairs officers. Since the faculty senate chair at Flagship was

not available, I added a faculty member to the interview total and discussed faculty issues with a key informant.

Participants were identified by each institution's conduct office where a relationship between the conduct office and faculty already exists. At one institution when an insufficient number of faculty conduct board members was identified the search parameters were broadened to include faculty in residence participants. Faculty respondents were current or immediate past members of the student conduct board. Student affairs personnel and others on campus familiar with faculty affairs were also interviewed. Out of the 25 participants, there were 6 female and 12 male faculty members. Staff respondents were 5 males and 2 females. With the exception of one African-American and one Asian American student affairs staff members, who were both males, the respondents were white.

The goal was to interview five to seven faculty members, one senior student affairs officer, the director of the conduct office and the chair of the faculty senate at each institution. I used purposive sampling because I wanted to gain a deep understanding of student affairs service. Purposive sampling is a qualitative research method used when the researcher desires a respondent sample with specific characteristics as in this case student affairs officers and faculty providing service to student affairs. I anticipated participants would more likely agree to an interview based on a recommendation from a student affairs staff member they already knew and their propensity to engage in service activities, evidenced by their participation in student affairs service.

Once initial agreement to participate was reached I followed up with the respondent to establish a meeting date and explain interview protocols. I endeavored to complete all interviews in person but scheduling conflicts made it impossible. Half of the respondents were

interviewed in their campus office during site visits and half by telephone. All interviews were recorded and saved electronically for transcription.

Respondents were asked questions using a semi-structured interview protocol. The faculty and staff protocols appear in Appendix A. In-depth interviews were chosen to be able to obtain meaningful descriptions of the respondent's service perspective. Interview questions related to conduct board experiences, motivation to serve, and opinions of student affairs service. For example, respondents were asked to define service, provide descriptions of the tenure and promotion process reflective of the weight given to service, and discuss their service to student affairs. Respondents were also asked to reflect on why they have chosen to participate on student conduct boards and why it was important to have faculty involvement in the conduct process.

In addition to interviews, prior to the site visits I read relevant governing documents such as student conduct codes, faculty manuals and university fact books to gain a broad understanding of university culture. During site visits materials such as student handbooks, handouts, flyers, and policy manuals were collected and saved for analysis. Field notes of my observations were kept along with interview notes for use during analysis. Observations consisted of notations about faculty office spaces, campus facilities such as libraries and student unions, exterior grounds, and material posted on bulletin boards. I also noted respondents' vocal inflections or facial expressions and my perceptions of their responses to interview questions. All participants have been assigned pseudonyms to protect their identity. Materials used for coding has been kept confidential and in a secure location.

Analysis

Data analysis consisted of reducing, unitizing, and coding the data to identify themes in a manner outlined by Bogdan and Biklen (2003). Following coding analytic generalization was used to compare theoretical implications against the empirical case findings (Yin, 2003). Analytic generalization is a way to move from case study descriptions to theoretical findings and this analysis method is the reason three cases were chosen for this study. Chapter 7, the cross-case synthesis, describes the overall data set which allows for the theoretical discussion in Chapter 8. Each case was prestructured which meant an outline guided the data collection process for each case.

I relied on the theoretical framework to focus my analysis. Specifically I reflected on the literature review and research questions to guide me through an analysis that focused solely on data pertaining to the study (Yin, 2003). Specifically a case by case analysis consisted of: 1) Coding data using field notes and interviews; 2) sorting the material to identify relationships, concepts, similarities and differences; 3) developing and testing themes; 4) writing and elaborating on the concepts uncovered during the reduction process (Miles & Huberman, 1994). A cross-case synthesis was then performed which aggregated the data from the three cases to form the final report.

Trustworthiness and Confidentiality

Bodgan and Biklen (2003) describe trustworthiness as the overall check of the fit between what the data says and what occurred in the study. Trustworthiness checks and balances are built into the design of this study in the following ways. The research methodology intends for multiple campuses and respondents to be included in the study. A naturalistic approach to

data collection was used and includes audio recorded oral responses, document collection, and observation.

Further, trustworthiness was enhanced through peer debriefing, researcher time in the field, and comparing case notes and observations with transcripts and collected campus artifacts. Peer debriefing is a technique whereby the researcher asks disinterested peers to engage in analysis of portions of the data and then comparisons are made between findings (Krathwohl, 1997). I solicited two peers for participation and I asked them to review similar portions of my data analysis and to engage in periodic discussions about this work. Overall, my goal was to ensure consistency between methodology used in this study and research conclusions.

The names of participating institutions and faculty respondents have not been disclosed. All institutions and participants have been assigned pseudonyms. During the study all materials were kept secure in password protected computer files or a locked cabinet. After completing the study raw data was electronically encrypted and stored on a compact disk.

Limitations

As with any study this research has limitations. However, because this is a case study designed to examine a theory about faculty participation in service to student affairs I have chosen to use analytic generalizability to extend the theory to the larger group of faculty at research institutions (Yin, 2003). In brief, analytic generalizability suggests the results have theoretical implications beyond the setting under study. As previously described in this chapter a cross-case synthesis was utilized to compare empirical findings against the theoretical framework described in Chapter 2.

The results of this study may be influenced by unknown discrepancies such as those that may be in collected documents, faulty memory of respondents, and misinterpretations of

recorded interview data, any of which could unduly limit the scope of the study. To ensure constancy and reliability of the data I obtained official institutional documents or common data sets such as The Integrated Postsecondary Data Systems (IPEDS, 2007) that describe each institutions faculty and student demographic, average class size, and enrollment.

In collecting data I was cognizant of my role as a researcher, however, during analysis and write up, I strived to provide sufficient information to yield confirmability of these findings. To guard against bias I kept written notes and logged my contact with the respondents to keep information organized. Further, in designing this study I attempted to ameliorate differences in institutional size and location by choosing universities that had similar student services units and conduct code procedures. Recorded interviews were transcribed verbatim and where they were inserted into the narrative they represent the respondents comments minus any hedge words or normal stammering that accompanies interviews.

Conclusion

This study has the potential to illuminate faculty perspectives on service at research institutions. Further, it gives faculty voice that can be added to the discussions on improving or meeting the mission of higher education institutions as they use service as one tool to educate students. The results of the study can be applied in the student affairs arena to develop programs or initiatives that have faculty support and participation. The next three chapters provide a description of each of the three campuses, the student affairs service environment, and themes that emerged for each case. The data analysis in this study is presented in two ways. Chapter 7 provides a cross-case synthesis of themes from Chapter 4, 5 and 6. Chapter 8 consists of a discussion of the theoretical framework, suggestions for further research and practice, and conclusions.

CHAPTER 4: THE CASE OF TRADITION UNIVERSITY

This chapter presents the results from the data analysis of Tradition University (TU) in three sections. First, a brief description of the institutional setting, faculty demographics, and faculty governance policy applicable to the case study. Second, a review of the research questions posed in Chapter 1. Third, a brief description of respondents and discussion of emergent themes from data analysis is provided.

The Institution

TU is located in an urban environment and enrolls more than 40,000 students. The university also has two comprehensive branch campuses located in nearby cities. The name of the institution has been assigned a pseudonym to maintain anonymity and increase respondent participation. A quarter of the student population are graduate and professional degree seekers. The Carnegie Foundation classifies the university as a Very High Research institution. TU is a state assisted institution founded in the 1860's and its primary mission is described as "the preservation, advancement, and dissemination of knowledge" (Tradition University website, 2007). The university benefits from historically favorable support from the state legislature and is assigned via state law the responsibility to exclusively offer "programs in law, medicine, forest resources, oceanography and fisheries, library science and aeronautics" (Tradition University website, 2007).

TU is a member of the Association of American Universities (AAU, 2006). AAU members form an elite group of 62 self selected American and Canadian research intensive universities leading higher education policy initiatives, generating the bulk of grant and contract funding among competing institutions, and sponsoring undergraduate and graduate programs which other colleges and universities seek to emulate. During the 2006 fiscal year, the university

reports more than 986 million dollars in external funding, including 147 grants over 1 million each. In 2006 only ten percent of the institutions annual 2.4 billion dollar operating budget was funded by the state (Tradition University website, 2007).

The Faculty

The university employs 5,816 faculty. Figures from the Integrated Postsecondary Data System (IPEDS) common data set show only 3,166 are considered instructional faculty because professional schools and stand alone graduate programs employ faculty who only teach graduate students. The university is able to offer small class sizes that average 35 undergraduates students and the undergraduate student to faculty ratio is 11 to 1 (IPEDS, 2007).

TU has multiple faculty ranks depending on position responsibilities and qualifications. Tenure-track faculty represent assistant, associate, and full professor ranks. Teaching faculty appointments are fixed terms and have the following categories: instructor, artist in residence, senior lecture, senior artist, principal lecturer, affiliate, adjunct, joint appointment, clinical, teaching associate, emeritus, acting, visiting, and visiting scholar. Faculty with research only appointments can hold the title of Research Professor, Research Associate Professor, Research Assistant Professor, and Research Associate. Research faculty are dependent on grant or contract funding and may engage in teaching as required by their funding sources. Faculty in some professional schools that generate income such as the Medical and Dental schools are considered to hold an appointment on a continuing basis, but are not tenured due to funding. Faculty without tenure hold tenure-track professorial titles.

Faculty Governance

TU has a strong culture of faculty governance. The institution has a descriptive faculty handbook delineating responsibilities, expectations, and policies. The current governance system was adopted in 1956. The handbook describes the extent of faculty governance at TU:

> By virtue of the authority vested in him by the Board of Regents under its resolution of May 19, 1956 and in conformity with the statutes of the state (see Section 13-01), the President authorizes the faculty to share with him and the academic deans responsibility for the formulation of rules for the immediate government of the University under such resolutions and executive orders as the Board of Regents and the President from time to time may adopt or issue.

Governance processes on the campus extend the opportunity to vote and participate in faculty matters to a wide range of faculty ranks. Almost all faculty with a 50 percent or greater appointments, except those on leave, clinical, affiliate, acting or visiting appointments are eligible. One exception is that Research and without tenure faculty may not vote on tenure and promotion policies or promotion votes outside of their employee classification.

Until 2004, the faculty had the responsibility for supervising significant portions of student services and programming. In 2004, the faculty handbook was changed and policies were disseminated to various offices around the campus. The faculty retained direct oversight of student government functions, student conduct, graduate student organizations, and academic regulations. The significance of the faculty authority is twofold. Cultural artifacts exist that created expectations faculty engage in elements of cocurricular education. Involvement today in day-to-day oversight of student life is primarily through collaborative councils. The Faculty Senate has 14 advisory councils that "serve as deliberative and advisory bodies for all matters of University policy, and are primary forums for faculty-administrative interaction in determining that policy" (Tradition University website, 2007). The Council with oversight responsibilities for student life is charged with "all matters of policy relating to non-academic student affairs

such as financial aid, housing, regulation of social affairs, eligibility rules, intercollegiate athletics, and general student welfare" (Tradition University website, 2007). The size of the councils are controlled by the senate body and can be enlarged or reduced to increase effectiveness. Non academic members from the student affairs division sit on the Council on Student Affairs which meets monthly.

Student Affairs

The Division of Student Life at the TU is in transition, moving from a highly centralized vice president model to a decentralized vice provost model in the last two years. The vice provost reports to the university provost and functions contained in this unit are enrollment management, residential life and dining services, student leadership and community development, counseling and health services, and administrative services. More than 1000 staff members comprise these units. The unbundling of services from the old vice president model did not change the relationships with faculty. Currently the student affairs unit is looking for ways to integrate faculty into the new model particularly around health and wellness consultations for students. The vice provost continues to serve on the Faculty Council on Student Affairs.

Respondents

Faculty respondents are members of the TU Faculty Review Board (FAB), a faculty senate appointed body that reviews decisions of other academic or administrative units when findings have been reached that a student has violated the student code of conduct and academic integrity policy. Specifically the board reviews all cases when students are suspended, expelled or require restitution be paid to the university. FAB reviews similar decisions made at branch campuses of the university. The FAB meets as needed depending on caseload and meetings can

last from one hour to several days depending on the complexity of the case. The board has the authority to affirm or reject earlier decisions or to allow the student to have a new hearing. Working with the FAB are several administrators from the vice provost for student affairs office and the president of the faculty senate who were also included in interviews to help add context and develop a complete understanding of the board's environment.

Consistent with its size and multifarious mission the duties of the FAB are complex. TU FAB duties (Tradition University website, 2007) as established by state statutes and provided in Appendix D. The process and interaction between students and faculty is legalistic in nature and scripted. The FAB relies on the chairperson to lead much of the fact finding effort and to coordinate functions between other university units. The FAB is required to follow formal rules of procedure and provide students with specific rights as they work through determining if a violation of the conduct code has occurred.

Respondents in the study comprised of 5 males and 3 females and with the exception of two student affairs officers held the rank of professor or associate professor. Table 1 in Appendix B provides demographic information on the TU respondents.

I first gained access to interview the respondents by contacting the student affairs office and then the chairperson of the FAB. I also contacted a former student affairs colleague in the College of Liberal Arts now serving as the Vice Provost for Academic Affairs to have a brief discussion of the university administrative structure and conduct process.

All respondents were first contacted by e-mail to gain their consent for an interview and follow up telephone calls were made as necessary. I kept a record of these contacts in my research notes. I strived to interview all respondents in person and was successful in meeting

with four participants in their offices during a two-day campus visit. The remainder of the respondents spoke to me by telephone from their campus office.

Faculty Service in Action

Participants were asked to reflect on conduct board experiences, motivation to serve, and their opinion of student affairs service. The interview protocol used in this study can be found in Appendix A. The process was guided by the following research questions:

1. What role do faculty play in student affairs service?
2. How is student affairs service reflected in faculty roles and rewards?
3. What motivates faculty to be involved?
4. What role does service play in the larger context of faculty work?
5. How does faculty involvement in service shape faculty perception about the institution?

The conceptual framework used in this study proposes that university culture affects faculty service to student affairs. Support for faculty service to student affairs could be informed by examining how faculty interpret their participation in the university community. Further, institutional cues, culture and faculty socialization influence participation decisions. Since institutions are becoming highly competitive or market driven at all levels it is possible that when all factors outlined in the conceptual framework are combined extreme reactions from faculty result.

The remainder of this chapter discusses the emergent themes from analysis of interviews with faculty and staff, university documents and field notes. Specifically this analysis considers motivation to serve, benefits of participation, the role of faculty in student affairs service, and how faculty incorporate service into their larger body of work. In addition to transcript analysis, a content analysis was conducted using respondent curriculum vitas to compare identified themes with work tasks.

Service Themes

Data in this study was collected in the spring and summer of 2007 by interviewing seven respondents and accumulating records as previously described. These themes were reached by reducing 37 broader clusters of data. Data reduction was accomplished by coding and sorting key words into broad concepts and finally into themes. The overall themes reached during analysis are service as a duty, administrative cynicism, relationships, and elites.

Recall that the theoretical framework described in Chapter 2 suggests organizational culture affects faculty conceptions of their work environment and influences participation in service to student affairs. This context is important in developing an understanding of student affairs service in action and how faculty contextualize their role. The emergent themes in this case reflect an analysis intended to evoke examples of theory in action.

Service as a Duty

This study attempts to understand faculty members conceptions of service to student affairs. In answer to the research question what motivates faculty to serve, TU faculty accept service appointments because it is an assigned duty. The definition of what constitutes service on the TU campus did not vary significantly between respondents. During the interviews the respondent answers to the question, how do you define service, was one of the shortest received and appeared to catch some of the respondents off guard. For example, when asked to define service Lisa Justice (Lisa), Professor of Law and Chair of the Faculty Appeal Board stated: "Ha, ha, I don't have definition. You are just expected to serve on these various committees and you do." The differences in answers were divided by faculty type and whether or not the individual faculty member had served or was currently serving in an administrative role such as department chair. Respondents were matter of fact in their discussion of service requirements and either

offered a service description that was part of their overall work effort, as was the case for clinical faculty, or stating service was part of a normal work engagement.

Service work at TU is multidimensional and encompasses all the elements of the institution's mission statement, which is "the preservation, advancement, and dissemination of knowledge" (Tradition University website, 2007). Respondents articulated clearly their role on campus and were not confused with their work expectations. A review of faculty respondent vita's support this theme and clearly delineates individual aims, publications, and professional association volunteer work. Respondents do not list their appointment on the FAB with the exception of Lisa Justice who is chair of the board. TU Faculty vitas only describe research, teaching and academic administration positions held. Non academic work was not listed and during interviews faculty framed student affairs service as institutional service.

Because the institution supports a multitude of faculty classifications, the sample of respondents were reflective of the various roles from research scholars and clinicians to emeriti faculty. All spoke in terms of understanding their work expectations as research, teaching and service without ambivalence. Bob Smith (Bob), Emeritus Professor of Medicine was straightforward with his conception of service work: "Well, I participate in committees and non-clinical and research endeavors that benefit the university." The primary focus of our discussion was student affairs service activities and it was enlightening to understand how these faculty integrated service into their work life. Discussions with student affairs professionals made it clear that faculty protected their roles and discouraged most service in the co curricular and residential education communities by tenure-track faculty. Generally, faculty with titles of instructor and lecturer engaged in direct work with student groups and residential education efforts. According to Ervin Fry (Ervin), Vice Provost for Student Affairs, formal requests for

faculty service participation are processed through the Faculty Council on Student Affairs. When asked described the level of collaboration between student affairs and faculty Ervin explained his interaction with the council as one example:

> I work closely with the faculty senate leadership generally, but more particularly the faculty council on student affairs. I sit on that body as an ex-officio member and that's probably the most, aside from the residence halls and some advisory groups, the most regular interaction with faculty and faculty leadership we have throughout the year.

Faculty motivation to complete student affairs service, a research question under study, is being performed out of a sense of duty to the department or college as a requirement for tenure first, and secondarily, considered part of a faculty member's institutional duty. Service is not performed with a student development perspective or from outside pressure to connect with students. Service to student affairs is considered institutional service. I asked Albert Glass (Albert), Department Chair and Professor of Classics, how he developed his perspective on service to student affairs:

> So there is certainly an expectation on the part of the administration that every faculty member engage in service, and indeed every time we have a review of a faculty member- which happens every year- that is a component of every report on every faculty member. . . That said, I think the nature of my department, the nature of the individuals with whom I work, I think we are all deeply committed to the notion that this is something we all need and want to do. I think we are a fairly civic minded body of people. That may be a consequence of the nature of my discipline, the nature of my discipline within the faculty at large.

In acknowledging tenure demands respondents described how service was rewarded and viewed by peers. Faculty at TU are given credit for involvement in scholarly associations, professional service to governing boards and institutional service. Respondents remarked on the pressure to publish or perish and the need for junior faculty to develop a research agenda. However, two opposing viewpoints on the value of service were identified when respondents were asked to reflect on the weight given to service during the tenure and promotion process.

Marvin Petrie (Marvin), Associate Professor, and Head of the Division of Physical Therapy, described the motivation to engage in any form of service as it related to promotion and tenure: "Honestly I think that is just tradition and part of it is just, I did it." The other position on service as it relates to promotion and tenure reviews was described by Dan Mountain (Dan), Professor of Earth and Space Sciences:

> We don't skip over it but here number one is research and number two is teaching. You know where I have heard these discussions come up is you know they'll say, well look faculty member X we are considering him or her for promotion to professor. You know there are publications and teaching but you know why isn't he or she an associate editor of journals? I would say it's the absence of these typical things that faculty do especially outside the university that would raise eyebrows.

Faculty do not see their role as responsible for student development. Discussions around this series of questions made it clear that academic mentoring and functions related employment post graduation formed the bulk of out of class contact. Faculty are supportive of a student's larger aspirations but expect self directed activities by the student and Dan's response illustrates faculty expectations:

> We design a curriculum that we think will serve a spectrum of undergraduates. Those who want to go to graduate school. Those who want to go work as engineering geologist or go into law or whatever. That's a challenge. We think about our curriculum. We are here at anytime. Any faculty member would give advice about coursework or careers and we are a very open and friendly department.

In answer to the research question what role do faculty play in student affairs service it was clear service to student affairs is purposive and related to academic issues. For example, none of the faculty respondents engaged in service that could be described as student cocurricular involvement. Service was generally related to the university, departmental concerns or professional associations and obligations all of which equated to academics. It was clear that the farther the service was from departmental obligations or supportive of scholarly efforts the

less it was understood by department chairs and peers. Even in departments housing faculty with extensive service records a total grasp of the importance of service to the university's function is not apparent. During my interview with Gwen English (Gwen), Professor of English Literature and President of the Faculty Senate, I asked her about barriers to service and she described her frustration with the lack of knowledge about service among department leadership:

> But if there isn't ever in that kind of department the grasp of what it is that people do is pretty limited and that in turn means the reward for doing it departmentally is very small. So if there is a barrier that's the biggest one. We can send out all the paper that we want to saying so and so did all these wonderful things and if you have got a chair sitting there going I don't know how to value that so I guess I just won't value it at all, that's a problem.

However part of the reason it is misunderstood is that TU faculty do not discuss their service involvement with peers nor could they explain what appeared to be an active reluctance to do so. Every faculty respondent stated they do not discuss their student affairs service activities with their peers. When I asked Lisa to tell me about how her colleagues viewed her service on the appeal board she summed up the phenomenon: "I bet 95 percent of them [faculty peers] haven't got any idea that I do it." When asked to compare his service record with that of his peers Dan remarked: "University service it's hard to judge. We don't often know what other faculty are doing on different committees so I'd say probably average." Bob stated: "I do not know what my peers do relative to what I do."

The next theme is administrative cynicism. TU faculty demonstrated a high degree of suspicion related to university administrators. In part, the cynicism was fueled by critique and debate inherent in the shared governance used to manage the institution. The discussion that follows illustrates how service on the FAB and to student affairs is part of the process.

Administrative Cynicism

How does faculty involvement in service shape faculty perception about the institution? Based upon interviews faculty at TU appear cynical of university administrators and service acts to protect the faculty ranks from overzealous academic changes and the adoption of management fads. Due to the size and complexity of the institution, this in itself does not appear to be out of place. A review of the faculty senate handbook gives faculty authority to check administrative decisions. Section 13-23 of the TU Handbook states:

> A. Subject to the provisions of paragraphs B and C of this Section, the President authorizes the University faculty to formulate regulations for the immediate government of the University and to share responsibility with him or her, the Chancellors at the Lakewood and Bayview campuses, and the academic deans in such matters as:
>
> 1. Educational policy and general welfare;
> 2. Policy for the regulation of student conduct and activities;
> 3. Scholastic policy, including requirements for admission, graduation, and honors;
> 4. Approval of candidates for degrees;
> 5. Criteria for faculty tenure, appointment, and promotion;
> 6. Recommendations concerning campus and University budgets;
> 7. Formulation of procedures to carry out the policies and regulation thus established.

Nonetheless, faculty recalled participation on the FAB as a way to reign in overzealous administrators on all TU campuses. When asked why she continues her student affairs service Lisa states: "I think administration has a huge tendency to get top heavy and arbitrary and I think without faculty nipping at their heels that it would be even worse." Lisa went on to describe her frustration with administrators:

> Bayview stubbornly argues that they are their own community and they have their own campus atmosphere so they should get to do what they want and I say atmosphere smatmosphere- that's not got anything to do with treating students fairly and equally that are in the same system.

Generally, faculty commented on mistrust of administrators, academic and non-academic, who are short timers out only to raise their profile. Administrators are believed to have a lower commitment to the institution. A healthy tension exists between faculty and university administrators. Service roles allow faculty to initiate responses to decisions, propose alternative plans or attempt to stop changes through organizational oversight. Gwen related the following story when I asked her to provide some examples of faculty service to student affairs and it was indicative of the healthy tension between the administration and faculty:

> Another place where- and this was a joint operation of the faculty council on academic standards and faculty council on student affairs, and I think there was one representative of instructional quality as well- the president called for a report … on the first year experience and this was sort of the classic I'll appoint my friends kind of thing or someone in one of those positions. So, the senate decided we had better take on issues of undergraduate education primarily because we know who the students actually were, and that pie in the sky sort of things was sort of brought in with the new administration was a desire for us to be more of a residential school. We are almost 60 percent commuter and that was sort of a big gap there in terms of understanding who the student body is.

The new administration has not stopped all efforts at changing the profile of the institution but faculty gained seats on panels studying the issue. For example, student behavior off campus has been a persistent challenge and similarly services to commuter students have been lacking. Faculty involvement resulted in the creation of a work group to study off campus behavior, chaired by a law professor, which proposed and ultimately passed regulations to extend university policies to the affected area. Commuter students were finally recognized and plans are in place to give this group places to congregate in campus buildings including a newly remodeled student union building.

While cynicism drives some faculty toward student affairs service roles, a byproduct is the development of relationships with other faculty in the university at large. One personal benefit for engaging in student affairs service are the contacts and ensuing relationships faculty

report. For some faculty relationships are described as self-serving because they enhance a position in the academic enterprise and for others a pleasant distraction from the work routine.

Relationships

TU is a large campus, making contact beyond the department level difficult, therefore the role of service in larger faculty work can be viewed from a collegial lens. Motivators to serve differ with each participant and sometimes are reflective of their role in the case of clinical faculty or can create and sustain relationships that are beneficial to the faculty member. Service is typically a personal benefit rather than work related, but for faculty who are politically motivated or in dual roles such a department chair it helps maintain visibility.

The campus is divided in a way that could be depicted of growth rings of a tree. The central core is the oldest and forms the undergraduate education areas followed by some graduate schools such as the college of law and then professional schools in health science and medicine. The campus design and topography makes interactions beyond the department level difficult. If a faculty member has an office in a newer area of campus, she/he would never have to traverse the older core section of the campus because of self sustaining units or academic silos. Due to the institutions' size respondents reflected on the need to be visible outside of the department and college in order to ensure their academic program maintains its profile on campus. Albert related the following example when I asked him to comment on his motivation to serve relative to his peers:

> This is a huge university and trying to get to know people in other units - your college administrators, your deans, associate deans, provost all the way up to the president - you have to work at that… You can't just let people make these decisions for you. So you need to be involved in these, particularly those committees that affect what happens to you as a department."

Another reason to be involved is to develop relationships with faculty in other units. All respondents remarked that their student affairs service participation allowed them to develop long term relationships with faculty from a diverse set of units which is difficult to do because of the structural organization of disciplines. Marvin remarked when I questioned him about the overall importance of his service to student affairs:

> It's also frankly an opportunity for me to get out of health sciences and up on upper campus and get involved in the things – even though in this case they are sort of negative things, but they don't always turn out negatively – issues that are happening across campus and it is an opportunity for me to interact with other faculty from all around campus.

As illustrated, faculty respondents enjoy the company of other likeminded people. However, respondents also understand how they and their department fit within the university due to broader relationships developed during service. Faculty respondents in this study were all cognizant of their department's elite status on campus and in the larger educational community. The next section discusses the elite viewpoint as described by respondents.

Academic Elites

Engagement in service work appears to be a part of a leadership role faculty take on as part of their work role at a prestigious institution. This service is often external and related to the discipline. However, because of high expectations there is trickle down service work performed that is traced back to supporting the entire educational enterprise.

TU has a high profile in the educational community of the state, nation, and international circles. This profile enables it to attract the best and brightest faculty, scholars and students, as well as financial donations and access resources to continually advance the institution. The university annual financial report shows significant strength in donor support. "Gift revenue in 2006 was $219 million. This is an increase of $47 million, or 27% from the prior year. Gifts are

used to support a variety of purposes, including capital improvements, scholarships, research, and endowments for various academic and research chairs" (Tradition University website, 2007).

As noted, service helps create and sustain relationships. When asked about service as a way to raise a faculty members profile respondents turned the question around and did not hesitate to discuss the prominence of their program in the educational community. Most respondents worked in nationally ranked programs and reflected on their experiences through that lens. Whether it was financial resources, the ability to generate grant or contract work, or attract the top students these experiences all factored into the conception of faculty life and student service expectations.

National prominence eases difficulty in raising private gift money and retaining faculty. Albert states: "We are a large department nationally. This is one of the largest classics programs in the country." Albert went on to discuss the prominence of the program within the college setting:

> We shepherd the resources that we have very well and if you want to look by any sort of measuring rod whether it be national reputation or the NRC rankings, fundraising, how many Rhodes Scholars that you have – things like that by any sort of measure we have been quiet successful.

As a group, the faculty understood the record of success but it did not make them callous to the centrality of their role as teachers. However, teaching is enjoyable when your students are high functioning and this creates a desire to participate in some level of student service. Remarking on the students in his physical therapy program Marvin said: "… you can't get into the program unless you are really smart, you are motivated and all those sorts of things." Marvin continued and commented on regular mentoring contact outside the classroom with students and the importance of discussing professional issues related to professional behavior:

> Part of that is a responsibility that we feel which is - there is also a shortage of physical therapists out there and I think its sort of in our nature as physical therapists to be kind of altruistic anyway - so we feel we have a responsibility once people are in this program to get them through the program successfully in the most positive way that we can.

A review of respondent vitas demonstrates this small group has a solid research and publication record, sits on prominent panels and edits prestigious journals in their profession. Campus service is diversified and ranges from departmental activities with students to faculty senate appointed committee assignments.

Conclusion

TU faculty service to the student affairs environment is geared toward supporting the university's academic mission. The themes of service as a duty, administrative cynicism, relationships, and academic elites drive home the fact that the enterprise is all about academics. At the personal level the student affairs service being performed helped create access and reify the faculty governing process and puts faculty members in contact with likeminded colleagues. Because of the codified governance structure, faculty service to student affairs is part of a work role that is not questioned. The faculty extended their cynical view of university administrators by inserting themselves into student issues and they hold the belief that protecting student rights is integral to their role.

The following two chapters illustrate the cases of Green State University and Flagship University before a discussion in Chapter 7 of the similarities and differences in these cases. Once the cases have been fully described an analysis of the theoretical implications, recommendations for further research and practice, and conclusions is the focus of Chapter 8.

CHAPTER 5: THE CASE OF GREEN STATE UNIVERSITY

This chapter, much like Chapter 4, presents the results from the data analysis of Green State University (GSU) Case in three sections. The name of the institution has been assigned a pseudonym to maintain anonymity and increase respondent participation. The first section constitutes a brief description of the institutional setting, faculty demographics, and faculty governance policy applicable to the case study. The second section is a review of the research questions posed in Chapter 1 followed by a discussion of emergent themes from data analysis.

The Institution

GSU, with a total enrollment of 19,000 students, is located in a rural setting where the primary economic activity is agriculture and natural resource industry. Graduate students comprise 15 percent of the total enrollment. Recently, high tech employers and specialty manufacturers have been locating in the area to take advantage of the economic environment. The largest employers are state and local government agencies and GSU is the number one employer in the county (Chamber of Commerce, 2007). The university was founded the 1850's as a private college. In the 1860's the state assumed partial control of the institution from the Methodist Church and declared it the state's agriculture college. The state did not gain full control until the 1880's. Today the institution declares itself to be a "land grant, sea grant, space grant and sun grant university." The university's mission is to "stimulate a lasting attitude of inquiry, openness and social responsibility (Green State University website, 2007). GSU is a state assisted university and lawmakers provided 36 percent of the annual operating funds in 2006-2007. During the 2006-2007 academic year the institution's total operating budget was 243 million dollars (Green State University website, 2007). The university does have one small

branch campus, located in a resort and retirement community and operates extension offices in all of the state's counties.

The Carnegie Foundation ranks GSU as a Very High Research activity institution. The primary enrollment at GSU is undergraduate students but the institution does support a variety of graduate programs primarily in the life sciences, engineering, pharmacy, and veterinary medicine. In 2006 funds from grant and contract activity totaled 184 million dollars (Green State University website, 2007).

The Faculty

GSU employs 2030 teaching and research faculty and 1433 professional faculty. Professional faculty is more commonly recognized as administrators exempt from laws affecting payroll and benefit policies. Professionals fill roles in student affairs, academic administration, information systems, and extension that are programming and support oriented.

Traditional faculty responsibilities can include advising, service, creative scholarly activity, and research, but can also vary by contract. GSU's Integrated Postsecondary Data System (IPEDS, 2007) common data set reports however only 899 faculty are engaged in classroom instruction making the faculty to student ratio 19 to 1.

Faculty Governance

The current GSU Faculty Senate bylaws were first approved in 1964 and have undergone multiple changes since. The responsibilities of the senate are to:

> Determine and establish the purposes of Green State University, formulate and evaluate policies and activities in harmony with these purposes; (b) assume responsibility for the creation, maintenance, and protection of a University environment conducive to the full and free development and preservation of scholarly learning, teaching, and research; (c) provide the means by which the administration may be apprised of representative opinion of the entire faculty.

Within the framework described above the faculty establish academic regulations, curricula and general educational standards while providing the university president consultative opportunities. All members of the faculty are represented through an apportionment process based upon college or unit full time equivalent (FTE) enrollment and student credit hours (SCH) generated during the most recent academic year. The total number of senators is 132.

Considering the senate's responsibilities and organizational structure when it comes to institutional priorities, budget, and processes of the central administration this system can best be described as consultative. While the university provost meets with the senate executive committee, the central administration can choose to not fund senate initiatives or adopt policies affecting budgets, enrollment, program creation or elimination. The senate's only real authority is over adoption and application academic regulations.

Student Affairs

Student Affairs units are supervised by a Rory Hopper, Vice Provost for Student Affairs (VPSA), who reports to the university provost. The organizational structure is flat and all 14 unit directors report directly to the VPSA. Enrollment management functions are not in the VPSA reporting line but a cross-functioning team has been established to coordinate activities involving student affairs units. Student affairs encompasses traditional units such as housing and dining, dean of students, student union and leadership, recreation, counseling, career services, TRIO programs, and programs for students of color. The VPSA is also a tenured professor in Ethnic Studies, a researcher in the field of higher education and student affairs, and currently leads the College of Liberal Arts on an interim basis.

The VPSA initiates or leads teams aimed at improving the cocurricular environment on campus and supporting student retention and graduation. Faculty service involvement is both ad

hoc and structural depending on the need. Student Affairs funds some faculty research and scholarly activity though civic engagement or community service efforts in the greater community. The VPSA also engages college deans, department heads, and faculty in the application of theory or dissemination of research data gathered at the institution for the purpose of improving student engagement.

Respondents

To understand the framework delineated in this study a group of faculty and student affairs administrators were interviewed. The intent of the research protocol was to interview faculty participants on student conduct boards. This effort was not possible due to insufficient number of teaching faculty participation in the conduct process. Consideration was given to finding another campus for the study. However, during my conversations with student affairs staff and by reflecting on the research questions I determined the campus environment worthy of study. Ultimately, I interviewed three faculty who were former members of the student conduct committee and two faculty that were part of a faculty in residence program coordinated by housing and dining services. Additional interviews were conducted with the VPSA, director of student conduct and the director of housing and dining services, and the president of the faculty senate to gain an understanding of their knowledge of faculty service to student affairs. Table 2 in Appendix B provides demographic information on the GSU respondents. During a two-day campus visit I toured the residential college, interviewed the VPSA, director of the Office of Student Rights and Responsibilities and director of the Housing and Dining office, and had a general conversation with a key informant. Due to the difficulty in finding faculty respondents all interviews were conducted by telephone.

Student conduct committee members had all participated in adjudicating misconduct within the last 12 months and faculty in residence participants were currently serving in their assigned role. Conduct committee members work with student affairs staff in the Office of Student Conduct, Rights, and Responsibilities and are placed in their role either by the faculty senate or through an ad hoc process coordinated by office staff. Board members are empanelled along with student representatives to hear cases involving alleged violations of the student conduct code. The board meets year round on an as needed basis if the staff in the student conduct office concludes a hearing is necessary. A description of the committee work as delineated in the GSU student handbook is provided in Appendix D.

Because the number of faculty respondents who had served on the student conduct committee was small, I contacted GSU student affairs staff for assistance in indentifying other faculty service activities. By contacting the GSU director of residence life, I learned that the university has a functioning faculty in residence program. Because this study is concerned with the faculty perspective on service to student affairs, I concluded that a different type of service configuration would be transferable across the case. My conclusion was reached upon reflection and consideration of the research questions and interview protocol. A brief description of the faculty service to the housing and dining function of the student affairs unit is below.

Faculty in residence interview respondents in this study are two male assistant professors involved in a cooperative effort with the Colleges of Engineering and Business. The two academic colleges assisted in raising half of the 40 million dollars needed to renovate an aging residence hall in the center of campus. Experiential learning programs sponsored by the College of Business comprise the bulk of structured experiences, but both faculty members engage students in formal and informal activities to enhance the living and learning environment of the

campus. The College of Business support for the residence hall is through an entrepreneurship program designed as a student business incubator. Some classes and seminars are also held in the building. Faculty are granted housing and in return expected to have a self directed amount of interaction with students.

Faculty Service in Action

Participants were asked to reflect on conduct board experiences, motivation to serve, and their opinion of student affairs service. The semi structured interview questions used in this study can be found in Appendix A. The process was guided by the following research questions:

1. What role do faculty play in student affairs service?
2. How is student affairs service reflected in faculty roles and rewards?
3. What motivates faculty to be involved?
4. What role does service play in the larger context of faculty work?
5. How does faculty involvement in service shape faculty perception about the institution?

As previously stated in Chapter 2, the theoretical framework used in this study proposes that organization culture shapes faculty behavior related to service. The interview protocol, document collection and observation data are used to analyze the theoretical framework. Theoretically, faculty participation and support for service to student affairs could be informed by how respondents interpret their role in the campus community. Further, faculty behavior and participation decisions are influenced by institutional norms, campus culture, and professional socialization.

Service Themes

Interviews with respondents took place during the summer of 2007. Forty-three data clusters comprise the themes that follow. The overall themes identified in this case are service as a safety net, financial demands and service as personal interest. A content analysis of respondent

curriculum vitas was also completed to compare faculty responses and identified themes with work tasks. The themes emerging from my semi-structured interviews with faculty and student affairs staff elucidates the descriptions that follow.

Safety Net

Faculty motivation to complete student affairs service was framed by respondents as educational development. Some service activities and practices amounting to providing "safety netting" to students weighed heavily on the mind of all respondents. Safety netting is a proactive position, like being a supportive bystander, waiting to swoop in if a need arises. Some interest stems from institutional economic needs that will be discussed in the next section but mostly the respondents were deeply interested in the lives of their students. Perhaps it is the original land grant mission of the institution but GSU faculty respondents care deeply for their students and engage their students very directly out of class with a variety of personal issues. This theme was a thread in all faculty responses, but strongest in the examples provided here.

Faculty reflections about interactions with students were diverse. Since I was interested in understanding what role faculty service to student affairs plays in student development interviews ranged widely. In a series of follow up questions on the role of faculty in student development Lori Story (Lori), Assistant Professor of Philosophy offered the following lengthy example that is not only chilling, it exemplifies the extra faculty effort and care at GSU:

> I had a guy a number of years ago, maybe six years ago, who he said Professor Story you're the only person I know who will understand what I am saying. He says, If I go to sleep my parents will die." And I went whoa. I said its okay. Here's one of those times when I have to be really alert and really on my toes. Well it turns out this kid hadn't slept for 5 days and I asked him if he know what bi-polar disorder was and he said well he kind of had. I said, would you do me a favor and he said sure anything. I said, would you walk over to the student health center with me. I got up walked out of my office left it wide open and everything and we walked to the student health center. Then I drove him up to the hospital and he was admitted with a profound case of bipolar psychic break. So students

> trust me for some reason. I mean I think they have good reason to trust me but they are able to.

Lori provided several other similar examples involving African-American Students, students in military reserve programs, and gay, lesbian, and bisexual students. She is known around campus for her desire to support students and student groups, which drives students to her and she appears to obtain energy from these experiences.

Faculty efforts and involvement outside the classroom extends to desires to see students be successful and eventually graduate. When I asked Al Eber (Al), Emeritus Professor of Animal Science to describe what he thought the faculty role in student development was he explained where he places his extra energy and what motivates him to do so:

> Anything that we can do to keep students in school and have them have a successful experience and go out someday and be productive members of society. I think that is all very important. Personally, I enjoy working with students. I'm that kind- guess you could say people person. I enjoy working with the undergraduates and graduates and so I can – this is where I guess my extra time if you have any is – things I feel directly deal with students.

Even though Eber has been retired 7 years, he teaches freshman retention classes, serves on dissertation committees, and participates in groups such as the Student Recreation Center Advisory Board and an alcohol task force. Certainly it could be argued that he likes to stay active in retirement, however, his committee involvement is all student centered. Eber's story typifies faculty at GSU and delineates the challenges of rank and file faculty to be involved in student affairs service.

The faculty in residence program provides energy to the faculty participants and is another example of safety netting students. Faculty in residence live in the residence hall with the students in specially designed apartment that gives them both access to students and limited privacy. Tom Easton (Tom), Assistant Professor of Agribusiness, describes why he has chosen

to participate in student affairs service and how his discussions in residence motivate him to continue:

> I like the young dynamic environment. Being around young people is inspiring. We'll have for example long discussions in the evenings with students about whatever topic. It can be a political topic and hear the different perspectives and see students excited and see students learn. I think often I find I can see more passion for certain topics in those discussions than I can see for example emerging in the classroom, which intuitively is a little bit surprising because you think people pick their majors the way they really want.

What is intriguing about the examples above is the effort to engage students at whatever level they present themselves. This effort is outside of the discipline, and at times beyond the reasonable scope of most faculty member's expertise. However, a balance must be struck as faculty provides a safety net, particularly in response to recent campus violence.

The safety net scenario is a stark contrast to the next theme. Persistent university financial issues weight heavily on the minds of respondents. By all accounts fiscal issues have reduced the total number of faculty available for service and this has placed a severe strain on an ever dwindling number who continue provide service to student affairs.

Financial Demands

Institutional financial pressures weigh heavily on the minds of faculty and staff and reduced the role of service in larger faculty work. Finances also reduced the role of faculty in student affairs service and created a larger role for student affairs professional faculty. GSU budget reduction and reallocation have changed the way the institution does business in everything from faculty rewards, service, hiring, position responsibilities, and recruiting or retention work. Many of the changes have affected structural processes and enhanced the role of administrators in student and academic affairs.

Insufficient funds have reduced faculty hiring while enrollment has climbed through increased recruitment and retention efforts. GSU's annual budget report states that the institution recently rebased its budgets "for each academic unit, linking revenues and expenses explicitly to generating Units" (Green State University website, 2007). Essentially the campus transitioned from a historical budget model to one linked to revenue generation based on individual college enrollment and grants and contract funding. The university has also seen reduced state support and been forced to cut approximately 13 million dollars from its education and general fund budget "because state funding and tuition revenues have not kept pace with increasing costs for the 2005-2007 biennium" (Green State University website, 2007). All faculty respondents recognized these pressures. During a discussion of his service record and how it compares to other faculty Scott Sebert (Scott), Associate Professor of History, stated he is more involved because of the reduced number of faculty. Scott remarked about the reduction in faculty hiring committees, "Not that we get very many of them anymore with our budget." Max King, Professor of Engineering and President of the Faculty Senate was much more descriptive when he summed how reduced faculty numbers impacted service. During our conversation about barriers to student affairs service Max said:

> One constraint I think is simply that we have fewer professors on campus than we had five years ago. We are probably down 20 percent. So the way we have been handling the budget crisis is people resign and retire and they don't get replaced. So we have not eliminated any departments but there has been a lot of downsizing. What that means first of all is fewer people. Secondly, the fewer people who are left feel like they are working harder because the number of students hasn't gone down. So that kind of creates an attitude in people. They just want to do their job and go home.

Under budget pressure obtaining faculty members to serve on student affairs committees is difficult. David Chase (David), Director of the Student Conduct Office reports faculty relate the financial pressures are a consistent barrier to service. David said senate appointees to his

committee are often too busy to participate or start and drop out. When I asked the VPSA what the barriers were to student affairs service he laments resources are a persistent problem that not only impacts service it affects teaching. However, he sees an opportunity in this dilemma that creates both learning opportunities for students and service for faculty. The VPSA states:

> I think here its being under resourced. That folks probably have a higher teaching load than they would have at most other institutions. Just the general base budget for units is pretty low so as a result people are very taxed and they have very little wiggle room to do things. So actually, one of the attractors to doing things is the opportunity for funding that we often provide through our partnerships that we really try to see some things.

The VPSA needs to keep faculty service as a main focus as student services faces budget reduction and similar overextension faculty face. An emeriti member of the conduct committee confided that student affairs was in the process of being restructured and positions were being eliminated.

Student enrollment has risen through a combination of recruiting and retention efforts. In 1996 total GSU enrollment was 13,784 students. Recall that in 2007 enrollment was more than 19,000 students which represents a 5000 student increase since 1996. Faculty of all ranks has not increased with rising enrollment. In 1997, GSU institutional research reported 2,270 faculty members which represent a total reduction in faculty ranks by 240 by 2007 (Green State University website, 2007). This reduction has been despite a 79 million dollar increase in grant and contract funding since 1997.

GSU faculty described how this has affected service and what was telling was how much administrators have assumed duties once completed by faculty. When I asked the faculty senate president to describe the level of collaborative efforts between the faculty senate and student affairs he reported: “So I would say for a lot of the student affairs kinds of things often it’s the case of a lot of the work is being done by associate deans or other administrators with a few

faculty members that get invited on." Professional faculty ranks have begun to fill voids left by faculty on senate committees responsible for student concerns. While reflecting on the fiscal challenges at GSU the VPSA describes the current environment as helpful to his unit's employees so that they can incorporate the division's "mission and vision in our conception of our work." However, long serving faculty on student committees state the over representation of non-teaching faculty is a detriment to making progress and results in gridlock. Scott stated,

> When I first started here 16 years ago out of say 6 faculty appointments at that level maybe three or four would be teaching faculty and a couple would be advisors. Now like this year on the academic standing committee I am the only teaching faculty out of about 6 faculty level appointments. The rest are advisors or administrators.

This means that critical faculty perspectives are not represented in decision-making or initiatives of the faculty senate and institution. When I asked the faculty senate president to describe who serves he stated it was terminal associate professors. Faculty stars are rewarded and this inspires other faculty to emulate the behavior. The faculty senate president related the challenge of obtaining diverse service participants:

> One common complaint is well so they [faculty stars] are behaving selfishly. They get away with it because they are bringing in a lot of money and their department heads and deans love them for it. So, the way to get the promotions and the big raises are not to work on university committees it's to bring in the money.

I asked David the same questions about the type of faculty member involved in service and he reported: "Unfortunately student affairs folk, professional faculty members, jump to serve on the board versus academic faculty don't necessarily. It's hard to keep them over the long haul."

The reductions in state funds, reliance on tuition dollars and external grant funding have created some interesting faculty service partnerships. GSU has an enrollment driven budget model and has worked diligently to retain and graduate students. During our discussion of

faculty student affairs service partnerships the VPSA stated the most prominent are connected to enrollment management. The VPSA described how the university has a committee of senior administrators and faculty leaders that is always searching for "an elegant model to begin to really forecast for the institutional levers that need to be manipulated in order for us to produce the kinds of enrollment picture we were looking at."

All respondents parroted the institutions marketing and retention mantra even if they were not completely satisfied with the results. When I probed for lessons learned during faculty service to student affairs engagements it appears faculty are sensitized if not fully indoctrinated in enrollment management mantra. For example, Scott commented, "there has been this tendency that students are consumers and we are here to meet their market demands." Al the emeriti faculty member from the Department of Animal Sciences said, "I do think the university is serious about soliciting- that's not the right word I guess – recruiting new students and retaining them once they are here I think."

The service partnerships identified in this study are the result of joint needs of all the stakeholders. From retention classes taught by faculty and the university president to residence hall redevelopment led by academic colleges and the housing and residence life department to civic engagement experiences funded by student affairs efforts are bearing fruit. A significant example of this commitment is the undergraduate residential colleges and faculty in residence programs.

In the case of the residential colleges, the College of Business and Engineering teamed up with the housing and dining unit to redevelop a residence hall in the heart of campus. College development officers delivered a 20 million dollar lead gift resulting in a 40 million dollar makeover of the building. Joe Gaines (Joe), an Assistant Professor in the College of Business

acknowledged the service partnership meets his professional needs and that of the college. When I asked Joe how he discussed service with his faculty colleagues and what their feedback was he said:

> They are right on board because this is the Ford residential college and the Texas Entrepreneurialship Program is integral part of the strategic initiative. Anything that I can do over here that brings, that progresses there [enhances student learning], is seen as being a big positive both to me, the department, and the college.

Tom, the other faculty member in residence interviewed in this study, has residence life experience as a graduate student and stated GSU was able to draw him in because of the program. However, in Tom's situation his in residence position is not connected to his academic appointment and his reflections on discussions with other faculty yielded conclusions that service is personally beneficial rather than rewarded professionally. GSU's Director of Housing and Dining Bob Smith (Bob) stated the institution currently houses five faculty members in similar roles. The positions come with limited expectations around student contact, and his office is seeking to expand the concept as departments and colleges warm to the idea.

If financial issues pressure faculty to choose between scholarly efforts, personal interest in service work sustains the effort of those in student affairs service. As the following section describes, faculty engage in service as an extension of their work role. However, as the data reveals prior socialization and a desire to help meet what faculty perceive as critical needs fuels overall involvement.

Service as Personal Interest

This study asked how student affairs service was reflected in faculty roles and rewards. The lack of a rewarded role for service meant student affairs service engagement is reliant on the goodwill of faculty. GSU service also develops a faculty role and defines the career of the

individual. Faculty may choose to volunteer through the faculty senate or participate in an ad hoc basis on committees based on personal interest. Personal interests and socialization into the profession have a profound impact on an individual's eventual faculty role. Respondents said the promotion and tenure process (P&T) and direction from department chairs clearly rewards research and publication efforts. But during my conversations with faculty it was evident that P&T was a reward if position descriptions were aligned with work effort. GSU P& T materials support this conclusion. "Candidates for promotion and tenure will be evaluated objectively for evidence in their performance of assigned duties, in their scholarship or creative activity and in their professional service" (Green State University website, 2007). The faculty role at GSU appears to be divided between research and instruction with the liberal arts and clinical faculty comprising the bulk of instructors who are engaged in service. Faculty respondents who receive tenure and are overweight in service become stuck at the associate professor level. Several faculty described their dissatisfaction with the system that leaves them in a terminal associate professor position but were satisfied with their work role. The faculty council president offers the following description of the phenomenon:

> What that means is that you have people on committees- a lot of them are associate professors who are never going to make full professor. I think the reality is they get a certain satisfaction out of doing committee work and they are good at it and so that's what they are going to do and they just may not get promoted for it.

When asked if negative perceptions by their peers impacted their decision to serve Lori commented: "We can't determine our own duties according to what other people do and don't do."

Every respondent was clear that their personal interests contributed to the service roles they adopted as a faculty member. Faculty were also socialized by their experiences in ways that

helped them navigate the promotion and tenure maze and there were no reports of being negatively impacted for the effort. The group of faculty interviewed had significant service involvement for their career tenure. Tenured members were involved in multiple on campus committees and the untenured faculty advised at least one student organization outside their college on top of their faculty in residence obligations.

Scott informed me that his scholarly contributions and service efforts were informed by his graduate school experience at UCLA. Further, Scott states when commenting on his long time mix of service that ranges from campus efforts to work in Africa: "But I do think those kinds of services are part of the package and part of what is expected of us and we should just do them. We as a community and where we as individuals think we can fit in and serve best." Tom, the youngest member of the respondent group, stated: "I had a very good advisor and mentor who just beyond advising on the research has helped me clarify a few of the broader concepts and I think I appreciate that."

Service obligations consume a significant amount of time that could be viewed as a pleasant distraction instead of engaging in research or other scholarly activity. The faculty council president compared highly productive research faculty against those involved in significant service by stating:

> You know in some sense you can see teaching as one way in which it can be a distraction from doing scholarship. You prepare for class, you give a good lecture, you get immediate feedback. It's rewarding. Service can be the same kind of - you may see that as a distraction. It's something to do. Oh, I can't work on this difficult problem right now because I have a committee meeting. So rather keep doing busy work and then you never get around to the difficult stuff.

Institutional interests have spawned central administrative service opportunities that compete for the limited time of faculty. Ad hoc student affairs groups meet to plan or discuss initiatives for combating alcohol abuse, student retention initiatives, or one-time projects. When asked about

the kinds of service opportunities that drawn in faculty I was repeatedly told about strategic initiatives. One conclusion I have drawn is that competing interests do little to clarify faculty roles. Tom stated for example:

> The university needs to decide what they want to be it seems. It's very difficult to have this balance between research and teaching. If you push all the faculty to research other things like teaching and service and working with the students inside and outside the classroom it's definitely going to get neglected.

However, strategic initiatives are just the tip of what is occurring in the administration. While far from an ongoing service commitment student affairs units host educational outreach projects and provide funding for programmatic collaboration. The VPSA provided two significant examples of such efforts. First in a small-scale collaboration, he sponsored workshops featuring higher education researchers Vincent Tinto, George Kuh, and Liz Whitt. The VPSA related that the workshops resulted in "follow up learning community work in some of the classes and some outreach based upon the effort initiated there." Many of the faculty attendees were interested in improving their teaching and student engagement efforts. The following lengthy quote describes VPSA's intention to guide student affairs service activities:

> While we also see faculty research programs involved without community service/service learning areas where we got grants that supported the exploration of hunger in the State. So we had extension research faculty and we provided mini grants for them to be able to go out and do work in the fields, out into the various counties. We also had economics faculty members involved with it in terms of looking at the economics of hunger. Anthropology faculty, so we have a broad number of research faculty who were involved in our efforts to look at student hunger. Right now, we are actually working with the faculty and doing and on-line survey of our students to develop a more extensive research project on student hunger issues. We have childcare, family life balance issue where we have faculty involved in our efforts to increase service to students who are parents. So we have research faculty involved in a lot of the efforts that we do.

Whether pleasant distraction, graduate school socialization or just a desire to work with students, GSU faculty who participated in the study enjoyed out of class contact with students.

While a faculty member who accumulates an extensive service record at the expense of research could be denied promotion to full professor, it is unclear if it restricts the granting of tenure.

Conclusion

The themes discussed in this chapter are service as a safety net, financial demands and service as personal interest. Overall GSU is a student centered campus that faces programmatic and hiring restrictions due to lack of financial resources from the state, student fees, and grant and contract money. Faculty respondents appear divided over the institutional direction, currently driven by financial demands, and are confused by administration research productivity messages that conflict with the historical faculty role and campus policies. Confusing expectations has limited the number of faculty available for service to student affairs.

The service environment to student affairs was particularly challenging. Because most faculty had already retreated from service efforts I needed to broaden my search outside of the student conduct service role. Fortunately, I was able to find two faculty in residence participating in jointly led living and learning program to include in this work. While these two faculty members had limited experience in service to student affairs, they were helpful in describing their motivations to serve. The faculty in residence service environment is transferable to the larger case. In addition, the faculty in residence are recent hires and had a good grasp on their work expectations and university policy, which are significant elements of this study. The remaining respondents provided a unique lens into the universities historical faculty roles and the struggle over the direction of the institution. The blend of both types of service provides a stronger base for the themes rising out of this research.

The next chapter discusses the third case in this study, followed by two analysis chapters. Chapter 8 consists of a cross-case synthesis of the themes identified at TU, Flagship and GSU.

Chapter 9 is a discussion of theoretical conclusions, suggestions for further research and practice, and conclusions.

CHAPTER 6: THE CASE OF FLAGSHIP UNIVERSITY

This chapter, much like the previous two, presents the results from the data analysis of Flagship University (Flagship) Case in three sections. The name of the institution has been assigned a pseudonym to maintain anonymity and increase respondent participation. The first section constitutes a brief description of the institutional setting, faculty demographics, and faculty governance policy applicable to the case study. The second section is a review of the research questions posed in Chapter 1 followed by a discussion of emergent themes from data analysis.

The Institution

Flagship is a land grant university and the state's oldest public higher education institution. The university is located in a rural setting where the primary economic activity is agriculture. The institution was founded in the 1880's by an act of the territorial legislature before the region was granted statehood by Congress in the 1890's. The university mission statement is expansive, and rather than being ambitious could be viewed as operational. The mission statement submitted by the university and adopted by the Board of Regents reads in part:

> Flagship University will formulate its academic plan and generate programs with primary emphasis on agriculture, natural resources, metallurgy, engineering, architecture, law, foreign languages, teacher preparation and international programs related to the foregoing. Flagship will give continuing emphasis in the areas of business, education liberal arts and physical, life, and social sciences, which also provide the core curriculum or general education portion of the curriculum.

During the 2006-2007 fiscal year the university's total operation budget, including student fees, auxiliary income and grant and contract awards, was 332 million dollars of which 38 percent represents state appropriations. The university operates four regional branch campuses that are programmatically based upon the economic needs of the region where they are

located. Three branch campuses share facilities and some administrative tasks with other state educational institutions. In 2007 and total student enrollment was 11,500 of which 19 percent were graduate students. The institution is represented in all of the state's counties by agricultural extension agents.

The Carnegie Foundation ranks Flagship as a High research activity institution. Flagship is primarily an undergraduate institution but offers the Master's and Ph.D. in areas emphasized in its mission statement. The university also has the state's only law school, which is located on the main campus. In fiscal year 2003 grant and contract funding reached more than 100 million for the first time in the institution's history and has remained at that level since. Since 1995 the university's external grant and contract funding has increased by 100 percent (Flagship website, 2007).

The Faculty

Flagship employs 871faculty statewide. The IPEDS common data set from 2006 states 545 faculty are engaged in teaching undergraduates and professional degree programs such as law and veterinary medicine. The faculty to student ratio is 18 to 1 (IPEDS, 2007)

Teaching faculty ranks as described in the university administrative handbook are adjunct, affiliate, emeriti, assistant professor, associate professor, professor, instructor, and senior instructor. Research and extension faculty can also hold the title of assistant, associate, or full professor. Employment criteria for all ranks require faculty members to "provide service to the university and/or his or her profession" (Flagship website, 2007).

Faculty Governance

The current council form of faculty governance was adopted in 1968. "The council is empowered to act for the university faculty in all matters pertaining to the immediate

government of the university. The council is responsible to and reports to the university faculty and, through the president, to the regents" (Flagship website, 2007). The council is a small group of faculty and not a senate as the name implies. Representatives are elected for three year terms from the faculty at large and do not necessarily represent a specific college or unit. Two undergraduate student representatives are elected annually as is a representative from the university staff and branch campuses. There is no graduate student representation. The total number of participants is 25.

Practical considerations, lack of budget authority, and organizational nature of the council makes it a consulting group since the university president and provost in conjunction with the Regents set priorities and policies. The council does empanel 46 committees with oversight of academic programs, tenure and promotion, research compliance, student affairs functions, arts, and parking. Committee membership comes from the faculty at large and is not comprised of elected council members. However, the oversight by the committees is limited since many of the areas have a corresponding administrative office as is the case for the financial aid committee and parking. The remaining committees are limited in scope and act to review decisions of the administration for personnel, classroom scheduling, and grievances from students related to faculty or staff members.

Student Affairs

Student affairs functions are led by Bo Gravel (Bo), Vice Provost for Student Affairs (VPSA) who at the time of our interview was also the dean of students and acting vice provost for academic affairs. Student affairs units encompassed student programming activities in student housing, recreation, student union, diversity programs, student judicial, violence prevention, and Greek life. Enrollment management functions and retention activities report

through the vice provost for academic affairs and represent admissions, student financial aid, registrar, tutoring/academic assistance, and career services.

The VPSA/dean of students works directly with student affairs department leaders. Student affairs departments are generally small and many employ less than five staff. In some cases a department leader is the only employee in the area. The largest units employing professional staff are campus recreation and housing services.

Faculty Service in Action

Participants were asked to reflect on conduct board experiences, motivation to serve, and their opinion of student affairs service. A semi structured interview protocol was used to collect data from respondents and the interview questions can be found in Appendix A. The process was guided by the following research questions:

1. What role do faculty play in student affairs service?
2. How is student affairs service reflected in faculty roles and rewards?
3. What motivates faculty to be involved?
4. What role does service play in the larger context of faculty work?
5. How does faculty involvement in service shape faculty perception about the institution?

This study uses a conceptual framework proposing that faculty service behavior is influenced by organizational culture. To understand how faculty interpret their role in service to student affairs an examination of their participation in the university community must be conducted. Factors that may affect participation decisions include university culture and faculty socialization. Since institutions are now highly sensitive to competitive factors, as seen in their enrollment marketing and sports information, the theoretical framework suggests faculty behavior is impacted as a result.

Service Themes

This study is concerned with the faculty service to student affairs phenomenon. I began a search for faculty respondents by contacting the university judicial affairs office and had a preliminary interview with the judicial affairs coordinator to become familiar with the institution's organizational structure. Following the informational interview, I began contacting faculty by e-mail to solicit their participation and to schedule interviews. In this case study six faculty members and two student affairs administrators were interviewed. Faculty members were current and former members of the University Judicial Council.

University Judicial Council is comprised of faculty and student members who volunteer to serve for predetermined terms. Membership eligibility is established by the faculty council. Faculty participants serve for one year terms and the board is led by a faculty member appointed by the faculty council. Board members are empanelled to hear cases involving alleged violation of the student conduct code. Board meetings are called by the university's judicial officer who is a staff member in the dean of students office. The duties of the University Judicial Council (Flagship website, 2007) can be found in Appendix D.

In the spring of 2007 I conducted interviews with all respondents in their campus office. During these interview time periods I toured campus to make observations and take notes. The total time on site was three days. The themes comprising this section were rendered from 45 data clusters. The reduction process consisted of coding and then unitizing the data into themes, which are students as consumers, confusing and misunderstood expectations, and personal interest. Lastly, to assist with this investigation a content analysis of the respondents vitas was conducted to evaluate identified themes with work tasks.

Students as Customers

A majority of the Flagship faculty and student affairs administrator respondents view students as customers and the role faculty play in student affairs service has been reduced as a result. This viewpoint was evident through a review of governing documents and in respondent answers to interview questions. As the university mission statement and governance processes through the Regents demonstrate the institution is focused on credentialing professionals and benefiting the state economy while providing limited education curriculum. The mission of Flagship University is to be "a high research activity, land-grant institution committed to undergraduate and graduate-research education with extension services responsive to [the state] and the region's business and community" (Flagship website, 2007). The mission statement does not reflect the traditional research, teaching and service emphasis that all respondents commented on was part of their campus role. Further, a recently adopted vision, values, and directions document which established a five year strategic plan does not specifically mention faculty service. Rather the university has adopted an outreach and engagement goal focused on agriculture extension and the delivery of programs primarily to improve efficiencies, promote access, recruit underrepresented populations and strengthen service learning (Flagship website, 2007).

The emphasis on students as customers is driven by enrollment needs. For the last several years new student enrollment has been flat and large numbers of students have been graduating which has resulted in a net enrollment loss. Enrollment management reports indicate university enrollment is down statewide by 1200 students since fall 2003 (Flagship website, 2007).

There is a general recognition among faculty respondents that serving the private good of parent and student stakeholders was being emphasized even if they did not appreciate the direction of the institution. Stakeholders according to respondents are part of an accountability mechanism. Joe Watts (Joe) Professor of Natural Resources in the College of Natural Resources and the University Ombudsman offered the following response when asked about external pressures on faculty to become more engaged in service: "Well I suppose the external demands that we would be talking about in this case would be the customers- the parents sending their kids to our good institution here." Chris Tester (Chris), Associate Professor of Counseling and Testing provided the following answer to the same question: "I think the big push now in terms of accountability is higher education is moving much more in kind of a business model direction. So in that regard the students are both our customers and our products." The VPSA summed up the recent changes and described the new emphasis as partly related to accreditation, but partly related to the institution "being willing to or feeling like we need to step back and reevaluate how we broadly define education and how broadly we deliver education."

Mirroring the strategic plan, service learning experiences are growing. These efforts are driven administratively and often have university learning outcomes attached. The VPSA described how the institution arrived at this arrangement which was:

> A conversation about our university level learning outcomes and trying to translate what those learning outcomes may mean in an academic discipline but also how student affairs might be a value to that academic discipline in achieving one of or more of those learning outcomes.

Faculty can choose to participate in service learning activities alongside students, but mostly they just structure class assignments using the service learning office as a clearinghouse.

Faculty bristled at this new direction. Elaine Clark (Elaine), an Associate Professor of Biomechanics feels the institution has capitulated to accountability pressures because student affairs has:

> Usurped the critical [teaching and learning], not in practice so much but in our mindset what I think are still really critical function of the university which is to prepare students with the learning they need, and the knowledge they need, and the skills that they need.

In a follow up questions about external pressures I asked if the accountability movement was positive for students and Joe stated the administrative involvement "creates a separation between the student and faculty." He further remarked students "don't get to know faculty on a one to one basis and I have had student's even complain about that."

The institutional direction due to declining enrollment and responding to demands for learning outcomes, have pressured the university to view students as customers and created some confusing faculty work expectations. The conflicting institutional messages and reward structure are not helpful in assisting faculty efforts to provide any level of service. The following section describes how faculty members interpret and perform student affairs service in the Flagship environment.

Confusing Roles and Expectations

The role of service in larger faculty work and how service is reflected in faculty roles and rewards is unclear to faculty. Faculty roles at Flagship are administratively established and published in the Faculty-Staff Handbook. Section 1565 Academic Ranks and Responsibilities defines academic rank and responsibilities. For promotion and tenure decisions as well as annual review purposes faculty are evaluated based on their position description. Since I was not privileged to review individual faculty member position descriptions, a review of the handbook

section delineating promotion and tenure requirements and annual reviews provides partial information for analysis.

Beyond the requirement of the appropriate credential, usually a terminal degree, the handbook enumerates the criteria for annual reviews such as effective teaching, scholarship in the form of creative activity, research, application, or performance. The handbook also discusses the importance of assessment of a faculty member's scholarship and the need for peer evaluation. There are sections on effective research programs, expectations for agricultural extension activity, administration, and the need to produce a professional portfolio as evidence of work accomplishments.

During document analysis of promotion and tenure requirements I discovered two subsections of Faculty-Staff Handbook focused on student advising and faculty service. The handbook states, "advising students, faculty, and/or staff is also important faculty responsibility and a key function of academic citizenship" (Flagship Faculty-Staff Handbook, 2007). Enumerated in the handbook was a list that includes the importance of overseeing course selection and scheduling; mentoring students to assist with career choices, class selection, and personal conflicts; advising student clubs and organizations; and facilitating undergraduate and graduate student research, as well as conference attendance. Effective advising performance is to be evaluated by peers and from student evaluations. Faculty may list the level of activity or accomplishments of groups and students they advise and any awards of accomplishments they received particularly those involving peer evaluation.

The Faculty Staff Handbook states: "Service is an essential component of the Flagship University's mission. Both extramural service and university service are the responsibility of faculty members in all units" (Flagship Faculty-Staff Handbook, 2007). The handbooks lists

what qualifies as service and states there is a hierarchy of participation. Faculty who actively participate in the life of the university, college and department through demanding roles or leadership positions are more highly valued than "those of a committee member or just regularly attending faculty meetings" (Flagship Faculty-Staff Handbook, 2007). In the handbook, service to students is not specifically listed but faculty are recognized for extramural "service to colleagues, co-workers, citizens, clients, collaborators, private and public organization and their representatives and government" (Flagship Faculty-Staff Handbook, 2007). Extramural service also includes leadership of professional associations, journal reviews or editorships and paid consultant activity.

Against the backdrop of evaluation of a faculty member's productivity in the areas of student advising and service it is clear that higher importance is assigned to activity that can be quantified or that raises the university's visibility with external audiences. Even with the language in the handbook respondent Elaine stated when answering the question, how do you define service: "We don't really have a good system for assessing impact. I think it should be something that has impact but we don't have a good system." Elaine went on to describe at length the challenges of assessing faculty service work for evaluation, tenure, and promotion as a faculty member and now department chair:

> Number one I probably didn't value it very much because it's not important for promotion and tenure ultimately. As a chair I actually value it more not in terms of quantity to take away from the teaching and research. I still think for folks that are moving in a tenure-track position you have to protect them. I think our jobs are too much. I think a three-fold mission for any one person is hard. But I really value it more because of what I perceive in higher education as how we have moved away from thinking of ourselves as organizations and parts of organizations and we reward complete autonomy and individual success period.

Joe reflected on evaluation a bit differently when I asked him to describe the weight given to service during tenure and promotion decisions. Joe stated the institution has gone to great

lengths to ensure position descriptions are aligned with work roles but that assessment remains a challenge:

> Ah, ha that's where it becomes a sticky wicket. While you are expected to do it [service] you better not do to much of it at the expense of research or you've had it. Research is still number one. We've gone through a lot of effort here to make evaluations in line with position descriptions but when it comes to tenure you better be able to count the beans and those beans as the number of refereed research publications. They can say what they want, but that's what it comes down to and beyond that it's nice if you are a good teacher and it's nice if you do a lot of service. But by gall until you get tenure you better at least tow the line on research and publishing.

Junior members of the faculty also understand the unwritten expectations at the institution. Sally Smart (Sally), Assistant Professor of Justice Studies, described witnessing a termination of a tenure-track faculty member who was not promoted because he was underweight in research and overweight in teaching and service. The termination came about amidst the change in reward structure and recent institutional research focus. Sally who was on the job just six weeks when the termination occurred said it sent the following message:

> Do the minimal amount of service that you possibly can because you need to publish. And that's where your focus needs to be. You still need to do your teaching but you need to publish. So we've kind of narrowed it down to promotion and tenure as focused on your publishing.

Elaine confirmed Sally's assessment when she said service is not valued and said, "I would say the practice is reflective of the weight. I think they match. I think there is no weight given to service and I think the tenure and promotion processes reflect that."

In analyzing how faculty involvement in service shaped perceptions about the institution the mixed institutional message around service manifested two additional insights. Because the overriding emphasis is to accomplish tasks associated with research and publishing respondents do not discuss service participation with colleagues. I asked every Flagship faculty respondent to reflect on the how their colleagues view their service on the conduct board and if anyone

influenced participation decisions. None of the faculty respondents in this study shared their service experiences with colleagues. When pressed for an answer to this phenomenon Joe gave a reply that sums up faculty sentiment. "I'm not sure how many know I'm even on it. But no, we pretty much support each other in whatever committee affairs we are involved in. Nobody either lauds me for it or holds it against me." Chris stated: "I don't know that I have ever really discussed my service with my colleagues." Failure to openly discuss service brings up an interesting issue for evaluation. How can committees and department chairs properly evaluate service when it is not discussed among colleagues given the context of peer evaluation called for in the faculty-staff handbook? The reluctance to discuss service limits knowledge of the practice among faculty and perpetuates a murky view of the activity on campus.

Another thematic dimension indentified at Flagship is that faculty who participate in extensive service provided less developed answers when asked to define service work rather than those whose service record was shorter. Chad Judge (Chad), Visiting Associate Professor in the College of Law defined service as an, "activity to benefit the college, the university, or the general population of the state or the U.S.." Chad's position is clinical and consists of significant interaction with students and external constituents. During the interview Chad acknowledged that research faculty off load student related service on him because:

> It particularly falls to clinical faculty to do that kind of thing because we are dealing with our students as colleagues practicing law. We act like a small law firm here and our students are like the associates and I am the supervising partner for their cases. As a result of that you end up giving them a lot of career advice and writing letters of recommendation.

Tricia Wallace (Tricia), Associate Professor of Toxicology, whose position at the university was defined 75 percent external service related to providing analysis of animal toxicology tests, had a difficult time defining faculty service:

> That's really a tough question and you probably won't get the greatest of answers from me because the way I have always defined service with regards to my role is serving the public and serving the state. So if you are defining service to the college it's slightly different but linked together. So when I said my job is 75 percent service what I do is I provide a service to our clients through the diagnostic laboratory.

The longest serving faculty member in my sample of respondents claimed to have never had to define service. Joe stated:

> How do I define service? That's a good question. I have never had to define that activity. I do it all the time and I have never had to define it. I guess assisting students or the community – community probably defined as professional, local, campus – with matters that are not classroom or research related.

As a land grant institution these faculty roles are commensurate with the university's historical roots. Some roles currently conflict with the institutions current research emphasis. It could be perhaps that those with less developed responses have been conditioned to not discuss service as openly as those with less extensive records. Or since some respondents see service as an integral part of their job they do not reflect as deeply as those trying to justify service as their work.

Due to the conflicting demands delineated above faculty independently develop a service ethos. Fortunately for Flagship, a sufficient number of faculty remain available to serve even though those that do recognize the challenge in the role. The next section of this chapter discusses how personal interest in student issues drives faculty to provide service to student affairs.

Personal Interest

Personal interest guides and motivates participation in all service activities including student affairs service work. Because faculty are not pressured to participate in student affairs service and the reward rubric mainly mentions extramural activities as service responses to

questions varied. The interest faculty had in student affairs service ranged from intellectual curiosity and professional obligations to understanding student culture and campus after dark. I asked Elaine how she became involved with the student affairs service and she remarked it was due to an interest to participate in a limited amount of service:

> I honestly tried to avoid a committee that met weekly and required a tremendous amount of my time. But secondly I just really found it interesting and it was a way to serve and engage with students which is something I really enjoy.

Sally said her service interests had a threefold motivation. She said: "It's motivated by, one my interest in the topic. Two, my need to get my service in. Three, the time commitment to this particular committee." According to the VPSA, faculty at the institution who are willing to give time to student affairs service is shrinking. The VPSA said, " I do think as the institution gets larger or the institution trends more towards a research institution these issues do become harder." The VPSA further noted a change in faculty demeanor towards students and their issues:

> The areas where we have seen a real spike of growth in this is as we have been asked to help with academic dishonesty issues, class behavior problems. In fact we have faculty who have simply almost abdicated some of their responsibility for classroom management asking and expecting student affairs to call "Bobby Jones" in and be the gruff uncle or the mean Dean and deal with it so the faculty person doesn't have to.

Despite its challenges faculty thrive on collegial relationships that occur from service and from out of class interaction with students. When asked why they continue to serve respondents indicated they benefited from the relationships they established on the committee and developed higher degrees of understanding about student culture on the campus from their service. Chris references the rewards of participation that enables contact with faculty peers: "Its certainly in all the committee work I have done in terms of being with other faculty there are some faculty that I probably never would have met had it not been for that committee work."

Elaine remarked the value of student contact from student affairs service is invaluable and stated, "I learned a lot on the judicial council that I would have never learned about students and student culture as a teacher in the classroom or having students work with me on research in the lab."

Conclusion

The main themes identified in this case are students as consumers, confusing roles and expectations, and personal interest. The current business like focus and student affairs-academic affairs efforts designed to highlight the value of a credential are allowing faculty to step back from service. Faculty do not appear eager to withdraw but educational conceptions are not shared with administrators. The university is hampered by a lack of resources and service expectations as they relate to student affairs are non-existent. Where service is recognized and rewarded, which is codified in the faculty handbook the focus is on external work. For example, the handbook makes specific references to external groups such as business organizations. The exceptions to this rule are clinical faculty roles which have service built into position descriptions. One faculty rank engaging in slightly more service to students are clinical faculty members who are having certain kinds of service duties assigned to them by academic administrators.

The previous three chapters have described components of faculty service to student affairs at three research universities on the West Coast. The following chapter provides a cross-case synthesis of identified institutional themes. Chapter 9 is a discussion of theoretical implications, suggestions for further research and practice, and conclusions.

CHAPTER 7: CROSS-CASE SYNTHESIS

The purpose of this study is to examine faculty service to student affairs at research universities. In conducting this research, I wanted to explore faculty service to student affairs and consider through a theoretical lens how service involvement is constructed. Three research universities on the West Coast were studied; Tradition University (TU), Green State University (GSU) and Flagship University (Flagship).

This chapter consists of a cross-case synthesis that describes the similarities, differences and prominent characteristics of the three cases as they relate to the research questions (Stake, 2006). The research questions below help guide the cross-case synthesis:

1. What role do faculty play in student affairs service?
2. How is student affairs service reflected in faculty roles and rewards?
3. What motivates faculty to be involved?
4. What role does service play in the larger context of faculty work?
5. How does faculty involvement in service shape faculty perception about the institution?

This chapter uses the case studies to provide a composite description of organizational, structural, and interpersonal factors contributing to or detracting from faculty service to student affairs at three Carnegie rated High or Very High research universities. The synthesis uses case examples to illustrate exemplar descriptions.

Theoretical Implications

This discussion will delineate a parsimonious display of the organizational and cognitive factors affecting faculty service to student affairs. The theoretical frame suggested in this analysis was reached by comparing the research constructs against the case data (Eisenhardt, 1989). Eisenhardt suggests that researchers in multicase studies "constantly compare theory and data – iterating toward a theory which closely fits the data. A close fit is important to building good theory because it takes advantage of the new insights possible for the data and yields an

empirically valid theory" (p. 541). In sum, during analysis a simpler theoretical framework emerged from the data, which are described in this chapter.

Thematically three dimensions emerged from the data, each having a subset of factors affecting faculty service to student affairs. These dimensions were policy and service participation model, symbolic or systemic institutional outlook, and faculty members perceived position utility. Analysis indicates campus policies and service participation models constrict participation in these cases. Further, campus cultures, as suggested by Berger (2002) were either symbolic or systemic. TU, classified as a symbolic campus, foments an inward looking institutional perspective. The symbolic campus is insular with its focus on improving academic programs, educating students, and maintaining status quo. Flagship and GSU as systemic institutions, look outward to peers or stakeholders for validation and this drives decision making and resource allocation. Both Flagship and GSU desire to improve grant and contract funding and are focused on identified stakeholder concerns as articulated in their respective mission statements.

The systemic or symbolic campus type impacts service to student affairs and the result is that systemic institutions have less student affairs service being performed by faculty. The primary factor for loss of service is fiscal and human resource issues as the systemic campuses struggle for funding. The main cognitive thematic dimension is position utility, which has several sub factors based on campus type. First is an integrated versus compartmentalized view of the faculty role. Second is the structural role as defined by a position description or a codified organizational role.

Cross-Case Themes

The study yielded significant information about the state of faculty service to student affairs at the three campuses. There are three primary themes and four subthemes arising from the cross-case synthesis. First is policy and participation model, which includes university policies, related to service and faculty recruitment methods. Second, organizational outlook that is driven by financial aspects of the three institutions. Third is a faculty members position utility developed by concepts of institutional citizenship, faculty type, and integration of scholarly identity with campus norms. The remainder of this chapter will alternate discussion between a focus on faculty respondents and institutional issues.

Policy and Service Participation Model

This section considers the research questions how student affairs service is reflected in faculty roles and rewards, as well as what role faculty play in student affairs service. Despite the volume of literature suggesting faculty play a crucial role in student development outside of the classroom there remains a gap between research and practice (Diamond & Adam, 2002; Kuh, Kinzie, Buckley, Bridges, & Hayek, 2006; Ward, 2003). An examination of these cases supports other research which suggests an ambiguous campus environment related to the roles and rewards for service (O'Meara, 2002; Rice, Sorcinelli, & Austin, 2000; Tierney & Bensimon, 1996). The results of this study show an environment where institutional groups, committees and administrators vie for a limited pool of available volunteers. There is no clear path to student affairs service and participation often results in serendipitous outcomes for the faculty member. This section examines the faculty service to student affairs phenomenon and provides relevant examples and comparisons between faculty type and institution.

The service component of the faculty role at research institutions in this study can be fulfilled with a number of options. Document analysis and respondent data demonstrates faculty can engage in service external to the university, in any number of university level committee assignments, elected positions on the faculty senate, or in ad hoc groups formed by administrators. Many roles are described in policy manuals and are official conduits for service. Many roles, and a direct competitor to the campus governance structure, are administratively driven. This study supports Birnbaum (2004) and Rice, Sorcinelli, and Austin (2000) research conclusions that conflict between a management culture and a faculty or shared governance culture are limitations to finding a balance in work expectations. In these cases there is an identifiable conflict between the desired direction of administrators and goals of the faculty, which are evident in policy documents and responses of participants.

Findings identified from the study through a review of governing documents did not generate a single mention of a defined faculty role for service to student affairs. General institutional service roles at all institutions received only cursory mentions. In fact, promotion and tenure guidelines and definition of faculty types merely list service as a requirement. Documents describing service list extramural examples and stress work in the profession over roles on campus. TU stood out for its defined responsibility at the faculty senate level to provide oversight to student services among others such as curriculum matters, budget and promotion and tenure. Ward (2003) in describing the "difference that difference makes" states that faculty at prestigious institutions often have more governance control than their counterparts at lesser known or lower performing universities (p. 60). However, TU like the other institutions in this study, did not prescribe the level or expectation of student affairs service participation by its

faculty. It was clear through this research that student affairs service at all three institutions studied is part of the larger institutional service mindset.

Where service distinctions are drawn at the three campuses they were around prominent external work. One example of this phenomenon is at Flagship where university tenure and promotion documents specifically place value on service to external constituents such as business or trade groups. While specific forms of service are rewarded, respondents discussing service to student affairs identified service work conflicts on campus that were disincentives to participation.

In answer to the research questions about motivators to faculty service, in large part faculty participation in service to student affairs is motivated by an identifiable outcome. However, as will be discussed later in this chapter faculty are also motivated by a sense of institutional duty. In this study there was a difference between administratively driven service work such as developing enrollment management models, designing educational seminars related to civic engagement, student retention efforts, and policy driven faculty service. Faculty respondents bristled at time spent completing esoteric reports or an outright rejection of an administrative service effort by their peers and preferred student affairs service appointments. Participation in student affairs committee work was an appointed role through the faculty governing body, with policy aims driving the work. Student affairs service in this study had an articulated purpose, as described in documents enumerating the functioning of the conduct process, and outcomes were easily defined by participants. According to Sally Smart, Assistant Professor of Justice Studies at Flagship, she used her prior administrative committee experience to choose her current appointment. When asked why she became involved with the conduct board Sally said, "I knew ahead of time the university judicial committee was going to be a fairly

moderate commitment. It was not going to be like meetings, you know, three hour meetings every week." Ward (2003) states this tension is not uncommon. "Service to students is valued but rarely rewarded, and time spent advising keeps the scholar from work that is rewarded. This is the crux of the tension so may faculty face in their work lives" (Ward, 2003, p. 59). Respondents were also equally critical of administrative service, working on project specific goals at the direction of a president, provost, dean or department head, than traditional service to student affairs.

In this study administrative respondents cited faculty engagement in service to student affairs as problematic. Primarily the issue is a dated recruitment model that relies on the goodwill of faculty to respond to calls for service. The next section describes the challenges of this passive system.

Recruitment Models

The most prominent observable fact among the cases was the passive models in place to recruit and retain faculty for service to student affairs. All faculty respondents when asked about how they got involved in student affairs service stated it was through the faculty governing body. The recruitment process is passive and consists of an annual mailing requesting faculty to return a response card indicating service roles they are interested from the committee on committees and parking to curriculum and promotion and tenure. No focused effort is given to promote service work, or its benefits to the campus or faculty member. Respondents described voluntarily returning a response card without knowing much about the obligation. In short, this is a passive recruitment model.

Overall, the low regard for service was illustrated by the respondents unanimous inability to reflect on any service that is revered by colleagues. Some faculty, such as Marvin Petrie,

associate professor of Physical Therapy at TU when asked to indentify service activity that receives the most support had to difficulty articulating and answer:

> I guess that's mostly administration, actually people who are a little, (laughter) ... I think although it's actually part of. I don't necessarily look at it as service its more of an academic issue. I suppose the mentoring of the junior faculty and mentoring of grad students probably receives as much attention as maybe anything else. Again it's not exactly a service issue. I can't think off the top of my head things that jump out.

Clearly communication about service between faculty, university leadership and student affairs administrators is poor or nonexistent.

Senior student affairs administrators were comfortable with the recruitment process and none indicated they were planning to request a change in the protocol from the faculty senate. Rather than attempt to change the system student affairs administrators have chosen to align their efforts with institutional priorities usually detailed in respective strategic plans. However, faculty respondents indicate they pay little attention to strategic plans or other accountability mechanisms beyond the departmental level. Faculty understand what matters most in their professional life on campus is the opinion of the department chair and peers since they are crucial evaluators for promotion and tenure or merit salary increases.

Stated institutional direction about general priorities and faculty viewpoints were notably not in synch. For example, Flagship's senior student affairs administrator expressed concern about the overall level of faculty engagement and empathy toward student issues, but has chosen to side step the challenge by inculcating deans, the provost, and president with his student affairs perspective with the hope that trickle down pressure and a seat at the leadership table will reverse the trend. Flagship VPSA reflected on the responsibility of student affairs units to engage faculty:

> To warm academic administrators to the work that we do as a part of telling our story and building credibility for the services that we provide. We simply can't sit back and lament the burdens that faculty have that somehow are disincentives for them to be involved. We have to do our part in making it easy for them.

Since faculty have individual agency to choose service participation across or outside the institution, they choose the service component that is most intriguing to them and that fits into their schedule. Faculty service to student affairs in this study elucidated a lurking curiosity of student life after dark, a genuine desire to assist students, or distrust of the campus administrators. Two of the three campuses were fortunate that this curiosity generated sufficient faculty response for committees to function. At Green State University (GSU) teaching faculty participation in most student affairs service has declined to the point where student affairs professionals have assumed the volunteer role. Faculty lament this change and some even recognize how it negatively impacts university operations, yet it continues. The faculty senate president at GSU expressed his concern about the lack of diversity in deliberative decision making which impacts the community:

> There is just a million little things that has to be done in order to have a reasonable quality of life and so there are a few hundred people out there, faculty members out there, who are having these deliberations making the decisions and making life bearable for everyone else. The problem is it's always the same people.

From a governance perspective student affairs employees are making decisions affecting university policy and students. GSU student affairs personnel give reason to question the objectivity of participants. Student affairs personnel at GSU have assumed a role that was once the sole domain of faculty. This shift is fundamental and depending on how deep the decision making authority of the group goes, marks a significant loss of faculty authority.

How important is structure and good communication between student affairs service participants? This study identified 16 of the 18 faculty respondent do not participate in any

unstructured student affairs experiences. Unstructured service would be involvement in student organizations outside the discipline that supports co curricular education. For example, this type of service would be classified as advising a fraternity or sorority, student organization, or a cocurricular club. This finding mirrors the recent conclusions offered by Porter (2007) who found in an analysis of the 1999 National Study of Postsecondary Faculty (NSPF) that service is generally limited to institutional initiatives. In the cases under study student affairs service obligations represented the majority of a faculty members service commitment and respondents were comfortable with the effort citing other work obligations. A conclusion to be drawn from this work is that clear intake procedures, operational guidelines and identifiable outcomes are needed if faculty are expected to serve.

Organizational Outlook

A faculty members understanding of the institutional organizational outlook addresses the research question about how faculty involvement shapes perceptions about the university. The theoretical framework in Chapter 2 describes Berger's (2002) model of symbolic and systemic campuses in the following ways. Symbolic models exemplify ceremonies, ritual, and history as significant artifacts influencing organizational decisions. At symbolic institutions a distinctive ethos is apparent on campus that signals or provides cues to suggest parameters to individual behavior. The systemic model can be characterized by the college's concern about its reputation among external constituencies that influences program and policy development. Systemic organizations identify competitors that compete for the same students, the administrative leadership looks beyond the campus for solutions and disciplinary affiliation is more important than college loyalty to most faculty (Berger).

Generally, organizational outlook undergirds all the themes in this study. However, it was most notable in the discussions about financial resources. There was a large disparity in funding sources for all three institutions and it became apparent during site visits that resource acquisition both promoted overall service and service to student affairs, yet as acted a barrier when administrative pressure called for increasing grant and contract funding.

Finances

Financial and personnel resources exacerbated the problem of finding willing volunteers at Flagship and GSU. Administrative respondents at these institutions acknowledged an over burdened faculty and persistent fiscal issues. Flagship and GSU respondents stated they were receiving central administrative pressure to increase external funding and that the pressure placed limits on the ability of faculty to volunteer. Where faculty members at Flagship and GSU were involved in service to student affairs or specifically university level service it was in administrative problem solving roles in areas like enrollment management and strategic planning. However, the administrative participants respondents referred to were not regular members of the faculty, rather they represented administrative roles from departments or colleges.

On the other hand, respondents at TU do not mention financial or personnel resources as roadblocks to service. A direct comparison between TU and the other two institutions using the IPEDS common data sets yields a 50 percent difference between faculty to student ratios indicating that personnel issues may play a role in service participation and the willingness of faculty to collaborate in student affairs initiatives. Kezar (2001) identified fiscal resources as increasing the likelihood of successful collaborations between academic affairs and student affairs units. While collaborations cannot be specifically defined as service, they enhance or

create new relationships and open doors to new possibilities for participation in service to student affairs. Certainly this example could be compared to NSSE data examined by Kuh, Kinzie, Schuh, and Whitt (2005) in the book *Student Success in College: Creating Conditions that Matter*.

Another difference between TU and the land grant institutions was service participation for profile raising purposes. TU faculty recognizes that university service raises visibility in the campus academic community. Visibility allows access to or creates relationships with power brokers that faculty can use to build support for their academic unit. When asked about his motivation for service TU Professor Albert Glass remarked:

> This is a huge university and trying to get to know people in other units, your college administrators, your deans, associate deans, provost all the way up to the president. You have to work at that. It's just not going to happen by accident and you need, I think you need to be aware that it is important for you to know these people.

At Flagship and GSU it appears that rank and file faculty were limited in their ability to affect decision making primarily because resource allocation decisions were made administratively by deans and department heads followed by consultation with faculty leaders. TU faculty are more empowered and independent in their roles while Flagship and GSU were more restricted and dependent on administrators. This conclusion is supported at all faculty levels at participating institutions. The proactive versus reactive approach to resource acquisition is striking between institutions and suggests a less empowered faculty group at land grant universities. Flagship Associate Professor Elaine Clark suggested faculty were apathetic and reactive in their response to administrative decisions:

> When I first got here one of the things that really struck me on this campus was how disengaged I perceived faculty to be with faculty council and faculty governance issues and the only time faculty got upset was when something didn't

> go their way. But it was very reactive. What I perceive is a pretty reactive state instead of a proactive state and I don't see that has changed a lot.

Fiscal issues create dynamics where faculty must focus more time on finding external resources which detracts from engaging in service work. Based upon the responses and participant types at the Flagship and GSU a severe strain in evident. Flagship faculty providing service to student affairs were mostly without an active research agenda or contract faculty with assigned clinical roles. Only one member of the judicial board at Flagship was a junior faculty member, and she had been effectively socialized in graduate school to navigate the research, teaching, and service requirement.

GSU resources were notably thin when looking at the physical plant maintenance, age of facilities and budget reductions due to decreased state allocations. A reduced number of faculty and pressure to generate external funding meant there was no teaching faculty providing service to the conduct board. Further, the institution's faculty in residence program was connected to an enrollment management model. Of the eight faculty in residence positions only one was academically linked and this faculty member was compensated based on his success in running the entrepreneurialship program. Bob Smith, GSU's Director of Housing and Conference Services informed me that the seven other faculty in residence simply lived in the buildings and had minimal expectations on their student contact. These in residence individuals ranged in employment rank from graduate student and lecturer to assistant professor.

The next section in this chapter discusses how faculty service to student affairs differs by faculty view of their position utility. Not only is there a dated recruitment model and financial concerns, many faculty report the role and reward structure to be confusing and flawed. As the respondents will illustrate in the section to follow, faculty with term or clinical appointments have greater opportunities or pressure to serve than their tenure-track peers.

Position Utility

Faculty service to student affairs is contingent on the attention faculty give to the utility of their role. As previously stated a faculty member's concept of position utility is a motivating factor for service. This understanding is formed by interaction with faculty peers, administrators, and students. This study supports the assertion that service significantly develops as faculty become accomplished scholars (Blackburn, Bieber, Lawrence, & Trautvetter, 1991; Braxton, Luckey, & Helland, 2002). This study defines utility as the centrality faculty place on their role as it relates to their input into institutional quality of life issues, respect by peers, and the rewards of promotion and tenure. Further the data suggests that faculty with an integrated view of their role have a more developed service perspective and engage in more service work than faculty with a compartmentalized viewpoint (Ward, 2003). Five of 18 faculty in this study had compartmentalized views of their work. Compartmentalized faculty were employed at Flagship and GSU, and they exhibited ambivalence about the research, teaching, and service role. Overall the group of five was not interested in taking the risk to veer from the recognized reward structure and become immersed in a significant faculty service project. To describe the overall theme of position utility this discussion focuses on institutional citizenship issues, faculty type considerations and role integration.

Institutional Citizenship

While manifested differently at each campus respondents all cited institutional citizenship issues as influencing their service to student affairs. Institutional citizenship as defined in this study are work behaviors which support the full mission of the university. Factors motivating faculty to engage in service to student affairs was evenly divided among respondents between personal interest and faculty type factors. However all faculty respondents acknowledged that

some form of service was required for promotion and tenure and while they may have initially become involved to check off a box on an evaluation, their current service has much deeper meaning. Institutional differences were apparent along governance and ideological lines with the strongest desire being expressed at TU to thwart central administration initiatives, poorly conceived policy changes or academic priorities related to students. Since there is a less defined student affairs service role for rank and file faculty at Flagship and GSU the motives for service were primarily personal.

Promotion and tenure demands are the impetus for service with all but a few respondents. However, following a student affairs service appointment and the development of a deeper understanding of institutional issues and culture through service, these cases illustrate how faculty become a member of the university community. Flagship's Tricia Wallace, Associate Professor of Veterinary Toxicology reflects on the question how student affairs service has developed or reinforced the personal viewpoint about the institution:

> Recognizing how 17 years later that I probably spend more time with my day doing things that are not written in my job description. That there is a lot more I think to what I define as being a good faculty member and providing service to the college than just what's on your job description and I have become less tolerant of people and I hate to say that, but less tolerant of people who are unwilling to give back. … I feel that with a lot of my interactions with my colleagues and with my students it has made me a better person.

From citing an obligation or duty to serve to fighting for campus quality of life issues faculty learn their involvement makes an impact. Respondents said student affairs service, as opposed to other types of committee work, results in identifiable outcomes rather than ongoing debates, esoteric reports that are shelved, or direct conflict with colleagues who disagree with your position. A finding from this research identified the reward faculty receive for student

affairs service is the affirmation of educational values and foundational issues that drew many of them to academe.

Another finding from this research is that personal factors expressed by faculty included empathy toward students and their personal issues, ability to be successful at the institution, and a desire to understand student culture. Some of the desire to understand student culture was akin to lurking after dark and was not expressed in concerned tones but rather based on curiosity. Senior faculty who previously held departmental and institutional leadership roles were more relaxed about student issues and applied knowledge gained from student affairs service in their current position. Associate professors and non tenured faculty expressing empathy about student concerns had previously identified with the common developmental or personal issues afflicting students (Chickering, 1969). GSU faculty members interviewed frequently mentioned concerns about students and their personal issues. GSU Associate Professor Scott Seebert said offered the following response when asked why he continues to provide service to student affairs:

> I have a certain, it's certainly an understanding of student life drawn from experience. I suffer from depression so I understand that sometimes you cannot be yourself and behave badly and you put pressure on yourself and you just make a bad decision. So, I thought it was important to be there on a committee that really can determine a student's future as a student.

These faculty demonstrated a desire to assist student navigation through developmental and transitional issues and were most likely to be the part of a group with a limited to non-existent research agenda.

Faculty respondents at TU stood out because all respondents cited an obligation to serve. Obligations were defined as a work role, a form of civic engagement, and collegial expectation. Beyond an obligation this faculty group expresses a significant degree of cynicism toward university administrators. All faculty were able to recall battles, confrontations and poor

decision making affecting students that their service helped to rectify. Tradition's Law Professor Lisa Justice remarked, "You know the board is not at all afraid to say you have crossed the line, you have went too far to whoever and in that case it's the president." Pope (2004) theorized governance participation motivated by cynicism required faculty to use all available resources to change the behavior of organizational decision makers. Birnbaum (2004) offers a competing theory for such behavior and instead suggests this form of shared governance is important for social institutions to function properly with checks and balances and a focus on education. It is important to note this is an enlightened view following service engagement. This is particularly interesting in light of the faculty senate mandate to share governance with the university president. However, TU respondents were particularly critical of administrators who they viewed occupied transient roles and did not have the best interests of faculty, college, or university at heart.

Expectations Differ by Faculty Type

The role service plays in larger faculty work is easily identified in an analysis of faculty type and the next section of this chapter which discusses role integration. Student affairs service is classified as part of institutional service at the three institutions in this study. None of the institutions in this study specifically rewarded student affairs service in the promotion and tenure process or for the purposes of annual performance reviews. Student affairs service when rewarded was due to written position descriptions or assignments by the department chair to a work group. Faculty respondents stated there was a general lack of understanding of service outside the department or college and therefore it was not rewarded at all. One specific issue was raised at all three campuses which was that student affairs service was difficult to measure or quantify. Flagship University Assistant Professor Sally Smart (Sally) picked up on the

confusion over faculty roles at her institution and is already planning to ameliorate the problem by keeping her service commitments low:

> It's like Ok, I see service as important but I also see how it is or is not valued within each department, each college and the university as a whole, and think that kind of has kept me from being more involved than I might otherwise be.

This response is consistent with other studies on faculty service (Tierney, 1997; Tierney & Bensimon, 1996)

Respondents stated that because of the problems measuring service outcomes it is often skipped over during promotion and tenure evaluations or annual reviews. The inability to measure service in the same way as research and teaching has resulted in a process where service is merely an appendage of faculty work rather than integrated into the whole of faculty work. Respondents stated service work for evaluation purposes could be likened to a check off procedure whereby it is simply noted that some work was completed. Even though a review of tenure and promotion documents and participant responses indicates changes have been made to better embrace various scholarly efforts the campus culture has not changed. Tradition University Associate Professor Marvin Petrie acknowledges the low weighting service receives in promotion decisions while acknowledging the slow changes occurring at his institution:

> It clearly receives some weight and I think the process has gotten more better, reasonable. There still is no question that scholarship is by far and away the huge bulk of, certainly gets the most attention in terms of promotion. Teaching next to that and I would say service and administration probably next to those. So service gosh I don't know how much I could quantify that, five percent of the decisions maybe something like that.

The experiences of respondents in this section are backed by research emphasizing that policies and work expectations have changed on paper but are complicated and slow to transform practice (Amey, 1999). For example researchers have found in service engagement surveys of senior academic officers that "expectations for these activities [service] are not increasing at the

same rate of research expectations, and that faculty seem to be increasingly required to excel in everything that do simultaneously" (O'Meara & Braskamp, 2005, p. 229). Further as described by Rice (1996) and Ward (2003) academic priorities do not occur by happenstance and faculty must plan their service engagement within the institutional context being highly aware of historical pressures, while being adept at integrating service into the whole of academic life.

Considering rewards as incentives for faculty, the structures were skewed toward research and teaching. A review of case descriptions for the faculty role demonstrates there is a value placed on specific kinds of service and documentation is available on each campus detailing acceptable forms of service. GSU's Lori Story has been a participant in conversations about promotion and tenure guidelines and the discussion breaks down when the topic turns to service:

> In our deliberations about the new P & T guidelines there is a minimum percent standard for scholarship and I every time the subject came up I asked why we don't have a minimum percent standard for service and nobody will answer the question.

Each institution rewards service to the academic discipline or external audiences such as institutional stakeholders that raises the profile of the faculty member and institution. Nowhere in the cases was it confirmed that student affairs service is a professional benefit for the participant. Reforming culture is difficult and these results reflect O'Meara's (2005) conclusions about institutional definitions of acceptable scholarship. An example of the practice at TU is service to prestigious journals or associations. The effort is recognized but only to determine a faculty members prominence in the field which in turn elevates the department and institution among academic peers.

Tenured respondents at the Flagship and GSU stated they negotiated a larger service role into their position description. In the case of clinical and contract faculty at all three campuses

service was defined in position descriptions as part of the professional role. At two campuses, TU and GSU, emeriti faculty provided service to student affairs. Finkelstein (2003) states the role of contract faculty defined as full-time term appointments, like those in this study, will continue to grow. Therefore, the faculty roles at Flagship and GSU validates Finkelstein's prediction. Overall it is clear that the varying faculty types at all three campuses have different service expectations with clinical and emeriti members having less dissonance around the concept of service.

Clinical faculty in law and medicine working with graduate students are responsible for socialization of students into a profession and report deeper relationships and greater contact with students. Faculty in clinical positions participate in student affairs service as a direct result of a rewarded professional role. Motivation to serve was no different than research faculty but the work role allowed for more student contact making student affairs service more likely.

Professional roles for clinical and emeriti beyond instruction were out of class mentoring of students, program coordination which required supervision, and writing professional references. Clinical and emeriti faculty recalled that in these roles they become sensitized to issues affecting students whether they are academically related or personal and the result is a deeper engagement in cocurricular issues. Moreover, this group recognized an obligation to participate in student affairs service that research faculty had little time to complete. Clinical faculty viewed service as rewarding and they integrated modalities of teaching and service into a single conception of their role. Because of the integration of the role clinical and professional faculty did not reflect deeply on their service and were more pragmatic about university life than research faculty. This finding is important to understand in the larger faculty employment

pattern identified by Finkelstein, Seal, and Schuster (1998) in that service as part of the work load for full time faculty will continue to be a significant issue.

Integration

An analysis of the respondents interviews and university records indicates the role of service in larger faculty work was similar between the three institutions and 18 faculty respondents. However, there were operational differences in faculty responses for graduate and professional programs and elite departments. Integration of scholarly identity to fit the norms of the campus is the single largest identifiable theme between respondents and their institutions. Analysis further concluded that institution identity and the range of issues each campus faces differed as did the quality of the service experience, validation by peers and acknowledgement of service on the vita by faculty and institutional type.

The research reported here identified a gulf between faculty perceptions of their obligations and larger accountability issues discussed by many administrators. A majority of respondents indicated accountability and a concern for learning outcomes was not a faculty issue. With the only exception being faculty who were current and former department chairs, respondents demonstrated significant difficulty reflecting on questions about governmental and accrediting accountability. TU Faculty Senate President Gwen English provided the following pragmatic response about external accountability:

> We recognize that the pressure is out there. I don't know if this is true on your campus, but on this campus it's sort of like, and the Bush administration will be over with soon and then Margaret Spellings will go away. That idea about accountability has been sold in ways that don't have a whole lot to do with what we do. I certainly discovered that in terms of working with the legislatures. I spent a good year and a half on a committee that was created by the legislature to do standards for English for entering 1st year students, and I think they thought that we were going just give them a multiple choice test. Or let's all just do AP. In fact, what we came up with was a solution they are not particularly enamored

> with and that was you have to change the last two years of high school so there is better articulation.

The primary assumption made was that accreditation demands were the responsibility of the central administration or college leadership to resolve. When accountability concerns were expressed the general theme was related to consumers demands for university programs and enrollment issues. None of the faculty respondents connected student affairs service with university learning outcomes, while student affairs leaders articulated vision statements, civic engagement opportunities, and faculty in residence programs as examples of meeting the pragmatic demands of connecting classroom pedagogy with life experiences. This finding is particularly interesting noting the various calls for engagement described by Ward (2003).

Analysis of these cases concludes that student affairs service performs the vital function of making large and complex universities feel smaller and creating awareness among faculty around student issues or concerns. Integration in these cases occurs when service activity is performed. These results support earlier findings about the role of faculty service (Lynton, 1995; Rice, Sorcinelli, & Austin, 2000; Ward, 2003). Student affairs service connects students and student affairs practitioners with faculty for robust out of classroom conversations around pragmatic issues in the community. Tradition's Gwen English stated:

> It hooked me because you really did get to consider- Is this good for the students? Is this something they can do? What's the difference between a B.A. and a B.S. in a science department? Why would a science department want to give a B.A.? Would those students be disadvantaged if they come out with B.S.? I mean getting to consider those kinds of things.

The cases describe the cultural fabric of the campuses and the historical relationships between campus constituents. The cultural fabric at Flagship and GSU is fraying under the weight of contemporary issues such as finance and changing faculty roles. Faculty service to student affairs is historically bound in policy manuals, and perceptually contemplated as the

norm while not in line with current workload expectations. Student affairs service is reliant on the good of faculty or casual contact and relationship development between faculty, administrative leaders, and student affairs staff. However, because faculty are free to choose service obligations those who elect to participate in student affairs service tend to have personal motivation factors unrelated to their discipline. Flagship's Joe Watts provided the following insights when asked about the benefits of student affairs service to the conduct board:

> Its most interesting thing I do on campus cause I kiddingly call it campus after dark. You see what the kids are getting into out there. Most faculty have no idea about that side of life on campus and every case is different and interesting. … I think it's really a great way to keep campus safe place where one can pursue ones education without misbehavior that can disrupt that process.

Regardless of the reasons for student affairs service it broadens perspectives that can be used in the discipline for instructional or research purposes and provides learning opportunities for the faculty member.

Since student affairs service takes faculty out of their department and focuses on broader aims it exposed the respondents to real life examples of service in action. These examples combined with research institution socialization developed cognitive dissonance among some respondents. Cognitive dissonance is defined by psychologists as having conflicting thoughts about an issue which then creates mental tension as the individual attempts to reconcile the disparate beliefs or knowledge (Festinger, 1957).

At Flagship and GSU a level of misunderstanding, if not resentment, was detected of faculty who are perceived to be performing significantly more service than their peers. Flagship's Sally Smart called the phenomenon "service gone wild." In this study "service gone wild" appears to be a misperception of faculty work. Social norms theory, used in research on campus environmental management, works from the premise that personal actions are often

based on misinformation or misperceptions of our environment (Berkowitz, 2005). Incorrect perceptions about others, in this case that a few faculty accomplish the majority of the service work, causes dissonance among faculty respondents. At Flagship Elaine reflected on this perspective:

> I don't see faculty engaged in a lot of service on this campus. There are some faculty who do a lot. Individuals and you see them doing 20 things. I mean I've got one guy in mind that he seems like he's on every committee. And he is great, he does an excellent job. I'm glad he's on them. But I don't know how he has time to do his teaching and his research. I don't mean that as a criticism but what I mean is so we have got a few faculty like him and others that are very fully engaged much more so than they probably should be and I think it's because there is not full engagement by the rest of the faculty.

In these cases the dissonance was brought about by the few cases of prolific service that are frequently discussed in collegial groups. However, in discussing the totality of service work by faculty throughout their careers, and extant research on service, it would appear there is balance and only a few outliers among the respondents actually do an overwhelming amount of service. Respondents who fit the outlier description are tenured faculty without a research agenda who really occupy a managerial and administrative role. Citing these examples it is hard to characterize service as anything other than completing an assigned work obligation.

Confusion about service is exacerbated by the fact that faculty respondents in these cases do not talk about service experiences with campus colleagues. Respondents stated they share research agendas, papers, issues about instruction and complaints about the administration but rarely do they talk about the rewards of service work. Tradition's Dan Mountain when asked to reflect on his service work and compare it to his peers said, "University service its hard to judge. We don't often know what other faculty are doing on different committees so I'd say probably average." This theme carried over into the contents of faculty members' vitas. While total institutional and professional service participation identified by respondents during interviews

was roughly equal across all three campuses, faculty at TU list few service entries and focus more on their disciplinary work than their counterparts at Flagship and GSU.

Obviously some of these differences can be accounted for by institutional mission and faculty classification. However, because student affairs service is such a small portion of overall faculty service work, combined with the pluralistic ignorance communicated during interviews it is difficult to conclude that service alone significantly informs faculty about campus norms or culture. For example, attending sporting and cultural events, eating lunch in the student union, reading the newspaper or participating in departmental activities may provide as many learning opportunities and feelings of connectedness to a campus as service.

Conclusion

Three primary themes emerged from the cross-case synthesis which are policy and participation model, organizational outlook and position utility. Chapters four through six provide detailed descriptions of the cases as to elucidate the context of the phenomenon under study. The composite description offered here establishes the context in which faculty service to student affairs takes place at three purposefully selected research institutions. Faculty in this study engaging in service within the student affairs framework does so within the context of faculty governance. All respondents acknowledged their service efforts were mainly unrecognized and misunderstood by peers. The benefits of faculty service to student affairs are an opportunity for the participant to understand the campus culture, students and exercise institutional citizenship rights for the betterment of the educational community. The composite description of the cases and accompanying themes provide grounding for a discussion of theoretical implications, suggestions for further research and practice, and conclusions offered in the final chapter.

CHAPTER 8: OVERALL CONCLUSIONS, RECOMMENDATIONS FOR RESEARCH AND PRACTICE

The purpose of this study is to understand faculty service to student affairs. A multiple-case study method was used to collect and analyze the data as reported in the four previous chapters. The focus of this chapter is a discussion of the overall themes elucidated from the theoretical framework, conclusions about the identified phenomenon and recommendations for further study and practice.

Eighteen faculty and seven student affairs administrators at three research universities were interviewed for this study. Two institutions, Flagship University (Flagship) and Green State University (GSU), have historical and policy driven expectations that collide with current institutional demands resulting in confusing expectations. Tradition University (TU), the third campus in this study, has succeeded in clinging to a governance model that provides oversight to student affairs functions with individual impetus for service centered on protecting or advancing academic functions. At Flagship and GSU the reduction in the role faculty service to student affairs comes at a time when external accountability pressures placed on institutions call for greater student-faculty contact (Kuh, Kinzie, Buckley, Bridges, & Hayek, 2006; Kuh, Kinzie, Schuh, & Whitt, 2005).

Overall Summary and Conclusions

The findings from the case studies suggest that Flagship and GSU exhibited a systemic organizational outlook and TU was symbolic in nature. Communication problems and the challenges working in the ambiguous service environment were concerns of respondents. Further, in completing this research it has become clear that faculty service to student affairs is integrated into a larger institutional mindset dependent upon a faculty member's social

construction of their role. The systemic and symbolic view of organizations is a good method for understanding faculty and staff work role behavior. Even though there have been many calls for service respondent faculty has not made the mental leap that differentiates this form of service from a myriad of other contributions.

To summarize, the systemic campuses were concerned with external issues such as increasing research funds, student recruiting models, state budget reductions, and consultant driven efforts for improvements in education delivery methods. The symbolic campus used a historical shared governance model to provide specific service to student affairs. The systemic campuses demonstrated a weaker faculty role in student affairs, and inconsistent perspectives about the value or purpose of student affairs service. Berger (2002) identified these university organizational norms as variables contributing campus culture and factors influencing learning outcomes. While Berger's study was focused on student learning outcomes the findings indentified organization culture attributes impact a community. Respondents at systemic campuses consistently identified fiscal and human resources as excuses limiting opportunities for service involvement. The most pronounced example at GSU revealed an almost complete retreat from policy driven service roles to student affairs by teaching faculty. Both systemic campuses echoed a consistent refrain of limited faculty involvement due to the push to increase grant and contract funding. Further, the outward looking view accompanying the systemic model competes for human resources due to the duplication of effort by academic administrators appointing faculty to ad hoc groups. Administrative work adds to the shortage of faculty available for service because the faculty ranks are already small due to attrition factors. Faculty respondents at systemic campuses indicated less satisfaction with the direction of the institution and ambivalence about the centrality of their role in the academic community.

At TU the focus of the faculty was on internal issues impacting delivery of education, department standing within the institution, and shared governance concerns. The ethos apparent at TU promoted faculty service to student affairs as an institutional duty and the role of the faculty in this regard was mandated by policy. TU faculty are more assured of their role and the centrality of their work in the life of the institution. Respondents had a firm and developed grasp on work expectation in research, teaching, and service. In particular, the service ethos had deep roots in governing documents and practice. The institutionalization of this faculty service role did not necessarily mean the campus has a robust student affairs unit, rather it ensured faculty concerns about student life, mainly academic, were frequently discussed or debated.

All campuses had poor communication and education structures around service. Structured service opportunities of the kind examined in this study relied on passive recruitment methods and the belief that faculty understood service expectations. This study determined that faculty did develop a service ethos on their own. The ethos was serendipitous in nature. The research suggests that senior faculty are more deeply engaged in a myriad of service activities than their junior peers. With three exceptions faculty in this study were associate or full professors. When junior faculty were in a service role institutional factors, such as budget shortages and programming initiatives could be pointed out as the impetus for service. Researchers have concluded that this phenomenon can be attributed to fact that senior faculty tend to have developed research agendas and thus can spend more time in service (Blackburn, Bieber, Lawrence, & Trautvetter, 1991; Braskamp, Trautvetter, & Ward, 2006). Also, at research universities where promotion and tenure is the focus faculty tend to be careful about overall service involvement (Ward, 2003). This research partially supports this claim, but adds a new dimension suggesting that position titles and defined position roles combined with an

increased emphasis to generate research grants have reduced the senior scholar's role at systemic universities. Research also demonstrates that some professions, particularly humanities and social sciences complete more service, and this study supports those conclusions at the institutional level (Braxton, Luckey, & Helland, 2002). A review of curriculum vitas, respondent reported negotiated workload, and differences between clinical and research faculty which differed by campus were a similar to the conclusion offered by Finkelstien (2003).

A review of respondent curriculum vitas demonstrates differences in how faculty report service work. TU faculty with the exception of the FAB chair list no student affairs service engagements under the vita heading institutional service even though most reported during interviews participating in several opportunities at various junctions in their careers including the current faculty appeal board role. This finding is not unlike that of Ward (2003) who stated service purposively removed from the vita or tenure review file. This suggests TU faculty make no distinction between institutional service efforts unlike their peers at Flagship and GSU. Faculty service at TU is weaved into faculty work rather than being an effort that expects a reward. At the two systemic campuses nine out of ten respondents reported at least one student affairs service role and four out of ten reported two or more appointments. Interestingly differences between general university service and professional service were less pronounced between campuses. However the service commitment was more significant at TU in terms of position, professional stature and impact on the campus. Table 8.0-1, provides the aggregate service counts by campus.

Table 8.0 -1. Respondent vita listings of service activity.

	Student Affairs Service	Institutional Service	Professional Service
Flagship University	8	47	53
Green State University	9	84	34
Tradition University	0	67	36

The symbolic or systemic campus type did not appear to affect total service participation as much as policy defined roles, negotiated work load and clinical versus research faculty type. A review of respondent appointment types yields a balance of participants from all career stages with the exception of the assistant professor role at the symbolic institution. Differences in governance methods, which in turn influence philosophical orientations, were clear. Symbolic campuses had governance documents requiring faculty oversight of student issues, while at systemic campuses faculty with clinical appointments and unique career trajectories had more involvement.

An integrated view of the faculty role versus a compartmentalized perspective increases the likelihood of volunteering for service to student affairs. Faculty respondents indicating a compartmentalized viewpoint tended to view student affairs in competition with academic issues, or could not identify the value of the service role in the larger scope of the institution. Faculty with integrated perspectives have affirmed an individual set of values that are grounded in their view of the professoriate. This grounding has links to a historical role for faculty (Finkelstein, 1984). Such a role is attuned to campus and professional quality of life issues and certainly to the importance of their academic specialty in the life of the institution. Thematically all faculty acknowledged gaining a deeper understanding of campus culture as a result of their student

affairs service. Common responses were understanding campus after dark, empathy for student issues, insight into behavioral trends, and oversight of administrative decision making.

Because no training occurs around the topic of faculty service to student affairs, whatever cognitive perspective a faculty member develops is influenced by their interaction with the environment, but more importantly by their willingness to volunteer for work that is not compensated and mostly unrecognized by peers. At the symbolic campus one theme stood out in contrast to the systemic institutions and that was the consistent centrality of the academic mission as it related to students.

Governance and Culture

Research on faculty service has primarily examined three main themes; time spent on task, gender and ethnicity issues, and as an obstacle to promotion and tenure (Blackburn & Lawrence, 1995; Fairweather, 1996; Finkelstein, Seal, & Schuster, 1998; Laden & Hagedorn, 1998; Perna, 2001; Tierney & Bensimon, 1996; Turner, 2002; Turner & Myers, 2000). Further, the extant body of literature on service work at the committee level provides little scholarship to which to compare these findings (Kezar & Eckel, 2004). However, since most institutional service resides in a constellation of work that could be described as governance related we can turn to the literature on organizational culture and shared governance for a perspective.

First are the differences suggested by Birnbaum (2004) in hard versus soft governance models. Birnbaum postulated soft governance models, or shared governance such as the type found at TU, provides opportunities for the collective development of perceptions. "The essence of soft governance is embedded in the socialization and expectations of the participants; institutions justify their behaviors, participants their roles and society its support, based on their consistency with processes roles, and missions established in the past" (Birnbaum, 2004, p. 10).

In contrast, hard governance like the kind found at Flagship and GSU, suggests more of a business model in operation. "Rational systems are based on calculations of cost benefit analysis, and are set in place to maximize the likelihood that certain desirable outcomes occur in the future" (Birnbaum, 2004, p.10).

The governance models at work at Flagship and GSU are hard and TU's is soft which explains the respondents perspectives as they conflict with or support occurrences in the environment. Earlier Birnbaum (1988) concluded the decentralization of campus authority had led to a vicious circle of retreat and retrench. "Unable to influence a larger institution, faculty retreat into the small subunit for which they feel affinity and from which they can defend their influence and status" (Birnbaum, 1988, p. 17). Respondents in this study indicated that committee work was one "retreat" used for collegial support and a feeling that they contributed to the campus environment. This point is particularly salient on the systemic campuses considering budget issues, external challenges affecting campuses and the pressures applied by committee chairs to keep up with institutional goals.

The reaction from participants in this study can be traced to the culture of faculty as a profession. As suggested by Kuh and Whitt (1988) the professoriate is a subculture built on the rituals and traditions of "academic freedom, the community of scholars, scrutiny of accepted wisdom, truth seeking, collegial governance, individual autonomy, and service to society through the production of knowledge, the transmission of culture and education of the young" (p. 76). Significant differences between the campuses, particularly around funding issues and enrollment, have driven administrative change at Flagship and GSU. Austin (1990) postulated changes to the larger organization when affecting faculty "threaten to weaken the core cultural values of the academy" (p. 66). Taken to its extreme the conflicts identified by respondents at systemic

universities threaten to disrupt cultural norms by calling into question the traditional work values held by faculty. At TU, a symbolic campus, service is one way faculty maintain some control and exercise their authority. The exercise of authority helps maintain faculty values previously discussed.

In *Images of an Organization*, Morgan (2006) suggests culture as a metaphor for understanding organizations. "Organizational structure, rules, policies, goals, missions, job descriptions, standardized operating procedures perform a similar interpretive function, for they act as primary points of reference for the way people think about and make sense of the contexts in which they work" (p. 139). Morgan frames cultural theory from a business perspective, which is a model that Flagship and GSU faculty are reluctantly being forced to adopt. The symbolic and systemic cultures of the cases in this study provide an organizational framework that signals to faculty and staff what is valued, accepted, required, and rewarded. However, faculty respondents this study were confused by mixed messages around service and what appears to be inconsistencies between policy and practice.

Higher education culture, when contrasted with Morgan's (2006) perspective, is admittedly different in that campus constituents challenge or question the process much more than corporate structures (Peterson & Spencer, 1990) . Williams, Berger and McClendon argue (2005) in an adaption of Schien's schema of organizational values that an individual's socially constructed reality is dependent on connectivity to the campus community. The authors' state that the further a person steps into the core of an organizational culture the more complex the interactions and the greater the possibility that how they perceive the institution differs from a peer. "Individuals across campus who easily share an understanding about the purpose of the bookstore, for example, may share very little about the educational benefits of an inclusive

campus environment or even what constitutes academic excellence (Williams, Berger, & McClendon, 2005). This research finds student affairs service helps faculty understand the organization functioning of campus and sharing of common educational frames.

Research also suggests that for faculty service activities to be successful they need to be funded and supported at all levels of the institution. This study found that the financial health of a campus was a factor contributing to reduced service to student affairs. When financial concerns and a desire to increase grant and contract funding was a message from the university administration faculty responded by reducing service participation.

Support can be fiscal such as providing office space, faculty release time or staff support. Other support can be through the campus leadership structure by emphasizing the value of service (Singleton, Burack, & Hirsch, 1997). The examination of the support mechanisms for student affairs service at all three campuses would suggest the symbolic campus provides structural, administrative, and psychological support to carry out the activity on a campus wide basis. At the systemic campuses the service effort was compartmentalized and the responsibility of each unit was to organize and execute.

The findings of this study suggest institutions should consider the importance of organizational perspectives as a way to understand faculty decision making. The symbolic or systemic model provides significant cues for expected work behavior. Considering the body of research previously outlined there is theoretical support for the conclusions suggested by this research. Scholars should continue to examine faculty service to student affairs for further evidence on structural and personal factors enabling service.

Recommendations for Future Research

This study addresses faculty service work to student affairs using student conduct as an example at selected research institutions. This research examined a portion of faculty service that is described in the literature as governance participation. These findings suggest that more study is needed around the topics of the definition of service, how campus type affects student faculty interaction, individual faculty member conception of their work at a research university and what are the administrative barriers to service. Based on the findings of this study I make the following recommendations for further research.

Significant work remains around is issue of defining faculty service and how it is evaluated for the tenure and promotion process or annual review. This study focused on the faculty service to student affairs phenomenon, yet it found respondents had difficulty defining their service work. Further, faculty in this study lumped together a multitude of work from serving on ad hoc groups and departmental committees to the service effort under study. Clearly some service being conducted by faculty is administrative work and should be dropped from the service conception in a research, teaching, and service workload. Most respondents recognized that their service work was undervalued even though it made important contributions to student learning and the quality of life at their institution. More research should be conducted to clarify or define a common definition of service and how it can be linked to research and teaching. In addition, research is needed to develop a service evaluation rubric that faculty or department chairs could use to determine effectiveness or impact on institutional mission and student learning outcomes.

More research should be conducted into how symbolic or systemic institutions function at the macro level. Defining and evaluating service is important, however if campus leaders,

faculty, and constituents do not understand the organizational culture driving their campus most service efforts will continued to go unrecognized. Whether it is fiscal health, enrollment management, total research capacity, or organizational concepts grounded in shared governance, the emphasis placed on these issues defines the symbolic or systemic campus. A symbolic or systemic academic community has implications for teaching, learning, research, service, and quality of work life.

Applied research should examine quality of life within institutions purportedly addressed by faculty service. This study determined that a faculty member's conception of their work role was a factor contributing to service. For example, one focus should be trust and respect issues as evidenced by the cynical view and lack of empowerment felt by faculty in this study. Researchers should consider how faculty could be motivated to engage in the total work of an academic community. This study found that the fiscal health of an institution impacts everything from class size, academic programs, and hiring. However, do faculty recognize academic traditions they may value become further frayed under the weight narcissistic behavior? After all historically as a community of scholars academe has been self governed.

This study focused on faculty service to student affairs but did not address structural factors inhibiting this form of service. What are the administrative barriers to service? Do student affairs units provide sufficient resources and training to enable faculty to support students at a time of significant mental and emotional development? What tangible and intangible rewards motivate faculty to engage in a robust interaction with students? These questions and many others should be addressed to assist faculty who may struggle with integrating their scholarly identity into the culture of campus life.

Implications for Practice

The reduction in the full time faculty and continued specialized research agenda continue to make finding willing service participants difficult (Finkelstein, 2003), especially in the current environment where research is the focus. The current environment calls for an evaluation of service models to determine where it is imperative faculty provide input. Practitioners should consider how policy, faculty socialization and education, and the functional role of student affairs impart participation. As a result of engaging in this research three policy and practice recommendation for faculty and student affairs professionals have become evident.

First, service should be properly defined and deliberated at the campus, college, and department level so there is consistency in the research, teaching, and service evaluation rubric. In this study it was determined institutional policy drives faculty service output. All campuses in this study had well defined descriptions for evaluating teaching and research. None of the campuses had policy language enumerating or for evaluating service. Practitioners working in this area would be advised to work at the department level to initiate conversations because this is the focal point of many faculty members understanding of their institution. Developing a coalition of departments and departmental leaders that could approach the governing system has more promise than a top down approach.

Second, faculty socialization to campus and education about the importance of service is a necessity. Respondents' answers to interview questions and a review of campus documents did not describe campuses with functional groups of administrators and faculty engaged in critical conversations about student affairs service. However, since this study has clarified that student affairs service is conceptually on the minds of faculty members, holistic conversations about institutional service and education need to take place on campuses. New faculty orientation

should include a discussion about institutional service and provide a specific definition based on campus norms. Faculty also need to be educated about the role of student affairs, history of the professoriate and external issues such as accountability, mandates, and stakeholder demands that drive decision making. Faculty senates and work groups should include institutional service in discussions about institutional citizenship and campus quality of life issues. Campuses should clarify what institutional citizenship is and how it affects the campus community. Finally, all faculty should openly discuss their institutional service commitments because as this study also demonstrates ignorance of service opportunities is a barrier. Faculty discussion should take place at the departmental level where this research demonstrates the reward and loose supervisory control structures exist that would reward service.

Third, student affairs practitioners must understand the concepts of faculty life and not assume faculty have been educated about service expectations or the role service can play in the research life of the faculty member. Student affairs practitioners need to understand the differences between faculty type and workload expectations. New methods of communicating the benefits of service, improved recruitment models, and education with all stakeholders must occur. Student affairs practitioners must not rely on faculty appointed models for service. Student affairs leaders need to go beyond accepting the common refrain from faculty that they are busy and find ways of linking faculty concepts of their role to service opportunities. This study has support for the assertion that faculty are willing to make a service commitment if they can organize the work around their scholarly identity.

Conclusion

Hoekema (1996) suggested more than a decade ago that the changes in higher education have brought about "a gradual separation between the academic program of the college and the

realm of college life" (p. 6). In recent months three high profile shooting incidents have occurred on campuses across the country with the most significant being the deaths at Virginia Tech. The shootings have caused policy makers at all levels, campus presidents, and police agencies to draft or implement elaborate action plans for indentifying mental or emotionally unstable students or stopping violence as it occurs. Much of these conversations involve student affairs professionals and certainly the responsible person in the event of a student crisis will be the senior student affairs officer. How much faculty involvement is part of these planning or response efforts?

My own personal experience demonstrates faculty will have not been a part of this conversation yet they represent the greatest level of contact with the students on a daily basis. What research has gone into the appropriateness or effectiveness of the models being implemented? How much of the violence could be stopped with appropriate faculty intervention or participation on governance committees that engage in work responding to distressed students? Can faculty service to student affairs ameliorate these difficult issues? Only with the passing of time will we conclude that the efforts were futile or effective.

This study suggests faculty service to student affairs is primarily a policy driven role. However, the monolithic structure that parcels out service engagements in under attack by forces attempting to change higher education imperatives. Service itself is not under fire, but the unintended consequence of adopting aggressive institutional research agendas has limited faculty participation in student affairs service. Aggressive efforts to increase grant and contract work and utilization of faculty time on administrative projects is part of this problem.

Each campus has unique challenges engendering faculty support for service to student affairs. The symbolic campus in this study espoused what could be described as traditional

academic values and appeared to have an easier task supporting some service as long as it was theoretically linked to the academic enterprise. Systemic campuses evidenced disparate approaches to service that ranged widely. Faculty completing service work on a systemic campus had less clear participatory obligations and fewer research obligations.

On an individual level all faculty respondents demonstrated care and advocacy for students and their issues. Because little professional gain occurs from faculty service to student affairs respondents discussed their expanded view of institutional issues and student concerns. In most cases respondents were able to point to collegial benefits and an enhanced understanding of their institution. The largest personal gain between all respondents was a sense that their service work made a difference in the life of a student and the institution.

REFERENCES

American Association of University Professors (1990). Statement on government of colleges and universities. Retrieved February 9, 2006 from http://www.aaup.org/statements/Redbook/Govern.htm

American Association of University Professors (1972). 1940 Statement of principles on academic freedom and tenure with 1970 interpretive comments. Retrieved March 31, 2006 from http://www.aaup.org/statements/Redbook/1940stat.htm

AAU. (2006). Association of american universities. *About AAU* Retrieved June 21, 2006, from http://www.aau.edu/aau/aboutaau.cfm

ACE. (1937). Student personnel point of view. Retrieved June 1, 2007, from http://www.naspa.org/pubs/StudAff_1937.pdf

Amey, M. J. (1999). Faculty culture and college life: Reshaping incentives toward student outcomes. *New Directions for Higher Education, 1999*(105), 59-69.

Astin, A. W. (1977). *Four critical years* (1st ed.). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

August, L. W., J. (2004). Culture, climate, and contribution: Career satisfaction among female faculty. *Research in Higher Education, V45*(2), 177-192.

Austin, A. E. (1990). Faculty cultures, faculty values. *New Directions for Institutional Research, 17*(4), 61-74.

Bailey, C. A. (2007). *A guide to qualitative field research* (2nd. ed.). Thousand Oaks: Pine Forge Press.

Berger, J. B. (2002). The influence of the organizational structures of colleges and universities on college student learning. *Peabody Journal of Education, 77*(3), 40-59.

Berkowitz, A. D. (2005). An overview of the social norms approach. In L. Lederman, L. Stewart, F. Goodheart & L. Laitman (Eds.), *Changing the culture of college drinking: A socially situated prevention campaign* (pp. 143–214). Creskill, NJ: Hampton.

Birnbaum, R. (1988). *How colleges work: The cybernetics of academic organization and leadership* (1st ed.). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Birnbaum, R. (2004). The end of shared governance: Looking ahead or looking back. *New Directions for Higher Education, 2004*(127), 5-22.

Blackburn, R. T., Bieber, J. P., Lawrence, J. H., & Trautvetter, L. (1991). Faculty at work: Focus on research, scholarship and service. *Research in Higher Education, 32*(4), 385-413.

Blackburn, R. T., & Lawrence, J. H. (1995). *Faculty at work: Motivation, expectation, satisfaction*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University.

Bogdan, R., & Biklen, S. K. (2003). *Qualitative research for education: An introduction to theory and methods* (4th ed.). Boston: Allyn and Bacon.

Boyer, E. L. (1990). *Scholarship reconsidered: Priorities of the professoriate*. Princeton, N.J.: Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching.

Braskamp, L. A., Trautvetter, L. C., & Ward, K. (2006). *Putting students first: How colleges develop students purposefully*. Bolton, MA: Anker.

Braxton, J. M., Luckey, W. T., & Helland, P. (2002). *Institutionalizing a broader view of scholarship through boyer's four domains*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Brubacher, J. S., & Rudy, W. (2003). *Higher education in transition: A history of american colleges and universities* (4th ed.). New Brunswick, N.J.: Transaction Publishers.

Bucher, G. R., & Patton, J. J. (2004). What would boyer do. *About Campus, 9*(2), 2-7.

Chickering, A. W. (1969). *Education and identity*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Colby, A. E., Beaumont, T., & Stephens, E. J. (2003). *Educating citizens: Preparing america's undergraduates for lives of moral and civic responsibility*. San Francisco: John Wiley & Sons.

Cooper, J. E., & Stevens, D. D. (2002). *Tenure in the sacred grove: Issues and strategies for women and minority faculty*. Albany: State University of New York.

CRAC. (2003). Regional accreditation and student learning: Principles for good practices (pp. 1-4). Washington DC: Council of Regional Accrediting Commissions.

Dannells, M. (1997). *From discipline to development: Rethinking student conduct in higher education*. Washington, DC: George Washington University, Graduate School of Education and Human Development.

Denzin, N. K., & Lincoln, Y. S. (2000). *The handbook of qualitative research* (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks: Sage.

Denzin, N. K., & Lincoln, Y. S. (2005). *The sage handbook of qualitative research* (3rd ed.). Thousand Oaks: Sage.

Diamond, R. M., & Adam, B. E. (2002). *Field guide to academic leadership* (1st ed.). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Dungy, G. J. (2003). Organization and functions of student affairs. In S. R. Komives & D. B. Woodard, Jr. (Eds.), *Student services: A handbook for the profession* (4th ed., pp. xxxi, 724 p.). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Eaton, J. (2003). *Is accreditation accountable? The continuing conversation between accreditation and the federal government*. Washington, DC: Council for Higher Education Accreditation.

Einarson, M. K., & Clarkberg, M. E. (2004). Understanding faculty out-of-class interaction with undergraduates students at a research university, *Association for the Study of Higher Education*. Kansas City.

Eisenhardt, K. M. (1989). Building theories from case study research. *Academy of Management, 14*(4), 532-550.

Fairweather, J. S. (1996). *Faculty work and public trust: Restoring the value of teaching and public service in american academic life*. Boston: Allyn and Bacon.

Fairweather, J. S., & Beach, A. L. (2002). Variations in faculty work at research universities: Implications for state and institutional policy. *The Review of Higher Education, 26*(1), 97-115.

Festinger, L. (1957). *A theory of cognitive dissonance*. Evanston, IL: Row.

Finkelstein, M. J. (1984). *The american academic profession*. Columbus, OH: Ohio State University.

Finkelstein, M. J. (2003). The morphing of the american academic profession. *Liberal Education, 89*(4), 6-15.

Finkelstein, M. J., Seal, R. K., & Schuster, J. H. (1998). *The new academic generation: A profession in transformation*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University.

Hoekema, D. A. (1996). College life in america: Historical context and legal issues. *New Directions for Student Services, 1996*(73), 3-17.

IPEDS. (2007). The integrated postsecondary education data system (Vol. 2007): Institute of Education Sciences, United States Department of Education.

Jorgensen, R. (2006). National survey of student engagement 2006. (pp. Student Research Data). Pullman, WA: Student Affairs Research and Assessment.

Kaplin, W. A. (1985). *The law of higher education: A comprehensive guide to legal implications of administrative decision making*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Kezar, A. (2001). Documenting the landscape: Results of a national study on academic and student affairs collaborations. *New Directions for Higher Education, 2001*(116), 39-51.

Kezar, A. (2004). What is more important to effective governance: Relationships, trust, and leadership, or structures and formal processes? *New Directions for Higher Education, 2004*(27), 35-46.

Kezar, A., & Eckel, P. D. (2004). Meeting today's governance challenges. *Journal of Higher Education, 75*(4), 371-399.

Kezar, A. J. (2003). Achieving student success: Strategies for creating partnerships between academic and student affairs. *NASPA journal, 41*(1), 1-21.

Krathwohl, D. R. (1997). *Methods of educational and social science research: An integrated approach* (2nd ed.). New York: Longman.

Kuh, G. D., Douglas, K. B., Lund, J. P., & Ramin-Gyurnek, J. (1994). *Student learning outside the classroom* (Vol. 8). Washington, D.C.: ERIC Clearinghouse on Higher Education.

Kuh, G. D., Kinzie, J., Buckley, J. A., Bridges, B. K., & Hayek, J. C. (2006). What matters to student success: A review of the literature, *National Symposium on Postsecondary Student Success*. Washington, D.C.: National Postsecondary Education Cooperative.

Kuh, G. D., Kinzie, J., Schuh, J. H., & Whitt, E. L. (2005). *Student success in college: Creating conditions that matter*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Kuh, G. D., & Whitt, E. J. (1988). *The invisible tapestry: Culture in american colleges and universities*. Washington, D.C.: George Washington University.

Laden, B. V., & Hagedorn, L. S. (2000). Job satisfaction among faculty of color in academe: Individual survivors or institutional transformers? *New Directions for Institutional Research, 2000*(105), 57-66.

Lynton, E. A. (1995). *Making the case for professional service*. Washington, D.C.: American Association for Higher Education.

Maxwell, J. A. (1996). *Qualitative research design: An interactive approach*. Thousand Oaks: Sage.

Miles, M. B., & Huberman, A. M. (1994). *Qualitative data analysis: An expanded sourcebook* (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks: Sage.

Morgan, G. (2006). *Images of organization*. Thousand Oaks: Sage.

Nuss, E. M. (2003). The development of student affairs. In S. R. Komives & D. Woodard (Eds.), *Student services: A handbook for the profession* (4th ed., pp. xxxi, 724 p.). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

O'Meara, K. A. (2002). Uncovering the values in faculty evaluation of service as scholarship. *The Review of Higher Education, 26*(1), 57-80.

O'Meara, K. A. (2005). Encouraging multiple forms of scholarship in faculty reward systems: Does it make a difference? *Research in Higher Education, 46*(5), 479-510.

O'Meara, K. A., & Braskamp, L. (2005). Aligning faculty reward systems and development to promote faculty and student growth. *NASPA Journal, 42*(2), 223-240.

Pascarella, E. T., & Terenzini, P. T. (1991). *How college affects students*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Pascarella, E. T., & Terenzini, P. T. (2005). *How colleges affect students: A third decade of research* (Vol. 2). San Francisco: Jossey Bass.

Perna, L. W. (2001). Sex and race differences in faculty tenure and promotion. *Research in Higher Education, 42*(5), 541-567.

Peterson, M. W., & Spencer, M. G. (1990). Understanding academic culture and climate. *New Directions for Institutional Research, 1990*(68), 3-18.

Pfeffer, J. (1982). *Organizations and organization theory*. Boston: Pitman.

Pope, L. M. (2004). A conceptual framework of faculty trust and participation in governance. *New Directions for Higher Education, 2004*(127), 75-84.

Porter, S. R. (2007). A closer look at faculty service: What affects participation on committees? *The Journal of Higher Education, 78*(5), 523-541.

Rice, R. E. (1996). *Making a place for the new american scholar*. Washington, DC: American Association for Higher Education.

Rice, R. E., Sorcinelli, M. D., & Austin, A. E. (2000). *Heeding new voices: Academic careers for a new generation*. Washington, D.C.: American Association for Higher Education.

Singleton, S. E., Burack, C. A., & Hirsch, D. J. (1997). Faculty service enclaves. *AAHE Bulletin, 49*(8), 3–7.

Stake, R. (2005). Qualitative case studies. In N. K. Denzin & Y. S. Lincoln (Eds.), *The sage handbook of qualitative research* (3 ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Stake, R. (2006). *Multiple case study analysis*. New York: Guilford.

Stoner, E. N. I., & Lowery, J. W. (2004). Navigating past the "spirit of insubordination": A twenty-first century model student conduct code with a model hearing script. *Journal of College and University Law, 31*(1), 1-78.

Tierney, W. G. (1997). Organizational socialization in higher education. *Journal of Higher Education, 68*(1), 1-16.

Tierney, W. G., & Bensimon, E. M. (1996). *Promotion and tenure: Community and socialization in academe* (Vol. 1). Albany, NY: State University of New York.

Tinto, V. (1993). *Leaving college: Rethinking the causes and cures of student attrition* (2nd ed.). Chicago; London: University of Chicago.

Turner, C. S. V. (2002). Women of color in academe: Living with multiple marginality. *Journal of Higher Education, 73*(1), 74-93.

Turner, C. S. V., & Myers, S. L. (2000). *Faculty of color in academe: Bittersweet success*. Boston: Allyn and Bacon.

Ward, K. (2003). *Faculty service roles and the scholarship of engagement*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Williams, D. A., Berger, J. B., & McClendon, S. A. (2005). *Toward a model of inclusive excellence and change in postsecondary institutions*. Washington, D.C.: Association of American Colleges and Universities.

Yin, R. K. (2003). *Case study research: Design and methods* (3rd. ed.). Thousand Oaks: Sage.

APPENDIX A. INTERVIEW PROTOCOLS

Faculty Interview Protocol

Introduction

1. The purpose of this study is to understand faculty service to student affairs. I am interested in learning your perspective on student affairs service at this institution. This interview is one way I will be exploring the phenomenon. I will also be making observations and collecting other artifacts such as documents during my campus visit. Your answers will be helpful to my understanding of service so I encourage you to provide as detailed a response as possible.

2. Before proceeding I need you to read and sign a human subject consent form which is required when research involves people. The form describes purpose and benefits, procedures, risks and confidentiality safeguards for participants in this study. This interview will be recorded and the data stored in an encrypted file. Aggregate data will stored indefinitely and interview material will be destroyed after one year. You can withdraw from the study at any time and you may refuse to answer any question asked. I do not anticipate participation in this study poses any risk to you or that you will receive any benefits from participation. Do you have any questions regarding the human subject protocol?

3. Do you have any questions before we begin?

4. Unless you have other questions, I am going to begin recording this interview.

Research Questions

Part 1 Demographics

Highest/Terminal Degree Institution
Length of current employment
Faculty Rank
Department/Other university position duties (i.e. academic coordinator, chair)
Research activity level (self defined)
Race
Gender Identity

Part 2 General Faculty Service

1. How do you define service?

2. Tell me about your involvement in service on campus and in the community?
3. How would you characterize your involvement in service relative to your peers?
4. Which institutional service activities on campus receive the most faculty support? Why?
5. Describe your institution's actual tenure and promotion practices reflecting on the weight given to service?
6. How is service reflected in your promotion and tenure documents?

Part 3 Faculty Service to Conduct Board

7. How did you come to be involved with the (Faculty Appeal Board) judicial conduct board and what is your length of service?
8. Why do you serve on the judicial/conduct board?
9. Tell me about how your colleagues view your service on the conduct board? Has this opinion influenced your participation?
10. What do you see as the importance of having faculty involved in the judicial/conduct board process?

Part 4 Faculty Service to Student Affairs

11. Tell me about your involvement in any student affairs service.
12. A lot of campuses are concerned with accountability and meeting external demands, how do you see that faculty involvement in service to student affairs is part of that process?
13. Tell me about any student affairs initiatives you have been a part of from the planning stages.
14. What role do you see faculty playing in student development?
15. Has service reinforced or developed any particular viewpoint you hold about the institution? What?
16. Is there anything else you would like to add?

Faculty Senate / Student Affairs Interview Protocol

Introduction

1. The purpose of this study is to understand faculty service to student affairs. I am interested in learning your perspective on student affairs service at this institution. This interview is one way I will be exploring the phenomenon. I will also be making observations and collecting other artifacts such as documents during my campus visit. Your answers will be helpful to my understanding of service so I encourage you to provide as detailed a response as possible.

2. Before proceeding I need you to read and sign a human subject consent form which is required when research involves people. The form describes purpose and benefits, procedures, risks and confidentiality safeguards for participants in this study. This interview will be recorded and the data stored in an encrypted file. Aggregate data will stored indefinitely and interview material will be destroyed after one year. You can withdraw from the study at any time and you may refuse to answer any question asked. I do not anticipate participation in this study poses any risk to you or that you will receive any benefits from participation. Do you have any questions regarding the human subject protocol?

3. Do you have any questions before we begin?

4. Unless you have other questions, I am going to begin recording this interview.

Research Questions

Part 1 Demographics

Highest/Terminal Degree Institution
Employment length at institution
Position Title
Department/Other university position duties
Race
Gender Identity

Part 2 Service

1. Describe the organization of the faculty senate/ faculty governance on your campus.

2. Tell me about the level of collaboration the faculty senate has with student affairs and/or with academic affairs. Can you give examples of any ongoing projects?
3. Provide some examples of how faculty is involved in service to student affairs.
4. How do you go about identifying faculty to be involved in student affairs service?
5. Describe the typical faculty member involved in service to student affairs. i.e. gender, rank, academic department, etc.
6. What do you see as barriers to faculty service?
7. What do you see as enablers to service?
8. Is there a push to have more faculty involved in service to student affairs?
9. Can you tell me about any attempts to increase faculty student contact due to accountability pressures and accrediting standards?
10. In your opinion what can be done to gain greater faculty participation in student affairs service?
11. Do you have any additional perspective to offer?

APPENDIX B. RESPONDENT DEMOGRAPHICS

Table A.0 -1. Tradition University respondents demographics

Name	Rank & Title	Years Employed	Race & Gender	Other Duties
Marvin Petrie, Ph.D.	Associate Professor, Physical Therapy	23 years	Caucasian Male	Div. head Physical Therapy
Bob Smith, M.D.	Professor Emeritus, Medicine	21 years	Caucasian Male	Clinical Director
Lisa Justice, J.D.	Professor of Law	25 years	Caucasian Female	None
Albert Glass, Ph.D.	Professor of Classics	19 years	Caucasian Male	Department Chair
Dan Mountain, Ph.D.	Professor of Earth and Space Sciences	33 years	Caucasian Male	None
Gwen English, Ph.D.	Professor English Literature	17 years	Caucasian Female	Faculty Senate President
Ervin Fry, M.A.	Vice Provost for Student Affairs	25 years	Caucasian Male	None
Dina Needa, M.A	Special Asst to the Vice Provost	15 years	Caucasian female	None

Table A.0 -2. Green State University respondent demographics.

Name	Rank & Title	Years Employed	Race & Gender	Other Duties
Al Eber, Ph.D.	Professor Emeritus, Animal Science	31	Caucasian Male	
David Chase, M.A	Director, Office of Student Conduct	4	Asian Male	None
Joe Gaines, Ph.D.	Assistant Professor of Business	3.5	Caucasian Male	Faculty in Residence
Lori Story, Ph.D.	Assistant Professor of Ethics	18	Caucasian Female	Faculty Senate Executive
Rory Hopper, Ph.D.	Vice Provost for Student Affairs	12	African-American Male	Interim Dean, Liberal Arts
Max King, Ph.D.	Professor of Engineering	18	Caucasian Male	Faculty Senate President
Scott Seebert, Ph.D.	Associate Professor of History	16	Caucasian Male	
Tom Easton, Ph.D.	Assistant Professor of Agribusiness	2	Caucasian Male	Faculty in Residence
Bob Smith, J.D.	Director of Housing and Conference Services		Caucasian Male	1/25 time College of Education Faculty

Table A.0 -3. Flagship University respondent demographics.

Name	Rank & Title	Years Employed	Race & Gender	Other Duties
Bo Gravel, Ph.D.	Vice Provost for Student Affairs	33	Caucasian Male	Interim Vice Provost Academic Affairs
Sally Smart, Ph.D.	Assistant Professor Justice Studies	1.5	Caucasian Female	None
Beth Tippins, M.A.	Director, Student Judicial Services	5	Caucasian Female	
Joe Watts, Ph.D.	Professor of Natural Resources	33	Caucasian Male	University Ombudsman
Elaine Clark, Ph.D.	Associate Professor of Biomechanics	6	Caucasian Female	None
Chad Judge, J.D.	Visiting Associate Professor of Law	8.5	Caucasian Male	Director Legal Aid Clinic
Tricia Wallace, DVM & Ph.D.	Associate Professor of Veterinary Toxicology	16	Caucasian Female	1/25 at Nearby Research U.
Chris Tester, Ph.D.	Associate Professor of Counseling	22	Caucasian Male	

APPENDIX C. CONSENT FORM

WASHINGTON STATE UNIVERSITY
CONSENT FORM – INTERVIEW

Researcher: Chris Wuthrich, Graduate Student, Department of Educational Leadership and Counseling Psychology, College of Education. Telephone 335-9745

Researchers' statement

I am asking you to be in a research study. The purpose of this consent form is to give you the information you will need to help you decide whether to be in the study or not. Please read the form carefully. You may ask questions about the purpose of the research, what I would ask you to do, the possible risks and benefits, your rights as a volunteer, and anything else about the research or this form that is not clear. When I have answered all your questions, you can decide if you want to be in the study or not. This process is called 'informed consent.' I will give you a copy of this form for your records.

PURPOSE AND BENEFITS

This project will interview faculty members who adjudicate violations of the student conduct codes at institutions defined by the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching as meeting to requirements for designation as Very High and High research productivity. The research design is a qualitative study using interviews. The participants will be asked to respond to a series of open-ended questions about their perception of how faculty perceive and meet service expectations to student affairs in the 21st century. The respondent may receive no benefits from participating in the project.

PROCEDURES

The participants will be asked to respond to a series of open-ended questions related to their perception of student affairs service. The duration of the interviews is expected to be 1 hour and the session will be tape-recorded for transcription purposes only. Recordings will be kept in a locked cabinet and destroyed after transcription. Participants may choose to not answer any question or to end the interview at any time.

RISKS, STRESS, OR DISCOMFORT

There are no risks associated with personal interviews. No questions of a personal or confidential nature will be asked.

OTHER INFORMATION

There will be no confidential data retained and the identity of the project participants will not be disclosed in the final report. All personally identifiable material will be kept solely by the researcher and destroyed at the conclusion of the class project. Data obtained from interviews will be used in narrative form for analytical purposes, submitted as part of the requirements for the Ph.D., and potentially published.

MEDICAL RECORDS ACCESS

No Medical Records are required in order to participate in this project.

Chris Wuthrich_____

Printed name of researcher Signature of researcher Date

Subject's statement

This study has been explained to me. I volunteer to take part in this research. I have had a chance to ask questions. If I have general questions about the research, I can ask one of the researchers listed above. If I have questions regarding my rights as a participant, I can call the WSU Institutional Review Board at (509) 335-9661. This project has been reviewed and approved for human participation by the WSU IRB. I will receive a copy of this consent form.

_____

Printed name of subject Signature of subject Date

APPENDIX D. CONDUCT BOARD DUTIES

Tradition University
Faculty Appeal Board Organization and Duties

Administrative Review by the Faculty Appeal Board

(1) The Faculty Appeal Board may conduct administrative review when exceptional circumstances do not exist or the student has not requested a formal hearing. When the Faculty Appeal Board determines that administrative review is appropriate, the chair shall notify all parties of that decision. The notice to the parties shall include a statement of:

(a) The allegations of misconduct against the student;

(b) The sanctions that were recommended by the initiating officer or the University Disciplinary Committee, if any;

(c) A date by which any voluntarily submitted written briefs or statements must be submitted.

(2) When the Faculty Appeal Board conducts an administrative review, the board may base its review on:

(a) All documents and any recordings considered by the initiating officer or the University Disciplinary Committee; or

(b) Oral and/or written argument of both parties; or

(c) Additional evidence.

(3) At the conclusion of its review, the Faculty Appeal Board shall enter an order. An initial order may be appealed and a final order may not be appealed, except that final orders of dismissal shall be reviewed by the President or the President's delegate. The student shall be provided with a written order which shall include a written statement of the board's decision within ten days of the conclusion of the review and information on rights of appeal, if any. In a case involving an alleged sexual offense, both the accuser and the accused shall be informed of the outcome of the review. In a case where the student is a minor, the board's decision may be reported to the student's parents or legal guardian at the discretion of the chair of the Faculty Appeal Board.

Formal Hearings Before the Faculty Appeal Board

(1) The Faculty Appeal Board shall conduct a formal hearing when exceptional circumstances exist and the student has requested in writing a formal hearing. Additionally, the Faculty Appeal Board may conduct a formal hearing in other circumstances as the board deems appropriate.

(2) Within thirty days after receipt of a written petition for a formal hearing before the Faculty Appeal Board, the board shall notify the requesting party of any obvious errors or omissions in the party's petition, request any additional information the board wishes to obtain and is permitted by law to require, and notify the requesting party of the name, mailing address, and telephone number of an office or person who may be contacted regarding the formal hearing.

(3) Within ninety days after receipt of a written petition for formal hearing or within ninety days after the party's response to a timely request from the board as provided in subsection (1) of this section, the board shall either deny the formal hearing or commence the formal hearing.

(4) Once the board decides to conduct a formal hearing, the chair of the Faculty Appeal Board shall schedule the time and place of the hearing and give not less than seven days advance written notice of the hearing to all parties. That notice shall include:

(a) The names and addresses of all parties to whom notice is being given, and if known, the names and addresses of their representatives;

(b) The name, business address, and telephone number of the person designated to represent the University at the hearing;

(c) The official file number and name of the proceeding;

(d) The name, mailing address, and telephone number of the chair of the Faculty Appeal Board;

(e) A statement of the time, place, and nature of the hearing;

(f) A statement of the legal authority and jurisdiction under which the hearing is to be held;

(g) A reference to the particular sections of University rules that are involved;

(h) A short and plain statement of the charges against the student; and

(i) A statement that a student who fails to attend the hearing or otherwise respond to this notice may lose his or her right to a formal hearing.

(5) If a student fails to attend or participate in a formal hearing, the Faculty Appeal Board may serve upon all parties a default or other dispositive order which shall include a statement of the grounds for the order. Within seven days after service of a default order, the student may file a written motion requesting that the order be vacated, and stating the grounds relied upon.

(6) The student may be represented by counsel and/or be accompanied by an advisor of the student's choice. No student shall be compelled to give self-incriminating evidence.

(7) The chair shall determine whether discovery is to be available, and, if so, which forms of discovery may be used. The chair may condition the use of discovery procedures on a showing

of necessity and unavailability by other means. In exercising such discretion, the chair shall consider:

(a) Whether all parties are represented by counsel;

(b) Whether undue expense or delay in bringing the case to a hearing will result;

(c) Whether the use of discovery will promote the orderly and prompt conduct of the proceeding; and

(d) Whether the interests of justice will be promoted.

The chair may decide whether to permit the taking of depositions, the requesting of admissions, or any other procedures authorized by Rules 26 through 37 of the Superior Court Rules.

(8) At appropriate stages of the hearing, the chair may give all parties an opportunity to submit and respond to briefs, proposed findings of fact and conclusions of law, and proposed initial or final orders. To the extent necessary for a full disclosure of all relevant facts and issues, the chair shall afford both parties the opportunity to respond, present evidence and argument, conduct cross-examination, and submit rebuttal evidence. A party filing a pleading, brief, or other paper with the chair shall serve copies on all other parties.

(9) Evidence, including hearsay evidence, is admissible if it is the kind of evidence on which reasonably prudent persons are accustomed to rely in the conduct of their affairs. Evidence is not admissible if it is excludable on constitutional or statutory grounds or on the basis of evidentiary privilege recognized in the courts of this state. The chair shall decide rulings on the admissibility of evidence, and the state Rules of Evidence shall serve as guidelines for those rulings.

(10) All testimony of parties and witnesses shall be made under oath or affirmation.

(11) The Faculty Appeal Board may appoint an examiner to conduct the actual hearing. The decision to use a hearing examiner requires the approval of a majority of the board members. The hearing examiner will then conduct the hearing and submit a detailed report to the Faculty Appeal Board according to the provisions of this section.

(a) If a hearing examiner conducts the hearing, an audio recording of the hearing must be kept, and the recording and any transcription thereof must be provided to the board.

(b) The Faculty Appeal Board may, at its option, request the hearing examiner to provide recommendations as to findings, conclusions, and decisions, but those recommendations shall not be binding on the board. The hearing examiner shall transmit to the board the full and complete record of the hearing and the board shall make its own findings, conclusions, and decisions based on the record.

(c) The hearing examiner will make initial rulings on the use of discovery, the admissibility of evidence, and the procedures for the hearing.

(d) The hearing examiner must be a member of the bar. Any member of the Faculty Appeal Board who is also a member of the bar, including the chair, may serve as the hearing examiner.

(12) The chair of the Faculty Appeal Board may issue subpoenas and enter protective orders.

(13) Members of the Faculty Appeal Board must avoid ex parte communications with any party involved in the hearing regarding any issue other than communications necessary to maintaining an orderly procedural flow to the hearing. Ex parte communications received by members of the board must be placed on the record, and the other party must be informed of the ex parte communication and given an opportunity to respond on the record.

(14) Findings, conclusions, and decisions by the Faculty Appeal Board shall be based exclusively on the evidence of record from the hearing and on matters officially noted in the record.

(15) The board shall enter an initial order which shall be served in writing on the student within ninety days after conclusion of the hearing or after submission of memos, briefs, or proposed findings, whichever is later, unless the period is waived or extended for good cause shown. The student shall be informed of procedures for appealing the decision. If the student does not appeal the board's initial order within the time set out in WAC 478-120-075(1), the initial order of the board shall become the final order, except all orders of dismissal shall be reviewed by the President or the President's delegate.

(16) The chair shall maintain an official record of the hearing. The record shall contain those items specified in RCW 34.05.476.

Green State University
Student Conduct Committee Organization and Duties

(1) The Student Conduct Committee consists of five faculty and five students appointed by the Vice Provost for Student Affairs and the Associated Students of Green State University, respectively. The bylaws of the Student Conduct Committee are available from the Vice Provost for Student Affairs or the Student Conduct Program.

(2) All hearings are closed and information presented in them and all supporting documents are confidential. The hearing is informal and does not follow administrative contested case or courtroom procedures.

(3) If the student has been properly notified and fails to appear, the Student Conduct Committee may proceed with the hearing and disciplinary action may be taken.

(4) During the hearing, the accused student may be accompanied by an advisor of the student's choice. The advisor may be a faculty or staff member, fellow student, parent, or any person of the student's choice so long as the availability of the advisor does not hamper the timeliness of the hearing. The student may choose to have an attorney serve as advisor; however, the advisor does not represent the student in a student conduct hearing and the student will be expected to speak for him or herself at all times.

(5) During the hearing, the student has the opportunity to offer information and testimony on his or her own behalf. The student also has the opportunity to review and respond to all information, statements, or evidence presented.

(6) The chairperson of the Student Conduct Committee, or designee, will decide any questions or objections to hearing procedures that are raised during the hearing.

(7) Members of the Committee may ask questions of any person present during the hearing and the chairperson will invite questions and comments from the accused student and the victim-claimant if present. The chairperson may also invite questions or comments from advisors or others present. If the chairperson decides an essential person or piece of information is missing, the chairperson may decide to reconvene the hearing at the earliest practical time that the missing information will be available.

(8) After the chairperson has determined that all necessary information has been presented and questions answered, the Committee will go into executive session and all other persons will be excused. The Committee will determine, based on a preponderance of the evidence, whether or not it believes the accused student is responsible for a violation of the regulations and, if so, the Committee will reconvene with the accused student and a representative of the Student Conduct Program to consider what sanctions may be appropriate. The accused student may waive his right to be present. The Committee may consider:

(a) Evidence of any mitigating circumstances presented by the student; and

(b) Other relevant information, including but not limited to, evidence of prior violations of the Student Conduct Code presented by a representative of the Student Conduct Program;

(9) The Committee will again go into executive session to make a decision about appropriate sanctions. The Committee's decision will be in the form of a recommendation to the Student Conduct Coordinator. The time between the conclusion of the hearing and the delivery of the recommendation to the Student Conduct Coordinator shall be no more than three days, excluding weekends and holidays.

(10) In cases of academic dishonesty or the reported misbehavior of an academic department student organization, the Committee shall make a recommendation within three days to the Associate Vice Provost for Academic Affairs, or designee, who shall make the decision. The accused student will be sent a letter describing the decision and any University expectations or actions taken.

Tradition University
Judicial Council Organization and Duties

University Judicial Council.

a. Composition. UJC is broadly representative of the academic community. The council consists of eleven members (five faculty members and six students). The student members, one of whom must be a graduate student, are appointed by the student government president with the advice and consent of the student government senate. The faculty members are appointed by the Faculty Council. The term of office is one year with the privilege of reappointment.

b. Quorum. Five members, at least two of which must be students, constitute a quorum and a majority of those present shall decide a case. In case UJC is unable to convene a quorum as defined above, the student government president or the chair of the Faculty Council may appoint persons to fill the designated student or faculty positions on a temporary basis.

c. Jurisdiction.
(1) UJC has original jurisdiction in the following instances:
(a) Any violation of the Student Code of Conduct that may not be appropriately handled within the living-group disciplinary body. [See B-1-b.]
(b) Any violation of student government rules and regulations not specifically designated to be heard elsewhere.
(c) Any matter that a living-group disciplinary body declines to hear. [See B-1-b.]

(2) UJC has appellate jurisdiction over decisions of living-group disciplinary bodies and decisions of the student government Judicial Council.
(2)
d. Range of Sanctions. The UJC has the full range of sanctions set forth in the Student Code of Conduct.