

Perhaps the near panic of recent years will awaken a new concern for achieving quality in the face of increasing students and teacher shortages. I believe that we have begun to examine critically some of the long-held assumptions as to the nature and organization of the teaching and learning processes. Your participation in this symposium is symbolic of this.

President Johnson recently declared, "Education is the first business of our society." This appears correct for it is our enormous capacity for learning that sets us apart from other forms of life and makes us distinctly human. And, it is through good teaching, as conceived in this symposium that these unique abilities are discovered, cultivated and put to creative use. What greater reward can one expect from his life's work than to help students realize their full humanity? As counselor or friend to prospective college students, what greater contribution can we make than influencing and cultivating proper attitudes in youth toward learning, education, achieving, or toward intellectual activity. Our resource persons have singled out these attitudes as major determinants of how well students perform in college and in life.

Permit me to close with a quotation from Dr. Sterling M. McMurrin, former Commissioner of Education in the U.S. Office of Education. He says, "Quite certainly the key to the quality of our entire educational enterprise is the intellectual strength of our teachers, their grasp of the aims and purposes of education, the quality of their own liberal education, and their competence in the subjects they teach."³

I share this conviction, just as, I am certain, each of you does. The challenge before us in this symposium and in subsequent instructional seminars is to improve our understanding of the principles undergirding the learning process and their application in our instructional approaches in the constant quest for quality teaching. Let us return to campus, stimulated and committed to achieving this task.

¹ Projections of Educational Statistics to 1974-75, 1965 Edition, U. S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare, Office of Education, OE-10030-65.

² Talent and Tomorrow's Teacher, The Honors Approach, New Dimensions in Higher Education, Number 11, U.S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare, Office of Education.

THE COLLEGE ADMINISTRATION AND STUDENT RIGHTS

LOREN D. PHILLIPS
Vice President
Shasta College

Among the main concerns of many college administrators today is the rising tide of student activism and student interpretation of the "innate rights" of students within the academic community. The means of meeting these challenges and, if possible, funneling them into constructive channels will vary widely among institutions of higher learning.

One important factor in the solution of these problems is whether the school is a university, four-year college or junior college. Apparently the higher the percentage of upper division and graduate students in an institution, the greater the chances of increased activism and the more often that an appreciable number of faculty members will align with students, against the administration. Teaching assistants (T.A.s) often identify themselves more with the students and their causes than with other segments of the college or university. Institutions which are surrounded by large colonies of non-student agitators are particularly susceptible to problems, as has been evidenced in California higher educational institutions at all levels. Among those who have been particularly plagued are the University of California at Berkeley; San Francisco and San Jose State Colleges; and some of the junior colleges which are close to such four-year institutions.

What do the students want. Here in California, the officers of the Associated Students of practically all junior colleges have picked up many of their ideas through Regional and State meetings of the California Junior College Student Government Association. Much of the leadership of this group could be considered as activist, although usually less radical legislation is voted than the extremists would like. However, the individual extremists have their influence upon students from many of the junior colleges and the causes are pushed persistently by one or more champions of the causes until some of them receive the endorsement of the governing groups of student bodies. The AAUP, the U. S. National Student Association, and others have drawn up a Student Bill of Rights which has gone far beyond any proposition for student license than has ever been conceived of before.^{1,2}

Among recent demands of the Senate of the Associated Students of Shasta College is one concerning "certain rights of students" . . . "which are guaranteed to all persons as residents of the United States" . . . and "the junior college

student has at time been denied these rights". These rights were listed as:

- (1) The right to a press free from censorship.
- (2) The right of students to take public stands on issues directly pertinent to Shasta College.
- (3) The right to form an organization around any particular interest.
- (4) The right of the students to be informed of all matters concerning Shasta College.
- (5) The right of students to participate with the College Administration in decisions which directly affect students.
- (6) The right of students to speak on any subject or hear speakers on any topic.

Another bill passed by the Shasta College Student Senate is the "Free Speech Area Bill". This calls for the right of peaceful dissent, to free speech and the distribution of literature on the Shasta College campus by both student and non-student groups. The bill would give the Senate the sole right to render the decision to grant permission to speakers to speak or anyone to distribute literature on-campus. The Administration would serve as a last resort for those who may be denied the right by the Senate or Student Court. But, there would be no way by which the Administration could bar a speaker or purveyor of literature — student or non-student. Free speech and literature distribution areas would be set up on campus, but no protection would be afforded to those people who would prefer not to have their peace disturbed by loudspeakers in the choicest part of the beautiful campus center court. Other than for the proposition of transferring a large segment of administrative determination from the Administration to the Senate and Court of the Student Body, the rules and regulations appear to be most responsible and well-defined.

The Shasta College Student Senate has also asked for the seating of a representative of the Associated Students on the Administrative Cabinet of the College. The Administrative Cabinet consists of the College's District Superintendent-President, the Vice President, Dean of Instruction, Dean of Students, Dean of the Evening Division, Dean of Business Services-Building Coordinator, the Associate Dean for Instruction-Vocational Education, and the Associate Dean of the Evening Division. The students here,

showed unusual boldness in asking for such a representative, especially since no faculty representative meets regularly with the Administrative Cabinet. Moreover, the Faculty Association has not asked for the seating of a representative on the Cabinet, inasmuch as its representatives or those of the associated students may meet with the Cabinet whenever they please. The policy has also provided for the Cabinet to invite Faculty or student body representatives into Cabinet Meetings for presentation and consultation on problems which particularly require their presence.

The Administration does not yet have the answers to these demands. But it must set up procedures which will facilitate finding the best solutions. First, it must be explained to the students that other parties and groups are as interested in these problems as are they. Students must realize that the faculty, administration, board of trustees, and citizenry also have a voice and vote. Ordinarily, the citizenry would be represented adequately on a policy making committee by board of trustee members, but there could be representatives in addition to the board if this group so desired.

My personal recommendation is that the proposals of the Student Body Senate be subject to the inspection of a committee constituted of four officers of the Associated Students, appointed by the President of the Student Body; three faculty members, appointed by the President of the Faculty Association; three administrators, including the Dean of Students, appointed by the President of the College, and two trustees, appointed by the Chairman of the Board of Trustees, and the faculty chairman of the Student Publications Committee. It should be up to this Committee not only to modify, but to approve or disapprove the specific requests of the Associated Students. They should not only consider these requests, but a total picture of student academic freedom.

This is certainly not a project which can be done in haste. It might be well to have laymen on the Committee or to bring in consultants or advisors to help inform the Committee and provide the Committee with their knowledge, experience and ideas. It took almost two years for a committee consisting of two members of the Board of Trustees, six faculty members and two Administrators to formulate an academic freedom policy which proved to be acceptable to both the faculty and the Board of Trustees. This was approved by the full Board of Trustees in regular meeting and became official written Board policy. The students deserve no less consideration.

Once the policy of student academic freedom is established, its interpretation should be made by the Administration with the help of the Student Court and the Associated Students. In respect to student and non-student speakers and purveyors of literature, determination should be left up to a committee organized much like the one which would arrive at the total general policy, excepting that Board or community representation may not be required.

Effective communication is basically significant. At Shasta College, for the past 2½ years, a Coordinating Council has met faithfully each week. This Council consists of Associated Student Body officers, the College President, Vice President, Dean of Students, Dean of Men, Dean of Women, and representatives of the Faculty Association. It is open to any student or other person who wishes to attend. Many problems have been worked out and a multitude of programs planned as this "no holds barred" group meets. The Council is considered as more advisory than official. Yet, it has proved invaluable in providing each group with the thinking and reasoning of the others and in eliminating misunderstandings. It deserves a major part of the credit for the fact that student demonstrations and anti administration friction have not been a part of the Shasta College scene.

Another committee that has met, primarily at times when disagreement looms concerning the College publication, *The Lance*, is the Student Publications Committee. Consisting of Student Body Officers, members of the *Lance* Staff, the Advisor to the *Lance*, Faculty Association repre-

sentatives and Administrators, the group seldom ever achieves unanimity of opinion. But such a committee helps clear the air, assisting the Editors and Advisor of this college newspaper to decide on what are the margins of the freedom of the press concerning libel and good taste in a learning situation.³

The College has been threatened with a clandestine, underground, off-campus newspaper. The student proponents of this paper were given consent to distribute it on campus, at least until it exhibited such bad taste and became so slanderous that it would lose the privilege. This "freedom" took some of the steam out of their determination. To date, financial problems and lack of sustained student support have prevented the publication of the inaugural edition. Possibly the *Lance* isn't "so highly censored" that it unduly activates the activists.

As a former agricultural program administrator, I noticed that few, if any, agricultural majors have borne the banners of radical political revisionism. However, agriculture professors and students should also be concerned with student activism, especially as it obstructs the short and long range excellence of college instruction. An irate citizenry and legislature can choke higher educational institutions financially and with attempts at sharp restrictions on the academic freedom of staff and students. Agricultural professors and students should join those who insist that order should prevail in the college or university. The basic conservatism and patriotism of the vast majority of agricultural students, if expressed by them, could go a long ways toward maintaining a more balanced expression of social opinion on campuses which presently may be dominated by students of the militant "new left".

1 Academic Freedom, the Presidents' Dilemma, "College Management", May, 1965, pp. 44-47.

2 Student Bill of Right, "College and University Business", McGraw-Hill publication, September, 1967, pp. 78-81.

3 How to Organize Control of Your Student Publications, "College and University Business", October, 1967, pp. 6-10.

TREASURER'S REPORT

YEAR ENDING MARCH 31, 1967

CASH RECEIPTS:

Balance transferred 5/17/66	704.78
Cash Sources:	
From members and sale of Journal	964.75
Sears and Roebuck Fund	1,000.00
Total Cash Receipts	2,669.53

CASH EXPENDITURES:

NACTA Journal:	
Printing	1,761.96
Postage	130.57
Freight	2.45
	1,894.98
Misc. Expenses:	
Copy of Charter	3.00
Incorp. recording	6.00
Pur. of Ledger	11.68
Pur. of Receipt Book	.26
Expenses of Speaker	223.85
Incorp., State of La.	8.00
	252.79
Total Cash Expenditures	2,147.77

BANK BALANCE April 1, 1967 521.76