

~~21371~~ 25

A SURVEY OF SOCIAL-REGULATORY  
PRACTICES IN SELECTED MICHIGAN  
COMMUNITY COLLEGES

By  
Martin E. Hollander

A THESIS

Submitted to  
Michigan State University  
in partial fulfillment of the requirements  
for the degree of

DOCTOR OF EDUCATION

Department of Adult and Higher Education

1968

ABSTRACT

A SURVEY OF SOCIAL-REGULATORY  
PRACTICES IN SELECTED MICHIGAN  
COMMUNITY COLLEGES

by

Martin E. Hollander

It was the purpose of this study to make a survey-analysis of the specific social-regulatory practices of selected community colleges in Michigan to ascertain the prevailing conditions that exist regarding the following:

1. The origin and extent of written social-regulatory policies and the provisions for change.
2. The types of rules of conduct.
3. The communication of social-regulatory policies and rules.
4. The enforcement of social-regulatory policies and rules.

A preliminary search of the literature revealed a paucity of research in this area at the community college level of education. It seemed then that research in this area was well in order and that data collected from this study would be of practical use to administrators in charge of discipline.

The following delimitations were established for the purposes of this study:

1. The study was limited to commuter-type publicly supported community colleges in Michigan with enrollments of more than 1500 students.
2. Data gathered for the study were limited to responses

made during interviews with Disciplinary Administrators, and information gained from the literature, student handbooks, college bulletins, and policy manuals of the colleges selected for the study.

Size, location and the experience of the disciplinary administrators were factors considered in the selection of the colleges to be studied.

After reviewing the literature, disciplinary administrators of the twelve colleges selected for this investigation were interviewed. An interview form was developed to be used as a guide. Disciplinary administrators were asked to respond to questions based on the above mentioned areas of inquiry. The responses were collated in the various categories, tabulated and analyzed.

The following major conclusions were drawn from the findings of the study:

1. Most of the larger community colleges in Michigan are in need of more carefully defined social-regulatory policies and rules governing student conduct and discipline.
2. Social-regulatory policies and rules are more likely to be reasonable and more readily accepted when students, faculty members, and administration share the responsibility for their formulation and when they are written in positive terms.
3. Communication of social-regulatory policies and rules is more likely to be effectively achieved when they are published and distributed and discussed at scheduled orientation sessions.
4. A student court system of enforcement of social-regulatory policies and rules is not perceived by the participating administrators as an effective means to handle infractions.

5. The extent of involvement of the faculty in the enforcement of student conduct at campus events is more and more being determined by professional negotiations and collective bargaining in Michigan.
6. The single disciplinary administrator concept is preferred over the concept suggesting a division of responsibilities according to the sex of a student.
7. Most of the enforcement problems in the institutions studied centered around drinking, theft, illegal parking, and cafeteria behavior.
8. Counselling and disciplinary tasks are not compatible functions for one person.
9. Student probation and withdrawal of certain campus privileges are the most widely used methods of discipline when infractions of rules occur.
10. Michigan laws in general permit the community colleges ample freedom to develop policies and rules for governing themselves.

Criteria were listed as standards by which major social-regulatory practices of Community Colleges could be clinically judged. The study was concluded by delineating the ideas generated from the findings regarding the need for future research.

### ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The author wishes to take this opportunity to thank all those whose cooperation made this study possible. He is greatly indebted to Dr. Max R. Raines for serving as a constant source of encouragement and guidance through his counselling, direction and sincere efforts above and beyond the call of duty as a doctoral advisor. The writer is also especially grateful for the excellent advice, assistance and constructive criticism which he received from the members of his Guidance Committee: Dr. Max S. Smith, Dr. John Useem and Dr. Fred Vescolani.

It would be impossible to list individually all the suggestions and assistance contributed by colleagues, fellow students and friends, but the author is no less grateful on that account. Sincere thanks must go to all of the disciplinary administrators of the colleges selected for this study for permitting the author to interview them and for being so generous with their time.

On a personal note, the writer cannot overlook the patience, understanding and cooperation exhibited by his family during this prodigious effort. A great debt of sincere gratitude and love must go to my wife, Bernice and our four sons, Jay, David, Daniel and Mitchell. Finally, the author feels indeed fortunate to have a most loyal and dear friend in Mr. Sol Dovitz, who graciously volunteered to be used as a sounding board. And lastly, the writer

must express his appreciation to Miss Janice Petro for the excellent job she did in typing the manuscript.

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER	Page
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS . . . . .	i
LISTING OF TABLES . . . . .	vi
I. INTRODUCTION . . . . .	1
Background	
Statement of the Problem	
The Need for the Study	
Delimitations of the Problem	
Definition of Terms	
Organization of the Study	
II. REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE . . . . .	15
The Emergence of the Community (Junior) College - Its Functions and Aims.	
Student Characteristics	
Historical Changes in the Administration of Discipline in Higher Education in the United States	
Development of Social-Regulatory Policies and Rules	
Communication of Social-Regulatory Policies and Rules	
Legal Implications of Conduct and Discipline	
III. METHODOLOGY . . . . .	60
Sources of Data	
Review of Publications	

Data-Gathering Instrument Used for Interviews  
Interviews with Disciplinary Administrators  
Selection of the Community Colleges for Visitations  
Treatment of Data  
Summary

IV. WRITTEN POLICIES AND RULES - EXTENT AND ORIGIN . . . . . 67

General Information  
Title of Disciplinary Administrator  
Extent of Present Policies Delimiting Student Conduct  
Area of Written Social-Regulatory Policies and Rules  
Origin of Written Policies and Rules  
Form of Written Social-Regulatory Policies and Rules  
Review and Revision of Social-Regulatory Policies and  
Rules  
Summary

V. THE COMMUNICATION OF SOCIAL-REGULATORY POLICIES AND RULES . . .90

Methods of Written Communication  
Orientation Programs  
Effectiveness of Communication  
Summary

VI. ENFORCEMENT OF SOCIAL-REGULATORY POLICIES AND RULES . . . . . 105

Extent of the Problem  
Frequency of Discipline Problems

Factors Contributing to the Extent and the Frequency of Student Conduct Problems	
The Role of the Disciplinary Administrator and Administrative Procedures	
The Role of the Faculty	
The Role of the Student	
Legal Implications	
Summary	

VII. SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, RECOMMENDATIONS, AND IMPLICATIONS FOR FUTURE STUDY . . . . .	142
BIBLIOGRAPHY . . . . .	180
APPENDIX A. LETTER OF INTRODUCTION FROM DOCTORAL ADVISOR . .	190
APPENDIX B. DISCIPLINARY ADMINISTRATOR INTERVIEW GUIDE FORM.	191
APPENDIX C. CHARACTERISTICS OF COMMUNITY COLLEGE FRESHMEN ACCORDING TO WEIGHTED NATIONAL NORMS . . . . .	202
APPENDIX D. MICHIGAN COMMUNITY COLLEGES SELECTED FOR INTER- VIEWS WITH DISCIPLINARY ADMINISTRATORS . . . . .	218

## LISTING OF TABLES

TABLE	Page
I. 1967 FALL ENROLLMENT FIGURES OF COLLEGES VISITED FOR PERSONAL INTERVIEWS - AS STATED BY DISCIPLINARY ADMINISTRATOR . . . . .	70
II. TITLES OF DISCIPLINARY ADMINISTRATORS OF TWELVE SELECTED COMMUNITY COLLEGES . . . . .	71
III. EXTENT AND DESIRABLENESS OF SOCIAL-REGULATORY POLICIES AND RULES IN EACH OF THIRTY AREAS . . . . .	80
IV. CURRENT PRACTICES OF DISSEMINATING INFORMATION ABOUT STUDENT POLICIES AND RULES OF THE TWELVE COMMUNITY COLLEGES VISITED . . . . .	103
V. AREAS OF STUDENT CONDUCT IN WHICH PROBLEMS MOST FREQUENTLY OCCUR IN THE TWELVE COMMUNITY COLLEGES VISITED . . . . .	114
VI. FACTORS CONTRIBUTING TO THE FREQUENCY OF STUDENT VIOLATIONS OF SOCIAL-REGULATORY POLICIES AND RULES . . . . .	120
VII. CLINICAL JUDGEMENTS OF THE SOCIAL-REGULATORY PRACTICES OF THE COLLEGES SELECTED FOR THIS STUDY ACCORDING TO SPECIFIC CRITERIA . . . . .	175

CHAPTER I  
INTRODUCTION

BACKGROUND OF THE PROBLEM

Social-regulatory policies regarding the maintenance of discipline and specific codes of conduct in colleges have changed greatly over the past several centuries, and what was once common practice at early American colleges would not be recognized or tolerated today. Frederick Rudolph, in his excellent book, The American College and University, does a superb job tracing the historical changes that have occurred in administrative attitudes regarding various social-regulatory practices in higher education.<sup>1</sup> He noted that during the mid-eighteenth century there were many colleges which had regulations of conduct reflecting an atmosphere of a boarding school for small boys.

Although this attitude has been grossly modified over the years, the concern for appropriate rules of student conduct is still a major one today. Social and political struggles of our times, and the anxieties created by sweeping changes in a rapidly changing society have increasingly entangled the relationship between students and their college regarding their rights and the college's rules and regulations. A clear example of this is the student-administration conflict that has erupted at the Berkeley Campus of the University of California.

---

<sup>1</sup>Frederick Rudolph, The American College and University, (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, Inc., 1962).

The community college, like any other institution of higher education, is also concerned with student conduct and discipline. As an educational institution, it serves as a common meeting place for students of all walks of life. According to Ralph C. Fields, Professor of Higher Education, Columbia University, community colleges attract a more representative group of students with respect to socioeconomic status and age than do typical four-year institutions, thereby having more heterogeneous student populations.<sup>2</sup> These students interact among themselves and directly or indirectly with the institution's Board of Trustees, Faculty and Administration. It is this interaction within a certain framework of order or organization that makes the school what it is.

As is the case with all individuals and groups in our type of society, the community college is subject to rules and regulations established for the common good. Under the General School Laws of the State of Michigan, it is empowered, as an institution of higher education, to adopt by-laws, rules and regulations for its own control and government.<sup>3</sup> It is clear then that the community college has the authority to establish social-regulatory policies or codes of conduct that will guide the behavior of anyone affiliated with it. The American Civil Liberties Union recognizes this propriety of supervision of student behavior when it clearly states,

---

<sup>2</sup>Ralph C. Fields, The Community College Movement, (New York: McGraw Hill Book Co., Inc., 1962), p. 80.

<sup>3</sup>State of Michigan, General School Laws, Legislative Service Bureau, 1960, p. 400-403.

The authority of the educational institution is an extension of the traditional legal authority which parents exercise over their children. Insofar as the institution is responsible for the welfare and guidance of its students, it must exercise reasonable control over their general activities. Not to do so would be to fail in the discharge of the educational function.<sup>4</sup>

Having the legal authority to establish rules and policies governing student behavior is one thing; however the establishment of functional social-regulatory policies that are reasonable and fair is another thing, a task that is not always an easy accomplishment. One would not have to search the wells of historical inquiry too deeply to find that the topic of student discipline has created much discussion and has reflected as much ambivalence among educators of young adults as any topic has in history.

This situation probably occurs because the term discipline has different meanings to different people. Webster's Dictionary reflects this confusion by giving the following four most common meanings.

1. Teaching, instruction, tutorship, education, etc.
2. Training or course of training which corrects, molds, strengthens or perfects, a faculty or faculties.
3. A rule or system of rules affecting conduct or action.
4. Control gained by enforcing obedience or order.

Although the definitions mentioned above still leave open the choice of which one a person might accept, most educational authorities generally recognize that the term discipline has been synonymous with

---

<sup>4</sup>Academic Freedom and Civil Liberties of Students, (New York: American Civil Liberties Union, August, 1956), p.3 (Pamphlet).

education and training as far back as man can recall. In 1928, Herbert Hawkes said,

Discipline may be defined either broadly or narrowly. Broadly defined it is as wide as education itself. Physical, moral and intellectual discipline may be defined so as to include the entire development of the individual, involving his relations to his environment both animate and inanimate, both human and divine.<sup>5</sup>

In a more specific sense, Williamson and Foley defined discipline as "re-education of those particular students who are in open conflict with fellow students, the faculty, the standards of society and the community."<sup>6</sup> One can see from definitions such as these that although most educators do agree that discipline is a process, or a tool of education, they can and do differ as to how, and to what extent this so called tool is to be used.

It is interesting to note at this point the historical relationship between the word discipline and education. The word discipline is actually derived from the Latin verb disciple "to teach or to train." Biblical literature reveals that this meaning stems from the methods Christ used in teaching and leading his disciples. Here we have an example of a leader teaching the desirability of a particular pattern of conduct in life in such a clear way that many people became convinced that his social and moral concepts should become their guides for behavior; ergo, these people became disciples or followers of a particular teacher or teaching.

---

<sup>5</sup>Herbert E. Hawkes, "Constructive Discipline," Association of American Colleges and Universities Bulletin, Vol. XIV, No.3 (April, 1928), p. 180.

<sup>6</sup>E. G. Williamson and J. D. Foley, Counselling and Discipline, (New York: McGraw Hill Book Company, Inc., 1949), pp. 2-3.

In essence then, discipline connotes a process of leadership and followership; leadership in teaching insight and understanding of particular concepts of social conduct, and followership in the acceptance and development of concepts of self-control in accordance with established rules or limitations. This concept of discipline is still esteemed among educators.

Another term used today in connection with the training of individuals for life in our democracy is "citizenship." Like discipline, this term has been defined in many ways. Generally speaking, citizenship may be thought of as the status of being a citizen. Most students entering college have come into their local, state, and national citizenship by birth and residence. But the word citizenship implies more than just status, for it involves a process of training or discipline that provides an individual with an opportunity to learn what his rights, duties and opportunities are in our way of life. Democratic living and good citizenship also imply the development of internal controls of behavior based upon knowledge and reason that will in turn help students anticipate the consequences of their actions throughout their lives, thereby enabling them to make more intelligent decisions. To this end, the policies and specific administrative rules of any college governing the education re-education or rehabilitation procedures relative to discipline and good citizenship can do much to encourage self-discipline and self-direction.

#### STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM

The recognized need for community colleges in the American educational system is reflected by the rapidity with which they have

been established. Enrollments over the past few years have spiraled and most community college facilities have become over-crowded, taxed almost beyond their limits. According to the Michigan Department of Public Instruction, community college enrollments have increased by more than one-hundred-percent during the last five years of the last decade, and even greater growth in student enrollment is anticipated in the future.<sup>7</sup> Generally speaking, as colleges grow larger, they tend to become more impersonal with respect to the administration and control of student behavior. An examination of the pattern of events that led to the "Berkeley Crisis" of the University of California shows how great the distance is and how difficult is the communication between those who make the multi-versity's rules and those who must live by them.<sup>8</sup> Rapidly growing community colleges are not immune from the development of this type of situation. Many of these "crisis situations" may in many cases be precipitated by the college's philosophy regarding social-regulatory policies and the level of communication and understanding that exists between the college and its students. As it was mentioned earlier in this study, history is replete with examples of the divergencies of opinion that have existed in higher education regarding the development, communication, and enforcement of social-regulatory policies. In the light of this, the author of this dissertation felt that an analysis of specific

---

<sup>7</sup>Community Colleges, (Lansing: The Department of Education, State of Michigan, 1963), p. 29. (Bulletin No. 366)

<sup>8</sup>William P. Lineberry (ed.), Colleges At the Crossroads, (New York: The H. W. Wilson Company, 1966), pp. 71-88.

social-regulatory practices of selected rapidly growing community colleges would be most timely.

It was the purpose of this study, therefore, to make a survey analysis of specific social-regulatory practices of selected community colleges in Michigan to ascertain the prevailing conditions that exist regarding the following:

1. The origin and extent of written social-regulatory policies and the provisions for change.
2. The types of rules of conduct.
3. The communication of social-regulatory policies and rules.
4. The enforcement of social-regulatory policies and rules.

It was also the purpose of this study to throw light upon emergent practices as well as prevailing conditions that generated ideas for future research and study.

#### THE NEED FOR THE STUDY

In a preliminary search of the literature, the author of this study found that there was a paucity of research in this subject area at the community college level throughout the country, and none to speak of in the State of Michigan. This particular subject area is one of major concern to those community college administrators who have been delegated the responsibility for implementing the social-regulatory policies and enforcing them. According to Thomas A. Brady, the former Dean of Extra-divisions Administration of the University of Missouri,

...we have today only a meager body of educational research on student discipline, we have few books or manuals, and our professional organizations rarely

devote to it any sessions for discussions and consideration of improved and more uniform practices. Rarely does one find an article in a professional journal that deals with this important subject....here is an academic wasteland so far as study and research are concerned.<sup>9</sup>

It seemed then that research in this area was well in order and that data collected from this study could be of practical use to administrators in charge of student affairs and conduct as a reference when considering criteria for the formulation of written social regulatory policies and the further development of student conduct rules.

Delimitations of the Problem:

The following delimitations were established for the purposes of this study:

1. This study was limited to commuter-type publicly supported community colleges in Michigan with enrollments of more than 1500 students.
2. This study was more concerned with written policies and rules related to student conduct and citizenship rather than with the specific administrative disciplinary actions taken for infractions of the policies or rules in individual cases.
3. Data gathered for the study were limited to responses made during interviews by disciplinary administrators, and information gained from the literature, student handbooks,

---

<sup>9</sup>Thomas A. Brady and Leverne F. Snoxell, Student Discipline In Higher Education, (Washington, D. C.: The American College Personnel Association, 1965), p. 2.

college bulletins, and policy manuals received from the community colleges selected for the study.

#### DEFINITION OF TERMS

Words and phrases have long created semantic problems. Depending on the context in which they are used, they could have different meanings. For the purpose of this study, and in the interest of providing a more common understanding of terminology, the following definitions of terms were used:

Chief Disciplinary Administrator--This term refers to the person on the community college administrative staff who is charged with the major responsibility of carrying out the college's policies and rules regarding student discipline.

Citizenship--This term applies to the student's recognition of his rights and responsibilities on campus. These rights and responsibilities include voting in school elections, complying with school policies and rules developed for the welfare of the general student body, loyalty to the school and its traditions, and striving not only for one's own betterment but the improvement of the general college community. In other words, it is a mode of behavior that is essential in government, or for that matter, in a community college, that will establish those conditions promoting order and progress in college life.

Code of Conduct--The term refers to those rules or standards of behavior that students are expected to comply with while attending college.

Community College (Commuter type)--A two-year, non-residential, comprehensive institution of higher education (beyond high school) that serves a particular community or several communities in a regional area by preparing some students for advanced college study, by preparing others for vocations, by offering all students a general education, and by offering non-credit post high school courses.

Control--The power to exercise restraints on an individual or a group through the imposition of a certain set of rules or standards delimiting student behavior; also the power to enforce the imposed rules.

Corrective approach--This is a conceptual approach to discipline that generally recommends the involvement of the counselling process--that is, to determine the causes for misconduct and then to employ guidance and counselling techniques to deal with the causes in order to prevent a reoccurrence of the infraction. This approach is not incompatible with the administration of discipline.

Discipline problem--Any conduct or behavior, aside from unsatisfactory academic achievement, which goes before any administrative officer or any staff or student agency, responsible for handling and enforcing student discipline.

Disciplinary Actions--Actions (including counselling and penalties) taken by disciplinary administrators or any staff or student agency responsible for handling and enforcing student discipline after consideration of the discipline problem. Penalties considered commensurate with the type and severity of misbehavior involved may include

loss of student activity privileges for a specified time, verbal reprimands, traffic violation fines, imposition of probation status, suspension or dismissal.

Dismissal--This term implies the involuntary separation of the student from the college. It may not be permanent but neither is a definite time set when return is expected.

Expulsion--Student behavior which is so eccentric and unacceptable that the college permanently excludes him from enrolling.

Governing Board of Trustees--The community college governing group established under the General School Laws of Michigan. The board members (individual members have no authority to act separately) have the power to make plans for, to promote, and/or acquire, construct, own, develop, maintain and operate according to defined policy and legal limits, the community college. It has the explicit power to adopt by-laws, rules and regulations for its own government and control of college operations.

Orientation--As defined and used, "orientation" refers to the help and assistance given new students via planned programs, classes, activities and college publications which may aid the students in becoming familiar with their new academic and social environment, the functions and aims of the college and the policies and rules with which they are expected to comply.

Policy--This term refers to general guidelines, established by the board of trustees of the community college, that serve to delimit con-

ditions under which various decisions can be made. These guidelines are broad in scope and worded to define "what" can be done. The "how" of operative action is usually considered administrative procedure.

Probation--This term refers to a middle status between good standing and suspension or dismissal. In this situation, the student remains enrolled in the college but under stated conditions according to college policies. Probation covers a stated trial period during which a student is given an opportunity to show that he can conduct himself according to the college's conduct rules. At the end of this period, the college determines whether the student is returned to a status of good standing.

Social Regulations--Prescribed regulations stated in either positive or negative terms that serve as policy or implement college policy relative to student behavior, discipline, and citizenship.

Student Council--The student organization authorized by the board of trustees to, within prescribed limits, share the responsibility for the administration of student affairs. Student councils are usually involved in the development, supervision, coordination, and financing of student activities. They may also play an active role in the formulation of policies and rules in the area of student behavior, discipline, and citizenship.

Student Court--A judicial branch of student government charged with the responsibility for assisting in the adjudication of certain

infractions of college policies and rules. Many community colleges do not encourage the formation of student courts because they do not believe it to be good practices to have students sit in judgement of other students. Some student courts have the power to prescribe penalties while others only judge the case leaving any penalties to be set to the administrative officers in charge of discipline.

Student handbook--That publication given to a student upon enrollment to help orient him to his new college environment. It is generally designed to provide the student with a broad spectrum of information about college life including the colleges policies governing standards of student behavior.

Suspension--Suspension is also an involuntary separation of the student from the college but it differs from dismissal in that it implies and states a time limit when return will be possible.

#### ORGANIZATION OF THE STUDY

In the first chapter, the background of the problem, a statement of the problem, and a discussion of its significance have been presented. Delimitations, and definitions of terms were also outlined.

Chapter II reviews the literature pertinent to this research study. The chapter was sub-divided into the following categories: (1) the emergence of the community college - its aims and functions, (2) historical changes in the administration of discipline in higher education in the United States, (3) the development of social-regulatory policies

and rules, (4) the communication of social-regulatory policies and rules, (5) legal implications of student conduct and discipline.

The methodology used in conducting and reporting this research study are described in Chapter III. The selection of community colleges for the study, the procedures for interviewing the chief disciplinary administrators, the review of college publications and materials, and the treatment of data are all briefly discussed.

Chapter IV reports the findings relative to the extent of present policies and rules delimiting student conduct and their origin of development.

The findings regarding the communication of social-regulatory policies and rules to students are presented in Chapter V.

In Chapter VI the findings concerning the enforcement of social regulatory policies and rules are presented.

Chapter VII, summarizes the significant findings, and presents conclusions drawn from the data of the study and implications for future research and study.

## CHAPTER II

### REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

Since World War II, our systems of public education have been rocketed into a challenging new era by the convergence of many powerful forces such as an explosion of population and knowledge; a fantastic burst of technological and economic growth; a declining reliance upon the unskilled worker; a decreasing death rate because of advances in medical research. These converging forces brought forth longer life spans; the outbreak of ideological conflict; the cultural and political upheavals of old customs; and the unparalleled demand for equality of opportunity for all Americans regardless of their race, creed, or national origin. The effect of these forces on our institutions of public education has been phenomenal. No longer are the educational needs of our people as simple as they were in the pioneer days or for that matter at the turn of the last century. In our complex economy, one can no longer depend solely on the "three r's" and expect to succeed to any great heights. In fact, today, a high school education has become the minimum and higher education or continuing education of some form the goal. As a result, more students than ever before are knocking at the doors of our community colleges, four year colleges, and universities requesting admission.

This upsurge in high educational enrollments and the above mentioned forces behind the increased student population reflecting young adults from all walks of life, have created tremendous pressures on our institutions of higher education, especially in the various areas of educational administration. This impact on the administration

of higher education has been particularly felt in the administration of student regulations concerning student conduct.

Although many books have been written in the fields of secondary school or college and university administration that contain sections on student personnel services, most of those that have chapters touching upon the topic of student regulations and student conduct have been mainly written for the secondary level of education with the remaining chapters for the university level. Very little has been written about community college social-regulatory policies; nevertheless, some of the secondary level and university level information is apparently applicable to the community college. Still the author has found that there is a paucity of research in this subject area. In 1962, Kinzter studied Board Policy Manuals in California Public Junior Colleges at the University of California. Although this study dealt with the over-all approaches of institutional written policies, it did not specifically deal with community college social-regulatory practices. At Columbia University, in 1963, Fley completed a doctoral dissertation dealing with The Changing Views of Deans and Personnel Workers Toward The Handling of Individual Discipline Cases. Hubbell studied The Varying Perceptions of Alleged Misbehavior and Resultant Disciplinary Adjudication at the University of Wisconsin in 1964. This doctoral dissertation compared the adjudicative judgments of parents, students, and student personnel administrators regarding disciplinary alternatives in various cases of alleged misbehavior rather than the regulatory policies governing discipline. In 1965, the Carnegie Corporation of New York sponsored a study of Junior College Student Personnel Programs

under the direction of Max R. Raines. This study, however, pertained mainly to the development of these programs and a general appraisal of them in various regions of our country. Raines and McDaniel co-authored a section of the findings of this study relating to the social-regulatory functions of large junior colleges. They found that the social-regulatory function differentiated the strongest and weakest student personnel programs more than any other function.

E. G. Williamson and J. L. Cowan, in 1966, completed a research appraisal of The American Student's Freedom of Expression at four year institutions of higher education. This study published by the University of Minnesota Press, was designed to determine: (1) How much academic freedom do students now enjoy? (2) Which institutions granted the most freedom or the least? (3) What forces prevented the expansion of freedom and how effective were they? (4) How much freedom should be granted? (5) Was the incongruity of perception between students and colleges regarding the amount of freedom a source of confusion and conflict.

The author of this research study found many books to be most helpful in reviewing the literature on this subject. To list but a few, there was Bakken's The Legal Basis For College Student Personnel Work (1961), Blackwell's College Law (1961), Bogue's The Community College (1950), Blocker's The Two-Year College: A Social Synthesis (1965), Brady's Student Discipline in Higher Education (1965), Dennis and Kaufman's The College and the Student (1966), Dunbar's The Michigan Record in Higher Education (1963), Gleazer's, Jr. American Junior

Colleges (1967), Hofstadter and Smith's American Higher Education - A Documentary History (1961), Katope's Beyond Berkeley (1966), Lee's God Bless Our Queer Old Dean (1959), Medsker's Junior College Progress and Prospect (1962), Rudolph's The American College and University (1962), and Williamson's Counselling and Discipline (1949).

The professional journals and periodicals found to be most helpful were the American School Board Journal, Education Digest, Journal of College Student Personnel, Junior College Journal, National Association of Secondary School Principals Bulletin, Personnel and Guidance Journal, and School and Society.

The review of the literature in this chapter has been divided in the following manner: (1) The Emergence of the Community (Junior) College - Its Function and Aims, (2) Student Characteristics, (3) Historical Changes in the Administration of Discipline in Higher Education in the United States, (4) The Development of Social-Regulatory Policies and Rules, (5) The Communication of Social-Regulatory Policies and Rules, (6) The Legal Implications of Student Conduct and Discipline.

#### THE EMERGENCE OF THE COMMUNITY (JUNIOR) COLLEGE-ITS FUNCTIONS AND AIMS

It was a little over a hundred years ago that the idea of a junior college was conceived as a means of relieving the large universities of under-classmen. The names of several university leaders were associated with the early development of the idea that the first two years of the university more appropriately belonged to the secondary schools.

According to Dunbar,<sup>1</sup> Henry P. Tappan, in 1852, in his inaugural address as President of the University of Michigan, advocated transferring the first two years of university work to the high school. William W. Folwell, at his inauguration, in 1869, as President of the University of Minnesota, echoed the idea of President Tappan by suggesting that the university devote itself to teaching upper-classmen and graduate students. Although Tappan and Folwell both strongly believed in the German plan of higher education, they never succeeded in eliminating the first two years or the "secondary years" from their own schools.

The task of re-organizing the university to pave the way for the establishment of the first junior college in the United States was left to William Rainey Harper, President of the University of Chicago at the turn of the century. In 1892, Harper separated the University of Chicago into distinct divisions. The upper division, the junior and senior years, was called the "University College" and the lower division, the first two years, was called the "Academic College". Four years later, in 1896, these titles were changed to "Senior College" for the upper division and to "Junior College" for the lower division. This according to Walter C. Eells, was the first use of the term "Junior College".<sup>2</sup> Thus in the beginnings of the junior college the

---

<sup>1</sup>Willis F. Dunbar, The Michigan Record in Higher Education. Detroit: Wayne State University Press, 1963, pp. 239-240

<sup>2</sup>Walter C. Eells, The Junior College. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1931, p. 47.

major encouragement came initially from the university.

In 1902, William Rainey Harper urged the school board of Joliet, Illinois to establish a junior college. The Joliet Junior College is thus the oldest extant public junior college in the United States. It exists today as evidence of the unusual persuasive powers of Harper, at the turn of the century, in fostering the junior college movement.

Harper, in 1900, is also credited with having instituted the awarding of the Associate of Arts Degree, at the University of Chicago, to all students who had successfully completed the junior college program of studies. He thus, officially recognized the junior college program as a specific collegiate achievement.

In Michigan, the Grand Rapids Board of Education opened the first junior college. In 1914, upon the recommendation of the University of Michigan, it established the Grand Rapids Junior College. In fact, this institution had come into being three years before the state legislature past the first enabling act. Jesse B. Davis, the principal of the Grand Rapids Central High School became the first President of Grand Rapids Junior College.

After the establishment of the Grand Rapids Junior College, the Michigan Legislature, in 1917, passed its first junior college enabling act.<sup>3</sup> The act empowered the board of education in any school district with a population of 30,000 or more to offer advanced courses of study to high school graduates. This advanced program was not to embrace

---

<sup>3</sup>Dunbar, op. cit., pp 40-41.

more than two years of college work. As a result of this first enabling act, Highland Park, Michigan, established the second junior college in 1918. Other early pioneers in the junior college movement in Michigan were Bay City (1922), Flint (1923), Port Huron (1923), Muskegan (1926), and Jackson in (1928).

Over the years, the term "junior" has been substituted by many junior colleges with "community", so that many junior colleges are now called "Community Colleges". A recent listing of junior colleges in Michigan revealed that 18 out of the 27 listed are now called "Community Colleges".<sup>4</sup> Russel, in a study reported in the Junior College Journal the two basic reasons for substituting the term "Community College" for "junior College": (1) The term "junior" is no longer an appropriate one because junior colleges are no longer to be construed as junior to a four year college, but are instead considered to be a separate and distinct area in our education system; and, (2) students attach a great deal of importance to the prestige factor of higher education and tend to feel that the word "junior" may have an inferior connotation at certain four-year institutions.<sup>5</sup>

Since the community college is now considered a distinct and separate area of our educational system, its function and aims should then be defined. In The Community College, the late Jesse P. Bogue, long-time executive secretary of the American Association of Junior Colleges, wrote an excellent summary of the basic functions of the community college:

---

<sup>4</sup>William A. Harper, ed., The 1967 Junior College Director, Washington, D. C.: The American Association of Junior Colleges (1967) pp. 32-34.

<sup>5</sup>John H. Russell, "Why Fourteen Colleges Changed Their Names", Junior College Journal, 31 (January, 1961), pp. 248-249.

By examination of life situations, of identifiable problems that need solution, on national, state, and local levels, we arrive at conclusions regarding the basic functions of community colleges. They are guidance and counselling for all students and for the people of the community; general education for all students regardless of vocational objectives; technical and other vocational training, and that on a continuing basis, for students who will not advance to upper division collegiate studies; the further democratization of higher education by surmounting barriers of geography and family financial difficulties; the popularization of higher education by breaking down family traditions and creating greater personal interest and motivation; adult education and university-parallel studies for those students who should continue formal education.<sup>6</sup>

From Bogue's definition of the basic functions of a community college one can readily see that he implies that the general purposes of this type of institution should be broad in scope in order to cover major areas of a community's higher educational needs.

Medsker, in his book, The Junior College: Progress and Prospect notes, however, that there is a tendency to confuse what might be regarded as the general functions of the junior college with the aims of a college in terms of desired outcomes for students.<sup>7</sup> He points out that while the functions of a college broadly define its expected per-

---

<sup>6</sup> Jesse P. Bogue, The Community College. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, Inc., 1950, p. 76.

<sup>7</sup> Leland L. Medsker, The Junior College: Progress and Prospect. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, Inc., 1960, pp. 84-86.

formance as an institution, the aims of the college are generally more detailed and specific with regard to the stated objectives of various areas of knowledge and understanding, the types of attitudes and appreciations, and the specific skills and abilities necessary for the institution to fulfill its functions. A statement of aims and objectives, then, according to Medsker, "...is to an institution what a road map is to the tourist or a flight plan to the pilot -- they chart the direction."<sup>8</sup>

In a study of the catalogues and handbooks of the twelve major community colleges of Michigan included in this research project, the author of this dissertation found that only two clearly made a distinction in their catalogues between their functions and their aims according to the criteria set forth by Bogue and Medsker. Only two Community Colleges in Michigan separated their statements of their colleges' functions from their colleges' aims.<sup>9</sup>

One Community College, for example, listed its major functions as: (1) personal, academic and vocation counselling, (2) general education, (3) technical and semi-professional education, (4) transfer education that parallels the freshman and sophomore years of four-year, degree-granting colleges, (5) cultural education for adults, and (6) specialized services for the community. Its aims were listed more specifically as striving to:

1. Contribute to good citizenship by helping students to understand democratic process.

---

<sup>8</sup>Ibid., p. 84.

<sup>9</sup>See Appendix D. The two colleges referred to are among the twelve listed but shall not be referred to by name in fairness to all of the colleges.

2. Prepare the student to make a contribution to the economic life of his community.
3. Expose the student to our cultural, social scientific, and spiritual heritage out of which he may construct a satisfying and consistent world view by which to guide his life.
4. Foster self-reliance on the part of the student by encouraging him to think critically in solving problems.
5. Encourage the student to participate in some form of satisfying creative activity and in appreciating the creativity of others.
6. Develop within the student increased understanding of the political and socio-economic problems confronting our nation and the world contributing to a sense of social responsibility.
7. Help the student to understand his relationship to his biological and physical environment so that he may better adjust to and improve that environment.
8. Develop within the student an appreciation and understanding of the contributions afforded by other ideas, races, and religions.
9. Develop with students skills in writing, speaking, reading, and listening which lead to improved self-expression and communication.<sup>10</sup>

---

<sup>10</sup>Ibid., Appendix D.

Another Community College in a very similar fashion listed major functions and approximately ten aims which conceptually included many of the same values stated in the example on the previous page. Both were quite definitive and distinctively clear. The ten other colleges typically had statements that tended to fuse their basic functions and their aims. Although there were differences among the colleges regarding their aims, most of them had closely related definitions of function.

#### STUDENT CHARACTERISTICS

Intellectual, social, and psychological factors affect the relationships that students have with the community college. A dearth of information in this area has handicapped student personnel workers in their attempt to better understand the perceptions, expectations, and backgrounds of two-year college students. This situation tends to exist more at the two-year non-resident public community college. Blocker, et al, in their very thorough book, The Two-Year College: A Social Synthesis, cites the need for more research in this area.<sup>11</sup> In the latest publication of the American Junior Colleges (1967), a standard reference in the field of community college work, not one major recently completed study in this area was noted in the ten pages of writings and research cited.<sup>12</sup> It should be noted however, that

---

<sup>11</sup>Clyde E. Blocker, et. al., The Two-Year College: A Social Synthesis. Englewood Cliffs: Prentis-Hall, Inc., 1965, p. 106.

<sup>12</sup>Edmond J. Gleazer, Jr., (Ed.), American Junior Colleges. Washington, D.C.: The American Council on Education, 1967, pp. 51-60.

research studies in this area have recently gotten under way. In 1967, the American Council on Education Office of Research published a major statistical survey of student characteristic information that included a variety of interesting data regarding the two-year public college freshmen student.<sup>13</sup> Of the total number of students enrolled full-time in the two-year public community college, approximately 89 percent fall within the age range of 17 and 19. Five percent are 20 to 21 years of age, and the remaining six percent comprises those students who are older than 21 years of age. There are also a large number of students who are not of college age and who make up a large portion of the part-time or "unclassified" student. Their ages range from the twenties to the sixties and sometimes seventies, and they comprise approximately 50 percent of the total number of the two-year college student in the United States. The perceived needs of these students in relation to education vary a great deal from those of their full-time younger counterparts.

The adult part-time students of a community college tend to be substantially more mature than the youthful full-time students, and this maturity is generally reflected in their seriousness of purpose both in personal activities and academic endeavors.<sup>14</sup> While younger students may be sincere in their endeavor to achieve, they are not as

---

<sup>13</sup>See Appendix C for specific breakdown of various freshmen characteristics according to Weighted National Norms.

<sup>14</sup>Blocker, Et. al., Op. Cit., p. 108.

definitive in their immediate goals. The part-time older students on the other hand, focus their attention generally upon the completion of college work required for graduation or to achieve a specific goal. It is for this reason that they have little or no interest in extra-curricular activities, athletics, or other non-classroom events compared to the more active participating roles of the younger full-time students.

D'Amico and Raines in their study of the "Employment Characteristics of Flint Community College Students" found that 57 percent of the students studied had part-time jobs.<sup>15</sup> The researchers noted that 63 percent of the men and 47 percent of the women worked on jobs which consumed a median of 22 and 16.8 hours per week, respectively. An interesting question was raised by the authors as to whether the majority of these students needed to work in order to pay their college and personal expenses. They noted that approximately half of those students with outside employment stated that they did not need to work to stay in college. It seems apparent from the above study that community college students tend not to withdraw from the community at large during his stay at college. They are, for the most part, active participants in the community's vocational activities and tend to continue to absorb the community's attitudes towards occupations and the value of education in attaining occupational advancements. This certainly has its affects on the students perceptions of the ultimate worth of a college degree.

---

<sup>15</sup>Louis A. D'Amico and Max R. Raines, "Employment Characteristics of Flint Junior College Students", Junior College Journal, 28, (December, 1957), pp. 193-195.

Obviously family background also conditions the attitude of students toward higher education. A generation or two ago it was the exception for a student of working-class background to enter college. Today, the number of community college students from working-class homes exceeds that from upper and upper-middle class homes. This was verified by a most comprehensive study of the socio-economic backgrounds of college students made by Clark who found that proportionally more two-year college students came from lower socio-economic backgrounds than do their counterparts in four-year college and universities.<sup>16</sup> Because his financial resources are limited, the parent of a community college student who is in a lower income bracket is not always in a position to assist his child in going to college. Hence, one does find a goodly number of community college students who are job oriented throughout their education. Because most of the unmarried community students at community colleges are forced to live at home, even though they may in many instances prefer not to do so, they are influenced to a much greater degree by their parents than is true of the students who go away to college. Hence, even though they may rebel and resent the pressure of the home, they are probably less likely to throw off the restraints of the past or to be as venturesome as their counterparts who have left home to attend college.

It was not the main purpose of the author of this dissertation to dwell on an item by item analysis of community college student characteristics, but rather, it was his intent to shed some light on the type

---

<sup>16</sup>Burton R. Clark, The Open Door College: A Case Study. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1960, p. 54.

of student personnel that most public community colleges find challenging them today. The major problem confronting the community college then is the necessity to develop those policies, social-regulatory and others, which will in the end provide those conditions which will motivate students to grow to the limits of their abilities. In order to accomplish this task it appears axiomatic that a good place for any institution to begin is to assess the students' thinking regarding the establishment of various programs and policies, since they, as the participants, are the primary purpose for their establishment. The goal of the college then, should be to involve students to strike the delicate balance between institutional and student expectations. In this way the institution will serve a beneficial function.

HISTORICAL CHANGES IN THE ADMINISTRATION OF DISCIPLINE IN  
HIGHER EDUCATION IN THE UNITED STATES

Over the past three hundred years disciplinary practices in American institutions of higher education have changed tremendously. For the most part the general practices of our early American colleges would not be recognized or for that matter even tolerated today.

In order to understand the vast changes that have occurred in the disciplinary practices of our institutions of higher education, it is imperative to refer to their historical origin. In 1636, the Puritans of the Massachusetts Bay Colony founded Harvard College. Their chief motives for its establishment were to advance and perpetuate learning and to supply the Puritan pulpits with ministers.<sup>17</sup> Subse-

---

<sup>17</sup>Richard Hofstadter and Wilson Smith, American Higher Education-A Documentary History. Volume I Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1961, p. 1.

quently, all of our pre-Revolution colleges were denominational in control and, almost entirely in spirit, with the sole exception of the College of Philadelphia whose control was non-sectarian. In Virginia, the Anglican College of William and Mary was chartered in 1693. In Connecticut, the Congregationalist Yale College was established in 1701. The Presbyterian College of Princeton was chartered in New Jersey in 1746. These were followed by the chartering of such schools as: the Anglican King's College in New York in 1754; the Baptist Brown College in Rhode Island in 1764; the Congregationalist Dartmouth College in New Hampshire in 1769; and, in New Jersey, the Dutch Reformed Rutgers in 1770.

In almost every respect all of these colleges were patterned after the residential colleges of the ancient universities of England with which their founders were familiar. These early American colleges carried on with the classical curriculum; their rules and regulations were almost a verbatim duplicate of those in Cambridge or Oxford. This was especially true in the early days of their existence. The formation of Christian Character, as well as the furtherance of learning were their aims. While exerting a profound influence on early colonial environment through the civil and religious leaders, the colonial colleges failed to establish themselves as popular institutions intimately affecting the lives of the people. This situation existed mainly because these institutions were shaped by aristocratic traditions and served mainly the aristocratic elements of colonial society. For example, Harvard's first code of laws admonished its scholars not to

"frequent the company and society of such men as lead an ungirt and dissolute life".<sup>18</sup> There were nineteen laws in all in the 1646 Harvard Code dealing with not only religious expectation in behavior but social as well. The Yale statutes were very explicit in their condemnation of a student found, "...Guilty of Profane Swearing, Cursing, Vowing, and Petty or Implicit Oath, Profane or Irreverent Use of the Names, Attributes, Ordinances or Word of God; Disobedient or Contumacious or Refractory Carriage towards his Superiors, Fighting, Striking, Quarrelling, Challenging, Turbulent Words or Behavior, Drunkenness, Uncleaness, Lacivious Words or Actions, Wearing Woman's Apparel, Defrauding, Injustice, Idleness, Lying, Defamation, Tale Bearing or any other such like Immoralities..."<sup>19</sup> The penalty was punishment by fine, confession, admonition or expulsion, depending on the case. One could well understand from codes such as these why early American institutions of higher education could easily be referred to as the "Citadels of Discipline". Yale had twenty penal laws in all covering everything from fornication to religious practice.

Schetlin, in her brief but informative article entitled, "Disorders, Deans, and Discipline", noted that "punishments for infractions of college regulations from 1630 to 1870 consisted primarily of public confessions and reprimands, public whippings, extra assignments, fines, suspensions, and at Harvard included a solemn public ritual of expulsion."<sup>20</sup>

---

<sup>18</sup>Ibid., p. 9.

<sup>19</sup>Hofstadter and Smith, Op. Cit., pp. 56 and 57.

<sup>20</sup>Eleanor M. Schetlin, "Disorders, Deans, and Discipline, The Education Digest, 33 (December, 1967), p. 49.

The standard means of discipline for most cases was flogging until 1718. This practice was then substituted by the practice of boxing, in which a student who violated a rule had to kneel at the feet of his tutor who cuffed him stingingly on the ear. This practice was eliminated by 1755 and omitted from most college laws by 1767. The elimination of these practices according to Rudolph, "...clearly recorded the humanitarian spirit that was loose in the Western world, but it may also have meant that the English college was being Americanized." <sup>21</sup>

The president and his tutors literally held big sticks over their students. They felt that their regulations and punishments were necessary regardless of their ineffectiveness in changing the behavior of student violators. It became increasingly obvious that as the rules became more punitive, the violations of these same rules occurred with greater frequency. The presidents were slow indeed in perceiving that their systems did not work. For tough as their penalties were, they did not bring order to their colleges. After the "bread and butter rebellion", in 1805, Harvard suspended half of its entire student body. Similarly, Princeton suspended or expelled 125 of its 200 students after the "Riot of 1807". The approach was dictatorial and vindictive. Presidents, in those days, who were distinguished clergymen, philosophers, scholars and teachers, felt compelled to demonstrate authority. There had to be a law and a penalty for every possible situation.

---

<sup>21</sup>Frederick Rudolph, The American College and University. New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1962, p.27.

W. Storrs Lee, in his delightfully descriptive book, God Bless Our Queer Old Dean, notes however, that "the law wasn't enough. Presidents and Professors continued to live in mortal terror of the youth they were guiding. With a crust of stale bread, a Harvard student scored a hit on the left eye of historian William Prescott and blinded the eye. University of Virginia faculty members were subjected to brutal assaults, and in 1842 a professor there was shot and killed by a trigger-happy assailant. At Oakland College in Mississippi a drunken student satisfied his grudge against the President by stabbing him to death. Dignified men of letters were stoned, whipped and ridden out of town."<sup>22</sup>

This type of college behavior hardly reflected the college atmosphere intended by leading educators of the time. The college was supposed to be a close community where students lived in on-campus dormitories like a large family, sleeping, eating, studying and worshipping together under one roof. Rudolph, cites facts to the contrary, however, dormitories actually facilitated rebellion by creating atmosphere void of planned recreational activities and conditions that were harsh, frustrating ones that invited tension and mal-behavior.<sup>23</sup> Dormitories between 1800 and 1870 actually documented the failure of college personnel to recognize the need for satisfactory outlets for the human energy and imagination of young men on campus. A possible reason for these conditions might well be that the college professors

---

<sup>22</sup>W. Storrs Lee, God Bless Our Queer Old Dean. New York: G. P. Putnam's Sons, 1959, pp. 62-63.

<sup>23</sup>Rudolph, op. cit., pp. 96-97.

in the middle 1800's were for the most part clergymen or men who had been trained for clergy. They were largely "divorced from the world" in their ideas and philosophy on student morals and standards of conduct. According to Rudolph, the faculty at Dartmouth between 1828 and 1862 was composed of two-thirds clergymen. Lafayette College in 1841 had its entire staff comprised of clergymen and in 1868 seven out of the ten faculty members at Princeton were Presbyterian ministers.<sup>24</sup> The paternalistic endeavor of these professors to create a campus world separated from the mainstream of life in the world outside was doomed to failure. By 1850, over 700 colleges had closed for lack of students.

The rigid academic philosophy and authoritarian methods of control of the early colleges slowly gave way to the development of an atmosphere of freedom rather than that of strict authority. In 1869, Harvard made a sharp distinction between scholarship and conduct, ranking students henceforth on the basis of academic grades alone. As for character, this no longer would count in the ranking of students. What was most important was intellectual performance in the classroom, not model behavior in the dormitory or village pub.<sup>25</sup>

By the 1880's, football came into being as a collegiate activity. As strange as it might seem, it had a favorable influence on student conduct and discipline. In many ways, it served to channel the human energies of young men in the right direction more effectively than

---

<sup>24</sup>Rudolph, op. cit., p. 159-160

<sup>25</sup>Hofstadter and Smith, op. cit., pp. 611-612.

directive from a faculty discipline committee, possibly because it built a loyalty to the college and its ideals among most of the students. Rudolph quoted the famous football coach, Amos Alonzo Stagg, as saying, "Until intercollegiate athletics came along, the major sport in America had been convivial drinking." He might have added, said Rudolph, "that football appeared to be responsible for cutting down the incidence of rebellions, rioting and hazing."<sup>26</sup>

It was also during this period following the Civil War that colleges realized more and more the importance of serving the needs of their students not only through expanded academic programs of elective subjects but through involvement in extra-curricular activities. This democratization of higher education continued to shift some of the disciplinary and regulatory functions over to students and students finally began to be treated like adults. According to E. G. Williamson, most forms of student participation in newly structured student governments centered on problems of discipline and control of student behavior.<sup>27</sup> In 1868, the University of Illinois inaugurated a comprehensive scheme of student government to establish more orderly and constructive relationships between faculty and students through student control of behavior. The system proved to be unwieldy, and students did not especially relish the idea of disciplining each other. From that day on, a greater number of higher education institutions made serious

---

<sup>26</sup>Rudolph, Op. Cit., pp. 378-379.

<sup>27</sup>Edmund Griffith Williamson, Student Personnel Services in Colleges and Universities. New York: McGraw Hill Book Company, 1961, p. 375.

attempts to involve students in the control of behavior. Numerous remedies were introduced in an attempt to bridge the communication gap between the student and their mentors.

During the first decade of the new twentieth century, the philosophy of most colleges served to encourage responsible democratic citizenship. This reflected the changing current of American life at the turn of the century. Student councils, extra-curricular student activities and clubs, fraternities, inter-fraternity councils, and other variation of the idea of self-government became widespread.

Over the past six decades students have been granted a wide latitude in the day-to-day management of their own extra-curricular student activities. Williamson noted, however, that students over the years increasingly insisted that they be granted an opportunity to participate in the actual making of general university policies as opposed to just extra-curricular affairs policy-making.<sup>28</sup> Undoubtedly the scope and extent of participation today are much broader than they were prior to World War II days even though evolution is not proceeding today as quickly as some educators might wish. According to Harry H. Lunn, Jr., the United States National Student Association, in 1955, found that in its study of 486 college student governments regarding areas of interest and action, that students were interested and involved in some 24 areas of university and college policy and decision-making either directly or on a consultative basis.<sup>29</sup> Of these areas, the functions

---

<sup>28</sup>Ibid., p. 378.

<sup>29</sup>Harry H. Lunn, Jr., The Student's Role in College Policy-Making. Washington, D. C.: American Council on Education, 1957, p. 19.

of determining and administering social-regulatory policies and student discipline policies ranked among the top three in terms of interest and some measure of involvement. The interest in these two major areas is not too unusual since it affects students so directly in their day-to-day life on campus. One phase of student participation in these two areas about which there seems to remain major disagreement is that of student-administered discipline, generally encompassed by the concept of the student court or discipline committee. McKown, in his book, The Student Council, noted that the student court movement in America began to flourish during the "late twenties" and "early thirties", but because of unfortunate experiences with this procedure, it was soon eliminated as a policy in most colleges until it was revived again just prior to World War II.<sup>30</sup>

The crux of objections on student competency in the area of discipline is the belief of many educators that students do not have the background to be involved in a wide variety of individual misconduct cases. According to a study cited by Lunn, Jr., out of thirty-five areas in which students were considered capable of taking action, deans ranked student competence in the area of discipline as sixteenth.<sup>31</sup> The literature on this subject also revealed that most college presidents felt that discipline cases should be referred to the Dean of Students, Dean of Men, Dean of Women or some other administrator.

During the greater part of the nineteenth century, the presidents of an institution of higher education handled most of the administrative

---

<sup>30</sup> Harry C. McKown, The Student Council. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1946, p. 265

tasks. In effect, he served as registrar, financier, admissions director, disciplinarian, and dean of faculty. By the turn of the century however, the growth in the number of students, plus increasing campus activities had laid burdens upon the president which he was unable to meet. At first the head of a college would follow the usual method of naming several staff members to serve as a committee on student affairs, designating a professor who had some qualifications as chairman. In time, the problems, activities and social affairs, in addition to such important matters as student government, loans, and assistance, proved too much for the committee. In fact, as time passed, discipline began to take up most of the committee's time. According to Lindsay and Holland, "Faculty Discipline Committees became very common during the first two decades of this century."<sup>32</sup> Their function was to deal with various violations of campus rules and regulations, or against public morals and decency. The student was summoned before the committee, who sat on a jury and made disciplinary decisions subject to review by the college president. But even a committee solely responsible for discipline became bogged down and took away time from the classroom. As a result, the offices' of deans of men and women came into existence.

The new administrators were appointed as chief officers of discipline of the college. They had to work out new techniques of approach to student problems before their offices would justify the expense of maintaining them. Lee<sup>33</sup> noted that the disciplinary administrator

---

<sup>31</sup>Lunn, Jr., Op. Cit., p. 20.

<sup>32</sup>E. E. Lindsay, and E. O. Holland, College and University Administration. New York: The MacMillen Company, 1930, p. 504.

<sup>33</sup>Lee, Op. Cit. p. 36.

is the person students go to when they are in trouble, when they need an advocate, when they have a grievance to air. Regardless of the title in the college catalogue, he is the official from whom the derelict with a bad conscience expects a summons, and with whom the "goof" knows he will eventually have to reckon. Sometimes the duties of the dean are intricately departmentalized. Sometimes he is labeled "Director of Student Activities", or "Student Welfare", "Director of Student Personnel", or "Dean of Students" or "Student Affairs". Lee went on to point out the rather humorous fact that students don't pay too much attention to titles, for they have an instinct for "sniffing their way" to the proper office regardless of the title on the door. To students, the official to whom students customarily go for their reckonings is known simply as "the dean".

Lindsay and Holland, in discussing the functions and responsibilities of the deans of men and women, indicated that these deans held strategically important positions for they were the chief bonds between the administration and the student body.<sup>34</sup> Persons qualified to hold this position must have the ability to work with young people. To be successful, deans of men and women must be able to establish a rapport with students, win and hold their respect and confidence. Deans must on the other hand, also be able to cooperate with faculty colleagues and interpret the rules of conduct set by the faculty and administration. They should without doubt be in close touch with the

---

<sup>34</sup>Lindsay and Holland, Op. Cit., p. 27

president to keep an open channel of communication. The reason for this close relationship between the president and the dean of students, according to Woodburne, "...is that when any situation occurs or any problem arises on the campus, the president is the one who is held responsible even though the dean of students may have been the person who made the decision; the president's office will either take the "heat" of an unpopular decision or will get the credit for a wise decision".<sup>35</sup>

But despite all that, this responsibility has implied for the deans in terms of status over the past years, Lee observed, that "the dean is still the most misunderstood character in the academic procession. In the eyes of the public and many students, he is "the campus spoil-sport, the man who orders the vital tackle out of action just before the big home game, the temperance agitator who has an over-whelming aversion to bourbon and beer,...the symbol of authority against whom university riots are waged."<sup>36</sup>

Alternately then, the dean, depending upon the situation at hand, is a sort of pastor and policeman, teacher and tyrant, sympathetic counselor and condemning judge. There are times when he is probably forced into the ambiguous position of representing the whole reach of law enforcement, and, in succession, serves as detective, prosecutor, defendant, jury, and judge for a single infraction. These are precisely the reasons why the dean must understand the dynamics involved

---

<sup>35</sup>Lloyd S. Woodburne, Principles of College and University Administration. Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1958, p. 172.

<sup>36</sup>Lee, Op. Cit., p. 33

in his interaction with other people. For in a way he is custodian of the best interest of all, and more specifically, he is the cohesive element between students, faculty members, administrators, and the public.

Although the Dean of Student Personnel Services is a conventional fixture today, it became apparent after World War I that the Dean himself could not possibly handle the multitude of behavioral problems that continued to come to the fore with increased enrollments. By the 1920's most colleges and universities were busy perfecting various systems of freshmen counselling. At first there was little debate about the role of the counselor in personnel work. It was generally accepted that a counselor could be one who not only talked with a student and advised him but also one who could in some measure be involved in the administering of discipline. Hence, for many years counselors assisted the "Deans of Students" in the disciplinary counselling process. According to Williamson and Foley,<sup>37</sup> the purpose of disciplinary counselling was to take action against a student in a given case to help him learn, or relearn the type of behavior which is acceptable to the group, the institution and to himself.

By the early 1940's, however, a serious question was raised in the field of counselling as to whether or not the counselling function and the disciplinary function could be integrated successfully and coped with by one person on the staff regardless of his title. This question erupted into a full scale debate with the publication of

---

<sup>37</sup>E. G. Williamson and J. D. Foley, Counselling and Discipline. New York: McGraw Hill Book Company, Inc., 1949, p. 26.

Carl Rogers', Counselling and Psychotherapy in 1942. Rogers, a psychologist, questioned whether a therapeutic relationship was compatible with authority. This produced a healthy but violent debate among student personnel workers, for essentially what Rogers was asking, was whether it was possible for a counselor to also be a disciplinarian.<sup>38</sup> He concluded that therapy and authority could not co-exist, noting that the mixture of the two functions nearly always proved unsuccessful in helping to establish a good relationship with the student. To Rogers, a separation of the counselling function from authoritative functions in our schools and colleges was an absolute necessity.

This recognition of the need to separate the counselling function from the disciplinary function was lauded by such authorities as Arbuckle<sup>39</sup>, Cortale<sup>40</sup>, and Maslow<sup>41</sup>. Counselling, according to the client-centered theory expressed by Roger was meant to be "ego-strengthening", and "self-regulatory", avoiding any impositions or

---

<sup>38</sup>Carl R. Rogers, Counselling and Psychotherapy. Boston: Houghton-Mifflin Company, 1942, p. 108.

<sup>39</sup>Dugald S. Arbuckle. Student Personnel Services In Higher Education. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, Inc., 1953, p. 138.

<sup>40</sup>Michael J. Cortale. "Counselors and Discipline", Personnel and Guidance Journal, 39 (January, 1961), pp. 349-351.

<sup>41</sup>Abraham H. Maslow. Motivation and Personality. New York: Harper, 1954, p. 137.

restrictions in dealing with the client. The miscreant, noted Lee<sup>42</sup>, was not to be approached with authoritarianism or threat so that he might be more agreeable to accepting an inviting course of rehabilitation. Discipline, on the other hand, was repressive, regulatory and punitive; it was "drum-head justice".

The argument as to whether or not a counselor should be involved in the administration of discipline still rages on in many circles of education administration. Novak, exclaimed in the Phi Delta Kappan recently, "Unless the counselor is freed to counsel, his service will be ineffectual and largely wasted. Too many schools expect counselors to administer discipline".<sup>43</sup> Cortale<sup>44</sup> in his survey of fifty principals in twenty-eight school districts in Nassau County, Long Island, regarding their practices in the use of counselors as disciplinarians, found that fifty percent of the principals felt counselors should handle minor discipline problems. Those that opposed the involvement of counselors in the disciplinary process did not do so because they felt a counselor couldn't handle this role effectively, but rather because other load factors and time posed a limitations problem. Cortale asserts that the rapport, acceptance, and understanding essential to a counselling situation are an impossible realization, if the counselor is responsible for discipline. However, he could assist in preventing the repetition of a disciplinary case by helping the

---

<sup>42</sup>Lee, Op. Cit., p. 158.

<sup>43</sup>Benjamin J. Novak, "Let the Counselor Counsel". The Phi Delta Kappan, 43 (January, 1962), p. 171.

<sup>44</sup>Cortale, loc. cit., pp. 349-351.

student to analyze his case and understand the reason for a penalty. Lee sums up the views of those who believe that counselling and disciplining can remain as one, in the process of helping a student to change his behavior, by quoting a college dean who said,

Discipline is not bad, unnatural, conducive to frustration, ego-damaging, or repressive. The corrective definition of discipline is training which corrects, molds, strengthens, and perfects. Learning is impossible without discipline. Students do not reject discipline unless they have been conditioned to do so. Most individuals recognize the need for discipline and are uncomfortable without it. The counselor must recognize that the individual who is in need of discipline is in no way different from the counselee who evidences other problems of adjustment.<sup>45</sup>

Essentially, the dean is saying that rapport is possible when discipline is a function of the counselor - just as rapport exists between parents and children.

The historical changes in the administration of discipline has been revealed in the literature. Disagreements as to the extent various college personnel should become involved in the area of student conduct, discipline, and citizenship, are still a matter of debate. However, it must be stated that in recent years there has been virtually complete agreement on the best approach to discipline by most college personnel involved in this process. The "corrective approach" seems to be favored over the purely "punitive" approach to discipline. According to Weinhoff<sup>46</sup>, the disciplinarian cannot forget that it is his basic responsibility to foster a change of attitude which will in turn,

---

<sup>45</sup>Lee, Op. Cit., p. 158.

<sup>46</sup>J. F. Weinhoff, "What Are Some Good Practices in Handling Student Discipline?" Bulletin of National Association of Secondary School Principals, 44, (April, 1960), pp. 68-70.

hopefully modify a student's behavior. Good practice in discipline must always involve a "positive" approach. The student must be able to see the justice of the action taken. This conviction is still shared by most student personnel workers today. Punishment without the goal of restoration of acceptable behavior is a lazy way of solving the problems of students with regards to their conduct and observance of institutional social regulatory policies.

#### THE DEVELOPMENT OF SOCIAL REGULATORY POLICIES AND RULES

Most colleges and universities in the United States are controlled by a board which has been given official legal authority to govern all aspects of the institution. These boards are usually made up of lay citizens rather than professional educators and are designated by a variety of official titles. The most common of these is the "Board of Trustees". Regardless of titles, however, the salient fact is that these boards, in particular, Community College boards, are public agencies and the ultimate controlling power and responsibility for developing the objectives and social values of the institution rest with them.

Each board, in order to carry its objectives, especially with respect to student conduct, citizenship, and discipline, must adopt policies which, when enacted, will cause these objectives to be accomplished. Once having adopted those policies necessary to provide broad guidelines for discretionary action relative to student conduct and discipline, which permit administrators to establish rules to regulate the social conduct of students, the board's third major respon-

sibility is to appraise the functional results of its policies. According to Rislov<sup>47</sup>, the very success of a board depends on how sincerely it concerns itself with the development of policies. A board can evade its policy-making task but it cannot nullify its ultimate responsibility, for this responsibility is essentially the reason for its existence. Spalding<sup>48</sup> noted that in the case of student conduct and discipline, especially, trustees tend to often neglect to formulate policies governing the administration of discipline. Yet these very policies are what is needed as an administrative guideline to help the administrator act with a consistent frame of references.

In 1962, a study of Board Policy Manuals in California Public Junior Colleges was made by Kintzer<sup>49</sup>. He noted that, in a survey made (in 1952) during the St. Louis Convention of the National School Boards Associated, only 35 percent of the schools represented had written policies. The use of written policy manuals has increased since 1952, however, it has only been in recent years that emphasis has been placed on improving the effectiveness of local boards with regards to the development of more functional and reasonable policies governing student conduct and discipline. After completing his research analysis of 23 community college policy manuals, Kintzer

---

<sup>47</sup>Sigurd Rislov, "The Board's Responsibility". Junior College Journal, 35, (September, 1964), pp. 9-11.

<sup>48</sup>Howard G. Spalding, "What Boardmen Should Know and Do About Discipline". American School Board Journal, 140, (March, 1960). pp. 18-21

<sup>49</sup>Frederick C. Kintzer. Board Policy Manuals in California Junior Colleges. (Junior College Leadership Program) Los Angeles: University of California, January, 1962.

indicated that few manuals reviewed, clearly distinguished between policy and rules and regulations. He further stressed that the goal of an efficient community college operation could best be reached by separating board policy from what should be defined as rules and regulations -- hence, clearly indicating the relationships between the board of trustees and its administrative staff.

Most significantly related to this study was Kintzer's frequency tables listing items pertaining to student conduct, discipline, and citizenship that were included in the policy manuals of the twenty-three junior colleges studied. Of the twenty-three manuals reviewed, the following number of junior colleges had policies listed on the following subjects:<sup>50</sup>

1. Smoking, drinking, gambling, hazing, etc. - 2
2. Clubs and organizations - 8
3. Neatness of Dress - 2
4. Secret societies - 2
5. Political activities of students - 1
6. Probation and retention - 6
7. Suspension and exclusion - 10

Kintzer concluded that junior college boards did not tend to concern themselves as much with student activities and student behavior as they did to other educational business.

Williamson and Cowan agreed with Kintzer's conclusion in their research on academic freedom for students. They stated that "at the

---

<sup>50</sup>Ibid., pp. 35-36.

outset of research we realized that there would be many patterns of administrative operation, yet we assumed that the existence of codified policies specifying the institutional position concerning most aspects of student academic freedom, particularly the various modes of student expression, would guide presidential decision making in crisis situations. We were startled to discover that, with the exception of policies regarding off-campus speakers, only 6 percent of the responding presidents reported the existence of written policies for any mode of student expression."<sup>51</sup>

In her survey of seventy hand books of small colleges and universities, Carter found that most colleges and universities have their policies, rules, and regulations on student conduct listed in their student handbooks.<sup>52</sup> This may well account for the paucity of written policies in this area in board manuals.

A search of the literature revealed that writers tended to shy away from stating the specific rules or policies that should be set up to govern student conduct and discipline. It was felt that these would differ with each institution depending on its community setting. However, most authors urged that policy statements should, whenever possible, be written in a "positive" manner rather than a "negative" one and that they should be developed with the cooperative involvement of students, faculty, and administration.

---

<sup>51</sup>E. G. Williamson and John L. Cowan, "Academic Freedom for Students: Issues and Guidelines." The College and the Student, edited by Laurence E. Dennis and Joseph F. Kaufman. Washington D.C.: American Council on Education, 1966, pp. 268-269.

<sup>52</sup>Cornelia Carter, "Survey of Handbooks in Small Colleges and Universities," Junior College Journal, 22, (May, 1952) pp. 508-509.

According to Lozo<sup>53</sup>, the value of a student conduct policy lies mainly in how it was evolved and promoted. He noted that it is not the code of conduct that matters but rather it is the spirit that recognizes the need for one, the cooperation of all in developing one, and the earnest desire to keep it working democratically over the years.

The first half of this century saw faculty members becoming more involved with the development of policies through the organization of faculty advisory committees or the faculty senates. Today most institutions in higher education seek the advice of their faculty committees before determining major policies. This is not true however in the case of student involvement in the policy-making process. Williamson and Cowan observed in their study of 1,000 four-year colleges and universities, that students only held membership on policy-advisory committees in approximately sixty percent of the schools surveyed.<sup>54</sup>

In this regard Paul Woodring, Education Editor of the Saturday Review, noted that "a properly organized student body with responsible leadership can play a useful role in making policy on matters of student discipline, since regulations governing student behavior should reflect the mores of the current college generation as well as those of the

---

<sup>53</sup>John P. Lozo, "Can Conduct Codes Favorably Affect Student Attitudes and Behavior?" Bulletin of the National Association of Secondary School Principals, 44, (April, 1960) pp. 130-131.

<sup>54</sup>E. G. Williamson and John L. Cowan, The American Student's Freedom of Expression. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1966, p. 134.

larger community." <sup>55</sup>

From Woodring's point of view involvement of students in the development of student discipline policies should not be construed as a superficial process, for if it is the process will break down.

Keeton, for example, noted that too often campus student government and college life were so organized and conducted as to arrest development toward mature responsibility. The areas in which students had authority and responsibility were often trivial, and their attempts to influence significant matters were so rebuffed as to discourage their learning responsible methods of democratic action.<sup>56</sup> This is indeed valid criticism of colleges who manipulate students in a process of continuous "wheel-spinning."

On the other hand, in colleges where the line between administration, faculty, and students disappears, in an attempt to assure the student that he is an equal, the student is often plunged into decision-making areas in which he is unprepared. In this respect, Henderson, as did other writers, cautioned that there should be understanding of the scope of responsibility delegated to student groups. He said,

Educational progress is a professional undertaking and it is essential that faculty and administration have full authority over it and student

---

<sup>55</sup>Paul Woodring, "Who Makes University Policy." Beyond Berkeley, edited by C. G. Katope and P. G. Zolbrod. Cleveland: The World Publishing Company, 1966, p. 150.

<sup>56</sup>Morris Keeton, "The Climate of Learning in College", College and University Bulletin, 15, (November, 1962) pp. 1-5.

relationships to it. Students should participate, but not control. It does not promote the welfare of the group as a whole to become democratic to the extent that every body decides everything.<sup>57</sup>

Other literature reviewed by the writer agreed with the author cited above that students, if given intelligent ground rules, can effectively participate in policy making, most especially in the area of student affairs which, to be sure, involves student conduct and discipline in some measure.

#### COMMUNICATION OF SOCIAL-REGULATORY POLICIES AND RULES

It is of little value for any community college to go through the formalities of utilizing the collective efforts of many individuals to help in the development of written policies, rules and regulations governing student conduct and citizenship unless students are in some way informed of them and given some understanding of the reason for their adoption. The best way to disseminate this type of information to students has long been a concern to deans and other personnel workers charged with responsibilities in this area. Many simply publish written policies, rules and regulations regarding conduct and citizenship in student handbooks, college bulletins or student newspaper, assuming, hopefully, that most students will read them. Others mailed them home in the form of a brochure or had them posted on campus bulletin boards or discussed them at student assemblies or orientation sessions. Films and similar media have also been tried

---

<sup>57</sup>Algo D. Henderson, Policies and Practices in Higher Education. New York: Harper and Brothers, 1960, p. 235.

and found effective in a number of instances.

Although the procedures mentioned have met with varying degrees of success depending on how they were planned and the type of institutional environment in which they were utilized, an examination of the literature indicated that most colleges favored Orientation days, Orientation or Freshmen Weeks, and Orientation classes as the best methods to use to orient their new students to college life.

From the point of view of the college, Blocker<sup>58</sup> noted that orientation programs provide the means by which students may be informed of specific regulations designed to facilitate their orderly intergration into the student body. Students, during orientation, are also explained new terms usually not known to entering college freshmen. More specifically, the institution expectations of the new students regarding academic standards, social conduct and citizenship are thoroughly discussed. It is at this time also that the different activities and student personnel services offered to students are introduced and explained so that students can effectively utilize them as the need arises.

Eddy<sup>59</sup>, in his book, The College Influence on Student Character, especially emphasized that of all the discussions planned for an orientation program it was most important for a college to go out of its way -- in fact, sometimes far out of its way -- to make known the under-lying postulates of its program in student conduct and

---

<sup>58</sup>Clyde E. Blocker, Et. al., Op. Cit., p. 257

<sup>59</sup>Edward D. Eddy, The College Influence on Student Character. Washington, D. C. American Council on Education, 1959, p. 100.

citizenship. Misunderstandings well up quickly. He said, if there were sound reasons behind the rules, and these were made known to students, that students were quick to understand both the reasons and the rules.

Orientation programs should not be planned merely as vehicles for administrative lectures, but they should rather, according to Arbuckle, "utilize the services of the entire faculty and of some of the student body to assist the incoming students as much as possible."<sup>60</sup> To this extent new students can recognize the various points of view from students, faculty members and administrators. And most important, that orientation is a cooperative venture designed to welcome and assist students.

#### LEGAL IMPLICATIONS OF STUDENT CONDUCT AND DISCIPLINE

Most charters of institutions of higher education have been founded under the grants of power extended by the state legislatures or in some cases, state constitutions. Boards of trustees have generally been given broad authority to govern and manage their colleges and universities including the implicit grant to enforce compliance with those policies and regulations which they establish.<sup>61</sup> As it was noted in Chapter I, the predominant number of community colleges in Michigan function under this type of broad authority granted by legislative enactments. Under this type of statute, a board appears

---

<sup>60</sup>Arbuckle, Op. Cit., p. 68.

<sup>61</sup>Clarence J. Bakken, The Legal Basis for College Student Personnel Work. Washington, D. C.: The American College Personnel Association, 1961, pp. 5-7 & 31-32

to have full control over discipline and can delegate its authority on discipline to the administrators or faculty of the school; that is, it may assign the responsibility for developing and enforcing rules and regulations within the framework of board policy to carry out the various programs and services of the college.

The courts generally have not interfered with disciplinary action when it was found that it was exercised without malice and for the best interests of the student body as a whole. In fact, for years administrators have lawfully restricted and controlled the actions of students basing their decisions on the concept of "in loco parentis." Blackwell, writing on college law, cited the court case involving Berea College in 1913 as an example where this principle of law was well stated.<sup>62</sup> The college in this case prohibited its students through regulations from entering public eating establishments in the community. The owners of the restaurants pressed for a court injunction to force the college to rescind its action. The court, however, sustained the right of the college to control its students in the following words:

College authorities stand in loco parentis concerning the physical and moral welfare and mental training of pupils. For the purposes of this case, the school, its officers and students are a legal entity, as much so as any family, and, like a father may direct his children, those in charge of boarding schools are well within their rights and powers when they direct their students what to eat and

---

<sup>62</sup>Thomas Edward Blackwell, College Law - A Guide for Administrators. Washington, D. C.: The American Council on Education, 1961, p. 104.

where they may get it; where they may go and what forms of amusement are forbidden.<sup>63</sup>

The position of public colleges to exercise sufficient supervision over its students and their social organizations was legally reaffirmed in many subsequent court decisions, one major one occurring in 1954. The State University of New York Board of Trustees, in 1953, resolved by policy that no social organization permitted in any state-operated unit of the State University shall directly or indirectly affiliate itself with any national or other organization outside the particular campus unit or shall operate under any rule which bars a student on account of race, color, religion, creed, national origin or other artificial criteria. Six national fraternities petitioned a federal district court to void the policy on the basis that it deprived students of their civil rights to assemble and affiliate with an organization of their choice. The judge ruled in favor of the State University of New York.<sup>64</sup> Although the case was appealed, the Supreme Court of the United States refused to hear the case thereby upholding the district court's decision.

In general then, publicly supported colleges and universities have the power to set up rules and regulations regarding the admission and supervision of a student. However, the highest court of our land has, since 1954, clearly enunciated that no student may be deprived

---

<sup>63</sup>Gott v. Berea College, 156 Ky. 376, 161 S.W. 204 (1913).

<sup>64</sup>Webb v. State University of New York, 120 F Supp. 554, 125 F. Supp. 910 (N.D. N.Y. 1954).

admission to a publicly supported college or in any way be restricted in his activities solely on the basis of race or color if otherwise he is eligible to participate as a student.

Other than those cases that have been tested in the courts because of a claim of racial prejudice, most court cases involving the student disciplinary procedures or the social-regulatory policies of institutions of higher education have been heard mainly on the contention that the institution had grossly violated due process procedures in considering the facts of the case or because the rules or regulations of the institution were thought unreasonable and detrimental to the welfare of the student.

One of the most important judicial decisions concerning procedural due process as it relates to a student's rights is the case of *Dixon v. Alabama State Board of Education*, decided in 1961.<sup>65</sup> This case involved six Negro students who were excluded from the Alabama State College in Montgomery, Alabama, just after there was a "sit-in" at a publicly-owned grill located in the county courthouse in Montgomery. Although the students received a letter informing them of their expulsion from school, they were not notified previous to their being expelled of any charges against them nor were they given any opportunity to be heard. The students assumed their expulsion was related to their alleged participation in the "sit-in" demonstration.

---

<sup>65</sup>Clark Byse, "Procedure in Student Dismissal Proceedings: Law and Policy," *Journal of College Student Personnel*, (March, 1963), pp. 130-143.

The case reached the U. S. Court of Appeals where Judge Rives, a highly regarded member of the Federal Judiciary handed down the majority opinion which was eventually sustained by the U. S. Supreme Court. The majority opinion favored the student complaintants who requested that the college be restrained from preventing their attendance at the school. This historic decision was based on the proposition that whenever a government body acts so as to injure an individual, the Constitution requires that the act be consonant with due process of law. Judge Rives found that the students were injured without due process in that they were dismissed without proper notice or foundation of the charges against them or the opportunity to be heard in their own defense. This in turn deprived the students of sufficient education to earn an adequate livelihood, to enjoy life to the fullest, or to fulfill their duties as completely as possible as citizens. The court further held void the right of a public institution of higher education to condition the agreements with its students or the granting of privileges upon the renunciation of the constitutional right to procedural due process.

Since the Dixon v. the Alabama State Board of Education decision, many public institutions of higher education have taken a second look at their social-regulatory policies and student disciplinary procedures. Increasingly, colleges and universities have shied away from specific regulations and restrictions regarding off-campus behavior, leaving much of this concern to become a matter of civil law. This move is supported by Professor John R. McDonough who recently stated

that "universities should seriously consider abandoning a quasi-parental role in setting and enforcing general standards of conduct for students."<sup>66</sup> The Stanford University Law School Professor instead suggested that the University's concern should not be as much with whether a student's conduct conforms to the requirements of good citizenship as it should be with whether the student's continued association...would appear to create unacceptable risks to its ongoing educational enterprise. Rather than acting as a moral preceptor to students, the university as proprietor of its campus would promulgate rules and regulations to insure the health, safety, and mutual convenience of all of its members in the academic community. In this setting students would be treated the same as any other member of the university's community. Since it is not the proprietor of off-campus physical domains, the university would entrust the students conduct off-campus to judgement under civil law.

James A. Perkins, President of Cornell University, was recently quoted as saying, "The student, in large part by his own choice, is moving away from the general protection of the academic community into the general domain of civil law. Education, even higher education, at public institutions, has become a constitutional right, not just a privilege, and that right cannot be denied arbitrarily without the prospect of constitutional review."<sup>67</sup> In recent times, more and more

---

<sup>66</sup>J. R. McDonough, "Standards of Conduct", Schools and Society, 95, (April, 1967) p. 244

<sup>67</sup>Earl Gottschalk, "Student Power: College Militants Seek Policy Voice, Stirring Turmoil", The Wall Street Journal, 85, (February 14, 1968) p. 12.

students are taking to the civil courts to sue universities over rules regarding the setting of fees, curfew hours, freedom to demonstrate, freedom of speech, etc., and student disciplinary actions. According to Martha Peterson, former Dean of Student Affairs of The University of Wisconsin, there is no question that areas of disavowals and conflict between institutional policies and student values exist. At the proceedings of the Nineteenth Annual National Conference in Higher Education, in April, 1964, she stated the following:

Whether these disavowals and conflicts lead to disruptive controversy or enhancement of learning opportunities depends to a large measure on the attitude and practices of an institution in handling the questions that arise. If an institution provides a clear and reasonable statement of its intent, displays willingness to discuss openly areas in which students and institutional policies differ, and guarantees to the students the right of due process and just penalties, the educational processes should be enhanced rather than hindered by differences of opinion; and campus living experiences will have a direct relationship to the continuing experiences of a student as a citizen in any community.<sup>68</sup>

Although Community Colleges do not have to contend with the massive problems connected with student housing or dormitory controls, their problems with student policies and disciplinary procedures are on a much lesser scale the same with regards to students' rights and due process. Like other institutions of Continuing and Higher Education they must be aware of the need to establish clear and cogently formulated policies that can bear the test of legal challenge and command the respect of their academic communities.

---

<sup>68</sup>Martha Peterson, "What Principles Should Govern Decisions When Students Disavow Institutional Policies?" Nineteenth Annual Conference in Higher Education, Association for Higher Education, (April, 1964) pp. 92 and 93.

## CHAPTER III

### METHODOLOGY

Chapter two presented a review of the literature pertinent to this study. The methods of research employed to investigate the topic selected for this dissertation are described in this chapter.

The procedures used included a search of the literature and other sources of data for information related to the study and the use of an interview questionnaire to aid the writer to ascertain the views and judgements of twelve disciplinary administrators regarding the social-regulatory practices of their respective community colleges, the process of selection of twelve community colleges visited, and an explanation of the treatment of the data collected.

### SOURCES OF DATA

The data gathered for the purposes of this research project were obtained from a number of different sources. They are listed as follows:

1. A review of the literature pertaining to the historical background of the subject, and a review of various articles and books dealing with related aspects of this study.
2. A review of college publications such as student handbooks, faculty policy manuals, college catalogues, college bulletins and announcements and school newspapers.
3. Interviews with twelve disciplinary administrators associated with the colleges selected for this study.

4. Newspaper articles reporting current news items related to the study area.

#### REVIEW OF COLLEGE PUBLICATIONS

A review of publications and materials of a number of community colleges and four year institutions of higher education was undertaken as a preliminary step for developing an interview guide to be used for interviews with the disciplinary administrators. The purpose of this procedure was mainly to give the writer a better understanding of the general concerns and philosophies of different colleges with respect to their social-regulatory practices, with particular emphasis upon those policies and rules governing student conduct and discipline. Some of these publications were found at the Michigan State University and Wayne State University libraries, while others were received from public community colleges in Michigan that had enrollments of at least 1500 full-time day students. These colleges were listed in the 1967 American Directory of Junior Colleges.

The college publications reviewed gave the author of this study an excellent overview of the extent and ways that various colleges published social-regulatory policies and rules in their student handbooks, faculty manuals, bulletins and brochures. The information gleaned from reviewing these publications formed the basis from which the author formulated the questions that later comprised the interview guide used to interview the disciplinary administrators.

#### DATA-GATHERING INSTRUMENT USED FOR INTERVIEWS

After a most helpful discussion with the author's doctoral guidance committee, and after seriously considering the various methods that

could be employed to collect data for this disseration, it was determined that the most effective and practical way to secure accurate data for the proposed study was to visit the twelve community colleges selected for the study and interview the disciplinary administrators regarding their views on the subject being researched.

As noted previously, the author made a preliminary review of the literature and of a variety of college publications from which information was gleaned to help formulate one-hundred-fifty questions which were grouped into four major areas. This was done so as to obtain data for the study according to the proposed chapter outlines. They are listed as follows:

1. General Information

- A. Name of College
- B. Enrollment
- C. Name and experience of the disciplinary administrator

2. The extent and origin of social-regulatory policies and rules of the institutions under study.

- A. Extent of Policies and Rules at each institution.
- B. Personnel involved in policy formulation.

3. Effective methods of communicating social-regulatory policies and rules.

- A. Written publications
- B. Orientation Sessions

4. Enforcement of social-regulatory policies and rules.

A. Extent of the Problem

B. Contributory factors

C. Enforcement practices

1. Role of disciplinary administrator

2. Role of Counsellor

3. Role of faculty

4. Role of student

5. Legal Implications - due process

Although the questions were formulated to obtain a positive or negative response from the responder, the interview approach permitted the interviewer to rephrase any questions that were not clear. A mailed questionnaire would not have provided this freedom of instrument clarification. The instrument was used to record the viewpoints and judgments of the disciplinary administrators. A copy of the instrument used as the interview guide can be found in the appendix.

INTERVIEWS WITH DISCIPLINARY ADMINISTRATORS

Interviews with the disciplinary administrators of the twelve community colleges selected for this study were arranged by personal phone calls. The disciplinary administrators interviewed are listed in the appendix.

Each of the interviews was held in the campus office of the administrator in charge of discipline. All of the disciplinary administrators visited were generous enough to set aside an adequate amount of time for an uninterrupted interview. The interviews were initiated by the inter-

viewer, who briefly explained the purpose of the study. The person being interviewed was assured that his comments and responses to the questions asked would not be identified by college. In each instance informality and a very relaxed atmosphere were the rule rather than the exception. Although the interview guide was designed as a forced choice type of instrument, the disciplinary administrators were encouraged to comment on their answers to certain questions to give the interviewer a better understanding of the reasons behind their responses. Most interviews lasted over two hours with one or two lasting a lesser amount of time.

It is interesting to note that each disciplinary administrator was very anxious to know how the other administrators responded to the same questions. Each was assured that upon the completion of the study, a composite chart of their combined responses would be sent to them.

#### SELECTION OF THE COMMUNITY COLLEGES FOR VISITATIONS

In selecting the community colleges to be visited for the personal interviews, several factors were taken into consideration. These factors are described in the following paragraphs.

Size - One of the factors in the selection process was the number of full-time day students enrolled in the community college. The study was limited to those community colleges with an enrollment of more than fifteen-hundred day students. The colleges selected for visitation ranged in size from approximately 1502 students to more than six-thousand students.

Location - The second factor considered important in selecting the colleges to be visited was that of location. It was considered important because colleges with a rural or suburban setting would most likely differ with regards to the types of student behavioral problems and administrative viewpoints, from colleges located in a larger urban or metropolitan area. Eight of the colleges selected had urban settings, two had suburban settings and two, rural settings, drawing students however from both rural and urban populations.

Disciplinary Administrator's experience - The third factor which the researcher considered in selecting the colleges for this study was the experience of the disciplinary administrator in terms of years of service. It was felt that the person in charge of student discipline and responsible for the effective communication of student social-regulatory policies and rules, should have held his position for at least two years. Hence, all disciplinary administrators included in the study served in their present position for at least two years. The writer wished to avoid interviewing an individual newly appointed to his position, because he might have been inadvertently placed in an awkward situation as a person just getting oriented to the job.

#### TREATMENT OF DATA

Upon completion of the interviews with each of the twelve disciplinary administrators, the questionnaire-type guides were filed separately along with the handbooks, manuals, bulletins, catalogues, brochures, and newspapers received from the colleges visited.

To facilitate the handling of the data recorded during the interview, a master chart was made for each major section of the questionnaire



guide that related to the topic outline of the dissertation proposal. Responses to questions for each of the sections of the interview were recorded positively or negatively under each college name, thus providing for greater ease and efficiency in tabulating the data.

Statistical treatment of the data was accomplished as simply as possible. Quantitative data that could be subjected to statistical analysis were not considered as important for the purposes of this study as were the comments of the disciplinary administrators in response to the specific questions. However, since each question ultimately required a forced choice response, simple tabulations were made to provide a reference point for the disciplinary administrators interviewed as to an overview of current practices.

After tabulating and analyzing the data gathered, conclusions, recommendations and implications for future research were drawn from the findings.

#### SUMMARY

This chapter described the methodology followed in gathering the data used for the purposes of this study. The sources of data were identified. They included (1) literature and research related to the study (2) various publications and other written materials of the colleges selected for this study and other institutions of higher education, (3) and interviews with the disciplinary administrators of the twelve community colleges involved in the study.

The means used to secure data for the study were described and factors considered in selecting the colleges to be visited for the purpose

of interviews were explained. The procedure followed in arranging for the interviews was also explained, as was the setting and conduct of the interviews. The explanation of the treatment and handling of the data gathered for this study concluded the chapter.

## CHAPTER IV

### WRITTEN POLICIES AND RULES - EXTENT AND ORIGIN

The previous chapters have presented a background for this research study, reviewed the literature of the subject and described the methodology used in securing the necessary data for this report. Findings of the study are reported in this chapter and the following chapters of this dissertation.

In this chapter, findings concerning general information about the colleges visited are briefly discussed, and the extent (scope) and origin of social-regulatory policies and rules are analyzed. The origin of policies and rules refers to the formulator of such rules and policies, such as the board of trustees, the disciplinary administrator, the student government, the faculty or a combination of these persons delegated this responsibility.

### GENERAL INFORMATION

The interviews with the disciplinary administrators of the twelve community colleges visited provided the researcher with certain general information about each college, data regarding the size of the college in terms of full-time enrollment, and the official title of the disciplinary administrator, and his years of service. Findings in these areas are listed below.

#### Size of Colleges Visited

The colleges visited ranged in size from a low of 1502 full-time day students to a high of more than six-thousand such students. Total enroll-

ment, including both day and evening students, ranged from a low of twenty-three-hundred-and-seventy-five students to a high of eleven-thousand, six-hundred students. The enrollment figures of the fall, 1967, semester at the selected colleges, as approximated by the disciplinary administrator of the college, are shown in Table I.

TITLE OF DISCIPLINARY ADMINISTRATOR

In Chapter II, the literature reviewed did not reveal any standard title for the disciplinary administrator at the college level. Although the position is referred to by a variety of different titles, most of the deans interviewed noted that to the students they were usually referred to simply as "the dean". The twelve disciplinary administrators of the colleges visited represented six different titles. The most common title used was "Dean of Student Personnel Services". Five community colleges used this title. It is interesting to note that none used the titles "dean of women" or "dean of men". The official titles of the twelve administrators in charge of discipline are shown in Table 2. The range for the years of service, in their official capacities, for the administrators interviewed was from a low of two years to a high of twenty-two years. It should be noted however that seventy-five percent of the administrators interviewed held their present positions for less than four years, and fifty percent not over two years.

TABLE I

1967 Fall Enrollment Figures of Colleges Visited  
for Personal Interviews - As Stated by Disciplinary  
Administrator

<u>Name of Community College</u>	<u>Approximate Enrollment</u>			
	<u>Full-Time</u>	<u>Evening</u>	<u>Other</u>	<u>Total</u>
Delta	2750	2000	750	5400
Flint	4900	4400		9300
Grand Rapids	3015	1500		5031
Henry Ford	6400	5200		11600
Highland Park	2090	1610		3700
Jackson	1502	1659		3161
Lansing	3200	1700		4900
Macomb	4243	6154		10397
Oakland	4800	700		5500
Schoolcraft	1969	1937		3906
St. Clair	1560	900		2460
Washtenaw	1600	775		2375

TABLE 2

Titles of Disciplinary Administrators  
at Twelve Selected Community Colleges

<u>Official Title of Disciplinary Administrator</u>	<u>Number of Colleges Using Title</u>
Assistant Dean of Student Services	1
Dean of Students	2
Dean of Student Affairs	2
Dean of Student Personnel Services	5
Director of Student Affairs	1
Director of Student Personnel Services	1

EXTENT OF PRESENT POLICIES AND RULES DELIMITING STUDENT CONDUCT

The first set of questions during the interviews with the disciplinary administrators was concerned with the extent of written policies and rules regarding student conduct, discipline, and citizenship. Data were also secured that revealed the types of college publications in which current policies and rules appeared.

In instances where the college did not have written policies or rules in certain areas of conduct, the disciplinary administrator recognized the possible value of written policies or rules in those areas which would help to clarify the institutional expectations of student conduct and citizenship.

AREAS OF WRITTEN SOCIAL-REGULATORY POLICIES AND RULES

Thirty areas of student conduct policies or rules had been listed in the interview guide form, and the disciplinary administrator was asked if his community college had written rules or policies in each of these areas. If he answered negatively, he was then asked to respond as to whether or not a rule or policy in that area of conduct would be helpful. The findings are described in the following paragraphs and are summarized in Table 3.

Student Rights - Only four of the twelve community colleges claimed to have written policies defining the rights of students. An examination of the student handbooks and catalogues of the institutions answering in the affirmative revealed that only three of these colleges actually

had published these policies and that of the three that had done so, only two were specific in their statements. Of the eight disciplinary administrators who noted that they had no written policy in this area, six felt that it would be helpful to have this area defined by policy while two did not see a need for it.

General Responsibilities and duties of student citizens - Nine out of the twelve colleges had broad policy statements in this area reflecting institutional expectations. The disciplinary administrators of the three institutions that had no policy statement in this area all stated that they would prefer one to clarify institutional expectations. One institution published the following policy statement in this area:

As part of the privilege attendant upon academic freedom, students are expected to act with a high-mindedness which integrates self into the well-being of the total community.

Dress and personal appearance - Eight of the community colleges visited had written statements defining acceptable standards of dress and appearance of students. The statements on dress and appearance in all cases except two, gave specific examples of apparel that would be acceptable for campus wear (some according to seasons) and at specific college social functions. Of the four institutions that had no policy regarding dress and appearance, three of the administrators interviewed did not feel that a policy was necessary, while one felt a policy in this area would definitely be worthwhile.

Students' rights to assemble - Only two of the community college disciplinary administrators interviewed noted that they had a policy or rule in this area. Of the ten colleges that did not have written statements in this area, six felt that there was a definite need for one, while four saw no special reason for having a statement in this area.

Student plagiarism - Six of the colleges included in the study had a policy statement regarding this area in their handbooks, while the other six colleges did not have statements. Of the six who had no statements, only one felt that one was necessary in this area.

Student cheating - Of the twelve colleges, seven had policy statements regarding cheating on school examinations, while five did not have statements in this area of conduct. Out of the five that had no policy statement in this area, only one felt that one was necessary. Most felt that this should be handled by the faculty.

Smoking - Eleven institutions permitted smoking in designated areas defined by a policy statement or rule, while one college permitted smoking but had no statement defining specific areas. The disciplinary administrator of the college that had no policy or rule in this area stated that he preferred one. Five of the twelve colleges did not permit the sale of cigarettes on campus.

Gambling - Eleven of the colleges prohibited all forms of gambling by policy statements that generally were broad in scope. Although

one college had no policy in this area, the disciplinary administrator interviewed felt that there was a very definite need for one. He noted that the lack of one was an oversight in the formulating of social-regulatory policies for students. Two of the twelve colleges even went so far as to forbid card-playing of any kind on campus.

Campus traffic and parking - Ten out of twelve of the colleges visited had written regulations governing campus parking and traffic. One of the two colleges that had no statements of policy in this area felt that there was a need for one. With the exception of one disciplinary administrator interviewed in this area, all of the administrators noted that this was a major area of college concern, especially since enrollments are rising so rapidly.

Classroom behavior - Five colleges had specific policies or rules in this area, while of the seven who had no rules or policies in this area, none saw a need for one. With rare exceptions, most administrators felt that the instructors by in large handled their own student problems well.

Games and recreational activities permitted on campus - Five colleges had rules or regulations governing student conduct in this area, while seven colleges had none. Of the seven that had no rules or regulations in this area, only one felt the need to have one.

Alcoholic beverages - Without exception, none of the colleges studied permitted the drinking of alcoholic beverages on campus.

Litterbugging - Only two out of the twelve colleges had written rules or policies on this aspect of citizenship, while ten did not have any. Of the ten that did not have statements in this area, only two felt the need to have one adopted. Others felt that this should be mainly a problem for student-government to deal with in a positive educational manner.

Moral behavior (necking, petting, etc.) - In this particular area four colleges had policy statements, while eight had none. Of the eight that had no policy statements in this specific area, none saw the need for one. Most of these institutions felt that if a particular case definitely needed some action taken they could function under such broad policy statements as "the college reserves the right to take action against any student for unbecoming conduct".

Hazing and initiations - Six colleges had social-regulatory policies or rules in this area while six did not. Four of the six colleges that did not have a policy statement on this subject, felt that one was definitely needed.

The use of explosives (firecrackers, etc.) and firearms on campus - Here again, the colleges selected for this study split evenly as to their use of a written policy or rule to govern the conduct of students in this area. Six colleges had statements and six did not have them. Of the six that had none, five wished they had a policy statement and hoped to develop a policy in this area. Of course all students must abide by state laws in this area.

On-Campus organizations - Without exception, all twelve of the community colleges involved in this study had policy statements or rules regarding the approval of and role of on-campus organizations. These policies or rules included such stipulations as eligibility of members, types of meetings permitted, responsibility of the advisor, etc. Most disciplinary administrators noted that more and more, the student government is being called upon to help the college formulate policy in this area.

Vandalism - Seven of the twelve colleges had policies or rules clearly defined in this area of conduct. Of the five that did not, three felt that a policy was needed in this area. The other two colleges considered the situation a matter concerning the civil authorities.

Theft, illegal entry or forgery - Seven colleges had statements in written form about infractions in this area and five had no statements. Of the five that had no policy statements in this area, only two felt that this was necessary. Three felt that this was a matter for referral to the civil authorities.

Identification cards - All except one college had policies relating to the use of identification cards on campus. The one college that did not have one, anticipated having one next year.

Conduct at games or other campus activities - Eight of the colleges had policies or rules in this area, while four colleges had no statement of policy in this regard. Three out of the four institutions

that had no policy statement reported that problems in this area were too infrequent to require one.

Poster and advertising limitations - Nine colleges had policies or rules governing the type of posters and advertising materials to be permitted on campus. In general activities sponsored by non-public agencies or groups were not to be advertised on campus unless they had community-wide welfare implications. Of the three colleges that had no policy in this area, all saw a need for one.

Distribution of unauthorized publications on campus - Nine colleges had policies governing unauthorized publications on campus, while three did not. All felt the need for a policy in this area mainly for the purposes of controlling unsponsored tabloids of questionable repute or unsigned literature which may have deleterious effects on the college or the welfare of its students.

Off-campus behavior detrimental to the college - Only three colleges noted that they had explicit policy statements regarding off-campus behavior detrimental to the college. It is interesting to point out that only one college of the nine that had no policy or rule in this area of student conduct, felt that one was necessary. Most of the disciplinary administrators interviewed thought that all off-campus behavior should be a matter for civil authorities to handle.

Student financial responsibility - Regarding this area of citizenship and student conduct, nine colleges had stated policies. Of the three

that had no policy or rule in this area, only one thought a statement was necessary.

Authorization of campus publications - Nine colleges had a policy or rule governing campus publications and defining their scope of operation. Although three colleges had no policy or rule regulating campus publications, each noted that it would be wise to have one written. Disciplinary administrators by in large felt that students appreciate written clarification in this area, because it avoids confusion and misunderstanding regarding the extent of student freedom of expression.

The falsification of records - Written policies in this area were found in seven out of the twelve colleges visited. Of the five that had no written policy in this area, four saw a definite need for one.

Authorization of guest speakers on campus - Eight colleges published policies or rules regarding use of guest speakers on campus requiring authorization. While four did not have policies in this area, two of them wished they had them.

Definition of penalties for violation of regulations - Five colleges defined and published penalties for specific violations of regulations. Of the seven that did not do so, only one thought that it would prove to be helpful to both the student and the college.

Procedures for disciplinary action - Six colleges defined specific procedures for disciplinary action as a matter of policy. The other

six colleges more or less played each situation "by ear", although three of the six did express a desire to formulate clearly stated policies in this area regarding student conduct and due process.

Disciplinary administrators who were interviewed noted that for the most part they did not experience any particular community pressure to adopt certain policies, standards or rules. However, they all stated that there was an increasing concern on the part of students regarding certain social-regulatory codes affecting campus publications, dress, and campus organizations, especially pertaining to their involvement in college affairs.

TABLE 3

Extent and Desirableness of Social-Regulatory Policies and Rules  
in Each of Thirty Areas.

Area of Policy or Rule	Have a Policy or Rule		If no, would You Like One?		Total Favoring Policy or Rule	
	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No
1. Student Rights	4	8	6	2	10	2
2. Student Citizenship	9	3	3	0	12	0
3. Dress-Appearance	8	4	1	3	9	3
4. Right to Assemble	2	10	6	4	8	4
5. Plagiarism	6	6	1	5	7	5
6. Cheating	7	5	1	4	8	4
7. Smoking	11	1	1	0	12	0
8. Gambling	11	1	1	0	12	0
9. Campus Traffic-Parking	10	2	1	1	11	1
10. Classroom Behavior	5	7	0	7	5	7
11. Recreation on Campus	5	7	1	6	6	6
12. Alcoholic Beverages	12	0			12	0
13. Litterbugging	2	10	2	8	4	8
14. Moral Behavior	4	8	0	8	4	8
15. Hazing-Initiations	6	6	4	2	10	2
16. Firearms-Explosives	6	6	5	1	11	1
17. On-Campus Organization	12	0			12	0
18. Vandalism, etc.	7	5	3	2	10	2
19. Theft, Illegal Entry, Forgery	7	5	2	3	9	3

TABLE 3 (CON'T)

Area of Policy or Rule	Have a Policy or Rule		If No, Would You Like One?		Total Favoring Policy or Rule	
	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No
20. I.D. Cards	11	1	1	0	12	0
21. Activity Conduct	8	4	1	3	9	3
22. Posters-Advertising	9	3	3	0	12	0
23. Unauthorized Publications	9	3	3	0	12	0
24. Off-Campus Behavior	3	9	4	8	7	8
25. Financial Responsibility	9	3	1	2	10	2
26. Campus-Publications	9	3	3	0	12	0
27. Falsification of Records	7	5	4	1	11	1
28. Guest Speakers	8	4	2	2	10	2
29. Penalties for Violations	5	7	1	6	6	6
30. Disciplinary-Procedures	6	6	3	3	9	3

### ORIGIN OF WRITTEN POLICIES AND RULES

In order to ascertain who wrote the current social-regulatory policies and rules governing student conduct and citizenship, administrators in charge of discipline were asked several questions. The questions were designed to help determine whether or not the students and faculty were involved in the process of formulating college policies or rules in this area, and also to determine the disciplinary administrator's attitude toward the involvement of students and faculty members in the establishment of social-regulatory policies and rules. Practices in reviewing and revising policies and rules were also ascertained by questions relative to procedure in this area.

#### Origin of Present Policies and Rules

Three of the twelve disciplinary administrators said that social-regulatory policies or rules were made entirely by administrators or the board of trustees without any student involvement at all. However, all twelve of the administrators interviewed definitely felt that policies and rules in this area should not be developed by administrators alone but should rather be developed by consulting student leaders. In fact, eight out of the twelve disciplinary administrators felt that in some areas, especially those not involving major legal responsibility, social-regulatory policies or rules could be developed by students alone. Other colleges expressed the conviction that students should never be permitted to develop policy or

rules in this area alone.

Since the reactions of disciplinary administrators to the extent of involvement of students in formulating written rules and policies were rather extensive in scope, they in essence painted an excellent picture of thier attitudes on the subject. Some of the typical reactions are listed below:

Rules superimposed on students are never as well accepted as those made and agreed upon by students.

Social-regulatory policies or rules should be developed by the student government and the faculty, but the dean should have the final say.

If we believe in the democratic process, students must participate in policy or rule development.

Certainly administrative perogative must be reserved in certain areas as to the amount of student involvement and the areas of involvement in developing policies or rules.

You get greater cooperation from the students if they help to develop rules.

Students have "inside information" and can be of real service to the college in developing acceptable social-regulatory codes.

Students should be encouraged to participate in the development of rules and policies in this area, but

not in connection with classroom behavior or anything covered by civil law or state school codes.

Students should be of help in areas such as student government, student activities and students' rights. The rest should be made by the board or its administrators.

Students are at times too harsh or too indecisive to do it on their own.

A few campus rebels will always protest no matter who made the rules.

Although only nine out of the twelve colleges developed social-regulatory policies on a cooperative basis through consultation with students, faculty, and administration, all felt that this should be the practice. It was generally conceded by most administrators that policies and rules made by a committee on which students and faculty had representation along with administration would have the highest degree of acceptance by the student body. Some typical comments that were made are listed below:

If everybody agrees -- student representatives, faculty, and administration -- policies and rules will be more readily accepted.

Committee-made rules generally reflect a cross section of opinion of all college personnel and students.

Form of Written Social-Regulatory Policies and Rules

The question often arises as to whether a rule stated in the

"positive" or the "negative" approach has any greater affect on the behavior of students. Should students be advised on what constitutes acceptable behavior or conduct, or should they be told what not to do? Disciplinary administrators were ask to answer these questions.

All except two of the twelve disciplinary administrators interviewed generally agreed that they found the positive approach to the writing of student social-regulatory policies or rules to have the best effects on students. However, many noted that it was not always feasible to state all rules in a positive manner. For instance, is there a better way to prohibit smoking or parking than by simply stating "no smoking" or "no parking"? Even so, ten administrators noted that their college rules were mostly stated in the positive, with a few in the negative style, because they were of the nature that simply called for this form. The disciplinary administrators questioned offered excellent rationales for use of the "positive approach" to state rules and policies. Some of these are listed below:

People tend to react better when told something in a positive manner.

Students generally hate a whole list of "don'ts".

Students tend to want to test the "don'ts".

With the so-called "rebels" the positive approach usually gains more acceptance.

Students like to be approached in a constructive manner regarding rules and limitations.

The don't approach to rules reminds students too much of high school.

Some administrators however, did defend the negative approach by making the following statements.

The use of the positive approach never quite "draws the line".

If a rule is reasonable and makes sense, what is wrong with a "no" approach?

Students don't respect a positive but often times vague approach.

If you're fair and involve students, call "a spade, a spade".

#### Review and Revision of Social-Regulatory Policies and Rules

Policy statements generally written by the board of trustees are likely to be broad in scope and serve as effective guidelines to administrative rule making for many rules; nevertheless these too must be occasionally reviewed and even revised. Rules to implement the policies of the board must be reviewed if they are to be kept current in terms of changes in the college environment. Several questions asked in this area produced various answers described in the following paragraphs.

Outmoded or Outdated Rules - Eight of the twelve disciplinary administrators interviewed revealed that in some cases their college rules were outdated. They noted that the areas in which rules needed to be revised, because of current changes in our society and new legal interpretations by the courts, were those involving dress and appearance, off-campus and on-campus clubs, off-campus housing and off-campus behavior. The tendency is for colleges to become less involved in these areas as far as regulation and control.

Present Practice regarding review and revision and recommendations - Six out of the twelve colleges visited reviewed their policies and rules annually while the other half noted that they have not reviewed their policies in several years. The large majority of disciplinary administrators did note, however, that they preferred reviewing policies and rules for possible revision as the need arises. Six out of the twelve insisted that rules should be reviewed annually even if the need didn't arise. They claimed it encouraged colleges to take a second look at their rules giving them a chance to anticipate any possible problems.

### Summary

General information about the twelve community colleges visited for the purposes of this study was presented in this chapter. This chapter also reviewed the extent and origin of existing social-regulatory policies and rules governing student conduct. It has reported the disciplinary administrator's views and judgments regarding the effect of the rules and policies on the student body in terms of

the origin of the rules and policies, and their written form.

Disciplinary administrators have varying titles, but all seem to be known to the students as "the dean". The community colleges visited ranged in size from approximately 1500 full-time students to more than six-thousand.

The community colleges visited differed significantly as to the areas in which they thought the need for rules were important. Areas in which there was unanimous agreement as to the need for written policy included (1) defining responsibilities of students (2) smoking (3) gambling (4) drinking (5) on-campus organizations (6) use of identification cards (7) campus publications (8) advertising and (9) distribution of unauthorized publications. A great majority supported the need for written rules and policies governing campus parking, vandalism, theft, falsification of records, guest speakers and disciplinary action procedures.

The vast majority of disciplinary administrators felt that students should participate in the formulation of rules and policies to which they are expected to conform. It was noted that students involved in rule making are more likely to comply with them. Students should not be involved in policy or rule making governed specifically by state law.

Disciplinary administrators generally agreed that policies and rules should be written in a style that stresses positive standards of behavior rather than the negative ones. They also felt that existing rules should be reviewed annually and revised as the need arises.

## CHAPTER V

### THE COMMUNICATION OF SOCIAL-REGULATORY POLICIES AND RULES

This chapter reviews the variety of procedures used by the community colleges involved in this study to disseminate information about its student social-regulatory policies and rules governing student conduct.

The researcher asked the twelve disciplinary administrators of the colleges visited to respond to a list of ways generally used by colleges to make students aware of their policies and rules. It was apparent from the responses made by the administrators that several different methods were used by their respective institutions to inform students about student conduct rules and policies. These included both verbal and written approaches to the problem. The responses by the disciplinary administrators will be described in the following paragraphs and summarized in Table 4.

Although social-regulatory policies and rules were communicated to the students via orientation programs, assemblies, and other meetings, there was unanimous agreement among the disciplinary administrators interviewed that statements of policy and rules were most frequently made and distributed through written materials such as handbooks, college catalogues, school newspapers, brochures, and, to a lesser extent, letters to parents.

#### Faculty policy manuals

The study revealed that, although ten out of the twelve community colleges visited provided their faculty members with policy manuals,

only three of the policy manuals made any reference to student conduct by way of policy, codes, or rules. All of the disciplinary administrators interviewed agreed with the authorities cited in the review of the literature that a well-written policy manual helps to improve the effectiveness of an institution by providing college administrators and faculty members with basic principles of action that act as guides for the development of supportive rules and regulations.

The lack of policy on student conduct in a faculty manual in nine out of the twelve colleges involved in this study was further explained by the fact that many governing boards assumed that student discipline was an administrative matter defined in publications such as the student handbook.

Little standardization was found in current manuals; only two made a distinction between policy and rules. The author did review the manual (of one community college) that could be cited as an excellent example of a policy manual with regard to written guidelines concerning student conduct, discipline, and student rights. The following excerpts concerning social-regulatory principles regarding student rights, expectations, and conduct regulations were taken from that manual.

The most basic necessity for the achievement of college purposes is freedom of expression and communication. Since knowledge is as broad and diverse as life itself, the need for freedom is equally broad. Yet, absolute freedom in all aspects of life means anarchy, just as absolute order means tyranny. Both anarchy and tyranny are antithetical to the purposes and necessities of the college. Therefore, the college always must strive to strike that balance between maximum freedom and necessary order which best promotes their basic purposes by providing the environ-

ment most conducive to the many faceted activities of teaching and learning.

Each right of an individual places a reciprocal duty upon others: the duty to permit the individual to exercise the right. The student, as a member of the academic community, has both rights and duties. Within that community, the student's most essential right is the right to learn. The College has a duty to provide for the student those protections, opportunities and environment which best promote the learning process in all its aspects. The student, in turn, has duties to his fellow members of the College -- the most important of which is to refrain from interference with those rights that promote the essential purposes and processes of the College.

The student is not only a member of the academic community; he is also a citizen of the larger society. As a citizen, he retains those rights, protections and guarantees of fair treatment which are held by all citizens, and neither the academic community nor the College may deny them to him. The enforcement of the student's duties to the larger society, however, is the responsibility of the authorities duly established for that purpose and not that of the academic community or the College. But as is always the case if the student's conduct is such to detrimentally affect the College, the College reserves the right to take action that seems appropriate.

More specifically, Lansing Community College operates within the framework of a basic philosophy, stated purposes, laws and regulations of the city and State and the expectations of the community in which we are located. The College makes the assumption that students while attending this College will conduct themselves as responsible citizens of the community in which they live.

We must understand our rights if we are to use them properly. They include personal rights of life and a range of significant liberties such as freedom of speech and the press. They include economic rights of property and contract and political rights. Each person, moreover, is assured that there will be no interference with his freedom or worship according to his conscience. In addition, there are rights of counsel, jury trial and other safeguards to protect individuals with "due process of law"...

This Community College policy manual contained another fine example of written policy which serves as guidance and direction for all bodies hearing students accused of violating all regulations, except those involving academic performance and achievement. The statements regarding "due process" are listed below:

1. The student shall be notified by an appropriate College official that he is accused of violating a regulation.
2. The student shall be notified that he may elect one of three courses of action.
  - a. The student may admit the alleged violation and request, in writing, that the administrative officer take whatever action seems appropriate. Should the student elect this course of action, he shall be notified that he is entitled to appeal the administrator's decision to the Judicial Body.
  - b. The student may admit the alleged violation, and request a hearing before the Judicial Body.
  - c. The student may deny the alleged violation, in which case the administrative officer shall refer him to the Judicial Body.
3. Prior to the hearing, the student shall be entitled to the following.
  - a. Written notification of the time and place of the hearing.
  - b. A written statement of the charges of sufficient particularity so that the student may prepare his defense.
  - c. Written notification of the names of the witnesses who are directly responsible for having reported the alleged violation to the Judicial Body, or, if there are no such witnesses, written notification of how the alleged violation came to the Body's attention.

4. The student shall be entitled to appear in person and present his defense to the Judicial Body, and may call witnesses in his behalf. The student may also elect not to appear before the Judicial Body. Should he elect not to appear, the hearing shall be held in his absence.
5. The student shall be entitled to be accompanied by counsel.
6. The student or his counsel shall be entitled to ask questions of the Judicial Body or of any witnesses.
7. The student shall not be required to testify against himself.
8. The student shall be entitled to an expeditions hearing of his case.
9. The student shall be entitled to an explanation of the reasons for any decision rendered against him.
10. The student shall be notified of his right to appeal the decisions of the Judicial Body. Should the student appeal, any action assessed by the Judicial Body shall be held in suspense until acted upon by a higher body.

The above shall serve as general guidelines with respect to the hearing of students accused of violating regulations. The implementation of the guidelines shall be left to the appointed administrative personnel.

#### Announcements or special bulletins

All of the disciplinary administrators noted that they used this means to disseminate information regarding any changes in rules and regulations, especially if they were made after the annual publications of the student handbook, catalogue, and other printed materials that generally refer to these items.

#### Letters to parents

Only three of the twelve community colleges involved in the study

noted that they used letters to parents explaining the social-regulatory policies or rules of the college regarding student conduct and discipline. The three disciplinary administrators at the colleges where letters were sent to parents explained that they felt obligated to keep the parents informed.

The disciplinary administrators at the other nine community colleges, however, firmly believed that if the community college is sincere in respecting the dignity of the student as an adult, it should communicate with the student primarily, and not with the parent. They were quick to note, nevertheless, that parents were always welcome to contact the college regarding any particular problem.

#### Student handbooks

Each of the twelve community colleges visited published a student handbook and used it to disseminate information about its student social-regulatory policies and rules. The amount of space allotted to these policies and rules varied from one page in one college handbook to twelve pages in another student handbook. In some cases the rules were not grouped together. The majority of the handbooks, however, did have most of the policies and rules on student conduct grouped together instead of having them scattered. The most commonly used titles for these groupings were "Rules and Regulations" and "Regulations". It is interesting to note that, although many handbooks cited certain rules of conduct, most were negligent in telling students the reasons for the rules. Disciplinary administrators interviewed for this study agreed that this is an area that needs to be given more

attention, especially since students today are more and more inclined to ask for the rationale behind various rules.

#### Brochures or letters to students

Ten out of the twelve community colleges visited used brochures and letters to inform students about rules and regulations. However, after checking further, it was found that the references to rules and regulations with regard to students were primarily in the form of a general statement of expected behavior and citizenship, rather than rules per se.

#### College catalogues

Although all of the disciplinary administrators interviewed for the purposes of this study noted that their institutions' catalogues were used to inform students about student policies and rules, the author of this study, after examining all of the 1967-68 community college catalogues, concluded that only eight out of the twelve catalogues actually made specific reference to student conduct and citizenship.

Statements in those community college catalogues that referred to student conduct were, in most cases, statements of policy rather than a listing of specific rules. Somewhat typical of the statements found in the catalogues concerning social-regulations and citizenship was one found by the researcher in the Henry Ford Community College Catalogue.

College students are considered to be mature individuals. Their conduct, both in school

and out, is expected to be dignified and honorable. The responsibility for success rests largely on the shoulders of the individual students.

The college requires the same degree of personal responsibility of students as the institutions to which they may transfer. Not many rules of conduct are set by the administration. On the contrary, it is expected that students will at all times consider they are living in a democratic situation and that the reputation of the institution rests on their shoulders. Common courtesy and cooperation at all times make conduct rules unnecessary.

The most extensive and definitive statements regarding student conduct and discipline, which the author of this study discovered after reviewing the twelve community college catalogues, were stated in one of the Community College Catalogues.

Enrollment in the Community Junior College carries with it obligations in regard to conduct, not only inside but also outside the classrooms and students are expected to conduct themselves in such a manner as to be a credit both to themselves and to the College. They are responsible to the laws governing the community as well as to rules and orders of the College and its officials, and they are expected to observe the standards of conduct set by the college.

Whenever a student fails to observe either the general standards of conduct as stated above or any specific ones which may be adopted by the proper authorities, or acts in such a manner as to make it apparent that he is not a desirable member of the College, he shall be liable to disciplinary action by the proper authorities.

As indicated in the section on attendance, instructors may drop from class any student who has had an excessive number of absences. Instructors may also suspend from class any student whose classroom conduct is improper and refer him to the proper administrative official for disciplinary action. In all such cases instructors will notify the Assistant Dean for Student Personnel Services.

In addition to the general standards established, specific violations of regulations which will necessitate disciplinary action are as follows:

1. Unethical conduct during examinations or in preparation of assignments designated by the instructor - plagiarism, for example.
2. Falsification of any official records required of the student by the College.
3. Possession or use of alcoholic beverages on College property, at any College-sponsored event, or appearance on campus while under the influence of alcohol.
4. Reckless driving and unauthorized parking of student cars on College property.
5. Engaging while on College property in initiation practices of organizations not officially recognized by the College and which obviously call attention to the initiates or members of the organization.
6. Participation in the name of the College in non-sanctioned activities off campus.
7. Violations of regulations necessary to govern various facilities and activities of the College which require special regulations.
8. Violations of any civil or criminal laws (i.e. theft, gambling, etc.) on campus or at College-sponsored events. Such violations are also subject to referral to civil authorities for investigation and action.

Students who are charged with violating general standards for good conduct or specific College regulations will be informed of the infraction in a personal conference with the Assistant Dean for Student Personnel Services. If, in his opinion official action by the College is warranted, the Assistant Dean will notify the student of the subsequent action by letter. The nature of disciplinary action is conditioned by the seriousness of the offense. Disciplinary action may be classified in one of the following categories:

1. Official Warning. The student is notified that he has violated standards of good conduct or specific College regulations. A copy of the

warning letter is placed in his personnel file and remains there until the student has completed his work at Flint Community Junior College. At that time, the student may pick up the copy of the warning letter and no further record is kept.

2. **Disciplinary Probation.** In more serious cases of a breach of College regulations the student may be placed on disciplinary probation. While on disciplinary probation the student may not participate in the student activities program, or receive honors or awards from the College. In some instances, the student may be prohibited from the use of a particular College facility if his violation is related to regulations governing that facility (i.e. library, student union, cafeteria, natatorium, laboratory, parking lot, etc.). Record of the probationary action is entered in the student's permanent record although the nature of the offense is not included.
3. **Suspension.** In those cases where there is a very serious breach of College regulations, a student may be suspended from the College for periods ranging from one week to one or more semesters. Also, such cases may be referred to civil authorities if there are obvious violations of civil or criminal laws. Notification of the suspension becomes a part of the student's record.
4. **Expulsion.** In cases of violations of a highly serious nature, or in cases of a repetitive pattern of irregular conduct, a student may be expelled permanently from the College.

The College makes use of disciplinary action as a means of educating the student to the realities of his responsibility as a citizen and also to protect the welfare of students, staff, and community.

#### Orientation programs

All of the community colleges involved in this study, except one, held orientation classes for new students. These classes or

sessions lasted from one to three days and ranged in number from 30 to 400 students, depending on the program that was planned and the facilities available. The disciplinary administrators who stated that they had orientation programs at their colleges noted they generally used the student handbook as an overall outline for the program. Thus, it was common practice to devote a portion of the total orientation program to social-regulatory policies and rules. These programs were primarily structured and carried out cooperatively by the student government, staff members connected with student personnel services, and various members of the administrative staff.

In the one college that did not have orientation classes, a convocation assembly was held for all freshmen at the beginning of the year, at which time rules governing student conduct and citizenship were reviewed. Attendance at this assembly, however, was not compulsory.

The disciplinary administrators did note that if the orientation program was voluntary, it did not tend to serve its purpose effectively as a method of communication. However, they also stated that if the program is provided for the students benefit, he must at some time begin to assume the responsibility for his own ignorance.

Several of the disciplinary administrators interviewed stated that student sponsored orientation programs should be encouraged more. They claimed that students who set the example have a far easier time informing freshmen about campus life, rules, and regulations. They even predicted that voluntary attendance would increase.

### School newspaper

Nine of the twelve disciplinary administrators interviewed reported that the college newspaper was used to keep the student body informed about policies and rules that affect them. For example, one of the headlines of the Jackson Community College newspaper, The Oracle, on December 15, 1967, read as follows:

#### Policy to Restrict Printed Hand-Outs

This article that accompanied the above headline explained to the students the significance of a new policy concerning the distribution of printed material on campus.

The three disciplinary administrators whose colleges did not use the school newspaper to disseminate information about disciplinary policies and rules felt that written material of this nature should only be included in official college bulletins and handbooks. Also, the paper should be mainly used for student purposes, not as an administrative vehicle for communication of this type of information.

### Special assemblies

Assemblies were certainly not considered a good means to communicate with students regarding social-regulatory policies and rules. Disciplinary administrators, by and large, noted that they did not think this type of topic could be handled effectively through an assembly procedure. They also noted that it was not really a functional procedure in light of the many student schedule conflicts and problems with facilities.

All of the disciplinary administrators pointed out the fact that although their respective community colleges used a variety of means to disseminate information relative to regulations and rules that students were expected to abide by while on campus, they did not resort to the exertion of pressure or compulsory methods to get students to read and become familiar with published policies. They did note that any student who broke a rule probably would not find it easy to plead his case on the basis of being unaware of the rule.

TABLE 4

Current Practices of Disseminating Information  
About Student Policies and Rules of the Twelve  
Community Colleges Visited.

Practice	Yes	No
Faculty policy manual	10	2
Letters to parents	3	9
Student handbook	12	0
Brochures-letters to Students	10	2
College Catalogue	12	0
Orientation Classes	11	1
School newspaper	9	3
Assemblies	2	10
Bulletins and Announcements	12	0

Effectiveness of various methods of communication

The interviews with the disciplinary administrators revealed that no one method of communication of social-regulatory policies and rules was effective enough to reach all of the student body. Different students apparently respond differently to certain methods of communication. It was felt that probably a combination of methods of disseminating information would prove to be most effective. The consensus was that the most effective combination of methods of communicating policies and rules should include both well defined written materials and well planned orientation classes where the information could be presented and discussed. When asked which single method of communication had the potential for being the most effective, disciplinary administrators indicated that well planned, required orientation programs would undoubtedly be the best method if sophmores shared the responsibility of presenting them. Student handbooks, catalogues, and the school newspaper were considered as good publications for the dissemination of policies and rules concerning conduct. All but one disciplinary administrator noted that most of the students on campus seemed to be aware of the policies and rules.

SUMMARY

This chapter reviewed the current practices of the twelve community colleges involved in this study in communicating social-regulatory policies and rules to the students. The types of written

materials used to express policy statements and rules were cited, with excellent examples noted. Communication methods, other than written materials, were also discussed. The effectiveness of various methods of communication of these policies and rules was also reviewed in terms of the views of disciplinary administrators.

It was concluded as a result of a review of the various methods used to disseminate information that no one method could be thought of as being effective for all of the students. Community colleges would be wise, indeed, to use a wide variety of means of communication to disseminate information about social-regulatory policies and rules regarding expected standards of student behavior.

## CHAPTER VI

### ENFORCEMENT OF SOCIAL-REGULATORY POLICIES AND RULES

The findings of two of the three facets of this study were presented in the preceding two chapters. Data and information pertinent to the origin, extent and communication of social-regulatory policies and rules were discussed. The analysis of these two areas of this investigation revealed that well thought out and developed social-regulatory policies and rules, thoroughly communicated to the students and the staff in a variety of ways, provide for a more effective administrative process in the community college. The findings of the third facet of this dissertation, the enforcement of social-regulatory policies and rules, will be presented in this chapter.

The changing concepts of discipline and the enforcement of college rules and regulations over the past few centuries were reviewed in chapter two. The pendulum has swung from the strict authoritarian enforcement of rules that were so detailed that they sometimes governed trivia, to a more democratic concept of discipline which emphasized self-control and citizenship education to eliminate much of the need for rigid enforcement. To be sure changes have taken place at colleges and universities with regards to the enforcement of rules just as our approaches to law enforcement have changed in society in general. Nevertheless, the problems involved in controlling student behavior seem still to be with us. Although self-restraint is the ideal goal, we find that realistically there are still those students who will not or cannot for various reasons abide by the codes of conduct established

by the college. In fact, it is hardly news today to note that an emerging breed of students are coming to the fore on campuses across the nation: students who are openly rejecting particular college or university policies and rules, students who are demanding, and often getting, a larger voice in campus affairs. The problems experienced by Columbia University this year and other universities in the recent past, reflect a growing concern by college and university officials about the growth of "student power" as a group force. They are concerned with the lack of respect for rules and regulations and the necessity for proper enforcement of policies and rules through disciplinary measures that are aimed to deter violators and correct patterns of misbehavior.

It has been noted above that the problem of student conduct at the four year college and the university has become one of considerable magnitude. But how extensive is the problem of misconduct in the larger community colleges of Michigan today? In which areas of student conduct are the problems most frequent? What are some of the contributing factors that are recognized by disciplinary administrators? What is the role of the disciplinary administrator, the counselor, the faculty, and the student in helping to enforce standards of conduct at the community college? Does the community college accord a student violator due process? And last but not least, do the present state laws provide the larger community colleges enough freedom to develop and enforce their own policies and rules? These were some of the major areas of inquiry involved in this aspect of the study that are discussed in this chapter.

EXTENT OF THE PROBLEM

The disciplinary administrators interviewed regarding the extent of misconduct problems at their respective community colleges were asked to rate the whole student body in terms of the over all frequency of violations. On a three point scale listing, with the ratings being low, average, and high, all but one of the administrators listed the frequency of student violations on the whole as being low. One disciplinary administrator thought that he would rate the frequency of student violations of college policies and rules as being average at his institution. All of the administrators noted that they spent less than ten percent of their time handling problems concerning student conduct and discipline. On the whole each rated the behavior of the students as being generally very good.

Some of the comments of the disciplinary administrators relative to the extent of misconduct problems were most enlightening. A few of them are listed below:

School spirit is rather high at this college, so we deal with a minimal amount of student discipline problems.

The beginning of the school year presents more problems than the end.

We've had few problems with student discipline to date; however, the present turmoil in society is bound to eventually rub off on community college campuses. Just look at what's beginning to happen in high schools - lunch room protests, etc.

With rapid increases in enrollment the problems seem to multiply - theft and parking are our greatest concerns.

You would think littering wouldn't be a major problem but it is to us.

Discipline problems of any serious consequence are few and far between.

We haven't experienced a student protest yet; I guess we're fortunate.

Certain types of problems seem to be seasonal and crop up at the same time each year.

Our problems are mainly individual ones. We rarely experience a group problem per se.

Like many other institutions of higher education, we have experienced a certain amount of racial tension, but I wouldn't categorize this with the general run of discipline problems.

We experienced our first student protests this year. However, our students and the college worked on the problem at hand and a solution was found.

#### Frequency of Discipline Problems

Even though the responses of the disciplinary administrators of the twelve community colleges involved in this study indicated



the behavior of the students to be generally quite good, they did acknowledge the fact that problems of misconduct existed to some extent. Hence, disciplinary administrators were questioned in this regard to determine in which areas of student conduct the problems did most frequently occur.

Although the findings were not conclusive, more than half of the disciplinary administrators selected four areas in which problems of misconduct most frequently occurred at most of the colleges. Their selections were made from a list of twenty-four possible areas concerning the violation of social-regulatory rules.

Out of the twelve colleges involved in the study, seven of them mentioned "drinking" as a most frequent violation of campus rules. Many of the disciplinary administrators noted that some students just out of high school and in college for the first time take this route to assert their independence. To show that they are adults, they have a few "beers" or other alcoholic drinks before a school affair. Apparently this seemed to be a symbol of maturity to some students.

Disciplinary administrators indicated that the best way to reduce the frequency of this problem was to make absolutely sure that the policy on drinking is well communicated to all of the students and to impose stringent penalties on those who violate the policy. They claimed that word soon gets around to students that this type of behavior is not tolerated. Several administrators quickly pointed out that they did not state that drinking was immoral or that it should never be done, but rather that there was a time and place for every-

thing. Social drinking to any real extent before attending a campus activity was considered poor judgment. Students apparently accept this type of an explanation or even a penalty much better than "moralistic preaching".

Campus traffic and parking violations was another area of conduct where problems of violations most frequently occurred. Nine out of twelve colleges pointed this area out as one in which violations became frequent. Some students, according to disciplinary administrators, will park illegally rather than risk being late to class. Others just hate to walk and will park as close to their classes as possible, even if it means parking in an area zoned "no parking" or "fire route". All but three of the colleges visited used security police to enforce violations in this area. The best deterrent to illegal parking, according to the disciplinary administrators, was to ticket the violator, thus punishing him where it hurts the most, his pocketbook. Cars were also towed away and fines levied by the college against the violator. In the three colleges that did not use security police to enforce campus parking and traffic rules, city police were relied on to aid in the enforcement process.

Disciplinary administrators at eight out of the twelve colleges visited listed "theft" as a violation of school social-regulatory rules frequently requiring much of their time allotted to the handling of disciplinary problems. Theft of books, purses, clothing and other personal property primarily occurred in various places on campus where items were left unattended for a few minutes. Items also were taken from unlocked cars. It is interesting to note that although one college

attributed the problem of theft to the location and setting of the college relative to community economic factors, the location and economic setting could not be considered as the main causal factor in the cases of the other seven institutions mentioning theft as a frequent problem. In some cases theft was attributed to campus students who allowed temptation to rule. In many instances, outsiders were apprehended, especially "teenagers". Disciplinary administrators generally used strong measures such as suspension or referral to the civil authorities, depending on the nature of the case. On certain campuses, the security police worked with the disciplinary administrator in handling the case.

Cafeteria behavior was another area of discipline in which three quarters of the colleges involved in this study experienced frequent violations. Disciplinary administrators cited "poor judgment" and "immaturity" as the two main factors precipitating problems in the cafeteria. For example, some students used the cafeteria as a lounge, a place to play cards or other games, or a place to hold lengthy discussions with friends. This deprived other students who wished to eat a meal or have a snack of a place to sit, thereby becoming a source of potential conflict between students. In cases where students became involved in fights or serious misunderstandings, students were placed on some form of social probation or temporarily suspended.

Another example is student carelessness with regard to refuse and litter. It was noted that the throwing of paper or bits of food as a joke sometimes got out of hand. Disciplinary administrators admitted that the problem of enforcement in this area is not an easy one in terms of supervision and personnel. Most agreed that the

situation required student organizational and educational clean-up campaigns for realistic help. Disciplinary action should be reserved for gross misbehavior.

Other areas of less frequent misconduct mentioned by disciplinary administrators included dress and appearance, student protests, lounge behavior, gambling, cheating, littering, conduct of off-campus organizations, off-campus behavior, financial irresponsibility, and racial conflict. Table 5 summarizes the findings regarding the areas of student conduct in which problems occur most frequently.

TABLE 5

Areas of Student Conduct in Which Problems Most Frequently  
Occur in the Twelve Community Colleges Visited

Area of Student Conduct in Which Problems Most Frequently Occur	Community College Responses	
	YES	NO
Dress and Appearance	1	11
Student Protests	1	11
Cafeteria Behavior	8	4
Lounge Behavior	5	7
Hazing and Initiations	0	12
Drinking	7	5
Theft	8	4
Moral Behavior (necking, petting, etc.)	0	12
Gambling	1	11
Campus Traffic & Parking Violations	9	3
Cheating	2	10
Behavior at Athletic Events	0	12
Litterbugging	4	8
Classroom Behavior	0	12
Vandalism	0	12
Distribution of Unauthorized Publications	0	12
Off-Campus Organizations	1	11

(TABLE 5 CON'T)

Area of Student Conduct in Which Problems Most Frequently Occur	Community College Responses	
	YES	NO
Off-Campus Behavior Detrimental to College	1	11
Library Conduct	0	12
Financial Responsibility	4	8
Carrying of Weapons	0	12
Racial Conflicts	2	10
Smoking	0	12
Narcotics	0	12

FACTORS CONTRIBUTING TO THE EXTENT AND FREQUENCY OF  
STUDENT CONDUCT PROBLEMS

In reviewing the literature, eleven basic factors were found to generally contribute to the extent and frequency of student conduct problems. These were used as the basis for questioning the disciplinary administrators regarding their experiences in dealing with the problems. Of the eleven factors mentioned only four were cited by most of the administrators interviewed as the main contributors to student misconduct. These factors were personality disorder or emotional maladjustment, immaturity, tension or conflict at home, and academic pressure.

In the first case, disciplinary administrators interviewed stated that those students whose malbehavior could be attributed to emotional maladjustment or personality disorders were usually referred to counseling agencies for psychological help with their personal problems and at the same time placed on social probation. If the problem continued to cause the student to act contrary to school rules or policy, he would be suspended or possibly excluded from school.

Many of the student conduct problems that disciplinary administrators adjudicated were of the type that mainly stemmed from immaturity. Violations of social-regulatory policies regarding drinking and parking, etc. are good examples of instances where individual maturity could have made the problem negligible. Administrators noted that many young students just out of high school who entered community college, sensed the need to be immediately liberated from parental restrictions.

They sometimes, however, found it difficult to handle their new status as adults within the framework of rules and regulations. The majority of the cases involving immaturity are generally dealt with through counselling or social probation.

Disciplinary administrators at eleven out of the twelve colleges visited stressed that even at the community college level, the home environment can be a disruptive factor in a student's life. Since most of the students at community colleges reside at home, what goes on in the family and the degree to which the family meets the needs of the student is to a large extent the conditioning factor that tends to motivate a student in either a positive or negative direction. There are many families in which a psychologically eccentric relationship exists between the parents and the student to such a degree that it sometimes makes life unrealistic. Disciplinary administrators noted that even at this age level, they found parents to be too over protective or at the other end of the scale, too little interest in the achievements of their sons or daughters. Community college students often offer this factor as a source of many of their school problems. In most of these cases, however, the colleges did not take the initiative in contacting the home. Instead, they worked through the student in seeking ways to mitigate his circumstances. If parents called the school, however, they were invited to the campus to discuss their problems and the school would offer them any help to resolve any troublesome situations confronting them or the student. In two-thirds of the cases where students were involved in violations of social-regulatory policies or rules, the students were communicated with directly. Only three institutions contacted the parents in

discipline cases. The reasons why administrators differed in their opinions regarding the contacting of parents will be discussed later in this chapter.

Academic pressure was recognized by seven out of the twelve administrators interviewed as a causal factor in certain disciplinary cases. Students in some instances were found to violate rules involving cheating and plagiarism mainly because they lacked enough time to cope with their studies. Many of these students worked at full or part-time jobs and attempted to carry academic programs that created too much pressure. In some situations, students who lacked confidence, or in some cases, particular abilities, became involved in the type of violations stated above, because of the fear of failure. Depending on the circumstances involved in each case, social probation, suspension, or dismissal were generally the disciplinary measures utilized to enforce the colleges' policies and rules in this area. This did not negate the use of counselling, however, to help the student to alleviate the pressures that caused him to violate a school rule.

Disciplinary administrators emphasized that their respective colleges may or may not have experienced certain problems of group misconduct due to the geographical location and population make-up of their particular institutions. For example, racial tension and conflict caused disciplinary problems and violations at only two of the colleges visited. Although financial insecurity was also a factor listed as a source of student problems depending on the location of the college.

With regards to student protests and student administration conflict, disciplinary administrators noted that unlike the four year colleges, community colleges in Michigan have not as yet experienced very extensive student protests or campus upheavals. They cited the fact that many students in the two-year colleges have work and school schedules that seem to delimit their involvement in too many organized activities. Also, it must be noted that the first year of community college is a year of adjustment, and by the time many students become involved in various activities or social movements during the second year, they are already involved in either transfer plans to a four year institution or graduation. All administrators, however, sensed that this rather peaceful climate may well change in the days ahead. They sensed that even at the community college, students will want to have much more say about their personal and institutional lives on campus and also a stronger voice in the administration of campus affairs. Table 6 summarizes the factors contributing to the frequency of student violations of social-regulatory policies and rules.

TABLE 6

**Administrative Perceptions of Factors Contributing To  
Student Violations of Social-Regulatory Policies and  
Rules**

Contributing Factors	Community College Responses	
	YES	NO
1. Personality disorders or emotional maladjustment	10	2
2. Non-Conformist Attitude	0	12
3. Immaturity	8	4
4. Home Environment	11	1
5. Racial Tension	2	10
6. Academic Pressure	7	5
7. Influence of Off-Campus Organizations	0	12
8. Financial Insecurity	3	9
9. Misunderstanding of Regulations	0	12
10. Student-Faculty Conflict	0	12
11. Student-Administration Conflict	0	12

THE ROLE OF THE DISCIPLINARY ADMINISTRATOR

Regardless of the title on the door, the disciplinary administrator is the person who is charged with the responsibility of seeing that students conduct themselves appropriately at all times. He is often forced in the ambiguous position of representing the whole gamut of law enforcement. For example, he sometimes must play the role detective, prosecutor, defendant, and judge for a single infraction. Having to play the alternating role of a sort of pastor and policeman, sympathetic counsellor and judge, or teacher and tyrant, is by no means a simple task.

In an effort to determine the role of the disciplinary administrator at each of the twelve community colleges visited, a number of questions were asked regarding administrative procedures and practices. Responses to this aspect of the interview will be presented in the following paragraphs.

Administrative structure and procedure

It was the practice, at all of the community colleges visited, to have one administrator charged with the over-all responsibility of the entire student personnel program. This program generally included admissions and records, counselling, student activities, student government, health services, financial assistance and student conduct and citizenship. Of course the board of trustees in each institution delegated the responsibility for student discipline to the president of the college, who in turn delegated the responsibility to the person

placed in charge of student personnel services. As reported in Chapter IV, titles of the individual placed in charge of student personnel services included Assistant Dean of Student Services, Dean of Students, Dean of Student Affairs, Dean of Student Personnel Services, Director of Student Affairs and Director of Student Personnel Services.

#### Responsibility for Disciplinary Administration

With regards to title, disciplinary administrators were questioned as to whether it would be best to divide the responsibility for student conduct on the basis of the sex of the student - that is - should there be a dean of men to handle the problems of male students and a dean of women for female students? The findings revealed conclusively that all twelve administrators interviewed opposed a division of responsibility for discipline on the basis of sex. The administrators called this administrative approach to handling discipline problems outmoded. The use of such titles as dean of men and dean of women were primarily disliked because they implied a partition of duties that just isn't realistic any more. There was unanimous agreement that a chief disciplinary administrator was imperative to avoid conflicting decisions in similar cases regardless of the sex of the student. None of the colleges involved in this study provided for a division of responsibility for the handling of discipline cases.

Disciplinary administrators also stressed the fact that generally speaking, less than 10% of their time was spent in the handling of

discipline problems. This supported the contention that the over all behavior of the students of the colleges was generally speaking, good.

### Referral Procedures

Faculty to disciplinary administrator - In response to the question relating to the existence of written procedures governing referrals from faculty members to the disciplinary administrator, nine out of the twelve disciplinary administrators stated that the referral procedures had been defined in writing but not in great detail. Three of the disciplinary administrators noted that this procedure was discussed at the beginning of each school year, however, nothing was in writing. Instead, the situation was generally handled by personal conference or through a phone call. Only one of the three colleges that had no written procedure in this area felt that they were necessary.

Most administrators agreed that the listing of referral procedures was necessary to assure that confidential information was handled correctly and cases adjudicated on the basis of written facts and explanations, not merely on what was thought to be the verbal understanding of the cases.

Disciplinary administrator referrals to staff and agency - Disciplinary administrators in eight out of the twelve colleges visited followed written procedures in making student referrals to other staff members or agencies. Four administrators made referrals on an informal basis without following specific policies or written procedures. Even though these differences existed in terms of the recognition of the

necessity for policies or spelled out procedures regarding referrals, all of the administrators stressed the fact that disciplinary administrators should know enough about the dynamics of behavior to be aware of normality and abnormality, so that on occasion, disciplinary cases requiring special help, could be referred to an appropriate professional person or agency. Those who functioned informally, generally used a personal phone call or a memorandum as a means of communication. When questioned about the necessity of policies and procedures regarding student referrals, all except one administrator felt that the manner in which referrals are made should be clearly defined.

#### Administrative Practices Regarding Discipline

The review of the literature revealed that even though it was considered good practice to formulate clearly defined policies to act as guidelines for administrative decisions, many institutions of higher education were negligent in this area and failed to develop policies which governed disciplinary practices regarding student conduct. It was also noted that the goal of an efficient community college operation could best be reached by separating board policy from what should be defined as rules and regulations -- hence, clearly indicating the relationships between the board of trustees and its administrative staff.

Disciplinary administrators interviewed for the purposes of this study were asked whether their colleges had written policies which they employed regarding such disciplinary measures as to the placement of students on probation, or the suspension or dismissal of students.

Six disciplinary administrators stated that disciplinary actions were taken according to stated policy, while the other six disciplinary administrators admitted that the board of trustees of their institutions had not written policies specifically covering actions in this area. Thus, administrative action in the latter cases was completely independent and free from the board's guidelines with the exception of possible review.

Withdrawal of student privileges - Disciplinary action that involved the withdrawal of certain student privileges for a specified period of time was a method that was used by all but three of the disciplinary administrators interviewed. For example, student violators in some cases were banned from certain activities for a stipulated time period, while in other cases students were deprived of the use of a particular college facility such as the library or cafeteria. Most administrators noted that the student's activity and identification cards were collected to insure compliance with the restriction of privileges. If the student complied, his cards were returned. Although all who used this method of discipline vouched for its effectiveness, the three administrators who did not, felt it was ineffective because it was difficult to enforce.

Probation - Disciplinary administrators in all of the colleges visited used a system of probation for student violators as a means of corrective discipline. It was generally agreed that placing a student on some form of probation for his misconduct was an effective means of

action in cases where it seemed that suspension or dismissal as penalties "did not fit the crime". The terms of probation, however, were sometimes imposed as a post suspension requirement. For instance, if a student was suspended for several days, he could be placed on probation status for six months with the stipulation that if the infraction of the conduct code was repeated, dismissal action would be initiated against the student.

Suspension - In all of the colleges visited for the purposes of the study, the administrator in charge of discipline was delegated the authority to suspend students for violating a social-regulatory rule. Disciplinary administrators noted that this method of discipline was rarely used and only in the most serious cases of misconduct or after other corrective measures had failed to bring about a behavioral change for the better. In some cases a student was suspended until a complete investigation of the infraction of school rules was made. The presidents and boards of each of the colleges visited only became involved in suspension cases if an appeal was made by the student requesting a review of the disciplinary action. Eight out of the twelve disciplinary administrators were required to keep their college presidents informed of the disciplinary dispositions of student cases of misconduct.

Dismissal or expulsion - The dismissal or expulsion of a student required board action, in six out of the twelve colleges visited. In the other six colleges, this action could apparently be taken by the disciplinary administrator but with the understanding that the board would review the decision if circumstances necessitated this action.

Disciplinary administrators were quick to note that this was the most severe penalty that could be imposed by the college, and that if possible, every attempt was made to avoid its use. Often a student was given the option to withdraw from the college instead of going through the formal expulsion procedures.

Support of disciplinary action by administrative superiors- Each of the disciplinary administrators interviewed stated that they had the full support of the college president on all disciplinary action. None could think of a case which they had handled where a superior administrative officer had reversed a particular disciplinary decision which had been made. All of the administrators stressed the fact that responsibility for the control of student conduct was not practical without the necessary authority to employ a variety of disciplinary measures to attempt to correct the misconduct. It was considered most important by disciplinary administrators that students be aware of this authority, otherwise, the disciplinary control factor is weakened in the attempt to correct misbehavior.

Notification of parents - Although eight out of twelve disciplinary administrators stated earlier in this chapter that they did not generally notify parents of disciplinary action against students because they felt the students had to eventually accept the burden of responsibility for their actions, most agreed that probably parents of students under the age of twenty-one years had a right to be informed. Administrative inconsistency was apparent in this area of disciplinary procedures. None of the colleges involved had specific

policies written regarding the notification of parents. Some of the comments disciplinary administrators made were most enlightening.

Parents should be notified only if the infraction is a major one.

How can you expect the student to mature if you continue to hold the threat of his parents over him -- who ultimately has to be responsible for his actions?

Parents have a right to know if a student is not twenty one.

Sometimes parents can help correct a situation; there are many who have a great deal to offer a student in terms of understanding, guidance and support.

A student in college needs to stand on his own two feet -- his parents can't be his crutch.

Records of disciplinary action - All except one disciplinary administrator stated that they kept confidential files on students who violated social-regulatory rules of the college. It was stressed, however, that these files never became part of the student's official record. One administrator who did not believe in a confidential file, inserted written summaries of disciplinary cases in the student's

cumulative record. Because a student's cumulative file was often referred to for reference information many disciplinary administrators were reluctant to place certain information in the record that might be detrimental to the student's future welfare.

There seemed to be a lack of uniform practice regarding the manner in which information, relative to cases involving disciplinary action, was handled. Most administrators agreed, however, that when a student transferred from the community college, it was not the usual procedure to include information on a transcript regarding a specific disciplinary action. None of the disciplinary administrators could refer to defined policies that specifically pertained to the manner of keeping records. The procedures used seemed to be determined by the particular philosophy of the individual in charge of discipline.

#### THE ROLE OF THE COUNSELLOR

In Chapter II, existing differences between authorities were reviewed regarding the role of the counsellor. The point in question was whether or not a counsellor could successfully integrate the functions of counselling and discipline as a professional responsibility. This question was raised during the interview with each of the twelve disciplinary administrators. The findings are discussed in the following paragraphs.

All but one of the colleges visited reported that their counsellors were not involved in the handling of discipline problems from

the viewpoint of meting out certain penalties. One college noted that the counselling and discipline functions had been combined for many years. In questioning the disciplinary administrators further, however, it became evident that every single one of them felt that counselling and the task of meting out discipline did not mix as the functions of one person. In the one college that combined the functions, it developed that a reorganization of personnel was being contemplated to eliminate this dual role concept.

Although all of the disciplinary administrators noted that they became involved in the counselling process during the course of handling various discipline problems, they stressed the point that the student is subjected to their counselling by virtue of authority. The student-counsellor relationship on the other hand was voluntary, one evolving out of a search for help.

#### THE ROLE OF THE FACULTY

To what extent do faculty members assume the responsibility for enforcing social-regulatory policies? The answer to this question was sought during the interviews with the disciplinary administrators of the twelve colleges visited.

In partial response to the question asked above, disciplinary administrators in all of the colleges visited stated that faculty members were responsible for their own classroom discipline. It was noted that with the exception of gross misconduct such as fighting, vulgarity, and plagiarism, etc. which generally was referred to the

dean's office, the faculty handled discipline in the classrooms very well. Responsibility for supervision and control of student conduct outside of the classroom (athletic events, dances, club sponsors, etc.) was assigned to faculty members in only six out of the twelve colleges visited. Only two of the disciplinary administrators of the six colleges that did not assign faculty members responsibility for the control of student conduct at certain extra-curricular student activities and events, felt that this should be done. Most of the administrators were quick to point out that regardless of their individual feelings, this question was unique, because in Michigan, it most probably would be answered through negotiations. Unlike most community colleges in the nation, most Michigan Community Colleges in the past year have been busily involved in collective bargaining. Responsibility for conduct control outside of the classroom is an item that disciplinary administrators can no longer always delegate by assignment. It is now an item that is subject to negotiations as part of the working conditions that become included in the bargaining process.

Outside of special events that in some cases could be assigned, all of the colleges reported that faculty members were expected to report observed infractions on campus to the disciplinary administrators. Although faculty members never played a direct role in adjudicating the initial case of misconduct, seven out of the twelve colleges visited, reported that faculty members participated as members of judicial review panels for hearing appeals of student discipline cases.

Some of the comments on the attitudes of most community college instructors toward their involvement in the supervision and control of student conduct beyond the walls of the classroom were not only informative, but most enlightening.

Non-involvement seems to be just as fashionable among faculty members as it is in the rest of our society. They often look the other way rather than do something about an obvious infraction of the rule.

Most of our faculty members are pretty decent about helping me do my job. They'll phone me many times to "nip a would be incident in the bud".

Some faculty members don't have vision beyond the classroom - what goes on on campus seems to be in another world for them.

Many faculty members don't like to jeopardize their popularity by doing what should be done about violations of school policy.

We sometimes expect too much from faculty members. Surely they should participate in supervising events as school representatives, but not as disciplinarians. There should be campus police for that purpose.

### THE ROLE OF THE STUDENT

The findings reported in Chapter IV regarding the involvement of students in the development of policies and rules concerning student conduct, and the review of the literature in Chapter II, substantiated the fact that it was good practice to encourage student participation in the formulation of policies and rules. It appeared axiomatic that those who were governed by rules should have had some say as to the form in which they were developed. Nevertheless, the truth of the matter is that policies and rules that had major implications were developed solely by administrators. Student involvement in reality was generally encouraged in developing policies and rules dealing with relatively minor areas of conduct.

In light of the above summary concerning the student's role in developing policies and rules, what should the role of students be in the enforcement of social-regulatory policies? Disciplinary administrators interviewed had very definite viewpoints regarding this question. The findings are reported in the following paragraphs.

#### Student Courts

The use of students to assist disciplinary administrators in enforcing social-regulatory policies and rules through a student court has generated a good deal of controversy. When disciplinary administrators were asked whether they had a student court on their campuses to handle student conduct violations, ten out of twelve responded

negatively. In the two colleges where a student court was used to assist the disciplinary administrator, cases were generally limited to dress code infractions or parking violations. The two administrators did not think that they were too effective. All twelve of the administrators involved in the interview viewed the use of a student court to aid in the enforcement of social-regulatory rules as an undesirable approach to the handling of student cases. They made the following types of comments.

Students dislike judging their peers one day and having to rationalize their position as a judge the next.

Students lack training in this area and sometimes are harsher than disciplinary administrators in their penalties.

There are certain types of information that should never be brought before a student court because of the harm it could bring to the student on trial.

Students should not be given responsibility in areas where the law implies that the authority and responsibility rests solely with the college.

### Penalties

Nine out of the twelve disciplinary administrators stated that students were not involved in considering the types penalties that

should be used to help correct violators. Three administrators noted that although they didn't believe in students playing the role of judges, there was nothing wrong in their helping an administrator to develop certain penalties to be used with certain violations. All of the administrators mentioned the fact that student opinion was often sought by administrators but that they were not always involved in the direct development of penalties.

#### Student Involvement in Hearings

None of the colleges visited permitted students to participate on panels to hear appeal cases of student violators. Generally the same reasons for not having students involved as those cited for the student court were given.

#### LEGAL IMPLICATIONS

The review of the literature revealed the fact that the charters of most institutions of higher education have been founded under grants of power extended by the state legislatures. Boards of trustees generally have been given broad authority to govern and manage their colleges and universities including the implicit grant to enforce compliance with those policies and regulations which they establish. The predominant number of the community colleges visited for the purposes of this study function under this type of broad authority granted by the legislature in section 1159, paragraph 12 of the General School Laws of Michigan. The one exception to this use of broad authority

was found in Highland Park Community College, where the college is physically connected to the high school and under the control of a K-12 school board. Because of this factor rules sometimes exist because the college is forced to adhere to certain secondary school codes adopted by the board. Disciplinary administrators predicted that in due time all of the community colleges in Michigan will be organized as separate districts with their own boards, thus eliminating K-12 boards of trustees and conflict with high school standards of discipline.

The position of community colleges to exercise sufficient supervision and control over its students and their social organizations has been legally affirmed. The main questions that have been raised in the courts regarding discipline, generally center around the mode of discipline, its reasonableness, and whether a student's basic rights were violated. Most community college administrators stated that they had not experienced any legal problems concerning any disciplinary actions that they had taken. However, they noted that the legal turmoil being experienced at the university and four year college level regarding student rights could well filter down to community college campuses.

In light of this possibility, disciplinary administrators of the twelve colleges visited were asked several questions regarding the degree of due process that they accorded students in discipline cases.

#### Written Notification of Violation

Disciplinary administrators in seven of the twelve colleges

visited notified students in writing regarding the alleged violation. Five of the administrators noted that they handled this situation by a personal conference.

Names of Accuser and Witnesses

Seven out of the twelve colleges reported that students are notified in writing of the names of the accuser and the witnesses. Five administrators stated that this procedure was not used but that they informed a student violator of these facts, if it became necessary.

Testimony of Accused

Student violators were required to testify, even if it meant self incrimination, in seven out of the twelve community colleges visited. Five colleges did not require students to discuss the apparent facts in violation cases. However, this did not necessarily eliminate the possibility of disciplinary consequences.

Privilege of Counsel

All of the disciplinary administrators interviewed stated that a student had the right to use legal counsel in cases involving violations of social-regulatory policies or rules.

Cross Examination of Accuser or Witnesses

Disciplinary administrators at all of the colleges involved in this study stated that the student had the right to cross examine

his accuser or any witnesses regarding the alleged violation.

### Hearings

Students at all of the colleges visited were entitled to expeditions hearings regarding alleged violations.

### Reasons for Disciplinary Penalties

All of the disciplinary administrators interviewed stated that students were entitled to an explanation of the reasons for a decision rendered against him.

### Right to Appeal

All twelve colleges visited provide students with the right to appeal the decision of the disciplinary administrator to the President of the college, a special appellate board or the board of trustees.

Most of the administrators felt that, all in all, the state laws permitted enough freedom for their institutions to develop and enforce their social-regulatory policies. Several administrators noted, however, that they felt the state legislature should counter-balance certain recent court decisions regarding student's rights, with laws stipulating emphatically the rights of public institutions of higher education with respect to the preservation of the institution's authority.

SUMMARY

This chapter reported the findings that dealt with the enforcement of student social-regulatory policies and rules at the twelve community colleges visited. The items discussed were the extent and frequency of student violations, contributory factors generally involved in misconduct cases, the role of the disciplinary administrator and other staff members, disciplinary administrative practices, and the legal implications regarding the administrative enforcement of disciplinary policies and rules.

Generally speaking, student conduct was rated very good by the disciplinary administrators interviewed. This was supported by the fact that they all reported having to spend less than ten per cent of their administrative time to handle disciplinary problems. The areas of most frequent concern to the disciplinary administrators were problems involving "drinking", "theft", "campus parking", and "cafeteria behavior". Problems involving a lesser frequency of occurrence were those dealing with "lounge behavior", "litterbugging", and "financial responsibility".

Although titles for disciplinary administrators differed, community colleges visited had only one administrator handling discipline cases. At no time was the responsibility divided according to the sex of the student.

Most disciplinary administrators noted they had written procedures in use for referral of conduct problems from disciplinary administrators to the staff and from the staff to them. There was general agreement that student conduct information should be handled discreetly.

With regard to disciplinary penalties, suspension and dismissal from classes were practices not too often used. The less severe disciplinary measures of probation or withdrawal of privileges were used more often. If dismissal had to be invoked, a student was usually afforded the opportunity to withdraw from school.

Disciplinary administrators by in large did not favor the idea of notifying parents regarding most violations. However, they generally agreed when questioned further that parents should be notified and subsequently involved in the more serious cases. In all cases, students should be contacted.

There was an apparent lack of uniformity among disciplinary administrators regarding their record keeping procedures. Most of the administrators kept confidential records.

All of the disciplinary administrators felt that the functions of discipline and counselling should be separated when referring to the role of the counsellor. Only one college assigned disciplinary duties to its counsellors.

The faculty of the community colleges visited, generally performed well in controlling their classroom discipline problems. In half the institutions they were assigned certain activities in terms of supervision and control. Generally speaking, faculty members were not considered to be too effective in enforcing college policies and rules outside of the classroom. Disciplinary administrators by in large preferred the use of security police to supervise campus sponsored activities. At any rate, it was felt that collective bargaining would

probably determine the role of the faculty in this area in the future.

Disciplinary administrators unanimously agreed that the student court was not a very effective means to deal with the enforcement of policies and rules. It was felt that students should not be involved in judging their peers. Administrators did agree, however, that students could be consulted regarding the various types of penalties that they considered fair to impose on student violators for certain violations.

The legal implications regarding the authority granted community colleges in Michigan to enforce their rules and regulations were reviewed. The degree of due process accorded student violators in the community colleges visited was also discussed.

## CHAPTER VII

### SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, RECOMMENDATIONS, AND IMPLICATIONS FOR FUTURE STUDY

A summary of this study, the methodology of the investigation, and the findings are contained in this chapter. Conclusions drawn from the analysis of the collected data are presented. Included also in this last chapter are suggested guidelines to aid administrators in charge of student personnel services in the development, communication, and enforcement of written social-regulatory policies and rules governing student conduct, and citizenship at rapidly growing community colleges in Michigan. Implications for future research and study are noted in the concluding paragraphs of the chapter.

### SUMMARY OF THE PROBLEM

History is replete with examples of the divergencies of opinion that have existed in higher education regarding the development, communication, and enforcement of social-regulatory policies. In light of this, the author of this dissertation felt that an analysis of specific social-regulatory practices of selected rapidly growing community colleges would be most timely.

It was the purpose of this study, therefore, to make a survey analysis of specific social-regulatory practices of selected community colleges in Michigan to ascertain the prevailing conditions that exist regarding the following:

1. The origin and extent of written social-regulatory policies and the provisions for change.
2. The types of rules of conduct.
3. The communication of social-regulatory policies and rules.
4. The enforcement of social-regulatory policies and rules.

Data were collected to provide answers to the following questions:

1. What is the extent of written social-regulatory policies and rules governing various areas of student conduct and discipline?
2. What aspects of student conduct and discipline should be governed by written social-regulatory policies and rules?
3. Who helped to formulate the written policies and rules governing student conduct and discipline?
4. Who should be involved in developing social-regulatory policies concerning student behavior and discipline in the community college and how often should these policies be reviewed?
5. What methods of communication are the most effective in disseminating information about social-regulatory policies in community colleges?
6. What areas of student conduct and discipline present the most frequent problems and what are some of the contributing

factors to these problems?

7. What is the role of the disciplinary administrator and how much time does he spend on the handling of discipline problems?
8. To what extent should the counsellors, other faculty members and students be involved in the enforcement of community college policies and rules?
9. To what extent is due process accorded students in disciplinary procedures?
10. Do present state laws permit enough freedom for the community college to develop and enforce its social-regulatory policies?

#### SUMMARY OF METHODOLOGY

The procedures used to study the problem included a search of the literature, and other sources of data for information related to the study. College publications such as student handbooks, faculty policy manuals, college catalogues, bulletins, announcements and school newspapers were used to obtain certain information. Newspaper articles were reviewed for items related to the study. The information gleaned from the review of these publications formed the basis from which the author formulated the questions that later comprised the interview guide used to interview the disciplinary administrators of the community colleges visited for the purposes of this study.

The major procedure used, however, to obtain data for this investigation was that of personally interviewing disciplinary administrators to ascertain what their views and judgments were regarding the social-regulatory practices of their respective community colleges. As previously stated, a preliminary review of the literature and various college publications pertinent to this study helped to produce the necessary information from which one-hundred and fifty questions were developed and grouped into four major areas according to the chapter outlines proposed for the study. The instrument was then submitted to the writer's doctoral committee for review. The constructive suggestions offered were most helpful in making final changes in the interview guide. A copy of the instrument can be found in the appendix.

Each of the interviews were arranged by personal long-distance phone calls. The factor of time prohibited written requests for personal interviews. The disciplinary administrators interviewed are also listed in the appendix.

The interviews were held in the campus office of the administrators in charge of discipline. The persons interviewed were assured that their comments and responses to the questions asked would not be identified by name. In each instance, informality and a very relaxed atmosphere were the rule rather than the exception. Although specific questions were asked, administrators were encouraged to comment regarding the reasons for their responses. Most interviews lasted over two hours with one or two taking a somewhat lesser amount of time.

In selecting the community colleges to be visited for the personal interviews, several factors such as the size of enrollment of the college, the location, as well as the experience of the disciplinary administrator were taken into consideration. The study was limited to those community colleges with an enrollment of more than fifteen-hundred day students. It was felt that larger institutions would be more apt to have written policies and rules. Eight of the colleges selected for this study had urban settings, two had suburban settings and two had rural settings. The location was considered important because of the possible differences that various environments reflect in terms of student behavior problems. All disciplinary administrators included in this study served in their present positions for at least two years. It was felt that it would be unwise to interview a newly appointed individual because he might not be too familiar with all of the policies, rules and problems relating to the social-regulatory practices of the college.

Treatment of the data was accomplished as simply as possible. Quantitative statical analysis were not considered as important for the purposes of this study as were the comments of the responders. Answers to the questions, however, were tabulated and reported. After tabulating and analyzing the data gathered, conclusions, recommendations and implications for future study were drawn from the findings.

#### SUMMARY OF THE FINDINGS

##### Title of the Disciplinary Administrator

The twelve disciplinary administrators of the colleges visited

represented six different titles, even though they were usually referred to simply as "the dean". The most common title used was "Dean of Student Personnel Services". Five community colleges used this title. Other community colleges referred to the person in charge of discipline as, "The Assistant Dean of Student Services", "The Dean of Students", "The Dean of Student Affairs", "The Director of Student Affairs", or "The Director of Student Personnel Services".

#### Experience of Disciplinary Administrators

The range for the years of service in position for the administrators interviewed was from two years to twenty-two years. Seventy-five per cent of the administrators interviewed held their present positions between two and four years.

#### Extent of Present Social-Regulatory Policies or Rules

Thirty areas of policies or rules related to student conduct and discipline were listed in the interview guide. Disciplinary administrators were asked to state whether or not his community college had a policy or rule in each of these areas. The findings for each of the listed areas are briefly summarized in the following paragraphs.

Student rights - Only four of the twelve colleges visited noted that they had written policies defining the rights of students. All except two disciplinary administrators felt strongly that clearly defined policies in this area would be most helpful.

General responsibilities and duties of student citizens -

Seventy-five per cent of the community colleges visited had broad policy statements reflecting institutional expectations. Even those that did not have statements, recognized the need to define institutional expectations in this area.

Dress and personal appearance - Eight of the twelve community colleges had written statements defining acceptable standards of dress and appearance. Three of the four colleges that had no written policy or rules regarding dress and appearance, felt that there was no need for one. It was noted that appropriate dress was at times difficult to define and even more difficult to enforce.

Students' rights to assemble - Although only two colleges had policies in this area, six of the ten remaining colleges visited felt that their institutions should develop a policy in this area.

Student plagiarism - Half of the disciplinary administrators interviewed noted that they had written policies and rules in this area. Of the remaining six, only one disciplinary administrator felt that a written policy or rule was necessary in this area.

Student cheating - Seven colleges had policy statements regarding cheating, while five did not. Only one of the five

colleges with no policy statements felt that there should be one.

Smoking - Eleven of the community colleges visited had written regulations regarding designated areas in which students were permitted to smoke. All administrators felt that smoking should be permitted, but only in designated areas. Five of the twelve colleges, however, did not permit the sale of cigarettes on campus.

Gambling - Eleven of the twelve colleges prohibited all forms of gambling by policy statements that generally were broad in scope. All disciplinary administrators recognized a need for policy statements and rules in this area. Two colleges went so far as to forbid card-playing of any kind on campus because of gambling problems.

Campus traffic and parking - Ten community colleges had written regulations governing campus parking and traffic. All administrators noted that this was a major area of college concern, especially with the advent of rapidly rising enrollments.

Classroom behavior - Five colleges had written regulations regarding behavior in this area, while seven did not have written policies or rules. Instructors apparently set their own standards.

Games and Recreational Activities - Only five colleges had specific written regulations referring to this area, the other colleges had none and most felt no need to develop any written rules in this area.

Alcoholic beverages - None of the community colleges visited permitted the drinking of alcoholic beverages on campus.

Litterbugging - Only two of the twelve colleges had written rules in this area. Most of the other colleges saw no need for definitive rules in this area.

Moral behavior (necking, petting, etc.) - Four colleges had policy statements, while eight had none. The great majority saw no need for specific written policies or rules in this area since action could be taken under such broad policy statements as: "The college reserves the right to take action against any student for unbecoming conduct".

Hazing and Initiations - Six community colleges had social-regulatory policies applicable to this area of behavior. All except two of the other colleges were considering the development of policies in this area.

Use of explosives (firecrackers, etc.) -and firearms on campus - Although only six colleges had rules and regulations governing the conduct of students in this area, most administrators felt policies should be written to clarify this aspect of

student conduct. Of course all students must abide by state laws in this regard.

On-Campus Organizations - All twelve colleges visited had policies governing the approval of and role of on-campus organizations.

Vandalism - Seven of the twelve colleges had policies or rules relating to this area of student misbehavior. Three others felt they needed to develop policies, while two colleges considered the situation a matter for civil authorities.

Theft, illegal entry or forgery - Seven colleges had written rules and regulations regarding infractions in this area and five had no policies written. Two of the five colleges hoped to formulate policies, while the remaining colleges consider this area one which should be referred to civil authorities.

Identification cards - Eleven had rules regarding their use. One college was developing policies and rules regarding their use.

Conduct at games or other campus activities - Eight of the colleges had policies written, while four saw no need for any because of the infrequency of problems in this area.

Poster and advertising limitations - Only three colleges had no policy statements in this area, however, all of the admin-

istrators interviewed saw the need for clearly defined policies and rules in this area.

Student financial responsibility - Of the twelve colleges visited, nine had written policies regarding student responsibility in this area. Two colleges felt no need to write policies or rules in this area. One college was in the process of formulating a policy.

Authorization of campus publications - Although only three colleges failed to develop written policies in this area, all recognized the need for them.

The falsification of records - Written policies in this area were found in seven out of the twelve colleges visited. Four of the remaining five colleges saw a definite need for policy development in this area.

Authorization of guest speakers on campus - Eight colleges published policies or rules regarding the use of guest speakers. Two of the remaining four colleges planned to develop policies or rules in this regard.

Definition of penalties for violation of regulations - Only five colleges defined penalties for specific violations. Six felt they did not want to do so, while one college thought it would develop statements in this area.

Procedures for disciplinary action - Six colleges had written a policy defining procedures, while the other six more or less played each situation "by ear". Three of the six colleges that had no policies governing this area admitted that they were desirable.

All administrators interviewed observed an increasing concern on the part of students regarding the written policies and rules that restrict their mode of conduct, especially with respect to their voice in college affairs.

#### ORIGIN OF PRESENT POLICIES AND RULES

The social-regulatory policies and rules of three of the twelve colleges were developed entirely by the board of trustees or administrators without any student involvement at all. Disciplinary administrators of the other community colleges did involve students in the formulation of most of the policies and rules pertaining to student conduct and discipline. There was unanimous agreement that students should be involved in developing social-regulatory policies, with the exception of those involving legal matters. All of the colleges felt that faculty should play a role in developing policies and rules dealing with student conduct and discipline. The social-regulatory policies and rules in nine out of the twelve colleges were developed on a cooperative basis through a joint effort of administrators, faculty members and students. Many administrators found it difficult to explain why some of their expressed beliefs were not

put into practice.

WRITTEN FORMS OF SOCIAL-REGULATORY POLICIES AND RULES

Administrators interviewed were for the most part in general agreement that, whenever possible, student social-regulatory policies and rules should be written with a positive approach, informing students of what constitutes acceptable behavior. However, it was noted that it was not always feasible to state all rules in a positive manner. For example, is there a better way to prohibit smoking or parking in certain areas than by simply stating "no smoking" or "no parking"? Even so, ten out of the twelve colleges visited noted that most of their policies and rules regarding student conduct were stated in the positive style. The rationale offered for the positive approach to policy and rule making was that "people tend to react more positively when told something in a positive manner".

STUDENT ACCEPTANCE OF SOCIAL-REGULATORY POLICIES AND RULES

Disciplinary administrators in attempting to be as objective as possible, judged that the policies and regulations of their respective colleges regarding student conduct were accepted fairly to very well by students. They admitted, however, that those student social-regulatory policies which were formulated by a committee representing administration, faculty and students seem to have the highest degree of acceptance.

#### REVIEW AND REVISION OF SOCIAL-REGULATORY POLICIES AND RULES

Community colleges involved in this study noted that current changes in our society and new legal interpretations by the courts made the review and revision of certain policies and rules imperative. Disciplinary administrators claimed that there is a growing tendency for many colleges to become less involved in areas involving dress and appearance, off-campus and in many cases on-campus clubs, off-campus housing and off-campus behavior.

Approximately half of the colleges reviewed their policies and rules annually. The others reported that they preferred reviewing them as the need arose.

#### COMMUNICATION OF SOCIAL-REGULATORY POLICIES AND RULES

Although social-regulatory policies and rules were communicated to the students via orientation programs, assemblies and other meetings, there seemed to be agreement among the disciplinary administrators interviewed that statements of policy and rules were most frequently made and distributed through such written material as policy manuals, handbooks, college catalogues, school newspapers, brochures, and to a lesser extent, letters to parents.

#### Faculty Policy Manuals

All but two of the twelve community colleges provided faculty members with policy manuals. Only three of the manuals provided faculty members, however, contained policies pertaining to student

conduct or a listing of any codes of conduct. Many disciplinary administrators explained the lack of social-regulatory policies and rules in faculty manuals by noting that most of their governing boards assumed that student discipline was an administrative matter that would be published in the student handbook. Only one college manual had separated board policies concerning student conduct and discipline from administrative rules and regulations. All administrators admitted that there seemed to be a laxity in this area of policy development. Disciplinary administrators agreed that policy guidelines approved by boards of trustees would prove to be a valuable reference when developing codes of conduct. There was complete agreement with the authorities in the literature that institutional expectations should be spelled out in well developed written policies.

#### Announcements or special bulletins

All colleges use this means to disseminate information regarding social-regulatory policies and rules, especially if changes occur after major publications are distributed.

#### Letters to parents

Most colleges in most instances preferred communicating with their students and generally refrained from communicating with parents regarding social-regulatory policies and rules. They firmly believed that if the community college is sincere in respecting the dignity of the student as an adult it should communicate primarily with the

student and not the parent. Three colleges felt that parents had a right to be informed. All administrators, however, welcomed any contacts by parents and stressed that they would be more than happy to cooperate with the parents in any way possible.

#### Student handbooks

All of the community colleges visited published student handbooks and used them to disseminate information about its student social-regulatory policies and rules. The amount of space allotted to student conduct and discipline varied markedly from just one page in one college handbook to twelve pages in another college handbook.

#### Brochures or letters to students

Ten of the twelve colleges felt a need to use brochures and letters to inform students as to rules and regulations. The disciplinary administrators from the other two colleges felt that all of the other publications used to disseminate this type of information were sufficient.

#### College catalogues

Of the twelve 1967-68 community college catalogues examined, only eight made reference to student conduct and citizenship and most of these references were broad statements regarding the institutional expectations of students with regard to conduct and citizenship responsibilities. Flint Community College had the most extensive and definitive statements regarding student conduct and discipline.

### Orientation classes

All of the community colleges involved in this study except one held orientation classes for new students. These classes or sessions lasted from one to three days. Student handbooks were generally used as the texts. Thus, it was somewhat common practice to devote a portion of the total program to discussion pertaining to social-regulatory policies and rules. One college held an orientation assembly at the beginning of the school year. Attendance, however, was not compulsory and many students did not attend, even though social-regulatory policies and rules were reviewed. Several disciplinary administrators suggested that these programs would be more effective if student leaders presided over them.

### School newspaper

Nine of the twelve disciplinary administrators interviewed reported that the college newspaper was used to disseminate information about social-regulatory policies and rules. Three colleges did not feel that the newspaper should be used for administrative communications.

### Special assemblies

Disciplinary administrators, on the whole, did not think that assemblies were an effective means of communicating with students regarding student conduct policies and rules. They claimed that conflict in student schedules made it impossible to reach the vast majority of students.

### Effectiveness of various methods of communications

Interviews with the disciplinary administrators revealed that no one method of communication of social-regulatory policies and rules was effective enough to reach all of the student body. Most were in agreement that the most effective combination of communication methods for informing students about social-regulatory policies would probably be the use of handbooks, catalogues, newspapers and compulsory orientation programs where student government officers would share the responsibility for planning and presenting the program.

### ENFORCEMENT OF SOCIAL REGULATORY POLICIES AND RULES

#### Extent of the Problem

On a three point scale ranging from low to high, all except one of the disciplinary administrators listed the frequency of student violations as being low. One administrator stated that the frequency of student violations at his institution was average. On the whole each disciplinary administrator rated the behavior of students as being generally very good.

The majority of community college disciplinary administrators stated that they spent less than ten per cent of their time in handling conduct and discipline problems.

#### Frequency of Discipline Problems

Of the twenty-four areas of conduct listed in the interview

guide, fourteen different ones were mentioned as problems of frequency. The areas of misconduct most frequently mentioned included campus parking, theft, cafeteria behavior, and the drinking of alcoholic beverages. Other conduct areas mentioned by disciplinary administrators included dress and appearance, student protests, lounge behavior, gambling, cheating, littering, conduct of off-campus organizations, off-campus individual behavior, financial irresponsibility, and racial conflict. The same problems were not common to all colleges in terms of frequency.

FACTORS CONTRIBUTING TO THE EXTENT AND FREQUENCY OF  
STUDENT CONDUCT PROBLEMS AS PERCEIVED BY ADMINISTRATORS

The following are a summary of the contributing factors:

1. Many of the student conduct problems handled by the disciplinary administrators were of the type that mainly stemmed from immaturity.

2. Since most of the students attending community colleges reside at home, the home environment can have a tremendous bearing on whether or not a student will violate rules and regulations. What goes on in the family and the degree to which the family meets the needs of the student is to a large extent the conditioning factor that tends to motivate a student in either a positive or negative direction.

3. Academic pressure was cited by many administrators as a factor which sometimes motivates a student to violate rules pertain-

ing to cheating or plagiarism.

4. Location and setting undoubtedly was a factor which contributed to violations of rules in certain areas of misconduct such as parking, theft, racial conflicts, and financial responsibility.

5. Racial conflict, although not a major problem was noted as a causal factor of certain violations of school rules.

6. Financial insecurity was also mentioned as a contributing factor to the frequency of certain violations, especially those involving theft of money and books, etc.

7. Many administrators noted an increasing amount of emotional problems and personality disorders as contributing factors to the frequency of violations in various areas.

ROLE OF THE DISCIPLINARY ADMINISTRATOR AND  
DISCIPLINARY PRACTICES

The disciplinary administrator of each of the colleges visited was charged with the major responsibility of directing the entire student personnel program. One aspect of his over all duties was student discipline. His authority in this area was usually delegated to him directly by the board of trustees according to policy or by the president of the college. The following statements reflect briefly the responses of disciplinary administrators as to certain practices relative to the administration of discipline:

1. All administrators opposed a division of responsibility according to sex. This approach was thought to be outmoded. A single person in charge avoided conflicting decisions in similar cases.
2. Nine of the twelve college administrators noted that written referral procedures were important in handling student conduct problems. It was felt that this was imperative to assure students that facts were placed in writing and handled properly.
3. All administrators stressed that some knowledge of the dynamics of behavior was essential in helping to recognize when cases should be referred to another agency for professional help.
4. Six administrators interviewed functioned according to written policies defining disciplinary penalties, while six were free to take disciplinary action independently, for they had no board guidelines.
5. Nine administrators reported that they often found the method of withdrawing privileges for a period time as an effective corrective disciplinary action.
6. The system of probationary status for student violators was used as an effective corrective action in disciplinary cases. This procedure allowed for flexibility in various cases.

7. All twelve disciplinary administrators were delegated the authority to suspend students for violating a social-regulatory rule. This method was rarely used, however, except in the most serious cases of misconduct.

8. Dismissal or expulsion of a student required board action in six out of the twelve colleges visited. In the other colleges it was understood that even though the board didn't initiate the action, it reserved the right to review or disapprove it. Since this was considered the most severe penalty that could be imposed by a college, a student was often given the option to withdraw from school in advance.

9. Eight of the twelve disciplinary administrators noted that they did not make a practice of dealing with a student's parents. In respecting the dignity of the student, they thought it best to deal directly with him. Some administrators were quick to stress that a parent had a right to be informed of all cases involving infractions of college rules. None of the colleges had written policies in this area. In extreme cases most administrators admitted that if the student were under twenty-one years of age, they would contact the parents.

10. Record keeping procedures were not uniform. They seemed to be determined by the philosophy of the individual adminis-

trator. All except one administrator kept confidential records, because they were reluctant to place certain information in a student's file that might serve as a detriment to him, even after he had corrected his ways.

11. All disciplinary administrators were supported by their superiors.

#### THE ROLE OF THE COUNSELLOR

Eleven of the twelve colleges visited reported that their counsellors were not involved in discipline. None of the disciplinary administrators felt that the function of counselling and discipline should be integrated as a single responsibility.

#### ROLE OF THE FACULTY

The following findings summarized the extent to which faculty was involved in discipline:

1. With the exception of extreme cases, faculty members were responsible for their own classroom discipline in all of the colleges visited.
2. Only six administrators assigned faculty members to special events. Others employed security police.
3. Many faculty members, however, did sponsor certain activities and hence were responsible for the discipline of the group.

4. Most administrators felt that faculty members were obligated to report infractions of college rules, however, they noted that most faculty members objected to this type of involvement.

5. Most administrators noted that the role of faculty in the area of enforcement will more and more be determined by collective bargaining negotiations. Unlike most community colleges in the nation, most Michigan Community Colleges in the past year have engaged in the collective bargaining process regarding working conditions and wages.

6. In most of the colleges, faculty members did participate on panels reviewing cases that have been appealed.

#### THE ROLE OF THE STUDENT

1. Although not accepted as a desirable means of enforcing social-regulatory policies by most of the twelve colleges, two colleges did use a student court to enforce rules not involving legal matters.

2. Most administrators felt that students dislike judging their peers.

3. It was felt that students lacked the training in the area of disciplinary enforcement and are sometimes harsher than disciplinary administrators in their penalties.

4. Most administrators stated that student violators generally didn't want certain facts presented before their peers.

#### LEGAL IMPLICATIONS

The main questions that have been raised in the courts regarding discipline, generally focus on the mode of discipline, its reasonableness, and whether due process procedures were employed in deciding the case. The following statements summarize the findings regarding administrator's responses to questions in this area:

1. Disciplinary administrators in seven of the twelve colleges notified students in writing regarding the alleged violation.

2. Students are notified in writing of the names of the accuser and the witnesses in seven of the twelve colleges.

3. Student violators are required to give testimony in seven out of the twelve colleges. Disciplinary administrators noted that the colleges were not courts and were not obligated to function as such.

4. All of the colleges permitted the student to use legal counsel in cases where rules were violated.

5. Disciplinary administrators at all of the colleges stated that students had the right to cross examine his accuser or any witnesses regarding the alleged violation.

6. Students at all of the colleges were entitled to expeditions hearings.

7. Students were entitled to an explanation of the reasons for a decision rendered against him.

8. All twelve colleges visited permitted a student to appeal his case to a special appellate board of faculty members and administrative officers or the board of trustees.

Most of the administrators interviewed felt that, all in all, the state laws permitted enough freedom for their institutions to develop and enforce their social-regulatory policies and rules. Several administrators, however, strongly urged the legislature to enact laws to strengthen the authority of colleges with regard to self preservation during times of student-revolt or protest. It was their feeling that institutional authority is slowly being eroded.

### CONCLUSIONS

The findings presented in this dissertation were based upon the responses of the disciplinary administrators interviewed for the purposes of this study. Their views and judgements along with the review of the literature and related research, helped to form the basis for the following conclusions:

1. Most of the larger community colleges in Michigan are in need of more carefully defined social-regulatory policies and rules governing student conduct and discipline than they presently have

written.

2. Many community colleges did not make a clear distinction between policy statements written by the board of trustees and administrative rules and regulations implementing policy.

3. Social-regulatory policies and rules are more likely to be reasonable and more readily accepted when students, faculty members, and administration share the responsibility for their formulation.

4. Although exceptions can be cited, students generally respond more favorably to policies and rules stated in positive terms rather than negative ones.

5. Community college students tend to comply with rules and regulations more readily if the reasons for their existence are clarified.

6. Communication of social-regulatory policies and rules is more likely to be effectively achieved when they are published and distributed and discussed at scheduled orientation sessions that are planned and presided over by administrators, faculty members and student leaders.

7. Misbehavior, aside from that which may originate from pathology, is either (1) an outgrowth of the individuals' home environment, (2) a matter of immaturity, (3) or an outgrowth of the individual's past or current problems of adjustment.

8. A student court system of enforcement of social-regulatory policies and rules is not perceived by the participating administrators as an effective means to handle infractions.

9. Faculty members tend to ignore infractions of various college rules outside of the classroom, because they are reluctant to become involved.

10. The involvement of faculty members in the enforcement of student conduct policies at certain campus events is more and more being determined by collective bargaining negotiations. Michigan seems to be a leader in this new venture in determining professional roles and working conditions.

11. The single disciplinary administrator concept is preferred over the concept suggesting a division of responsibilities according to sex.

12. The counselling and disciplinary tasks are not considered compatible functions for one person. Counsellors are rarely involved in the administration of discipline.

13. Student probation and withdrawal of certain campus privileges are the most widely used methods of discipline when infractions of rules occur.

14. Dismissal, expulsion and suspension of community college students for violating social-regulatory policies or rules are used as disciplinary measures only in the most extreme cases. Students are in some cases given the option to withdraw in situations

which might demand this type of penalty.

15. Michigan community college laws did not seem to restrict the colleges from developing their own policies and rules governing themselves. Section 1159, paragraph twelve of the Michigan General School Laws is apparently broadly stated to permit a great degree of freedom in terms of the determination of college policies and rules.

#### RECOMMENDATIONS

Undoubtedly the results of this study indicate that more attention must and will be focused upon the research of the behavioral sciences for some answers to the ways in which the administration of discipline can be most effectively accomplished. Certainly not all disciplinary administrators, faculty members, students and behavioral scientists always agree upon the answers to the problem, however, this should never deter the search for a common core of agreement that could be referred to as a guideline in dealing with the administration of discipline. The personal, ethical, moral, and political implications of today's student unrest makes this task imperative. The following criteria are offered as broad standards by which major social-regulatory practices in Michigan community colleges can be clinically judged as satisfactory:

1. CLEARLY AND COGENTLY FORMULATED WRITTEN SOCIAL-REGULATORY POLICIES SHOULD EXIST AND SHOULD BE PUBLICIZED.

Rationale: The college must assume its obligation to define its expectations of

students. The enlightenment of students as to their defined roles on campus is an important part of the educational process.

2. SOCIAL-REGULATORY POLICIES SHOULD BE FORMULATED COOPERATIVELY AND DEMOCRATICALLY.

Rationale: It would seem desirable to have administrators, faculty members, and students share in some way in the formulation of policies for it seems reasonable to assume that people who are involved in the policy-making process will be more likely to accept the policies formulated.

3. POLICIES AND REGULATIONS SHOULD BE SYSTEMATICALLY REVIEWED PERIODICALLY.

Rationale: Policies and regulations governing the social order of the community college may well meet the needs of common utility at a particular period of time in the development of the college; but, in the further process of this development, they may cause anti-social effects if they are outdated and are not progressively changed as the social, customs and mores of the college community change.

4. THE DIFFERENCES BETWEEN THE ROLE OF THE BOARD OF TRUSTEES AND THE ROLE OF THE ADMINISTRATOR REGARDING THE SOCIAL-REGULATORY FUNCTIONS IN COMMUNITY COLLEGES SHOULD BE RECOGNIZED AND MUTUALLY RESPECTED.

Rationale: The line between policy-making and administrative function is often difficult to determine, but it is a necessary one to define. The board, representing the public interest, should make the broad policy-making decisions of the college. It should also make sure the college is well managed, but should not become involved in the process of management. In exercising the authority derived from the board, the administrator should establish and be responsible for an organization to adequately carry out the management of the college. The administrator

would be wise to keep the board well informed regarding the various aspects of the management process. A well informed board would be more likely to make intelligent decisions, especially, during troublesome times.

5. A COLLEGE, REGARDLESS OF ITS SIZE, SHOULD HAVE SOME OFFICIAL WITH PROFESSIONAL TRAINING IN THE BEHAVIORAL SCIENCES AND ADMINISTRATION RESPONSIBLE FOR THE ADMINISTRATION OF STUDENT DISCIPLINE.

Rationale: The administration of discipline is a vital part of the education process and should be carried out by a professionally trained person who has a good conceptual understanding of the disciplinary process and social-regulatory policies of the institution.

6. CONSISTENT IMPLEMENTATION OF SOCIAL-REGULATORY POLICIES SHOULD BE ENHANCED BY OPEN AND SYSTEMATIC COMMUNICATION BOTH HORIZONTALLY AND VERTICALLY.

Rationale: Two-way communication is one of the major conditions of effective administration. It requires that all persons whose interests are vitally affected by a proposal be able to participate in the discussions from the time the problem is defined until a decision is reached.

7. DUE PROCESS SHOULD BE DEFINED BY THE COLLEGE TO SAFEGUARD THE STUDENT FROM ANY POSSIBLE ABUSES AND INJUSTICES IN CASES INVOLVING POSSIBLE DISCIPLINARY ACTION.

Rationale: Although colleges are not, in a true sense, microcosms of society, and although campus citizens do not exercise the same political control of the educational community as they do in civil government, the American tradition of fair play makes it seem that colleges are morally bound to provide violators of its codes with procedural guarantees for a fair and just hearing of the charges and the right to appeal a decision to the highest authority of the institution.

8. PENALTIES SHOULD BE CHOSEN PRIMARILY WITH THE AIM THAT  
THEY WILL ASSIST IN THE REHABILITATION OF THE STUDENT.

Rationale: The major purpose of the disciplinary process, aside from keeping the law, should be the education of the student.

9. THE CONFIDENTIALITY AND PRIVILEGED CHARACTER OF STUDENT  
DISCIPLINE RECORDS SHOULD BE SAFE-GUARDED BY THE COLLEGE.

Rationale: Disclosure of confidential information, under any circumstances, except by court order, would make it impossible for colleges to hold hearings and expect students to tell them the truth.

A clinical judgement of the social-regulatory practices of the twelve colleges visited for the purposes of this study, according to the criteria stated above, can be found in Table 7.

TABLE 7

Clinical Judgements of Social-Regulatory Practices of the Colleges

Selected for this Study According to Specific Criteria.

CRITERIA	COLLEGES VISITED											
	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J	K	L
1. Clearly and cogently formulated written social-regulatory policies should exist and be publicized.		X					X		X			
2. Social-regulatory policies should be formulated cooperatively and democratically.	X	X				X	X		X	X		X
3. Policies and regulations should be systematically reviewed periodically.	X	X		X			X			X		X
4. The differences between the role of the Board of Trustees and role of administrator regarding the social-regulatory functions in community colleges should be recognized and mutually respected.	X	X	X	X	X	X	X			X	X	X
5. A college, regardless of its size, should have some official with professional training in the behavioral sciences and administration responsible for the administration of student discipline.	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
6. Consistent implementation of social-regulatory policies should be enhanced by open and systematic communication both horizontally and vertically.	X	X	X	X	X	X	X			X		X
7. Due process should be defined by the college to safeguard the student from any possible abuse or injustice in cases involving possible disciplinary action.								X				

An "X" denotes that the college's Social-regulatory practices are judged to be satisfactory according to the specific criterion.

TABLE 7 (CON'T)

A "X" denotes that the college's social-regulatory practices are judged to be satisfactory according to the specific criterion.

CRITERIA	Colleges Visited											
	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J	K	L
8. Penalties are chosen primarily with the aim that they will assist in the rehabilitation of the student.	X	X				X	X	X	X	X	X	X
9. The confidentiality and privileged character of student records should be safe-guarded by the college.	X	X	X	X		X	X	X	X	X	X	X

The researcher wishes to emphasize that the judgements in Table 7 were not based on an in-depth study of the operational functions of the respective institutions. The judgements were clinically based on the impressions that the investigator of this study gained from interviewing the disciplinary administrators with regard to their perceptions of the social-regulatory practices of their respective institutions.

The following guidelines are also recommended by the investigator of this study to assist Michigan community colleges in their efforts to develop effective social-regulatory policies, rules, and practices:

1. The ultimate aim of any discipline program from its inception should be to foster the growth of self-control, the student's acceptance of basic responsibility for his own actions, as well as the acceptance of external limitations which are necessary for all members of the college community.

2. The policies governing social-regulatory practices should be carefully defined in statements that suggest the reasons for their being. "Prevention" should be given as much attention as "cure", if not more.

3. The policies established by the board of trustees should be clearly distinguished from administrative codes designed to implement policies.

4. All policies and rules that are developed should strive to strike a balance between the protection of the rights of individual students and rights of the larger college community so that both can be permitted to achieve legitimate educational objectives.

5. Policies should, whenever possible, be formulated in positive rather than negative terms.

6. When discipline problems arise, methods of adjudication or counselling should be consistent with the best known theories and principles of psychology. Regardless of how much firmness the case demands, each individual should be treated with respect as a human being.

7. Disciplinary action should be consistent with established board policy.

8. The board should delegate full authority as well as responsibility for discipline to the disciplinary administrator.

9. Referrals of discipline problems should be made promptly, and whenever possible, on a written form which offers information that will support any action to be taken.

10. A system of record keeping regarding disciplinary cases should be developed and established as standard procedure for all personnel involved in this area.

11. Expulsion or suspension should be used as penalties only in extreme cases.

12. A system of probation and/or withdrawal of privileges is excellent as a corrective measure to be used in certain cases.

13. Counsellors should counsel offenders but should not be the disciplinarians.

14. The responsibility for discipline should not be divided according to the sex of the student.

15. Faculty members and students should, as citizens of the college community, report infractions that may be or are harmful to the welfare of others. They should not, however, have to be the enforcers. Campus police should be employed for this task.

#### IMPLICATIONS FOR FUTURE RESEARCH

This investigation of the social-regulatory practices of selected community colleges in the State of Michigan has convinced the author that community college deans of student personnel services must find time in their hectic schedules for dialogue with

faculty members and students. It is imperative that their views be taken into account before formulating meaningful conclusions on current crucial issues in higher education relating to policies and rules governing student behavior.

Continuous research is needed to aid community college administrators to come to grips with the increasing amount of problems in this area of study. In light of this, the ideas generated by this study regarding future research needs in this area are delineated below by listing questions to which answers can be sought through well-designed studies.

1. Are there differences between the perceived academic freedoms of students on community college campuses and actual freedoms? Are there certain freedoms or opportunities that they consider to be more important than others?

2. What should the essential purpose be of student publications? To what extent do students, faculty and administrators agree on this question, especially in terms of the right to dissent.

3. What are the basic causes of student protest? How can provisions for dissent and criticism be provided for to avoid disruption of college activities?

4. What type of students are actively protesting?

5. What is the student's perception of procedural due process that should be used in the adjudication of student conduct cases?

6. What criteria should be used to determine which data should be treated confidentially in student records? Who should have access to these records? What are current practices and how do they affect students?

7. How effective are student governments in improving student citizenship? How do they perceive their roles in terms of the development and enforcement of social-regulatory policies and rules?

8. Do campus disciplinary codes of multi-campus community colleges differ? If so, why?

It is hoped that some of these questions can be answered through investigation and study. In the midst of a rapidly changing society, one fragmented by a variety of critical issues, it is most difficult to keep fundamental values in focus. Answers to the questions proposed for future research should prove to be most helpful in considering changes necessary in community college policies and rules and hopefully, changes in attitudes of all of the members of the academic community.

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

BIBLIOGRAPHY

1. Arbuckle, Dugald S. Student Personnel Services in Higher Education. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, Inc., 1953.
2. Bakken, Clarence J. The Legal Basis for College Student Personnel Work. Washington, D. C.: The American College Personnel Association, 1961.
3. Blackwell, Thomas E. College Law - A Guide for Administrators Washington, D. C.: The American Council on Education, 1961.
4. Blocker, Clyde E., et. al. The Two-Year College: A Social Synthesis. Englewood Cliffs: Prentis-Hall, Inc., 1955.
5. Bogue, Jesse P. The Community College. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, Inc., 1950.
6. Brady, Thomas A. and Snoxell, Leverne F. Student Discipline In Higher Education. Washington, D. C.: The American College Personnel Association, 1965.
7. Clark, Burton R. The Open Door College: A Case Study. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1960.
8. Dunbar, Willis F. The Michigan Record In Higher Education. Detroit: Wayne State University Press, 1963.
9. Eddy, Edward. The College Influence on Student Character. Washington, D. C. American Council on Education, 1959.

10. Eells, Walter C. The Junior College. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1931.
11. Fields, Ralph C. The Community College Movement. New York: McGraw Hill Book Co., Inc., 1962.
12. Cleazer Jr., Edmond J. (Ed.) American Community Colleges. Washington, D. C.: The American Council on Education, 1967.
13. Harding, Arthur L. The Rule of Law. Dallas: Southern Methodist University Press, 1961.
14. Harper, William A. (Ed.). The 1967 Junior College Directory. Washington, D.C.: The American Association of Junior Colleges, 1967.
15. Henderson, Algo D. Policies and Practices in Higher Education. New York: Harper and Brothers, 1960.
16. Hofstadter, Richard and Smith, Wilson. American Higher Education - A Documentary History. Volume I. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1961.
17. Lee, W. Storrs. God Bless Our Queer Old Dean. New York: G. P. Putnam's Sons, 1959.
18. Lindsay, E. E., and Holland, E.O. College and University Administration. New York: The MacMillan Company, 1930.

19. Lineberry, William P. (Ed.) Colleges at Crossroads. New York: The H. W. Wilson Company, 1966.
20. Lunn Jr., Harry H. The Student's Role In College Policy-Making. Washington, D. C.: American Council on Education, 1957.
21. Maslow, Abraham H. Motivation and Personality. New York: Harper and Brothers, 1954.
22. McKown, Harry C. The Student Council. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1946.
23. Medsker, Leland L. The Junior College: Progress and Prospect. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, Inc., 1960.
24. Nash, Paul H. Authority and Freedom in Education. New York: John Wiley and Sons, Inc., 1966.
25. Rogers, Carl R. Counselling and Psychotherapy. Boston: Houghton-Mifflin Company, 1942.
26. Rudolph, Frederick. The American College and University. New York: Alfred A. Knopf, Inc., 1962.
27. State of Michigan. General School Laws. Lansing: Legislative Service Bureau, 1960.
28. Van Dalen, Deobold B. and Meyer, William J. Understanding Educational Research. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, Inc., 1966.

29. Williamson, E.G. Student Personnel Services In Colleges and Universities. New York: McGraw Hill Book Company, 1961.
30. Williamson, E.G. and Cowan, John L. The American Students Freedom of Expression. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1966.
31. Williamson, E.G. and Cowan, John L. "Academic Freedom for Students: Issues and Guidelines." The College and The Student. Edited by Dennis, Lawrence E. and Kaufman, Joseph F. Washington, D.C.: American Council on Education, 1966.
32. Williamson, E.G. and Foley, J.D. Counselling and Discipline. New York: McGraw Hill Book Company, Inc., 1949.
33. Woodburne, Lloyd S. Principles of College and University Administration. Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1958.
34. Woodring, Paul. "Who Makes University Policy". Beyond Berkeley, edited by C.G. Katope and P. G. Zolbrod. Cleveland: The World Publishing Company, 1966.

PERIODICAL ARTICLES

35. Byse, Clark. "Procedure in Student Dismissal Proceedings:  
Law and Policy". Journal of College Student Personnel,  
March, 1963.
36. Carter, Cornelia. "Survey of Handbooks in Small Colleges and  
Universities." Junior College Journal, 22, May, 1952.
37. Cortale, Michael J. "Counsellors and Discipline". Personnel  
and Guidance Journal, 39, January, 1961.
38. D'Amico, Louis A. and Raines, Max R. "Employment Character-  
istics of Flint Junior College Students", 28, Junior  
College Journal, December, 1967.
39. Gottschalk, Earl. "Student Power: College Militants Seek  
Policy Voice, Stirring Turmoil", The Wall Street Journal,  
85, February, 1968.
40. Hawkes, Herbert E. "Constructive Discipline", Vol. XIV,  
No. 3, American Colleges and Universities Bulletin, 1928.
41. Keeton, Morris. "The Climate of Learning In College", 15,  
College and University Bulletin, November, 1962.
42. Lozo, John P. "Can Conduct Codes Favorably Affect Student  
Attitudes and Behavior?" Bulletin of the National  
Association of Secondary School Principals, 44, April, 1960.



43. McDonough, J.R. "Standards of Conduct", 95, Schools and Society, April, 1967.
44. Novak, Benjamin J. "Let The Counsellor Counsel". The Phi Delta Kappan, 43, January, 1962.
45. Peterson, Martha. "What Principles Should Govern Decisions When Students Disavow Institutional Policies?"  
Nineteenth Annual Conference in Higher Education,  
Association for Higher Education, April, 1964.
46. Rislov, Sigurd. "The Board's Responsibility". Junior College Journal, 35, September, 1964.
47. Russell, John H. "Why Fourteen Colleges Changed Their Names", 31, Junior College Journal, 31, 1961.
48. Schetlin, Eleanor M. "Disorders, Deans, and Discipline", 33,  
The Education Digest, December, 1967.
49. Spalding, Howard G. "What Boardmen Should Know and Do About Discipline", 140, American School Board Journal, March, 1960.
50. Weinhoff, J.F. "What Are Some Good Practices in Handling Student Discipline?", 44, Bulletin of the National Association of Secondary School Principals, April, 1960.

51. Williams, E.G. and Cowan, John L. "Academic Freedom for Students: Issues and Guidelines". The College and the Student, Washington, D. C.: American Council on Education, 1966.

PAMPHLETS

52. Academic Freedom and Civil Liberties of Students, New York: American Civil Liberties Union, August
53. Community Colleges. Lansing: The Department of Education, State of Michigan, 1963.
54. Kinster, Frederick C. Board Policy Manuals in California Junior Colleges. Los Angeles: University of California Press, January, 1962.

BULLETINS, CATALOGUES AND HANDBOOKS

55. Delta Community College Bulletin, 1967-68. University City, Michigan: Delta Community College, 1967.
56. Delta Community College Student Handbook, 1967-68. University City, Michigan: Delta Community College, 1967.
57. Flint Community Junior College Catalog, 1966-68. Flint, Michigan: 1966.
58. Flint Community Junior College Student Activities Policies, 1967-68. Flint, Michigan: Flint Community Junior College, 1967.

59. Grand Rapids Junior College Catalog, 1967-68. Grand Rapids,  
Michigan: Grand Rapids Junior College, 1967.
60. Grand Rapids Junior College Student Handbook, 1967-68. Grand  
Rapids, Michigan: Grand Rapids Junior College, 1967.
61. Henry Ford Community College Bulletin, 1967-69. Dearborn,  
Michigan: Henry Ford Community College, 1967.
62. Henry Ford Community College Student Handbook, 1967-68.  
Dearborn, Michigan: Henry Ford Community College, 1967.
63. Highland Park Community College Catalog 1967-68. Highland  
Park, Michigan: Highland Park Community College, 1967.
64. Highland Park Community College Student Handbook, 1967-68.  
Highland Park Michigan: Highland Park Community College,  
1967.
65. Jackson Community College Catalog, 1966-68. Jackson, Michigan:  
Jackson Community College, 1966.
66. Jackson Community College Student Handbook, 1967-69. Jackson,  
Michigan: Jackson Community College, 1967.
67. Lansing Community College Catalog, 1967-68. Lansing, Michigan:  
Lansing Community College, 1967.
68. Lansing Community College Student Handbook, 1967-68. Lansing,  
Michigan: Lansing Community College, 1967.

69. Macomb County Community College Bulletin 1967/68. Warren,  
Michigan: Macomb County Community College, 1967.
70. Macomb County Community College Student Handbook 1967-68.  
Warren, Michigan: Macomb County Community College, 1967.
71. Oakland Community College Bulletin 1967-68. Bloomfield  
Hills, Michigan: Oakland County Community College, 1967.
72. Oakland Community College Student Handbook of Auburn Hills  
Campus, Highland Lakes Campus, and Orchard Richard Campus,  
1967-68. Bloomfield Hills: Oakland Community College,  
1967.
73. Schoolcraft Community College Catalog, 1967-68. Livonia,  
Michigan: Schoolcraft Community College, 1967.
74. Schoolcraft Community College Student Handbook, 1967-68.  
Livonia, Michigan: Schoolcraft Community College, 1967.
75. St. Clair County Community College Catalog 1967-68. Port  
Huron, Michigan: St. Clair County Community College, 1967.
76. St. Clair County Community College Student Handbook, 1967-68.  
Port Huron, Michigan: St. Clair County Community College,  
1967.
77. Washtenaw Community College Catalog 1967-68. Ann Arbor,  
Michigan: Washtenaw Community College, 1967.

78. Washtenaw Community College Student Handbook Manuscript  
1968 (unpublished). Ann Arbor: Washtenaw Community  
College, 1968.

APPENDIX A.  
LETTER OF INTRODUCTION  
BY  
DOCTORAL ADVISOR

MICHIGAN STATE UNIVERSITY

To Whom it May Concern:

Martin Hollander, one of my doctoral students, is conducting a study of social regulatory policies and practices in the larger community colleges of Michigan. He plans to visit with a number of chief administrators regarding matters of policy development and implementation.

He is a competent writer, and I feel he will do an outstanding job. I am sure you agree that his study is a timely one. He will, of course, make his findings available to you. Your assistance and time will be appreciated.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in cursive script, appearing to read "Max R. Raines", followed by a horizontal line.

Max R. Raines  
Associate Professor

MRR:rm

APPENDIX B.  
DISCIPLINARY ADMINISTRATOR  
INTERVIEW GUIDE FORM

Social Regulatory Practices  
Questionnaire  
For  
Administrator In Charge Of Discipline

I. Informational Data

- A. Name of Community College: \_\_\_\_\_
- B. Year College Was Founded: \_\_\_\_\_
- C. Current Enrollment: Day \_\_\_\_\_ Night \_\_\_\_\_ Total \_\_\_\_\_
- D. Name of College President: \_\_\_\_\_
- E. Administrator in Charge of Discipline:
- Name: \_\_\_\_\_
- Official Title: \_\_\_\_\_
- Years of Service in Position: \_\_\_\_\_
- Sex: Male \_\_\_\_\_ Female \_\_\_\_\_

II. A Survey of Written Social Regulatory Policies and Rules

- A. Does your institution have a written social regulatory policy or rule that: (please circle yes or no)
- |  |     |    |
|--|-----|----|
| 1. <u>Defines students rights?</u>   | YES | NO |
| <u>If answer is NO, would one be helpful?</u>                              | YES | NO |
| 2. <u>Defines general responsibilities and duties of student citizens?</u> | YES | NO |
| <u>If answer is NO, would one be helpful?</u>                              | YES | NO |
| 3. <u>Defines dress and personal appearance of students?</u>               | YES | NO |
| <u>If NO, would one be helpful?</u>  | YES | NO |
| 4. <u>Delimits the students right to assemble?</u>                         | YES | NO |
| <u>If NO, would one be helpful?</u>  | YES | NO |
| 5. <u>Refers to student plagiarism?</u>                                    | YES | NO |
| <u>If NO, would one be helpful?</u>  | YES | NO |

(please circle  
yes or no)

- |     |   |     |    |
|-----|---|-----|----|
| 6.  | <u>Deals with student cheating?</u>   | YES | NO |
|     | If NO, would one be helpful?  | YES | NO |
| 7.  | <u>Permits smoking in areas approved by the fire Marshall?</u>                      | YES | NO |
|     | If NO, would one be helpful?  | YES | NO |
| 8.  | <u>Prohibits gambling on campus?</u>  | YES | NO |
|     | If NO, would one be helpful?  | YES | NO |
| 9.  | <u>Deals with campus traffic and parking?</u>                                       | YES | NO |
|     | If NO, would one be helpful?  | YES | NO |
| 10. | <u>Deals with classroom behavior?</u>   | YES | NO |
|     | If NO, would one be helpful?  | YES | NO |
| 11. | <u>Defines and delimits games and recreational activities permitted on campus?</u>  | YES | NO |
|     | If NO, would one be helpful?  | YES | NO |
| 12. | <u>Prohibits students from drinking alcoholic beverages on campus?</u>              | YES | NO |
|     | If NO, would one be helpful?  | YES | NO |
| 13. | <u>Deals with litterbugging?</u>  | YES | NO |
|     | If NO, would one be helpful?  | YES | NO |
| 14. | <u>Deals with moral behavior (necking, petting, etc.)?</u>                          | YES | NO |
|     | If NO, would one be helpful?  | YES | NO |
| 15. | <u>Deals with hazing and initiations?</u>   | YES | NO |
|     | If NO, would one be helpful?  | YES | NO |
| 16. | <u>Prohibits the use of explosives [firecrackers, etc.] and firearms on campus?</u> | YES | NO |
|     | If NO, would one be helpful?  | YES | NO |
| 17. | <u>Deals with the approval of and role of on-campus organizations?</u>              | YES | NO |
|     | If NO, would one be helpful?  | YES | NO |
| 18. | <u>Deals with vandalism and destruction of property?</u>                            | YES | NO |
|     | If NO, would one be helpful?  | YES | NO |
| 19. | <u>Deals with theft, illegal entry or forgery?</u>                                  | YES | NO |
|     | If NO, would one be helpful?  | YES | NO |

(please circle  
yes or no)

- |     |   |            |          |
|-----|---|------------|----------|
| 20. | <u>Deals with the use of Identification Cards?</u><br>If NO, would one be helpful?                            | YES<br>YES | NO<br>NO |
| 21. | <u>Defines conduct at games or other campus activities?</u><br>If NO, would one be helpful?                   | YES<br>YES | NO<br>NO |
| 22. | <u>Deals with poster and advertising limitations?</u><br>If NO, would one be helpful?                         | YES<br>YES | NO<br>NO |
| 23. | <u>Deals with the distribution of unauthorized publications on campus?</u><br>If NO, would one be helpful?    | YES<br>YES | NO<br>NO |
| 24. | <u>Deals with off-campus behavior detrimental to the college?</u><br>If NO, would one be helpful?             | YES<br>YES | NO<br>NO |
| 25. | <u>Deals with student financial responsibility on campus?</u><br>If NO, would one be helpful?                 | YES<br>YES | NO<br>NO |
| 26. | <u>Deals with authorized campus publications?</u><br>If NO, would one be helpful?                             | YES<br>YES | NO<br>NO |
| 27. | <u>Deals with the falsification of records?</u><br>If NO, would one be helpful?                               | YES<br>YES | NO<br>NO |
| 28. | <u>Deals with the authorization of guest speakers on campus?</u><br>If NO, would one be helpful?              | YES<br>YES | NO<br>NO |
| 29. | <u>Deals with the definition of penalties where regulations are violated?</u><br>If NO, would one be helpful? | YES<br>YES | NO<br>NO |
| 30. | <u>Defines procedure for disciplinary action?</u><br>If NO, would one be helpful?                             | YES<br>YES | NO<br>NO |

B. Would you say that the written social regulatory policies of  
your institution:

(please circle  
yes or no)

- |    |   |     |    |
|----|---|-----|----|
| 1. | Are developed by administrators only?       | YES | NO |
| 2. | Should be developed by administrators only? | YES | NO |

(please circle  
yes or no)

- |     |   |     |    |
|-----|---|-----|----|
| 3.  | Are developed by involving students and administrators in specific areas?   | YES | NO |
| 4.  | Should be developed by consulting student leaders or in some cases directly involving them                                | YES | NO |
| 5.  | Should in some areas be developed by students alone.  | YES | NO |
| 6.  | Are in some areas developed by students alone.  | YES | NO |
| 7.  | Are developed cooperatively through consultation with student, faculty, and administration.                               | YES | NO |
| 8.  | Should be developed cooperatively through consultation with student, faculty, and administration.                         | YES | NO |
| 9.  | Are mostly stated in a "positive approach". That is, in terms of what <u>can</u> be done rather than what <u>cannot</u> . | YES | NO |
| 10. | Are mostly stated in the "negative approach".   | YES | NO |
| 11. | Should mostly be stated in "the positive approach".   | YES | NO |
| 12. | Should mostly be stated in "the negative approach".   | YES | NO |
| 13. | Have been accepted fairly to very well by students.   | YES | NO |
| 14. | Have been accepted rather poorly by students.   | YES | NO |
| 15. | Permit student government to develop certain conduct, discipline and citizenship rules.                                   | YES | NO |
| 16. | Should permit student government to develop certain conduct, discipline, and citizenship rules.                           | YES | NO |
| 17. | Are in some cases outmoded or outdated.   | YES | NO |
| 18. | Are reviewed annually.  | YES | NO |

(please circle  
yes or no)

- |  |     |    |
|--|-----|----|
| 19. Are reviewed as need arises.             | YES | NO |
| 20. Have not been reviewed in several years. | YES | NO |
| 21. Should be reviewed annually.             | YES | NO |
| 22. Should be reviewed as need arises.       | YES | NO |

C. Does your college disseminate information about its student policies and rules:

(please circle  
yes or no)

- |  |     |    |
|--|-----|----|
| 1. Through publications and written materials?   | YES | NO |
| 2. By providing faculty members with a policy manual?  | YES | NO |
| 3. Through bulletins or announcements.   | YES | NO |
| 4. Through letters to parents.   | YES | NO |
| 5. Through distribution of a student handbook.   | YES | NO |
| 6. Through distribution of brochures or letters.   | YES | NO |
| 7. Through a college catalogue.  | YES | NO |
| 8. Through orientation classes.  | YES | NO |
| 9. Through school newspaper.   | YES | NO |
| 10. Through assemblies.  | YES | NO |
| 11. By exerting pressure or influence to get students to read and become familiar with published policies. | YES | NO |

D. In your opinion, which of the following methods of disseminating information about student policies and rules would appear to be effective:

(please circle  
yes or no)

- |                     |     |    |
|---------------------|-----|----|
| 1. Student Handbook | YES | NO |
| 2. Assemblies       | YES | NO |

(please circle  
yes or no)

- |  |     |    |
|--|-----|----|
| 3. School Newspaper                    | YES | NO |
| 4. Orientation classes                 | YES | NO |
| 5. Classroom discussion                | YES | NO |
| 6. College Catalogue                   | YES | NO |
| 7. Student bulletins and announcements | YES | NO |
| 8. Letters to parents                  | YES | NO |
| 9. Student Government Involvement      | YES | NO |

- E. Do you feel most of the students are aware of student policies and rules?
- |     |    |
|-----|----|
| YES | NO |
|-----|----|

III. Violations of Social Regulatory Policies and Rules.

- A. The areas of student conduct in which problems are the most frequent are:

(please circle  
yes or no)

- |  |     |    |
|--|-----|----|
| 1. Dress and appearance                    | YES | NO |
| 2. Student protests                        | YES | NO |
| 3. Cafeteria behavior                      | YES | NO |
| 4. Lounge behavior                         | YES | NO |
| 5. Hazing and initiations                  | YES | NO |
| 6. Drinking                                | YES | NO |
| 7. Theft                                   | YES | NO |
| 8. Moral behavior (necking, petting, etc.) | YES | NO |
| 9. Gambling                                | YES | NO |
| 10. Campus Traffic and Parking Violations  | YES | NO |
| 11. Cheating                               | YES | NO |
| 12. Behavior at athletic events            | YES | NO |
| 13. Litterbugging                          | YES | NO |

	(please circle yes or no)	
14. Classroom Behavior	YES	NO
15. Vandalism	YES	NO
16. Distribution of unauthorized publications	YES	NO
17. Off-campus organizations	YES	NO
18. Off-campus behavior detrimental to college	YES	NO
19. Student political demonstrations	YES	NO
20. Library conduct	YES	NO
21. Student financial responsibility	YES	NO
22. Carrying of weapons	YES	NO
23. Racial conflicts	YES	NO
24. Smoking	YES	NO

B. In rating the frequency of violations of policy by the over-  
all student body--please check one of the following:

High \_\_\_\_\_ Average \_\_\_\_\_ Low \_\_\_\_\_

C. Which of the following factors help to contribute to the  
frequency of problems?

	(please circle yes or no)	
1. Personality disorders or emotional maladjustment.	YES	NO
2. Non-conformist attitude	YES	NO
3. Immaturity	YES	NO
4. Home Environment	YES	NO
5. Racial Tension	YES	NO
6. Academic Pressure	YES	NO
7. Off-campus influence of clubs or organizations	YES	NO

- |                                     | (please circle<br>yes or no) |    |
|-------------------------------------|------------------------------|----|
| 8. Financial insecurity             | YES                          | NO |
| 9. Misunderstanding of regulations  | YES                          | NO |
| 10. Student-Faculty conflict        | YES                          | NO |
| 11. Student-Administration conflict | YES                          | NO |
| 12. Student-Student conflict        | YES                          | NO |

IV. Enforcement of social regulatory policies and rules.

A. Which of the following best describes disciplinary  
administration in your college?

(please circle  
yes or no)

- |   |                           |    |
|---|---------------------------|----|
| 1. The administrator in charge of the entire student personnel program handles most of the discipline problems.   | YES                       | NO |
| 2. The person in charge of discipline is called:  |                           |    |
| a.) Disciplinary Administrator  | YES                       | NO |
| b.) Dean of Men   | YES                       | NO |
| c.) Dean of Women   | YES                       | NO |
| d.) Dean of Student Affairs   | YES                       | NO |
| 3. The person in charge of discipline spends the following amount of his time handling student conduct and discipline:                                    | (please check one answer) |    |
| a.) More than 50%   | _____                     |    |
| b.) Between 25% and 50%   | _____                     |    |
| c.) Less than 25%   | _____                     |    |
| d.) Less than 10%   | _____                     |    |
| 4. Responsibility for discipline is divided on the basis of the sex of the student (Dean of Men for male students and Dean of Women for female students). | YES                       | NO |
| If NO, should this be done?   | YES                       | NO |
| 5. There are written procedures governing referrals from faculty members to the disciplinary administrator.   | YES                       | NO |
| If NO, should there be?   | YES                       | NO |

(please circle  
yes or no)

- |   |  |     |    |
|---|--|-----|----|
| 6.  | There are written procedures governing referrals from disciplinary administrators to other staff member (Psychological Diagnostician, etc.). | YES | NO |
|   | If NO, should there be?  | YES | NO |
| 7.  | Makes up its own policy as day to day need arises.   | YES | NO |
| 8.  | Employs written policies passed by; the governing board regarding the suspension, probation, or dismissal of students.                       | YES | NO |
| 9.  | Employs a procedure of disciplinary action that results in the temporary withdrawal of certain student privileges?                           | YES | NO |
| 10.   | Has the authority to suspend or place students on probation.   | YES | NO |
| 11.   | Does not have the authority to permanently dismiss a student from college.   | YES | NO |
| 12.   | Has complete backing of superiors.   | YES | NO |
| 13.   | Respects students rights and employs due process procedures in handling cases.   | YES | NO |
| 14.   | Notifies parents if student is guilty of misconduct.   | YES | NO |
| 15.   | Disciplinary actions are meant to be more corrective than punitive.  | YES | NO |
| 16.   | Must notify the college president, or other superiors, of disciplinary disposition of student cases.   | YES | NO |
| 17.   | Keeps confidential records of disciplinary action administered to students for misconduct.   | YES | NO |
| B. Which of the following statements best describe the counselors role in enforcing student social regulatory policies? |  |     |    |
| 1.  | The counselor counsels students  | YES | NO |

(please circle  
yes or no)

- |                                       |     |    |
|---------------------------------------|-----|----|
| 2. The counselor disciplines students | YES | NO |
| If NO, should they?                   | YES | NO |
| If YES, should they not?              | YES | NO |

C. Which of the following statements best describe the role of the faculty in enforcing student social regulatory policies?

- |  |     |    |
|--|-----|----|
| 1. Responsible for classroom discipline  | YES | NO |
| 2. Responsible for supervision and control of student conduct outside of class (athletic events, dances, etc.) | YES | NO |
| If NO, should they be?   | YES | NO |
| 3. They on the whole handle discipline in the classroom well.  | YES | NO |
| 4. Responsible for student citizenship training as:  |     |    |
| a.) Participant in Orientation Sessions  | YES | NO |
| b.) Sponsor or Faculty Advisor of Student Government   | YES | NO |
| c.) Faculty Advisor of campus organizations  | YES | NO |
| 5. Participate as members of judicial review panel for hearing appeals of student discipline cases.            | YES | NO |
| 6. Contribute to the formulation of social-regulatory policies of the college.                                 | YES | NO |

D. Which of the following statements best describes the role of the student in enforcing student social regulatory policies?

- |                              |     |    |
|------------------------------|-----|----|
| 1. There is a student court. | YES | NO |
| If NO, should there be one?  | YES | NO |

(please circle  
yes or no)

- |  |     |    |
|--|-----|----|
| 2. Participates in developing penalties for certain areas of misconduct.   | YES | NO |
| 3. Permitted to participate on panel to hear appeals of student disciplinary action.                                       | YES | NO |
| If NO, should this be allowed?   | YES | NO |
| 4. Serves in an advisory capacity regarding student discipline.  | YES | NO |
| If NO, should this be initiated?   | YES | NO |
| E. The following due process is accorded students in disciplinary procedures:  |     |    |
| 1. Student is notified in writing of the alleged violation.  | YES | NO |
| 2. Student is notified in writing of the names of the accuser and the witnesses.   | YES | NO |
| 3. Student may admit his guilt or seek judicial review.  | YES | NO |
| 4. Student is not required to testify against himself.   | YES | NO |
| 5. Student is entitled to counsel.   | YES | NO |
| 6. Student is entitled to cross examine accuser or witnesses.  | YES | NO |
| 7. Student is entitled to expeditious hearing.   | YES | NO |
| 8. Student is entitled to an explanation of the reasons for a decision rendered against him.                               | YES | NO |
| 9. Student has right to appeal his case to a higher body.  | YES | NO |
| F. Do present state laws permit enough freedom for your institution to develop and enforce its social-regulatory policies? |     |    |
|  | YES | NO |

APPENDIX C.  
CHARACTERISTICS OF COMMUNITY  
COLLEGE FRESHMEN ACCORDING  
TO WEIGHTED NATIONAL NORMS

AMERICAN COUNCIL ON EDUCATION  
OFFICE OF RESEARCH FALL 1967

WEIGHTED NATIONAL NORMS FOR ALL FRESHMEN

	All 2-Year Colls.	<u>2-Year Colleges</u>	
		<u>Public</u>	<u>Private</u>
<u>Age, In Years, as of December 31, 1967 (1)</u>			
16 or Younger	0.0	0.0	0.1
17	2.3	2.0	3.7
18	68.5	68.2	70.2
19	18.9	19.2	17.5
20	3.3	3.4	2.9
21	1.2	1.1	1.3
Older than 21	5.8	6.1	4.3
<u>Average Grade in High School**</u>			
A or A+	1.0	0.9	1.7
A-	2.9	2.7	3.5
B+	8.1	8.0	8.9
B	20.1	20.1	20.0
B-	17.0	17.2	15.7
C+	24.1	24.3	23.1
C	25.2	25.2	25.4
D	1.6	1.5	1.8
<u>Secondary School Achievements**</u>			
Elected President Std. Orgnz.	14.3	13.7	17.5
High Rating State Music Contest	7.3	7.0	9.1
State/Regional Speech Contest	3.4	3.1	5.2

	<u>All 2-Year Colls.</u>	<u>2-Year Colleges</u>	
		<u>Public</u>	<u>Private</u>
Major Part in a Play	13.3	12.7	16.6
Varsity Letter (Sports)	30.3	31.1	26.3
Award in Art Competition	5.3	5.3	5.3
Edited School Paper	6.8	6.6	8.0
Had Original Writing Published	9.8	9.3	12.2
NSF Summer Program	0.4	0.3	0.4
St/Regional Science Contest	1.3	1.5	2.2
Scholastic Honor Society	10.2	9.9	11.9
National Merit Recognition	2.4	2.4	2.2

(1) Age was reported as percentage of students nineteen or older in the 1966 Ace Reports.

**\*\*Note --** Items indicated by **\*\*** are repeated as shown from the 1966 Survey, and also in the 1966 National norms (Ace Research Reports, Vol. 2. No. 1 and appear as shown.

AMERICAN COUNCIL ON EDUCATION  
OFFICE OF RESEARCH FALL, 1967

WEIGHTED NATIONAL NORMS FOR ALL FRESHMEN

<u>Number of Applications to Other Colleges</u>	<u>All 2-Year Colls.</u>	<u>2-Year Colleges</u>	
		<u>Public</u>	<u>Private</u>
None	66.0	68.2	54.0
One	17.2	16.3	22.3
Two	9.5	8.9	13.3
Three	4.2	3.8	6.1
Four	1.8	1.6	2.7
Five	0.7	0.7	0.9
Six or More	0.6	0.6	0.7
<u>Number of Acceptances by Other Colleges</u>			
None	61.1	62.8	53.0
One	25.5	24.5	30.3
Two	9.7	9.1	12.6
Three	2.7	2.6	3.3
Four	0.7	0.7	0.5
Five	0.2	0.2	0.2
Six or More	0.2	0.2	0.2
<u>Major Influences in Deciding to Attend this College</u>			
Parent or Other Relative	48.8	48.4	51.0
H.S. Teacher or Counselor	22.7	23.2	20.1
Friends Attending this College	14.8	14.2	18.0

	All 2-Year Colls.	2-Year Colleges	
		<u>Public</u>	<u>Private</u>
Grad or Other Coll. Repr.	9.7	8.5	16.3
Counseling or Placement Service	5.4	5.5	5.0
Athletic Program of the College	5.0	5.3	3.5
Other Extracurricular Activities	3.1	3.0	3.2
Social Life of the College	5.4	4.8	9.0
Chance to Live away from Home	6.5	5.6	11.1
Low Cost	33.4	37.2	12.6
Academic Reputation of the Coll.	26.5	24.9	35.4
Most Students are Like Me	9.1	8.1	14.6
Religious Affiliation	6.3	1.2	33.9

AMERICAN COUNCIL ON EDUCATION  
OFFICE OF RESEARCH FALL 1967

WEIGHTED NATIONAL NORMS FOR ALL FRESHMEN

<u>Region of Home State (2)</u>	<u>All 2-Year Colls.</u>	<u>2-Year Colleges</u>	
		<u>Public</u>	<u>Private</u>
Middle States	26.8	27.9	20.7
New England	2.1	0.2	12.5
North Central	31.9	37.0	23.1
Northwest	1.9	0.2	11.6
Southern	13.9	10.9	29.9
Western	19.9	23.4	0.8
Foreign	0.5	0.3	1.4
<u>Fathers Education</u>			
Grammar School or Less	14.9	15.3	12.6
Some High School	23.3	23.8	20.4
High School Graduate	32.2	32.5	30.7
Some College	15.8	15.4	18.0
College Degree	10.1	9.5	13.4
Postgraduate Degree	3.7	3.4	4.9
<u>Mothers Education</u>			
Grammar School or less	9.5	9.8	7.4
Some High School	20.5	21.0	17.7
High School Graduate	44.4	44.4	44.5
Some College	15.6	15.3	17.4
College Degree	8.6	8.1	11.5
Postgraduate Degree	1.4	1.3	1.5

	All 2-Year Colls	2-Year Colleges	
		<u>Public</u>	<u>Private</u>
<u>Racial Background</u>			
Caucasian	87.7	87.6	88.3
Negro	3.2	3.4	1.8
American Indian	1.2	1.3	0.8
Oriental	0.7	0.6	0.8
Other	7.2	7.1	8.3
<u>Religious Background</u>			
Protestant	51.7	52.4	48.8
Roman Catholic	33.6	34.5	28.4
Jewish	1.6	1.5	2.2
Other	10.6	8.8	20.1
None	2.6	2.8	1.4
<u>Present Religious Preference</u>			
Protestant	46.6	46.9	44.9
Roman Catholic	32.9	33.8	28.0
Jewish	1.5	1.4	2.1
Other	11.4	9.5	21.5
None	7.6	8.3	3.5

AMERICAN COUNCIL ON EDUCATION  
OFFICE OF RESEARCH FALL 1967

WEIGHTED NATIONAL NORMS FOR ALL FRESHMEN

<u>Fathers Occupation</u>	<u>All 2-Year Colls.</u>	<u>2-Year Colleges</u>	
		<u>Public</u>	<u>Private</u>
Artist (Incl. Performer)	0.6	0.6	0.5
Businessman	23.6	22.6	29.3
Clergyman	0.7	0.5	1.8
College Teachers	0.2	0.2	0.2
Doctor (M.D. or D.D.S.)	0.7	0.7	1.0
Educator (Secondary)	1.3	1.3	1.4
Elementary Teacher	0.2	0.2	0.2
Engineer	6.3	6.4	5.5
Farmer or Forester	8.6	8.5	9.1
Health Professional (Non-M.D.)	1.0	1.0	0.8
Lawyer	0.4	0.4	0.7
Military Career	1.6	1.6	1.4
Research Scientist	0.3	0.3	0.4
Skilled Worker	16.4	16.7	14.8
Semi-Skilled Worker	10.8	11.3	8.4
Unskilled Worker	5.2	5.5	3.9
Unemployed	1.2	1.2	10.8
Other	20.9	21.1	19.8
<u>Estimated Parental Income</u>			
Less than \$4,000	5.9	6.1	4.5
\$4,000 - \$5,999	11.6	11.4	12.3

<u>(Estimated Parental Income (con't))</u>	<u>All 2-Year Colls.</u>	<u>2-Year Colleges</u>	
		<u>Public</u>	<u>Private</u>
\$6,000 - \$7,999	16.1	16.2	15.3
\$8,000 - \$9,999	14.7	14.9	13.3
\$10,000 - \$14,999	19.8	20.1	17.6
\$15,000 - \$19,999	5.8	5.8	5.6
\$20,000 - \$24,999	2.2	2.1	2.7
\$25,000 - \$29,999	0.9	0.8	1.2
\$30,000 or More	1.6	1.5	1.9
Have no Idea	21.5	20.8	25.2
 <u>Major Sources of Financial Support During Freshman Year</u>			
Personal Savings or Employment	39.0	41.6	24.9
Parental or Family Aid	44.6	42.7	54.9
Repayable Loan	9.4	8.3	15.5
Scholarship/Grant/or Other Gift	11.5	11.4	11.7
 <u>Concern About Financing Educ.</u>			
None	35.7	35.6	36.4
Some Concern	55.6	55.6	55.6
Major Concern	8.7	8.8	8.0

AMERICAN COUNCIL ON EDUCATION  
OFFICE OF RESEARCH FALL 1967

WEIGHTED NATIONAL NORMS FOR ALL FRESHMEN

<u>Highest Degree Planned</u>	<u>All 2-Year Colls.</u>	<u>2-Year Colleges</u>	
		<u>Public</u>	<u>Private</u>
None	8.6	8.9	6.8
Associate (Or Equivalent)	20.7	21.7	15.4
Bachelors Degree (B.A., B.S.)	38.0	37.5	40.7
Masters Degree (M.A., M.S.)	21.7	37.5	40.7
PH.D. or ED.D	4.5	4.4	5.1
M.D., D.D.S., or D.V.M.	2.3	2.4	2.2
L.B. or J.D.	0.5	0.5	0.4
B.U.	0.4	0.4	0.4
Other	3.3	3.3	3.2
<u>Probable Major Field of Study</u>			
Agriculture (incl. Forestry)	4.3	4.8	1.7
Biological Sciences	2.4	2.5	2.0
Business	26.5	27.3	22.5
Education	9.1	8.4	12.9
Engineering	10.9	11.1	9.9
English	2.2	2.1	2.7
Health Professions (Non-M.D.)	6.8	6.9	6.5
History, Political Science	4.2	4.2	4.1
Humanities (Other)	2.9	2.2	6.5
Fine Arts	8.4	8.3	8.8
Mathematics or Statistics	1.6	1.6	1.5

	All 2-Year Colls.	<u>2-Year Colleges</u>	
		<u>Public</u>	<u>Private</u>
Physical Sciences	1.3	1.3	1.1
Pre-Professional	4.3	4.4	3.7
Psychol, Sociol, Anthropol	5.5	5.2	7.3
Other Fields (Technical)	4.8	5.1	2.8
Other Fields (Non-Technical)	2.6	2.4	3.6
Undecided	2.1	2.1	2.2
<u>Probable Career Occupation</u>			
Artist (Incl. Performer)	4.9	4.8	5.2
Businessman	14.2	14.6	12.1
Clergyman	1.3	0.3	6.7
College Teacher	0.7	0.6	0.8
Doctor (M.D. or D.D.S.)	1.8	1.8	1.8
Educator (Secondary)	9.9	9.2	10.5
Elementary Teacher	6.7	6.1	10.2
Engineer	8.6	8.7	8.6
Farmer or Forester	3.3	3.7	1.6
Health Professional (Non-M.D.)	4.5	4.5	4.1
Lawyer	1.6	1.7	1.3
Nurse	3.7	3.7	3.5
Research Scientist	1.2	1.2	0.8
Other Choice	28.4	29.2	23.7
Undecided	9.1	9.2	8.9

AMERICAN COUNCIL ON EDUCATION  
OFFICE OF RESEARCH FALL, 1967

WEIGHTED NATIONAL NORMS FOR ALL FRESHMEN

	All 2-Year Colls.	<u>2-Year Colleges</u>	
		<u>Public</u>	<u>Private</u>
<u>Objectives Considered to Be Essential or Very Important</u>			
Achieve in a Performing Art	9.1	8.6	11.5
Be an Authority in my Field	62.5	62.3	63.3
Obtain Recognition From Peers	36.6	36.4	37.7
Perform or Compose Music	6.3	6.1	7.5
Be an Expert in Finance	12.4	12.9	11.6
Be Administratively Responsible	26.1	26.2	25.6
Be very Well-off Financially	46.8	48.0	40.1
Help Others in Difficulty	57.2	55.0	69.1
Join the Peace Corps or Vista	15.2	14.7	17.9
Become an outstanding Athlete	14.2	14.4	13.2
Become a Community Leader	18.7	17.5	25.6
Contribute to Scientific Theory	8.4	8.5	7.8
Write Original Works	9.0	8.9	9.8
Not be Obligated to People	25.8	25.8	26.0
Create Works of Art	14.4	14.4	14.5
Keep up with Political Affairs	41.5	41.0	44.3
Succeed in my own Business	50.5	50.9	48.6
Develop a Philosophy of Life	75.9	74.7	82.4
<u>Students Estimate Chances are Very Good that they will</u>			
Get Married While in College	8.5	8.4	9.3

	<u>All 2-Year Colls.</u>	<u>2-Year Colleges</u>	
		<u>Public</u>	<u>Private</u>
Marry Within a year after Coll.	21.5	20.9	24.4
Obtain Avrg. Grd. of A- or Higher	2.2	2.2	2.4
Change Major Field	11.6	11.6	11.5
Change Career Choice	12.8	12.8	12.8
Fail one or More Courses	2.8	2.8	3.1
Graduate with Honors	2.8	2.7	2.8
Be Elected to a Student Office	1.7	1.6	2.3
Join Social Frat. or Sorority	22.0	20.4	31.0
Author a Published Article	3.0	2.9	3.8
Be Elected to an Honor Society	1.3	1.3	1.4
Participate in Demonstrations	3.6	3.7	2.8
Drop out Temporarily	1.1	1.1	1.1
Drop out Permanently	0.6	0.5	0.8
Transfer to another College	18.4	18.2	19.9

AMERICAN COUNCIL ON EDUCATION  
OFFICE OF RESEARCH FALL 1967

WEIGHTED NATIONAL NORMS FOR ALL FRESHMEN

<u>Can Presently Do This Well</u>	<u>All 2-Year Colls.</u>	<u>2-Year Colleges</u>	
		<u>Public</u>	<u>Private</u>
Type 40 Words per Minute	42.6	42.3	44.3
Sketch Recognizable People	9.1	9.3	8.2
Speak Second Language Fluently	10.1	10.6	7.7
Break 100 in Golf	12.3	12.7	10.2
Water Ski	34.7	34.7	34.2
Ski on Snow	15.3	15.4	14.8
Sight-read Piano Music	16.3	15.4	21.1
Read Music (Singing)	26.4	25.1	33.4
Identify 13 Species of Birds	18.2	18.6	16.1
Referee a Sporting Event	34.8	35.1	33.6
Recite Long Passages from Memory	9.9	9.5	12.0
Identify Architectural Styles	11.6	11.5	11.9
Sail a Boat	14.7	14.7	15.1
Identify Constellations of Stars	7.9	7.9	7.8
Use a Sewing Machine	37.9	37.2	41.6
Use Roberts Rules of Order	12.1	12.3	10.7
Mix a Dry Martini	21.3	22.4	15.1
Set a Table for a Formal Party	39.2	38.6	42.1
Name Players of Prof'l. Athl. Team	30.7	31.3	27.5
Score a Tennis Match	28.7	29.5	24.4
Identify Many Music Compositions	9.7	9.6	10.1
Program a Computer	1.3	1.3	1.0

	All 2-Year <u>Colls.</u>	<u>2-Year Colleges</u>	
		<u>Public</u>	<u>Private</u>
Use a Slide Rule	23.4	23.4	22.9
Swim a Mile Without Stopping	26.4	26.7	24.5
Name the Animal Phyla.	7.7	7.7	7.6
Describ Diff. Between S <sub>t</sub> ocks/Bonds	37.8	38.7	33.2
Develop and Print Photographs	8.1	8.6	5.9
Bake a cake from Scratch	42.0	41.2	46.7
Describe the Bill of Rights	41.4	41.1	42.6
Do at Least 15 Push-Ups	70.9	72.1	64.1
<u>Agree Strongly or Somewhat</u>			
Faculty Should Make Curriculum	84.4	83.9	87.0
Married Women Belong at Home	63.3	62.3	68.8
Discourage Large Families	42.0	43.2	35.5
De-emphasize College Sports	20.5	20.3	21.6
Publish all Scientific Findings	43.6	44.1	40.9
Individual Cannot Change Society	34.2	35.2	29.0
Benefit of College is Monetary	68.9	70.1	61.4
My Beliefs are Similar to Others	73.0	72.4	76.5
Base Faculty pay on Student Eval.	60.3	60.5	59.8
Std. Publications Should be Cleared	61.3	59.8	69.6
Women Should be Drafted	23.3	24.1	18.6
Voting Age Should be 18	64.8	65.2	62.7
College Has Right to Ban Speaker	44.8	43.5	51.7
Give Disadvantaged Pref. Treatment	50.5	49.9	53.9
Colleges too Lax on Std. Protests	54.1	52.9	60.7

AMERICAN COUNCIL ON EDUCATION  
OFFICE OF RESEARCH FALL 1967

WEIGHTED NATIONAL NORMS FOR ALL FRESHMEN

<u>Percentage of Students Reporting That During the Past Year They</u>	<u>All 2-Year Colls.</u>	<u>2-Year Colleges</u>	
		<u>Public</u>	<u>Private</u>
Voted in Student Election	67.5	66.5	72.7
Came Late to Class	56.6	56.8	55.8
Played a Musical Instrument	36.7	35.8	42.0
Studied in the Library	38.5	37.9	41.5
Checked out a Library Book	48.3	47.0	55.6
Arranged Date for another Std.	52.6	51.8	58.2
Overslept and Missed a Class	22.8	23.2	20.6
Typed a Homework Assignment	22.4	22.0	24.7
Participated in Demonstrations	15.7	16.0	13.7
Was late with Homework Assgnmt.	76.6	76.8	75.7
Argued with a Teacher in Class	42.8	43.9	36.8
Was Guest in a Teachers Home	31.7	31.0	35.5
Rode on a Motorcycle	61.2	61.8	58.1
Slept or Dozed in Class	45.4	45.1	46.7
Studied with other Students	89.4	88.9	92.0
Did Extra Reading for a Class	11.5	11.3	12.4
Took Sleeping Pills	5.7	5.7	5.6
Tutored Another Student	34.1	33.4	37.7
Played Chess	38.0	38.3	36.1
Saw a Foreign Movie	6.1	6.1	5.9
Took a Tranquilizing Pill	10.5	10.2	11.7

	All 2-Year Colls.	<u>2-Year Colleges</u>	
		<u>Public</u>	<u>Private</u>
Discussed Religion	25.7	23.5	37.7
Took Vitamins	59.4	58.9	62.3
Visited Art Gallery or Museum	64.6	64.1	67.7
Took Trip of more than 500 Miles	64.2	64.0	65.1
Got a Traffic Ticket	24.7	25.3	21.3
Missed School because of Illness	3.5	3.5	3.4
Smoked Cigarettes	19.4	19.6	18.3
Discussed Politics	16.8	16.7	17.4
Played Tennis	52.1	52.7	48.7
Drank Beer	55.3	57.7	42.1
Played Bridge	6.6	6.2	9.2
Discussed Sports	41.9	41.8	42.2
Asked Teacher for Advice	21.5	20.7	25.3
Had Vocational Counseling	62.1	61.9	62.7
Stayed up all Night	63.2	63.6	60.6
<u>Dating Pattern in High School</u>			
One Steady Girl or Boy Friend	23.5	23.7	22.4
A series of Steady Dates	19.5	19.4	19.9
A Few Friends, But no Steadies	22.5	22.0	25.2
Pretty Much Played the Field	17.8	17.9	17.1
Seldom or never Date	16.7	16.9	15.4

APPENDIX D.

Michigan Community Colleges

Selected for Interviews

With Disciplinary Administrators

COLLEGES SELECTED FOR INTERVIEWS  
WITH DISCIPLINARY ADMINISTRATORS

1. Delta (Community) College

History - Founded in 1957. Opened in 1961. Absorbed  
the old Bay City Junior College.

Location - University Center, Michigan, 48710

Control - By public. Delta College Board of Trustees -  
9 elected board members.

Disciplinary Administrator. Palmer B. Kern, Dean of  
Student Affairs.

2. Flint Community Junior College

History - Founded in 1923 in old high school. Moved to  
present campus in 1955.

Location - Flint, Michigan, 48503

Control - By Public. City of Flint Board of Education - 9  
Selected board members.

Disciplinary Administrator - Dr. Donald Stanbury, Assistant  
Dean for Student Personnel Services.

3. Grand Rapids Community College

History - Founded in 1914 as part of high school. Moved  
to present location in 1925.

Location - Grand Rapids, Michigan, 49502

Control - Grand Rapids City Board of Education - 9 elected  
board members.

Disciplinary Administrator - Donald R. Black, Assistant  
Dean of Student Services.



4. Henry Ford Community College

History - Founded in 1938. Received present name in 1952.

Location - Dearborn, Michigan, 48121

Control - Public. Board of Trustees - 6 elected board members.

Disciplinary Administrator - Wallace Smith, Dean of Student Personnel Services.

5. Highland Park Community College

History - Founded in 1918.

Location - Highland Park, Michigan, 48203

Control - By Public. School District of Highland Park Board of Education - 7 elected board members.

Disciplinary Administrator - John Harmon, Director of Student Affairs.

6. Jackson Community College

History - Founded in 1928

Location - Jackson, Michigan, 49201

Control - By Public. Board of Trustees of Jackson Community College District, - 7 elected board members.

Disciplinary Administrator - Russell Hanson, Dean of Students.

7. Lansing Community College

History - Founded in 1957.

Location - Lansing, Michigan, 48914

Control - By Public. Board of Trustees - 6 elected board members

Disciplinary Administrator - Kenneth Sproull, Dean of Student

Personnel Services.

8. Macomb County Community College

History - Founded and opened in 1954.

Location - Warren, Michigan, 48093

Control - By Public. Board of Trustees - 7 elected board members.

Disciplinary Administrator - Richard DeCosmo, Dean of Student Personnel Services.

9. Oakland Community College

History - Founded in 1966

Location - Bloomfield Hills, Michigan

Control - By Public - Board of Trustees - 6 elected board members.

Disciplinary Administrators - Dr. Harlacher, Vice President of Campus Administration, Arthur Jalkanen, Dean of Students at Auburn Hills, Ned A. Brodbeck, Dean of Students at Highland Lakes, Dean of Students not appointed as yet at Orchard Ridge.

10. Schoolcraft Community College

History - Founded in 1961. Opened in 1964.

Location - Livonia, Michigan, 48151

Control - By Public. Board of Trustees - 8 elected board members.

Disciplinary Administrator - Edward V. McNally, Dean of Student Affairs.



11. St. Clair County Community College

History - Founded in 1923

Location - Port Huron, Michigan, 48060

Control - By Public, Board of Trustees - 7 elected board members.

Disciplinary Administrator - Chester A. Aubuchon, Director of Student Personnel Services.

12. Washtenaw Community College

History - Founded in 1965

Location - Ann Arbor, Michigan

Control - By public. Board of Trustees - 7 elected board members.

Disciplinary Administrator - David Pollack, Dean of Student Services.

# THEORY OF THE EARTH

1

MICHIGAN STATE UNIVERSITY LIBRARIES



3 1293 03085 4388