# ADVICE AND DISSENT

As this issue of *A & D* goes to press, a number of

students are still conducting a sit-in on the second

floor of our administration building in order to protest

the lack of student participation in decisions on

faculty retention. Regardless of how the members of the

faculty stand on this issue--and we are aware that there

are a variety of views on this subject--we feel that

there may be a unified position that we can take relative

to the sit-in itself. We think that the faculty must

make it clear that they go along with the administration

in endorsing the peaceful and legal nature of this demon-

stration. Clearly, it is within the students' constitu-

tional rights to petition and dissent in a non-violent

manner as they are now doing. We therefore urge everyone

in the campus community to try to reach some understanding

regarding the basic issues the students have raised, and

we express our hope that we can solve these problems with-

out any outside interference.

--The Editors

*PROPOSAL FOR CRITERIA*

The recent student protests concerning faculty firings have prompted me to present some proposals which have been on my mind for quite some time. The proposals concern criteria for retention and promotion. I will present them as general guidelines to be followed by each department as the department formulates more specific criteria for its own use.

Since these general guidelines depart rather radically from the criteria which departments are presently encouraged to follow, they may strike some readers as a joke. I would like to assure such readers that these proposals are in no way intended as a joke. Perhaps attention to the reasons I will give in support of these proposals will convince you that at least I am serious about them, whether the individual reader wishes to take them seriously or not.

*Criteria for Retention:*

1. The individual faculty member must have an educational background considered by the majority of the members of his department to be sufficient in his *individual* case.

2. The individual faculty member must be in general agreement with the majority of the members of the members of his department either politically or in his approach to and attitude toward his discipline.

3. The individual faculty member must have a life style which is either approved of by the majority of the members of his department or sufficiently inconspicuous, in their estimation, that it not present a danger to the image which the majority of the members of the department wish the faculty to present.

4. The individual faculty member must not openly display an attitude toward education or toward the educational system of which San Diego State College is a part which is not approved of by the majority of the members of the department.

*Criteria for Promotion:*

1. The guidelines for the retention criteria are also to be used in formulating the first four criteria for promotion.

2. In the event that a department has more than one member eligible for promotion, each of which is judged more or less equal on the basis of the above-mentioned criteria, the following criteria may be used in further determining the ranking order of these individuals:

   a. Number of years spent at the present promotional level.
   b. Number of years of teaching experience.
   c. Service to the college.
   d. Professional publications.

In my opinion these guidelines roughly approximate the criteria which in fact have been, are, and will continue to be used no matter what the stated criteria of any particular department may be. I originally had intended to present evidence for this statement. However, I am now inclined to think that evidence of any sort would be useless in convincing people who are not already aware of the truth of the statement. That is, *awareness* is what is needed-- not arguments. If an individual wants to believe that the statement is false, he will do so no matter how much evidence is presented. This is because the statement deals with self-deception--a self-deception which, in my opinion, goes far beyond what is obvious to most of us. Let me mention just a couple of examples at the risk of becoming extremely unpopular with the people involved.

When I first came to SDSC four years ago I had the idealistic naiveté of a person who had had no previous first-hand contact with school politics. Becoming aware of what goes on behind the scenes was, I can remember, a genuinely distressing experience for me. I say I can remember that it was a distressing experience because at this point that is about all that I can remember about the experience. I have now become so accustomed to the kinds of things that distressed me at that time that I can hardly remember any of the specific things which bothered me. The process is similar to becoming acclimated to smog. Nevertheless, as with smog, what you have long since failed to notice can still prove extremely unhealthy. Among the memories which are still alive are those of my first department meetings dealing with hiring. The department had voted upon certain criteria which the candidates should meet. However, I soon became aware that the criteria really functioned primarily as rules for formulating arguments, rather than as actual criteria for making selections. That is, the department members seemed to select their future colleagues more on the basis of the guidelines I have presented for the retention criteria, but supported their choices and argued against the choices of other department members by attempting to make it out to be the case that their choices were better choices on the basis of the criteria which the department had officially adopted. By saying that this is what happened in my own department, I am *not* saying that my department is composed of dishonest members. We were all acting like normal American game-playing human beings who have become accustomed to getting what we want not by asking for what we want but by saying something which we think will be more appropriate to the circumstances but still likely to get us what we want. I got right into the game along with everyone else.

More recently, I appeared before the Tenure Review Committee to make a statement which I considered relevant to Prof. Emami's case. I explained to the committee that I thought real harm was being done to the entire academic community by adhering to the policy of dismissing people who are judged not suitable on the basis of criteria something like those I have presented, but attempting to justify the dismissal on the basis of criteria considered more appropriate for dismissing a faculty member. The impression I got from the committee's non-verbal response (as opposed to their expressed cordial acceptance) was that they considered my statements to be somewhat of an affront to their dignity. Nevertheless, throughout the entire meeting it was obvious (to me) that the aspects of the case which most interested the committee members (as was evidenced by the questions they asked, the alertness they showed, etc.) were those which concerned (mostly indirectly) the kinds of things which would be covered by my proposed guidelines, not the criteria which were supposedly used in arriving at the decision not to rehire Prof. Emami. (Let me assure the alert readers that I realize that my making such a statement in such a case was an instance of the kind of game-playing which I am protesting.)

The problem here is not that we _use_ criteria of the sort I have mentioned in arriving at decisions concerning whether or not to hire, retain, or promote, (in fact, I believe that the institution would be better served if we openly used these criteria) but that we profess to make such decisions on the basis of different criteria. This places the individual most affected by the decision in a situation where he can fight the decision only by presenting evidence relevant to a set of criteria which doesn't matter anyway, but can't confront the real reasons for his dismissal, since the real reasons are supposedly the ones which don't matter anyway.

Moreover, the justifications for the dismissal serve unjustly to blacken the condemned man's record with future employers. However, I am not sure that this last point makes a great deal of difference, since I suspect that future employers, being aware of the games which are played in this area, would be more concerned to learn the real reasons for the dismissal than to hear the justifications.

The great harm done to the school as a whole by this practice comes from the widening of the already large communication gap created by a government which professes to have peace as its foremost objective and consequently labels its policies--which are obviously intended to accomplish various economic and political objectives at the expense of peace-- as "peace offensives," etc. In each case the people being given the phony justifications simply lose respect for the people and institutions offering the phony justifications. (although in each case there are a number of people who continue to defend the policies of the father-image on the basis that he must know what is best no matter how strange the whole situation seems.)

One of the most educational experiences anyone could derive from coming into contact with this institution _could_ come from its setting an example of honesty and sincerity, rather than the present example of fear, expediency, distrust. However, I suppose the educational experience derived from contact with the current example can also be beneficial.

--Eugene A. Troxell (Philosophy)

## O, THE PAIN OF TEACHING _AND_ PUBLISHING

It was stated in the December 18, 1969 issues of this semi-publication that what is disappointing in teaching is the dull repetition of the same classroom material year after year. And what is not disappointing in teaching is the positive influence the teacher may have on students which stems from his excitement gained from in-depth study of his special area of interest.

Recently there has been much criticism of the undue emphasis on scholarship and publishing instead of teaching. I believe this raises an important question: Is it worth the effort, or even feasible, to be both teacher and researcher? All too frequently, "publish or perish" might just as well read "publish _and_ perish." Far too many young scholars, even doctoral candidates, feel pressure to rush into print, to submit an unripe piece of work, in order to further their career. I think it is wise to distinguish between scholarship and publication. Clearly not all publication represents scholarship. And conversely, not all scholarship results in publication. There are some who deserve to "publish _and_ perish." The faculty member who feels the compulsion to write down everything he knows is guilty of what is, at best, intellectual immaturity, and at worst, a combination of vanity and opportunism.

I take scholarship to imply a concern for truth. I do not mean this in any subtle or metaphysical sense (cf. Webster--_scholarship_: the fund of knowledge and learning). The implication that there can be teaching without scholarship is based on the assumption that there is some body of data about which it may be said that all the relevant evidence is in; for example, the multiplication table, the names of the presidents, the list of conjunctions which take the subjunctive. To the extent that there are such areas, it seems to me true by

4

definition that they do not properly come under the rubric of scholarly teaching, but rather under what I would distinguish as training.  In short, I understand scholarship to involve the continuous evolution and examination of even the most basic assumptions, and indeed, it is revision and refinement of these assumptions that often constitutes genuine progress. Once I saw an able scholar wearing as a tie-pin a golden question mark.  Its utility was not only that it held his tie from falling into the soup, but also that it reminded him of his professional commitment to continue raising questions to answers already given.  I believe this is what a large part of our commitment to graduate studies consisted of--scrutiny of written articles in our professional journals to weigh the importance of each thought to our own field and to examine the value of each word to the article's thesis.

To answer the question raised above about the union of teaching and research, one answer may state that teaching *presupposes* scholarship; that the task of getting under the surface of the subject is the *sine qua non* of teaching (as opposed to training).  Another answer is to say that it *is* possible to become a teacher-scholar, without having the luck to start as a congenital genius, if one is willing to cultivate at the same time an intelligent love for human learners, and a systematic habit of building, upon the best knowledge available, some sort of intellectual contraptions aiming to solve significant problems.

The teacher-scholar is scarce, partly because talent is not universal but partly, too, because some graduate students who have enough talent to excel remain too self-centered to become good teachers, or too self-indulgent to persist in significant inquiry.

The best institutions are trying for a "corner" on this scarce type of personnel; and they will compete more and more intensely for it--raising its economic value--as automation and team teaching increase.  These innovations are bound to demand a cadre of creative master teachers for every age level from pre-school up.

The standard of teaching will rise, because education must exploit the human learning capacity more and more efficiently and because students are growing more articulate about their expectations.  The creativity demanded will be diverse:  within and across departments, and at levels of speculative theory, cultural synthesis, and practical application.  Some of the teacher-scholars will have solo parts, others will practice an emerging art of inter-disciplinary and even cross-cultural collaborations, but they will all have in common the combining of teaching with research into significant problems.

The large, mediocre middle group that has made up the bulk of the teaching profession in the past may be expected to diminish, and even to be supplanted by a great unpopulated gap between the top-flight personnel--the teacher-scholars, teacher-scientists, and teacher-administrators,--and the menial personnel who tend the machines and the routines that remain unmechanized.

In the language-teaching sector of the profession, the mass of non-scholar teachers who have patiently corrected the same mispronunciations year after year, without discovering how to head off the causes of the interference, will have no progeny.  Their successors will either move up into the predicted élite, or move down among the oilcan people.

The same conditions will dispose of the type that has sacrificed teaching to do research on unimportant questions, on the theory that one must publishing something or perish.  A few geniuses will have research professorships, but the rest must either excel at both teaching and investigation or accept tasks such as elaborating instructional materials, analogous to the engineering graduates who make a life career as draftsmen.

Then, getting back to the main issue of teaching versus publication, I believe teaching is a form of publication (i.e., rendering public).  If there is a significant distinction to be made, it is that written publication is aimed at informing those who are absent; oral publication, at those who are present.  If the stakes are rising, as I think, there is no time for the humdrum but we must *make* time for imaginative thought applicable to the class-room and possibly in written form for those not attending our classrooms.

--C. Ben Christensen
(Spanish & Portuguese)