

Appendix 6.1: Document Review

Documents Reviewed Re: Academic Freedom

- Selected portions of the University Statutes and its Appendix A
- Handbook for Administrators
- University Fact Book
- Student Handbook
- Manual of Research Policies
- Integrity Advisory Document
- Recent articles published by AAUP regarding academic freedom, security concerns in connection with academic freedom, Academic Bill of Rights, Catholic teachings and the connection to academic freedom, and reports of censured universities.

Documents Reviewed Re: *cura personalis*

- University Mission Statement
- Various academic and administrative mission statements
- University Fact Book
- University Statutes
- Middle States publications
- Strategic Plans
- Student Handbooks
- Departmental annual reports
- Documents containing policies for selecting undergraduate students
- Career Planning and Placement reports

Documents and Policies Reviewed Re: Fair and Equitable Standards

- Non-Discrimination Policy: This policy is published in all Academic Catalogs, Student Handbooks, the University Statutes, Handbook for Administrators, and Collective Bargaining Agreements.
- Sexual Harassment Policy: This policy is updated and distributed annually to all University employees and appears on the University web-site. The Sexual Harassment Policy provides contact names, addresses, and telephone numbers for immediate response, investigation, and resolution and outlines the procedures for filing a complaint.
- University Statutes: Article Four of the University Statutes incorporates the policies and procedures that affect faculty members. Article Four, Chapter Five deals with personnel matters and the procedures for appointment, reappointment, promotion and tenure. Article Four, Chapter Seven focuses on due process and the applicable procedures for initiating grievances.
- Handbook for Administrators: The Handbook for Administrators provides the policies and procedures affecting administrators which include benefits, employment policies, a progressive assessment process, and a grievance procedure for unlawful discrimination complaints and termination for poor performance.
- Collective bargaining agreements with Local 153 of the Office and Professional Employees International Union and Local 805 of the International Brotherhood of Teamsters (the maintenance/skilled craft staff) stipulate the terms and the process for filing grievances in any controversy arising from the terms of the agreement and the terms and conditions of employment.

Appendix 6.2: Diversity Distribution Among Administrators, Faculty, and Students

The percentage of all minority students (undergraduate and graduate, full and part-time) within the University (including Marymount College as of 2002) has increased 2.7% from the Fall of 1999 to the Fall of 2004. In 1999, the percentage of minority students (identified as Black, American Indian/Alaskan Native, Asian/Pacific Islander, and Hispanic) was 21.1%; in Fall 2004, the number increased to 23.8%. These gains are, in part, illusory because they coincide with an increase in the percentage of students who reported race and ethnicity. The percentage of students who did not self-identify in 1999 was 17.5 percent; this was reduced to 16.1 percent in 2004, reflecting a 1.4 percent increase in the number of students who reported race and ethnicity.

The undergraduate population has seen an overall increase from 1999 to 2004, from 21.7% to 23.8%, a 2.1% increase. The percentage of Black students slightly rose by 1.8% (5% in 1999; 6.8% in 2004); the percentage of Asian/Pacific Islander undergraduates rose 1.5% over the five year period, from 4.3% in 1999 to 5.8% in 2004; and the percentage of Hispanic undergraduates has decreased from 12.2% in 1999 to 11.2% in 2004. Marymount College, which merged with the University in 2002, has the largest minority undergraduate population with 34.7% registered in the Fall of 2004. The population of Black students at Marymount College is 16.5% and the Hispanic undergraduate population is 13.4%. Asian/Pacific Islander undergraduates are 4.7% of the total population at Marymount.

The graduate population of minority students has steadily increased since 1999 from 20.6% to 23.8% registered in the Fall of 2004, a 3.2% overall increase. This is somewhat tempered by the decrease in the percent points of the number of students who reported their race/ethnicity. The percentage of students who did not self-identify in 1999 was 19.6 percent; this was reduced to 16.8 percent in 2004, reflecting a 2.8 percent reduction in the unknown category.

The percentage of full-time women faculty has slightly increased over time, from 36% (noted in the IPED-S Report of 1999) to 37.6% in Fall 2004. The percentage of full-time minority faculty has increased from 13% in 1999 to 16% in the Fall 2004. Although there has been an increase in the percentage of women and minority faculty, increased attention in the recruitment of a diverse faculty by the University administration has become part of the recruitment process and procedures of the University. The recruitment of minority faculty continues to be a challenge in that there is a limited pool of candidates and the goal to create a diverse faculty is shared by colleges and universities nationwide.

There has also been an increase in the diversity among administrators: in 1999, 20% of full-time administrators were identified as minority members, while in 2003, this figure rose to 22.4%.

The percentage of the full-time clerical staff in 2003 identified as members of minority groups was 46.8. Fordham's skilled craft/service and maintenance staff has the largest percentage of minority members, with 54.7% identified as such in 2003.

Appendix 6.3: Institutional Integrity in Communications Survey Results

Administrators, faculty, alumni and students were surveyed to gather substantive information to ascertain the integrity of Fordham's various print and electronic publications and public relations announcements. We developed four surveys specifically for each of these groups, which are provided in this report. Utilizing the University's email system, every Fordham administrator and faculty member and every student with a University email account received an email message with a link to a website survey. Additionally, more than 30,000 Fordham alumni for whom the University has an email address also received an email message that linked to a website survey. Since this was an electronic survey, respondents were not provided with copies of publications or public relations announcements to review. Responses to each statement were assigned a numerical value between 1.00 (strongly disagree) and 5.00 (strongly agree). All responses were submitted anonymously to a central computer server; and the results were automatically aggregated and tabulated. The members of the task force did not have access to any submitted survey, and they received only the aggregated results from the University's WebGroup.

Findings

This survey returned a total of 3,771 usable survey responses from the four audiences as of December 10, 2004: (a) administrators: 269; (b) faculty: 164; (c) alumni: 2,450, and (d) students: 880. All four groups were asked to comment on whether the University's various print and electronic publications and public relations announcements publishes a definition of institutional integrity against which the various work of the institution is benchmarked and evaluated. The results follow.

Institutional Integrity. Fordham University's faculty, administrators, alumni, and students agreed that the University's various print and electronic publications and public relations announcements publish a definition of institutional integrity against which the work of the institution is benchmarked and evaluated. There were several statistically significant differences among the respondents. The alumni gave higher ratings than all other groups. The student ratings were greater than those of faculty members. However, there were no statistically significant differences between the faculty or students and any other group. We do not judge these differences to be significant because (1) they are small, (2) the faculty and administrators have a different vantage point than the alumni and students, and (3) the concept of institutional integrity is vague.

Academic Freedom. Fordham University's administrators and faculty agreed that the University's various print and electronic publications and public relations announcements provide an environment where academic and intellectual freedom exists and flourishes.

Ethical Standards. Administrators and faculty members agreed that the publications and announcements demonstrate adherence to ethical standards for its internal and external constituencies.

Outline Grievance and Other Procedures. Administrators and faculty members agreed that the University's various print and electronic publications and public relations announcements outline grievance, disciplinary, appeal, and (if applicable) arbitration procedures.

Honest and Fair Communications and Honors Commitments. Fordham University's alumni and students agreed that the University's various print and electronic publications and public relations announcements: (a) communicates with its internal and external constituencies in an honest, fair and objective manner; and (b) keeps its promises, honors its commitments, and represents itself truthfully to its various internal and external constituencies. Although the average level of alumni agreement was significantly higher than that of students, the difference in vantage points of the alumni and students make it unwise to draw conclusions from what are small differences.

**Standard 6 Integrity Survey Instruments
Administration**

	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neither Disagree nor Agree	Agree	Strongly Agree
1. Fordham University, in all of its various print and electronic publications and public relations announcements, publishes a definition of institutional integrity against which the varied work of the institution is benchmarked and evaluated.					
2. Fordham University, in all of its various print and electronic publications and public relations announcements, provides an environment where academic and intellectual freedom exists and flourishes.					
3. Fordham University, in all of its various print and electronic publications and public relations announcements, demonstrates adherence to ethical standards for its internal and external constituencies.					
4. Fordham University assess and evaluate periodically print and electronic publications and print relations announcements to insure their overall effectiveness in maintaining ethical standards.					
5. Fordham University, in all of its various print and electronic publications and public relations announcements, outlines various grievance, disciplinary, appeal, and (if applicable) arbitration procedures.					

Faculty

	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neither Disagree nor Agree	Agree	Strongly Agree
1. Fordham University, in all of its various print and electronic publications and public relations announcements, publishes a definition of institutional integrity against which the varied work of the institution is benchmarked and evaluated.					
2. Fordham University, in all of its various print and electronic publications and public relations announcements, provides an environment where academic and intellectual freedom exists and flourishes.					
3. Fordham University, in all of its various print and electronic publications and public relations announcements, demonstrates adherence to ethical standards for its internal and external constituencies.					
4. Fordham University, in all of its various print and electronic publications and public relations announcements, outlines various grievance, disciplinary, appeal, and (if applicable) arbitration procedures.					

Alumni

	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neither Disagree nor Agree	Agree	Strongly Agree
1. Fordham University, in all of its various print and electronic publications and public relations announcements, publishes a definition of institutional integrity against which the varied work of the institution is benchmarked and evaluated.					
2. Fordham University, in all of its various print and electronic publications and public relations announcements, communicates with its internal and external constituencies in an honest, fair, objective manner.					
3. Fordham University, in all of its various print and electronic publications and public relations announcements, keeps its promises, honors its commitments, and represents itself truthfully to its various internal and external constituencies.					

Students

	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neither Disagree nor Agree	Agree	Strongly Agree
1. Fordham University, in all of its various print and electronic publications and public relations announcements, publishes a definition of institutional integrity against which the varied work of the institution is benchmarked and evaluated.					
2. Fordham University, in all of its various print and electronic publications and public relations announcements, communicates with its internal and external constituencies in an honest, fair, objective manner.					
3. Fordham University, in all of its various print and electronic publications and public relations announcements, keeps its promises, honors its commitments, and represents itself truthfully to its various internal and external constituencies.					

Survey Results

Fordham University Administrators

University Administrators	Institutional Integrity	Academic Freedom	Ethical Standards	Overall Effectiveness	Outlines Grievance Procedures
Average	3.52 a	3.92	3.99	3.58	3.40
Median	4.00 b	4.00	4.00	4.00	3.00
Mode	4.00	4.00	4.00	4.00	4.00
N = 269					

Fordham University Faculty Members

University Faculty	Institutional Integrity	Academic Freedom	Ethical Standards	Outlines Grievance Procedures
Average	3.34 a, e	3.77	3.87	3.44
Median	3.00 b, c	4.00	4.00	4.00
Mode	3.00	4.00	4.00	4.00
N = 164				

Fordham University Alumni

Alumni	Institutional Integrity	Honest & Fair	Represents Truthfully
Average	3.81 a	4.11 d	4.07 d
Median	4.00 b	4.00 e	4.00 e
Mode	4.00	4.00	4.00
N = 2,450			

Fordham University Students

Students	Institutional Integrity	Fair & Objective	Represents Truthfully	
Average	3.61 a, c	3.69 d	3.62 d	
Median	4.00 b, c	4.00 e	4.00 e	
Mode	5.00	5.00	5.00	
N = 880				

Note: Test for statistically significant differences between groups were conducted for each item for which groups responded to identical questions: Institutional integrity (faculty, administrators, students, and alumni), academic freedom and ethical standards (faculty and administrators), honest and fair and represents truthfully (alumni and students), and outlines grievance procedures (faculty and administrators). Statistically significant differences are noted in the table and below.

a Alumni gave higher ratings than administrators, faculty, or students (TK .4,3755 = 6.36, 8.70, and 7.83 respectively, $p < .05$).

b The extended median test indicates that there are significant differences among the medians. ($c23 = 75.53$, $p = .000$). The Kruskal-Wallis mean ranks test (KW) indicates that the ratings of the alumni exceed those of the administrators, faculty, and students (KW = 312.49, 513.26, and 217.02 respectively, $p < .05$).

c Mean student ratings were greater than those of faculty (TK .4,3755 = 4.61, $p < .05$), as were median ratings (KW = 296.24, $p < .05$). TK = Tukey-Kramer HSD

d Two-tail t tests of independent samples with unequal variances indicate that mean ratings of alumni were significantly greater than those of students for honest and fair ($t1394 = 10.91$, $p < .000$) and for represents truthfully ($t1370 = 10.95$, $p < .000$).

e Although the medians for student and alumni ratings of "honest and fair" and for "represents truthfully" appear to be equal, an examination of the distributions of the scores using a continuity corrected chi-square tests indicate that alumni ratings are higher than those of students for honest and fair ($c21 = 79.946$, $p < .000$) and for represents truthfully ($c21 = 81.126$, $p < .000$).