

MINUTES OF THE COMMITTEE ON ADMINISTRATIVE STRUCTURE
(ad hoc Committee of the Faculty Senate)
February 14, 1977, 3:15 p.m.

Memorial Room - Garrett Conference Center

Members present: Dr. Hugh Thomason, Chairperson; Mrs. Kay Carr, Dr. Kenneth Clarke, Dr. Thaddeus Crews; Dr. Joe Glaser, Dr. Norman Hunter, Dr. Martha Jenkins, Dr. Marion Lucas, Dr. Robert Pulsinelli, Dr. Norman Tomazic, Mr. Robert Turek, Dr. Martha Watson.

The first meeting of the Faculty Senate ad hoc Committee on Administrative Structure was called to order at 3:15 p.m. by Dr. Hugh Thomason, Chairperson. All members of the committee were present and introduced themselves. Since there were no volunteers to take minutes Dr. Jenkins offered to do so if the job could be rotated among members of the committee.

Dr. Thomason handed out a ditto of the Committee's assignment (Copy will be filed with minutes) and asked for discussion on how to proceed.

Dr. Glaser asked how the charge came into being. Dr. Thomason explained that the committee was formed by action of the Executive Committee of the Faculty Senate to study the administrative structure and its rate of growth and to make recommendations to the Senate based on results of the study. The committee assignment was developed from the large number of concerns relative to administrative structure presented by the Faculty Senate.

Dr. Lucas gave some data on the growth of the administration (1969-1975) which he and Dr. J. Johnson had collected while on the Advisory Committee to the Faculty Regent (Copy will be filed with minutes).

A discussion ensued concerning the administrative level at which we should start and the availability of job descriptions. It was suggested that there is a lot of concern at the department head level and that this would be a good starting level. Also, responsibilities for some positions are delineated in the Faculty Handbook and descriptions for some jobs may be available from the University. Some information on administrators and faculty who have release time for administrative responsibilities is available from faculty work load schedules, but there is very little consistency between departments in reporting the data.

Dr. Thomason went over the Committee Assignment with the group. He indicated that parts b and c (appropriateness of title and salary) were both judgmental; part d (extent to which responsibilities of position fulfilled) might be accomplished by looking at the institution self-study and the faculty evaluations of administrators, if available; part e (rate of growth of administrative positions compared to growth of student body and teaching faculty) should be relatively easy to do using the data presented earlier by Dr. Lucas as a foundation; and part f (making appropriate recommendations) would be a natural follow-up of the previous parts of the assignment.

Dr. Glaser suggested that we might make a report to the University based on the data given by Dr. Lucas and use that as a basis for gaining support for the work of the committee. The fact that the data are two years old was noted. Dr. Thomason stressed that our work should not necessarily proceed hurriedly but as we learn where and when we can get information. Curtis Logsdon in Institutional Research should have a lot of information we will need.

Dr. Tomazic mentioned that the way positions are filled is of some concern.

Dr. Watson inquired if information on load reduction is available. Dr. Lucas indicated that such information is available on work load reports. In the 1969-75 data 92 administrators were given 727.75 semester hours for administrative duties and 487 teaching faculty were given 320.06 semester hours for activities other than teaching, such as advising, recruiting, etc.

Dr. Thomason suggested that we divide up into subcommittees to look into the various parts of the assignment. Even though some parts may hinge on others we can still be identifying resources.

The question was raised by Mr. Turek as to whether library staff should be included in the study. The opinion was that they should be included.

Mr. Turek asked if there are any comparisons of data presented by Dr. Lucas to other studies. Dr. Thomason reported that Dean Davis knew of no model study. The use of the Hegis report and comparison of our administrative structure with certain benchmark institutions were mentioned as possibilities.

Dr. Thomason suggested four (4) subcommittees as follows:

- 1) Committee to bring data presented by Dr. Lucas on growth of administrative positions up to date.
- 2) Committee to delineate the administrative structure (positions and responsibilities).
- 3) Committee to determine the appropriateness of title and salary to responsibilities.
- 4) Committee to determine whether administrators are fulfilling of their positions, including resources and techniques to use to get the needed information.

A discussion ensued concerning how the work of the subcommittees might proceed and the general negative attitude of the higher administration and Board of Regents concerning study of the administrative structure by faculty. Dr. Thomason indicated we could count on objective cooperation in furnishing needed data. In some cases a letter stating the need might be appropriate.

Committee assignments were as follows:

- 1) Growth of Administrative Positions
Dr. Lucas, Ch.; Dr. Glaser; Dr. Watson
- 2) Competency of Administrators (resources and techniques to obtain the information)
Dr. Tomazic, Ch.; Mrs. Carr; Dr. Thomason
- 3) Appropriateness of Title and Salary to Responsibilities
Dr. Pulsinelli, Ch.; Dr. Hunter; Mr. Turek
- 4) Delineation of Administrative Structure (positions and responsibilities)
Dr. Jenkins, Ch.; Dr. Crews; Dr. Clarke

The next meeting of the overall committee was set at 3:15 p.m. Monday March 7. This was thought to be sufficient time for subcommittees to meet before the group meeting.

Dr. Lucas noted that if we do a study and make a comparison with a benchmark institution this will delay our recommendations to the Faculty Senate.

Dr. Thomason stressed that the committee should proceed slowly and carefully. The Faculty Senate is in a proving situation and we must be careful, be sure, and be prepared to justify based on facts.

An evaluation of administrators by the Faculty Senate or AAUP was mentioned as a possibility.

The meeting adjourned at 4:20 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Martha C. Jenkins