MINUTES OF THE COMMITTEE ON ADMINISTRATIVE STRUCTURE
(ad hoc Committee of the Faculty Senate)
March 7, 1977, 3:15 p.m.

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

The meeting was called to order at 3:15 p.m. by Dr. Thomason,
Chairman. Dr. Glaser volunteered to serve as secretary to the meeting.
Dr. Thomason announced that Dr. Kenneth Clark had asked to be replaced
as a member of the committee in view of his impending retirement. His
request was approved, and Mrs. Linda Pulsinelli was appointed to replace
him on the committee as a whole and on sub-committee 4, Delineation of
Administrative Structure.

Dr. Thomason announced that the business of the day would be to
hear progress reports on the activities of the various sub-committees.
He called first upon Dr. Lucas, speaking for sub-committee 1, Growth
of Administrative Positions. Before Dr. Lucas' report, the minutes
of the first meeting of the whole committee were accepted unanimously.

Dr. Lucas explained that he had found Curtis Logsdon helpful, but
not fully prepared to give the sub-committee the sort of information it
had hoped for. The employee records at Western are in the process
of being classified for computer retrieval, but the project is not yet
complete. Logsdon did provide the most current list of Western's
benchmark institutions and copies of the data that have gone into
Western's two surveys for HEGIS, The Higher Education Information
Survey. The sub-committee's next step was to obtain the complete HEGIS
report for 1972. Dr. Glaser explained, however, that the employment
figures in that report were sadly lacking in uniformity. The sub-
committee had reluctantly concluded that no valid comparisons between
Western and other benchmark schools could ever be drawn from HEGIS
because each reporting institution apparently uses its own definitions
in compiling data for the report. Dr. Lucas pointed out that Western's
own definitions of such terms as "Instruction" and "Academic Support"
have changed since 1972, with the result that no valid comparisons
between Western that year and Western now can be drawn, even from
Mr. Logsdon's sets of figures for those respective periods. HEGIS,
and Western's own official statistics, which are based on HEGIS categories,
proved totally unproductive.

Dr. Lucas went on to report that the sub-committee had concluded
that the only way to obtain valid comparisons with other schools was to
correspond directly with local faculty senates or AAUP chapters or
administrations and ask for figures that would mesh with the ones we
are able to derive for Western. Discussion followed on whether the
letters sent out ought to ask for general information or for very specific
statistics covering narrowly defined categories of employment. It
was decided that a letter asking whether employment information was
available at all should be sent to the benchmark schools and that a
detailed questionnaire should be compiled while the results from the
first letter were coming in. In this way, as Dr. Jenkins remarked,
questionnaires could be sent only to those schools from whom there was
a prospect for a useful answer. Mrs. Pulsinelli recommended that the
first, general query include a stamped, addressed postcard for reply
to insure as large a number of returns as possible.

With regard to the first, general letter requesting information
on the availability of employment figures, both Dr. Jenkins and Dr.
Thomason felt that local faculty senates and local AAUP chapters should
be contacted, but not the administrations of the benchmark schools.
There was general agreement. Dr. Hunter volunteered to contact the
ex-president of AAUP at Toledo University, a personal friend of his,
and find out about the availability of information from Toledo and
probably some other Ohio schools that his informant might know about.

Dr. Thomason next called on Mrs. Carr to report for Dr. Tomazic's
sub-committee, Competency of Administrators. Mrs. Carr reported that
the sub-committee felt that an evaluation of the process of administration
at Western was likely to prove less sensitive than an attempt to weigh
the competence of individual administrators, and that the same end would
be served by each approach. A general evaluation of the administrative
process would serve to quite effectively pinpoint areas where improvement
is needed without the potential for hard feelings that is inherent in
an oppressively personal approach. The sub-committee felt that the
areas singled out as relative weaknesses in the administrative process
at Western by the last institutional self-study would provide a good
base for its deliberations. Its plan, then, is to consider each of
these eight areas in detail and attempt to draw up a report that will
go beyond the recommendations of the self-study in specificity and
support.

The next committee to report was Dr. Pulsinelli's, Appropriateness
of Title and Salary to Responsibilities. Dr. Pulsinelli explained that
his sub-committee had not yet been able to meet but that he anticipated
little difficulty with its assignment and had several ideas on how it
should carry out its study.

Dr. Thomason then called for Dr. Jenkins' report for her sub-
committee, Delineation of Administrative Structure. Dr. Jenkins had
also had an interview with Mr. Logden and found out that it would be
at least a month before his current project of sorting administrative
personnel according to their lines of responsibility and place in the
organizational scheme of the administration would be available. In the
mean time, Dr. Jenkins went on, the sub-committee has been working with
the outline of Western's administrative structure outlined in the
Faculty and Staff Handbook and with the most current list of personnel,
trying to fit everyone listed into some slot in the administrative model.
In this effort, the sub-committee had run into two serious problems. The
first was the difficulty of dealing with part-time administrators without
some definite way of knowing how much of their time went to administration.
The second was the problem of distinguishing between administrators and
clerks. Mrs. Pulsinelli confirmed this difficulty and added that a further one came from the attempt to distinguish between administrators and staff assistants. Mr. Turek commented that the whole ad hoc committee urgently needs to decide on some definitions to decide such matters, definitions that will be vital to the work of all the sub-committees. Dr. Lucas offered percentage of teaching time as the most workable differentia between faculty and administration, but Mr. Turek pointed out that decisions on that basis would exclude librarians from the faculty, and Mrs. Pulsinelli added that such a definition would do nothing to resolve the problem of distinguishing between administrators on the one hand and staff or clerks on the other. The problem was not resolved.

General discussion followed about the ad hoc committee's aims and best strategies. Mr. Turek felt that the most central duty of the group, and possibly the only one which it could carry out successfully, was to document trends in administrative growth and structure at Western. Dr. Thomason added that an area of growth that the committee had so far not considered was that of programs; it would be interesting, he felt, to have an idea of how many new programs, such as the Public Service Institute, have come into being at Western since 1972. Mrs. Pulsinelli and Dr. Crews insisted on the need for clear definitions, without which whatever statistics the committee arrives at will be useless. Dr. Thomason rose once more to this issue, suggesting that membership in either the Kentucky Employees Retirement System or the Kentucky Teachers Retirement System might provide a basis for separating the administrators and faculty from the clerks and staff. Then Dr. Lucas' percentages of classroom time could be used to further distinguish between faculty and administration. Dr. Lucas himself testified that the definitions that he and Dr. Johnson had used in their earlier study had been more pragmatic than formal, so there was some questioned whether a strictly comparable set of figures could be derived even on that basis.

After more discussion of isolated points, Dr. Thomason ended the meeting with expressions of optimism and good will.

The meeting adjourned at 4:30 p.m. with the time of the next general meeting to be announced when Dr. Thomason has had a chance to reconsider the schedules of the members.

Respectfully submitted,

Joseph A. Claser