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Too little attention has been devoted to the large importance in the governance of colleges and universities of the department and its chairman.

The departmental chairman in the typical American university is a (if not the) key administrative officer. Hence, there is need for much more thoughtful analysis of what he does and what he might do than yet exists.¹

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

Observers of the current educational scene quickly agree that the demands upon the modern university in recent decades have increased with astounding enormity and intensity. The mutual impacts, each upon the other, of society and the university reflect the remarkable yet sometimes appalling diversity and complexity of our contemporary age. To remain relevant, therefore, and in order to render unique contributions in its own time, the university has demonstrated the flexibility and adaptive qualities that are perhaps singularly unmatched by any other major social institution.

Such an extensive and profound metamorphosis would be expected to carry in its wake the need for major changes and adjustments by institutions of higher learning in their functional and structural fabrics, and such is the case. Indeed, the organization of a modern American university consists of a vast network of overlapping and interlocking functions and structures. A comprehensive, cosmopolitan institution presents a magnificent panoply of academic and administrative units that serve as instruments through which the parent organization fulfills its mission and
purpose in society. That an institution has a continuing need for evaluation of its various components in order to maintain its educational relevance was noted on a previous occasion:

The processes of a university are infinitely subtle and complex. Where processes are complex and subtle, there is always great opportunity for sympathetic self-study and there is always room for almost unlimited improvement. ¹

At one level of this complex are the academic departments, which, along with the position of their chairmen, form the subject of this study. For, as colleges and universities have become larger and more intricate, so too have the departments and their chairmen become more fully involved and influential in the determination and execution of educational policies and programs.

Need for the Study

In their book, The Academic Marketplace, Caplow and McGee listed twelve topics of vital concern to colleges and universities about which, they asserted, "We have virtually no information."² Listed first among these topics was the academic department as a work group.


Commonly, the department is an important level at which institutions of higher learning translate into reality their variegated programs of instruction, research, and service. Since the department is the basic unit in the academic enterprise, conceptions of it organizationally and of the position of its chairman seemed significantly relevant to the functional operation of the department in the University complex.

With this in mind, it was assumed by the writer to be quite likely that the relative degrees of "success" in departmental operations and in the chairman's functions were dependent in considerable measure upon the attitudes and opinions of the chairman toward his post, and upon the strengths of leadership and professional responsibility seemingly possessed by the chairman. Thought to be equally important were the effects of University policies and practices upon the departmental operation and upon the chairman's function, and held as likewise significant were the views toward his role and the department itself as perceived by departmental faculties and by various administrative officers in the University setting.

**Purpose of the Study**

The purpose of this study was to examine certain departmental procedures and to determine and evaluate some of the
attitudes, opinions, and perceptions concerning certain aspects of five academic departments and concerning the role of their chairmen as viewed by selected faculty and administrative personnel at The Ohio State University. Prior to launching the investigation, the writer's discussions of the proposed study with numerous members of the faculty and administration drew their interest in it and pointed toward the prospective usefulness that it might serve. It is hoped that a number of meaningful insights, conclusions, and recommendations have resulted from this investigation, and that it may have contributed at least some small measure of clarification relative to a few of the intricate processes of academic administration. If this purpose has been fulfilled, the author would be happy in the knowledge that some assistance had been rendered thereby to the University and to higher education.

**Value of the Study to the Writer**

After nine years of professional work at a university, one may be prone to think that he knows his institution very well. If the writer held a number of prior illusions about this, however, his notions and understandings were at least soon modified and qualified by the enriching opportunities of consultation with many of those faculty members and University administrators who are on the "firing line" of performance and who daily come to grips with the multiform challenges of academic service.
This investigation has therefore been of inestimable value to its author's educational career by causing him to re-examine some of his earlier conceptions and by projecting him into productive learning situations that drew upon the substantial experience of those personnel who contributed to this study.

**Scope of the Study**

Five departments were included in the investigation, one from each of five colleges, selected by the standard of size: that is, the largest department in each college in point of number of faculty members in the ranks of instructor through full professor, excluding in the numerical tabulation staff members who were primarily researchers, extension personnel, staff members on leave, emeriti, and the like; departmental faculty associated with the University branch centers were, however, included in the count.

Utilizing this standard, the departments listed below were selected. Because schools operate administratively as large departments under the appropriate college, one unit, the School of Home Economics, was considered as a department and its director as a chairman for the purposes of this study. Indicated below are the five departments studied, the number of departmental faculty members determined by the foregoing criteria, and the parent college of each.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Department</th>
<th>Faculty Count</th>
<th>College</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Business Organization</td>
<td>(39)</td>
<td>Commerce and Administration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>(64)</td>
<td>Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electrical Engineering</td>
<td>(43)</td>
<td>Engineering</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td>(65)</td>
<td>Arts and Sciences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Home Economics</td>
<td>(52)</td>
<td>Agriculture and Home Economics</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Selected for interview were the five department chairmen and four members in the rank of full professor in each department. Professors were chosen for interview by selecting their names in alphabetical order from the top of the departmental lists as published in the 1962-1963 Ohio State University Faculty Directory. Excluded in this determination were professors who had served as chairmen, associate, acting, or assistant chairmen of departments, and also excepted were professors emeriti, extension staff members, personnel on leave, members who had been on the departmental faculty less than five years, and those who were holding other major administrative appointments. A departure from this interview-selection procedure was necessary in a few instances because of the unavailability of faculty members for interview, in which few cases they were passed over for succeeding names on the list.

In order to allow for differential views at several levels of the University, and to turn more light upon the department as an integral unit of the institution, various administrative officers of the University were included in the investigation. Interviews were held with the deans of the colleges indicated, with the Acting Dean of the Graduate School, and with central administrators (the President and his cabinet officers). It should be noted, however, that these administrators were asked not to limit their comments solely to the five departments under study.

3 The Ohio State University, Faculty and Staff Directory Bulletin (Columbus: 1962-1963), pp. 245, 251, 252, 255, 259.
In summary, the scope of interviews in this investigation was as follows:

**Numerical Analysis of Interviews**

- Department chairmen ................................................................. 5
- Departmental faculty (4 full professors in each of the 5 departments) ........................................ 20
- Deans of colleges ............................................................... 5
- Acting Dean of the Graduate School ........................................ 1
- Central administrators (President and cabinet) ......................... 10

Total 41

Contained in the Bibliography is a complete list of the persons interviewed in these various categories.

**Limitations of the Study**

The writer has not presumed that this investigation constituted a definitive study of the departmental operation. The problem was circumscribed by at least two formidable limitations. First, the study was principally confined to a limited number of administrative units and to a select body of personnel within one institution, and, second, the personal and professional limitations of the investigator undoubtedly entered into the picture. These factors may have been reflected in the author's definition and approach to the problem, in his interview techniques, in his treatment of the information collected in the course of the study, and perhaps in other significant ways. Throughout the investigation, however, the author attempted to keep before him the well-placed
advice of one of his respondents, whose admonition was given as follows:

There is such a wide diversity in departments, their faculties, and their chairmen, that it is most difficult to generalize. Be very cautious, therefore. Be reserved in saying that "these are the characteristics of a good department and a good chairman, and these are their bad aspects."

Methods of Procedure

Several distinctly different approaches to this study would have been possible. Perhaps each avenue of access to an investigation has its unique strengths and shortcomings. Certainly this is thought to be true when one deals in the subjective arena of opinions about human and organizational interrelationships. Other writers have commented on this question of role differentiation:

The problem of reciprocal relationships and expectations becomes important in any situation where the attainment of the organization's objectives is contingent upon its members measuring up to their responsibilities as defined by themselves and by their associates. Individuals differ in their attitude toward various methods recommended for the solution of such problems. Some members may emphasize techniques for reducing incongruities between expectations and performance. Others may be more deeply concerned with methods for resolving inconsistencies among expectations.4

The method chosen for this investigation took the general form of a case study. The writer held a structured interview with each one of the forty-one persons listed on the schedule. In formulating the interview questionnaire (see Appendix A), the author consulted a wide variety of persons and sources in an effort to accommodate a diversity of response in keeping with that control imposed by the subject. Most of the questions were highly subjective and "open-ended," which meant that the individual interviewee had the latitude to respond in ways unique to himself or to departmental and other situations as he perceived them. This study, then, was concerned with personnel views about departmental matters. In consequence, therefore, and following the procedures widely employed in other studies, published and otherwise, the writer has utilized anonymously a number of direct quotes of respondents in order to convey certain points with emphasis and to illustrate the range of thought on sundry questions. If these commentaries embody negative overtones at times, one may attribute this to a rather general tendency of staff personnel to accentuate in interviews certain problem areas with which they are wrestling at a given time. Other observers have commented on this phenomenon as a kind of catharsis syndrome. In selecting representative comments, however, it is thought that a reasonable balance was maintained in presenting an overview of the attitudes and opinions expressed.
Plan of the Study

This chapter, Chapter I, is devoted to an introduction of the subject of the investigation. It includes specific statements that define the need for the study, its purpose, its value to the writer, the scope of the study, its limitations, the methods and procedures utilized, and the study plan. A survey of some significant literature related to the topic is presented in Chapter II. The departmental system of organization is considered in Chapter III, including a delineation of some of the forces at work in an organization, historical aspects of the departmental system, and some current perceptions of that system at The Ohio State University.

Constituting the bases for Chapter IV are the processes of selection and reappointment of chairmen and a number of motivations that may influence a candidate to seek or accept the chairmanship. Chapter V discusses the chairman as an administrator, including some conceptions of his position, his authority, his delegational practices, and related functions attached to the departmental office. Chapter VI is concerned with the chairman's leadership role in academic programs—his involvement in staff recruitment and development, evaluation, graduate education, and in student relations. Presented in Chapter VII is a synthesis of views descriptive of the able chairman; also discussed are the major duties of chairmen.
and some noteworthy influences attendant upon the chairman's office. Chapter VIII concludes the study, outlines its principal findings, indicates some possible implications, and advances several recommendations that may merit further consideration.

Finally, the Appendixes contain related documents and other significant information. It was impossible to include all, or even the major portion, of respondent comments in the main body of the study; hence, additional observations that duplicated, supplemented, or extended various themes of the study are also recorded in the Appendixes.
CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

Chroniclers of the educational scene have commented on the seeming reluctance of university personnel to turn their investigative efforts upon the inner workings of the university itself. If this observation has been justified in the past, at least the present and future indications point toward a vastly greater emphasis upon institutional research. Certainly the present scope of self-studies undertaken by colleges and universities across the nation indicates no lack of curiosity, about the dynamics of higher learning.

Over the years, various writers have given their competent attention to several aspects of the campus, notably, the role of the president, the role of the dean, principles of administration, student personnel, faculty relations and academic freedom, governance of athletics, and other topics. But relatively little formal investigation has been reported on the functional operation of the department and its chairman. Resumés of several significant publications relevant to the study are presented in this chapter.
A widely influential study, *The Academic Marketplace*, though not limited to a consideration of the department and its chairman, has nevertheless become something of a classic in its field and should be reviewed here. Its main investigative focus is upon faculty working conditions and performance and upon the problem of faculty mobility within the academic labor market, as represented by the authors' data collected from 418 professors associated with 215 departments and that collected from administrative officers of ten institutions of higher learning.

Included in this book by Caplow and McGee are chapters on how faculty vacancies occur, how performance is evaluated, the strategy of the department, procedures of recruitment, patterns of choice, selecting the replacement, and academic government and the personnel process.

The authors put forth a feudal typology which they suggest is sometimes useful in classifying departmental chairmen. The symbolism is somewhat gross in its characterizations and ascribes essentially negative tendencies to the chairmanship. Obviously, therefore, the typology is not all-inclusive and by no means would all department chairmen fit neatly into one or another of these categories. The Caplow-McGee nomenclature for diverse chairmen,

---

distilled from academic lore and utilizing medieval terminology, is as follows:

The Robber Baron - absolute autocrat;

The Lord of the Mountain Fief - benevolent despot;

The Yeoman Farmer - pillar of the university's workaday program;

The Gentleman Adventurer - a carefree administrator, adept at attracting contract research and foundation support;

The Honest Burgher - spokesman for the egalitarian, discipline-oriented department;

The King's Man - authoritarian and close to the dean or central administration;

The Boy Ruler - takes his orders from the senior faculty members of the department; he is low-pressure and somewhat permissive.2

Several notable recommendations came out of the Caplow-McGee study and are useful to register here; they are: (1) that the tenure rank of lecturer be established for men primarily interested in teaching; (2) that the order of seniority at each academic level be respected and strengthened; (3) that standard base salaries be adopted for all academic ranks, and that salary information be made a matter of public and accessible record; (4) that a standard teaching load, expressed in class hours, be adopted in all departments of the university for all members of the teaching staff; (5) that both the period of probationary appointments and the period of probation be much extended; (6) that the fringe benefits of

2bid., pp. 196, 197.
faculty employment be improved and expanded; (7) that the personal and arbitrary control of administrative officers over members of the faculty be reduced as far as possible; (8) that existing procedures for the location of candidates to fill vacant faculty positions be improved by increasing the amount of available information; (9) that regular, orderly procedures be established for the selection of a new faculty member from a roster of candidates; (10) that regular, orderly procedures be established for promotion and for the renewal of contracts; and (11) that the existence of a faculty vacancy be established always on the basis of demonstrated need for a particular position, and never on the basis of automatic succession.

A long-time college president, Henry M. Wriston, has added much to the literature of higher education by his sage observations and reflections upon his days in administration. Because of his extensive experience in dealing with departmental matters it seems wise to include here several statements from his rather pithy assessment of the chairman's office:

It is essential that the president put his thought and energy into developing strong chairmen... Some chairmen like to think of themselves as "head" of the department. They acquire a proprietary interest in it; the members of the faculty in that department are "my men" to the chairman. However, permanent heads should be avoided; men get tired after a while. When tired they are apt to be arbitrary. They also get into ruts, recruiting
their new staff from a narrow range of institutions.\(^3\)

Wriston asserts that when the time comes to change the executive leadership of a department, it should be done with conviction and precision to avoid a row:

> Often a good chairman likes relief; he will suggest it himself. When that occurs, a number of changes can be made. Sometimes the strongest man does not want to be chairman; he is proof that it is not necessary to be chairman to maintain one's prestige. The best device that I found was a formula which stated that neither the appointment as chairman nor the substitution of another was to be regarded as an expression of approval or disapproval of the manner in which the department had been administered; it was a routine assignment of duties for the time being—in the nature of a committee assignment. But no device, no formula will assuage the feelings of the oversensitive. Yet every time I timidly shrank from making a change the consequences were undesirable. In university administration of a faculty the maintenance of a corps of strong chairmen is a major—not a routine—obligation.\(^4\)

In a passage that touches upon the dynamics of resistance, Wriston records some of his efforts, often futile, to innovate and strengthen comatose departments:

> The really frustrating experience is to try to strengthen a weak department with two or three senior


\(^4\)Ibid.
faculty members in it. They will not seek out prospects likely to put them in the shade. Other universities discourage their best new products from applying for or even accepting a position. Even if a strong appointment is made, it is likely to be transitory--the eager young instructor wants more stimulating colleagues.

The president may take the bull by the horns, go out and find a good man and appoint him as chairman. This drastic procedure may occasionally succeed, but in most instances is not likely to work well. The departmental colleagues of the "president's pet" will accept him reluctantly, if not resentfully. They will find ways to drag their feet. This may be their natural pace; the process need not be malicious. The "outsider" is made to feel himself an outsider. If he becomes an insider, he tends to sink toward the local level. More likely he gets out.

In thirty years I tried many gambits to strengthen weak departments. I was still trying when I retired. But it must be confessed that the only device that worked with any consistency was to keep the weak department fluid with term appointments until the unsatisfactory "leaders" retired. Sometimes retirements could be accelerated. Then a fresh start was possible.\(^5\)

A similar observation about recalcitrant faculty members blocking efforts to regenerate a department was noted by Dodds, Robb, and Taylor:

Many a president, we venture to say, can report more than one case in which an eminent or promising person needed by a department was not called because of the personal objection of just one professor. The intellectually independent, perhaps brash, young man who challenges cherished traditional views in his field, who advocates new approaches to old schools of specialization, may need protection by the administration when his reappointment or

\(^5\)Ibid., pp. 107-8.
promotion comes up. Not infrequently a "young Turk" is by temperament an uneasy or inconsiderate colleague whose manners leave something to be desired, whereas the less-inspired mind, the all-round citizen with a "better-adjusted" personality, is a more congenial fellow. Moreover, loyalties to each other and to the pervading image each has of his department may transform it into a sort of social club maintaining its own qualifications for admission.  

The question of what title should be given to the departmental executive often merits discussion in higher education: should the executive be denominated "chairman" or "head"? This question was briefly explored in an article by Bowler, who asserts that the answer depends "largely on the basic administrative philosophy prevailing in a given institution." It is most difficult to give an unequivocal response to this query, although the distinction usually made is that the head is commonly given more absolute authority in administration than the chairman.

But this distinction can scarcely be applied universally, for, in some institutions, one title or the other is largely historical and does not connote a shade of difference in the authority or responsibilities of the departmental administrator. For that

---


7 Ned W. Bowler, "Who Should Be in Charge of the Department--Head or Chairman?" The Journal of Higher Education, XXXIII, No. 6 (June, 1962), Columbus: The Ohio State University, pp. 315-318.
matter, the use of authority by the department executive and the
existing atmosphere of his department concerning the democratic
vis-a-vis the authoritarian influences presents quite variant
patterns even within the same institution where the chairmen or
heads are operating under the same title and university regula-
tions. Much depends upon the personalities of the executives and
their faculties, how long the administrator has been in his post,
the diverse needs of one department at a given time, and upon other
variables affecting the relative authority exercised.

Chancellor Kimpton of the University of Chicago engaged in
a bit of nostalgic reminiscence when he recalled some of the virtues
of the old-line department "head." This passage reveals the Chan-
celloir's astute conceptual grasp of the comparative strengths and
weaknesses inherent in the head-concept vis-a-vis the chairman-
concept:

... A great deal can be said for the old head
of a department... He was appointed for life, it
was his department, and he ran it. The running of
a department was a career, as important to the head
as his own research and teaching, and sometimes far
more so. All decisions were his after whatever
consultation he chose to engage in; but he knew
that the stature of his department was his own
stature in the university and in the academic world
in general. There were some great department heads
in those days, and, more important, there were some
great departments. I still share enough of the
faculty resentment for the administrator to realize
that the old system had to go, but there are some
lessons here for us. What is everybody's responsi-
bility is nobody's responsibility, and a present-day
chairman must have more of a function than presiding
at meetings. He must be selected with great care by the faculty and the administration, and he must be armed with real power. Of course, he should consult with his senior colleagues before any major moves, but he can become immobilized by too much democratic razzle-dazzle. Above all else, the department must be his real responsibility, rather than a rotating chore that he reluctantly assumes for his allotted term. The chairman of the department is the one the administration of the university can trust in the all-important business of promotions; and it is on him that the future quality of the university rests.

"No one plays a larger part in determining the character of higher educational institutions than the department chairman," so asserts Robert D. Patton in an editorial in the Journal of Higher Education. Editor Patton offers a number of significant insights into the chairman's role and function in this brief but analytical article. In following the theme that "the chairman is called upon to be everything to just about everybody around an educational institution," Professor Patton makes the point that when the service of a chairman extends over a period of years, "he becomes the virtual creator of his department, for no one will be added to the staff who does not pass his careful screening processes." He exerts influence over the character of the student body

---


of his department, and virtually no aspect of administrative concern to the department escapes his purview in some manner. Therefore, the staff, the alumni, and the students of the department will "bear something of the chairman's imprint."

The chairman's position gives him the opportunity to exert profound effects upon other aspects of the department and its program. For example, in the matters of making staff assignments and in the allocation of departmental activities, these functions are almost exclusively the province of the chairman. The reason for this has been observed by Patton: "When matters of salary, assignment of desirable courses, or research opportunities are concerned, staff interests become so personal and acutely competitive" that decisions by the chairman are called for. Younger and newer faculty members often have to teach out of the area of their special interests--and they are assigned the elementary courses at that; their research interests are frequently subordinated to the interests of senior staff people; the chairman must render decisions on such matters with substantial wisdom--decisions that can neither be delegated nor shunted aside. "These allocative decisions, being highly personal," states Patton, "become an inevitable part of the burden of anxiety which the chairman cannot delegate. But in making them, he is turning careers in directions which may continue for life."

\[10\]

\[\text{Ibid.}, \ p. \ 460.\]
A helpful study was done by Aldmon on the problem of establishing "critical behavioral requirements" of the department head, as derived from data collected from three institutions of higher learning: the University of Tennessee at Knoxville; the University of the South, Sewanee, Tennessee; and Western Carolina College, Cullowhee, North Carolina. His investigation encompassed the following sub-problems: (1) gathering statements of behavioral practices from department heads and staff members; (2) establishing and categorizing critical tasks of department heads; (3) analyzing, describing, and categorizing effective behavioral practices of department heads; (4) analyzing, describing, and categorizing ineffective behavioral practices of department heads; and (5) setting forth critical behavioral requirements.

Aldmon employed a modified version of Flanagan's Critical Incident Technique in gathering his data. His research instrument in the study consisted of cards on which the respondents described situations in which the department head performed practices, services, or activities, described the department head's behavior in handling various situations, and offered the reasons as to why the respondents felt these behaviors were most or least effective.

Evaluation of the effective incidents by Aldmon yielded thirty-one critical tasks performed by department heads. Abstracted

most frequently was the task, "establishing and maintaining working relationships with staff members." Further, thirty-nine critical tasks were abstracted from incidents in which the department head performed least effectively. But again, "establishing and maintaining working relationships with staff members" occurred most frequently, establishing a positive correlation between these two items.

When these two foregoing lists were combined, some forty different or distinct critical tasks of department heads were formulated. Aldmon's analysis of the combined lists established ten critical task areas or categorizations as significant, as follows: curriculum, instruction, institutional operation, public relations, staff personnel, student personnel, finance and business management, physical facilities, evaluation, and department operation. Upon inductively grouping these items within the ten task areas, and using the frequency of reports of tasks as a criterion, he found the department head's function in the area of "staff personnel" as most significant.

That investigator also found thirty-seven effective behaviors to be represented in 255 statements of effective behaviors abstracted from the effective incidents. The effective behavior of the department heads which appeared most often was the one stating that the head "takes initiative in promoting needed action." Seven significant categories emerged from the list of
thirty-seven behaviors; they were these: integrity and self-control, consideration, cooperative planning, scientific problem solving, change, communication, and management. The effective behaviors of department heads reported most often were those grouped under the category of "cooperative planning." Conversely, when Aldmon evaluated forty distinct behaviors drawn from some 205 statements of ineffective behaviors, he again found another positive correlation, in that the factor cited most often was that the department head "fails to discuss problems with those persons concerned." The same behavioral categories which emerged from the effective behaviors were also produced from the ineffective behaviors. Again, departmental head behaviors grouped in the category "cooperative planning" were reported most frequently.

Aldmon found that seven positive, significant, or "critical," behavioral "requirements" were indicated for the department head. They may be stated as follows. The effective department head: acts with personal integrity and displays emotional stability in administrative performances; shows consideration for others; provides for cooperative planning; seeks the resolution of problems through scientific procedures of problem solving; realizes that change is inevitable, that it should be evolutionary, and that change should be tailored to the established needs within the department; communicates freely and effectively with personnel at various levels; and the effective department head provides for proper management of the department.
Another investigator, Doyle, studied the operation of the department chairman in thirty-three selected colleges of liberal arts under private auspices and having minimal enrollments of 500 students. Liberal arts colleges of universities were not included because, as he observed, the conditions under which the chairman functions in a university were likely affected by the policies and practices operative with respect to the professional and graduate schools of the university. All but eight of the institutions which he studied were church-related.

Doyle found that the status of the chairman is influenced by a complex of factors determined by the policies of the college administration, among which were: the method of selecting the chairman, his qualifications, and the scope of the chairman's participation in committees, administrative and advisory boards, and in the faculty senate.

His data revealed that department chairmen were principally selected on the bases of three criteria—previous teaching experience, outstanding teaching ability, and administrative talent. Relatively lesser weight in the chairman's appointment was placed upon the following attributes, though they were considerations: productive scholarship, national reputation, ability to deal

---

harmoniously with others, evidence of published research, and church activity in the church-related colleges.

Reporting on the general duties of departmental chairmen, Doyle's investigation set forth these as predominant: teaching; supervision of teaching in the department; and administrative duties that included budgeting, responsibility for the statement of departmental aims and offerings, maintenance of the department library, keeping of personnel records for faculty and student personnel, and other assorted duties such as personal research and that of representing the department and institution at various meetings. The duty-distribution indicated that department chairmen were primarily functioning as teachers and secondarily as administrators. Doyle's data disclosed that the subject chairmen of his study, unlike their counterparts in large departments of major institutions, devoted the major portion of their time as chairmen to student instruction, counseling, and the sponsorship of student activities.

A brief but interesting vignette of the department head's role was presented in the form of a paper\(^{13}\) at the annual meeting of the American Association of Collegiate Schools of Business in Chicago, Illinois, on April 25, 1962, by Dr. John F. Mee. Professor Mee, former chairman of the Department of Management in the

---

School of Business at Indiana University, reflected upon his fifteen years of service in that post and set forth some of his perceptions of the departmental executive's attributes and responsibilities. While the paper was limited to a consideration of the role of chairmen of departments in schools of business, nevertheless, several generic observations and conclusions were made and are worthy of record here.

A chairman or head, asserts Professor Mee, should have certain basic attitudes, knowledges, and proficiencies, as follows:

1. A general knowledge of the functional areas and disciplines of the school or college of which his department is a part. This basic knowledge permits the chairman to understand the relationship of his department to the wider profession and to the other associated departments and disciplines of the same school.

2. Knowledge of the current research and literature, of the professional leaders, of the professional associations and societies, of new instructional methods and technologies, and of the trends in the field which his department represents.

3. Ability to visualize and design a curriculum with proper course offerings for his departmental area, keeping in mind that this curriculum must be ever creative and sensitive to the changing conditions of society.

4. Talent for attracting and recruiting an outstanding faculty in the best balanced interests of the teaching, research,
publication, and public service facets of the departmental contribution to the school. The chairman's ultimate success hinges upon the performance of his faculty.

5. Administrative skills requisite to the development of faculty members and to forestall their becoming obsolescent. This involves providing the resources and possibilities for continuing research, publication, and participation in the professional association programs of the departmental field.

6. Ability to develop professional contacts with outside agencies, such as those of government, foundations, business, and other institutions for the benefit of his department faculty and students.

7. Professional competency for attracting and developing superior students, graduate and undergraduate, for his department.

8. An attitude that he, as chairman, is a provider and not a competitor for his faculty; he insures a proper climate and the resources to foster the teaching, research, and publication needs of the faculty.

9. An attitude that welcomes innovation and creativity; the chairman invites criticism and evaluation of departmental programs.

10. A positive view of a value system that establishes fair norms of faculty productivity and rewards consistent with the results and contributions toward the total program.
11. Ability to achieve his satisfactions through the performance of the faculty to whom he, as chairman or head, is responsible. His efforts are channeled into the facilitative forces for his faculty.

12. Endeavor to find the time to engage in research, in order to hold the respect and cooperation of his faculty.

13. As department head, always to strive to preserve a paramount sense of loyalty to the larger institution.

Several significant findings resulted from a study of leadership and administration in 22 departments in the liberal arts college of a moderately large university made by an earlier investigator in this field. This earlier study explored the relationship between the leader behavior of the department administrator and the reputation of his department for being well administered; another facet of the investigation was to determine the usefulness of reputational data as criteria of administrative quality. Some of the more important findings were these:

1. There is some relationship between the style of leadership of the department chairman as this is viewed by department members and the department reputation on the campus for being well

---

or poorly administered. This conclusion seemed to be especially true if the actual behavior of the department chairman is viewed from the standpoint of what is held to be "ideal" behavior by members of his department.

2. Departments that achieve a reputation for good administration are those led by chairmen who attend to two facets of leadership concerned with (a) organizing departmental activities and initiating new ways of solving department problems and (b) at the same time developing warm considerate relationships with members of the department.

3. There was a lack of significant relationship between the faculty members' general impression of various characteristics of their departments and the campus reputation of the department's administration. This finding enhances the earlier reported finding of relationship between the behavior of the department chairman and administrative reputation and makes it more significant. Also, it points to chairman behavior specifically, rather than to a general impression about the department, as the more likely determiner of "reputation."

4. The significance of administration in large (compared with smaller) departments is well recognized by deans and other central officials of the college administration, and that in selecting department heads for larger departments more care was used. Therefore, chairmen of very small departments might be appointed on
the basis of seniority with little regard for other qualifications, but in large departments demonstrated ability to assume administrative responsibility would be a prerequisite to appointment.

A recent investigation of administrative practices in the teaching departments of a large Midwestern university was made by Haas and Collen. They noted and related their study to the theoretical concept that the prevalence of formal, systematic administrative procedures directly increases with organizational size. That is, "policies and procedural rules are usually promulgated in an organization to offer guide lines for action when many persons have to make many decisions on a wide variety of problems." The principal data for the Haas-Collen report were obtained through interviews with the chairmen of over 80 departments of the subject institution, augmented by information drawn from various records and other interview material.

The Haas-Collen study included the following questions posed to department chairmen: (1) What is the typical procedure used to fill faculty vacancies in your department? (2) How do you tell whether or not a faculty member in your department is fulfilling his position in a satisfactory manner? and (3) Have you ever had a faculty member who had tenure but was consistently performing in an unsatisfactory manner? If so, what is usually done?

---


16 Ibid., p. 46.
In their investigation, three types of departmental decisions were treated: hiring of faculty members, evaluation of staff members' performance, and the procedures for handling incompetent personnel. Some of their findings were these: in the processes of hiring and evaluation, procedural formalization was found to increase as both the size of the department and frequency of decision-making increase, but repetitiveness of decision-making is the factor which tends to produce increased formalization rather than size per se; formalization of procedures for dealing with incompetent personnel is not as intimately related to departmental size as are the practices in hiring and evaluation; high-prestige departments rely more consistently on formalized methods of assaying the performance of staff members; high-prestige departments do not differ from those on the other extreme in the extent of formalization of procedures involving the disposition of the cases of tenured but unsatisfactory personnel; and, departments of the social sciences and humanities employ more humanistic methods in handling unsatisfactory performers than those used in the administration of staff relations in other departments.
CHAPTER III

THE DEPARTMENTAL SYSTEM OF ORGANIZATION

An Historical Antecedent

It is difficult to trace with certainty the earliest origins of many of the organizational patterns which have evolved among the world's institutions of higher education. In America, however, Harvard, as the nation's oldest center of collegiate learning, has had the distinction of establishing many precedents that have later found favor in other universities of the United States. The departmental system of academic organization seems conclusively to be a case in point. President Eliot of Harvard recorded the genesis of this major innovation:

The influence of the Harvard Board of Overseers is not exerted through criticism and inquiry only. Their action has sometimes been constructive in a high degree. Thus in 1766 it was the Board of Overseers, and not the President and Fellows, that accomplished the great reform of making the college instruction departmental by subject. Before that date one tutor had been assigned to each entering

class, and had taught that class in all its subjects for four years. At the instance of the Board of Overseers, each tutor thereafter taught the same subject, or kindred subjects, to all the four classes. The president and the three professors of that day had already dealt with their several subjects before each successive class; so that all the instruction in the College became from that data departmental.

Thus, almost two hundred years ago, an academic pattern was launched which would subsequently be adopted and modified by virtually all of the nation's two thousand colleges and universities. Through the years, the cumulative effect exerted by the general adoption of the departmental system has indeed been profound. For the direction of scholarly affairs has been charted in large measure by decisions made in reference to the teaching, research, and service functions that derive from the departmental establishment.

American higher education today is in a state of flux. Urgent needs are seen to define its goals and purposes and to refine its programs and practices. Historically, the mission of higher learning has been to discover and conserve knowledge and to extend and transmit knowledge. While the "ivory tower" concept of collegiate existence may have had a legitimate place in earlier ages, the fact is that the manifold functions of knowledge give great utility to contemporary universities, which find themselves deeply involved in the ongoing processes of the social, cultural, political, religious, and economic aspects of our nation and the world.

As enrollments expand, as academic programs proliferate, as more claims are placed upon the institutions of higher education
by all sectors of our society, these institutions shall increasingly feel an economic "pinch" in adequately supporting their multiform and variegated programs. Consequently, there is and shall continue to be a pressing need for evaluation of institutions in all of their components in a ceaseless effort to improve their internal effectiveness and external service.

Departmental Origins at Ohio State

From its inception as the Ohio Agricultural and Mechanical College, The Ohio State University has utilized the departmental system of academic organization. Then, as now, institutional purpose and direction were issues, and it was not without some rancor and protracted discussion that the new institution's Board of Trustees was finally able to reach a decision on the College's curricula and structure.

Much of the controversy centered upon the issue of a broad gauge education, incorporating the liberal, scientific, and classical studies along with the agricultural, practical, and mechanical arts, versus a program that would be restricted virtually to the latter.

At a meeting of the Board on January 6, 1871, a special committee of the Trustees offered a resolution recommending the adoption of a plan for the College's organization, providing for ten departments, as originally formulated and submitted by Joseph
Sullivant in September, 1870. In language that today seems relatively quaint, this committee presented its report:

The committee to which has been referred the various propositions relating to the course of instruction in our institution, begs leave to report, as indicating the general scope to be ultimately embraced without going into details, and principally with a view of guiding us in the construction of our new buildings, the following schedule of the departments to serve as a basis in the organization of the Ohio Agricultural and Mechanical College:

1. Department of Agriculture.
2. Department of Mechanic Arts.
5. Geology, Mining, and Metallurgy.
8. English Language and Literature.
9. Modern and Ancient Languages.
10. Department of Political Economy and Civil Polity.

By accepting the report and adopting the plan, the Trustees thus charted the course for the new institution, conceived in a broad and liberal program and destined to become a major University.

Today, The Ohio State University is in the process of assessing the adequacy of its academic organization. At present, the University is divided into ten colleges and a Graduate School, whose subdivisions comprise ninety departments of instruction, including ten schools.

---

2Alexis Cope, History of The Ohio State University, 1870-1910 (Edited by Thomas C. Mendenhall), The Ohio State University Press, Columbus, 1920, Vol. 1, pp. 36, 37, 102, 103.
Some Dynamics of Organization

The academic department is not a self-sufficient nor independent unit of operation. It interacts with and is dependent upon the larger college complex and its parent university structure in virtually every aspect of its function, be it research, student interchange, financial support, the formulation of academic policies and standards, and all the rest. Moreover, at least three aspects or accessory forces of organization usually come into play in departmental administration: the formal component, the informal component, and the extradepartmental component. These three elements also interact and wield their influences with varying degrees of effect upon the program of the departments.

The formal element of operation is prescribed in University rules and regulations which flow from established policy and structure, and it is implemented through delegated responsibility and authority invested in the chairman. It is common for the chairman to assign some of his responsibilities to staff members or committees.

The informal aspect of the department is composed of those relationships that derive from the communications among faculty members, their professional and personal interests, their friendships or cliques. The informal structure of a department forms a kind of sub-culture, often built around professional areas or divisions that are within but subordinate to the parent discipline.
of the department itself. The main thrust of a department and the decisions of its faculty may be affected by the power alignments associated with one or the other of these informal constituents of the department.

The third or extradepartmental element that may operate in a departmental organization is principally attributable to the control exerted by outside agencies, that is, by national or regional associations that exercise some influence or supervision over curriculum, accreditation, facilities, library resources, educational levels of staff members, research funds, and the like. The influence of these extra-institutional bodies on departmental decisions is often profound, for departments must be conscious of and in reasonable conformity with professional standards that transcend the University's own governance.

It is often difficult to sift out the relative weights of these three organizational forces or to identify them separately and specifically, but that they do in fact exist and exert kinetic influences upon the department and sway its deliberative and operational processes may be discerned from the lines of reasoning implicit in many of the respondent comments.

Contemporary Organizational Perceptions at Ohio State

Basically, the departmental system of academic organization, as such, seemed to be sound, although some personnel
expressed dissatisfaction with a specific department's location within a particular college. Their feelings were that some departments could operate with greater functional and administrative effectiveness if assigned to other colleges which were deemed to be more congenial to a particular discipline. As one professor observed, "Real problems are created for a college in which a large number of faculty members don't identify with the majority of the faculty of that college."

A rather different approach was taken by other respondents who felt that the particular college to which departments are allocated, and even the overall institutional organization itself, are not the most significant factors determining departmental and institutional viability. Such a position may be summarized in this fashion: departments preceded colleges in our University history, and the way our departments are presently dispersed among the respective colleges can be eminently successful if perceptive administrators and staff members are available at all levels to implement the system. In sum, when special problems exist, they are more likely to arise because of inflexible attitudes and partisan commitments of departmental personnel than because of the schema of organization.

Nevertheless, considerable opinion was developed that indicated excessive disciplinary fragmentation, which calls for more structural flexibility and administrative acumen. A central administrator analyzed the problem in this manner:
Of course, we need to have an everchanging structure at all levels, but my deep concern, though, is that there is a tendency to create new departments as an expediency in the attempt to solve the problems presented by existing deficiencies in administrative leadership on the department or college levels. I see greater need now for departmental consolidation than for a proliferation of departments. But some pressures to departmentalize to a greater degree stem from national emphases and professional specialization.

But the impact of increased professional specialization, which is the genesis of departmental proliferation, was unavoidable and irreversible in the view of this professor:

The departmental system destroys some of the overall perspective in our college, but information in our field is exploding so fast we wouldn't dare deemphasize the specialized nature of our program as is best represented in the departmental type of organization.

Then, too, academic formalization must consider the presence of a specialized degree as a determinant of organization; a chairman observed:

I think the University is overextended in its number of departments. Departments are not needed in non-degree-granting areas. But if you have a degree attached to a subject area, then you need a departmental organization to supervise that special degree.

Faced with these differences of views on the number, diversity, and allocation of departments, it is also noteworthy that departmental size in either extreme of being "too-large" or
"too-small" is also of serious moment, as illustrated by the following comments:

A faculty member:

I favor the departmental system, but with modifications. A department should be small enough that a chairman can be in touch with the research, teaching, and other activities of his individual staff members. Our department is too large. The advantages of keeping departmental size down to about 25 faculty members are provable.

A faculty member:

When a department meets and its personnel are comparative strangers to one another, then I say the department may be too large.

A central administrator:

Some departments are too small. As a yardstick, I would say that if a discipline is not represented by at least fifteen faculty members on a particular staff, then this operation should become allied with another department.

In cases where departments were too large, alternatives were suggested:

A department chairman:

Our department is harder to administer because of size, and I recommend modification. We must have established subordinate divisions of the department. As an alternative, we're thinking of a school of ________; I would prefer a school housing a number of departments, which would break up this present department into three or more departments under the school. The school would also draw in several other departments of the college.
A professor:

When a department becomes large it ought to be coordinated and unified by a central head who will promote its unified purpose. There needs to be a clear recognition of the importance of coordination between the various areas within the department. We're moving toward part-time coordinators to head our various areas, but they will be subordinate and responsible to the department chairman.

There seemed to be little doubt that a movement in the direction of greater academic cohesiveness would be a desirable objective to halt the trend toward a state of separation which impedes interdisciplinary communication and cooperation. If departmental boundaries have not been substantially breached in structure, at least it is fully recognized and widely accepted that the explosion of knowledge has clearly demonstrated the intimate inter-relatedness of previously autonomous disciplines. With cautious optimism, a central administrator spoke to this problem and suggested that its resolution turns on the tractability of professors and deans, rather than on that of chairmen:

I don't foresee much change in the offing, except we must have much closer ties between related departments. For example, the social-behavioral science departments need much improvement on this score. We have too many departments and I would like to see some amalgamation in both the social and the natural sciences. It's damaging to have related subject-matter areas separated by departmental barriers. The institute is an innovation to bridge these barriers, but our institutes are involved only
in research as a general practice. They're doing a tremendous job. I don't know what's going to come out of this President's Permanent Planning Committee on University organization--there's no more conservative group in the world than university professors. And each dean is standing in front of his little cave, club in hand, defending the past.

While much has been achieved through the uses of interdepartmental institutes, as previously noted, their principal utility has been in the pursuance of research, which leaves much to be done in instructional and service rapprochement among allied academic areas. Needed, apparently, is an administrative device (institute, or the like, with instructional emphases) that is relatively large but small enough to accommodate the educational variance conceived as desirable for faculty organization in a multidisciplinary institution. This seeming need does not suggest that departments are inadequate to the traditional tasks which they have assumed and discharged, but rather that they prove to be comparatively ineffectual in meeting many of the services expected of a comprehensive University of the present day.

When one analyzes a compilation of additional respondent observations it appears to be quite evident that new directions are sorely needed. A subjective interpretation is as follows:

1. There is entirely too much isolationism and provincialism on the part of some of the departments. The needs and
welfare of the entire University should be paramount in reconciling interdepartmental differences and concerns.

2. An overlap in academic coverage causes some friction, usually over whether a course belongs in this or that department—there is some competition for a course subject from time to time.

3. Certain departments tend to "look down" on other departments. This is attributable to a lack of knowledge and understanding among several fields of learning as to each other's discipline, and it stems in part from the traditional philosophic conflicts existing between the liberal versus the professional interests and between the general versus the specialist dialogues.

4. More problems of cooperation arise where the needed interdisciplinary approach traverses several colleges; less difficulty is experienced among departments within a given college.

5. Vested interests need to be overcome in order that smaller departments offering closely related subject matter might be consolidated.

6. The delineation of research functions, the disbursement of research funds, and the division of respective responsibilities attendant thereto, are sources of competition between kindred departments.

7. Problems of interdepartmental cooperation exist in the areas involving agreements on course credits allowed toward academic degrees and in the matter of concurrence on descriptive survey courses to be offered.
8. There should be an expansion and intensification of cross-disciplinary faculty seminars, not only within the several colleges but also in the University at large, in an effort to bridge many of the quasi-artificial barriers between areas of scholarship.

9. The practice of making joint appointments of faculty members among departments should be expanded where appropriate.

10. Greater emphasis needs to be placed upon the general education approach to higher learning, with a consequent strengthening of honors and individual study programs on interdisciplinary and interdepartmental bases. Such increased emphasis would place more responsibility on individual students, and would also meliorate to some extent the problem of increasing enrollments by lowering the pressure on the formal classroom situation. Another by-product would be that of more effective utility of existing facilities and resources, including the libraries.
Motivations of the Chairman

When a person seeks a position, or accepts one that is tendered, it is not unusual for his colleagues to speculate on the factors that motivated his interest and action. The conditions that actuate a candidate's attraction to the office of the chairmanship are no exception.

Prior to the interviews in this study, the investigator had postulated several prospective motivations that might induce potential chairmen to seek and/or accept executive leadership of departments, as follows:

a. The desire to lead, make decisions concerning, exercise authority over, and supervise others.

b. The desire to change pace and leave (or alter) his former assignment.

c. To achieve an increased salary.

d. To gain an opportunity for larger service to his academic discipline.

e. To realize prestige and gain recognition.

f. To foster higher ambitions in administration.

All of these factors were cited or alluded to with varying degrees of emphasis by various respondents, but it seems clear
that the reasons for aspiring to an office span a broad spectrum of motivations, and they cannot be reduced to the black-and-white polarizations of self-seeking or monetary causations on the one hand, or of purely altruistic or sacrificial service origins on the other. This observation was illustrated by a central administrator whose thoughtful comment bespoke his long years in academic service:

The reasons are varied and sundry, I suppose. Usually it's not for monetary considerations alone, because in many of our departments some professors get higher salaries than the chairman, although the chairmen usually receive a "wear and tear" allowance. A chairman has to give up some of his professional growth when he accepts the head job. In some few cases I've known of in the past a chairman has accepted his post when he's failed at virtually everything else, but this is not too common, fortunately.

The reasons why a particular man is offered the job vary, too. In one case you may be looking for a savage man who can come into a bum department and straighten it out.

But people want to build monuments to themselves and it's normal for a man to want to say that he's the chairman of the best department in the country. Let me say again that economics are not a motivating element for a chairman at Ohio State because salary levels are not high enough for that.

And the weathered maxim that "the job seeks the man" is still operable, especially if the candidate is outwardly aggressive in his intents; three members of the faculty remarked:

If you recognize someone wants the chairman's post so badly he can taste it, he wants status, then he's not likely to get the support he would need from
a majority of the people. There is never a shortage of people who will use political pressure. But, in this department, few people have ever wanted the chairman's job. I suppose that some might be motivated in accepting the post, however, because it would probably enhance their salary and retirement income.

The people who are the most desirous of having the chairmanship often have "Napoleonic" characteristics, and we don't want this type.

Most of us follow the Ohio State axiom that anyone who wants the job shouldn't have it. But a man with a clear talent for administration and with a desire to serve his profession may, we hope, be drafted for the job; and, he should be well paid for taking it.

And, along the same vein, an administrator expressed an allied thought:

I do not know of a single chairman who sought the job. On our campus chairmen don't accept the post for salary reasons. A chairman accepts this responsibility because he is wanted and others have confidence in him; most of us are responsive to what our colleagues think and expect of us. Most any man has ideas of his own he's like to try out in teaching, research, and service.

According to one respondent, a new breed of administrator is being formed in universities today. Men are being drawn out of teaching too early, he felt, in order to accept various administrative posts. But one positive element in this trend is that "we need and want someone in these jobs who is a bit of a
scholar and who has discovered his own administrative interests early--someone who might become an academic statesman."

The factors of enhancing one's prestige and honor, and an opportunity to stimulate academic innovations are significant reasons to interest some potential chairmen. In the vernacular of sports, one commentator reduced to simplicity the impulse to lead:

A person accepts the chairmanship for the same reasons men want to play quarterback on a football team--you want a chance to call signals--there are some plays and programs you'd like to try out--then, you want to help to develop the talents of others.

A chairman corroborated the same idea:

Money was not a factor, because I had to give up certain money-producing activities when I took the chairmanship. But the honor and prestige of it appealed to me, and I thought I could accomplish a few things to help the department.

The general culture and environment of the department undoubtedly have an influence upon a person's decision on whether or not to take the chairmanship. As one chairman indicated, he would not have been remotely interested in the position if the incumbent were to be solely a "coordinator of hoopla." It was evident, however, that the department needed and wanted a leader of some magnitude, so he took the responsibility. Implicit in his experience was the judgment that a chairman is seriously encumbered without the confidence that the faculty wanted him, had
participated in his selection, and that he had the full support of the dean in his appointment as departmental executive.

Pointing out the complex of attitudes surrounding the chairmanship, a dean observed that accepting the post transforms the career of its holder:

The man who accepts the chairmanship from another position within the department wants to give continuity to the values and programs that are already underway, so as not to jeopardize the curriculum and his colleagues. Faculty members differ greatly in the amount of respect that they have for the chairman's work; to some, it's a dirty job; while, to others, it's a fine professional opportunity for leadership of one's colleagues. Undoubtedly, prestige and status may be factors, though this would be more of a factor with off-campus aspirants. It's a hard choice for a man to accept the chairmanship of a big department because the job modifies his entire academic life.

We usually don't have men actively seeking the post. We had one case though--a professor in a department of this college was doing a lot of irrational politicking in a vain effort to get a chairmanship--but we didn't give it to him.

A strong loyalty to the University seems characteristic of older men who have accepted the chairmanship. Considerable appeal is found by some in an opportunity for larger contributions to an institution, and dedication to one's subject matter and a consuming desire to promote the advancement of disciplinary knowledge and utility are often persuasive determinants for chairmen. But disciplinary prestige alone, stated a professor, is a tenuous criterion for a chairman to bank upon:
When a man gets to be a full professor there's really no place to go up through the University, other than through a chairmanship. But if there is prestige in the job it's confined to the University alone. Prestige in administration is not carried over in the discipline nationally because the chairmen tend to fall behind in the things that bring wider recognition—that is, research and creative contributions in one's own field.

Yet, in the institution itself, there can be little doubt but that the chairmanship gives a man more influence in formulating University policies, and he is afforded a wider audience in the expression of his views, and those of his department, on academic matters.

To some, the elements of chance and propinquity were chiefly responsible for a particular person being vaulted into the chairmanship. This nuance of circumstance was cited by a professor and a chairman, respectively:

Some men became chairmen because they were caught in the stream of events rather than because they had a conscious aspiration to the chairman's post. A vacancy occurred, a person was named acting chairman and he simply stayed in there. In accepting the job, most chairmen saw in it an opportunity to exert leadership. Most people get in a rut after six, eight, or ten years and they want a change in status or duties. A departmental chairmanship fulfills this need.

I accepted this job because I enjoy working with people and I wanted to become more fully involved in decisions that have to do with the goals of the department. I suppose I assumed that I could
help the faculty move in the direction they want to go. I was available and willing to take on the tasks and was offered the opportunity.

Other possible motivations of prospective chairmen were these items mentioned by respondents: ambition for a deanship; more interest in administration than in teaching and research as personal functions; acquisition of a University "badge"; the sense of duty and commitment; the opportunity to hire faculty members and the challenge of engaging in staff development; the chance to get better secretarial service; and, to achieve the relative freedom attendant to administering the department.

The Selection and/or Reappointment of a Chairman

University Rule 13.0503, initiated by the Board of Trustees, prescribes that

there shall be a Chairman of each Department . . . who shall be the administrative head . . . of the Department. . . Each Chairman. . . shall be appointed for a term of four years by the Board of Trustees upon the nomination of the President. A Chairman. . . shall be eligible for re-appointment.

In selecting a Chairman. . ., the President shall confer with the Dean of the College involved (or with the proper administrative officer or officials if no College is involved) who, in turn, will consult with the faculty of the Department . . . as well as other appropriate University officials.

In principle, this Rule is observed throughout the University. But in practice, its construction is sufficiently broad
to allow considerable variance in its actual application, particularly with reference to the degree and methods of faculty consultation in the process of selecting a chairman. There exist not only qualitative differences among the colleges with respect to faculty participation in the selection of chairmen, but quantitative differences as well. In addition, the stage at which faculty members become involved in the selection process is another variable.

Moreover, the initiatory aspect of launching the selection process fluctuates in practice, depending upon the circumstances surrounding the vacancy in the chairmanship, i.e., the reasons for the vacancy, the advance notice of its prospective occurrence, and who takes the initiative in the process—the dean, the faculty, or the outgoing chairman.

Apropos the process of selection, one faculty member observed pensively:

The common tendency is for the dean to appoint an acting chairman and then usually recommend his confirmation as chairman. This is generally a poor procedure, but I'm happy the way it's worked out in our own department.

Another said:

We always try to 'jump the gun' on the dean in finding suitable people to fill the chairman's job. We usually get a committee to work on it right away when a vacancy exists or is impending in this position. The faculty wants to have some prospects or candidates in mind in advance of formal
action on the matter, before the dean has entered the selection process. Our faculty takes a vote on the candidate so it is possible to tell the dean, "We voted unanimously on this candidate."

Chairmen are very strong links in the college chain, and choosing them is a most important decision. Obviously, filling an executive post is not a popularity contest, and the selection process must go forward on terms that consider foremost the particular needs of a department at a particular juncture in its development. Patently, these factors will vary from time to time, from college to college, and from department to department. Perhaps the most formalized procedure for faculty consultation and clear-cut methodology of selecting and/or reappointing departmental chairmen is that in use in the College of Arts and Sciences. The personnel of that College also seemed to have fewer and less intensive feelings of ambiguity about the selection process than staff members of the other colleges included in this study. For those reasons, the methodology used in that College is set forth here and it is generally characteristic of the procedures utilized by the other colleges.

Procedures used in the College of Arts and Sciences.--(1)

Search for and selection of a new chairman. When the search is about to begin for a new department chairman, the dean calls a general meeting of the faculty of the department concerned and makes known the conditions and methods to be followed in searching for and selecting the new chairman. The dean reminds the faculty
that filling the department chairman's post is considered as a major replacement, and he asks staff members to do much soul-and-mind-searching about the department's needs. Every member of the departmental faculty has a responsibility in getting the best man that may be found to fill the chairmanship, subject to certain realistic limitations (salary, etc.) that are outlined. In this meeting, the dean asks that all staff members consider the type of leadership needed by the department over the ensuing years, and he informs the faculty that they will have opportunities to suggest the names of prospects for the chairmanship, including the names of their colleagues already in the department, and to assist in an evaluation of the whole field of candidates. The dean also apprises faculty members that they may propose any modification of these search-selection procedures that they deem to be desirable changes.

Each member of the departmental faculty is requested to write a letter to the dean, briefly outlining the type of individual thought to be needed as department chairman, and suggesting three names of members of the department to serve on the Departmental Search Committee. At the same time, faculty members are requested to indicate in the letter the name of any member of the department who should be considered as a candidate for the departmental chairmanship, so that, if there is considerable support for some individual candidate in this category, he would not be chosen to
serve on the Departmental Search Committee. From the information contained in these letters to the dean from faculty members, the dean selects a Search Committee and notifies the department of the persons chosen for service on this Committee. The Committee, composed of from three to five members in the department, then begins its search by soliciting the names of prospective candidates from members of the department faculty, from chairmen of other departments, and from any other available sources.

After gathering substantial information on the recommended candidates for the chairmanship, the Departmental Search Committee brings the list and its supporting data before the department membership for discussion. Customarily, the list is greatly reduced as a result of this open discussion of candidates. From the remaining names, the department decides the question of which specific candidates are to be concentrated on, and then letters of evaluation and recommendation are collected on the most promising prospects for the office. Another review by the department usually results in decisions upon the candidates to be invited in for interviews.

Before interview invitations are extended to candidates, however, another committee, the Dean's Advisory Committee, comes into action. This Committee performs a significant function because, in the selection of persons to fill major offices such as the chairmanship, it is important if not crucial to have the good will and concurrence of closely allied departments and essential
to have the approval of certain administrative officers. To assure this understanding, therefore, the Dean's Advisory Committee is composed of the Vice President for Instruction and Dean of the Faculties, the Vice President for Research, the Dean of the Graduate School, and includes several members of departments closely associated with the particular department whose chairmanship is to be filled.

This Committee provides the dean with assistance in examining and evaluating both the total list and the reduced list of candidates. In advising him, it is one of the responsibilities of the Dean's Advisory Committee to insure that the department is not collecting the names of prospects of mediocre stature and, generally, to see that the department is not being either too conservative or too ambitious in its listing of prospective candidates. This committee also meets with the persons selected for interviews, and it may offer suggestions to the Departmental Search Committee of possible candidates, and of people who might evaluate them, and they also may write directly to personal or professional friends who know the candidate under consideration.

After the interviews, reactions of the department toward individual candidates are assessed by the Search Committee, and the dean determines the reaction of the Dean's Advisory Committee. Following these steps, the Search Committee chairman meets with the Advisory Committee to discuss the department's views.
this discussion, judgments are made as to whether enough good candidates for the departmental chairmanship are under consideration to result in a selection, whether or not the search should be continued, or what further action should be taken. All along the line of this process, the objectives and efforts of all concerned are to conclude the search with decisions that focus on several of the best qualified and interested candidates, rather than on one alone. For, it is pointed out that final selection of the chairman from a group of well-qualified candidates strengthens the position of the chosen man with the department, the dean's office, and with central administration.

Having thus consulted with and received the counsel of the department and his Advisory Committee, the dean submits the name and credentials of his recommended selection for the chairmanship to the president. Each department chairman is appointed for a term of four years by the Board of Trustees upon the nomination of the president. Chairmen are eligible for reappointment.

(2) The review and reappointment of a chairman. Far from being perfunctory, reappointment of a chairman is contingent upon the results of a thorough review of his performance in the previous four-year term and upon assessment of the departmental milieu. Near the end of the chairman's term, the dean talks with him to ascertain the presence and nature of any departmental problems and asks him if he is willing and amenable to continuing in the
chairman's post. (If the chairman desires to be relieved, and is adamant about it, or is neither persuaded nor asked to continue in the post, then the search for a new chairman is instituted under the procedures previously outlined.)

If the chairman is willing to continue in his post, the dean then visits each departmental staff member in the faculty member's own office and poses to him two questions which pertain to the chairman's service: "What are the strengths and weaknesses of the departmental administration?" and "As a faculty member, you had personal and professional expectations when you joined this department and this institution--are you living up to these expectations?"

After completing his survey of the department in this manner, the dean organizes and evaluates these responses from which he is able to derive a judgment of the situation. He then discusses his findings with the chairman, along with the chairman's reactions and appraisals, and together they arrive at a decision as to whether the chairman may continue in his position and, if any special circumstances are prescribed, under what conditions he may continue as department chairman. If the dean's decision is in favor of continuance, he transmits this recommendation with supporting data to the president who may submit the chairman's name to the Board for reappointment.

With only a few exceptions, wide agreement in all of the colleges favored the retention of the "present methods" of selecting
department chairmen, given the University rules as prescribed, and given the disparate understandings of the process and the flexibility that prevails in actual practice among the various colleges. The four-year review and the procedures for considering the chairman's reappointment also met with general favor.

Virtually no one at any level supported a rotational form of chairmanship, principally on the grounds that the rotational concept types the position as one which constitutes an unwelcome burden to be accepted reluctantly and held as briefly as protocol allows. A central administrator expressed his concern that the conditions of appointment not be misconstrued:

I would be dissatisfied with the present system if it were thought that the four-year review of chairmen is a rotational concept. The review is good, but we are not seeking a rotating chairmanship nor the idea of a four-year "term." If the chairmen are well chosen, and if they continue to do an effective job, then an atmosphere of permanency should pervade their appointment, subject to review. There should not be a 'temporary' concept associated with this position.

In the opinion of another central administrator, neither the process of selection nor that of review is satisfactory:

I'm not entirely satisfied with the present system, either in selection or in review. Our departments are so different. In the small departments, administration is relatively minor. In any case, the selection of a chairman is not a popularity contest. And a grave mistake is committed when you try to get a great researcher to give up his first love for the burden of administration.
As to the four-year review of the chairman's appointment, we should have continuous review. This review procedure is not working as well as it should, except in one college. After all, the president, the deans, and other administrators are always under review. Chairmen should be reviewed at least annually. But, when all is said and done, the responsibilities and sacrifices of department chairmen are not being recognized adequately or monetarily. In effect, chairmen are taking a cut in salary.

It was obvious that faculty members of several departments thought that the four-year review is largely perfunctory and mechanical. Not so, said this chairman, who also offered his opinion of a rotating assignment:

I know first-hand that review is practiced in our college. The dean talked with every member of my faculty before recommending my reappointment. For this kind of department, rotation is not the answer—it might work in a small, intimate department where the chairman's duties are not too heavy. But, in any event, the term should probably be longer than four years.

The dynamics behind review, as a means of improving administrative practice, were set forth by this central administrator:

We have a very good arrangement, if it is followed. The four-year formal review, preparatory to reappointment of a chairman, can be used to great advantage in negotiating with the chairman as to how he can become a better chairman. It is a time of stock-taking, the faculty is consulted about it, and natural expression is given to faculty opinion that might not otherwise be expressed. And in an outfit like this we have to put a lot of credence in the dean's recommendation which carries a lot of weight in the final decision.
The concluding statement of the above passage embodies the dean's substantial role in influencing the selection or reappointment of a chairman. A dean characterized his approach to the process in this way:

Sometimes I appoint a committee and at other times the department selects a committee to screen candidates. I'm very well satisfied with the system; if I weren't, I'd try to change it. If in any case I found myself in disagreement with a departmental faculty in the choice or reappointment of a chairman, I would tell them that I would send their recommendation to the President along with the one I wished to present, stating the reasons for our respective choices and giving the basis of my stand, and then the President can make his choice.

This dean's method of operation quite clearly includes a thorough consultation with the departmental faculty in the assessment of a candidate's qualifications, and his approach takes account of the fact, as a professor observed, that "the chairman has to work with his departmental staff, so it's only proper that the faculty should express their opinions and desires in his selection." Another professor stated the same conviction in a different manner:

I would strongly recommend that the dean not submit for approval the name of any man for the chairman's job who does not have the endorsement of the department faculty. Stars sometime emerge within the faculty, and, when you balance all factors, the faculty is apt to be very wise in selecting its chairman.
While the faculty usually has the opportunity to participate in the chairman's selection and review, admittedly in varying degrees among the colleges, University rules do not rigidly bind the deans to necessarily follow faculty recommendations or decisions on this matter. But faculty members are sensitive to those cases in which their opinions are not sufficiently sought or weighed, as this professor's words attest:

The rules and protocol of selecting a chairman are not always observed in this college and, from what I hear, in other parts of the University either. More consultation of the faculty needs to be practiced, and wider alternatives in selection should be offered.

But, the above statement runs counter to the opinion of a central administrator, who favors consultation but cautions against a faculty vote; favoring a strong executive selected by the administration, he asserts:

I don't favor much of our present system. I don't think the faculty should have a right to select the chairman--for that's a clear way to perpetuate mediocrity. It's fine to consult them, but faculty assent or a vote shouldn't be required. I agree with consultation all the way down the line, but a faculty vote on the choice of a chairman is just not called for. Chairmen are part of the key management team and you can't operate a department like a happy anarchy, as a lot of faculty people would like to do. I prefer the department "head," and no man should serve in that job beyond age 65.
Similar reservations were expressed by other personnel who felt that the present system, as practiced, has its weaknesses and allows flagrant abuses. Instances were cited in which it was alleged that the faculty had deliberately picked "weak persons" to be chairmen, individuals who could easily be manipulated, so that the faculty might thus operate with a minimum of supervision or interference. An administrator said that this \textit{laissez faire} attitude was exemplified by one faculty member who told him seriously that "we don't need a department chairman--our only need is a good secretary." While this type of statement may be heard occasionally, this investigator did not find either the comment or the attitude behind it to be widely prevalent. To the contrary, most staff members hold firmly to the view that so many more advantages accrue to departments which are led by strong and able chairmen that they would not have it otherwise.
Ordway Tead has asserted that administration is "the function within an organization which is responsible for establishing its objects, purposes, aims or ends, for implementing the necessary organizing and operating steps, and for assuring adequate performance toward the desired end." Commonly, the administrative process is understood to comprise the functions of planning, organizing, budgeting, staffing, directing, coordinating, evaluating, and reporting. At one time or another, an executive will find all of these component activities to be useful, if not essential, to effective administrative practice. These eight facets of administration are generic to the management enterprise, whether in business or in education. But it must be quite evident that no two administrators would bring the same experience, competencies, strengths, or interests to bear in the use of these various processes.

---

University rules charge the department chairman with the duty to carry out specific administrative responsibilities (refer to Appendixes B and C). His relative success in discharging these functions depends, in part, upon the understanding and acceptance of the administrative process by the chairman and by those which it effects. It is helpful, therefore, to examine the views and evaluations of various personnel associated in this process. Central administrators and deans seemed intensely responsive to this subject.

A central administrator observed:

I have several comments on the chairman as administrator. Many departments underemphasize the process of selecting new staff members, which is the most crucial aspect of university life. I sometimes think more care is taken in selecting departmental secretaries than is used in choosing new faculty members. In the second place, not enough time is spent in planning for growth and development. A third deficiency is the unavailability of some chairmen at certain times of the year when they are sorely needed to resolve problems that arise when they arise. Yet, these same chairmen are highly critical of central administration when decisions on other matters are not forthcoming immediately. When a chairman is not on hand to give coverage, he should delegate some responsible person to be in charge who has the capability and authority to act in behalf of the chairman and the department. This problem is often thrown into bold relief on the matter of approving graduate students for admission; their applications are referred to the departments for evaluation, and if the chairmen don't act promptly a time lag occurs, admissions are delayed, and these students may choose to enter some other institution—yet, many of the chairmen and the students misplace their blame upon the admissions office instead.
A dean stated:

We have in this college one chairman who won't administer— he thinks 'administration' is a dirty word, and we have to jog him up occasionally. Another chairman likes to make a small job in a small department take up all of his time, whereas he actually has time for teaching and other duties; he is a classic example of Parkinson's Law in operation.

A central administrator offered his view:

Some chairmen apparently lack the knowledge of just what the administrative process is, while others lack the courage to make this process operative— it's so nice to be a good fellow. My predecessor on this job said of one department chairman, 'He presides over his department, and if there is chaos he presides over chaos.'

A central administrator asserted:

In general, the whole process of administration is given secondary attention by the chairman; they often view this process as a nuisance; they want to bypass administrative detail, partly because of their dual role and their primary identification with the faculty.

A central administrator stated:

The administrative process is used in very different ways by chairmen. Some are dictators, yet some are thoroughly democratic; some are active, and others are doing nothing— they're dead weights. Some of these chairmen are presiding over departments that need leadership, yet they're not giving leadership but are spending their time in peripheral activities of no importance.

The foregoing comments were incisive and critical appraisals of the chairman in his administrative role. Two additional comments focus on the chairman in a bit different light.
A dean observed:

Some chairmen attempt to operate so democratically that they do it at the price of sacrificing efficiency, but in so doing they may gain in other areas such as strengthening their relationships and rapport with their faculties; thus, a chairman's leadership may be exerted through encouragement of faculty progress, and I think it important to remember that people often set higher goals for themselves than any superior would dare to impose.

A central administrator stated his opinion:

I think that dreaming is another important component of the administrative process—the ability and time to use the quality of imagination. Some parts of our academic program that are generally accepted today were just wild dreams ten years ago. Then, there's still another aspect of this process that is significant; it's this, and I quote Paul Buck who made the statement at a presidential inauguration several years ago: 'The art of administration is in the ability of an administrator to allow the faculty to push him in the direction he wants to go.'

A common complaint was that chairmen are so preoccupied with doing that which is immediately and pressingly at hand, that little or no time is found to devote to the planning and reflective aspects of executive leadership. Respondents voiced their concerns quite explicitly and precisely.

A professor said:

I notice a functional imbalance in favor of budgeting. Planning and organizing are perhaps the most important aspects of departmental administration, but they are postponable and therefore get less attention than budgeting.
A chairman stated:

The administrative elements of planning and deliberation should take more of my time, but the urgent needs for decisions press upon you and not enough time is devoted to these two important aspects of administration.

Another chairman observed:

The coordinating and control functions are more time-consuming than other elements of the administrative process; the proper flow of communications requires this. Administrators should have more time for planning and for exercising good human relations.

Some disparate views were expressed on relative emphasis to be given to the coordinating function.

A professor stated:

Coordinating is really the chairman's *raison d'être*—this element of the administrative process is the most significant part.

A central administrator said this:

Many chairmen do manifest disparities in their attention to the various elements of the administrative process. For example, there is often a lack in the 'directing' aspect of administration. 'Planning' is frequently pretty sparse. Sometimes overdone is the 'coordinating' aspect, then the chairman has to justify this and make it look like a program. In some cases the man is fulfilling a clerical role and is not an administrator.

A chairman observed:

I put more emphasis on coordination, though I control the personnel budget and handle this myself, acting under some advice.
A considerable divergence of opinion and much ambivalence existed on the matter of whether or not the chairman of a large department should, or can, continue to teach and do research concurrently with his administrative duties. And the attitudinal divisions on this question, interestingly enough, did not accord with any degree of uniformity to the respondent's role in the University. Convictions on this problem varied as much between central administrators themselves as it varied between these administrators and members of the teaching staff. The whole spectrum of divergent opinion existed in each separate group of respondents, from the polar extreme of "no, research and teaching are impossible and out-of-the-question for chairmen," to that of "yes, by all means, the chairman must continue his research and teaching activities."

Images of the Chairman

The department chairman is a pivotal front-line administrator whose actions determine in large measure the academic character of the institution—so it was almost universally agreed among those interviewed on this question. As one staff member put it, "As the chairman goes, so goes his department; as the departments go, so goes the University." Indeed, it was the general consensus that chairmen, through their regular, grass-root decisions, exercise more influence on institutional program than is wielded by any other administrative segment. A dean expressed it this way:
The chairman has the key job, the most important job on the campus. He has to interpret administration to faculty and faculty to administration. He sets the tone for his department, evaluates the performance of his faculty, extends the recognition and remuneration of his faculty—so he wields a powerful influence for good or bad over a notably independent faculty.

A central administrator said:

When you look at the cumulative effect of the day-to-day decisions of chairmen, these decisions shape the destiny of the institution, whereas no one decision on one particular day has much effect. Much depends on the chairman's view of his own role. If they think they are solely to 'keep the peace' then they've missed their mission. A chairman should be a leader, but much depends on the quality of his faculty and the needs of the department as determinants of whether or not the chairman functions as a presiding officer or as a more absolute leader.

According to several respondents, a tendency is evident among numerous faculty members to view the chairman as a sort of knight or captain who leads their ranks in forays upon the administration. A central administrator gave a terse analysis of this view:

There is a misunderstanding of the role of the chairmen. Some members of the faculty think that the chairman should be a 'front' for them and represent them before the 'enemy' administration. These are not feudal days when a department faculty is trying to storm someone's castle.

A professor felt that every administration encourages chairmen to be powerful figures, and "some chairmen deserve it and
others don't." He was distressed at what he termed the administration's inclination to ignore the talents of many professors--to consider them as a kind of employee--which has deleterious effects upon faculty morale, although this circumstance is not always the chairman's fault. "It seems to me that the faculty voice at the University level is being downgraded," asserted one chairman who decried faculty impotence and favored an investment of greater influence in the faculty rather than in chairmen.

Another chairman declared:

A chairman's influence can be very great indeed, but his relative influence depends upon his own strengths and skills and on those of his organization. The chairmen sit on the executive committee of this college, but this is not the practice in all of the colleges of the University. Outside of these factors, much of the chairman's role depends a lot on how it is viewed by central administration.

Three professors voiced similar opinions:

Chairmen carry a great deal of responsibility in representing their departments, but not all chairmen carry the same weight in presenting their opinions before the councils of the mighty.

Chairmen are influential in setting the academic character of the institution only to the extent to which they serve on and influence the important, University-wide committees.

Although Ohio State is the sum total of its departmental functions, yet I do not believe that the chairmen are the most influential aspect of the institution. The chairmen work more informally and do not exert a group influence of great magnitude. The Council on Instruction and the Faculty Council are much more influential in determining University policies.
That changes should be instituted to enable chairmen to bear more weight in the determination and governance of University policies and programs came as a recommendation of one central administrator. This depth of confidence in the centrality of the chairman to the academic function was also emphasized by a dean:

If we had top-notch chairmen and could give them good support, most of our problems would disappear. This is why we have deans, to try to build up poor chairmen and further develop good chairmen. We try to work through the chairmen in an effort to bring some uniformity in standards and atmosphere to the whole group and to help the chairmen profit by each other's experiences.

Departmental provinciality was scored by one chairman who felt that some of his colleagues in the chairmanship lack the proper vision of the University as a totality and often fail to see its orderly development "as a symphony" in which any one department plays only a part.

The Chairman's Authority

There is a maxim in administrative practice to the effect that along with the duties and responsibilities of an office should be conveyed authority sufficient to the tasks delegated. At The Ohio State University, the rules governing departments and their chairmen (refer to Appendix B) are rather explicit in their prescriptions, seemingly investing the chairman with substantial authority commensurate with the needs and designs of departmental
programs. To be found in these rules are such phrases as "a chairman. . . shall be the administrative head. . . of the department," and "the chairman. . . shall. . . operate the business of the department. . . with efficiency and dispatch."

Nevertheless, this investigator received some variety of response from interviewees who commented on the chairman's authority as it is sometimes modified by other influences. For example, the dean exerts his influence.

A central administrator stated:

I think chairmen have an adequate amount of authority, but their use of it depends in large measure upon how a dean operates the college. A chairman should remember that as an administrator he has line responsibility, but in the internal academic program he serves in a staff capacity. Concerning authority, I would draw a certain line between atmosphere and responsibility--the chairman must keep the latter and seek to build the former in a democratic fashion.

A chairman observed:

The chairman's present authority is adequate if he uses it with good sense. If he abuses it, his department and the dean have ways to cope with his abuse; perhaps this is truer in my college than in others, but much depends upon the quality of the dean.

A central administrator stated:

This matter of authority sometimes depends upon the dean; technically, the chairman has enough authority, but if he is subject to a wishy-washy dean then his authority is greatly modified.
The effect that a dean may have on the decision making role of the chairman, in matters of promotion that usually are initiated on the department level, brought this statement by a professor:

We thought the chairman had enough authority, but a recent case brings this into question: a certain promotion was made in this department and our chairman didn't know anything about it until it was an accomplished fact—he was not even brought into the decision and was not consulted on a face-saving basis either. Naturally, he was upset, and even more so because the person who was promoted shouldn't have had it.

That the transmission and use of authority is a constellation of factors was enunciated by the following personnel.

A dean observed:

A chairman's authority is limited by the existence of authority above and below him, and much depends upon his own skills in implementing his authority. He has to exercise his authority in reference to and limited by the total complex of authority around him.

A professor stated:

The chairman has a great deal of authority over routine matters, but the staff should make the decisions on selecting a department chairman, selecting new staff members, and making curricular changes. Sometimes the democratic process is misplaced, however, and a prime example is in the fact that our faculty recently spent 45 minutes discussing the departmental flower fund; policy matters should be of a higher order of consideration.
A central administrator observed:

Our present rules invest the chairman with substantial authority, but the difference comes in the way chairmen use it. A secretary can take a vote; but what we need are not simple votes but a depth of consultation and then a decision by the chairman.

In practice, therefore, the use of authority by the department administrator, and the existing atmosphere of his department concerning the democratic vis-a-vis the authoritarian influences, presents some considerable variance at The Ohio State University, as is seen by the foregoing statements. Much seems to depend upon the personality of the department executive, upon the degree of tractability of the faculty, upon the length of service of the administrator in his post, and upon staff morale and other general characteristics of the department. It is a rather generally observed and commonly acknowledged phenomenon that when a staff is happy—satisfied in terms of its assignments and emoluments—the members of this staff are more likely to accede to a relatively free reign by the chairman, granting to him, without serious contest, a rather broad latitude to make decisions and to represent the faculty in the broadest terms.

In sum, adequate authority is requisite to administrative decisions and, to be effective, it should be clear-cut, closely allied to the duties to be discharged, and not be fragmented among so many people and so many levels as to immobilize the process of
decision. The chairman needs to be a catalyst and stimulus of his departmental staff and programs; authority and a penchant for decisions are basic ingredients in his enterprise.

It must be remembered, however, that no department operates unto itself exclusively, and that the chairman's function is modified by budgetary considerations and by decisions properly placed at other levels. In the final analysis, the core of the success of a chairman, or of any administrator, and of the effectiveness of his authority, rests not solely on the technical legality of this authority, but rather depend upon his abilities to inspire cooperation and to exert leadership for voluntary commitment on the part of his faculty.

The Chairman as a Delegator; Ancillary Departmental Functions

Hardly any area of the chairman's work is more fraught with possibilities for relieving his burdensome load than that provided by his delegational options. Yet, a chairman knows by experience, if not intuitively, that to delegate too much, or the wrong thing, can be hazardous to his own role and to efficient departmental functioning.

The question of what and how the chairman delegates and in what areas this cannot be properly done elicited a wide range of responses. From the point of view of a dean:

Theoretically, there's nothing a chairman can't delegate; much depends upon the quality of his people--if someone in the department can do a better
job at budgeting or staff selection, then the chairman can delegate these things to the appropriate people—he can delegate any segment he wishes.

More conservatively, a chairman said:

There's nothing you can't delegate, but some things you'd better not delegate. One can confer with his staff about many things, but the chairman has to take the final responsibility for planning research, departmental budgeting, and the like, which cannot be delegated.

A central administrator was convinced that "most people who won't delegate are perfectionists" who are not willing to take a chance on anyone else.

A consensus formulated from the respondents is as follows. The chairman may delegate: preliminary work that foreruns his own decisions; preparation of bulletin materials; much of the contact work with students; and survey studies of the curriculum and recommendations for the development of new courses. The chairman should not delegate: the decisions on promotions in rank and to tenure positions, salary advancements, and faculty evaluations; the budgetary function; the resolution of interpersonal staff problems; the final selection of new staff members; the release of staff members who are not to be retained; matters of faculty dereliction and discipline; allocation of teaching, research, and service assignments; load equalization; orientation of new staff members to the department; and public relations problems involving the department. As a professor said, "There is simply no way to delegate
responsibility itself." This notion was reinforced by a dean's assertion that the chairman "is stuck with what happens in his department--and I mean anything that happens."

There was general agreement that committee work should be held to a minimum in handling delegated matters. The point was made by a professor that the overly-democratic approach diffuses the administrative process too much into the department and erodes scholarly time.

Several central administrators were sensitive to the practice among some chairmen of delegating (in some cases, to the clerical staff) of certain prescriptive elements in administration, such as signing official documents, giving approval to requests for equipment or funds, and the like. Primarily, however, the chairmen attempt to shoulder their full weight of administrative duties. But sometimes when they do delegate, their delegational technique leaves the faculty in doubt, as this professor observed:

I believe the chairman should delegate certain things and convey to his subordinates the responsibility and authority to go ahead with the matters delegated; too often, chairmen leave their staff members in doubt about the extent of their responsibility and authority to pursue delegated matters.

A number of professors voiced the conviction that their chairmen seldom failed to approve committee recommendations that dealt with officially delegated matters. Others made the point
that the chairman alone can present the department's case before and handle intercessions with the college and central administrations. Some departmental personnel felt that the department executive should also serve as the chairman of all major committees in his organization, or, at least be a member of these committees. In one department this practice was commented on by a professor: 'The chairman sits in on committee meetings when he expects problems to arise; this tends to bias the committees, and he usually gets what he wants, but this doesn't seem to disturb the faculty.'

The use of committees by chairmen varies extensively from department to department. (Refer to Appendix F for a composite list of standing committees which respondents thought were most essential to departmental operation.) Some administrators depend largely on ad hoc committees that are assigned special problems as they arise, and which terminate as these matters are reported on. But, other departments depend upon a large number of continuous committees, as attested to by this central administrator:

Our chairman felt he could delegate most anything, and did—he used about 20 committees and had everybody working on at least one—the committee chairmen were rotated each year; this system worked very effectively and its use gave the department chairman a lot more time for his own scholarship.

The introduction of administrative positions subordinate to the chairman has come to be the practice in several departments. A dean explained why he had initiated this innovation:
I have introduced the positions of assistant chairman and associate chairman in an effort to handle delegational responsibilities by the use of auxiliary administrative personnel, rather than by delegating to the faculty; I do not believe in administration by committee—the administrative act needs to be made a clean-cut one. Administrative consultation should be on the matter of policy and not on the 'how-to-do-it' level. Consultation serves the sole purpose of fructifying the process of decision by the chairman.

A professor commented on this practice:

Our chairman delegates to the associate chairman and assistant chairman and to the coordinators of the areas within the department; he delegates curriculum and some personnel matters to committees. Actually, our chairman would not think of reversing the decision of a committee--the committees also report their decisions to the departmental faculty.

But, faculty members still want access to their chairman even though they may know he needs assistants:

We now have an assistant chairman, which helps considerably, but what we now hear is that we can't get to the chairman. This matter of delegation depends so much upon the personality of the chairman and whether or not he's acquisitional by nature. What is important is the atmosphere, and that he should poll his staff from time to time.

Staff personnel feel strongly that the chairman cannot delegate his personal responsibility to the individual faculty member, and that a direct line of contact must be kept open between them.
With additional staff aid the chairman could become more of an educational leader and less of an office manager—such is the corporate opinion of those who are knowledgeable about the chairman's day-to-day activities. Typically, the chairmen are dedicated to their respective professions and departments and wish to see that both will be brought to near-perfection. But when the work situation and the general environment detract from or modify this objective, then the chairmen tend to become preoccupied with secondary facets of their office to the exclusion or diminution of the primary functions of program planning, development, policy making, research, instructional and personnel evaluation, and other central aspects of the leadership role in the departments.

Cited most frequently as factors interfering with the chairman's central tasks were: answering routine inquiries by phone and mail; bookkeeping of various accounts; course sectioning and reporting enrollments; processing records and correspondence relating to staff personnel and student placement; preparation of bulletin copy; and other multiple activities described by respondents as "movement of a mass of paper, and errand-boy types of minutiae." Ideally the chairman should have time for scholarship, but respondents reported that so often the chairman seems to get involved in the ongoing machinery of the department and loses his overall academic perspective.
Speaking to this dilemma, a chairman expressed his desire to alter his job emphases:

I would like to make the job primarily an academic position, divorced of budgetary and minor administrative details. It should be a job primarily of leadership in teaching and research and of upgrading the instructional program.

Supporting the previous view, a dean and a professor suggested possible correctives:

Dean:

Much of the chairman's paperwork needs to be delegated. But often this can't be done because of the University's attitude toward second-level help; we need to be able to employ more women at better salaries to handle this important paperwork—we need this desperately.

Professor:

The chairman's operation in this department could be greatly improved by the use of a career-type, high-grade, secretarial assistant or executive secretary to the chairman. We've had a continuing parade of young women who leave their jobs about the time they're broken in. This is a waste of money and time and puts a big burden on the chairman and his department.

Voicing modest optimism, a chairman put the emphasis on proper utilization of existing staff assistance:

It gets better every year, but there's a lack of clear-cut efficiency in administration so that you find yourself doing things that persons with less skill, pay, and qualifications could be doing. Maybe our jobs need to be studied by an efficiency expert. Some of our problem is due to improper use of staff aides.
Another chairman accented his preference for executive secretarial assistance over that of assistance drawn from the professional teaching staff:

Some departments have vice chairmen and other assistants but we don't. We have a large teaching staff, but I'd rather have my secretary upgraded to the position of assistant to the chairman than to pull a professor off of his regular duties to help me.

Some chairmen are able to make effective use of departmental committees for the transaction of even routine types of work, which in other departments is performed by the chairman himself or by subordinates in his office. One professor indicated that he provides "staff assistance" to the department and its chairman by spending fifty percent of his University time in committee work—an informal arrangement, since he was not an assistant or associate chairman in the department office. He felt this practice was fairly typical among his teaching colleagues of that department, and he expressed his opposition to hiring full-time professional administrative assistants to the chairman to do this work which he considered to be the proper responsibility of the departmental faculty.

But this latter view is not invariably shared by faculty members in other departments. One professor freely affirmed that his chairman was overworked, even harassed, by what he termed "too much busy work." This faculty member felt that the chairman deserved to be relieved of much of this activity; his feeling was, however, that it would be unfair to saddle the faculty with the
more mundane kinds of work which, more appropriately, "should go to high-quality clerical staff members, but we're short on these people."

Far from being a minor circumstance, therefore, the absence of an able clerical staff of the right size, capable of assuming many of the department's marginal duties as well as the usual stenographic services, was deemed to be a very crucial matter. Typical of the comments offered by respondents about the clerical staff shortage are these statements of faculty members representing different departments or separate divisions of departments:

Our current situation is pitiful—we have two secretaries who are trying to take care of the clerical services needed by forty faculty members.

We lost our manuscript typist because of budgetary strictures; actually, we needed two such typists.

I have to hire at my own expense outside help to do my University clerical work.

Our stenographic help is very inadequate. We have two secretaries for nineteen professional staff people.

Inadequate! One secretary serves thirty-one members of the faculty!

We have only two stenographers to service a whole host of staff members. This is 'penny wise and pound foolish.'

And, a dean said:

When a faculty member wants to present a paper, he either has to type it himself or let his wife do it.
Recognizing the deleterious effects of this unfortunate situation, if it were to go unchecked, the University Planning Committee some time ago gave its attention to the urgent need for improving clerical conditions and office procedures in colleges and departments. In its Supplementary Report Number 3 to the Faculty Council, the Committee made these observations:

The Planning Committee is convinced that the organization, structure, and office facilities on both departmental and college levels need to be modified and greatly improved if the University is to gain the efficiency required to do the much larger job which lies ahead. This conclusion is based in part upon the experience of the committee members themselves and of those numerous persons on the campus who have volunteered information.

It is the view of the Planning Committee that early correction is needed. Too much valuable effort is being wasted by having members of the University's professional staff perform office work of all kinds which should be done by secretaries, stenographers, and clerks. There is not enough supporting help to assist the professional staff in attaining desirable objectives in teaching, research, writing, and public relations. This deplorable situation, with a few exceptions, is general throughout the University.

The foregoing statement went to the heart of the matter of insufficient clerical, stenographic, and secretarial assistance, which continues to be a knotty hindrance to departments and a costly problem for the University. It may be termed knotty because of its inadequacy, and costly because the valuable time
of professorial personnel is necessarily being expended in clerical operations, whereas, under more favorable circumstances, this time might be more properly devoted to their academic duties. That the efforts of chairmen to administer departmental affairs effectively and efficiently are made the harder to achieve by this pervasive situation is self-evident. Obviously, the chairman must exercise discretion in deciding what duties are properly administrative as differentiated from those activities that are clearly clerical in nature. A number of transgressions of this concept and the frequency with which chairmen often eschew detail work was lamented by one central administrator who observed that "in some cases you find secretaries administering departments, which, in effect, becomes administration by civil service." Nonetheless, the shortage of qualified secretarial and clerical personnel constitutes a definite and marked obstacle to the attainment of greater academic productivity and to the realization of higher morale on the departmental level.
CHAPTER VI
THE CHAIRMAN AND THE ACADEMIC PROCESS

Staff Recruitment

Strong departments are dependent upon the ability to maintain productive recruitment of able scholars. Retirements and the normal rates of personnel attrition and transiency render essential that those departments which would preserve and extend their vitality must be constantly occupied in regenerative endeavors.

To this end, one of the most crucial trusts of the department chairman is his obligation to be a vigorous, optimistic, and implacable pacesetter in the enlistment of new staff members of sound quality. Moreover, experience has shown that the better a department chairman is known and respected, and the wider his contacts, the greater are his potential results in spearheading the major recruitment ventures of his department.

But even with substantial initiative by the chairman and his colleagues, a department's success in recruitment is also decidedly influenced by a whole network of interconnected conditions, not the least of which is a candidate's availability or desire to
move from his present situation, for whatever reason. Taking availability as a predicate, however, there exist certain organizational factors that enhance or influence the recruitment milieu, and not all of these elements are subject to institutional control or manipulation.

Found to be most prevalent in their effects upon recruitment are the following environmental factors. They are listed in no order of primacy, because the relative weight of their importance depends upon the special case of each individual prospect under consideration: salary levels; reasonable teaching and work loads in subject areas and at the level of special interests; opportunities and facilities for research, particularly that which is allied to one's special interests; opportunities for professional growth and advancement; departmental visibility and prestige; availability of travel funds, and sabbatical and other leave benefits; favorable image of the institution nationally; library resources; institutional size and composition, whether cosmopolitan-comprehensive or otherwise; sources and nature of institutional support and governance—whether it is public, private, or church-related; geographical location of institution, affecting matters of climate, regional travel, and national cultural and social communication; suitable residential housing; institutional physical plant, the campus context, including the relative attractiveness and adequacy of the campus, faculty offices, laboratories, and
faculty parking; extent of faculty participation in the determination of university polity; consulting opportunities; superior graduate school; options of teaching the fourth quarter or third semester-trimester; good human relations in the department, and the presence on the staff of recognized scholars and other colleagues compatible to one's field of interest; academic freedom and relative independence from extra-institutional interference; metropolitan-urban or suburban-rural locations, affecting matters of local transportation, recreation, and the like; student admission and retention policies of the institution; town-gown relationships and community receptivity; availability of secretarial services and student assistants; employment opportunities for spouse; adequacy of elementary and secondary schools; modern personnel policies and practices, and the affluence of multiple fringe benefits, such as retirement program, health services, faculty club, campus and community concerts, lectures, drama, museums, and artistic programs, athletic activities, and the like. Other recruitment influences also come into play, of course, such as that of an institution's ability to make early contract commitments.

Simply the act of putting the best institutional-community foot forward creatively could be a great boon to recruitment, suggested a professor. In a somewhat unique proposal, he felt that The Ohio State University could and should capitalize on its present assets through extensive use of an attractive publication:
Staff members in our field tend to go to areas that are glamourized—Boston, Los Angeles, New York. If you can build up the image and the attractiveness of a state or area in personal and geographical attraction, it helps very greatly in recruitment. Industry goes where there are engineers, and engineers go to a locale where they would like to live and where their families would like to settle. We desperately need some attractive brochure material to hand out to staff prospects as a part of our overall recruitment program. This material could be prepared by the University, the State, the Chamber of Commerce, or other groups, or by all of them cooperatively, but the whole community ought to be brought into the picture and it should present attractively and appealingly the educational, cultural, social, recreational, residential, and economic advantages that would attract a man and his family to want to locate here. This could be done and done honestly, because we do have attractive advantages—and this material could be used extensively in recruitment and in a hundred other ways.

Several reservoirs for departmental recruitment are customarily used, and these sources will commonly be tapped in accordance with the varying and specific needs and circumstances among departments at different times. Usually at the head of the list are the national and regional professional associations of the particular discipline, but also utilized repeatedly are the foundations, accrediting agencies, sister institutions, learned societies, government, industry, placement organizations, the practicing professions, educational journals, and, plainly, the graduate student level of the department of the recruiting institution.
It seems to be the enduring custom to give priority of consideration to those recruitment candidates known personally or by professional reputation to the department chairman and his colleagues, regardless of the immediate source of origin of the prospect for appointment. Departments are prone to feel that the latter practice has become ascendant because so-called "blind" recommendations frequently produce personnel prospects whose qualifications are not consonant with the particular needs of a given department.

The Chairman and Graduate Education

Perhaps no aspect of higher education is more central to the nature and purpose of a comprehensive university than its graduate program. Historically, graduate instruction was launched at The Ohio State University in 1878, when the first graduate student entered in residence. Initially, the University's graduate program was not formally organized, and each department had full responsibility for its own offerings with but little reference to the work of other departments.

As colleges came into being under the University structure the practice developed for each college to supervise and control the graduate programs offered in the various departments of the respective college. By 1902, graduate work in the College of Arts had reached such magnitude that a Graduate School was established to exercise immediate jurisdiction over graduate study in that
College. This movement thus formed the base for the University-wide Graduate School, which was organized in 1911 to administer all graduate work offered in the departments of the University, and the past half-century has witnessed a tremendous growth in graduate enrollment and in the expansion of advanced degree programs.

Yet, the departments of instruction continue to be administered as budgetary units of their parent colleges, with the departmental chairman reporting administratively to the dean of his college. Faculty members of the departments who are eligible to supervise graduate study constitute the Graduate Faculty. An administrative duality thereby confronts department chairmen because graduate programs are administered under the primary control of the Graduate Council. The Council consists of the Dean of the Graduate School and three elected regular members of the Graduate Faculty from each of eight areas, as follows: (1) Agricultural Sciences, (2) Biological Sciences, (3) Education and Psychology, (4) Engineering Sciences, (5) Humanities, (6) Physical Sciences, (7) Professional Biological Sciences, and (8) Social Sciences.

Departments are represented on the Council through their appropriate areas, although the Council sits as a committee-of-the whole in rendering judgments and decisions concerning the graduate offerings of departments. In a real sense, therefore, departmental
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chairmen have functional relationships with and are subject to
a faculty administrative body, the Graduate Council, in the pro-
vision of graduate programs. Administrative duality thus exists
in the fact that the chairman is also responsible to the dean of
his college.

In an effort to delineate some of the crucial concerns of
those personnel involved in graduate instruction, this investi-
gator posed the following question to his interviewees: "What
major problems concerning graduate education are facing the de-
partment and its chairman?" Typically, all departmental respond-
ents decried the paucity of graduate scholarships and fellowships
and the restrictive effect this limitation exerts upon academic
affairs and upon the recruitment of superior graduate students.
Numerous other significant observations were voiced by those
interviewed.

One professor made this pungent assertion:

The taking of graduate courses while in ______employment has become the road to promotion. You
can get whole classrooms of people who want to be
on a higher salary schedule. Therefore, you get
many students with only pecuniary interests. The
tendency is to take "crip" courses in so-called
graduate work. Graduate courses in our field have
been pretty much reduced to "A's" and "B's" and some
courses are pretty thin. This type of graduate work
becomes disreputable!

An administrative officer said this:

Human resources and physical facilities are
our big problems. We need an investment of $20,000
and 150 square feet of floor space per graduate student, on the average, in physical facilities and instrumentation. Additionally, we need one faculty adviser for about every twelve graduate students, because three out of twelve of these students are working on dissertations.

Holding the quality line, preserving the optimal contacts of teachers with individual graduate students, and improvement of library resources occupied the attention of this professor. He commented:

This is local but important. The substantial increase in the number of graduate students in our department makes it most difficult to uphold our standards—you just can't do graduate education on a mass basis. We're working on this problem, but we've slipped some. For example, our graduate seminars which formerly had twelve students now have to accommodate twenty; now you know that this situation is bound to be more of a lecture than a seminar.

He continued:

The relative inadequacy of special library collections for graduate research in our field is of concern to us. Then, too, I think we are behind in the Big Ten in the matter of providing assistantships, fellowships, and other forms of help to students. But, surprisingly, we have a better average in attracting students on the Ph.D. level than some other institutions.

A college dean offered these trenchant observations:

A major problem for our ________ department and its chairman is that of getting out from under the clutches of the national trend to buy good
graduate students. Tying admission for graduate study to conditions of employment and special grants must be re-examined! We need to be able to offer more adequate stipends and financial aids, of course, but there has to be a rational approach to this matter. On the other hand, selection of students is a most plaguing problem for another one of our departments--our selection standards for graduate students in the department of ______ are very loose, too loose!

Then, the dean turned to a different aspect of this subject. Speaking with some fervor, he made this statement:

I'm not satisfied with the present method of accrediting professors for the teaching of graduate work and for the supervision of graduate students. This process needs improvement and liberalization.

Chairmen sometimes find themselves "on the spot" with their faculties because of the apparent intransigence of University-wide administrative bodies that exercise control over departmental course offerings. As the departmental leaders, the chairmen, after much urging, are often able to initiate stringent evaluations of curricula that involve their faculties in depth over a long period of time. Not uncommonly, the study committees come up with recommendations to eliminate some courses, reorganize others, and add new subjects that will bring the department into line with national professional trends. Expectedly, the departments feel that the best available knowledge about their needs resides in the faculties of departments. Consequently, they want
to see their diligent study of programs recognized and their recommendations come to fruition through adoption by appropriate University councils. Frequently, departmental people say that their national prestige and the ability to attract students turn on the matter of adding new courses which up-date their curricula.

Chairmen usually have to carry the weight of presentation and intercession in behalf of these proposed curricular changes. Then, they often say, the boom is lowered--they are turned down cold by one or another of these administrative bodies. As one chairman said after such an experience, 'The Council on Instruction is our prime source of frustration!'

A professor spoke about the problem in this manner:

Our graduate curriculum needs attention badly. The Office of the Dean of the Graduate School gave us a lot of encouragement and we began to propose new courses, but these University committees have stymied our efforts to expand.

And a chairman added this observation:

We would like to build up our graduate area. We need to, because we're one of only fourteen institutions in the nation offering the Ph.D. in our area. But, the problem is in getting our proposals approved.

Some professors were deeply concerned about what they perceive as the wavering image of the University and its effect upon the recruitment of more and better graduate students and faculty members. 'Why don't we get more Woodrow Wilson Fellows?' asked one teacher. Then with some hesitation he volunteered, 'I wonder
if the reasons are negative and have to do with our University's impression nationally?" Another professor stated that several graduate students in his department are asking about the distinction of the degrees they will receive from Ohio State, fearing a diminution of prestige unless the University is able to retain its superior graduate faculty. Some departmental staff members suggested that the teaching loads of graduate assistants need to be pared substantially. At least in one department there seemed to be consensus that assistants are facing classes too large and that they have too many student papers to grade to do a qualitative job of it. One comment was, "Graduate assistants need more time for their own work, time to write theses!"

Chairmen are key figures in the recruitment of staff members and, anent the faculty personnel problem, one chairman expanded the arena of discussion by his assertion that a basic hindrance in building a departmental faculty is attributable not only to the salary-budgetary deficiency but also to Ohio's lag in developing a master plan for colleges and universities:

Our number one departmental difficulty on the graduate level is in the building of a staff, the retention of a distinguished faculty, and in affording these people the opportunity to do research; but back of this rests the lack of definition by the University of its function, and back of even that rests the fact that the State has not defined the role of higher education, its purposes and functions, in Ohio. There is simply a lack of policy on what this University is and shall become.
Other areas of the chairman's graduate education responsibility came under scrutiny. One such area concerns the ways and means whereby a chairman may stimulate his staff toward professional growth. As one central administrator put it, "A man can't lay down his learning; so many professors receive the Ph.D. and feel that their education is over." Admittedly, it takes lot of ingenuity on the chairman's part to properly energize his staff. The administrator, a former college official, stated emphatically that the chairman must be preoccupied with the constant task of re-educating his staff. It is imperative, he suggested, that the chairman see to it that staff rotation is practiced on a regular basis:

All departments should have at least one man per year out on other assignments, on Fulbrights, in industry, or whatnot; people are never the same again after these fine experiences and, in my view, this practice can be a workable answer to the in-breeding dilemma.

The subject of graduate education helped a dean train his sights on another recurrent problem facing the departments and their chairmen. Concerning outward mobility as it effects the development of a relatively stable and permanent staff, he asserted that the replacement of the University's eminent professors as they reach retirement age with scholars of equal ability is often an insurmountable obstacle for the departments, particularly on the graduate level. Expanding his statement, he declared:
We need to recruit young men for our graduate faculty who will not use this institution as a transient shelter until they move on somewhere else. We're not a holding corporation for temporary expediency. We must hold more of these young scholars who all too frequently are using us as mere stepping stones on the path to Wisconsin, Harvard, and California!

Respondents expressed several additional ideas of significance with respect to the problem areas of graduate education. One professor felt that "the public doesn't know enough about us and our graduate programs." It was his conviction that the University has done a poor job in publicizing nationally its achievements. A central administrator was concerned with philosophy vis-a-vis practice: "What is the purpose of graduate education?" He pointed out that some departments are research oriented, while others are service oriented, "and this divergence makes quite a difference," particularly in its effect upon departmental programs and in the relationships of departments to the corporate University and its sustaining publics.

The usual tendency is to think of the impact of increasing enrollments only in terms of its effect upon the undergraduate divisions of the University. The fact is, however, that graduate enrollments have already begun to undergo marked increases. A fifty per cent gain, for example, has been registered in the past five years according to the Graduate School Record, which reports that
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the number of graduate students at Ohio State increased from a total of 3,020 in the winter quarter of 1958 to a figure of 4,586 in the comparable period of 1963. (Four of the five departments included in the present investigation recorded high percentage gains in enrollment during that period.) This omnipresent situation makes it essential, asserts another member of the central administration, that "new techniques be designed to deal with these increasing numbers in a qualitative manner." He suggested that one alternative to cope with this problem may be through the adoption of and emphasis upon an intermediate degree or certificate positioned between the Master's degree and the Doctorate.

Other significant observations of interviewees among the administrators who responded to this subject of the departments' relation to graduate work may be summed up as follows: (1) central administrator - more thought needs to be given to the relevancy of graduate instruction to the world "outside" - and this re-direction of the University's emphases requires a sense of purpose and mission; (2) central administrator - graduate instruction is an increasingly costly venture, and this fact is a practical educational problem related to the growing tendency of faculty members to confine their work to a relatively few students at the expense of broader contributions; (3) central administrator - in what manner may graduate education seek to prepare the generalists who will be expected to relate a more specialized and expanding knowledge to the dynamic
uses of society; (4) central administrator - those departments that are productive - the University’s best - have staff shortages; yet, those departments that are not doing well on the graduate level have the staffs, but not enough of the staff members are scholars to attract graduate students; (5) central administrator - the University puts more money in graduate assistantships than many other comparable institutions, but, as between the two factors, the quality of the faculty should be of more significance than the amount of support offered to students through graduate fellowships; (6) dean - more subsidization for graduate research is needed; (7) dean - the University needs a facility with lounges, meeting rooms, and related services where graduate students of widely diverse specializations may meet socially in an environment that fosters an atmosphere of educational commonality; (8) dean - some departments have a lack of balance in emphasis on the research and teaching processes because of poor decisions in selecting staff people on the department level (whereas Harvard, for example, uses outside juries to make decisions on new staff people at the full professor level); some departments are out of balance by virtue of overemphasizing research to the exclusion of teaching; no less research is desirable, but ways need to be found to recognize and promote and encourage good teaching and service and to grant advancements accordingly; and (9) dean - some departments are too lax in pushing staff members into doctoral advising who
have no real commitment to research; these departments tend to push their graduate faculty coverage (staff members certified to supervise graduate student programs) for status and prestige reasons and for salary advances; therefore, some marginal men are pressured into this important work; then, the inferior graduate students gravitate to these staff people because their standards are not too high—and there goes quality!

The Chairman's Relationships With Students

Discussions by this investigator with various departmental personnel indicated that the chairmen of the departments studied seemed to be relatively insulated from contact with students. Those contacts that do occur were suggested to be rather formal, and were usually based upon special problem situations. There were notable exceptions, of course, such as those cases in which the chairman teaches, or serves as an adviser of Master's or doctoral candidates, or when he consults with student committees and councils in those departments that encourage this type of student activity and participation in departmental affairs.

If the existence of this condition may be termed an insufficiency or weakness in the chairman's performance, then one may be led to conclude that chairmen are likely to be out of touch with an important source of information about the teaching function and its adequacy on the departmental level, at least from the student viewpoint. This gap may also mean that the chairmen are
missing an opportunity to foster a quality of *esprit* among the students, particularly those on the graduate level who, frequently, have come from other institutions and who, therefore, may need a stronger sense of identification with the profession, the department, and the University than now exists.

Students were not included in the interview schedule of this study. But, as germane to the topic, the writer's attention was directed to this problem not only by interview comments of respondents but also by a chance conversation with a doctoral student who broached the subject of departmental "atmosphere," which he asserted is a significant factor in the morale and success of graduate students. Perceptively, he suggested that this departmental "tone," for good or ill, could be ascribed to the attitudes and demeanor of its chairman.

This student had taken his Master's degree at another public university in the Council of Ten. He spoke warmly of his previous institution and of the depth of professional and personal experiences that he had enjoyed there at all levels of the university. The president of the university, he reported, held a weekly "open house" in his office, at which time students at large might drop in unannounced (without appointments) for an hour or two of informal conversation with the president. This weekly
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occasion, he said, was as much social as otherwise; no agenda were prepared and the get-together did not take the form of a meeting. The president's aides were usually on hand to assist with hosting duties and to note any special observations that student opinion might reflect about the university and its programs. For, students felt quite relaxed, he stated, and were often very frank in sharing with the president and his aides certain concerns or problems affecting their personal and academic experiences at the university.

He mentioned the foregoing example particularly because he felt that this friendly custom of that campus had a wholesome and pervading effect upon departments and the university in general. Specifically, it was his opinion that the president's initiative in this particular situation set the stage for staff receptivity and amicable relationships throughout the institution, and particularly at the department level which was his point of emphasis. For, as a Master's student there, he and his student colleagues had felt themselves to be genuine constituents of the department—a state of mind which he asserted was singularly lacking in his department at Ohio State, and which he said had been the confirmed experience expressed by his student conferees in other departments who were serving on the Council of Graduate Students here.

Again, he contrasted the situation here with that in his previous institution where graduate students were invited to certain
departmental meetings, sessions in which especially those students who held assistantships, fellowships, or other teaching-research assistant appointments were invited to participate in the meeting programs and were encouraged to offer their comments, critiques, and suggestions about any aspect of their departmental experience. Once more, he underscored the profound significance of departmental atmosphere to graduate students and emphasized that the predominant influence in creating positive experiences must originate with and be stimulated by the chairman.

Whether or not this student's and his colleagues' unequivocal judgments of the local scene are either typical or valid may be problematical. The fact remains, however, that those observations were analogous to the comments also received by the writer from various respondents at each interview level in his study. It may be said, at least, that these candid descriptions of the departmental and institutional environments at the other university clearly offer affirmative and creative possibilities worthy of consideration at any university, especially on the graduate level.

**Evaluation of Instruction and Staff Development**

If departments are to make their fullest contributions to the institution's programs of instruction, research, and service, then it is quite clear that among the chief departmental concerns, in addition to staff selection, will be the functions of evaluating instruction and research, staff development, and the evaluation
of individual staff members' performance. It is equally clear that the personnel who participated in this study were in accord in their dissatisfaction with the methods and effects of these several processes as they actually operated. Crisp portrayals of the current problem were put into focus by a central administrator and a dean:

We fall into a trap of considering the professor and his classroom as a privileged sanctuary and thus make few evaluations of him. Virtually no evaluations are made of his tests, his classroom techniques, and the like. The chairman and his department should handle evaluations, and the stimulus should arise from the college office. Latitude should be allowed the departments in choosing their evaluation methods. Really, all of us should be subject, willingly, to an evaluation of our work and be amenable to suggestions for improving it. After all, bestowal of professorial rank is not conferral of perfection.

I can't seem to do anything about evaluation of instruction. We simply can't get an adequate index of the competency of the individual faculty member. We don't know what the individual is doing or could do. We don't have time to get acquainted with the man; time to do it is the main factor. This University is shot through with uncriticized purposes and methods which leads to a sort of smoothing down and averaging of the competencies of faculty members. We need to make this University educationally creative, and at virtually every level this is not put foremost among the values held. Higher education seems to be just a vast drama where people are playing out their roles.

Under University Rule 13.0503 (consult Appendix B), the responsibility is in fact lodged in the department chairman for continuous evaluation of instructional processes and for leadership
in the study of methods of improving these processes. But, by all accounts, the chairmen of large departments are hard-pressed to find the ways, means, and methods to perform the evaluative tasks that are recognized needs. Expressing this view, almost in defense of his chairman, a professor indicated what he thought to be the encumbrances:

Evaluation is one of our weakest links; it pretty well sums up to this—if the students like you, you're in. The University structure and its utilization of finances are not geared to assist the chairmen in the evaluation and fostering of instructional processes and programs. Our staff is so large that we don't and can't visit classes very much—it would be too expensive to do this. They tell the chairman that he has to evaluate his staff, but he has neither the time, the budget, nor the staff to do it.

But, could there be other reasons why evaluation is sparsely practiced? Admittedly, this process treats of highly subjective and debatable criteria. Perhaps it is a natural tendency to act with reservation when contemplating a venture into a task that is surrounded by a marked lack of precision. The process of evaluation falls into this imprecise category, according to the expressed doubts of several respondents; hence, its use is problematical:

A dean stated:

No valid measuring sticks or absolute criteria are available for this task of instructional evaluation. So much subjectivity and artistry are
involved; teaching is sort of intuitive, which defies measurement. We don't have a college-wide class visitation or evaluation program; if they exist, they're departmental controlled. Impetus for improvement can come from the dean's office, but actual implementation must be on the department level.

A professor made this comment:

I doubt if it's possible to really evaluate instruction. The appraisal by an external authority is always an invidious thing. We just wouldn't hire anyone whom we didn't think could do the job. But I think student reactions to teaching are important.

A dean observed:

No, I'm not satisfied with instructional evaluation, and I never will be; but it may be that the person who would score highest on a scale developed to measure his teaching ability may not be your best teacher. What is a fair day's work? How do you plant the spark of learning in your students? Often, you can see negative results better than those positive. But we rely mainly on peer evaluations of instruction.

Various approaches to faculty evaluation have been employed with varying degrees of conviction in the departments studied. Among these techniques are: appraisals by students; classroom visitation by the chairman or his representatives, or by departmental committees; team teaching; consultations of and by senior professors; and a cautious reliance on the inexact, and possibly inaccurate, reportage of the "grapevine" or common hearsay. Each one of these
methods has its proponents as well as its detractors, and to all
of the methods are ascribed some virtue as well as palpable defect
and fallibility. The following series of quotations illustrate
concisely some of their procedural strengths and weaknesses
experientially:

A professor stated:

We tried a system whereby senior staff men would
look in on the classes of the junior men and try to
shepherd them, but it's like a lot of other things
in a university where you have a lot of freedom—the
success of any venture depends on the motivation of
the junior and senior men and their willingness to
persevere toward the success of a program. Student
evaluations have a place, but they should be used
only in relation to other evaluative criteria. I
use student evaluations in my own program, particu­
larly when I've changed some aspects of the curriculum.

A professor asserted:

There is no evaluation system. The informal
grapevine is our only system. Class dropins were
tried for awhile with our new staff people, but this
was discontinued. What can you do after a man be­
comes tenured?

A chairman observed:

We don't have evaluations. We talk about it, but
just don't do it. Some faculty members have student
evaluations on a regular basis but this is not a de­
partment-wide practice. I favor student evaluations
if they are focused on the course and not on the
teacher. We don't practice classroom visitation.
We use one approach that has possibilities, one in
which we have two or three people working on a course
and teaching together; they can criticize each other
and offer suggestions on a team basis.
A professor remarked:

Evaluation of instruction at the freshman level is pretty good in this department. The younger teachers come to those of us who are older for help. I never did approve of formal, systematic visitation of classrooms to check on the quality of teaching. But a scholar who comes to our department and just tries to teach with his left hand is cheating the University and its students.

A professor said:

I'm not satisfied with this evaluation impasse, but I'm against the visitation system and we don't use it. Our staff members of instructor and below are supposed to consult regularly with a full professor. I have no better system to suggest. But our chairman is good at this; he uses his sensitivity and often seems to have 'extra radar' that enables him to know pretty well about the teaching level, partly because he talks to a great many people in the department, including students.

Somewhat surprisingly, student appraisals of teaching met with general favor when under proper control. One department has utilized quarterly student evaluations for thirty years. Operating under the aegis of the departmental student council, a subcommittee of students assembles the data on individual teachers following classroom assessments, student consultations, and discussions with staff members. When these evaluations have been surveyed and tabulated, the subcommittee visits each professor concerned to present a summary report of their findings and rating. The department chairman, who heartily endorses this procedure, also receives a copy of
the report and he attributed "dramatic results" to the process. He forecast, however, a possible return to an older system wherein course supervisors worked with individual teachers and provided assistance in the preparation of course outlines, in weighing the merits of various teaching methods, and in deciding matters of course content and articulation. The chairman voiced his hope that he and his colleagues would not have to institute the classroom visitation approach to faculty evaluation.

Little support or enthusiasm were evidenced by the chairmen and professors for systematic classroom inspection, partly on the grounds that the classroom environment is in fact altered by the presence of formal evaluators, and partly because of the traditional academic concept of classroom sanctity and the feeling that it is demeaning for a teacher to submit to this kind of activity.

A dean felt that the answer to the "good teaching" dilemma pivots on the mechanisms of staff selection and promotion, and many other observers have belabored the prevailing penchant of universities to hire teachers but promote researchers. The following account by the dean speaks to this problem and prescribes what might be a partial solution:

We say we have a commitment to good teaching, but I fear we only give lip service to it. The deans should design an alternate route whereby a person can get promoted to full professor other than by the route of research productivity alone. Good teaching should be better recognized; otherwise our best
teachers may go to institutions where a premium is placed upon instructional skills, where good teaching is recognized and rewarded. The deans should communicate this concern and intention to the department level. A basic college might provide for this approach. There is a place for blue-chip scholars, but all teachers should not be expected to be of this emphasis. We need staff members whose primary strengths are in superior teaching at all levels, including Ph.D. instruction. It's too bad that we lose some fine teachers who leave solely because they don't want to emphasize research.

In use in a number of departments is the committee on promotions, whose responsibility it is to recommend faculty promotions after thorough study of the personnel records of teachers and after interviewing the entire department staff and considering student opinion for wider appraisal. These procedures appear to be sound as far as they go, but it has been pointed out that departmental records are more likely to carry reportage of faculty research publications rather than sound documentation of good teaching. And in the absence of classroom visitation or other reliable indices of measuring instructional competence, consultation of faculty colleagues still remains in the realm of relative opinion. When personnel decisions are called for on the matters of retention, tenure, and promotion (and, to some extent, at the earlier stage of selection), these decisions tend to be resolved, therefore, on bases for which there is tangible, material evidence, specifically, on the basis of faculty publications.
Primary reliance upon this criterion, although it may provide some executive comfort and substantive ground for decision on promotions, may also have its shallow applications from time to time. For, as a professor described the situation in his department, faculty research is perfunctorily "looked at" in terms of titles and quantity, with but little precise attention being given to the quality and validity of the research itself. Clearly, respondent views indicate a breadth and depth of sentiment against an employment of the factor of research-publication as the predominant criterion for promotion. But, given the inordinate importance attached to this criterion at the present, it must assuredly be the department chairman's firm responsibility to insure that this research emphasis is evaluated with integrity and consistency.
CHAPTER VII

RECAPITULATION OF THE CHAIRMAN'S MAJOR TASKS,
INFLUENCES UPON HIM, AND CHARACTERISTICS
OF THE ABLE CHAIRMAN

Many conspicuous factors come into play in departmental management and bear profoundly upon the chairman's role and function. Impinging with varying degrees of intensity on the chairman's performance and upon the department's program are the availability of a qualified professional staff, the adequacy of salary, research, travel, and equipment funds, space allocations, a competent non-professional and clerical staff, and adequate support for graduate assistants, research assistants, and other staff aides. These several matters have been discussed in separate detail in preceding chapters, but an additional observation is applicable: in the final analysis, budgetary realities seem to be a primary governor of the qualitative and quantitative limits of these important areas, all of which exert a marked effect upon the department. Since fiscal possibilities are more likely to be determined on the institutional rather than on the departmental level, the consequence is,
therefore, that many phases of the chairman's performance affecting his image in the eyes of his staff are in a sense beyond his span of control. He may, and usually does, use what influence and persuasive art that he can marshal to enhance his department's competitive position in the funding marketplace, both institutionally and outside, and he exercises considerable regulation of budgetary disbursements within the department. But the fact remains that staff perceptions of the chairman's relative "success" in the executive function often turn on conditions that are determined largely outside of his administrative jurisdiction.

Summary Conceptions of the Chairman's Major Tasks

Personnel perceive the responsibilities and duties of the chairman to be a multiplicity of major tasks. Coincidental with this study, and reflecting the immense operational network that surrounds his office, one chairman1 who contemplated his impending retirement from departmental administration had prepared a job analysis (recorded in Appendix G) which might serve as a guide for his successor. That statement reported the extensive and diverse expectations that attach to the chairmanship and, in the main, corroborated the respondent views that were expressed to this investigator. Again, the matters of budget, human relations, and of selection, retention, evaluation, and promotion of the departmental faculty were held to be among the chief concerns of chairmen.

1 Robert M. Estrich, Chairman, Department of English, The Ohio State University.
Prior chapters of this study have presented a substantial account of the administrative and academic processes, but their acute centrality to the chairman's function needs to be amplified and extended by additional synoptic observations. One of the most comprehensive statements about the chairman's role came from a dean, who expressed his views this way:

I want the chairmen in this college to be accurate in their judgment of people and to give to me, as dean, good recommendations for academic appointments. The chairmen should use effectively the consultative resources in his department and know when to go with or against his group; he has to know how to transcend partisan jealousies within the faculty; he has to be able to spot the four-flushers, the lazy ones, and the weak before we get stuck with them. He must pick good people and help the department to grow in responsibility, creativity, and productivity; the chairman must make himself knowledgeable to the wide publics served by his department.

Further, he must maintain a climate of good human relations; he must manifest skill in the assignment of staff duties and see to it that there is a proper utilization of staff power in its fullest potential--tasks that require great artistry, for bad duty assignments can destroy morale.

I should say, too, that chairmen, on occasion, have brought in some of the weirdest proposals and used phony rationales to try to support them. Often, these proposals concerned budgetary matters, and it was evident that the chairmen either hadn't given adequate thought to the propositions or they just didn't understand the fundamentals of the budgetary process; budget-making by the chairman must be handled with the utmost care and integrity.

The primacy of the chairman's administrative function, discussed previously, and of his need to reserve unto himself the
task of making final decisions on staff assignments, occupied the attention of a central administrator:

A chairman must recognize that his administrative duties come first. He should work closely with the dean and with his faculty on implementing clear-cut objectives of the department. He should select and assign staff members with the goal of attaining the best objectives of the department and the University. I regret to report that there is too much feeling on the campus that the professor is a 'self-assigning' individual who will make his own decisions about the courses he is to teach during hours of his own choosing, and that the professor takes his leave at his convenience rather than in consideration of the department's welfare. The chairman must not abdicate his responsibilities in these matters. Finally, I would suggest that the chairmen must have fiscal responsibility.

A professor stated that the chairman should be mainly concerned with:

Seeing that the machinery of the department operates smoothly, to insure the best opportunities for and efficiency of his faculty on a regular basis; being well informed, diplomatic, and wise in assuring that the total resources of his department are utilized and developed to the fullest extent possible; making a constant attempt to stay abreast of the numerous trends in his field; strengthening his ability to effectively determine what is the best judgment of his faculty on University matters, and representing them adequately in regular dialogues with the college and University administrators; and with efforts to coalesce opinions and to interpret the collective judgments of the department, and to present a strong case for his faculty.

The above view perceives the chairman to be skilled as an intercessor. This view was typical of the comments of other
faculty respondents who saw the chairman primarily as an enabling influence and as a coordinator:

A chairman of a department faculty, in my view, is first a coordinator and then a leader; leadership is important, but the chairman must respect the knowledge and wisdom of the staff whose work he is facilitating. The chairman is careful to see that the staff is not tied up with minor administrative matters, and he ought to be moving along the lines of the best thinking of his faculty members whom he is organizing for decision.

A compendium of staff members' expectations of the chairman include these additional functions: the chairman should (1) promote faculty research opportunities; (2) maintain conditions that allow the faculty to teach relatively unfettered; (3) keep the staff informed about departmental and University-wide affairs; (4) represent the department at major meetings on campus and elsewhere; (5) keep informed about and communicate to the staff information on the major national trends in the subject field; (6) promote the department's cooperative relationships with other departments toward the realization of institutional objectives; (7) be sensitive to public relations matters, and foster a positive image of the department inside and outside of the University; (8) supervise curriculum development; (9) seek to keep the department's physical facilities and equipment adequate to its current needs; (10) strive to maintain faculty salaries at a
competitive level; (11) mediate differences between faculty members and assuage personality clashes; (12) concentrate on the ways and means to develop the potential of individual faculty members; (13) administer departmental business affairs with dispatch and effectiveness; (14) develop and sustain meaningful contacts with alumni; (15) recruit quality students, maintain good student relations, and enhance student assistance through scholarships, fellowships, assistantships, and other aids; (16) encourage an optimum participation of the faculty in professional associations and conferences, and seek adequate travel resources to foster this activity; (17) insure integrity in both the undergraduate and graduate instructional programs; (18) maintain a realistic relative emphasis between teaching, research, and service; (19) evaluate staff performance and provide suitable recognition wherever and whenever deserved; this aspect of administrative leadership nurtures incentive and increases the motivation and creativity of staff members; (20) assign faculty work loads with great care and with the effort to maintain reasonably equitable loads, in keeping with departmental needs and in deference to the abilities of individual staff members.

Other concerns were voiced by respondents, as represented by this series of succinct observations. First, concerning the formulation of goals and objectives:

A professor observed:
The chairman must be primarily concerned with staffing, program development, and formulating a statement of long-range, intermediate, and short-range objectives of the department; otherwise, you just have a bunch of people on the payroll seeking their own personal objectives.

A central administrator's appraisal:

As I see it, the chairman's main responsibility is to look ahead five or ten years to see where the department is, or should be, headed—to assess its principal areas of development—and to build a staff and curriculum to meet these goals. Too many chairmen just live from year to year without using much vision, and too many departments are top-heavy with men on the verge of retirement.

The chairman's discretion and methodology brought this comment from a professor:

An effective chairman has to know instinctively when to use democratic procedures in exercising his leadership—there are times when the chairman should present proposals as among alternatives, and take a firm stand—you can't please everyone all the time, and a chairman should recognize this fact.

Course articulation, student initiative, and staff morale concerned this professor:

The chairman should insure that instructors maintain a healthy attitude toward undergraduate students. He should see to it that all courses are coordinated and mesh satisfactorily, that there's no gap in the educational process. In the graduate area, it's the chairman's responsibility to see that more individual initiative is required of students. Finally, the chairman must endeavor to keep his staff happy and vigorous.
The lack of leadership by the chairman in cultivating the talents of younger staff members brought the ire of a central administrator, who said:

The chairman's attention should be continuously directed toward working out an effective program to develop the young staff members into productive and creative scholars. Many of our young faculty people have become bitching cynics because their chairmen have not given proper attention to their professional development.

Finally, the chairman is expected to show insight into all levels of his department. He must take the lead in policy formulation, planning, curriculum development, staff recruitment, University relations, and a multitude of other important functions. And, in a professor's words, "It helps if he is a budget wizard."

In short, the chairman must mold a unified pattern and program from widely diverse interests and, at the same time, "posture toward the administration," as one staff member observed. Can all of these expectations be reconciled? A member of the teaching staff, somewhat somberly, thought not--there are just too many variables to insure harmony and equilibrium. His comment was this: "It is important for the chairman to recognize that it's very doubtful whether he can construct a coherent program in the kind of departmental operation of the size and complexity that exists."
Influences Upon and Characteristics of the Able Chairman

Existing in the chairmanship are manifest dichotomies which in effect predetermine that certain role conflicts will likely face the departmental executive. One of these ambiguities concerns the chairman's major orientation. By virtue of his role in the administrative hierarchy, the chairman is generally expected by his organizational superiors to be institutionally oriented; yet, at the same time, the departmental faculty expects its chairman to be fundamentally oriented toward their discipline. This so-called "swivel effect," steering between the administrative Scylla and the faculty Charybdis, requires the utmost skill and perspective of the chairman as he seeks workable resolutions of often contrasting objectives, methods, and attitudes represented by these two academic camps.

Moreover, the chairman also faces a related dichotomy that is inherent in the acts of leadership and superintendence. Patently, executive direction is necessary, and leaders are supposed to lead. But requisite to the process of leadership are not only the acts of administrative initiative on the part of the executive, but also importantly requisite is the willingness for compromise and accommodation on the part of personnel subordinate to the group leader. Not infrequently, therefore, the various options for decision that are built into this situation are the source of ambivalence which plagues the departmental executive
and his group. For example, one may observe the quandary of the chairman who delegates, consults, and generously utilizes the committee system, and thereby adds what are often deemed to be unwelcome "burdens" to the work loads of a busy faculty engrossed in teaching and research; yet, if the chairman does not liberally share these processes of deliberation and decision, he risks the charge that he rules by administrative fiat.

The functional role of the chairman is, therefore, complex and many-faceted. His several "publics" involve direct work with or responsibility to his departmental faculty, deans, University-wide committees, students, central administrators, prospective staff members, alumni, prospective donors, professional societies, accreditation agencies, and to various segments of the community. Such a wide scope of responsibility, coupled with the mediative nature of the chairmen's position, quite evidently places great importance upon the personal and professional qualifications required of successful administrators of academic departments. In an effort to find the most prevalent attributes associated with a qualitatively competent performance of successful chairmen, all interviewees in this study were asked a series of questions which developed their views on the subject. The writer formulated a composite of the "able chairman" from his assessment of respondent data. The responses of individual interviewees, by position, are reported in Appendix E. This
investigator found the following personal and professional characteristics to be most important in the able chairman's tableau of qualifications.

An able chairman is reasonably accomplished in the elements of academic scholarship. He is knowledgeable about the competencies required for effective teaching and productive research, principally because he has had substantive experience in these endeavors. The able chairman feels impelled to stay abreast of the trends and progress in his profession, and he continually seeks every possible opportunity to advance his own contributions to teaching, research, and service. He will strive to communicate to his colleagues and to the institution information about the major trends and emphases in his discipline.

An able chairman possesses a genuine interest in and an aptitude for effective administration. He understands and uses with reasonable facility the components of viable administration, namely, the functions of planning, organizing, budgeting, staffing, delegating, directing, consulting, coordinating, evaluating, and reporting. He willingly accepts the burdens of administration and recognizes that the role of leadership is often a lonely and unrewarded enterprise. An able chairman will be circumspect and impartial in exercising his authority and administrative judgment, weighing carefully the effects of alternate courses of action. He will avoid over-identification with any
special group within the department and will accord equal treat­
ment, even socially, to all members of his staff. The able chair­
man will utilize his talents to strengthen the human and material
resources of the department, and, when inequities exist, he will
seek ways and means to rectify them.

An able chairman is committed to democratic values and
procedures. — He understands some of the elements of group dynamics
that lead to creative participation and action in the department.
The able chairman is both a persuasive leader and an effective
listener. Through the use of group meetings and individual con­
ferences, he regularly consults staff members on a variety of
questions and seeks to involve departmental personnel in appro­
priate decisions affecting them and their organization. He is
perceptive of individuals within the group context and is able
to elicit from them a caliber of work tailored to their individual
proficiencies.

An able chairman is humane and is sensitive to the needs
and desires of his associates. — He possesses many of the innate
qualities of diplomacy and is able to sustain constructive and
friendly relationships with people, recognizing that person-to-
person rapport is dependent upon restraint, personal solicitude,
respect for the individual, and upon a pervading cognizance of
the human element. His empathy and disposition for interpersonal
relationships will lead him to seek harmony; yet, when dissidence
exists, his patience, understanding, and optimism will serve to mollify and direct into positive channels divergent views. His forbearance enables him to accept the fact that problems and frustrations are indigenous to the role of group leadership.

An able chairman possesses those traits and abilities that inspire confidence and that motivate personnel to high levels of personal performance and professional achievement. He is a person of rectitude and integrity, whose personality and character imbue the faculty with a justified faith that they can trust him. An able chairman is steadfast, decisive, and courageous—a person who is willing to take a stand on important questions. He is secure intellectually, socially, and psychologically, accepts responsibility readily, and manifests no need to take refuge in gross rationalizations and evasions. He is resourceful in the use of his energies and time in manifold ways that stimulate the efforts and enthusiasm of his colleagues.

An able chairman is loyal to his discipline, his department, and the supporting institution. He will strive for the maximum of balance and advancement for each one of these academic units, and will work for their interacting concord and professional accommodation. When disparate objectives and policies arise among and between the institution, the department, and the discipline, the able chairman will seek to reconcile them, and he will not pit one against the other for partisan interests or gain which
would thereby derogate one or more of the components of his profession.

An able chairman enjoys vibrant physical and mental health sufficient to the arduous schedule and demanding nature of the duties and tasks residing in the chairmanship. — He is energetic, and his reservoir of strength allows him to "bounce back" from a succession of stringent obligations.

An able chairman is sensitive to the educational needs and personal welfare of students. — He believes that students are an integral part of his department and the institution, and that they are not a mere appendage to be reluctantly tolerated. Through counsel and guidance, the able chairman will utilize the resources of his department and the institution to develop creative opportunities whereby students may be enabled to fulfill their educational objectives more fully.

An able chairman will seek to rise above the parochial and provincial in his personal and professional commitments. — He is alive to the rest of the world and is aware of the grand sweep of higher education and of its impact upon and service to the national and international scenes. He is oriented to goals that are not terminus in his discipline and department—goals that serve more fully the interests and needs of the total institution and its supporting publics.

Manifestly, if all of the foregoing qualifications were found to be personified in one chairman, it is likely that he
would epitomize the quintessence of models; experientially, human fallibility often precludes a realization of models. In practice, many chairmen function quite effectively with a shorter span of qualifications than that range which might be optimally desired by University personnel. Nonetheless, respondents perceived the able chairman in this composite image, and further, it was suggested that the more serious the departure from this profile of desirable characteristics, the more tenuous the executive's role and functions are likely to become. Finally, it can be observed that a perceptual profile may be useful in the process of selecting department chairmen.
CHAPTER VIII

SUMMARY OF THE FINDINGS, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The principal objectives of this study were to present an overview of certain departmental procedures and to examine some of the opinions and attitudes of selected faculty and administrative personnel of The Ohio State University regarding the departmental system and the chairman's role.

The personal interview, utilizing a questionnaire, was the main instrument of the investigation, augmented by data drawn from documents, books, periodicals, bulletins, and a variety of additional sources. Interviews were granted by the chairman and four professors of each of five large departments, by the deans of the respective colleges and the Graduate School, and by the University President and his cabinet officers, who comprised a total of forty-one respondents. The writer does not suggest that the departments included in his study necessarily define the typically prevailing organizational and administrative patterns of either this University or of other institutions in the large, nor does he imply that respondent viewpoints presented in this
investigation should be applied carte blanche to situations requiring wider perspectives than those possible in this study.

Findings

A review of this study indicates that a number of significant findings have emerged from the comments, views, and opinions expressed by the respondents who participated in the survey. A summary of the investigator's major findings is as follows:

1. A majority of each interview segment of this study perceived the department chairman as a key figure in the academic hierarchy. Faculty opinion suggested, however, that the central importance of the chairman's office is not sufficiently registered in the determination of University policies and programs, except in those cases in which an individual chairman might bear enough personal influences to sway the decisions of administrators and strategic institutional committees.

2. Considerable variance was noted among the colleges in the procedures used to select department chairmen at the University. This condition was evident in respondent statements which particularly emphasized the range and different depths of faculty consultation and participation in the selection process, and in the varying degrees of formalization of the selection methodology as utilized by the several colleges.

3. Several significant factors seem to bear upon a chairman's acceptance of his post. The elements found to be most
important were these: (a) the desire to lead; (b) the search for prestige and recognition; (c) to gain an opportunity for growth in administration; (d) the attraction of different, more general work; (e) the chance to put into practice one's ideas about needed program modifications; (f) the opportunity to gain a stronger voice in decision-making at various University levels; and (g) the sense of duty presented by a call to serve one's colleagues and the University. Aspiration for advanced economic reward seemed to be negligible as a motivating incentive.

4. The nature of the chairmanship classifies it as a hybrid position, for a chairman must attempt to maintain distinct but unified identities as an administrator and as a member of the faculty. As a generalization, it was found that central administrators emphasized the chairman's administrative role and expected that his major orientation would be toward the institution, whereas departmental staff members accentuated the chairman's faculty status and expected his orientation to be primarily directed toward the discipline and the department. This dichotomy confronts the chairman with the possibility of role conflicts as he steers his course among contrasting interests and commitments.

5. No substantive support was found for the rotating concept of the chairmanship, principally because this view tends to type the position as a transient or evanescent assignment that does not conduce to the most responsible efforts in departmental
planning. It was thought that the rotational system also creates major problems for the chairman in administrative continuity and control.

6. The chairman appears to be invested with sufficient authority to carry out his responsibilities, but the use of authority by the department administrator and the existing atmosphere of his department concerning the democratic vis-a-vis authoritarian influences present some considerable variance at The Ohio State University. The net effect and applications of either the democratic approach or the more absolute style of leadership seem to pivot in the main upon the personality of the chairman, upon the degrees of "followership" acceptable to the faculty, upon the length of service of the executive in his post, upon nuances of staff morale, and upon the relative affluence and other general characteristics of the department.

7. A compendium of seventeen functional expectations of the chairman were drawn from respondent observations. They indicate that the chairman should seek to promote, extend, and provide leadership in the improvement of the following departmental concerns: (a) effective internal communications; (b) unfettered teaching; (c) opportunities for research; (d) staff recruitment and development; (e) staff and instructional evaluation, and staff recognition and promotion; (f) human relations; (g) curriculum development; (h) physical facilities, equipment, and instrumentation; (i) faculty salaries and the departmental budget; (j) student
recruitment-selection, and student counseling and assistance; (k) public relations with the college and central administration, and with alumni, the community, and the profession; (l) effective and equitable personnel, business, consultative, and administrative procedures; (m) adequate secretarial and clerical assistance; (n) creative contacts with other departments and with University committees and councils; (o) a reasonable balance in the assignments of faculty work loads and in the allocation of the teaching, research, and service functions; (p) departmental planning; and (q) attractive fringe benefits, adequate travel funds, and improvement of the conditions of faculty leaves.

8. Clearly, the chairman's attitude toward his position was found to bear significantly on his performance. Interviewee statements, for example, indicate that when a chairman views his administrative responsibilities as burdensome details with which he would rather not be bothered, this outlook almost inexorably casts its shadow over the quality and efficiency of his executive pursuits.

9. A composite profile of the able chairman was formulated from interviewee responses to a question dealing with perceptions of his most important attributes. Predominant were nine recurrent items. The following personal and professional characteristics were found to form the image of the best qualified chairman. An able chairman: (a) is reasonably accomplished in
the elements of academic scholarship; (b) possesses a genuine interest in and an aptitude for effective administration; (c) is committed to democratic values and procedures; (d) is humane and is sensitive to the needs and desires of his associates; (e) possesses those character traits and leadership abilities that inspire confidence and that motivate personnel to high levels of personal performance and professional achievement; (f) is loyal to and ethical in his discipline, his department, and the supporting institution; (g) enjoys vibrant physical and mental health; (h) is sensitive to the educational needs and personal welfare of students; (i) will seek to rise above the parochial and provincial in his personal and professional commitments.

10. Some of the recurrent criticisms offered by respondents concerning the chairman's performance were these: (a) the chairman is not regularly available to counsel with staff members; (b) the chairman is out of the office at certain times of the year and does not designate some responsible person to act for the department in his absence; (c) the chairman does not give enough emphasis to the process of selecting new staff members; (d) the chairman gives but little attention to departmental planning and long-range development; (e) the chairman does not regularly convene departmental staff meetings, and his consultations with faculty are superficial and infrequent; (f) the chairman has practically no contact with students except in emergency situations; (g) the
chairman mistakenly thinks that most everything has to be submitted to the faculty for a vote; (h) departmental committees deliberate on various questions and report their findings and recommendations to the chairman, but these studies then get buried in the chairman's office and nothing further is heard about them; (i) the department faculty gets very little feedback through the chairman from the dean and central administration; (j) the chairman is not aggressive enough in communicating departmental needs to upper University echelons; (k) beginning staff members are not getting much supervision or help in professional development from the chairman; and (l) the chairman has allowed some inequities to creep into the matters of faculty promotions and work load assignments.

11. Staff members of some departments believe that they and their departments could operate with greater functional and administrative effectiveness if assigned to other colleges which were deemed to be more compatible to a particular discipline.

12. Personnel at all levels of the study felt that departments and their chairmen need more adequate and consistent measures for assessing the performance quality of individual faculty members and for stimulating staff development. Respondent views indicated a depth of sentiment against utilization of research-publication as the sole or predominant criterion for promotion.
13. This investigation disclosed that the following factors, listed without sequential significance, constitute the most important influences upon an institution's capabilities in recruiting departmental staff members: (a) salary levels and the institution's ability to make early contract commitments; (b) reasonable teaching and work loads in subject areas and at the level of special interests; (c) opportunities and facilities for research, particularly that which is allied to one's special interests; (d) opportunities for professional growth and advancement; (e) departmental visibility and prestige; (f) availability of travel funds, and sabbatical and other leave benefits; (g) favorable image of the institution nationally; (h) library resources; (i) institutional size and composition, whether cosmopolitan-comprehensive or otherwise; (j) sources and nature of institutional support and governance—whether it is public, private, or church-related; (k) geographical location of the institution, affecting matters of climate, regional travel, and national cultural and social communication; (l) suitable residential housing; (m) institutional physical plant, the campus context, including the relative attractiveness and adequacy of the campus, faculty offices, laboratories, and faculty parking; (n) extent of faculty participation in the determination of university polity; (o) consulting opportunities; (p) superior graduate school; (q) options of teaching the fourth quarter or third semester-trimester; (r) good human relations in the department, and the presence on the staff of
recognized scholars and other colleagues compatible to one's field of interest; (s) academic freedom and relative independence from extra-institutional interference; (t) metropolitan-urban or suburban-rural locations, affecting matters of local transportation, recreation, and the like; (u) student admission and retention policies of the institution; (v) town-gown relationships and community receptivity; (w) availability of secretarial services and student assistants; (x) employment opportunities for spouse; (y) adequacy of elementary and secondary schools; (z) modern personnel policies and practices, and the affluence of multiple fringe benefits, such as retirement program, health services, faculty club, campus and community concerts, lectures, drama, museums, and artistic programs, athletic activities, and the like.

14. A felt need exists for an attractive brochure that could be used by departments to adequately portray to prospective staff recruits the full sweep of institutional and community assets.

15. Respondents cited examples of academic snobbery and rivalry that were said to exist between departments. These conditions were ascribed partly to personal biases, in part to scholarly competition in closely related areas of instruction and research, and in some measure to divergent educational philosophies. The problems in interdisciplinary cooperation were more generally attributed to partisan attitudes of personnel than to a particular scheme of academic organization. Interviewee opinion
indicated that there were fewer problems of cooperation between departments within a given college than there were problems existing between departments of separate colleges.

16. Considerable sentiment was found to exist among the personnel interviewed to the effect that it is unrealistic to expect the Council on Instruction, whose composition is nine faculty members and three ex-officio representatives of the central administration, to be able to render appropriate judgments and decisions on a University-wide scope that encompasses the academic programs of ninety departments.

17. The present budgetary system, as it effects the departments, tends to encourage hurried efforts to spend funds toward the end of each budget year because of the requirement to turn back any unspent surplus. This present system, respondents asserted, invites departmental stockpiling, budget padding, crash decisions, and profligate spending. These conditions were also said to place a great burden upon the chairman in his administrative role, and, because of the restricted continuity between budget periods, the planning functions of the chairman are seriously impaired and his ability to effect early contract commitments with prospective staff members is infringed, resulting in the loss of able candidates to other institutions.

18. While institutes serve a useful function in the coordination of interdepartmental research efforts, collective
opinion indicated that these bodies have thus far not been able to implement similar accomplishments in the instructional realm.

19. There is a definite and precarious shortage of sub-professional, clerical, and secretarial personnel in the departments studied. This finding is hardly a startling, new discovery, but its existence as a problem of great significance is re-confirmed as a substantial obstacle to faculty productivity and departmental efficiency.

Conclusions

In a sense, summary determinations are more often tentative than they are final or complete, but assuming that the writer's findings in this study were meaningful under the conditions allowed by a relatively small sample, several observations seem to be relevant and have culminated in a number of general impressions and principal conclusions.

1. It appears conclusive that the reasons for a prospective chairman's aspiration to that office, and his acceptance of it, span a broad spectrum of motivations, and that no single over-arching causation emerged as overwhelmingly emphasized. It also seems clear that even when persons are deeply interested in the chairmanship, an unwritten code generally restrains them from overt competition for the position; this circumstance is not unique with departmental administration, of course, since avoidance of any act that would smack of self-aggrandizement can be identified with the ethics of most professions.
Evident, too, is that the economic advantages of the ch...
make more complicated the chairman's administrative role, particularly with reference to his relationships with the regulatory groups.

3. With additional staff aid the chairman would have the time to become more of an educational leader; more professional and sub-professional assistance could reduce the chairman's tendency to be preoccupied with managerial duties of the departmental office. If one accepts the viewpoint that the chairmanship is primarily an academic position, then the major job emphases will perhaps be placed upon departmental scholarship—the provision of leadership in teaching and research and in upgrading academic programs, including the functions of staff recruitment, development, and evaluation. This conclusion is based upon respondent reports that the chairman gets so involved in the ongoing machinery of the department that his time and attention to scholarly affairs are eroded, causing him to lose his overall academic perspective.

4. Delegation can be a useful tool in the chairman's departmental kit when it is used with reasonable skill and wisdom. But the chairman must be careful that he does not delegate too much or the wrong things. He must maintain proper control of departmental functions and assume the final responsibility for decisions. At times, he may find it necessary to take a stand that runs counter to the opinion of a large segment of his faculty; in such cases, he should, when appropriate, communicate
their views along with his own views, recommendations, or decisions, to higher echelons so that some sense of departmental symmetry and proportion is represented for review and decision at other levels of administration. While the chairman may and should delegate to his staff many duties, he does not have the option to delegate his final accountability for those specific functions conferred upon and entrusted to him by official rules of the Board of Trustees.

5. Adequate authority is requisite to administrative decisions, and, to be effective, it should be clear-cut, exercised with precision and restraint, closely allied to the duties to be discharged, and not be fragmented among so many people at so many levels as to immobilize the process of decision. Authority and a penchant for decisions are basic ingredients in the department chairman's enterprise, but these factors are necessarily modified by budgetary considerations and by decisions properly placed at higher levels of the institution.

In sum, it is concluded that the core of success of a chairman as an executive leader, and the net effect of his authority, rest not solely on the technical legality of his jurisdiction, but also reside in the chairman's abilities to inspire cooperation and to exert leadership for voluntary commitment on the part of his faculty.

6. The relative adequacy of the departmental budget has a great influence upon the extent to which the chairman may carry
out his qualitative and quantitative objectives for the department. Since budgetary limits are usually set outside of the department, many aspects of the chairman's work are foreordained and modify his ability to live up to certain expectations that staff members hold for him.

7. When the data in this study are compared with implications drawn from the literature and with the investigator's observations, he is led to conclude that greater emphasis is increasingly being placed upon the chairman's administrative function. Particularly in the larger departments, this trend seems to be one of movement toward the chairman as administrative coordinator and markedly away from a conception of the executive as a "head" who exercises more absolute control of his department.

8. Interviewee comments lead to the conclusion that departmental efforts in staff recruitment and in the retention of a distinguished faculty would both be markedly enhanced by the advent in Ohio of a master plan of higher education. Pointing to the academic clarity that such a plan has brought to California, where a state-wide pyramidal structure has evolved with the University of California at its apex, it has been suggested that a comparable definition is urgently needed in Ohio. Proponents feel that such a system would define the role of higher education in Ohio, would establish the respective zones of institutional influence, and would chart the course of advance in curricular
programs, research emphases, admissions policies, fiscal support, and in the specific interrelationships of public institutions in this state. Directions need to be projected by a scheme that will assign institutional responsibilities in the areas of undergraduate, graduate, and professional instruction. Conclusively, such a design would establish the current role of each university and blueprint what each is to become. If this were done, it is thought that the planning and programming endeavors of departments would be immeasurably improved.

9. The personnel who participated in this study were virtually unanimous in their dissatisfaction with the methods and effects of evaluating instruction. While some opposition was voiced toward official classroom visitation, especially the visitation of classes taught by senior staff members, this procedure was not ruled out as a possibility. It was felt that evaluations of teaching by students also have a place in such a system, but should not be the sole criterion. It seems conclusive that each department should be responsible for evaluation of its own faculty, utilizing in the process college and University guidelines that would inject into the system some standardization and control on an institution-wide bases.

10. Intensified academic specialization seems to be the order of the day, which suggests the strong likelihood of an increasing proliferation of departmental units in conformity with national professional emphases.
11. The stated fact that competition exists between departments for a proposed subject-course indicates that these respective departments have closely related content areas which may suggest that some departmental consolidation could be effected, particularly in the cases of the smaller, non-degree-granting departments.

Recommendations

The author's summary of findings and conclusions discussed in this chapter suggested several recommendations that flow from the study, as follows:

1. In view of the increasing emphasis that is being placed upon the chairman as administrator and coordinator, the author recommends that a candidate's unique interests and competencies in these functions be given especial significance in the selection decision. Particular importance should be attached to the prospective chairman's commitment to democratic procedures and to his skills in utilizing the group process in departmental administration.

2. It is suggested that chairmen, prospective chairmen, and institutional personnel who participate in the selection and appointment of chairmen may find constructive insights embodied in Findings number seven, nine, and ten. It is recommended that these findings be consulted because of their content analyses of,
respectively, functional expectations of the chairmanship, a composite profile of personal and professional attributes characteristically associated with the image of an "able" chairman, and a compendium of criticisms of the chairman's performance.

3. The writer suggests that college deans and departmental personnel may wish to re-examine the procedures for the selection and review-reappointment of department chairmen as they are employed in their respective colleges. This recommendation is offered with the possibility that more consistency, uniformity, and depth of consultation in this process might be practicable among the colleges, and it is tendered with the thought that consideration might be given to a system along the general lines as that utilized by the College of Arts and Sciences (presented in Chapter IV).

4. It is the investigator's judgment that the pivotal role that chairmen play in the academic enterprise should earn for them a greater voice in budgetary decisions and in the determination of college and University policies and programs. Whereas some of the colleges include their chairmen on the college executive committee, others do not; the writer suggests that chairmen can properly and constructively serve on this strategic committee in each college, and he recommends that they be invariably included in its membership as one step toward an upgrading of the chairman's contributions and influence.
5. The investigator recommends that department chairmen inaugurate systematic and continuing programs for staff orientation and development. In terms of orientation, it is suggested as a possibility that new faculty members begin their appointments a week or ten days prior to the opening day of their first quarter in order that they might attend a series of meetings and workshops sponsored by each department, under the leadership of its chairman and faculty, for the purposes of staff orientation.

6. Reliable and consistent ways need to be found wherein departments may better recognize, encourage, and reward good teaching. Good teaching should be a significant criterion in academic advancement. The investigator proposes the consideration of establishing separate rank and promotional categories for staff members who are engaged solely in the teaching function. But in the absence of that system, and if research achievements continue to hold primacy as promotional criteria, then it is suggested that department chairmen should assure that these accomplishments are weighed on bases that are qualitative and equitable.

7. The writer recommends that consideration be given to the establishment in each college of an interdepartmental evaluation team to work with the dean and with the respective department chairmen to devise and implement criteria for evaluating the individual performance of faculty members in the areas of instruction, testing, grading, and other activities attendant to the classroom
and laboratory situations. Further, it is suggested that an evaluation council be established with representation from each college team so that a University-wide texture might be given to the overall evaluation effort and so that a desirable degree of uniformity in evaluative policies and procedures could be effected in the departments.

8. At best, the state of interdepartmental communication seems to leave much to be desired. The writer therefore believes that the chairman should work for an expansion and intensification of cross-disciplinary faculty seminars, not only within the several colleges but also in the University at large. This recommendation is offered toward a concerted effort to bridge some of the barriers that exist between various areas of higher learning, which, if followed, could result in cooperative innovations between the instructional programs of departments. Where appropriate, the practice of making joint faculty appointments between departments should be expanded. It is also recommended that closely-related departments hold joint discussions at least once each year in order to consider formally all matters of mutual concern. Similarly, joint departmental conference committees might be established on a continuing basis for the purpose of advising the respective departments, through their chairmen, on various interdepartmental relationships involving policy matters, standards, curricula, personnel, research, planning, and the like.
9. The Pattern of Departmental Administration as formulated by the Faculty Council sets forth an eminently sound operational procedure, and it merits much closer attention by the chairmen and by departmental faculties. The investigator found that some faculty members did not know of the existence of this policy statement, and when it was called to their attention they marveled at the number of recommended procedures that were not observed in their departments. For example, some departments did not hold regular plenary meetings of the faculty. It is suggested that many of the administrative pitfalls that were developed in this study might be avoided or softened by departmental adherence to this pattern.

10. As a companion to the recently-completed long-range master plan for the campus physical plant, it appears quite timely that a similar investigation be developed in the realm of human resources. The writer suggests the relevance of a study that would examine current staffing situations throughout the institution and project its personnel requirements for the immediate years ahead. The problems created by staff shortages and inequitable work distributions on the departmental level are particularly acute and may become more intense in all categories if some suitable remedy is not found.

11. The writer recommends that reference be given to Finding number thirteen by those departmental, college, and institutional officials who are regularly engaged in faculty recruiting. This finding outlines a series of factors that are thought to influence departmental and institutional capabilities in the recruitment of
staff members, and it also sets forth some of the determinants of decision on the part of prospective departmental recruits. This finding should also prove helpful to University personnel who might be responsible for drafting brochure materials that could be used in promoting recruitment programs. Every effort should be made to strengthen the University's posture for successful recruitment.

12. It is recommended that every possible avenue be explored toward increasing secretarial, clerical, and stenographic coverages in the departments. The chairmen and their faculties are in urgent need of assistance in these important positions. Additionally, it is specifically suggested that the University and its colleges give consideration to the establishment of executive secretarial positions to department chairmen. Such posts would be filled by top-quality and experienced personnel who could assume a full range of responsibilities and serve as expediters, thereby relieving the chairmen of many of their managerial duties.

13. It is suggested that department chairmen try to find the time for broader contact with students. Much advantage could seemingly accrue to the departments, their chairmen, and to students through an increased interpersonal association. Reference is particularly made to the importance of the chairman's rapport with undergraduate student majors and graduate students of his department. In appropriate instances, it would seem to be desirable for graduate assistants, research assistants, and other personnel in
similar student categories, to be invited to sit in on certain faculty and departmental meetings and, when feasible, to participate in such programs. Under the leadership of the chairman, and with the cooperation of the faculty, departmental seminars or inter-disciplinary workshops could be programmed on a variety of subjects for the departmental majors and graduate students. If it were carried out on a systematic and regular basis, this type of project would offer the prospect of fostering better understanding, cohesiveness, and professional identity within the department. Additionally, such programs and relationships might encourage more young men and women to enter upon careers in college and university teaching.

14. It is recommended that the University prepare a brochure, or pamphlet materials, that would be useful in staff recruitment by the departments. It is suggested that this brochure should capitalize on the assets of the University and the community and should portray the educational, cultural, social, recreational, residential, geographical, and economic advantages, as well as other fringe benefits, of the University and community.

15. Finally, since this investigation had a limited focus upon five academic departments and selected personnel within one university, it is recommended that additional studies be undertaken, hopefully broader in scope and design. Additional studies would supplement and might serve to assay the relative validity of this and other existing investigations.
APPENDIX A

QUESTIONNAIRE

1. What changes, if any, would you make in the departmental system of academic organization: (If no comment, pose subsidiary question: Do you prefer other more general, less specialized systems, such as areas, divisions, etc.?).

2. Would you change the present procedure of selecting the department chairman and/or alter the conditions pertaining to his length of service in that post? Comment.

3. Do you consider department chairmen to be pivotal figures in determining the academic character (policies and programs) of the institution? Comment.

4. What factors are the most important elements in motivating a department chairman to accept his post (or, in some cases, to seek it)?

5. What are the most important attributes to be possessed by a department chairman?

6. What do you perceive to be the major responsibilities and duties of the department chairman?

7. Is the department chairman invested with authority commensurate with his responsibilities? Comment.

8. What do you observe here concerning the democratic vis-a-vis the authoritarian department?

9. How effective (is) (are) the (chairman) (chairmen) in the use of the administrative process?

10. Realizing that all of the following items impinge in some measure upon the role and function of the department chairman, comment on the relative adequacy/inadequacy of any of the following categories in terms of the reasonable needs of the department(s): Qualified professional staff;
salary budget; research budget; equipment budget; travel budget; budget for graduate and research assistants; non-professional and clerical staff; space allocations; other.

11. Should the chairman of a large department continue to teach, research, consult, and publish, along with his administrative duties? Comment.

12. What present functions performed by the department chairman do you consider to be either extraneous to or undesirable/inappropriate aspects of the chairman's work?

13. What changes in duties of the department chairman would likely occur if he had additional staff assistance?

14. What and how does the department chairman delegate, and in what areas can this not be done?

15. Designate the standing committees that you think would be proper for the department(s) to have in regular use.

16. Does the department chairman function differently with staff members of different ranks within the department? Comment.

17. Please comment upon the adequacy/inadequacy of any aspect of the chairman's working relationship with one or more of his various publics (faculty, dean, students, central administration, alumni, other chairmen, University committees, the community, etc.).

18. How would you change the job of department chairman if you could?

19. Comment on the relative emphasis and balance that may exist among the departmental functions of instruction, research, and service. (This observation may pertain to either the division of labor or the emphasis that determines advancement.)

20. University Rule 13.0503 specifies that the department chairman... shall "evaluate continuously the instructional... processes and lead in the study of methods of improving them." Are you satisfied with the evaluation of instruction? Comment.
21. Are you satisfied with the manner of evaluating the individual performance of professional staff members in the department(s)? Comment.

22. Staff recruitment is a major responsibility of chairmen; what, therefore, are the most significant factors enhancing the chairman's ability to recruit members of the departmental staff at Ohio State?

23. What are the most significant factors impeding the recruitment of members of the department staff(s)?

24. How is staff development, training, and supervision handled in the department(s)?

25. Comment on the state of interpersonal relations within the department(s).

26. What internal policies and practices in the department(s) would you recommend changing?

27. What factor is most likely to constitute an issue on the department level and be the source of the most intradepartmental friction?

28. What major problems concerning graduate education are facing the department and its chairman?

29. What changes, if any, would you recommend concerning present policies and practices external to but effecting the department(s)?

30. Comment on the relationships and cooperation between departments.

31. What, in capsule form, is the most significant problem now facing the department and its chairman?
APPENDIX B

The Ohio State University Rules for the University Faculty Ratified by the Board of Trustees, October 10, 1960

13.00 Establishment and Administration of Colleges, Schools, Departments, and Institutes.

13.05 Establishment and Administration of Department or School.¹

13.0501. Departments and Schools; Defined.*

The unit of the University organization for instruction, research, and extension in a defined field of learning is the Department or School.

13.0503. Chairmen of Departments, Directors of Schools.*

Section 1. There shall be a Chairman of each Department and a Director of each School, who shall be the administrative head, respectively, of the Department or School. Each Chairman and Director shall be appointed for a term of four years by the Board of Trustees upon the nomination of the President. A Chairman or Director shall be eligible for re-appointment.

In selecting a Chairman or Director, the President shall confer with the Dean of the College involved (or with the proper administrative officer or officials if no College is involved) who, in turn, will consult with the faculty of the Department or School as well as other appropriate University officials.

*Rule initiated by Board of Trustees.

¹Publication for Faculty Information: Statutes Applying to the University; By-Laws of the Board of Trustees; Rules for the University Faculty. Columbus: The Ohio State University (October, 1960), pp. 42, 43.
Section 2. The duties of the Chairman of a Department or the Director of a School shall be as follows:

a. To have general administrative responsibility for its program, subject to the approval of the Dean of the College.
b. To present to staff members a pattern of administration as approved in principle by the Faculty Council with a view to the adoption of such portions as meet the approval of the Department or School. This pattern is attached to these rules immediately following Rule 13.07 and marked "Pattern of Departmental Administration."
c. To operate the business of the Department or School with efficiency and dispatch.
d. To plan with the members of the staff and the Dean of the College a progressive program.
e. To evaluate continuously the instructional and administrative processes and lead in the study of methods of improving them.
f. To evaluate staff members periodically in accordance with criteria approved by the Board of Trustees and subject to instructions from the Vice President, Instruction and Research, and also according to such supplemental criteria as may be set up by the Department or School.
g. To recommend to the Dean of the College, after consultation in accordance with the Pattern of Departmental Administration, appointments, promotions, dismissals and matters affecting the tenure of members of the Departmental and College staff.
h. To encourage research and educational investigation.
i. To lead in maintaining a high level of morale.
j. To see that adequate supervision and training are given to those members of the staff who may profit by such assistance.
k. To prepare (after consultation with the Professors, Associate Professors, and Assistant Professors with tenure) annual budget recommendations for the consideration of the Dean of the College.
APPENDIX C

The Ohio State University Rules
For the University Faculty

Pattern of Departmental Administration

On December 9, 1941, the following pattern of departmental administration was approved in principle by the Faculty Council. The Council recommended that each department discuss this pattern with a view to the putting into practice of such portions thereof as meet with the approval of the department:

1. Consultation by the chairman on all matters concerning departmental policy is on the whole desirable.
2. Consultation in this connection means conference, discussion, and interchange of opinion.
3. For purposes of consultation the following matters may be generally considered policy matters: curriculum and instruction personnel, dismissals and new appointments; promotions in rank; salary increases; cooperation with other University units.
4. For purposes of consultation, certain matters are more appropriate for individual than group conference: promotions, dismissals and salary increases. All others are generally appropriate for group consultation.
5. Group consultation should include all members of the Departmental Faculty on regular contract. (Amended 6/10/58).
6. Certain departments are organized in divisions according to educational field. Under such conditions consultation on divisional matters that do not

---

2 Publication for Faculty Information: Statutes Applying to the University; By-Laws of the Board of Trustees; Rules for the University Faculty. Columbus: The Ohio State University (October, 1960), p. 44.
concern other divisions may properly be carried on with the division concerned.

7. Consultation, regardless of the issue or person consulted, should acquaint the chairman with opinion other than his own. This opinion should be carefully weighed and the weight of majority opinion should be determining on the chairman's decision in all but exceptional cases.

8. In the event the chairman feels it necessary to depart from the majority opinion, he should so inform his staff when they are present together in a meeting. He should give reasons and invite comments.

9. Meetings of the entire department faculty (as defined in Rule 24.01) in all departments with a staff of five or more persons should be held not less often than once a month.

10. No general recommendation is possible as to departmental committees. These must emerge from local needs as considered in staff meetings.

11. Information on all matters of general departmental interest should be communicated to all members of the department faculty. This avoids misunderstanding, dispels irritation, and encourages cooperation, loyalty, and improved morale.
Concerning the Chairman's Relationships

A professor:

Except through student organizations, our chairman has very little contact with students unless the student initiates the contact. As to the dean, our chairman has had some very frustrating experiences at times in trying to represent the faculty and students before the dean. Some informal bypassing of the dean is occasionally helpful in our contacts with central administration; sometimes we think the dean doesn't understand our problems. Our chairman probably should be more active in coordinating our relationships with the professional field off-campus; we need an advisory committee composed of off-campus people active in the profession to advise the department. It would also be helpful to have an advisory committee of people representing other departments to take a look at what we're doing in this department.

A professor:

Our chairman sticks up for us as between the faculty and the outside world, but between himself and the faculty the relationships are a little on the light side. On alumni affairs, we started an alumni newsletter about two years ago and we're beefing up our alumni relations—we've learned that it's important to do it.

We should make a concerted effort to deepen our departmental contacts outside of the University. We are light on our outside resources; our research is tied to three or four people in the department, younger staff people, who are responsible for bringing this in; it's not through the chairman's influence. We've had neutralism from the chairman, the dean, and central administration on this matter of getting research opportunities.
Central Administrator:

Well, the "swivel effect" varies among chairmen, but generally chairmen tend to be overbalanced in their emphasis toward their colleagues in the department--that is, they don't "swivel" enough toward the welfare of students because of the preoccupation of chairmen with the inordinate research emphasis by faculty, which subverts the teaching function.

A chairman:

I have an 'open-door' policy in seeing students; then, we have a regular social-gripe session for our graduate students, also attended by faculty and department administration, and the students really pop-off. Our relationships with students are very good.

As to other contacts, too much of my time is spent in 'swiveling' away from my faculty--I spend so much time swiveling toward the college and University administration that less time is available for the faculty.

Central Administrator:

Chairmen should have a sense of responsibility about the requests made by them or through them in behalf of their departments or their faculties. I can say that some people sign their names to most anything around here.

Central Administrator:

I haven't found any department overdoing the job of getting outside support--this effort certainly needs strengthening.

Central Administrator:

One chairman demonstrates brash disloyalty and crass opposition toward several matters at the University; an effective dean would not tolerate this because of its effect upon students and the classroom situation.

All too often, some chairmen have limited vision about their jobs--they don't see the potential that's there--they see their responsibility as being solely to their faculty.
Central Administrator:

My general feeling is that chairmen usually identify with their faculty rather than with the administration; chairmen wish that central administration would just give them what they want and then leave them alone. This attitude is almost inevitable because of the chairmen's dual role and partly because of the size and variation of functions. For the chairmen to blame central administration from time to time is a natural outgrowth of their not being fully involved in the process of decision—they're going to have to take a role of more responsibility. Each department and college needs a man like __________; he fights for his department and college and their needs, but he doesn't write letters to Santa Claus.

Central Administrator:

A chairman noted for his contacts with departmental alumni was bothered because he couldn't identify one of his graduates whom I had seen out of state (I had forgotten his name.) He looked through his alumni cards and couldn't find the name of this former student under the city location of my visit. This greatly disturbed him. Well now, my point is that not many of our chairmen would even expect to have that close a contact with their alumni. But to be able to do so is a very desirable thing.

A professor:

Our chairman is faced with a faculty of individuals in this department, but he uses tact in exercising his power; he consults and then persuades his department through the use of logic and reason. The last thing he should do is to become arbitrary.

A professor:

Our chairman is somewhat aloof—his associations with his faculty are on a formal business level but not on a personal level. We need fireside chats between the chairman and the senior faculty, and it would be good to go to lunch with him occasionally.
A professor:

In general, our chairman is authoritarian concerning decisions in big matters, but democratic on little problems. The faculty should participate more in major policy decisions.

A dean:

A feeling of insecurity almost invariably haunts people who move into administration for the first time. We like to select our chairmen from among people who have had experience and feel secure, persons who have made some mistakes but who don't make the same ones twice.

A dean:

In my view, only two chairmen in our college are not allocating their time properly in their work with various publics of the department. One chairman does not pay enough attention to the needs of students, and the other chairman is too community-oriented.

A Central Administrator:

The so-called "swivel" effect applies to all administrators. Too many administrators are swiveling in the direction of central administration--there is a tendency for everything to be pointed toward the administration building in a kind of subservience. All administrators should swivel toward the firing line, that is, the classroom, library, and laboratory. If the chairman is trying to move up in administration, he is likely to be more conscious of central administrative opinion. Being a University professor is a fine profession which deserves more credit than it now gets. The faculty and student leaders are the most important people on the campus. We need more chairmen who are willing to object when they have legitimate concerns about our decisions.

A professor:

The role of the chairman has not been very well delineated and his role is more like a kaleidoscope in that it is a fluid, growing type of function. The more democratic the chairman is the more masters he has.
A professor:

Our chairman's relationships with various University publics could be characterized as follows: with the dean and college administration, good; with students, poor, for lack of time; with alumni, poor--lack of time; and with central administration, poor--he's scared.

A chairman:

I'm concerned about people who are only concerned with their own little bailiwick. A chairman should help interest his faculty in University-wide concerns, enable them to see the institution as a totality, its problems and main thrusts--help the faculty see the student body as a whole and look beyond one's department and college.

A chairman:

I've run myself ragged trying to keep up with the college at the expense of the department. I've about made up my mind that my main responsibility is to the department. We're not doing nearly enough toward the public and our alumni. Of course, there will be peak years in which more attention is devoted to one area or the other, then, other aspects of the department will receive more emphasis at other times. As a chairman, you always feel you're neglecting one or more important areas of concern as you become absorbed in dealing with the one area that claims your attention at any given time.

A chairman:

The dean's office and the central administration are getting too clogged up with administrators. When I want to phone ________ in the administration building directly without going through the dean, I will do so. We're getting top-heavy with administrators. Another thing, a University of 40,000 students is unthinkable.

A chairman:

The one thing that is taking more time than we have to give to it is the critical shortage of qualified professional staff people, and at a time when our enrollment is increasing by leaps
and bounds! We may have to delegate to a faculty member the re-
sponsibility for staff recruitment. The University of California
has one man on the faculty of their companion department who spends
his time recruiting staff members for them.

A professor:

The students don't know our chairman, and this is a loss for
the students. On the staff level, our departmental faculty should
know each other better, we should get together more, for this would
build a solid esprit de corps and would foster closer ties.

A professor:

I know of one department here that does a superb job in
alumni relations, through the leadership of its chairman. But our
department can't seem to summon the interest for this type of
effort. We don't have the close, warm relationships with our alumni
that we ought to have. Most of these young people on our staff are
hell-bent on the research binge, and not much follow-up is done with
alumni. We try to put teaching first, but we have to keep on top
of the heap among the various schools, which means a constant re-
search emphasis, too.

A professor:

Our chairman's relationship with the dean is a trifle
strained, but it's not particularly painful and I think some
tension is built into the situation by their different interests.
The chairman identifies with the members of his department, which
is normal and expected; his lot would be unhappy if he didn't do
that.

Central Administrator:

The problems that arise in the chairman's work with deans,
University committees, central administration, and the departmental
faculty usually derive from a weak chairman who does not assume
the responsibilities and authority of his post.

Central Administrator:

As to outside contacts, right now some chairmen are out quite
a bit looking for funds--in fact, they're probably out too much--but,
if they don't do it, who will?
Central Administrator:

There is too much of a gap between department chairmen and the rest of administration. Chairmen become defensive and think they have to fight for things--then they think the administration is against them. The problem is lack of communication, really. We need a good instrument of communication; we don't have a good one here, but we're beginning to develop it and it's very important that we do so.

A dean:

The chairman should know his students pretty well, particularly the beginning students, and he should participate in the activities of the students in his department, such as the student council, honoraries, and the like.

A dean:

Our college has too little contact with alumni, the community, and other outside publics. Our chairmen should be generating a constant flow of newsworthy items from their departments to inform the larger community.

Central Administrator:

We're not doing much about interdepartmental contacts of chairmen, particularly in the matter of promoting the inter-college relationships of chairmen. Maybe we should encourage University-wide meetings of chairmen, or perhaps smaller groups of chairmen, to foster better acquaintanceship and to discuss matters common to departments.

A professor stated:

Ideally, the chairman would visit the classes taught by those of instructor rank in order to give them guidance in teaching; at least, he should be aware of what's going on in classes taught by graduate assistants and instructors. But the chairman wouldn't ordinarily do this with the senior faculty members, however.

A professor observed:

There's no basic difference in the way our chairman operates with staff members; except in one instance, perhaps--we have
an executive committee composed of the chairman and his assistants and including the heads of divisions within the department; their committee discussions don't always trickle down to the junior staff level, but socially there's no difference.

A professor asserted:

Technically there should be no difference, but in practice the senior staff members get to exercise more of their "know-how" because of older friendships with the chairman; the senior staff has certain duties that junior members do not have--this is an element in the power relationship.

A dean stated:

The chairman will want to call in his junior staff when they're effected by a decision to be made, even though the senior staff may carry the weight of the decision. The chairman should keep good communications with the graduate assistants and maintain an open-door policy for them.

Central Administrator:

The chairman should give preference to the senior professors in the assignments of courses to be taught, hours of teaching, committee assignments, and such. However, he should be available to all members of the faculty.

Central Administrator:

Regard your senior staff as senior counsel, but do not be aloof in your dealings with the junior staff.

A department chairman stated:

My approach is different only to the extent that when you have a staff member who is an international figure in his field you are sometimes obliged to handle him with kid gloves; but this is a factor of individual personality rather than rank.
A central administrator observed:

There's bound to be some difference, such as the chairman's giving more weight to the views of his senior faculty members; but caution must be exercised here, and he shouldn't let his fraternization practices get out of hand.

A dean stated:

The chairman's decisions have to be broad and deep, therefore it's a mistake to deal differently with staff members.

A central administrator had this view:

There should be help from the chairman for the instructor on his teaching and instruction methods, while the professor won't need much help in that area; but the chairman may need to assist professors in improving their research.

A central administrator stated:

The chairman should view the members of his faculty as being of equal quality; of course, the differences attributable to such variables as age, experience, and present level of professional development must be taken into account. But stasis cannot be allowed to develop because of the chairman's unwarranted favoritism toward the senior men who may think they have it made.

A central administrator observed:

Formerly, the chairman of my department had the practice of using his senior professors as consultants to help him decide on matters of rank and promotion—he discussed these subjects with them—but that was about the only difference functionally. His executive committee was composed of the full professors in the department, and this body constituted his policy making and administrative committee.

A professor stated:

The younger members of the department have different problems that they're often unaccustomed to handling, such as
various classroom situations, lecture presentation techniques, discipline, and so on—these types of problems are often unique to our newer men and they need the guidance and counsel of our older men to turn to. Actually, the responsibility for the department rests more on the senior staff members and, naturally, the chairman consults them more often because he's known them longer and better.

A professor stated:

No, there's no substantial difference, except the senior men's opinions may carry a little more weight with the chairman. The department has a planning committee composed of senior-senior professors who act as a sounding board for the chairman's ideas.

A professor stated:

The chairman sees our younger staff members with less frequency than the others, in fact, they think they are being evaluated when he sees them; he consults with older members to some extent, but he formerly worked under them and he will cross them only after getting the cooperation of the other staff people. His consulting group is the middle-inner circle. Both ends of the spectrum are left out to some extent, you see.

A central administrator commented:

No generalizations are to be made here, except as prescribed by rules. The chairman should give more attention to the departmental orientation of new staff members. But there should be equality of treatment at all levels, and the chairman can't afford to be permissive and lenient with his senior men and be rigid and authoritarian toward the junior staff people.

A dean stated:

The votes shouldn't all be counted alike; the opinions of full and associate professors should carry more weight in the chairman's decisions.
A chairman stated:

There's as much inherent difference among people as individuals as there are differences attributable to the various ranks alone, and how you deal with them depends partly on how they view you as the chairman.

A professor stated:

We have many departmental committees; our younger staff people are prone to think that these committees are making big decisions in secret, particularly in the case of our executive committee, which some of our younger faculty members think tends to be a bit authoritarian.

A professor stated:

We have some crystallizations of opinion about various decisions that could almost be characterized as cliques; there are two generations of full professors in our department and they think differently on a regular basis, but the chairman keeps out of it.

A professor stated:

The chairman should know the difference between a good man and otherwise—he must be able to tell a rose from a turnip and act accordingly; it takes courage to make decisions, but the chairman has to know who's creative and who's not and treat them accordingly.

A central administrator observed:

Any chairman may have some departmental people whom he uses as a sounding board, perhaps senior men he turns to for information on which to base his decisions. But this factor of rank bothers me—the hierarchical aspect of it. I would be willing to give less recognition to the distinctions of rank made between our permanent faculty members.

A dean stated:

Yes, the chairman will make some distinctions because there are normal differences among staff people in their stages of development. He has responsibility for training and development, which
means he functions in different relationships to his individual faculty members.

Concerning Staff Development, Training, and Supervision

A dean:

Aside from the University-wide orientation program for new staff members, a good bit of the development of new staff people occurs by osmosis and voluntary consultation; we try to get the new junior members to sit in on classes of our senior staff before the new people take over. Some of the departments have seminars on teaching and orientation meetings, and the regular staff meetings of departments help some in this developmental process.

A dean:

Most departments have inadequate programs for staff training and supervision, particularly in the philosophy and objectives of undergraduate courses and their service functions. This depends on the chairman and his leadership. So often they don't emphasize enough the preparation of undergraduate majors.

Central Administrator:

What programs? We're just beginning to be concerned about this area of faculty preparation on the department and college levels. One college does a great deal in the social area to make their new people feel at home.

A professor:

Our program is not very formalized, though we work together. People are encouraged to attend conferences, seminars, and to take courses. Our whole faculty convenes for a workshop out of town once every two or three years; also, we have an all-day session about every year.

A chairman:

There's a lot we should be doing in this area. We have no formalized program for training or supervision of new faculty
members. Our introductory courses taught by junior level people have supervision, usually in their first two or three classes. We have no organized classroom visitation.

A professor:

We don't have a formal program in this area, but each new staff member is assigned a senior staff member to whom he can turn for guidance and help. In general, it does not include classroom visitation, but it could at the request of the junior man. Our student evaluations are very effective. The chairman keeps close watch on this. We in the department do not feel that teaching methods need to be taught, and that a man is either a teacher or not.

A professor:

Staff development is almost completely in the hands of our various instructional areas, and it is informal and voluntary—and I might say, not adequate. The chairman alone sees the student evaluations (except the instructor himself) after two quarters of service, and the chairman has conferences with these instructors regarding the evaluations by students.

A professor:

Our program is not adequate. We have one staff person who meets with the 401 instructors and they meet occasionally to evaluate their progress. We ought to have a special course for Ph. D.'s on the methods of college teaching, testing, and so on.

Central Administrator:

This area of instructional evaluation is inadequate across the board, particularly in the matter of the teaching function. Too much assumption is made that because a person knows a discipline that he knows how to teach it. As a start, two colleges have had seminars for staff members to consider the processes of learning and teaching.
A dean:

We had a series of seminars on teaching, testing, the learning process, and related subjects, but they were very poorly attended by the faculty. Maybe there was too much else going on which hindered their attendance, rather than a lack of interest on their part.

A professor:

We have no formal program. We have our introductory courses taught by graduate students, and the upper staff people work with them on their methods, testing, syllabi, etc. A course on methods of college teaching should be offered.

A professor:

We provide course outlines and give supervision to some of the new staff people. In cases where there are two sections of a course, the new staff member is given an opportunity to audit the course first before starting to teach it. We use a coordinator to help train our junior staff, also.

A professor:

We are turning our attention to this problem now. Young instructors are assigned to introductory courses and are encouraged to progress in teaching on up through the curriculum. He can call on the senior staff members for help, but no classroom visitation exists. Our student council is our official sounding board for effective teaching. We are looking into more supervision, perhaps a seminar for new staff as a possible method of training.

Concerning the Democratic vis-a-vis the Authoritarian Department

Central Administrator:

Generally, we have too much administration by committee at the department level. In some cases the democratic process is actually perverted, although they try to be sincere. In a few cases we have authoritarian departments because they've just decided to operate this way--the chairman is viewed as being in a
permanent assignment. They're fairly small departments and the chairman has been in his post a long time, pre-dating most of his staff, and he has been able to get things for his faculty, so things just ride along that way.

Central Administrator:

Most faculty members enjoy a benevolent dictator. They want to participate in major decisions but they don't want to be bothered with much else.

A professor:

Probably, the faculty participates too much in departmental decisions; I think they would be content to have some decisions made in their name.

A professor:

I think we're democratic, but our chairman may be a benevolent despot and we don't even know it, because he's so smooth in his operating methods.

Central Administrator:

If professors could really be objective and avoid some biases, faculty decisions on departmental matters would be more effective and fully justifiable. But this doesn't always work—human frailties enter in. But, in any case, the chairman can't abdicate his responsibility and relegate to committees the tough decisions that the chairman himself is unwilling to take responsibility for.

A professor:

We should have fewer committees than we have—I'm for ad hoc committees, mainly. It's time-consuming to try to involve everyone in every decision, and this is not necessary. Our process of making departmental decisions is partly democratic and partly authoritarian, and when we get into trouble over decisions it's
always because we're too much one way or the other. I respect minority votes, and if responsibility is delegated generally there has to be an effective system of managing it—things need to be talked through so that decisions are not forced.

A professor:

Our departmental teaching staff participates at the proper level in curricular decisions, but people often feel they don't have enough say in staff selection in some of our areas—but we're well informed. In general, I would say that the department is democratic, but in some of our areas we're democratic where it doesn't matter and authoritarian where it counts.

A dean:

Generally, I would characterize the departments as democratic in their decision machinery, but in the exceptions, where the chairman is authoritarian, you usually find a situation where the chairman does the hiring, he makes the course assignments on his own, and occasionally he may be the kind of person who will not plan any social engagements to which departmental personnel could be invited.

Central Administrator:

Probably the teaching staff should participate more in departmental decisions, however, I have a general feeling that only those people have a right to make decisions who are in a position to assume responsibility for the consequences of these decisions. Some departments are too democratic for their own good—or, rather, what I mean is that the democratic method is misdirected.

A chairman:

The process of departmental decisions and the degree of faculty participation bother us some. When we were smaller, a lot of our problems were handled in our regular staff meetings. Finally, though, as we grew and got a number of part-time staff members, we had people participating in decisions who were not familiar with the problems. So we put these matters into committees.
A professor:

As a generalization, I would say that our department is semi-democratic in that our staff should participate more in decisions, which they don't do enough of because of lack of time, simple mechanics, and irregular staff meetings. Our departmental faculty doesn't meet in plenary sessions but twice a year, but our subdivisions meet almost weekly, and the committee which advises the chairman meets weekly (all of our areas are represented on this committee).

Central Administrator:

Across the board, I think our teaching staffs participate in departmental decisions at about the right degree, though there are some bad spots, I would say that our departments are generally democratic, and as I hear stories filtering back from other campuses, I think we are ahead of the pack on this score.

A dean:

Our teaching staffs participate in departmental decisions at about the right level in three-fourths of our departments. The only reason we need committees is if the combined intelligence of committees enable you to do a better job. Our departments don't have chairmen who need committees to make decisions for them. We counsel our chairmen if they seem to need help as between the democratic or the authoritarian roles. The only way the chairmen can lead is to have the support of their staff people.

Concerning Intra-Departmental Issues

A professor:

There are two camps in the department: one is composed of those who are principally interested in doing research on the campus, and the other is composed of those whose principal interest is teaching. Their basic problem is one of communication. We need to conclude that instruction and research are not inimical.

A professor:

The philosophy and methods that we would support as desirablely pervading in the achievement of educational goals are our main
issues. Often, the friction centers in the areas of curriculum and program.

A chairman:

Budget, salaries, and promotions are the matters most likely to raise issues and cause friction in this department.

A professor:

Divergent evaluations of the contributions and work of faculty members are the origin of the most friction for us. This is an issue you can't duck because a decision has to be made relative to promotions in salary and rank, the granting of tenure, and matching offers that staff members get from other institutions.

A professor:

Disputes caused by age-spread in the faculty cause us some problem. There's a striking chasm at the present time between the men educated before World War II and those prepared after World War II; it goes pretty deep and is a delicate problem. Amity must be preserved because of the high market value of the younger men; some of them will take promotion to assistant professor without salary raise in order to stay here, but this isn't a good solution experientially, and it won't get any better. In order to preserve our standards, we're having to bring in men on the assistant professor level, but this is not being accepted too readily by the men with their Ph. D.'s who joined us a year or two ago and are still at the instructor rank.

A professor:

The role of a generalist versus the role of the specialist is a source of trouble, plus the matter of what aspect of our curriculum will receive special emphasis--power comes into play here among the vested interests.

A dean:

Promotions, committee assignments, and course allocations are most likely to cause friction as I observe the departments.
A professor:

I see some preferential treatment for certain individuals and it's not always justified--this bothers me.

A professor:

The only issue of major proportions that I can think of is that of bringing in senior staff men, that is, adding a new man to the staff in the ranks of assistant or associate professor. The disagreement is among the senior staff members--some want to bring in new people at the senior level, and others disagree with this policy.

A professor:

Our most recent problem has been the lack of understanding of the reasons for decisions in the department and the consequences of this action; a good many frustrations involving our curriculum revisions were due to lack of understanding on both sides of the issues.

A professor:

We've had a few issues develop that caused some friction; but we're setting up a faculty advisory committee to advise the chairman, and this body should help to solve a lot of the problems.

A chairman:

The notion of change and the way it is implemented often is a source of misunderstanding; staffs become tradition-bound and resist change--they don't want the 'sanctity' of their individual bailiwick invaded.

Central Administrator:

Probably the issue of academic standards will arise--how tough we get--what will be the quality of our educational program in the acceptance and retention of students.
A professor:

We have so much freedom of speech ourselves that we wrangle over little things, but we have pretty good agreement on the major things; curriculum rebuilding probably causes more trouble than other subjects.

A professor:

We have a dialogue between the vocational versus the liberal approaches to our field—it could be termed a breadth vs. depth dichotomy in the department.

A chairman:

Internal and external work loads cause the most discussion here.

A professor:

Proposed curriculum changes that would have the effect of reducing substantially the relative importance of any area of departmental instruction is sometimes a problem; but, as universities go, I think we have less friction in the department than any others I know of, mainly because of our size and diversity and the fact that we're all under one umbrella rather than existing as separate budgetary units.

Central Administrator:

The most volatile thing is the assignment of work loads by chairmen, which will have to be tightened up—we can't avoid it with more students on the way. It's inevitable that the faculty is, generally, going to have to work harder.

A professor:

There is a conflict between those who see the institution as a normal school which just happens to be on a university campus and those who think that no one can purvey an education who hasn't had one himself.
Concerning Recommended Changes

Central Administrator:

We've not been handling budgeting and remodeling in the departments in the best way. We're now putting more responsibility on the dean for budgeting in his college; this moves the budget operation closer to the department level and places more responsibility for financial decisions with the deans and the chairmen.

Central Administrator:

We have reached the point where new approaches to department development will have to be carried out. Concerning academic program, for example, the Council on Instruction's role would be to set broad policy. Then, the colleges will have to do increasing study of new and old programs in properly allocating the resources assigned to them. More of these decisions should be placed on colleges which will adjudicate programs and resources among their respective departments. Each college, in consultation with its departments, ought to find out what courses can be eliminated and which new courses should be supported. University educational policy, exercised by the Council on Instruction, could then in effect say to a department, through its college, "you can add a course if you eliminate one"--for the Council must retain the power of review.

A professor:

I would propose a change in the yardstick and manner of thought used in supporting research in the humanities vis-a-vis the sciences. When you want to do research in the humanities and ask for support the matter is decided as if the research operation were to be one based on the natural sciences. But research in the humanities doesn't work the same way as it does in the natural, physical, and social sciences. Elaborate instrumentation is not needed--but plain time is needed in humanities research. There is an inconsistency in research support, therefore--you can get money for equipment, but just try to get money to be relieved in time. To get research money you have to propose a project and our field doesn't always lend itself to this; our field doesn't seem so grandiose and specific as proposals in other fields. In the humanities, we need support for time in research.
and money for travel to the site of our research resources, often at distant libraries. More decisions on the allocation of research funds should be intrusted to deans and department chairmen so that research monies would be distributed more equitably.

A dean:

The undergraduate colleges need to have ex-officio representation on the Council on Instruction.

A chairman:

Some adjustment needs to be made in the budgetary process. In our enrollments, we are a peculiar department and highly fluid like English, Mathematics, and Music—we can't even 'guesstimate' our enrollments in advance with any accuracy, and this causes budgetary problems which the central administration must understand. This dilemma causes a bad situation in hiring staff people, and sometimes it is unfair to them. We need an amount of funds that we can bank on.

Central Administrator:

We should have a stronger University policy on the quality of graduate education and our courses of instruction. Some courses are weaker than they should be for a major University.

A professor:

First, this college presently has an unrealistic attitude about not appointing any of its Ph. D. graduates to faculty positions here—this should be liberalized. Second, financial support to graduate education is largely a college matter rather than a departmental matter, and the college has been weak on this.

Central Administrator:

Central administration needs to cultivate a deeper sensitivity for the job of department chairman—in fact, there should be a fuller feeling of mutual respect both ways. Additionally, we need much better communication throughout the whole University, to and from the administration and the departments. Central administration should recognize that department chairmen need to be clewed in on big ideas more than they are at the present.
Central Administrator:

We need a more equitable system of allocating funds. But we have to be careful to guard against unwarranted academic proliferation—if the faculty were allowed to add all the courses they want without abandoning any, some courses would have only five or six students and the University would soon go broke. Our curricula has to be evaluated and updated and related very carefully to the use of classrooms and other facilities.

A dean:

In those departments that are heavily engaged in contract research, a certain part of the research proceeds should be earmarked for rebate to the departments concerned. Some of these departments are supporting the University. More money should be plowed back into the departments in supporting research, instrumentation, and facilities of these respective departments that are already heavily engaged in contract research.

A professor:

We don't follow a policy of decreasing the load as a man advances in rank, but I think this should be a practice because the senior staff people advise Master's and Ph. D. students and otherwise hold heavy committee assignments. Not enough recognition is given to this fact.

Central Administrator:

Our larger departments need to get themselves so organized that they can improve and bring better balance between teaching, research, and service. These departments should ask themselves: How can we best serve the total needs of The Ohio State University? Then, the departments need to evaluate their teaching methods.

A professor:

I would want to change or eliminate the political structure in order to cut out the backbiting and dog-eat-dog attitudes that some senior staff members demonstrate. These attitudes are not unanimous, of course, they're isolated, and I suppose we do much
better on this score than some other departments. But politics are at work here, and some men who should have become full professors had gotten in bad with the people in power, so they weren't promoted. I'm lucky in my own case--I did not get into people's hair and rub people in the wrong way. Our chairman can be independent and rise above the opinions of the senior staff, though; he promoted one man to full professor against the votes of the other full professors.

A professor:

The chairman should call together the senior staff members for an occasional meeting--this is not done. This could be a sort of informal bull session in which the professors could be asked to voice their opinions on various matters; the chairman could simply ask: 'Well, fellows, how are things going? Are we headed in the right direction as a department?' Or, the chairman could even do this on an individual basis. We need a departmental critique with consultation and free and open debate.

Central Administrator:

The members of departments, through the leadership of the chairmen, should re-read the recommended pattern of departmental administration approved by the Faculty Council on December 9, 1941; if accepted and practiced by the departments, this pattern would have a markedly beneficial effect on department operations. Some departments don't meet often enough in plenary sessions for good hard work to hammer out, through fruitful discussions, a departmental planning program. This deficiency is most flagrant and the complaint most often heard about departments. Sometimes they meet for lunch in their monthly session and barely get beyond the meal itself.

A professor:

We need more recognition for areas or subdivisions within departments; more responsibility should be delegated by the chairman to the heads or coordinators of these areas and allow them to make more of their own decisions on research, service, and instruction.
A chairman:

Each department should have a staff person to handle the accounting and unified management for the research work within the department. Many of our professors who are engaged in research have to spend a lot of time in bookkeeping types of operations. There's too much of this, so we should centralize this accounting under one person in each department. But I hate to do it because it would create another minor administrator.

Central Administrator:

It would be helpful if chairmen could see their role as that of decision-makers; anything that limits this concept as it applies to a vital area, such as promotions and salaries, is bad.

Central Administrator:

More attention needs to be given, particularly by the chairmen, to the development of young scholars on the department level; these young scholars need to cultivate and nourish wholesome and constructive attitudes toward their University and profession. The chairman is a key figure in this enterprise.

Central Administrator:

There ought to be some supervision of teaching techniques at the beginning levels of instruction. A little more uniformity is needed. The central administration ought to work more closely with the department chairman as a group; no University-wide meeting of this kind has ever been held, to the best of my knowledge. At the very least, the deans should meet with the chairman of their respective colleges to encourage leadership and to develop more systematic and effective departmental operations.

Central Administrator:

Decisions within departments are made, too often, on a basis of a pure plebiscite; rather, most decisions of consequence should be made by the chairman, after consultation. Some departments are very much like social clubs and cliques.
A dean:

Each department should have a director of elementary courses who would emphasize the teaching function and help in course development and teaching evaluation. I believe that one of the most pressing needs of most departments is to get a first-rate member of the teaching staff whose assignment will be to coordinate, plan, and change the undergraduate curriculum and to visit classes, evaluate teaching, and to assist young instructors in developing an *esprit de corps* for teaching.

I think we need to banish forever the notion that the classroom is a man's castle. Visitation should be the order of the day on the lower levels. If teachers know someone cares, teaching will improve, we will have better coordination of courses, and we can avoid much duplication.

Concerning the Chairman's Continuance in Teaching and Research

A professor said:

By all means, the chairman should continue in all of the educational functions, especially teaching. By so doing, he will be more currently acquainted with what a faculty work load is and, therefore, he will not try to impose too many outside jobs on his faculty because he knows first-hand what they're up against. Then, too, doing all of these things, particularly teaching, keeps the chairman up to date on things in the profession and gives students a chance to get to know him.

A professor stated:

Some experience in teaching and research is important to the chairman. He should continue these activities if possible, otherwise he may not have the information upon which to understand the details faced by his faculty and to make adequate provision for the secretarial help that's needed. You have to go through a job to know just what is in it. An occasional research project for the chairman, or his teaching of an occasional course, is probably the best answer.

A central administrator asserted:

Yes, as long as a chairman has his dual role he should continue to teach and research. But he needs an adequate number
of assistants so that he may delegate to them many of the things that presently occupy his valuable time.

A professor stated:

I think the chairman should continue to teach. To face a class gives reality to the chairman's role, even when the amount of teaching is greatly reduced. But I really don't see how he can expect to do much research--his sacrifice of his own research is simply one of the burdens a chairman has to carry. Instead, his efforts should be in keeping informed about the scholarship of the members of his department staff.

A chairman stated:

It's not very practical to expect a chairman to engage in both teaching and research--perhaps he can engage in one or the other from time to time--it all depends upon the amount of administration he faces. I make it a point to serve on research committees in order to stay in touch with this part of our program.

A professor stated:

It all depends upon the man and his personality. Our chairman likes to conduct departmental business on a face-to-face basis, and his door is always open; yet, he finds the time to teach at least one course per year, but we of the faculty do not assume that the chairman should teach.

A professor stated:

Our chairman tries to do too much teaching. It's probably good for a chairman to continue to do some research so that he's continually aware of the changing conditions encountered by his departmental faculty. But it's more realistic for this research and writing to be done in collaboration with others, so that he doesn't carry the full load of it.

A professor stated:

I think the chairman should maintain his direct contacts with students, and therefore he should continue to teach and do
research insofar as possible. But you can't do everything; for instance, much of the information taught in our field today was not even known just a few years ago, and it's hard for the chairman to keep up with these developments.

Another professor stated:

    Administration is a full-time job, but it is desirable for the chairman to continue to teach and research because these activities keep his attention on the level of the problems he's dealing with as chairman, and they develop his feeling for departmental programs.

A professor stated:

    It would be fine if the chairman could teach and do research once in awhile, but it's probably neither possible nor realistic to expect. His administrative load is the determinant, and the answer is not just to add more administrative assistants to the chairman so that all can then pursue their teaching and research activities. Rather, I think the man's service as chairman should be limited to two terms, eight years, so that he doesn't get too far away from the full-time teaching and research functions.

A college dean observed:

    The chairman should, if possible, continue his teaching and research. The kind of man I want as chairman will always want to do these things but, unfortunately, his virtual inability to do them in harmony with an administrative job is one of the built-in frustrations of his position. To be a good teacher you have to keep abreast of your subject and keep your lecture materials up-to-date and vibrant; this is most difficult to do alongside of a full-time job in administration. And a man can't indefinitely trade on the accumulated capital of his past career in teaching, for it grows stale. Therefore, it is my conviction that if a chairman cannot do a qualitative job in teaching along with his other duties, then he should stick to administration solely. The rub comes in, however, through the fact that most of our recognition comes from our professional and scholarly achievements. But I'm not in favor of the chairmanship being relegated to a part-time position.
A central administrator expressed this view:

Yes, even a chairman of a large department should continue his active program in teaching and research--otherwise he is bound to lose contact with his profession. When _______ was chairman of the department of ________, he published more than the heads of the several divisions within his department; so, it can be done.

Another central administrator stated:

The University owes it to the chairman to provide him with adequate help to insure that he will continue to teach and research on some basis, even part-time. This must be done so the chairman doesn't become a mere office boy who provides no professional leadership. They've just got to have help so that they may continue in teaching and research.

Another central administrator observed:

We have departments that require greater administrative skill and more time than is required to administer some of our colleges here. And I think that any educational administrator is justified in feeling, and should feel, that he is a teacher even though his form of teaching is not given through a formal classroom situation.

A college dean asserted:

If chairmen are willing to delegate some of their administrative duties, they can find the time to teach and do research; they must understand their role to be successful, but chairmen will differ on the approaches used in their job, and they should. Some chairmen will spend all of their awakened hours on the job.

A department chairman offered this opinion:

I think a chairman can do a bare minimum of teaching, an occasional seminar, but I do more than that. We're short-handed on teachers in the department, and I have to do it to give coverage to all of our class sections. I don't like the thought of giving up teaching and would like to keep my hand in the classroom, but it surely runs counter to my administrative efficiency.
APPENDIX E

INTERVIEWEES' RESPONSES CONCERNING THE PERSONAL AND PROFESSIONAL ATTRIBUTES THEY CONSIDER MOST IMPORTANT IN THE CHAIRMAN'S TABLEAU OF QUALIFICATIONS

**Professor**

Ability to inspire the faculty.

A knowledge and acceptance of the fact he can't always "live by the book."

Be an innovator and be able to find ways to relieve the faculty of detail so they can do more research.

Be humane and sensitive to the needs and desires of his associates.

Interest in keeping abreast of all the new research in the departmental fields.

Get along with people--be a diplomat.

Be willing to look at his job as being full-time.

Penchant for being available to see the members of the faculty.

**Dean**

Have an understanding of the place and obligations of his department to the college and to the University.

Know the importance of upper level and graduate work.

Be able to recognize a good scholar-teacher when he sees one and not be afraid to advance such a man above himself as chairman.
Professor

Be alive to rest of the world--aware of education's impact on the outside world.

Be sensitive to the proper balance drawn between research and teaching.

Be able to earn respect commensurate with the authority he commands.

Be a good decision maker.

Be a good listener.

Be persuasive.

Loyalty to his colleagues--will go to bat for you.

Have respect for the individual and be cognizant of the human element.

Dean

Ability to motivate people to do their very best.

Have patience for administrative details--"housekeeping" and paperwork, and be effective at it.

Be an effective planner.

Be comfortable in rendering decisions.

Central Administrator

Possess genuine administrative ability.

Ability to establish rapport with members of the department.

Have the respect of other chairmen in his college.

Possess national prestige in his field of competence, if possible, this is a PLUS factor.

Have the courage and strength to go to bat for his department.
Professor

Have integrity—this is "tops." Imbue the faculty with a justified faith that they can trust him—that he's giving you the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth—and that there's no finagling.

Have experience as a teacher.

Have an ability in group dynamics and a commitment to group action.

Be insightful about the role of the department and have experience in staff participation.

Willingness to take a stand on things and not be neutral.

Central Administrator

Be a bifurcated individual—interested in both teaching and research.

Have real leadership ability—"gets people to do what he wants them to do because they want to do it."

Central Administrator

Ability to develop and evaluate alternate courses of action.

Courage to stick with decisions made.

Be first and foremost an educational administrator.

Doesn't have to be a scholar, but should be a respected member of his discipline.

Ability to see individuals in the group and to elicit from them a caliber of work tailored to their individual abilities.

Professor

Dedicated to the objective of training students.

Dedicated to the objective of getting support for his faculty.
College Dean

Chairman must have accomplishments and qualifications in the field represented by his department—professional standing.

Have confidence that he knows what he's doing.

Have an organized mind and skill in using it.

Be able to extract satisfactions from administrative work.

Have a disposition for inter-personal relationships and a desire to foster harmony.

Professor

Have sense of fairness and empathy.

Be a well-organized person in his own life—have good proclivities for allocating his time properly—be able to delegate.

"Have the courage to trample on those who don't produce toward the departmental objectives."

Be a minor joiner.

Be interested in promoting the reputation and stature of the department.

Professor

Tact.

Ability to make decisions and take responsibility for them.

Be a dominant enough personality that his decisions prevail.

Have drive—great energy—endless patience—willingness to put in limitless time.

Professor

Pleasing personality.

Our processes are educational, not dictatorial, so he must have reputation and competence as an educator.
Professor

Personal magnetism.

Be understanding—a good listener.

Be able to help a man correct his mistakes without hurting him. "Our chairman has bailed us out without others ever knowing about it."

Be fundamentally honest with his staff and superiors.

Chairman

"Does his personality respond to the challenge confronting him? Can he say 'no' and make people like it? One of the outstanding qualities is the ability to accomplish something by calling your group together and letting them discover for themselves the answer that you thought should be made in the first place. This improves morale."

Departments need different kinds of people at different times in their existence—depends on needs of the department and institution. Some chairmen are just a holding operation, while others are engaged in a rebuilding effort.

Central Administrator

Has a view that goes beyond the little areas of specialization. Not provincial.

Able to offer stewardship.

Interest in placing new knowledge into use.

Modest—not an empire builder.

Have a primary interest in his discipline, but have a University-wide view as befits a leader in a comprehensive University.

Have a concept and grasp of the administrative role as well as the academic role.

Be exceedingly well informed.

Be able to exercise wisdom and leadership in the development of reasonable unity in departmental programs.

Be unwilling to operate the department solely on the basis of votes.
College Dean

Ability to practice consultations before making decisions.
The desire to make his department best.
Have a concept of his job as that of a service job.
Have patience, forebearance, tolerance, and understanding toward people.
Have a solid scholarly background so he can understand the processes of teaching and research and their interactions.

Central Administration

Be optimistic.
Be a pacesetter for his department.
Like to work with people at all levels.
Have breadth of knowledge beyond his own discipline.
Be a good business manager.
Be a scholar in his own right and be a good teacher to command respect.
Have outstanding leadership qualities.
Be comfortable in delegating.
Be a good organizer of his faculty in order to exploit their talents to a maximum degree.

Professor

Tremendous physical vigor. If he has strong views he has to use care and discretion in presenting them. "Chairman should not be just a functionary. Our chairmen have always been charming and have promoted amiable relationships. But the days when everyone knew each other are probably gone forever."
Professor

Penchant, for self-sacrifice and service.

Ability to handle delicate matters like salary and load.

Love of teaching.

Doesn't seek job--job seeks him.

"We've had several men who refused to accept the chairmanship--sometimes we could reassure them and build them up to take it."

Central Administrator

"As first among the important attributes to be possessed by a chairman, I would list the ability to recognize quality, to pick good faculty members, and the knack of pulling the best out of his faculty. Further, the easiest thing in the world is for an administrator to say 'no'--yet, instead, he needs to listen carefully and say 'yes' as often as possible. He needs to be alert to the importance of building a strong staff, particularly on the lower levels. He must possess the quality of being impartial--it is disastrous for a chairman to play favorites. Nine-tenths of the complaints about chairmen derive from allegations of partiality."

Professor

Have a very diplomatic approach and professional quality.

Some people decide after they are in teaching for awhile that their strengths lie in administration. Some have higher ambitions and aspire to becoming an administrative career man.

Professor

Have great unselfishness.

Enormous energy.

Willingness to take initiative.
Ability to consult and act accordingly.
Have tolerance for many kinds of people.

**Central Administrator**

Ability to redirect into positive channels the adverse competition among members of his faculty.

**Central Administrator**

Have a sense of loyalty to the University at large.
Be able to tolerate the drudgery of administrative work.
See himself as primarily an administrator.
Firm ability to take charge.
Ability to maintain high morale.

**Chairman**

Like to work with a group--have real vision in terms of their field--know what's going on nationally--have a realistic ability to move forward in educational programming and research--be able to sort out what's important from what's not--be able to eliminate the minutiae from the job--cut short of perfection when decisions are called for--set the pace in performance.

**Professor**

A man does not have to have a great reputation, but he should understand his own field well enough to know the problems of a scholar. He should identify with the major tasks of the department.

Should enjoy planning and leading a team.

**Professor**

Vibrant mental and physical health.
Initiative and ability to "stick to one's guns."

Sympathy for and understanding of people and their ambitions.

Have a breadth and depth of vision about one's field as a whole--be broad guage in interests and abilities--have a desire to serve.

**Central Administrator**

Fairness--integrity above and beyond reproach.

Be respected by colleagues as a scholar.

Have an institutional loyalty, oriented to the goals of the University, that will transcend his department and serve the total interests and needs of the University.

He must be a secure person intellectually and psychologically.

He must never be apologetic for being involved in administration.

He must be willing to give leadership to faculty, students, and alumni, and be willing to be a colleague of his fellow administrators.

**Chairman**

Should be devoted to serving his department--must be willing to sacrifice his personal goals for the good of the department.

Must be scrupulously honest--even a casual statement of intention to do something is remembered interminably as a promise by faculty members.

Must be artful and skilled in compromise in order to deal successfully with "faculty prima donnas who are aggressive."

**Professor**

Must be a scholar--"if this quality is not there, any other virtue the man may have is severely handicapped."

Be respected and looked up to.

Have an interest in fostering the aims of the department.
Ability and patience for administrative drudgery—to do all kinds of "homework" and tedious routine—maintain patient industry.

Have a clear head and mind.

The retiring scholar is not desirable in this job.

Have the ability to operate in the University community effectively—no department can exist alone.

**Chairman**

Be able to live with problems and frustrations.

Have a dedication for administrative work and not desire to be back in teaching.

Liking and empathy for people, and comfortable feeling about administration.

**Professor**

Ability to maintain a friendly working environment in the department.

Ability to give directions that do not offend.

Understanding of total institution.

Knowledge of organization and how to run one.

**Central Administrator**

Be a fine scholar, teacher of merit, a leader of men, be able to inspire the faculty to be creative and developmental, have administrative skill.

**Professor**

Have ability to present problems and meet them with fairness and without prejudice—no playing of favorites—"a chairman is put in a box on a lot of decisions; like a parent, he may have to grant some special privileges occasionally, but the bases of his decision must be known."
**Professor**

Basically aggressive--extremely practical--extremely purposeful--and have ability to hold his focus on the department without getting lost in larger issues.

**Professor**

A chairman should be the kind of person who is willing to work through others in a democratic way--he should be genuinely interested in people, including students. He should continually ask himself, "Where would I like to see the program of this department going?" He should be a good planner and always be interested in looking for new staff people.

**College Dean**

A chairman must be very circumspect--equal treatment, even socially, must be accorded to all members of his departmental staff.

He must have the respect of his departmental faculty.

He must recognize that administrative duties are his most important responsibility--chairmen often get into hot water when they think this unimportant.

A chairman must have the ability to remain aloof from any over-identification with any special group within the department.

**Central Administrator**

"I think it depends on the concept of his role, whether or not he's to be a leader among his colleagues. We're a long way from the medieval university where things were very informal. As a university becomes more complex the chairman's role requires tremendous skill and understanding. If we are to keep departments as they now are, then we need to give much more emphasis to the administrative aspects of the job than is now given."
APPENDIX F

STANDING COMMITTEES THAT RESPONDENTS THOUGHT TO BE

ADVISABLE FOR EFFECTIVE DEPARTMENTAL OPERATION

(Some of which have Sub-Committees)

Executive Committee
Administrative Committee
Student-Faculty Organization Committee
Curriculum Committee
Personnel and Recruitment Committee
Graduate Committee
Library Committee
Senior-Tutorial Committee
New-Staff Committee
Committee on Planning and Operations
Staff Meeting Program Committee
Advisory Committee on Ranks, Promotions, and Tenure
Faculty Advisory Committee to the Chairman
Counseling-Student Relations Committee
Space and Equipment Committee
Research Committee
Staff-Load Committee
Employment-Student Placement Committee
Safety Committee (Sciences and Engineering)
Colloquia-Lecture Series Committee
Public Relations-Alumni Committee
Committee on Scholarships, Fellowships, and Assistantships
Honors Committee
Committee on Undergraduate Majors
Committee on Evaluation of Instruction and Research
Interdepartmental Advisory Committee
Many Ad Hoc Committees to handle special, short-range assignments
APPENDIX G

THE OHIO STATE UNIVERSITY

The Chairmanship of the English Department: Some Notes

Toward a Job Analysis

By Robert M. Estrich, Chairman

I. The chairman's job revolves around a series of annual tasks which occupy all four quarters of the year. They provide the frame within which everything gets done, and upon their handling most of the department's work depends. In the present structure the chairman is largely assisted in many of these tasks by his administrative assistant, the executive secretary, the vice-chairman, and various committees. To try to break the operations down into special individual responsibilities, however, would be meaningless here because, first, they are finally the chairman's responsibility no matter what help he has. Second, the amount and kind of aid he has depend to a large degree upon the knowledge, capability, personality, and number of his assistants. Third, a different organization could be developed that would re-allocate and redefine all the duties and positions of the chairman's administrative staff (the present organization has rather grown than been planned). Here follows a listing of the annual tasks arranged as far as possible according to their calendar occurrence.

A. Preparation of bulletin copy, demanded early in the fall quarter for the succeeding year to go to the college Curriculum Committee, the Graduate Council, the Council on Instruction, and the University Editor.

1. Requirements and recommendations in all college bulletins.
2. Curriculum and course descriptions. New and revised courses.
3. Schedules of courses.
4. Teaching schedules and quarters of service for all staff.
B. Evaluation of instructors and assistant professors and decisions on tenure, dismissal and promotions. Tenure and dismissal cases to be settled by mid November.

C. Advising and planning with the year's crop of Ph.D. candidates about job getting. Letter writing to other chairmen about our candidates. To be done early in the fall quarter and continued until candidates are placed.

D. Hiring new staff for succeeding year.

1. Faculty staff. Involves basic department educational planning as well as budget. Requires much consultation with existing faculty, individually and in groups. As much as possible is done before Christmas, but continues until late spring. Much correspondence. The chairman both conducts interviews and organizes them for others at the M.L.A. and in Columbus.

2. Non-faculty staff: graduate assistants, assistants, assistant instructors. Advertising, interviews and correspondence begin early in fall quarter. The two latter jobs reach their peak at end of winter, continue throughout spring and summer, and occur in smaller numbers before the beginning of each quarter.

E. Evaluation of faculty, promotions, salary raises, and new needs in preparation for budget. Usually starts in January. Reviews of all faculty save those already reviewed for tenure and dismissal. Group consultation. Individual conferences. Chairman's five-year plan often called for by dean. All these plans, programs, and adjudications call for constant and continuing collection of information about faculty and constant evaluation by the chairman who, although he consults with the department, has to take a great deal of initiative in these matters.

F. Preparation of budget. Plans and conferences with dean start early in winter quarter (sometimes in the fall). Rarely settled before summer, sometimes not until late July or early August. Includes estimates of enrollment and staffing needs on non-faculty levels as well as faculty salaries, promotions, and raises. In the summer
of the even years the chairman will probably be asked to make estimates and recommendations for the biennial budget, which comes to the legislature in the odd years.

G. Interviews with all "casual" staff, last half of winter and spring quarters. To discover plans of graduate assistants, assistants, and assistant instructors, to encourage the best to stay and complete their programs expeditiously, to discourage or dismiss the incompetent, to adjust teaching loads to the needs and best interests of individuals, etc., etc. This is an especially important task of the office because of its effects upon our graduate students and their progress as well as upon the quality of teaching done in our 400-level courses.

H. Appointment of departmental committees for the succeeding year. To be made in view of who will be on duty when, and cleared with individuals (as far as possible and when wise) before settlement. Spring Quarter.

I. Quarterly adjustments in teaching loads, schedules, assistants, resigned and added staff. In the last half and first week of each quarter.

J. Advising, assisting, and planning for light quarters, quarters off, research duty, Fulbrights and foundation grants for (mostly) regular faculty. Writing recommendations. Chiefly in fall and spring quarters, but often at whatever time during the year a faculty member crystallizes his own plans. This has become very important lately not only for individuals but equally for the department's own economy.

K. Supervision of and liaison with branches. Staffing, deciding about course offerings, consulting with teaching staff on problems which ought to be handled elsewhere but are not. This is the most frustrating and meaningless job the chairman now has, because of the total lack of definition by the top administration of the University of the purposes, functions, and future of the branches. Heaviest in spring and summer, but constant through the year.

L. Planning the agenda of and chairing two senior staff meetings a month, departmental staff meetings, and meetings of special groups of the department. Important because much of the department's policy is settled in these meetings, both in detailed cases and in general. Information is also disseminated, and problems debated.
M. Serving on committees. The present chairman finds it necessary to the proper handling of his duties to be an ex-officio member of several of the Department's major committees. He simply needs the information available only there. As a result of Arts college organization all chairmen are members of the Arts College Executive Committee; sometimes the chairman is asked to serve on smaller, usually ad hoc college committees; and, while the present chairman avoids as much as he can the big university councils and committees, in view of the importance of university policy to the affairs of the department, he would be irresponsible if he refused to serve on a selected group of them.

N. Supervision of teaching and relations of students to staff. While the chairman can personally do little of this and much of it is done by his assistants, yet he is constantly an adviser on such matters and consequently a court of appeal. He is also the recipient of a vast number of comments from staff and students alike, and he is steadily asked to review individual cases, which may range from transfer credit to problems of discipline, grades, and mental health. The job can be as important as it is time consuming, for the integrity of the department is often involved, as is frequently fair play to both students and to instructors, and nearly always the public relations of the department. Sometimes special cases even require wisdom if the chairman has any.

O. The active encouragement of creative scholarship, educational experiment, criticism, and writing of, in fact, all creative activity—by members of the department. This means not only helping to get the already mentioned money, aids, time off, etc., etc., but most especially giving the chairman's personal attention to the specific jobs the staff are doing or contemplate doing—talking over problems, planning time and programs, and especially being interested, reading and criticizing Mss., reading and commenting on publications, helping to define the intellectual problem, and so on. There is no end to this job, year around. It is vital. It is shared with the rest of the department of course, but the present chairman is constantly amazed by the need of members of the department to consult an executive officer.

P. Handling miscellaneous correspondence. Throughout the year the chairman of a big, nationally known department
has a steady daily mass of correspondence that can hardly be classified. It comes from students, former students, future students, and would-be students, and from faculty, former faculty, and potential faculty. From organizations professional and public. From individuals and groups. On problems of language alone, questions come from the Governor of the state, major business and legal firms, publishing houses, teachers, writers, women's clubs, and youngsters from every grade from the third through high school. Questionnaires of the utmost importance concerned with the major problems of education in America to the junk that comes from graduate students seeking an easy means of writing a thesis are constant. Former graduate students now teaching elsewhere--whether in Australia, Saudi Arabia, Paris, or Podunk--write for help, advice, or recommendations. School boards, principals, and teachers seek information about curricula or an analysis of the records of their students on our placement test. The A.A.U.P. refers the records of a case to the chairman because a faculty member of another school was once a student here. A former student asks for an affidavit to submit to the House Un-American Activities Committee. A youngster in Wyoming wants help on a term paper about James Thurber, a hopeful poet in Bellefontaine wants help to publish, and a gang of bored soldiers in Turkey refer a bet on the differences between British and American English. A German scholar wants to get in touch with a former Ohio State Ph.D. in English, and a South African professor needs help to get out. The Secretary of the Modern Language Association asks for advice in dealing with Project English, and the University of Indiana asks for nominations to its vacant chairmanship. About half of this endless, indescribable correspondence is important and requires thoughtful handling, half is essentially trivial, but nearly all of it requires careful answering if for no other reason than to protect the public image of the University and the Department.

11. Implicit in several items listed above, but needing an all-over comment to itself, is the chairman's role as advisor, helper, disciplinarian, interpreter, defender, and lay analyst to members of the staff and students alike. These responsibilities have included for the present chairman everything from lending money, to aiding sinners to get out of town ahead of the
law and/or the police, helping people to get adequate medical care (sometimes free), taking the responsibility of firing staff even in mid quarter for gross misbehavior, defending staff against lies and malicious reports, interpreting department personalities to the administration and public (and often to each other), examining the truth of reports, published and private, concerning the behavior of staff and students, consulting with staff on everything from their divorces to their real estate deals, their possible retirement annuities and their possible need of a psychiatrist. Sometimes the questions discussed with students and staff involve a choice of or planning for a total professional career, sometimes it is how to get out of a foolish mess. Many of these are familiar to any teacher anywhere and are a part of the job of us all; some can be done only by someone with the authority of the chairman's position or with the authority of long and intimate acquaintance with the university and the community. In any case, I wish to point out emphatically that such problems come to a chairman not because of the personality of the incumbent, but because he tends to represent authority, personal detachment, practical knowledge of ways and means, and a certain objectivity. Insofar as any of these problems involve the University, the Department, or an individual's professional career, they are, of course, the proper and necessary business of a chairman; and the human animal being what it is, one has only to scrape the surface of a professional problem to find a personal one underneath.

III. Public relations within the university. The chairman has to carry the brunt of the Department's public relations within the University, whether it be preparing a five-year evaluation of staff and projected salaries for the dean, a projected research proposal to various administrative officers, calling attention to distinguished work done in the department, justifying department aims, functions, and standards to administrative officers, or pacifying other chairmen whose sons and daughters are not doing well in English 417 even though mama and papa are writing their themes for them. The chairman appears before curriculum committees, the Council on Instruction, and the Graduate Council to defend not only curricular changes but also to defend the kind of developments, courses, and programs not infrequently viewed suspiciously or resentfully by other departments. The chairman is also frequently asked to advise other members of the department upon the performance of their duties and the nature of the problems in college and university committees, just as he does about departmental committees. I have only touched lightly here on what is often a complex and sometimes difficult job.
IV. Public relations outside the University. This covers everything from explaining to a millionaire alumnus why his son properly was failed in an English course in the spring of the young man's senior year, to accepting as many engagements as possible to speak before groups of Ohio public school English teachers, to acting when asked as president of the English group of the Ohio College Association, to helping to set up new organizations like the Ohio English Association. Most especially it involves the never-to-be accomplished task of trying, by whatever means, to explain to individuals and to groups by letters, conferences, newspaper interviews, etc., etc., the function and nature of serious teaching of language, composition, and literature.

(The present chairman at one time did a great deal more of this sort of thing—especially publicly—than he is now able to do. Some of the work he has been able to delegate, more is not getting done. It is very important that his successor be able to resume this work and push it farther than he is now doing.)

V. Serving as state and national representative of a major department in a major university. Unhappily the present chairman, after a good start and some accomplishment, has had to cut back his activities in this essential field. The first reputation of a great department—what brings it, for instance, its best graduate students—comes from its scholars, their teaching, and their publication, of course; but next it comes from the chairman, directly or by his encouragement of others to participate in national organizations and movements, to keep closely in touch with other chairmen, secretaries of national organizations, etc.—to know and to be known. These things are not public relations alone, valuable as public relations have become in our brave, new world; they are active participation in the community life of English teachers and scholars. In the next few years, such participation is going to be even more important than it has been in the past, for with the national government and the big foundations interesting themselves in providing funds to improve the quality of English teaching all over the country, any failure to participate will lower the department's national standing rapidly and catastrophically. Not to be active, to take but one example out of many, in the new National Conference of English Department Chairmen is regrettable. It is imperative that the department secure a chairman who can carry his full weight on the national scene.
VI. Finally, for reasons which are too obvious to repeat, the chairman has to do some teaching, preferably of advanced undergraduate and graduate work. It is equally important to the department and to the man.

Note to Dean Fuller:

If this report were ever to be used by a successor to me as a guide to his duties, it could perhaps profitably be re-organized. As it stands it is designed to indicate to you and the committee the scope of the job, the calendar, and some of the job's various complexities. If it were to be a guide for another chairman, it might be useful to break it down into something like this:

I. Routine and repetitive tasks and responsibilities.
   A. Curriculum
   B. Staff
   C. Policy making

II. Non-routine (variable constants).
   A. Personnel activities
   B. Supervision of teaching
   C. Public relations
   D. Serving as the department's representative
   E. Teaching

I believe that most of the detail discussed in the long analysis could be organized under the above heads. It would lack the calendar references.

Winter Quarter, 1963.
APPENDIX H

METHOD OF SELECTING DEPARTMENT CHAIRMEN IN THE
COLLEGE OF AGRICULTURE AND HOME ECONOMICS AT
THE OHIO STATE UNIVERSITY

When a vacancy occurs or is about to occur in a department chairman's position, the dean of the college appoints a departmental committee to assist him in the process of screening and making recommendations among the candidates for appointment. The dean and this committee hold a meeting with the departmental faculty and distribute cards requesting information supportive of nominees that individual faculty members would wish to be considered for the chairman's post (see facsimile below). The dean then meets with the committee to evaluate the nominations presented on the cards and to consider any other possibilities; the dean and the committee weigh the relative qualifications of the candidates, keeping in mind the needs of the department, the college, and the University, and arrive at a decision of which candidates will receive more formal consideration. The dean and the committee come to a consensus on the matters of which candidates will be interviewed and under what circumstances the interviews
will proceed. The committee may offer recommendations, but final decision rests with the dean in presenting a candidate to the President for nomination by him to the Board of Trustees, the appointing authority.

**FACSIMILE**

Check below your first choice regarding a successor to

___ Someone presently employed on the faculty of this Department.

___ Someone from outside the Department.

List below in order of preference the names of persons whom you believe to be eminently qualified for the position:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Someone on the faculty</th>
<th>Someone from the outside</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>1.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>2.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>3.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

List in order the 3 qualifications you consider most important:

1. __________________________________________________________

2. ______________________________________________________________________________

3. __________________________________________________________

If you wish to do so, kindly check appropriate spaces below regarding your position and tenure:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Academic Rank</th>
<th>Service in Dept. as Instructor &amp; above</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Professor</td>
<td>20 or more years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate Professor</td>
<td>15-20 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistant Professor</td>
<td>10-15 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instructor</td>
<td>5-10 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2-5 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Less than 2 years</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX I

SPECIFICATIONS FOR OFFICE OF CHAIRMAN,

DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

College of Education
The Ohio State University

Approved by the Department of Education, December 4, 1961

1. Duties outlined in Section 2 of Rule 13.0503 of the Rules of the University Faculty are basic.

2. The Pattern of Departmental Administration approved by the Faculty Council, December 9, 1941, is accepted in principle.

3. Since the Department of Education is one of the largest departments in the University with functions requiring many interdepartmental relationships, both among college departments and those outside the College of Education, and has some responsibility for leadership in education in the state, nation, and the world, the Department Chairman should, within the framework and policy of the College of Education, concentrate his efforts on the following:

   a. Taking initiative and exercising leadership in the development of outstanding programs in teacher education among members of the Department, among College departments and the University at large, in the state, and in the nation.

   b. Encouraging the development of expertness and leadership on the part of individuals and groups within the Department by finding appropriate means for each staff member to make his contribution in the area of his greatest competence—instruction, research, or service.

   c. Planning and developing means for coordinating the many diverse functions of the Department.
d. Giving direction and leadership to the development of programs by seeking agreement on policies and principles that serve as a guide for departmental action.

e. Making the staffing, budget, salary, and assignment which, after consultation, he deems to be in the best interests of the departmental contributions which are appropriate to the total College and University educational effort.

f. Keeping on the frontier of developments in teacher education and, as a result of his study, bringing to the staff implications and propositions which challenge present practices.

g. Facilitating the planning and organizing of programs of instruction in the various areas of teacher education and developing operational procedures for enhancing the effectiveness of the faculty members responsible for these programs.

h. Planning and organizing the work of the departmental office in cooperation with his associate (assistant) chairmen and members of his advisory committee elected by the departmental staff.

4. Because of the size and complexity of the Department it is proposed that two staff members of the appropriate professional rank be employed to assist the Chairman. The administrative title of Associate Chairman or of Assistant Chairman seems appropriate for such personnel.

5. While it is assumed that the central office structure will be such that certain duties now performed in this office will be delegated by the Chairman to his associates (assistants), it is also recognized that the concept of the office outlined above suggests the need for further amplification of the roles of persons in these positions.

It is assumed, also, that the need for informal area centers such as the "Elementary Education Center," the "Science and Mathematics Education Center," etc., still exists, and that consideration must be given to the relationship between them and the roles of personnel in the Office of the Chairman.

The Advisory Committee suggests that the Department give further consideration to various aspects of departmental organization as the process for the selection of the Chairman moves forward.
6. The Chairman and the Associate Chairmen (or Assistant Chairmen) may through research or part-time teaching maintain an association with the areas of their teaching specialties; the extent of their participation in these programs, however, will be dependent upon the duties of the office of the Chairman.

7. The specifications for the office of the Chairman assume the existence of an adequate clerical staff working under the direction of an office manager directly responsible to the Chairman.

8. Suggestions on the personal qualifications of the Chairman.

   a. He should be a person who can provide the initiative in helping individuals solve problems of load in teaching, research, and service.

   b. He should have demonstrated ability to stimulate research activity and writing to the extent that he can provide ways for a person to engage in his research and writing.

   c. He should be a person who can recognize potential for research among persons in the Department.

   d. He should be aware of the "growing edge" in the profession.

   e. He should have a balanced view with a profound respect for the entire range of activities in the Department. He should respect teaching and service as well as research.

   f. He should be able to assume leadership in promoting the development of the competencies of both students and staff in the Department.

   g. He should be able to lead in fostering better understanding and relations with other departments in the University.

   h. He should be able to delegate and foster leadership in others with a view toward staff developments.

   i. He should have a deep concern and devotion to public education at all levels of instruction.

   j. He should value diversification of teaching and research activities within the Department.
k. He should be a person who can recognize and utilize both agreement and differences as positive forces in developing principles of action.

l. He should have a genuine liking for the processes of decision making.

m. He should have had sufficient experience in college and university programs to provide an understanding of techniques for building strong departmental programs.

n. His personal and social adjustment should be such that face-to-face contacts with individuals and groups are congenial and businesslike.
APPENDIX J

On February 19, 1958, a policy on teaching load was adopted by the University's Administrative Council, as follows:

The Ohio State University fulfills its responsibilities by providing teaching, service, and research. It is expected that faculty members will contribute to meeting these obligations of the University in ways which are in keeping with their abilities and interests within the practical limits of efficient operation. In any departmental staff there is considerable difference in the interests and capabilities of individual staff members; some can render particularly notable service in the field of teaching, some may serve best by emphasis on research, still others are equipped by virtue of special interests and talents to make maximum contributions in the field of special services. It therefore devolves upon the administration (chairman) of the department to make the teaching, service and research assignments in keeping with the best utilization of the staff in order that the best interests of the students are served, while at all times restricting these assignments so as to provide time for reflection, the development of ideas and the extension of our frontiers of knowledge. Faculty appointments should be regarded as full-time responsibilities to the University. (Council's italics). All outside activities, whether for added compensation or otherwise, must not be performed at the expense of the teacher's primary responsibilities; such activities should only be undertaken with the full understanding and approval of the chairman of the department and the dean of the college. 3

---

3The Ohio State University, Faculty Handbook (Columbus: January, 1961), p. 17.
A great deal of difference is readily discernible in the practices and procedures employed by various colleges and universities for departmental administration. Much of this divergence in structure and methodology may undoubtedly be attributed simply to tradition or historical accident. But, hopefully, much of it has come about by rational design and has been updated and adapted to institutional purposes over the years. Since the immediate study at hand was principally based upon internal data (opinions expressed in interviews) of one institution, The Ohio State University, the design of the author's investigation did not include an exhaustive, comparative evaluation of the prevailing structures, programs, and practices among the departments of other institutions, a subject of some magnitude that might very well form a useful investigation.

However, it was thought that better orientation to this study would be possible, and that more perspective would be injected into it, if some related data from other universities were included. To obtain this information, the author wrote to the secretary of the faculty of other institutions of similar size and
composition in this general locale. Responses were received in various form and detail. The writer has therefore prepared this report on departmental policies and procedures in use at five other member universities of the Council of Ten, and he incorporates it among the Appendixes as an integral part of his investigation.

The University of Illinois

The Department

The department is established as the primary unit of education and administration for the purpose of carrying on programs of instruction and research in a particular field of knowledge. The staff of a department includes persons of all ranks who, on the nomination of its head or chairman, are appointed or assigned to it.

Departments have the fullest measure of autonomy consistent with the maintenance of general college and university educational policy and correct academic and administrative relations with other divisions of the university. Should a dispute arise between the department and another unit of the university concerning the proper limits of this autonomy, the department may appeal for a ruling directly to the dean and the executive committee of the college and, where the president considers it proper, to the president, who

\[4\]

The University of Illinois, Statutes, pp. 16, 17, 18.
makes a decision after consultation with the senate coordinating council.

A new department may be created by the board of trustees on the vote of the faculty of the college in which the department is to be located, and on the recommendation of the college and with the approval of the appropriate senate and the president.

Departments may be organized with either a chairman or a head.

**Department Organized with a Chairman**

The chairman is appointed biennially by the board of trustees on nomination presented by the president after consultation with the dean of the college and with the executive committee of the department concerned.

In each department organized with a chairman, the voting faculty consists of the instructors, assistant professors, associate professors, and professors. With the consent of the executive committee, the chairman may invite other persons to attend departmental meetings, but such persons have no vote.

The voting faculty of the department has the power to determine such matters as do not so affect relations with other departments or colleges that they properly come under the supervision of larger administrative units.

In each department organized with a chairman, there is an executive committee elected annually by the voting members of the
department from the ranks of assistant professor and above. Should the department so determine, members of the executive committee may be elected for two-year terms. The chairman of the department is ex officio a member and the chairman of this committee.

The chairman and the executive committee are responsible for the preparation of the budget and for matters delegated to them by the voting faculty of the department. In a department which has a voting faculty of not more than five members, the executive committee consists of all persons of the rank of assistant professor and above. In all other cases, the size of the executive committee is determined by the voting members of the department.

In each department organized with a chairman, that officer is responsible for the formulation and execution of departmental policies and the execution of university and college policies insofar as they affect the department. He has the power to act independently in those matters delegated to him by the executive committee. He reports on the teaching and research of the department, has general oversight of the work of students in the department, collaborates with the executive committee in the preparation of the budget, is responsible for the expenditure of departmental funds for the purposes approved by the executive committee, and he calls and presides over all meetings of the department and of the executive committee. The chairman, together with the executive committee, is responsible for the organization of the work of the department, and for the quality and progress of that work.
In the administration of his office, the chairman is charged to keep in mind the individual responsibility of other members of the department for the discharge of the duties committed to them by their appointments, and he is asked to allow proper scope to the ability and initiative of all members of the department.

**Department Organized with a Head**

The head of a department is appointed without specified term by the board of trustees on nomination presented by the president after consultation with the dean of the college and all members of the department of the rank of assistant professor and above. He may, however, be relieved of his duties and title as head of the department by the board of trustees, on recommendation of the president in consultation with the dean of the college.

The head of the department has the power to decide on those matters that do not affect other departments or properly come under the supervision of larger administrative units.

In each department organized with a head, that officer has general direction of the work of the department. In regard to departmental policies, he consults with an advisory committee which is constituted as follows: the faculty of the department may elect an advisory committee from the staff who are on indefinite tenure. If the faculty does not so act, the advisory committee then consists of all members on indefinite tenure, unless the department is
organized in divisions, in which case the advisory committee consists of the heads of the several divisions.

The head of the department consults with each member of the department regarding the nature and scope of the work in charge of that member. He is required to call regular meetings of the departmental staff for explanation and discussion of policies, educational procedure, and research. The head is responsible for the organization of the work of the department, for the quality and efficient progress of that work, for the formulation and execution of departmental policies, and for the execution of university and college policies insofar as they affect the department. He reports on the teaching and research of the department, has general supervision of the work of students in the department, prepares departmental budgets, and is responsible for the distribution and expenditure of departmental funds and for the care of departmental property. In the administration of his office, the head is charged with recognizing the individual responsibility of other members of the department for the performance of the duties assigned to them by their appointments, and it is prescribed that the head also make proper allowances for the ability and initiative of all members of the department staff.

Procedures for Changing the Departmental Organization

Provisions are in effect that enable the faculty to petition to change the department structure. This is the procedure:
when at least one-fourth of the members of the department of the rank of assistant professor and above (in no case less than two members) desire that the form of the departmental organization be changed, a written request to this effect is submitted to the dean who calls a meeting to poll by ballot the members of the department of the ranks of assistant professor and above. The dean then transmits the voting results to these department members and to the president, together with whatever recommendation he considers appropriate. If the vote called for a change in the department organization, then the president transmits this recommendation to the board of trustees.

State University of Iowa
College of Liberal Arts

Supra-Departmental Units

When a supra-departmental unit, such as a school, contains more than one department, administrative matters channel through the director of the unit to the dean.

Departments

Each department is required to hold regular meetings and establish, with the approval of the dean, the manner in which

departmental business is to be transacted and communications handled. Matters of policy, including matters relating to the curriculum which come within the jurisdiction of a department, are decided by the methods thus established. No department may adopt policies contrary to the letter and spirit of college policy, of course.

The executive officer of a department may be either a head or a chairman. Chairmen are appointed for a term of not exceeding four years, but are eligible for reappointment. The duties and responsibilities of a head and a chairman are identical. When a vacancy in the headship or chairmanship of a department exists or is impending, the dean consults with the members of the department concerning the kind of executive officer which the department desires and the candidate to be considered. In the event his recommendation differs from that of the majority of the departmental membership, the dean reports his reasons to the department and the provost.

The head or chairman, after consultation with appropriate members of the department and other persons whom he may deem it advisable to consult, recommends the appointment, reappointment, or promotion of staff members. If his recommendation differs from the majority opinion of the appropriate members of the department, the reasons for this action are reported to them and to the dean.
Department Organization

The department is the primary unit of education and administration within the university. The chief executive officer of the department is designated chairman. The chairman of a department is appointed by the board of trustees upon recommendation of the president of the university, after nomination by the dean of the college. The chairman is responsible for educational, research, and service programs, budgetary matters, physical facilities, and personnel matters in his department. It is prescribed that he take into account the advisory and program-planning procedures determined by the department.

Advisory Procedures within Departments

The voting faculty of each department establishes the procedure to be used for providing the department chairman with advice on departmental matters, including those of promotion, appointments, and the preparation of departmental program plans. The department chairman reports to the dean of his college the procedure that is adopted by the departmental faculty and any subsequent changes in

6Michigan State University, By-Laws of the Faculty Organization (December 15, 1961), pp. 1, 2.
the procedure that are voted by the department faculty. Each de-
partment faculty reviews its procedures at least every five years.

Each year departments prepare a program plan projecting
departmental plans for five years ahead. At the time of the pre-
sentation of the program plan and annual report, the dean conducts
a comprehensive review of departmental activities and programs.

At intervals not exceeding five years, the dean, through
consultation with the voting faculty of the department and any
others he may deem appropriate, reviews the desirability of re-
newing the term of appointment of the department chairman. At the
same time, the chairman is consulted by the dean concerning his
interest and willingness to continue. If the chairman does not
want to continue, or, if in the dean's judgment it would be de-
sirable to make a change in the chairmanship, the dean consults
with the entire departmental voting faculty concerning a replace-
ment.

Within the five-year term, either upon the decision of
the dean or the incumbent, a departmental chairman may be re-
lieved of his administrative duties. There is no limit, other
than the university rule on retirement from administrative posi-
tions, on the number of terms an individual may be appointed
chairman.
Departmental Committees and Chairmen

Each department has a departmental committee which consists of all the members of professorial rank. Subject to the authority of the regents, under the laws of the state, and subject to the powers and jurisdiction vested in the university faculty and the faculties of the several colleges, schools, and divisions, and in the president and administrative officers, the immediate government of each department is vested in this departmental committee, which has jurisdiction over all the interests of the department with power to determine all questions of educational and administrative policy. This committee may designate a member of the department to act as secretary.

Departmental recommendations regarding the annual budget, including that for summer session, appointments, dismissals, promotions, and salaries, are made by the full and associate professors, and are transmitted through the chairman to the dean. The committee of full and associate professors may delegate by annual action to a smaller committee or committees or to the departmental chairman any part or all of the following: (a) recommendations regarding salaries, equipment and supplies, recommendations for appointment or promotion of classified personnel and
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appointment of assistants, and may delegate by annual action to the full professors recommendations for promotions to that rank.

The departmental committee of any department may by ballot express its preference for its chairman, and the entire ballot is transmitted by the chairman to the dean of the school or college concerned. The university faculty may prescribe rules governing the nomination of departmental chairmen. The dean of the college or school to which a department belongs, after consultation with the president, and after receiving the ballot, or after affording an opportunity for this ballot, appoints a chairman from the members of professorial rank. The term of appointment is one year, but no limit is placed upon the number of consecutive appointments.

Duties of Department Chairmen

The duties of the departmental chairman are as follows: (1) to be the channel of official communications for all matters affecting the department as a whole, between the department and the president, provost, the dean, the various directors, or other departments; (2) to call meetings of the departmental committee and to preside, and to call a meeting at the request of any two members of the department; (3) to have charge of all official correspondence of the department, and of all departmental announcements in the catalogue, or other university publications; (4) to have the oversight of all lectures in the department delivered by anyone not a member of the department; (5) to see that all necessary
records of teaching and research of the department are properly kept and are always accessible to the proper authorities; (6) to make annually a statement of all the activities and needs of the department to the dean for transmission to the president or provost; (7) to make requisitions for all departmental supplies; (8) to act as a source of arbitration either between students and any member of the department, or between different members in the departments; (9) to submit new courses proposed by the department for approval by the executive committee of the division or by the university course committee; (10) in case of any emergency, to act pending a meeting of the departmental committee; and (11) in general, to act as the executive of the department.

Joint Departmental Conference Committees

The departments of both the Madison and Milwaukee campuses of the university are separate but coordinate, and each may take whatever actions that the departmental faculty considers appropriate. A pattern of inter-departmental relationship has evolved, however, in order to maintain cooperative development and parallel programs. It is the practice to hold joint discussions between corresponding departments at least once a year. These discussions may be engaged in by departments, by the executive committees of the departments, or by special committees elected for the purpose. Discussions cover course offerings, content of corresponding courses, standards of instruction, academic achievements of the staff and
their research interests, physical facilities, faculty appointments, development of programs and courses, and other items considered as appropriate from time to time. It is the custom for the chairman of a department to send to the chairman of the corresponding department the minutes on those matters of mutual concern considered in meetings of the department or of the executive committee.

The functions, composition, and procedures of joint departmental conference committees are as follows:

1. **Function.** To serve in an advisory capacity to the departments through their chairmen on major matters of policy and standards, including the establishment of new courses and modification of old ones; tenure appointments; course, grade point, and credit requirements insofar as these are determined by departments; admission to candidacy for higher degrees, insofar as this is determined by departments; other items which either department may wish to take to the school, college, or university faculty.

2. **Composition.** The joint departmental committees are composed of an equal number of annually-elected representatives from each department with no limit on the number of successive elections. The number of representatives from each department may vary according to the size and interests of the department. The committee, as needed for special purposes, may agree to invite additional representation from departmental members who are most
directly concerned or affected. In cases where a member of a departmental conference committee has been recommended for promotion by his department, he withdraws from the discussion of his own case by the committee and does not vote upon his own case.

3. Procedures.
   a. A minimum of one meeting is held each semester.
   b. The first meeting is called upon the request of either department by the first person on an alphabetical list of committee members. Until a permanent chairman is elected, this person serves as temporary chairman.
   c. Alternate meetings are held in Madison and Milwaukee.
   d. The chairman includes an agenda in his notice of a meeting called.
   e. Minutes of the committee are sent promptly to the chairman of each department concerned.
   f. Whatever the disposition by the initiating department of joint conference committee recommendations on any matter, copies of these recommendations accompany any recommendations on the matter considered which are forwarded to the dean of the school or college concerned.
   g. The joint conference committee is also notified on matters of concern to the committee of each final recommendation going from a departmental chairman to his dean.
General Statement

No all-university rule exists with respect to the selection of department heads or chairmen. The only all-university aspect is that when a dean proposes an individual to head a department, the nominee must be approved by the president. The proposed appointment is then transmitted to the board of regents for final approval.

Procedures in the College of Science, Literature, and Arts

Chairmen of departments and directors of schools appointed after the effective date (1958) of the college constitution are appointed ordinarily for a term of three, four, or five years, and are eligible for additional terms. It is made clear that non-reappointment or failure to accept reappointment carries no implication whatever as to the quality of the work or conduct of the chairman or director. Chairmen of departments and directors of schools are nominated to the president by the dean after consultation with each member of the department concerned, preferably individually, and with representatives of related departments.

8Letter from Tracy F. Tyler, Professor of Education and Assistant to the Vice President for Academic Administration, University of Minnesota, to the investigator, March 1, 1963.

9It is interesting to note that departments and schools, as well as colleges, at the University of Minnesota may have their individual constitutions, subject to authorization by the University Board of Regents.
The dean may appoint to advise him a committee, representative both of the department concerned and of related college or university departments.

The directors of the schools of journalism, social work, and library science presently serve for indefinite terms. Other chairmen, who were serving when the aforementioned constitution was adopted, continue also on indefinite appointments.

Institute of Technology

Included in the Institute of Technology of the University of Minnesota are engineering, architecture, chemistry, physics, geology, and astronomy. The procedure for selecting a chairman is as follows: the dean of the college holds informal conversations with senior staff members in the department and elsewhere and ascertains their views. The dean then recommends a candidate to the president. Appointments are indefinite, subject to the pleasure of the dean.

Institute of Agriculture

Included in the Institute of Agriculture are agriculture and its allied programs and services, and forestry and home economics. The procedure for selecting a chairman is as follows: a committee, consisting of the director of resident instruction, the director of the agricultural experiment station, and the associate dean (who has responsibility for outlying schools and stations),
convenes to consider possible nominees for the department headship. The three upper ranks of the department concerned are consulted by this committee, and suggestions of individuals both off and on the campus are assembled. This committee deliberates on the merits of the candidates and, upon reaching a decision, submits to the dean a list of three nominees for the headship. The dean then makes his choice after holding informal conversations with the president and the academic vice-president.
APPENDIX L

DRAFT STATEMENT OF THE DUTIES AND RESPONSIBILITIES OF

ACADEMIC DEPARTMENT HEADS AT THE

PENNSYLVANIA STATE UNIVERSITY

February 5, 1962

The department head at The Pennsylvania State University has three principal duties and a host of others which, although important, are not crucial in the general estimation of the department head's performance. He is responsible for the direction of programs in resident instruction, continuing education, and research. With respect to these he has two basic and inescapable duties:

1. Recruitment and retention of an able staff.

2. The development of a practical and up-to-date array of courses.

The department head at The Pennsylvania State University has both line and staff responsibilities. The occupant of the post is appointed by the trustees upon the recommendation of the president of the University and the dean of the College. He holds his office at the pleasure of the president and the dean. He is administratively responsible to the dean. While it is patently impossible to summarize all the duties which a department head may be called upon to perform, or which he may consider it necessary to perform, he would normally have the following responsibilities:

A. Administrative

1. To organize the department and to serve as its chief administrative officer responsible for programs of resident education, research, and continuing education.
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2. To develop department policies, coordinating them with those of the College and University.

3. To administer the budget assigned to the department.

4. To prepare and submit required reports.

5. To supervise the department's secretarial and service staff.

6. To approve textbooks for classroom use and recommend their adoption to the office of the dean.

7. To prepare schedules of course offerings and teaching assignments and, in the process, maintain liaison with other academic department heads of the College, officers of the Graduate School, and other officers of the University.

8. To administer, under present University policy, the departmental programs of instruction and research at the Commonwealth Campuses and Centers.

9. To supervise and manage the physical facilities under the jurisdiction of the department.

B. Faculty

1. To recruit faculty and to make recommendations for appointments to the dean.

2. To make recommendations to the dean relative to promotions, salary adjustments, tenure, and leaves of absence for department members.

3. To serve as a communications channel between the faculty and the Executive Committee, dean, and administration.

4. To select and recommend to the dean, section heads for the major areas within a department.

5. To recommend department members for Graduate School membership.
6. To encourage excellence in teaching and to develop and administer department policies relative to teacher improvement.

7. To encourage research and writing on the part of department members.

8. To organize and supervise the operation of appropriate faculty seminars and convocations.

9. To recommend and approve staff for Continuing Education.

10. To recommend and approve staff for Commonwealth Campuses and Centers.

C. Students

1. To advise and supervise undergraduate students within the department.

2. Supervise or approve, as the case may be, graduate students' theses and dissertations, and to advise and supervise graduate students within the department.

3. To organize and supervise the operation of appropriate student seminars, convocations, student groups, and clubs within the department.

D. Liaison

1. To cooperate with and assist:
   a. the associate or assistant dean for research in stimulating research and writing on the part of department members; and
   b. the associate or assistant dean for continuing education in formulating and staffing programs.

2. To develop and maintain contacts with:
   a. research organizations and foundations, both on and off campus; and
   b. business, labor, professional, and public groups.
3. To serve as liaison between the department and other academic departments of the College and University and with the Graduate School.

E. Committees

1. To serve as a member of the Executive Committee of the College.

2. To serve as an ex-officio member of the University Senate.

F. Professional

1. To teach courses at either or both the undergraduate and graduate level.

2. To engage in research and writing.

G. Such other duties as may be assigned by the president and the dean.
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I, Hal Reed Ramer, was born the son of Claude O. and Dixie Carroll Ramer, in Kenton, Tennessee, on June 8, 1923. My elementary and junior high school training were received in the public schools of Kenton and Nashville, Tennessee. I received my secondary school preparation in the public schools of Raleigh, North Carolina and Nashville, Tennessee.

My undergraduate education was pursued at George Peabody College during the years 1940-1942 and 1945-1947, and I was granted the Bachelor of Science degree in chemistry, in 1947. Service in the U.S. Army Air Force occupied the interim years of 1943-1945. After graduation from college, I held positions with the General Shoe Corporation and with Travelers Aid Society.

In 1950, I enrolled in the Graduate School of Vanderbilt University in its instructional division known as the Nashville School of Social Work, whose academic offerings were cooperatively sponsored by George Peabody College and Scarritt College. My field work placements, as an integral part of this graduate study, were taken in counseling at the American Red Cross, Nashville, and in administration and community organization at the Council of Community Agencies, Memphis. I attended Tulane University during the summer
session, 1950, in order to acquire special credits in my social work program. In 1951, the Nashville School of Social Work discontinued its previous sponsorship and became the Graduate School of Social Work of The University of Tennessee, from which institution I received the Master of Science degree in 1952.

As a special consultant to the staff of the Community Services Commission of Nashville and Davidson County, certain research findings and recommendations of my Master's thesis, dealing with public welfare services, were published in the final urban study reports of the Commission, a provisional agency established by the Tennessee General Assembly. During the year 1952-1953, I was employed as a Counselor on the staff of Family and Children's Service, Inc., Nashville.

In September, 1953, I joined the staff of The Ohio State University and served as Assistant Dean of Men until September, 1958, when I took a part-time position at the University's Director of the George Wells Knight International House, which post I held for two years while engaged in Doctoral study.

In August, 1957, I attended the Harvard Seminar on Higher Education, a special case-study program in administration, staffed by faculty members of the Harvard Business School, sponsored by the National Association of Student Personnel Administrators, and held at the University of Pennsylvania. In the summer of 1958, I attended the Institute on College and University Administration at the Center for the Study of Higher Education, University of Michigan.
In 1960, I was appointed Staff Assistant to the President of The Ohio State University and served in that position until September, 1962, at which time I was granted educational leave for the academic year, 1962-1963, in order to complete the dissertation for the Doctor of Philosophy degree. This degree, in the major field of higher education with collateral areas in sociology, student personnel-guidance, and philosophy of education, will be conferred on August 23, 1963, at the University's Summer Quarter Commencement.

I have accepted the position of Assistant State Commissioner for Higher Education, Tennessee Department of Education, Nashville, effective August 15, 1963.