

PRELIMINARY DRAFT

A MEMORANDUM ON THE GOVERNING OF THE UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA

Preface

This is one of ten memoranda prepared as part of a study, undertaken at the request of the Carnegie Corporation, of "the governing of American colleges and universities." It is not intended to constitute an appraisal of the relative worth of the educational program, of the organizational structure, or of the administration of the institution dealt with. It is not intended that any one of these memoranda shall be published for general distribution.

The purpose of this (and nine similar memoranda) is to describe the organization and functioning of the institution. From the analytical description of the functioning of ten institutions of several types, it is expected that it will be possible to determine whether significant problems arise from the manner in which authority for decisions is distributed among the trustees, the president, deans, department heads, and faculty.

In short, this study is designed to reveal:

What differences, if any, are commonly encountered in balancing the initiative and experience of a faculty, on the one hand, and institutional responsibility and executive leadership, on the other?

What organizational mechanisms facilitate, and which impede, the effective working together of scholars, teachers, educational administrators, business administrators, and laymen serving as trustees in the administration of a college or university?

When does the role played (and perhaps the skills and traits exhibited by department heads, deans, president, and trustees facilitate the educational accomplishment and maximize the zeal of faculty members, and when does it limit accomplishment and zeal?

I. THE INSTITUTION AND ITS ENVIRONMENT

DEVELOPMENT TO 1900

The University of Minnesota was established in 1851 by the Minnesota territorial legislature only two years after the organization of the territory. When Minnesota was admitted as a state in 1858, the University became, by virtue of a specific provision of

MAG  
GC 215m

TAND, UWA  
4432196

2.

the new state constitution, an autonomous agency of the state and was ensured a large measure of freedom in its operations.

During its first two decades the University provided only sub-collegiate instruction, and was faced by almost continual financial difficulties. During these early years it underwent several reorganizations. By 1859-60, there was doubt as to the ability of the institution to continue to function, and the outbreak of the Civil War forced it to close its doors. In 1863, John S. Pillsbury became interested in the school and from then on devoted a considerable portion of his energies and resources to placing the institution on a sound financial and educational basis. His efforts were successful and the University resumed operations in 1867. Folwell was appointed as the first President in 1869 and in that same year the first collegiate-level instruction was offered by the school.

Passage of the Morrill Act in 1862 stimulated some Minnesotans to organize an independent Agricultural College of Minnesota that the state might participate in the land grant program provided by that law. Pillsbury and others argued that the state should not support two institutions, but should concentrate its resources on building a single, strong University. This counsel prevailed and the Agricultural College was absorbed by the University in 1868. Later, several unsuccessful attempts were made to separate the two institutions. Today the Institute of Agriculture occupies its own campus in St. Paul and is one of the major academic units of the University.

During the first fifty years of its life, the University grew slowly and gradually gave up its sub-collegiate programs. The loss of

enrollment from the dropping of these programs, the difficulty of recruiting agricultural students to attend the school, and a number of financial crises caused no end of problems for the institution. Despite these and somewhat inconsistent support by the legislature, the University expanded its operations until by 1900 most of the major academic units that now comprise the University had been established.

#### SERVING THE STATE

Shortly after 1900 and again in the later 1920's, the state legislature attempted to subject the University's expenditures to the pre-audit and control of a central financial and administrative agency. In each instance, the University resisted this action and clung to the autonomy provided for in the state constitution. The Minnesota Supreme Court upheld the University's independence: "The whole power to govern the University" it ruled, "was put in the Regents by the people...and no part of it can be put elsewhere but by the people." As a consequence, the University is often referred to as the "fourth branch" of the Minnesota state government.

In 1911, Vincent was appointed the third President of the University. Under his leadership, the Law and Medical schools were expanded and part-time teachers-lawyers and teachers-doctors were replaced, over substantial opposition, by full-time, professional teaching staffs. The University entered into an agreement providing for the graduate training of medical personnel at the Mayo Clinic under the supervision of the University's graduate school. The Graduate School acquired a new dean and began to develop into one of the outstanding graduate colleges in the country and a significant influence within the University. Both the College of Education and the College of

Science, Literature, and Arts were reorganized. The extension program was expanded extensively and the University, in fact, as well as in name, a "state-wide" university.

From 1920 to 1939, the University continued its development under its fifth President, Lotus D. Coffman. Coffman inaugurated the General College which provides post-high school training in terminal as well as in transfer curricula for any high school graduate of the state. He also founded the Center for Continuation Study which has enabled the University to make its resources more readily available to professional and other groups in the state desirous of additional education and training.

The University of Minnesota is often characterized (and with some degree of pride) as a "people's university." This characterization of the school comes largely from the fact that the institution has, throughout its entire existence, been identified closely with the people of Minnesota, assuming as its primary responsibility the satisfaction of their educational needs. To this end, the University has often undertaken to provide educational programs not traditionally thought to be a part of a university's domain. The General College, for example, has made it possible for many Minnesotans to attend the University and receive valuable educational experiences. Another is the sub-collegiate training offered by the University's five vocational schools of agriculture. In this, and in many other ways, the University has served the educational needs of the state and has developed a close relationship with the people who provide the bulk of its support.

PRESENT MAKEUP

Today the University of Minnesota consists of 15 major academic units located on three main campuses - Minneapolis, St. Paul, and Duluth. The St. Paul campus houses the Institute of Agriculture with the College of Agriculture, Home Economics, and Forestry, the School of Veterinary Medicine, and the Central Agricultural Experiment Station. The Duluth Campus, formerly a state teachers' college, is a branch institution which offers a wide variety of undergraduate programs and some limited graduate instruction. On the central campus, in Minneapolis, the College of Science, Literature, and Arts, the Graduate School, the Law School, the College of Medical Sciences, the College of Education, the School of Business Administration, the General College, the University College, and the Institute of Technology are located. In addition, the University maintains four out-state vocational schools of agriculture, nine agricultural experiment stations, a mines experiment station, and the graduate medical center at the Mayo Clinic in Rochester, Minnesota.

The state legislature appropriates approximately 40 per cent of the institution's annual operating budget. An additional 12 per cent of the University's income comes from student fees; endowment income provides another 11 per cent. Federal government grants, including the income from the original land grants, furnish 5 per cent of the budget. Nearly 12 per cent is derived from fees charged the general public for services rendered by the University's hospitals, clinics and laboratories, and the sale of livestock and agricultural products from the farm campus. The operation of various auxiliary enterprises (bookstores, dormitories,

cafeterias, University Press, etc.) bring in nearly 18 per cent, but the bulk of this money is earmarked for the maintenance of these units. Admissions to athletic contests account for the remaining 2 per cent and this revenue is normally used to support the physical education program.

In 1956, the various units of the University enrolled nearly 26,000 students. Nine-tenths of these were Minnesota residents and about half were commuters from the Minneapolis-St. Paul metropolitan area. The small number of non-residents - about one-tenth - is somewhat unique. At several other state institutions with national reputations, non-resident students make up as much as a third of the student body. Over the past 15 years, however, Minnesota has consciously restricted admission to non-residents by requiring a higher promise of academic achievement from them than from bona fide residents of the state. It has accepted, however, a greater proportion of out-of-state students at the graduate level. In 1956 almost 47 per cent of the graduate students came from outside Minnesota, with out-of-state students accounting for 91 per cent of the enrollees in the Mayo Foundation program at Rochester.

The University of Minnesota is recognized by many educators throughout the country as one of the leading universities in the country. In Minnesota, the University has enrolled about 50 per cent of all students who attend institutions of higher education within the state. This position of prominence, both within and without the state, is part of the climate which affects the governing of the institution. Faculty, administrators, and students alike have a high degree of institutional pride. The maintenance of the University's status is

accepted by all as a major organizational goal and this unanimity makes possible the unification of the many diverse interests and personalities found within the school.

## II. THE FORMAL ORGANIZATION

### A. THE BOARD OF REGENTS

The University of Minnesota is formally governed by a twelve-member Board of Regents. For much of the University's history the Board was regularly appointed by the Governor. In the late 1930's, however, the legislature reasserted its rights under the original law and since that time the Board has been elected by the legislature. One-third of the Board is chosen each legislative biennium with the provision that nine of the members must represent the nine congressional districts in the state. Three members are elected as representatives at-large. Vacancies on the Board which occur between legislative sessions may be filled by gubernatorial appointment.

The Chancellor (President) of the University serves ex officio as President of the Board. The Board elects for a two year term from its own membership a First Vice President and a Second Vice President. The Board also selects a Secretary, Treasurer, and Assistant Secretary, all of whom are not normally members of the Board.

The Board has four standing committees - Budget, Executive and Finance, Investment, and Physical Plant - and the Board may organize other committees. The Executive and Finance Committee is chaired by the First Vice President and includes four other members of the Board. The size of the other committees is determined from time to time by

the Board and members are appointed by the President. The Secretary of the Board also serves as Secretary for all committees of the Board.

The Board holds regular meetings monthly except in July and August. During the fall quarter the Board customarily meets every Saturday on which the University has a home football game. At its annual meeting in May, the Board elects officers <sup>and</sup> determines the calendar of regular meetings for the coming year. Special meetings may be held upon the call of the President or upon the request of seven members of the Board. <sup>Resolutions</sup> All matters to be discussed at a regular meeting must be submitted and placed on the agenda at least <sup>seven</sup> ~~fourteen~~ days before the meeting and Board members must receive notice of the meetings at least fourteen days in advance of the meeting. A majority of seven is the legal quorum for the conduct of all business.

Complete authority to govern the University is formally and legally vested in the Board. It must approve any actions taken by the President or staff of the institution. Authority has been delegated to the President, University Senate, and the separate college faculties to handle most questions as to the instructional program and student body. But major changes in educational policy or program, however, must receive Board approval prior to it being put into effect, and the University Senate has, formally, only an advisory authority in this area. Both academic and non-academic staff appointments must be approved by the Board before they take effect as well as any other personnel actions. This extends to requests for leaves of absences, appointment of less than full-time staff, and some assistants. The Board has delegated to the President, and in some cases to the Vice President for Business



Administration, the power to execute contracts involving some real estate transactions, the federal government, and athletic contests.

## B. THE UNIVERSITY ADMINISTRATION

1. The Presidency--. The chief executive of the University of Minnesota is formally styled the Chancellor of the University, but traditionally has been called, President. He is selected by the Board and serves at its pleasure. He is charged with the general superintendance of the institution, and appoints, with the approval of the Board, all members of the academic staff, administrative personnel, and non-academic employees. He presides at meetings of the University Senate and is ex officio a member of the various college faculties. With the exception of the Faculty Consultative Committee, he appoints all University wide faculty and administrative committees. He is responsible for preparing the annual budget, and for <sup>a formal request</sup> presenting the budget to the state legislature, and after the enactment of the budget, for allotting monies to each of the units of the institution. He is required to make an annual report on the status of the University to the Superintendent of Public Instruction and such other reports as required by the Board of Regents.

The President's immediate staff consists of an assistant, an aide, and an office staff comprising five to six people. The assistant to the President has no line authority and is not assigned any specific, continuing staff responsibilities. He devotes a share of his time to external relations and assists in the preparation of the budget. The President's aide is responsible for maintaining the office records and

serves as the President's chauffeur. The office staff is supervised by the President's secretary and includes a receptionist, messenger, file clerks, and typists.

Directly supporting the President are two Vice Presidents - one for Business Administration and one for Academic Administration. The Vice President for Business Administration has formal line authority over all units of the institution concerned with the business and financial affairs of the University. This officer also serves as the chief financial staff officer for the Board of Regents. The Vice President for Academic Administration has no line responsibility for the <sup>Teach</sup>academic units, but serves primarily as a presidential staff <sup>admin</sup>officer in this area. He is charged, however, with general supervision of a variety of University wide units which support and are related to the academic program of the school.

In addition to these two officials, a Provost of the Duluth Branch serves as the President's deputy in the day-to-day management of that unit. Each of the Deans of the major academic units, the chief administrators of the three unattached offices, and the military departments report to the President. In total, approximately twenty-four officers report directly to the President.

## 2. University-Wide Administrative Units--.

a.) Business Affairs. There have developed over the years at Minnesota a large number of service and administrative offices which have responsibilities that cut across college and school lines and have a primary concern with matters of administration or management. These offices are supervised by the Vice President for Business Administration

and his deputy, the Comptroller. These units are:

Office of Comptroller	University Civil Service
University Bookstores	University Services (in-
Protection and Safety (University	cluding dormitories, garages,
Police)	printing, etc.)
Contracts and Rentals	Physical Plant (both new construc-
Field Auditor	tion and maintenance)
	Insurance and Retirement

Each of these offices have formal responsibility for activities implied by their respective titles. Only two require further description.

The Comptroller, under the control of the Vice President for Business Administration, supervises all financial affairs of the University. These include the functions of purchasing and supply as well as accounting, student loan collections, and the bursar's office. The University Civil Service has reference to all staff members not employed directly as academic personnel. These include, in addition to office personnel, all the research and technical staff employed by the institution in the various research units separately maintained by the school. Hiring for these positions is done by competitive examinations administered by this office and no non-academic appointments can be made without clearance through the Civil Service. The office administers the personnel code for non-academic employees, handles relations between the University and such collective bargaining units that have been established by certain classes of workers, and clears all personnel actions affecting the non-academic staff. Presently over 500 different job classifications are maintained by the Civil Service.

The conduct of all business and financial matters is governed, formally, by a three-volume code of business procedures. This manual, developed by the Vice President for Business Administration, covers all

standard operating procedures for the processing of personnel actions, property and equipment actions, and financial and budget records. Standard forms have been developed for use in the administration of business and financial matters. By and large this aspect of the University's governing process is highly formalized and routinized.

b.) Related Academic Units. Most of the departments of the institution which service all the colleges and schools and whose function is closely related to one or more aspects of the academic program are grouped together under the Vice President for Academic Administration.

These include:

University Libraries  
Office of Dean of Students  
Student Unions

Health Service  
Office of Admissions and  
Records

In addition, the Vice President for Academic Administration supervises the:

Department of University Relations  
(press office)  
Department of Concerts and Lectures  
Bureau of Institutional Research

University Press  
Museum of Natural History  
The three attached Military  
Units (Air Force, Army, and  
Navy)

An administrative officer is responsible for the daily conduct of each of these organizational units. In some instances, the supervisory authority is qualified, in day-to-day practice, and the unit director has formal access to the President.

*must make  
reference*

c.) Administrative Committee. The heads of these various units, together with the Deans, constitute the Administrative Committee of the University. Technically and formally this group is a standing committee of the Senate and its members are all ex officio members of the Senate. The membership of the Committee is determined by the President and

formally it is supposed to meet weekly to discuss with the President general administrative and fiscal policy.

C. THE COLLEGES

No standard nomenclature is used to designate the fifteen major academic units that make up the University of Minnesota - six are colleges, four are schools, two are institutes, and one each a division, a branch, and the Summer Session. Some of these units encompass within their formal organization schools and colleges in addition to the departments normally found as the basic subdivision of a major academic unit. Each of these units, with the exception of the Duluth Branch, is presided over by a dean.

The largest and most complex of these fifteen units are: 1) the Institute of Agriculture, 2) the Institute of Technology, 3) the College of Medical Sciences, and 4) the College of Science, Literature, and Arts. Although the formal organization of each of these is alike in some respects, there are significant differences that make it necessary to describe each briefly.

1. The Institute of Agriculture is headed by a Dean appointed by the President, with the approval of the Board, who serves at their pleasure. Directly responsible to the Dean are <sup>two</sup> ~~three~~ assistant Deans.

(One is responsible for business affairs, admissions and records, library, and the branch agricultural stations. Another is concerned with the resident instruction units which include a) the College of Agriculture, Home Economics, and Forestry, b) the St. Paul vocational School of Agriculture, and c) the Agricultural Extension Service. Within the

Who?  
Assistant  
Dean?

— Danell  
Tray 8

a. Director  
not under  
Danell  
complete

b. Director  
not under  
Danell

College of Agriculture, Home Economics, and Forestry are some twelve academic departments and the Schools of Forestry and Home Economics. The third Assistant Dean is the operating head of the School of Veterinary Medicine. In Addition an Associate Dean of the Institute serves as the Dean's deputy for day-to-day management.

The Dean of the Institute is assisted in his task by an Institute faculty consultative committee elected by, and from, the Institute faculty. An executive committee, composed of department heads, consults with the Dean on budgetary and financial matters. The Institute has a citizen's advisory committee consisting of 17 members, 11 of whom are representatives elected by each of the 11 state-wide agricultural associations and 6 selected by this 11 from a list nominated by the University. Full faculty meetings are held once each quarter (3 times a year) and are used largely for disseminating information.

Within the two schools of the College of Agriculture, Home Economics, and Forestry, there is no formal departmental structure. For purposes of administration, the heads of the two schools are regarded as department heads.

2. The Institute of Technology comprises three schools - Architecture, Chemistry, and Mines and Metallurgy -, the College of Engineering, the Mines Experiment Station, and the St. Anthony Falls Hydraulic Laboratory. The Dean, an Associate Dean, and three assistant Deans constitute the top staff for the Institute. The department heads of the various departments and/or divisions meet irregularly with the Dean, as an executive committee, to consider budget and fiscal matters. Educational policy is largely a matter initiated by the individual departments and reviewed at the Institute level by the Dean and/or the executive committee.

*who?*  
*Headless*  
*Johnson*

The College of Engineering, the School of Chemistry, and the School of Mines and Metallurgy are departmentalized, with the Department of Chemistry in the School of Chemistry broken into four divisions comparable to departments. The Associate Dean is the operating head of the College of Engineering, and an Assistant Dean is in charge of the day-to-day management of each of the three other major units.

3. The College of Medical Sciences is made up of the Medical School, the School of Public Health, the Nursing School, and the University Hospitals. A Dean is assisted by an assistant Dean and a Director of Hospitals in operating these units. There are also two assistant directors for administration of the University Hospitals unit. Both the Medical School and the School of Public Health are departmentalized, with the former perhaps the most highly departmentalized unit within the University.

4. The College of Science, Literature, and Arts consists of twenty-three instructional departments and the School of Journalism, Library School, and the School of Social Work. The Social Relations Laboratory, the Public Administration Center, and two inter-disciplinary study groups - American Studies and International Relations and Area Studies - also fall within the jurisdiction of this College. The student body of the College is divided into a lower and upper division identified as the Junior College and Senior College, respectively. These two units are essentially records keeping units, although some students in the Junior College are terminal, rather than four year students.

The Dean of the College presides over this complex enterprise. He is assisted by an Associate Dean, a deputy, and two Assistant Deans.

The two assistant Deans are responsible for the student counselling and records of the Junior and Senior Colleges.

The faculty of the College is highly organized and formally is given a large advisory role in its governance. The top faculty group is an advisory committee to the Dean which is composed of faculty elected as representatives of each of the five divisional councils within the College. These councils, in turn, are elected by the departments included within each division and normally are the chief faculty governing group for the particular council. There are, in addition, a number of faculty committees, ranging from one on scheduling to one on the "improvement of instruction." Each of these groups have, in addition to the faculty, student representatives appointed by the Dean. Those committees with jurisdiction over problems that cut across college lines also include representatives from the respective academic units concerned. In some instances, these representatives are voting members and in other instances, non-voting members of the committee.

5. The Graduate School. Like the Dean of the Summer Sessions, the Dean of the Graduate School has no line authority over any of the faculty. The graduate school faculty holds appointments in the Graduate School and in their respective departments or units. The top management of the Graduate School is vested in a Dean and an Associate Dean. Advising the Dean and the Associate Dean are 11 faculty committees, representing each of the major areas in which graduate work is offered by the University. While the Graduate School Dean has no formal authority over the faculty, all appointments to any of the tenure ranks must receive his approval before the recommendation is submitted to the President and



the Board of Regents. This advisory authority of the Dean is significant in that he is able to control, to some degree, the caliber and quality of the graduate faculty and thereby indirectly influence personnel actions recommended by the Departments, Colleges and other units.

Of the remaining ten units, neither the School of Business Administration nor the College of Education is departmentalized. In the absence of formal departmental structure, faculty committees perform the normal line function carried out by departmental chairmen in the other colleges.

The formal authority for the daily management of each of the 15 major units has been delegated to the Deans by the President. The degree to which this authority has been further delegated by the Deans to department chairmen, faculty and other groups is largely a function of the tradition within each unit and the personality of the Dean concerned. In the College of Science, Literature, and Arts, for example, there is an extensive formal apparatus through which the faculty may participate in the governing of that College, while in the Institute of Technology and College of Medical Sciences, this type of machinery exists to a lesser degree.

The Duluth Branch of the University is governed by a Provost who has under him an Academic Dean and a Business Manager. The Academic Dean is more nearly a Dean of Faculties with some line authority over the faculty of this Branch and the Business Manager is, in reality, the Provost's Deputy in this area of concern. The faculty at the Duluth

Branch is represented in the University Senate and on the Faculty Consultative Committee, but are not members of the departments or instructional units on the Minneapolis campus.

#### D. THE DEPARTMENTS

All but two of the major instructional divisions are organized into departments presided over by a departmental chairman. Each departmental chairman is appointed by the President, upon recommendation of the Dean of the College, and with the approval of the Board of Regents. There is no formal term of office for the chairman and it is expected that his tenure is indefinite. Under the supervision of the Dean, the chairman has the primary responsibility for managing the department, including preparation of the departmental budget, development of the academic program, originating personnel actions, and any other matters directly affecting the department.

Some of the larger departments, English, for example, have assistant chairmen to relieve the Chairman of administrative detail. Often the assistant chairman will be assigned a specific task in the department, such as the supervision of the introductory course or the teaching assistants employed by the unit.

Each department is required to hold a meeting each quarter, but many departments have formal provisions for the holding of monthly or bi-monthly meetings. The specific, formal structure of the department and the procedures it employs in carrying out its functions vary considerably from college to college and also from department to department to department within the individual colleges. The only uniform

procedure appears to be in the distinction made between tenure and non-tenure staff in formulating the departmental recommendations concerning promotions, pay increases and the addition of new staff. It appears that normally the tenure staff are the determinant group in making the departmental recommendations to the Dean and President.

#### E. THE FACULTY

At the University level, the faculty formally participates in the governing process through the University Senate. This body is made up of elected representatives from each of the academic units, the Administrative Committee, and the Faculty Consultative Committee. The last two groups are voting members of the Senate, ex officio. The elected representatives are chosen by secret ballot each fall by each of the various colleges for a term of one year. Only those faculty which hold regular appointments on the University staff are eligible to vote and to be elected to the Senate. Terms of Senate members are for one year with indefinite eligibility for election.

In choosing the members of the Senate, the faculty are divided into two groups in each of the academic units. The tenure staff (associate and full professor) vote as a group, electing from their body one representative for each ten regular tenure people in that college. The non-tenure staff (instructor and assistant professor) vote as a group electing one representative for each forty members of their group in that college. The Executive Committee of

the Graduate School is authorized to designate seven elected members to serve concurrently as representatives of the Graduate School.

The President is ex officio chairman of the Senate and with the consent of the Senate appoints a Clerk of the Senate. The Senate chooses from its own membership a vice chairman who serves for one year and presides over Senate meetings in the absence of the President.

The Senate meets regularly six times a year with special meetings held upon the call of the President, the petition of ten members of the Senate, or twenty voting members of the faculties. A majority of the Senate constitutes a quorum for the conduct of all business except the consideration of amendments to the constitution of the Senate. In this latter case, a majority of two-thirds of the membership of the Senate must approve any amendments submitted to the Regents for their approval.

The By-Laws currently provide for fifteen standing committees. Membership on these committees is determined by the President, with the consent of the Senate, and non-members of the Senate may be appointed to any standing committee. The only exception to appointment by the President is membership on the Faculty Consultative Committee which is a completely elective body.

The University Senate is presumed to have general legislative authority over educational questions affecting the University as a whole. This authority is subject to the right of the Regents to govern the University and the power of the President to suspend Senate action and ask for a reconsideration of the issue. Questions which concern the internal affairs of a single unit of the institution do not fall within

the jurisdiction of the Senate and are reserved to the faculty of that unit. The Senate also has general power to enact regulations governing student relations with the University in those areas which concern the institution as a whole.

The Faculty Consultative Committee is composed of seven members of the faculty who hold the rank of associate or full professor. Members of the Committee are elected by the tenure staff of the University as a whole for three year terms, with eligibility for one immediate re-election. The choice is made from a list of nominees selected by the tenure staff and the list must total twice the number of positions on the Committee to be filled. If, in the final election, there is no representative from the St. Paul or Duluth campus, the elected members shall appoint one faculty member for each of the campuses not represented.

The Committee is responsible for meeting with the President to confer with him on any policy questions concerning instruction, research, personnel or service functions of the University. The Committee has no formal authority to act on its own and serves only as an advisory group. It is required to report once a year to the Senate on matters discussed by it and the President.

### III. THE "INFORMAL ORGANIZATION" OR GOVERNING PROCESS

#### A. FUNCTIONING OF THE BOARD OF REGENTS

Formally and legally the Board of Regents must approve all actions taken by the University. In actual practice, the Board's approval of policy decisions is largely the acceptance of recommendations

submitted to it by the President. In those areas relating directly to basic educational policy or academic staff, the Board's influence is negligible. Its influence is slightly greater in questions concerning finance and property.

Analysis of a sample of the minutes of the Board's meetings over a two year period reveals that in only one or two instances was the Board called upon to consider a major question of educational program or policy. The degree to which the Board actually took its collective mind and asserted a positive influence is not known, but these questions were discussed at Board meetings. The first instance concerned the impact upon the University of the predicted increase in college enrollments. Another related to the acquisition of some property which would be used to house the General College and some of the other terminal programs of the institution. Since the property in question was somewhat removed from the main center of the Minneapolis campus, there was some question of the impact this move would have upon the academic program of the school. No specific result of these discussions is recorded, and only on these two occasions was the Board invited to review directly an issue of major educational import.

The presentation to the Board was made, in each instance, by the President and his top administrative staff. Since the sessions were executive sessions and not fully reported in the published minutes, it is not known exactly how the presentation was framed or considered. The Board was probably presented with a firm recommendation as to the decision the President and his staff thought advisable.

The minutes of the Board of Regents follow a rather consistent pattern in terms of the actual actions taken by the Board. The bulk - 40 to 50 per cent - of the record is made up of lists of personnel actions formally approved. These included not only promotions, but also resignations, new appointments, leaves of absences, requests for outside work, temporary assignments, appointment of part-time research staff, and even prizes awarded to students at the University. The next major item was a listing of gifts and bequests which had to be formally accepted by the Board. The remainder of the minutes dealt largely with property and financial transactions by the University; only a few references in these minutes indicated the Board's consideration of educational programs or policies.

The Board meets frequently - in comparison with other governing boards - 10 to 12 times a year - the meetings, themselves, take, on the average, about two to two and one-half hours each. This means that the Board devotes, at the most, approximately 30 hours a year to its task of governing the institution.

This consideration leads to the question of how can the Board, in an institution of this size and complexity, be kept sufficiently interested in the institution to make an effective contribution to it, and at the same time not become embroiled in the minute matters of administrative detail. On the Board of Regents at Minnesota, like on most governing boards, are leaders in the community and the state. These men and women, for the most part, have been successful in their chosen professions and have more than a token contribution to make. The integration of the Board with the institution is a major problem

faced by the President and one that defies ready solution.

The President at Minnesota indicated that he attempts to achieve this integration by using the many specific items on the agenda as "jumping off points" for the discussion of significant problems confronting the institution. For example, the resignation of an outstanding man from the faculty to accept a more remunerative position at another institution was used to focus the Board's attention on the problem of faculty compensation and the relative level of salaries at Minnesota and other leading universities.

While this device has some limited effectiveness, there is a feeling that the members of the Board feel inadequate in considering general educational policy. Their interest and experience gives them a greater feeling of assurance in dealing with questions of finance and physical development. When these issues are presented to them, they can, and do, perhaps, make a larger contribution to the governing of the institution than in other areas of concern.

Although the Board of Regents at Minnesota is selected by a political body, the state legislature, there is no apparent reflection of partisan influences. However, in recent years it has frequently been suggested by some on the faculty that the Board too heavily represented either the "liberals" or the "conservative" political groups in the state. Some of the older faculty recall instances when the climate of the institution was distinctly changed because new appointees caused a shift in the basic political composition of the Board. In one instance the Board reversed an earlier decision as to the dismissal of a faculty member and granting him a sum of money in



partial compensation for damages. Shortly after World War I, this faculty member, a member of the political science department, had been dismissed by the Board because of certain actions and positions he had taken during the war and early post-war period. In the late 1930's when the majority of the Board represented a different political complexion, the man was reinstated with an emeritus rank.

There is no provision, either formally or informally, for direct consultation between the Board and the faculty. In some cases, this has led to faculty resentment, or at the least, faculty misunderstanding of the Board's actions. A recent case concerned the selection of the present President and the difficulties between a committee of the faculty formed to consult with the Board and the Board committee charged with this task. The two groups had met several times and narrowed down the list of prospective appointees to a group acceptable to both the Board and the faculty. Some few weeks later, the Board announced the appointment of the new President without first informing the faculty committee that a decision had been reached. The faculty resented this action, but the matter was eventually smoothed over. In retrospect, the cause of the problem is now attributed to a breakdown in communications which, under the circumstances, appeared somewhat unavoidable.

Despite this and other instances, there is no pressure on the part of the faculty to secure a direct channel to the Board. This contrasts with the situation at Cornell. There faculty pressure over a period of years resulted in state legislation providing for the appointment of four faculty members as full members of the governing board.

## B. THE FUNCTIONING OF THE PRESIDENCY

The President and his staff constitute the formal center of actual authority in the University. The President is chairman of the Board but does not actually preside at the Board's meetings. He presents each question and takes a major role in guiding discussion. The current President estimates that he has the floor between 60 and 75 per cent of the time at a Board meeting. In addition to his formal position vis a vis the Board, the President, as chairman of the University Senate, can influence the deliberations of that body.

Like every executive of a large enterprise, the President of the University lacks time in which to consider fully the variety of questions requiring decision that arise. To the degree that he is unable to review these issues, the influence of his immediate staff becomes significant. The assistant to the President, although he has no formal authority, has some influence in the determination of questions relating to university development and alumni relations. The Vice President for Business Administration is perhaps the effective budget officer of the institution although the President devotes considerable time to budgetary matters. To a lesser degree, the Vice President for Academic Administration influences the decisions that are made with respect to educational program and policy.

The working relationship between these four men is close; each is in contact with the others daily. The President's calendar, for example, indicated that about one-third of his formal appointments were with the two Vice Presidents, either singly or together. Secondly,

the offices of these individuals are located close together and are connected by an inter-office communications system; their proximity allows frequent on-the-spot conferences and the communication system stimulates frequent discussions without the necessity of actual face-to-face meetings.

In addition to these people, the Director of University Relations, the Dean of the Graduate School, the Athletic Director, and one or two other Deans have frequent contact with the President. Proportionately, the President did not have, in the sample of appointments reviewed, much direct contact with the faculty. Those which he did have were restricted largely to two or three older members of the faculty regarded by most as the real leaders of the faculty at the University.

The President plans two tours of the state each year, in the spring and the fall. On these tours he talks and meets with a variety of groups, often delivering up to three speeches a day. In this manner, he acquaints the people who provide a major share of the University's financial support with its needs and plans. These, and other efforts which he undertakes to identify the institution with the state, consume a considerable portion of his time and limit the time that he can devote to internal management of the institution itself. The President believes that this activity is an essential part of his duties as state university president but simultaneously recognizes that it prevents his thorough participation in the consideration of issues of educational programming for the University. He must rely upon his immediate staff and the Deans of the several units to stimulate educational innovation and to recommend new programs and policies; the demands on his time limit the direct influence he can exercise.

In addition to his efforts as the University's chief public relations representative, the President, both as President and as an individual, is called upon to devote his energies to projects that are not directly related to the governing of the University. He serves frequently on national committees dealing with the problems of education. This experience is valuable to him and to the University but his service cuts into the time that he has available for the University.

This presents a key problem in the role which a president of a university or college should play. He must devote time and effort to creating external support for his institution. Simultaneously he must find time in which he can work with his faculty, give leadership to educational evaluation and programming, and oversee the institution's internal management. If he spends much time away from the campus or in the prosecution of these other tasks, his influence is lessened. The gap is then normally filled by others on the administrative or academic staff who have neither the primary responsibility nor the authority. While this may not be bad, per se, the President, under such circumstances, cannot be considered as filling the post of educational leadership for which he was appointed. This is not to imply that this situation exists at Minnesota, but rather to indicate that the need for conserving a President's energies is recognized as important by the present President and his staff.

### C. THE FUNCTIONING OF THE TWO VICE PRESIDENTS

The two vice presidents, who support the President, wield strikingly different influence in the governing of the institution. This difference is partially attributable to differences in the formal authority assigned to each. The Vice President for Business Administration has effective and formal authority over the business and financial units of the institution, while the Vice President for Academic Administration has a more limited jurisdiction. This disparity in their formal powers and duties, however, does not begin to tell why the Vice President for Business Administration, Mr. Middlebrook, is considered by most members of the faculty at the University as the key figure in the decision-making process. To a large degree, his influence is attributable to his dynamic personality and to the fact that he has been at Minnesota for almost 30 years.

William Middlebrook joined the institution in the late 1920's as Comptroller, after serving in a similar capacity at Purdue University. Since then as the University's chief financial staff officer, he has built up an efficient business and service staff, orderly procedures for finance, purchasing, and related matters and has earned the confidence of the Board in him and his judgement. During the years 1939-1944, when the University was governed by two interim presidents, Mr. Middlebrook was the effective head of the institution. The actual influence which he had then was greater than he now exercises, but any examination of the governing process at the University of Minnesota will indicate that he significantly influences most decisions made by the president and the board. Some on the faculty contend that his influence, exercised largely in preparing the budget, is too great, but none at the University deny his capabilities or his large contribution to the achievements of the institution.

The Vice President for Academic Administration came to this post after serving as an assistant to Presidents Coffman, Ford and Coffey. His influence is derived from the fact that he has frequent contact with the President rather than from his formal position in the hierarchy. He exercises no line authority over the Deans and academic staff. Matters are discussed or "cleared" with him, in order to learn the President's thinking on the issue. This Vice President is not regarded by the faculty or the Deans to be as influential as the Vice President for Business Administration. He is not able to relieve the President of the need for frequent contact with the Deans and he does not afford the faculty with a satisfying voice in the administration of the University.

#### D. THE FUNCTIONING OF THE COLLEGES

In actual practice, the major academic units operate almost as autonomous units. Formally, but to a larger degree, informally, the Deans have been given a large measure of freedom in the governing of their units. Their recommendations regarding personnel, educational programs, and related matters are, in effect, final. It is only in the area of the budget that their authority is less, and here it is a matter of the President's problem in distributing the funds as much as possible in accordance with their demands.

The freedom which the Deans possess explains, in part, the great variety of administrative practice found at this level of the administration. This is particularly true in reference to the participation by the faculty in the decision-making process of the colleges. Traditionally, the College of Science, Literature, and Arts is regarded as the most "democratically

run" of the various colleges. Within the College is an elaborate, formal organization through which the faculty participate and are able to exercise influence. The present Dean, also, feels that government by the faculty in this manner is highly desirable and leans upon his faculty to a great degree. In the Institute of Technology, there is not as much direct faculty participation in the government of that unit. Not only does the Dean's interpretation of his role curb this tendency, but also there is not the tradition present in the College of Science, Literature, and Arts.

In the two colleges - Education and Business Administration - where there are no formal departments, the Dean conducts the business of the unit through faculty committees. These committees approach departmental divisions and to some degree might be classified as such. The selection of a new faculty member in one of the areas taught by the college is done by the Dean, but with the active assistance and guidance of a committee of individuals who work in the particular field. Curricula and other matters are considered in the same manner. Within the College of Education, the informal groups constitute departments in all but name, and there is the feeling that this situation will be formally recognized in the near future. The faculty in the School of Business Administration feel that the time has now come for some kind of departmentalization. If departments are created, it will merely be a recognition of the fact that departmental groups already exist and are in operation.

The autonomy of the major academic divisions arises in part out of the tradition at Minnesota for considerable college independence. Another contributing factor is the size of the institution and the sheer physical impossibility of having one man actively direct the enterprise. This is

in stark contrast to some of the smaller institutions which we have visited - Toledo, Dennison, Georgetown - where the President was much more involved in the administration below the institution as a whole.

The Deans of the colleges are appointed by the President with the approval of the Board. The selection of a Dean, however, is not done without some faculty consultation. When the Dean of the College of Sciences, Literature, and Arts was chosen, there was a large measure of faculty participation, partly because of the tradition in the school. Faculty participation was not, and is not, in the form of an election nor does it involve the entire faculty. Normally the President will consult with a faculty committee of senior members in the unit. This group will assist and advise, but the final decision is the President's. In another case, the Dean was selected after the President consulted with several senior people individually. The tactic used here was related to the fact that the school concerned was one which had a strong clientele in the state. To proceed in another fashion might well have subjected the University to considerable external pressures.

At the present moment, a new Dean of the Law School is being chosen. Here, again, a committee has been formed to advise and assist the President. The President, himself, has spent a fair amount of his energies in this task and perhaps has played a leading role in the preliminary screening of applicants.

Because of the autonomy of the colleges, the role of the Dean is an important one. Unless the Dean exercises leadership over his unit, there is almost no other level from which this leadership can come. The Self-Survey Committee of the University indicated that the Dean presents the last



line of defense in protecting the integrity of the University's educational program. The President and the central administration can do nothing more than a cursory review of recommendations made by the Deans regarding appointments, promotions, and curricula. Unless the Dean organizes himself and the college to screen effectively the proposals, the program of the institution can well be diluted and made less significant.

The Deans, themselves, accept this conception of their role, but each appears to approach his task somewhat differently. The Dean indicated that he felt his most important job concerned the selection of new staff. If significant changes in program are to be made, this man stated, it will be through the influence of the new men as they grow up in the institution. There must be, at all times, fresh ideas and concepts which come with the newer staff. Therefore he felt it extremely important for the Dean to take a direct hand in hiring in order to insure this flow of personnel necessary to the development of the college. In another college, this problem was largely handled by the Departments, with little or no participation by the Dean, except as a last step.

#### E. THE INFLUENCE OF THE GRADUATE SCHOOL

At most institutions, graduate education is primarily a function of the separate departments in which the students take their advanced work. The students normally identify with the departments, and the graduate school, itself, is often an appendage to the institution.

This description does not fit the Graduate School at Minnesota for this unit is regarded as a major, significant factor in the governing process. Formally, its influence is derived from the fact that the Dean

must approve all recommendations for appointment to tenure ranks and that the Graduate School controls a reasonably large sum of money for research grants. Informally, its influence comes from a number of sources, not the least of which is the tradition which surrounds the school. This century has seen the Graduate School grow both in numbers of students and in breadth of program. With this growth came a good part of the University's recognition as one of the leading institutions of higher education in the country. The faculty are proud of this development and regard appointment to the graduate faculty as a distinction. Unlike the other schools or colleges which are professionally oriented in a more narrow sense or which have particular program goals, the Graduate School is considered to have more of a University-wide orientation. Proposals or suggestions emanating from this unit have a degree of authority and acceptance which they might not have if they came from the other units.

This conception of the Graduate School as University in orientation is partially attributable to the manner in which the school is governed. There are some 11 group committees and an executive committee of graduate faculty who participate directly in reviewing programs and course offerings of the school. The 11 group committees are not narrowly constructed, but are inter-disciplinary which makes it possible for them to break out of the professional or departmental boundaries that might constrain them under other circumstances.

The personal prestige of the Graduate School Dean is another factor contributing to the influence which this unit possesses. He is regarded by both faculty and administration as extremely capable and dynamic. There is no feeling that he is arbitrary in his management of the school, yet there is a conscious recognition of his leadership. This is in contrast to the

feelings about one other Dean who also is recognized as a leader, but at the same time is thought to be rather rigid in some of his administrative actions. Of the various Deans in the institution, the Dean of the Graduate School has more contact, proportionately, with the President than do the others. Partial testament to the high esteem in which he is held by the President was the Dean's appointment as Chairman of the University Self-Survey Committee. While the exact nature of the Dean's influence, and the extent thereof, is impossible to identify, there is no doubt that he is one of the more important figures in the decision-making process.

#### F. THE FUNCTIONING OF THE DEPARTMENTS

##### 1. Departmental Operations.

There appears to be no standard practice or procedure followed by the various departments in organizing themselves to participate in the governing process. There is a high degree of formality in the way in which some departments consider issues of academic policy; e.g., the English Department in the College of Science, Literature, and Arts. There are frequent staff meetings, a large number of departmental committees, formal votes on questions, and a standardized manner by which the department makes its recommendations concerning the selection of a new chairman. The tradition of the department and its size (one of the largest in the College), dictate this kind of operation. One official hypothesized that this method was employed to compensate for the relative lack of prestige enjoyed by the Department outside the University. This process gives the staff a feeling of importance which they do not have as professionals, except within their own discipline. In advancing this hypothesis, the official used the Physics Department, where

there is much less concern with formal organization, as an example of a unit in which the staff had prestige outside their own discipline and therefore had less need for an extensive formal organization.

One generalization about departmental operations holds generally true throughout the University. The departments effectively make most decisions concerning personnel, academic policy, course offerings, and rearrangement of curricula. While departmental recommendations are reviewed at the College, and sometimes the top administration, level, this review is usually pro forma.

The degree to which the departmental recommendation is final is indicated by statistics compiled by the Senate Committee on Education. These statistics indicate that over a five year period 60 per cent of the departments had no proposals for new courses rejected by a higher level and 23 per cent of the departments had only occasional rejections. During this same period, over 1300 new courses were added to the curricula, and only 412 were deleted. The Self-Survey Committee commented there is a need for an over-all University curriculum group to review and assess decisions as to the addition and deletion of courses. Theoretically, the Senate Committee on Education is responsible for approving the courses offered; actually, these statistics suggest the decisions are made by the individual departments.

The raw figures (cited above) by themselves do not indicate whether the divisional or college committees seriously reviewed the proposals submitted. In response to another question in this same study, the departmental chairmen gave these answers:

41 per cent thought that the need for new courses was reviewed and considered seriously at the college level

37 per cent felt that some examination was made

18 per cent thought that there was little, if any, systematic appraisal of course proposals

These figures (as those cited previously) are for the University as a whole; they do not reveal variations in individual college or departmental practice. Faculty members consulted indicate that in the College of Science, Literature, and Arts faculty committees actively review course proposals, while in other colleges, the review is less often or intensively made.

Within the departments it was reported that only about 1/4th of the meetings were devoted to curricula matters and that only three departments had developed forms on which new course proposals were to be filed. The least formal attention to this area of concern was given by the departments on the St. Paul campus and in the Medical School. In 3/4ths of the departments, recommendations were forwarded only after full departmental consideration. Most of the other departments acted through a small committee and even where there was full departmental consideration, it often took the form of approving a department's recommendation.

The selection of new personnel is primarily carried out by the individual departments. Recommendations for appointment, particularly to the non-tenure ranks, are normally accepted with little review. Appointments to tenure ranks, or promotions to those levels, however, involve some review by the Graduate School and are screened more carefully by the respective Deans. In spite of this, the Self-Survey Committee noted that there is relatively little that the top administration can do to correct mistakes in judgment made by the departments in the building of a competent staff. Thus, while formally the selection of personnel is made above the departmental level, the department plays the decisive role in this area.

At Minnesota, like at Princeton, there is a clear distinction made between the participation by faculty of tenure status and those of non-tenure status. Formally this is seen in the election of the Consultative Committee and the University Senate. Informally it exists particularly in the making of promotions and recommendations for pay increases. Practically every department uses the tenure staff as a special sub-committee to consult with the chairman in this area. In some departments, the scope of the discussions often carries beyond personnel matters and includes consideration of basic educational policy. Some of the departmental chairmen interviewed pointed this out and indicated that often the younger staff members were a little resentful of this. The chairmen felt, however, that unless a concerted effort was made to avoid this kind of situation, it would continue. This aspect of departmental practice was considered in the AAUP report (cited above) and viewed with some concern.

## 2. Role of the Chairman.

The department chairman is selected by the President and the Dean, with the approval of the Board of Regents. Tenure is indefinite, at the pleasure of the President.

This statement of the formal arrangements, however, may lead to an inaccurate understanding of the role of the department chairman. A survey conducted by the AAUP indicated that in only 12 per cent of the cases were the faculty fully consulted before the appointment of a chairman. In 35 per cent of the cases there was some consultation, normally with senior faculty members, and in 11 per cent of the cases no consultation at all. This survey may understate the frequency with which the faculty is consulted. Indeed

interviews in a number of departments suggest that in most instances department chairmen are selected only after some consultation with the department concerned.

In both the English and Political Science Departments, attempts have been made to formalize the process of consultation. The English Department annually "elects" a chairman. In practice, this means that each year the English Department recommends an individual for appointment to the Dean and the President. While this procedure exists, it has not made any significant difference either in the tenure of the chairman or the authority of the President in making a selection. The present chairman has served for several years, and his predecessor had held the post for 10 to 15 years. The Department of Political Science has a formal three-year term for its chairman, but again this has had little effect on actual tenure. Also this Department, in its statement on personnel procedures, outlines a method for selection that involves consultation with every member of the departmental staff.

#### G. THE FUNCTIONING OF THE FACULTY

1. The University Senate. Formally, the faculty participates in the governing of this institution through the University Senate. Actually, however, the Senate does not effectively voice the faculty's views. A major reason is its size and the faculty's limited participation in it; often only a bare quorum is present for its meetings. Recently, for example, an effort to amend the constitution of the Senate (requiring an affirmative vote of at least 2/3rds of the body). At the first meeting, this number was not present and the decision was made to defer action. At the next meeting, there were still two or three members short to make a quorum of 2/3rds. A call went

out for members, and after a time, enough additional people appeared so that the amendment could be passed if there were no negative votes.

The present organization of the Senate is only two years old. Prior to this time, it had consisted of all tenure faculty and had grown to an unwieldy size. This consideration and the fact that meetings were poorly attended sparked a move for reorganization. It was hoped that by making the body 1) elective and 2) representative of both the tenure and non-tenure staff it would make the Senate a more effective device for faculty participation. While there seems to be some indication that this has come about, in part, the general feeling is that the Senate, even now, is not influential.

Of the various Senate Committees, the Committee on Education is perhaps the most important. It has undertaken several studies and has been more active than the rest. The ultimate influence which this group will exercise in the governing of the University is not known, but a number on the faculty expect it to emerge as an important unit.

2. The Faculty Consultative Committee. This wholly elective body of seven faculty members was created in 1949-1950 after the morale of the faculty had been severely damaged by a series of incidents. The most important was a large cut-back in staff which came almost without notice and in which there was very little opportunity for the faculty to consult on the way in which the releasing of individuals would be carried out. There was a feeling that the faculty had been ignored because there was no direct channel of communication between the faculty, or a representative of the faculty, and the President.

The Committee's constitution authorizes it to consult with the President on any matters affecting the faculty. Since its inception, the Committee has



spent most of its efforts in discussions relating to the budget in an attempt to introduce faculty opinion into considerations preceding the adoption of this document. Some attention has been devoted to other issues, but not to the extent given the budget.

The Committee's influence on decisions is difficult to measure. It meets about 8 to 10 times a year with the President, more often in those years when the legislature is in session. The President, a little doubtful of the Committee at first, now raises questions with it and uses it as a means of obtaining faculty opinion. The faculty-at-large seems to enjoy a sense of representation and of security which was lacking before the creation of this Committee. But there is an obvious dissatisfaction with the Committee's ability to know and reflect the views of the whole faculty. Those who have served on the Committee feel that members of the faculty have not contributed enough of their time and energy to acquainting the Committee with the views of the group. At the same time, some of the faculty feel that the Committee has not made enough effort to inform itself of the faculty's views and in turn to report to the faculty on matters considered.

This problem appears to be common among committees created to serve a like function at other institutions. At Denison and Toledo, similar faculty groups felt themselves to be somewhere in a state of limbo and unable to solve this question of making the consultative or conference committee an effective representative of the faculty.

The Consultative Committee at Minnesota is not, like the Conference Committee at Toledo and Denison, a "gripe" committee or one which considers personnel matters. In this respect, it also differs in function from the Committee of Three at Princeton. This is due, in large part, to the

Committee's efforts to avoid particular issues involving single faculty members and to concentrate on broader issues of educational and fiscal policy.

Whatever influence the Committee has had in its short existence is due to the caliber of men who have served on it. For the most part, the faculty have elected only the really outstanding individuals on the faculty and the one man considered the "elder statesman of the faculty," William Anderson, served as its chairman for six years.

#### H. THE INFLUENCE OF OTHER FACTORS

1. The AAUP. The Minnesota Chapter of the American Association of University Professors has a membership of approximately 700, out of a faculty of 2000. It is the largest local unit in the country and has been considered one of the most active chapters. The AAUP took the leadership in the creation of the Consultative Committee and later was of considerable importance in the reorganization of the Senate. Some faculty members contend that it is the only medium through which the faculty can consider the larger issues of educational policy. They contend that the AAUP has contributed to the feeling of University identification by the faculty. It has conducted itself in an effort to be influential by avoiding petty grievances and by attempting to be reasonable in its position. On its own, it has carried out several studies concerning faculty welfare and faculty participation in the administration. These reports have been given some publicity and have formed the basis for some faculty discussion of problems.

2. The Campus Club. When the question was asked, "What binds this enterprise together?", more often than not the questioner was told that an important factor was the faculty club. The club occupies the top floors of the

student union building and a large number of the faculty eat lunch there or gather there for informal social occasions. It is maintained that many times important decisions are made by chance meetings of individuals and that often the informal atmosphere of the club contributes to the mediation of differences.

Perhaps most important, the club affords an opportunity for the faculty of the various professional groups to develop contacts with faculty from outside their own areas of specialization. This has aided the development of inter-disciplinary undertakings and maintained the tradition at Minnesota for this kind of activity.

The club provides a natural focal point for faculty activity because of its location on the main campus. It allows faculty to gather easily on short notice and promotes an identification with the University as a whole.

It must be noted, however, that not all of the people asked rated the club as significant a factor as did some. The full-time teaching faculty were most impressed with the influence of the club, while some of the administrators had reservations about its key significance.

3. Professional and Accrediting Associations. It was observed that at Toledo and at Denison these organizations exercised some influence in the determination of academic policy and in the structuring of curricula. Also the demands of these groups were often used successfully as support for additional funds or equipment. At Minnesota, there did not appear to be as much concern about the standards of these groups or the pressure that they might bring to bear upon the institution. In one case, a new program was not accredited by a professional organization. This did not dissuade the particular college from offering the program or from further work in this area. There

was hardly any worry that the failure to receive approval would damage the institution in any way.

This experience would tend to support a hypothesis advanced in the memorandum on Toledo in which I indicated that perhaps the professional associations were most influential in institutions comparable to Toledo and not in institutions of the stature of Minnesota. One reason for this is the fact that often the standards required at Minnesota are far above the minimums demanded by the professional organizations.

#### I. SOME MISCELLANEOUS COMMENTS

While the departments at Minnesota are strong and an important unit in the administration, there is not the narrow departmentalization that one might expect. Several inter-departmental and inter-disciplinary programs are in operation, both in research and in teaching. There is no formal structure that has been created to foster this, as at Princeton, but rather the development has come more or less naturally. A factor in this is the tradition at Minnesota, particularly in research, for this kind of approach.

One individual interviewed stressed the role and influence of a group of administrators who held secondary positions in the hierarchy. Their influence stemmed from a variety of factors, among which was that many of them had grown up together in the institution and were close personal friends. This enabled them to confer informally on the telephone or over luncheon and to resolve issues or questions that concerned relationships between their various units. This informal communications network, short-circuited, to some degree, the formal channels, with the result that often decisions were arrived at without any formal record, except for the final recommendation.

#### IV. SUMMARY

The University of Minnesota is recognized as one of this country's leading institutions of higher education. It offers, hence, an important case study of how in an effective, large educational enterprise the decisions are made that result in growth and especially educational achievement. This study suggests seven conclusions as to how decisions are made here:

1. The Board of Regents helpfully counsel the President and his staff on questions as to finance and physical development and assist in interpreting the University to the people and political leaders of the state but do not significantly influence the decisions made as to educational program or policy or the selection of personnel to carry this program out.

2. The major decisions as to what financial resources are needed and how these resources shall be distributed among the University's various activities are made by the President and the Vice President for Business Administration; little influence over these decisions is exercised by the faculty as a body.

3. The basic decisions of an educational enterprise - those having to do with the character of the educational program and the selection and promotion of teaching personnel - are made by the faculty with tenure within the academic departments. Personnel actions and decisions on curricula questions must be approved by the Deans, the President and Board of Regents. Yet decisions are effectively made in the department and often by the senior members of the department.

4. Demands on the President's time to deal with matters of political and public relations, finance and physical development drastically limit the

time he can give to consideration with the faculty of educational issues. Under such circumstances, the President's staff and the Deans must assume responsibility for seeing that educational program and personnel needs are reflected in over-all financial, public relations and physical development decisions.

5. The faculty is given a voice through the Consultative Committee in the making of financial decisions by the President and his staff. The benefit is, however, largely psychological. The faculty has access to the President and this access satisfies their demand for participation in financial decisions that affect educational program and the economic welfare of the faculty as individuals.

6. The influence of the Deans of the major academic units over decisions on educational questions or personnel actions varies markedly. Those Deans who exercise the greatest influence all are said to be especially skillful in handling committees of the faculty. One or two Deans have been able to assert authority over such decisions but their actions have led to faculty uneasiness in their respective units. In other instances so much of the Dean's time has been claimed by the constituencies the school serves and by general administration routines that they have exercised little influence over educational program or personnel matters.

7. The large achievement of this institution as an educational enterprise despite the dispersal of decision making power is, in substantial part, the result of:

- a. A strong institutional pride apparent among the faculty and administrators alike,
- b. The functioning of a few strong individuals, i.e., the President, the Vice President for Business Administration,

the Dean of the Graduate School, and five or six elder faculty members who, over a period of time, have gained considerable respect for their contributions, and

- c. The unique contribution of the Graduate School in bringing together faculty from the University as a whole, identifying them with the University rather than with particular units, and stimulating their research and teaching.