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CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

HISTORICAL BACKGROUND

Following World War II, and through the mid 1960's, colleges and universities across the United States flourished as they grew both in size and in complexity. As long as these institutions experienced continued growth, they had an increasing financial base from which to cover inefficiencies and ineffectiveness in the management of these institutions. Beginning with the late 1960's, growth of collegiate institutions had slowed considerably. Particularly among private colleges and universities, many had actually suffered substantial losses in enrollment. The decline in enrollment meant that collegiate institutions had to begin exercising care in managing limited financial resources.

FORCES REQUIRING CHANGE

Many educational leaders and management experts proposed solutions to bring about effective management of collegiate institutions. One of these "solutions", and the one with which this study has concerned itself, was the effort of colleges and universities to train executive
executives to become better (more efficient and effective) managers.

An article from the Chronicle of Higher Education underscored the urgency of the need to improve management of colleges. The article called attention to a large number of institutions which have closed or have been forced to merge with other stronger institutions in order to survive. In essence, this article warned that colleges must be managed better in order to survive.

Recently, a variety of forces have emerged which support the need for better management of collegiate institutions. Among the numerous forces which have been identified are:

- new requirements of accrediting associations;
- additional federal government regulations;
- continuing inflation;
- changes in national priorities;
- the rising trend toward collective bargaining;
- increased propensity for litigation;
- state-wide master planning for higher education; and
- new delivery systems for higher education.

---

ACCREDITING ASSOCIATION REQUIREMENTS

We are now, it seems clear, on the threshold of a new era of accrediting - the next major step in the evolution of the accrediting process - and the new emphasis will be essentially different from the one now in use. For one thing, increasingly sophisticated instruments are becoming available for direct measurement of the outcome of the educational process and for relating those outcomes to the specific objectives of an institution and to the characteristics of the students. Further, higher education is breaking out of its structural bonds. It is no longer compressed within a neat box of two 18 week semesters or three 12 week quarters a year during which students, upon proper exposure to formal class instruction supported by library and laboratory, accumulate 30 semester hours or 45 quarter hours a year for four years. Bold new ventures which do more than modify the old structures are upon us - ventures truly innovative in their rejection of old patterns.¹

If accrediting associations demand measurably good performance from colleges and universities, more competent management will be required to achieve the performance level demanded by accrediting associations.

ADDITIONAL FEDERAL REGULATION

Another force which required improved management of colleges is the federal government. Collegiate institutions have been required to develop some complex, time-consuming and costly reports for the government. One of these, the Higher Education General Information Survey

HEGIS) requires general information about students, faculty, programs. Students and faculty must be tallied by rank, race, sex, etc. so that the government can audit the results of "equal opportunity" in both admissions and employment. In addition, colleges and universities have been required to develop "affirmative action" programs in order to actively recruit, hire, and upgrade both minority and women employees. In the case of affirmative action, the Contract Compliance Division of the Department of Health, Education and Welfare can actually terminate all federal grants if the institution is found to be in non-compliance with the federal executive orders on the subject. Compliance with these federal mandates required that management be organized sufficiently to produce accurate, timely data in response to those governmental requests.

CONTINUING INFLATION

Another force which now required more effective or efficient management has been the rampant inflation of the past few years (averaging 7.25% from 1972 through 1976), and the consequent impact of that inflation on collegiate finances.

---

Traditionally, colleges are frightfully managed. In a time of plenty, that was not as serious a problem as it has become. My experience is that many institutions that are in serious difficulty have assets exceeding their indebtedness by more than three to one.¹

The financial crisis was caused, according to the 1973 Educational Resources Information Center (ERIC) Research Currents publication, by the fact that:

- growth has ceased or regression occurred; costs continue to rise. Income from enrollment expansion no longer fills the gap between expenditures and costs. In many industries rising costs have been overcome through increased productivity. But higher education is a labor intensive industry. "Productivity" of faculty members can be increased only slightly without loss of student-teacher interaction.²

In studies dating back to 1970 and 1971, William Jellema found a grave financial situation in colleges, with "special impact on smaller, private colleges and universities."³ Executive managers of these institutions, in particular, must be prepared to deal effectively with anticipated financial problems.

In another study of forty-eight four-year, private

liberal arts colleges, Jenney and Wynn\(^1\) found financial conditions worse than they had been previously; i.e. more institutions were facing annual operating deficits.

**CHANGE IN PUBLIC PRIORITIES**

Jenney and Wynn also noted that a change in public priorities has lessend demand for the traditional collegiate institutions in favor of vocational or career oriented education. A 1972 *Chicago Daily News* article\(^2\) supported the contention that a new technological elite may emerge at the forefront of society replacing the traditionally educated college graduate. The same article added that the "personnel requirements of a technological society not only continue but actually expand."

A September, 1975, article in *CHANGE* magazine\(^3\) noted that the economic value of going to college is greatly reduced over what it was in the mid and late 1960's. Assuming that these assessments were correct, executive managers of traditional collegiate institutions may be required to change or add to their conventional educational

---


programs or adjust to even smaller enrollments.

THE TREND TOWARD COLLECTIVE BARGAINING

Another factor affecting the management of higher education is collective bargaining. By 1973, according to the North Central Association Quarterly, more than 150 community colleges and vocational schools and almost 100 four-year colleges and universities were enveloped in some form of collective bargaining with faculty. An Association of Governing Boards (AGB) report of the same year listed two assumptions about this rapidly growing phenomenon.

One assumption frequently attributed to the collective bargaining movement was that faculty unions would take over the decision-making for the campus. The other assumption was that if the union campus representative could find creative ways to include faculty governance in collective bargaining without allowing the system of decision-making to become the exclusive property of either, then the highest standards of collegiality would be preserved. In either case, the traditional role of manage-

---


ment in colleges and universities would be changed and made more complex with the need to relate to various formal bargaining units among the faculty and staff of these institutions.

PROPENSITY FOR LITIGATION

Another factor which required more effective management in colleges and universities was the increasing propensity for litigation from faculty, students, and others who believe themselves to have been wronged by the institution. In many instances, the behavior of executive managers is the basis for legal actions against the institution. One president of a complex university\(^1\) indicated that his institution is threatened with litigation on the average of once a week. Most litigations, however, do not reach the courtroom stage but are resolved by the management of the institution. Hence, effective management will be required to negotiate workable and appropriate settlements on these issues.

STATE-WIDE MASTER PLANNING

Lewis Mayhew noted that:

\(^1\)Raymond Baumhart, S.J., Unpublished address to faculty of Loyola University, (May, 1974).
By 1980, every state will probably have a state master plan for higher education and some form of statewide coordination and control. Higher education has become too expensive and too significant for state governments to allow it to function in the laissez-faire manner of the past, and the increasing needs of higher education for government subsidy is apt to conflict with university integrity and desire for autonomy.  

Dr. Mayhew's quotation itself explained that state master plans are likely to bring about state-wide coordination and control which, in turn, will require effective management to preserve the integrity and autonomy of each institution.

NEW DELIVERY SYSTEMS

Dr. Samuel Gould and his national committee on Non-Traditional Delivery Systems in Higher Education have addressed themselves to the shape of collegiate institutions of the future. These several and sometimes forceful changes in the modes of higher education will require preparation by college administrators who may have to manage institutions quite different from those which they have managed in the past. The typical collegiate administrator, academically prepared to teach rather than to manage, would

---


likely require some training to learn how to manage non-traditional programs in an effective manner.

In Illinois, with the creation in 1965 of a state-funded community college system,\(^1\) as part of its master plan, placed substantial pressure upon four-year institutions, both public and private, to compete for students. Effective management will be needed to help institutions, particularly private, compete for these students with the lower-cost community college system. In just ten years, this new system for post-secondary education has blossomed to the extent that 70% of all entering college freshmen are now attending public community colleges.\(^2\)

**SUMMARY OF INTRODUCTION**

Numerous other factors have already, or probably will, contribute to the need for more efficient and effective management of colleges and universities. Such other issues, including tenure, changing expectations of faculty and staffs, the development of proprietary schools by such corporations as Westinghouse, Xerox, and Bell and Howell, and others, will continue to require more skilled management.

---


The factors cited in the introduction simply served to illustrate an urgent need, at this juncture in the development of higher education, to improve the efficiency and effectiveness of the management of colleges. The literature review in Chapter II noted several methods which could be employed to improve the performance of colleges. The focus of this study, executive development programs, represented only one important solution to the myriad problems confronting higher education today.

The preliminary portions of this chapter listed some conditions to which colleges and universities have had to learn to respond.

PURPOSE

The present study had for its purpose, the examination of programs for executive development in Illinois private colleges and universities. This examination was accomplished by means of a survey and interviews with college presidents. The results of the survey and interviews served first, to inform the reader what efforts were in existence for executive development in this group of colleges; and second, as a basis for recommendations on structure of collegiate programs for executive development. Since this study was a pioneering effort which cataloged programs of this type, it resulted in a list of recommendations for further study of this topic.
THE PROBLEM

There exists a need for more effective and efficient management of collegiate institutions as documented throughout Chapter II of this study. One major solution to the problem is management development training for executives of these institutions. While the literature suggests the need clearly and repeatedly, it did not specify what form these development programs should take. No extensive study existed which provided a plan for implementation of executive development programs. This study afforded some direction to collegiate executive development programs through results of the survey of existing programs in private Illinois colleges and universities, and by recommendations which resulted from the study. Further, the study acknowledged the total amount of money spent for executive development and suggested avenues for reducing expenditures.

Dr. Marvin W. Peterson, Director of the Center of the Study of Higher Education, University of Michigan, supports the need for this type of study when he wrote this author saying:

The area of in-service management development programs on which you propose to do your dissertation is an intriguing one and also a relatively unresearched one . . . I apologize if my response is not particularly specific; however, it's my general impression that virtually nothing has been done short of descriptions of types of programs, possibly surveys of people's experience with them,
and some in-house evaluations. It appears that you have a good area to pursue for research purposes; and I look forward to seeing something in the not too distant future.¹

This study went beyond the research recommended by Dr. Peterson because it first developed a list of executive development topics from the literature, and then learned which topics were included in existing programs in one group of colleges. Further, the study recommended specific elements of a comprehensive program for executive development.

DESIGN OF THE STUDY

Since the purposes of the study were to examine programs for improving the executive management in private colleges and universities, and to recommend a structure for programs at other colleges, the following steps were taken:

Step 1

The literature was surveyed to find possible topics for inclusion in programs for executive development of collegiate administrators. These topics were grouped into broad categories, including: The Role of Management, Tools of Management, Decision-Making, Communications, Delegation,

¹Dr. Marvin W. Peterson, unpublished letter to Thomas E. Murray, November 12, 1973.
Motivation, Coaching and Performance Appraisal, Organization, Professional Development, Personnel Skills, Financial, Law, Ethics, Long-Range Planning, and other. In addition, the literature review provided benchmarks with which the comprehensiveness of existing programs was compared. These benchmarks included:

A. Organization Analysis to determine organizational training needs.
B. Personnel Inventory and Performance Appraisal to determine personnel strengths and weaknesses.
C. Training Needs Assessment by line management.
D. Planned Development which includes:
   i. Programming of the material.
   ii. The specific topics for inclusion in the program.
   iii. Availability of resources for training (time and manpower).
   iv. Budget for training.
E. Statement of Program Objectives.
F. Commitment from Top Management.

**Step 2**

Utilizing program topics suggested by the literature, the study elicited concurrence from a panel of management experts in order to sharpen and modify the lengthy list of topics. The criterion selected for inclusion of these
topics in the suggested program was a two thirds acceptance of these topics by management experts who said that they were either essential or very important for collegiate executive managers. Using that criterion for acceptance was sufficient to eliminate a number of topics that were not "uniformly" regarded by management experts as important. The results of this survey were presented in Chapter III with a narrative description of the topics eliminated from the preliminary list by the panel of management experts.

Step 3

The next step was to develop a survey instrument to be completed by presidents of private colleges and universities in Illinois. Since the purpose of the study was to determine what executive development programs were underway within Illinois private colleges and universities, this survey was submitted to presidents of the fifty-one private colleges and universities in Illinois. (The names of those who received the survey are contained in Appendix III.) The data received from the survey of college presidents indicated the colleges which have programs for executive development and the elements of the existing programs within this group of collegiate institutions. The data were expanded further through in-depth interviews with selected college presidents. Such pioneering effort also raised additional questions which provided sources for recommendations for
further study. Prior to submission to the fifty-one college presidents, the survey instrument was field-tested for content validity and reliability through a mailing to four Chicago-area college presidents and was further modified according to their recommendations.

Private colleges and universities in Illinois were selected for this study because private higher education has experienced the most severe results from the several forces which impact upon collegiate institutions. The group of institutions surveyed ranged from quite large and complex to small and simple. (See Appendix 1 - List of Institutions Participating in the Survey.)

Step 4

Once having learned of the existence of executive development programs, an in-depth series of interviews with appropriate executives from colleges and universities who have executive development programs was undertaken to:

A. Examine more closely data obtained through the survey.

B. Seek documentation for program philosophy and content.

C. Seek information on willingness of institution to participate in cooperative efforts to improve executive management within each institution.

D. Compare existing programs with elements suggested in the literature as essential for this type of program to be effective.

Step 5

The results of the in-depth interviews are presented in Chapter IV by means of narrative analysis of existing programs.

Step 6

In Chapter IV, elements of existing programs are critiqued in relation to criteria suggested by the literature and by management experts as described in the first step of this study.

Step 7

Lastly, the study provided a graphic representation on the status of existing programs for executive development in Illinois private colleges and universities compared to a representation of what "ought to be" as recommended by the literature and management experts.
DEFINITIONS

The study concerned itself with the top management of collegiate institutions; i.e. those managers who have responsibility for shaping the directions of the institution. Presidents, Vice Presidents, and Deans were included in the category "top management".

Peter Drucker's definition of management is the most comprehensive and perhaps the most pertinent for purposes of this study.

The first thing is that management, that is, the organ of leadership, direction, and decisions in our social institutions, and especially in business enterprise, is a generic function which faces the same basic tasks in every country, and, essentially, in every society. Management has to give direction to the society it manages. It has to think through the institution's mission, has to set its objectives, and has to organize resources for the results the institution has to contribute. Management is, indeed, J. B. Say's "entrepreneur" and responsible for directing vision and resources toward greatest results and contributions.

In performing these essential functions, management everywhere faces the same problems. It has to organize work for productivity and achievement. It is responsible for the social impact of the enterprise. Above all, it is responsible for producing the results - whether economic performance, student learning, or patient care - for the sake of which each institution exists.1

Management Experts - Consultants or faculty who earn their livings designing and/or implementing programs to improve management.

Practitioners - College or university presidents who may or may not have formal training in management; but who, nonetheless, practice management in a college or university.

Executive Management - The key management positions in a college or university. Titles would usually, but not exclusively, include the president, vice presidents, deans, and program directors and others such as personnel director, business manager, director of planning, who have been regarded by chief executive officers as executive managers.

Topics - Topics include those content areas for executive development programs initially found in the literature and recommended by experts for inclusion in an executive management program.

Composition - For purposes of the study, composition of programs refers to financial, time, and manpower resources recommended as desirable for executive development programs.

QUESTIONS TO BE ANSWERED IN THE STUDY

The major questions to be answered in the study were as follows:
1. How many private colleges and universities in Illinois have programs for developing their executive management?

2. What topics are included in these programs?

3. What are the costs for these programs?

4. Who shapes or directs these programs?

5. What topics are suggested by the literature and experts as essential for executive development?

6. How much time of key executives are presidents of private colleges and universities in Illinois willing to allow for improving management skills of key executives?

7. How much money are collegiate presidents willing to authorize for executive development?

8. What obstacles prevent more executive development from taking place?

9. How comprehensive are the executive development programs in Illinois private colleges and universities?

10. What would help make these programs more effective?
The answers to these questions were analyzed narratively. The analysis is reported through narrative interpretation of the data.

OUTLINE OF SUBSEQUENT CHAPTERS

Chapter II of this study encompasses a review of the literature pertinent to this study; including literature relating to: The Need for Management Improvement and Reform; Major Management Theorists; Existing Management Development Efforts; and other similar studies.

Chapter III explains the process through which the study was conducted: development of the survey instruments; validation of topical lists; submission of these surveys to collegiate presidents; and the questions utilized in the interviews with collegiate presidents.

In Chapter IV, the results of both the written and interview surveys are reported and interpreted.

Chapter V lists conclusions of the study along with a number of recommendations for further study and for action.
CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

Chapter I of this study presented a background of the need for this study, listing some major forces which have required more effective and skilled management of collegiate institutions. In addition, the first chapter of this study stated the problem to be studied and the purposes of this study, which were to survey programs for improving the executive management in private colleges and universities, and to suggest elements of a program for improving executive management.

Also in the first chapter, the procedural steps of the study were described and basic terms were defined.

Chapter II presents a review of the literature relating to executive development in colleges and universities. The first segment of this literature review lends support to the need for the study by noting several calls for management improvement of colleges and universities made by both educational and business leaders. The second part of the literature review acknowledges major strides of management theory and practice in the United States since World War II which contributed to the
existing body of knowledge that could be systematically taught to executives of colleges and universities. The third part of this literature review lists some sources for professional development opportunities available to collegiate managers. The last segment of this review cites the few related studies which have been done in this area.

Collectively, the parts of this review establishes a sound base from which the author proceeded with the survey described briefly in Chapter I and amplifies in Chapter III of this study.

THE NEED FOR MANAGEMENT REFORM IN COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES

A good place to begin this section is with an article entitled "Is Efficiency Taboo in Academia?" In that article, Dr. Harold B. Wess, whose personal background includes both business management and educational administration, quotes from Alvin Eurich concerning the term EFFICIENCY in education. Eurich states:

It is a word from business, and educational institutions must not be businesses. At the same time

---

we know, however reluctantly, that competition was
the principal factor that forced business to develop
efficient procedures. Colleges and universities
. . . are just starting to learn that resources -
financial, physical, and human - can and must go
further in the future than they have in the past.¹

Wess then asserted that higher education must perform
the function of auditing dollar costs in relation to some
norms established for higher education. He predicted that
if colleges and universities do not become more efficient
and become capable of articulating that efficiency to their
publics, including state legislatures, the legislatures
will demand this efficiency as a base for appropriations.
Another writer, John W. Lee, indicated that:

The pressure on university administrators to
operate their institutions efficiently has grown al­
most daily. Many observers have noted that external
pressures have caused most major changes in higher
education. The inability of the university to renew
and revitalize itself without congressional action,
a Sputnik shock, or student rebellion bears witness
to the inertia inherent in higher educational
systems.²

Then came Lee's appraisal of the situation which
agreed with the views of Dr. Wess.

¹Alvin C. Eurich, "Increasing Productivity in Edu­
cation", Higher Education in the United States: Economic
Problems, (Cambridge, Mass: Harvard University Press,
1968), p. 185.

²John W. Lee, "Legislating Effectiveness in Higher
Education", Educational Record, Vol. 53, No. 1, (Winter,
Thus, it is not surprising to find many legislators attempting to help university administrators change their institutions to make them more effective.\textsuperscript{1}

Lee commented further that much legislation has been shortsighted and has actually been harmful to colleges and universities. He then drew attention to the fact that college presidents are now confronted with problems that are both \textit{managerial} and \textit{political} in nature.

Rev. Paul Reinert, S.J., former President of St. Louis University, indicated in his recent text\textsuperscript{2} that nearly half of the U.S. private colleges would have exhausted their liquid assets by the end of the present decade. Rev. Reinert further indicated that while colleges and universities can look toward governmental funding to help them, they must first rely on self-help measures in order to survive. A sound managerial reorganization may likely provide a good beginning to self-help efforts.

Dr. J. Douglas Brown, then Dean of the Faculty, Princeton, commented that:

\textit{A part of the problem in assuring a sense of economy in universities and colleges is an attitude of aloof superiority on the part of a faculty toward what they consider to be a cribbing control upon}

\textsuperscript{1}Ibid, p. 90.

"academic" freedom in teaching and research.¹

He also indicted the business offices of universities and colleges by adding that:

... business offices of universities and colleges have also been remiss in constantly talking and totaling dollars instead of showing a sustained interest in what dollars do in teaching and research.²

While the comments quoted thus far have concentrated on efficiency as one goal of educational management, Peter Drucker commented that:

While efficiency - doing things right - is important, effectiveness - doing the right things - is a great deal more important.³

Accepting the assumptions of Mr. Drucker as valid, the tasks of an executive development program should be directed not only toward making administrators more efficient but also toward making them more effective. Paul Dressel commented on the problem of measuring effectiveness:

---


²Ibid, p. 3.

Lacking acceptable measures of effectiveness, we are driven by external pressures toward processes which emphasize efficiency, and here it is that much of the frustration of the faculty becomes evident.¹

Dressel commented further that:

If we are going to innovate in order to increase efficiency and effectiveness, we should stop wasting time in tinkering. Minor changes in credit hours, changes in the calendar, changes in requirements, consideration of whether and by what procedures credit by examination shall be granted, discussions of changes in grading practice, introduction of junior year abroad, work-study programs and the like all have the possibility to change in the programs, but the history of higher education as I see it is one of messing around (I use the phrase deliberately) with discreet aspects of educational experience spending endless hours making minor changes which often affect only a minority of students and have so little impact that it really makes no difference to the students involved. If anything, such tinkering may disturb what unity already exists in a program.²

Later, in the same speech, he concluded that:

It seems to me that colleges and universities must begin to examine the effectiveness in bringing about changes in young people, their effectiveness in contributing to the improvement of the quality of living in their community, state, and nation. To do this requires an institution to look beyond the grades made by students in particular courses to the cumulative impact by the educational experience of the individual.³

¹Paul L. Dressel, "Innovation, Efficiency, and Effectiveness", (an address delivered on January 12, 1976, University of Akron), p. 16.

²Ibid, pp. 16-17.

Once a university recognizes that it can be more effective, it must plan to train its executives (and perhaps its faculty as well) so that they are prepared to operate in a more efficient and effective manner.

Perhaps the most direct comment on the subject is one from Lawrence Bogard in which he stated that, "Whether or not higher education, even as it exists today, can survive without good management is questionable." Bogard adds:

If colleges and universities are to retain any measure of autonomy whatever, they must realize that freedom pre-supposes responsibility and accountability. Institutions no longer have any option between disjointed laissez faire enterprise on the one hand and planned integrated activity on the other.

Bogard proceeded to indicate specifically what institutions of higher education must do as part of their programs of scientific management. The first and foremost task he assigned to scientific management in higher education is the, "conduct of a critical and continuous self-examination of curriculum and administrative and operational procedures . . ." Secondly, he called for the establishment of "relevant goals and objectives" and "... timely and

---


2 Ibid, p. 10.
valid information in order to achieve the above . . .

Accepting Bogard's proposal that scientific management is at least one salvation for higher education as we know it today, it follows that these "scientific managers" must be created by means of training programs for educational executives who are presently operating our colleges and universities.

Even the Carnegie Commission on Higher Education, which produced six years of written recommendations between 1967 and 1973 concerning the future of higher education in the United States, concluded that although, studies have been . . . helpful, effective action is essential. The real achievements lie with those who act effectively. 3

The same report cautioned that "planning for the future of higher education should be on a contingent basis" subject to continuing re-examination. Though most sources quoted in this paper would agree that effective planning is a basis for sound management decisions in

---

1 Ibid, p. 11.


higher education, it was noteworthy that planning was not thought of as a one-time function - or an every ten years or so activity. It must be a continual activity. If planning is to result in a successful and realistic plan, it would require the training of administrators to become active participants in the ongoing process of planning.

A most useful text on the topic of management in higher education, entitled Institutional Priorities and Management Objectives,¹ is the result of the 1971 meeting of the Association of American Colleges. William Jellema, editor, prepared a litany of actions which colleges and universities could take to improve the quality of management. Among the recommendations were:

There are still institutions that have left relatively uncultivated - in terms of fiscal efficiency - some area of planning and management.

There are still institutions handling their administrative staff organization, development, and evaluation at less than optimum.²

This researcher would add that there are many institutions which have still given little or no serious


²Ibid, p. 144.
thought to the need for developing professional administrators in any systematic fashion. In addition, Jellema added:

There are still institutions that do not plan ahead as intelligently as they could — although one of the benefits of the financial crunch most frequently reported by institutions in our study . . . . was that it had forced greater attention to long-range planning.¹

Jellema's comment added credence to the contention that where programs for executive development do exist, they more frequently exist by virtue of external pressures rather than because of some a priori decision by top management that preparing administrators to operate more effectively and efficiently is a sound management practice.

In the same text, James L. Hayes, former President of the American Management Association, asserted that:

Administration is basically the same in all human institutions. It makes very little difference whether we have a manufacturing plant, a hospital, the government, or a university. The basic principles of administration are present in every one of them and no matter what the administrative mode may be — faculty centered, administration centered, or otherwise — the management verities must be recognized. It would seem to be the essence of good scholarship for these varities to be identified and applied in education. The mission of an organization, the kinds of people involved, and the external environment in which the organization exists — all of these may

¹Ibid, p. 144.
Hayes' statement lends authority to the notion that if the principles of administration are the same in all types of organizations, then much of the research and experimentation about management done by industry could be used and/or adapted for use by universities and colleges. This author has personally found businessmen most eager to share their costly and time-consuming training developments with colleges and universities - perhaps simply because the not-for-profit organization is not in direct competition with them. Hospitals and schools could probably borrow much of what had been developed for industry.

Hayes made another point worth recounting here when he stated that: all administrators, "when they manage, engage in planning, organizing, coordinating, motivating, and controlling."^2 To follow up only one of Hayes' management functions, motivation is a skill which requires knowledge - knowledge about how the human being operates, what he needs and how he responds to those needs. This example


^2Ibid, p. 198.
was cited to indicate the kind of knowledge that a professional administrator might obtain from a formalized program for executive development within a college or university.

Looking forward to the future from 1968, Alvin Eurich added some ingredients to the list of essential ingredients for "any coherent and intelligent attempt to manage the future of higher education",

- a candid recognition of past mistakes
- a sensitive awareness of major current problems and practices, and to make our institutions relevant to existing and emerging needs
- imagination and ingenuity in the search for better answers to pressing problems
- careful planning that takes full account of all major aspects of higher education
- courage to act
- effective activation of plans, and constant evaluation and re-evaluation of the results.¹

Eurich made a concrete organizational suggestion for improving management of our colleges and universities when he stated:

Every major institution of higher learning in the United States should begin now to build its capacity to manage the future. Specifically, there should be established on every major campus an Office for Planning and Development, headed by one of the administrative vice presidents. The purpose of this office and of this officer would be to change the posture of the institution vis-a-vis the future. Instead of adjusting grudgingly to the momentous changes which are

transforming American society, colleges and universities must aggressively plan for the future.¹

Eurich even recommended that the budget for the office prescribed above be in the range of one fourth of one percent of the institution's budget. Planning and administrative development become almost inseparable since, as soon as plans are made, the gaps in management's ability to carry out those plans become evident. If administrative development came first, the participants of those programs recognized that planning² is the first task of "scientific" management. Reverend Theodore Hesburgh, President of Notre Dame University, in a response to the comments of Alvin Eurich, noted that:

... so many academic administrators have come to their jobs with only the vaguest kind of preparation, and, as a consequence, have spent all too many years learning how to administer the institution on a day-to-day basis, leaving little time to plan and march ahead.³

Another report of the Carnegie Commission on Higher Education⁴ described one of the major causes for the in-

creased problems of managing our collegiate institutions.

The accumulation of functions by an institution adds to its complexity, to greater size and thus to more levels of bureaucracy, to divided attention by top administrators, and to uncertain loyalties. It may also lead to contradictions in purposes, to inefficiencies in operation, and to inconsistencies among activities.¹

This report suggested that the best means for making educational institutions more efficient was to make them simpler. This author questions the feasibility of returning to the simpler days of the past but concurs in the notion that institutions of higher education must devote time and resources to articulation of their purposes and not attempt new functions which are unrelated to those basic purposes.

One organization, founded to assist "universities, colleges, schools, government agencies, and other organizations to develop future plans and improve operations and programs" is the Academy for Educational Development, Inc. This organization established a Management Division in 1970, which has for its purpose to provide "practical information to college presidents and other administrators on daily problems as well as on long-term questions of

financial planning and program improvement."¹ To achieve its purposes, the Management Division of the Academy for Educational Development investigated ways administrators can improve education while keeping down costs. In addition, it offers seminars and training programs to college presidents, chief administrators, and college trustees. Further, it publishes research reports, etc. on a quarterly basis to help administrators improve the quality of management in collegiate institutions.

John Millett, a Vice President for the Academy for Educational Development, recently prepared a brief publication entitled, "An Outline of Organization, Operation, and Administration for Colleges and Universities",² in which he listed categories for concern by college administrators including such items as: the enterprise, governance and administration, purposes, organization, operations, support services, management of resources and techniques of direction and evaluation and accountability. These simple headings indicated, for Millett, the areas in which educational executives should be competent to act

efficiently and effectively.

Kenneth Thompson, of the Rockefeller Foundation, provided another similar list of questions and areas about which administrators must do something if their institutions are to flourish and reach their potential. It is interesting that Thompson was writing about institutions in under-developed nations.

In the same way that not every nation has made the hard decisions prerequisite to benefiting from foreign assistance, not every institution has prepared itself for genuine organic growth. It may have failed to come forward with a practical design for upgrading its faculty, neglected research opportunities, overlooked salary problems, or forgotten about community support. It may have lacked a nucleus of devoted and responsible leaders willing and able to foster institutional growth, if necessary at the expense of their own professional advancement and prestige. There are certain matters that institutions no less than individuals or nations, cannot leave to chance. What is to be their role in a wider geographic region? How are they to weigh numerical growth against the pursuit of excellence? How much or how little should they undertake in a specific field? Is their mission to train the teachers, public servants, engineers, and doctors to serve the nation and other social and educational institutions? Or is their role conceived in more parochial, if worthy, terms of building a civic culture for their immediate constituents? Finally, has the leadership made a fresh and self-critical review of strengths and weaknesses and laid down the broad guidelines for responding to institutional needs? Recognizing that its resources are always more restricted than its needs; how far has it gone in establishing priorities for determining points of emphasis next year, three, or five years hence.

Thompson provided a list of questions which challenged administrators of any collegiate institution in any nation of the world. This author believes that one of the quickest ways to assure that those questions are answered is to provide for management development of administrators already running our colleges and universities. Thompson concluded his remarks on the happy note that, "as institutions (become) capable of joining scholarship with effective action, appreciation of them and support for them can be expected to follow." ¹ Regardless of whether or not the reader will accept Thompson's "happy ending", it may be concluded from his comments that administrators need to be prepared to direct more attention to the issue of establishing priorities and goals.

The 1971 annual meeting of the Association of American Colleges was titled "Institutional Priorities and Management Objectives" and called attention to the fact that these are tasks which must be performed by effective administrators.

Establishing priorities and setting goals requires some sophisticated planning skills among university ad-

ministrators. One recent publication indicated that:

Orderly growth and efficient resource allocation in universities requires a systematic and coherent way of planning ahead, by envisioning the scope and direction of institutional development. Although university administrators recognize the need for charting the future course of their institutions, planning is one of the least understood functions of administration.¹

While this statement supported the need for training administrators to become effective planners, this task is made more difficult by prior realities. Kenneth Boulding noted that:

The governance and organization of universities is an accretion from the past, deriving partly from medieval patterns and partly from the corporate model. This governing principle of the American university indeed has been defined as that of a corporate oligarchy tempered by an active labor market ... ²

He added that:

The main power of the administration is exercised through control over all budgets and veto over novelties. The administration, however, has very little power over the actual conduct of the faculty or the promotion of novelties.³


³Ibid, p. 10.
Though planning remains a major task for collegiate administrators, unlike the business corporation, administrators in academia do not have a history of being able to control those ingredient parts of the enterprise necessary for effective planning, as indicated by Mr. Boulding. Adding to that uncertain ability of academic leaders to plan is, according to John Caffrey, "the wall of faculty resistance to changes which will in any way reduce their privileges and prerogatives."¹ To counter this resistance and plan for the future needs of higher education, James Farmer, writing for the Western Interstate Commission for Higher Education (WICHE) recommended a Program Planning Budgeting Systems approach to help "provide additional insights into program changes by identifying resource requirements, and developing costs by program"² as a device for improving outstanding of objectives and outputs of a college or university. Farmer acknowledged that PPBS has several conceptual deficiencies which applied to institutions of higher education. He does not believe, however, that these deficiencies should preclude use of this one tool for increasing the efficiency of the


management of our collegiate institutions. Farmer pro-
vided some useful definitions of the terms planning, pro-
gramming, and budgeting.

Planning - The selection or identification of the
overall long-range objectives of the organization
and systematic analysis of various courses of
action in terms of relative costs and benefits.

Programming - Deciding on the specific courses
of action to be followed in carrying out plan-
ning decisions.

Budgeting - Translating planning and programming
decisions into specific financial plans.1

Marvin Peterson, of the University of Michigan, re-
lated Program, Planning, and Budgeting Systems (PPBS) to
the central tasks of management in a university. He in-
dicated that the introduction of new management technology
such as PPBS "may have far-reaching implications for other
parts of its formal and social organization, for the
people who work in it and for the organization's relation-
ship with its environment."2 He indicated that conven-
tional planning is usually "not tied closely to managerial
and operational control". He suggested that PPBS provide
an attempt at a rational framework which relates the
functions of "Planning, Managerial Control, and Oper-

1Ibid, p. 7.

2Marvin W. Peterson, "The Potential Impact of PPBS
on Colleges and Universities", The Journal of Higher Edu-
cation, Ohio State University Press, (No. 1, January,
1971), p. 3.
ational Control" to the budgeting and information system.

For example, in the area of decision-making, he noted that, "PPBS actually builds into the organization many new decision points. For instance, each program . . . requires three levels of decision - policy and objectives, programming, and budget."¹ He cautioned that at least in academic areas, faculty and students should be involved in the program decisions. Working with Dr. Peterson's assumptions, it is evident that educational executives who wish to use Program Planning Budgeting Systems (PPBS) must be provided with some training in order to implement this innovation effectively. Perhaps the most interesting caution of Dr. Peterson with reference to the changes which Program Planning Budgeting Systems can bring about in the institution's decision-making process was as follows:

Another impact on decision making that should be foreseen is the ruthlessness of more accurate information. For instance, one now expects the educational expense per student credit hour to increase with the increasing class level and to be higher for the sciences than the humanities . . . one can only offer a word of caution about using them (cost figures) for comparison between programs. The inequities may only serve to polarize or politicize faculty and student groups which are faced with decisions on goals or programs.²

¹Ibid, p. 9.

However, Program Planning Budgeting Systems offer only one approach to improving management of collegiate institutions. Just as modern data processing equipment and techniques have brought about the possibility of PPBS, they have also given birth to other systematic management techniques such as "modern space management", one technique for increasing the efficiency and effectiveness of the university enterprise. Brooks defined modern space management as:

a means of permitting institutional officers to learn more about the operation of their colleges and universities; to make more rational decisions about their existing space; to plan more effectively for future needs; and to interpret the moplex world of academic facilities to state legislatures and other important constituents. . . . the use of modern space management techniques must always bear in mind that the changing nature of the academic enterprise demands that the formulas and measures need constant re-examination. At their best, they are an accurate reflection of academic purposes and economic realities; at their worst, they are rigid exercises in irrelevant measurement.¹

Since the computer offers administration the opportunity to audit the use of physical space in an institution, educational managers have one more tool to learn

to use in order to improve the quality of the management of our collegiate institutions. The Illinois Board of Higher Education has conducted a series of state-wide surveys for this purpose.¹

Another term gaining wide acceptance in educational circles is that of accountability. John J. Corson suggested a re-structuring of the systems of governance for our universities as means for improving the administration of them in which he indicated that:

... every extension of authority must be accompanied by a means to enforce accountability. Whatever form of governance exists must produce results that are acceptable to the several constituencies within a college or university. If the students are given complete authority for student life, the environment they create must facilitate learning in the opinion of the faculty and those who provide financial support. By the same token, if the faculty is delegated authority for the control of admissions, curricula, and certification of educational accomplishment, its members must be held accountable by students as well as by administrators, trustees, and professional groups... If the president is granted full authority in matters pertaining to the institution's administration, then he must be held accountable by the trustees and the constituencies he services, particularly the faculty and students.²

¹Illinois Board of Higher Education, Statewide Space Survey, (Springfield, Illinois, August, 1968)
As the reader reacts to the notions of Corson, it is well to contemplate the kind of preparation that administrators require to manage effectively in that type of restructured environment.

Steven Muller, Vice President for Public Affairs at Cornell, drew attention to another task of collegiate administration; i.e. the task of effective communication. He stated:

My single great lesson from past conflicts at my institution is the crucial role that better communication can play in preventing and allaying tensions and disturbances. . . . until now, (most universities) have put greater effort into external communication than has been devoted to on-campus communication.¹

Writing from the crisis-ridden period of 1970, Mr. Muller recommended such devices as: a weekly administrative newsletter, face-to-face discussions between administrators, faculty and staff, visible leadership by the president, and lastly, establishment of a campus ombudsman.² While these devices may help establish an effective system of communication, the more important task "central to any notion of change, adaptability or self-renewal is the introduction of

'new' ideas into an existing system," according to Everett M. Rogers. Rogers dealt with the technology of the communication process in which he included several variables beginning with: the innovation, communication, the social system into which the communication has taken place, the time dimension of phases of this communication. Rogers recommended opening systems to innovation by means of collective decision-making as well as by shifting personnel with existing structures to keep the organization vital and alive. Mr. Rogers then made several specific recommendations for renewing an organization:

1. Develop and select innovations for the large university that have a clear-cut relative advantage and test their effectiveness under operational conditions before adopting them on a widespread scale.

2. Establish an organization within the university to facilitate change and self-renewal in its social structure.

3. Establish an organized procedure within the large university of informing those at the top, accurately and rapidly of the needs for change at the lower levels of the hierarchy, and the actual consequences of attempted innovations.

4. Utilize personnel recruitment, selection, and training, policies that encourage development of a staff oriented to innovative approaches.

5. Utilize informal interpersonal channels of communications to diffuse innovations.¹

These recommendations, especially the fourth one which suggested training efforts would often require administrators to develop new communication skills in order to utilize these new structures and mechanisms. In substance, Dr. Rogers recommended a formula for producing a vital, innovative organization. It seems that his case is an effective one for training of collegiate executives because of the complexity of his own view of effective communication.

On the issue of control, which is another essential task of management, Dr. Robert Marshak, President of the City College of the City of New York, indicated that he has re-organized his college by means of requiring a substantial increase in reports to central administration and projections for the future from the several divisions reporting to him.\(^1\) Dr. Marshak's solution to making his institution operate more efficiently was, apparently, to assure personal knowledge of every major activity in the university.

By way of contrast and seemingly alone among the sources reviewed in this study, Edward Levi, former President of the University of Chicago, stated:

---

\(^1\)Robert Marshak, "Problems and Prospects of an Urban University", a Report by the President, (City College of New York, New York City), p. 128.
As a rule of thumb, one can predict that the university with detailed rules and many procedures will turn out to be a poor university. The spirit of a university and the customs which reflect the care with which faculty discharge their responsibilities are of much greater significance.1

The foregoing pages of this review have attempted to list some of the numerous recommendations for reforming and improving the management of our collegiate institutions. The words efficiency and effectiveness, the tasks of management including, at least, planning, organizing, controlling, evaluating, communicating, motivating, decision making, and delegation, plus such new management techniques as Program Planning Budgeting Systems, Management by Objectives, and Modern Space Management provide fertile ground for a survey to determine which of these are systematically taught to executives of private colleges and universities in the state of Illinois. These recommendations did not provide a detailed guide on each area. The task of providing the details for each area or technique to improve collegiate management was beyond the scope of this present study.

The comments of Bolton and Genck provided an excellent

conclusion to this segment of an effective lead into the
next part of this review.

Limited attention to management in universities
underlies many of the serious difficulties confronting
higher education today. Considerable strengthening of
management is needed if universities are to develop
the capacity to change and to be relevant, purposeful,
and meaningful for the academic community and for
society as a whole.

The management requirements of universities have
expanded dramatically in recent years, mainly because
of the universities' growth in size and the complexity
of issues now confronting higher education.¹

The recommendations made throughout the preceeding
pages served to acknowledge the need to manage colleges
more efficiently and effectively. In addition, the liter-
ature review included several suggestions for improving man-
agement. Consensus among those sources was not desired nor
found among the several sources quoted thus far in the re-
view of the literature. The survey of college presidents
(Cf. Chapters III, IV, and V) depicted some details of
specific programs to improve management.

¹Earl C. Bolton and Frederick H. Genck, "Universities
and Management" The Journal of Higher Education, Vol. XLII,
No. 4, Ohio State University Press, April, 1971.
MAJOR MANAGEMENT THEORIES

Earlier parts of this study have focused on the need to improve the executive management of colleges and universities and a number of forces which require this improvement now. This portion of the review summarizes views of six major management theorists who, since World War II, have recommended better ways to manage organizations.

The purpose of this portion of the literature review is to cite the major themes of important management theorists as a working base for this author's development of a suggested program to improve management of collegiate institutions. The theorists cited herein have each developed a series of assumptions about management which can be translated into elements of a program for improving management. These theorists have been described by THINK magazine as those who have influenced management most, based on a 1969 survey of the FORTUNE 500 companies. 1 In addition, because so many of these theorists cited Peter Drucker as one of their sources, his work was also included in this review. Chester Barnard's work was also included because he dealt with the important, but often forgotten, area of corporate ethics.

---

Drucker noted that managers practice the discipline of management. He listed some specific skills which "pertain to" the professional manager.

One of these is communications within the organizations. Another is the making of decisions under conditions of uncertainty. And there is also a specific entrepreneurial skill: strategic planning.¹

Drucker made another distinction in his definition of management. He noted that it is a practice rather than a science. In this, he stated "it is comparable to medicine, law, and engineering. It is not knowledge but performance."²

... "Its practice is based both on knowledge and on responsibility."³

Continuing Drucker's thesis that management is a practice rather than a science, in both fields a body of scientific method has developed in medicine, since Hippocrates - in management, mostly since World War II.

Another major theorist, Douglas McGregor, delivered a speech in 1957 (which became the basis for his famous book) in which he labeled what he called the conventional conception of management's task in harnessing human energy to organizational requirements. He called the conventional

²Ibid, p. 17.
³Ibid, p. 17.
set of assumptions Theory X. These were, according to

McGregor:

1. Management is responsible for organizing the elements of productive enterprise - money, materials, equipment, people - in the interest of economic ends.

2. With respect to people, this is a process of directing their efforts, motivating them, controlling their actions, modifying their behavior to fit the needs of the organization.

3. Without this active intervention by management, people would be passive - even resistant - to organizational needs. They must, therefore, be persuaded, rewarded, punished, controlled - their activities must be directed. This is management's task in managing subordinate managers or workers. We often sum it up by saying that management consists of getting things done through other people.

   Behind this conventional theory, there are several additional beliefs - less explicit, but widespread.

4. The average man is by nature indolent - he works as little as possible.

5. He lacks ambition, dislikes responsibility, prefers to be led.

6. He is inherently self-centered, indifferent to organizational needs.

7. He is by nature resistant to change.

8. He is gullible, not very bright, the ready dupe of the charlatan and the memagogue. ¹

McGregor noted that any enterprise was organized ac-

According to these premises, that management could either be coercive or weak in responding to the assumptions listed above. McGregor suggested another set of assumptions about human nature and motivation which he called Theory Y. These assumptions have been the basis for a substantial amount of the management development which has taken place since McGregor's 1957 speech. Those assumptions were:

1. Management is responsible for organizing the elements of productive enterprise - money, materials, equipment, people - in the interest of economic ends.

2. People are not by nature passive or resistant to organizational needs. They have become so as a result of experience in organizations.

3. The motivation, the potential for development, the capacity for assuming responsibility, the readiness to direct behavior toward organizational goals are all present in people. Management does not put them there. It is a responsibility of management to make it possible for people to recognize and develop these human characteristics for themselves.

4. The essential task of management is to arrange organizational conditions and methods of operations so that people can achieve their own goals best by directing their own work efforts toward organizational objectives.

McGregor made reference to Peter Drucker's assertion that Theory Y management is management by objectives rather than management by control.

McGregor acknowledged that, "change toward the direction of Theory Y would be slow, and it would require extensive modification of the attitudes of management and workers alike."
One apostle of McGregor's theories has estimated that it takes ten years to turn the people in a Theory X organization into Theory Y because of prior conditioning.

McGregor's assumptions about human nature were based upon a theory of human needs developed by another major management theorist, Abraham Maslow, who developed what he termed a hierarchy of needs in which the lower needs, once satisfied, would lead to a higher set of needs. Maslow's hierarchy of needs proceeded from physiological needs at the lower end to self-actualizing needs at the upper end of the scale.

These needs described by Maslow were, from highest to lowest: Self-Actualization Needs; Esteem Needs; Love Needs; Safety Needs; and Physiological Needs.  

In another of his books, Maslow cited the need for people to do work that is worthwhile doing in order for 

---

1F. Scott Myers, Unpublished Speech to Industrial Management Institute, (Lake Forest College, March, 1968).  


them to do a job well.\(^1\) Maslow agreed with the concepts of McGregor but questioned\(^2\) whether Theory Y management can or will work in all cases.

In support of McGregor, however, he stated:

Treat working people as if they were high-type Theory Y human beings (not only because of the Declaration of Independence, Golden Rule, and Bible) but also because this is the path to success of any kind whatsoever including financial success.\(^3\)

Of greatest interest for this study was Maslow's belief\(^4\) that people are improvable.

Another of these major theorists, Rensis Likert, has identified what he calls organizational and performance characteristics of different management systems based on a comparative analysis.\(^5\) He grouped his characteristics under four major headings which he termed operating characteristics or management styles. The management styles he described were: System 1 - Exploitive Authoritative; System 2 - Benevolent Authoritative; System 3 - Consultative; and System 4 - Participative Group. He called the first three of these systems authoritative and System 4 participative.

---

\(^1\) Ibid, pp. 6 and 13.
\(^2\) Ibid, p. 41.
\(^3\) Ibid, p. 41.
\(^4\) Ibid, p. 25.
In appraising System 4 management (his preferred system), he stated:

A science-based management system, such as System 4, is appreciably more complex than other systems. It requires greater learning and appreciably greater skill to use it well, but it yields impressively better results, which are evident whenever accurate performance measurements are obtained.¹

What Likert recommended was a conscious, planned, systematic effort to move from whatever style a company was using at a given moment in time as measured by his validated test² to a System 4 management system.

The application of this new approach, according to Likert,

requires that managers and supervisors first learn the relevant principles, master their application, and develop the behavioral skills to use them on the job. This may require managers to make important changes in their concepts about how to manage and change some of their attitudes and values.

Likert believed that this process would take three years³ or more to achieve in an organization and that substantial results in many areas would not begin immediately or even in the first eighteen months of an effort to

---

¹Ibid, p. 41.
²Ibid, pp. 197-211.
³Ibid, p. 93.
change management style.¹

One of the key points in Likert's studies was the usually missing ingredient in conventional industrial accounting systems which he termed human asset accounting.²

Likert was also quite optimistic³ that managers could learn to use System 4 management in their organizations, a belief which supported the purposes of the present study.

In The Human Organization, Likert listed ten topics⁴ which he termed the "principles and procedures involved in operating a System 4 enterprise", including those dealing with:

1. Leadership
2. Organizational Structure
3. Decision Making
4. Setting Objectives and Goals
5. Control Processes
6. Compensation
7. The Productive Use of Differences and the Management of Conflict

¹Ibid, p. 92.
²Ibid, p. 115.
³Ibid, pp. 189-190.
8. Facilitating Innovativeness and Creativity
9. Training and Personnel Development
10. Improving Administration in Developing Countries

Since only one of the institutions which participated in this study operates a branch in another country, Number 10 is not important here. However, the other nine topics suggested by Likert provided one reference for topics included in the checklist of topics which was submitted to college presidents to learn which topics were included in present programs to improve collegiate management.

Another major theorist, Frederick Herzberg, discounted several topics such as human relations training, sensitivity training, communication, employee counseling as wasteful efforts of management to improve employee productivity. He noted that motivation was best accomplished by enhancing factors that are intrinsic to the job itself such as "achievement, recognition for achievement, the work itself, responsibility, and growth or advancement."²

He also described what he called hygiene factors³

---

²Ibid, p. 57.
³Ibid, p. 57.
which, in his view, would cause an employee to become dissatisfied but would never, by themselves, cause an employee to be happy. In Herzberg's view, the learning task of management was to develop sufficient knowledge of motivation to let the employee motivate himself. He did, however, acknowledge that hygiene factors needed to be present to some degree in order to keep an employee from being dissatisfied.

For Herzberg, the manager needed to be able to structure the organization and individual jobs within the organization so that the employees could motivate themselves. In this regard, Herzberg agreed with McGregor that if the appropriate elements are present in an organization, the employee will be productive.

Blake and Mouton\(^1\) focused their attention on helping a manager to determine first what his/her style was, and then helping those managers to move from where they were to the ideal of a fully participative manager.

Blake and Mouton defined five major styles of management.\(^2\) The basic question in their major work was "How are


\(^2\)Ibid, p. 10.
organization purposes achieved through people by bosses?"1

They added that:

Whenever a man acts as a manager, he is in some way making assumptions about how to solve problems of achieving organization purposes of production through people.2

In particular, they noted that at the top of an organization,

... concern for production may be demonstrated in the kind of policies which are established and the character of direction given to major programs of organization effort.3

In view of these authors, management development programs flow from the style of top management. For example, a 9,9 top manager4, defined by Blake and Mouton as the ideally participative manager, would design not individual development programs but programs for teams whose training would ultimately help the organization to achieve its objectives. At the other end of their spectrum, Blake and Mouton's 1,1 manager5, defined as the bureaucrat as one has concern neither for the tasks nor for people in the organization, would implement training programs mechanically, if at all.

1 Ibid, p. 8.
3 Ibid, p.9.
The unique contribution of Blake and Mouton to this study was their recognition that managers have a dual orientation, on one hand, an orientation to production (9,1 manager), and also an orientation to the people in the organization (1,9 manager). They recognized the possible dichotomy of managerial concerns and informed management of the consequences of attention to either production or people without a similar level of attention to one but not the other.

Another major theorist, Chris Argyris, in his 1960 work, *Understanding Organizational Behavior*, theorized a set of propositions relating to a "psychological contract"\(^1\) between the employee and an organization. In this contract, the employee submerges his ego-needs in return for: "(a) wages and job security; (b) togetherness; (c) control; (d) non-involvement."\(^2\) While the employee gives up (at least on the surface) some rights, the employee retains the right to set up informal organizations, to remain uninvolved in the concerns of management and the health of the organization, to do whatever level of work that employee can reconcile with his own needs.

---


\(^2\)Ibid, p. 114.
Because of the different needs of the individual and the organization to which he/she belongs, Argyris dealt with the issue of how these different (perhaps far different) needs are reconciled.

He pointed to biological models of organizations as the backdrop for his research into the structures and inter-relationships of living social organizations. He suggested that different organizations would have markedly different social systems and that some advantages accrue to each type of organizational structure. He cautioned management about trying to motivate employees to be as enthusiastic as management in an organization where employees are dependent upon management and where they do not want to become involved in the concerns of management. Further, he cautioned against what he called pseudo-human relations training which simply points out to the employee the gap between an actual condition and the ideal condition.

He did recommend some specific areas for management development. He believed that management should be trained in dealing with people who have a low or high sense of self-worth (depending upon the environment of the organization). In addition, management people should be trained

---

1Ibid, p. 2.

2Ibid, p. 80.
to understand themselves as a basis for understanding the employee. Managers, according to Argyris, should be sharing the "feedback results" of organizational surveys to that their behavior can be directed to enhancing the organization rather than becoming destructive. Lastly, he believed that training should encompass an examination of top level interactions in the organization.

Likert, Argyris, and Blake and Mouton emphasized the need to analyze climate or style of the organization in order to determine what type of management development is likely to be helpful in improving the efficiency and effectiveness of the organization.

Throughout this section of the literature review, theories have been discussed which form a basis for the list of topics suggested for inclusion in collegiate executive development programs. It is noteworthy that, while several of these theorists agreed with at least portions of what another theorist stated, they each had a somewhat different approach to improving the management of an enterprise. It is because of these differing theories and opinions of the major theorists that a workable, "real-world" list of topics for inclusion in executive development programs could only be developed by a survey of the actual users of these topics.
Parts I and II of this review dealt with the recognition by educational and business leaders that the management of collegiate institutions needs to be improved, and with some major theorists whose works have provided a body of knowledge basic for executive development programs.

This part of the study lists some of those efforts which are underway to improve collegiate management. Only in the past few years have these efforts begun to blossom. Beginning in 1973, the Academy for Educational Development, Inc. and the American Council on Education have published *A Guide to Professional Development Opportunities for College and University Administrators.*¹ This guide described a variety of management development opportunities for college administrators sponsored by numerous organizations. The 1975 edition of this volume contained notice of 165 programs sponsored by 88 organizations. These programs ranged from the sophisticated Institute for Educational Management at Harvard University² to particular skill pro-


grams such as the Seminar for Music Administrators sponsored by Westminster Choir College.¹ The programs ranged in length from less than one day to six full weeks in residence. This guide grouped programs into the following specific categories:

Administrative Orientation; Organizational and Personnel Management; Career Planning and Personal Development; Planning, Budgeting, and Decision-Making; Financial Development and Funding Raising; Student Services; Auxiliary Services; Miscellaneous Conferences.²

Program techniques or methodologies and topics cited in this study were drawn from the first category of programs — Administration Orientation. (Cf. Appendix II — Topical List)

Another source which suggested topics for executive development programs was the Management Development Guide, published periodically by the American Management Association.³ Using this guide, program topics were drawn from the course descriptions in two categories: Senior Management Programs⁴ and General Management Programs.⁵ It is

¹Ibid, p. 19.
²Ibid, p. i.
⁴Ibid, p. 64.
⁵Ibid, p. 68.
worth noting that the American Management Association has recently begun a serious effort to develop programs for the not-for-profit organizations: colleges, hospitals, religious orders, etc.

One ongoing model for administrative development programs among Illinois colleges was found at Harper Community College in Palatine, Illinois. The Harper program was discerned from two sources from Harper as another base for developing lists of techniques and topics for programs. One of these sources was a book written by Dr. Robert Lahti, the President of Harper College, entitled *Innovative College Management*\(^1\) in which he suggested a management system (based on Management by Objectives) with which Harper is managed. Secondly, this study referred to *An Administrative Development Program Guide*\(^2\) developed for Harper College. In addition, the researcher interviewed Dr. Lahti at the conclusion of the study to secure Dr. Lahti's comments on the recommendations of the study. (Cf. Appendix VIII) The Harper Administrative Development Program is one of the most widely imitated programs of its type in Illinois.

Table No. 1 shows a number of techniques used to implement successful programs for management development.

---


drawn from the three sources listed previously in this section of the review. The most comprehensive of these sources was the Training and Development Handbook¹ sponsored by the American Society for Training and Development. This handbook was intended to be a thorough source for methods of training. Table No. 1 compares the listings of techniques found in this handbook with actual methods employed in training programs in the Management Development Guide² of the American Management Association and the Academy for Educational Development, Inc. and American Council on Education Guide.³


³Academy for Educational Development, Inc. and American Council on Education Guide.
| Techniques and Methodologies for Programs to Improve Management |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Case Method</td>
<td>Case Method</td>
<td>Case Method</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lectures</td>
<td>Lectures</td>
<td>Lectures</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Role Playing</td>
<td>Role Playing</td>
<td>Role Playing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Incident Process</td>
<td>Small Project Sessions</td>
<td>Incident Process</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small Group</td>
<td></td>
<td>Small Group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discussion</td>
<td></td>
<td>Discussion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expert Instruction</td>
<td></td>
<td>Expert Instruction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task Forces</td>
<td></td>
<td>Task Forces</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Panels</td>
<td></td>
<td>Panels</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Performance</td>
<td></td>
<td>Performance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Critiques</td>
<td></td>
<td>Critiques</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inbasket Exercises</td>
<td></td>
<td>Inbasket Exercises</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Simulation</td>
<td></td>
<td>Simulation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Correspondence Study</td>
<td></td>
<td>Correspondence Study</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Job Instruction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Human Relations Lab</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
As is evident from a review of this table, all three sources utilized the case method, lectures, role playing, and discussion. Two of the three sources employed coaching or performance critiques in their administrative training programs. The Training and Development Handbook provided the longest and most comprehensive list of methods and techniques utilized in training programs.

The sources listed in this section of the literature review served as the source documents for development of a total list of topics for executive development programs. As amplified further in Chapter III, this list of topics was submitted to experts in the field of management training for review and comment. If a collegiate institution chose not to develop its own internal management development programs, these sources would provide as a useful list of available programs in which collegiate executives could participate.

The second part of the chapter discussed several management theorists whose theories have contributed to the shape of management training programs. The third portion of the chapter provided several examples of programs for executive development and, from these programs were drawn management development topics for later selection by a panel of management experts and college presidents.
CHAPTER SUMMARY

The purposes of this chapter were to review the literature relating to the improvement of management, in particular, the management of colleges and universities.

Collectively, these parts of the study furnished both a theoretical and practical base for determining what should be included in an executive development program for collegiate administrators.

Chapter III deals with the actual instruments used in this study and the specific groups of collegiate administrators surveyed and interviewed.

Chapter IV deals with the results of the survey and interviews and interpreted those data. Chapter V contains both the conclusions of the study, including a comparison of "what is" compared with what "ought to be". This concluding chapter also includes recommendations for further study in this area.
CHAPTER III

THE PROCEDURES

SUMMARY OF PREVIOUS CHAPTERS

The first chapter of this study described the need for the study, its purposes, and limits. Those purposes were: to examine programs for improving the executive management in private Illinois colleges and universities by means of a survey and interviews of college presidents; and, based on the results of the survey and interviews, to recommend a program for improving executive management within colleges. Chapter I also outlined procedures that were to be followed in the study. Those procedures are amplified in the present chapter.

Chapter II dealt with the review of the literature, beginning with a call for management reform in colleges and universities and followed by a description of some major management theories which have frequently formed the content base for executive development programs. The third part of Chapter II related some existing efforts, external to the institutions they serve, for preparing collegiate executives to be better managers.

Chapter III describes the step-by-step procedures
used in the examination of existing executive development programs in private colleges and universities in Illinois. The procedures are listed in the following pages.

SURVEY OF THE LITERATURE

The first procedure in the study was the development of a list of program topics for improvement of executive management in colleges and universities from such sources as the Training and Development Handbook, the Guide to Professional Development Opportunities, as well as the Guide to Management Development.

The Training and Development Handbook was also used as the initial base for the development of a list of techniques or methodologies by which training programs could be conducted. The list was compared and contrasted with techniques suggested by the other two sources. (See Table 01, Chapter II) Using the same three sources,


cross-checked against topics suggested by major theorists, a preliminary list of suggested program topics was developed for later submission to college presidents.

LIMITING THE TOPICAL LIST

The preliminary list of topics was first submitted to a panel of selected management experts for their evaluation of the importance of each topic in an executive management improvement program for private colleges and universities. This procedure was followed in order to test the usefulness, comprehensiveness, and worth of the initial list of topics before these topics were submitted for the consideration of college presidents. Submission of the topics suggested in the literature to a panel of experts in management development also provided a reference point from the "real world" for the value of these topics for executive development. Upon the recommendation of the panel, an improved and more limited list was developed for later submission to presidents of private colleges in Illinois.

The panel of management experts included:

Mr. James D. Carter, President of Personnel Development Institute of Palatine, Illinois. Mr. Carter has had at least 15 years of management development experiences, including at least five years of Associate Director of the American Management Association Training Center in Chicago, Illinois.
Dr. Leroy G. Cougle, President of Associated Training Systems in Libertyville, Illinois. Dr. Cougle has had more than 25 years of training experiences. He was a pioneering member of the National Society for Programmed Instruction (NSPI). He has designed and presented numerous training programs for industry, education, and other not-for-profit organizations. He is a faculty member in the School of Applied Management Sciences at the University of Wisconsin (Kenosha). Dr. Cougle's own dissertation validated the use of programmed learning as a useful tool for management training.

Dr. Warren G. McGoverny, Vice President for the Advanced Management Institute at Lake Forest College. Dr. McGoverny's experience includes numerous experiences assisting managers to become more effective utilizing the participative style of management.

Dr. Dominic Parici, Chairman of the Department of Management, School of Business Administration, DePaul University, Chicago, Illinois.

Dr. Robert Malone, Chairman, Department of Management, School of Business Administration, Loyola University of Chicago, Chicago, Illinois.

Dr. Edward Wrapp, former Director of the University of Chicago, Executive Program; and presently Professor of Business Policy at the University of Chicago.
The management experts were given a preliminary list of program topics (Cf. Appendix II) and asked to rank the importance of each topic for inclusion in a program for executive development of collegiate administrators. Topics were accepted for inclusion in the later survey of college presidents when those topics were termed as essential or quite important by two thirds of the panel of experts. The panel of management experts was asked to evaluate the topics suggested from the literature and indicate whether each topic was, from his perspective, essential, quite important, somewhat important, or of marginal importance for executive development programs for collegiate executives.

This panel was selected to review the preliminary list of topics because each member had worked in both a collegiate environment and with business.

The results of the management experts' comments were several:

The panel of management experts viewed some topics as either redundant or of secondary importance to the improvement of executive management in private colleges and universities. They recommended, therefore, that these topics be eliminated from further consideration.
Secondly, the panel of experts supported the notion that an executive development program ought to include a wide variety of topics.

Among the further specific observations of the panel of management experts, there was a wide diversity of opinion on important topics for executive managers. They did, however, agree that the Systems Approach to Management was not important for executive development. Other topics viewed by the panel as relatively unimportant from the initial survey were: managerial maturity; academic leadership goals; decision-making, decision-management; job enrichment; characteristics of work and the environment; personal skills for managers. Improving human relations was the least important of all topics listed according to the panel.

The panel was also asked to recommend suitable techniques for executive development programs. None recommended sensitivity training as a suitable method for teaching management topics. Only one panel member recommended programmed learning as a useful tool, and he on a limited scale. Other techniques listed were: role playing; simulation; conference; and small groups. While these techniques were listed, there was little consistency from the responses on the best techniques for conducting executive development programs.
DEVELOPMENT OF THE FINAL SURVEY INSTRUMENT

The final survey instrument was much broader in scope than the initial content survey sent to management experts since, in addition to topics for executive development programs, it also dealt with: (Cf. Appendix III - Survey and Cover Letter to College Presidents)

A. Types of programs for executive development;

B. Responsible office for executive development;

C. Number of executive managers in each institution;

D. Total dollars spent annually for executive development;

E. Dollar amount that chief executives would be willing to spend on development of their executive managers;

F. Number of people which each chief executive would be willing to commit to responsibility for executive development within each institution;

G. Indicators of what would help make existing executive development efforts more successful;

H. A question asking whether or not institution has done an organizational analysis to determine management needs;
I. A question asking whether institution has done an assessment of executive skills;

J. Information on whether program has a separate budget and reserved space;

K. Information as to whether or not an institution has a written statement of philosophy and/or objectives for the executive development program;

L. Commitment of chief executive to a specified level of time to be made available for each executive's development;

M. List of topics which are now included in executive development efforts of each college or university participating in the study.

FIELD TESTING OF THE INSTRUMENT

The pilot phase of the survey was concerned with evaluating the instrument. Those questions explored were: (A) Does the wording of the items convey the same meaning to all the readers? and (B) Does the instrument solicit the replies that it is stipulated to request? The first question referred to readability of the instrument. A primary concern was to establish construct validity because the instrument pertained to assessment of perceptions. Like measures of intelligence and attitudes,
primary importance must be placed upon making sure that definitions of the constructs used were commonly understood. To establish construct validity, Campbell and Fiske proposed that two kinds of evidence about a measure were needed: (A) evidence that different measures of the construct yield similar results; and (B) evidence that the construct as thus measured can be differentiated from other constructs.¹

In this study, construct validity was established by the following procedures. A major portion of the survey instrument was reviewed by a jury of five management experts mentioned earlier in this chapter. The experts were asked to rate the importance of each topic for the improvement of executive development in private colleges and universities in Illinois. Based on the frequency of their positive responses, the final draft of the survey was prepared. Topics which were not selected as essential or quite important by two thirds of the panel were not included in the later survey of college presidents.

The second phase in the process of evaluating the instrument was conducted as follows: The proposed survey

instrument for college presidents was mailed to four presidents of private colleges and universities. These presidents were selected since each was president of a different type of institution. One was president of a large, urban Catholic university. Another was president of a somewhat smaller, secular or non-church related university. The third was president of a four-year, suburban women's college; and the fourth had been president of a small Protestant church-related university.

Instructions to those presidents were as follows:

The purpose of this letter is to ask you to participate in field testing of my dissertation questionnaire. Field testing means simply to obtain informed comment on the questionnaire before it is sent out to a total population which, in this case, will consist of presidents of all private colleges and universities in Illinois. Therefore, your comments will be used to assure that this questionnaire is valid in both its content and construction as these relate to the stated purposes of the study.

Please write your comments directly on this questionnaire. You are not asked to respond to these questions, simply to comment on them and suggest further modifications of them as seem appropriate to you.

These modified questionnaires will then be mailed to presidents who are members of the Federation of Independent Illinois Colleges and Universities.1

---

1Thomas E. Murray, letter to presidents who validated survey instrument, June 3, 1976.
From replies to the initial survey instrument, it was learned that a proposed question on management style of chief executive officers should be eliminated because it was too general to be of value as it was and, if it were expanded, would have taken an undue proportion of the survey instrument. Therefore, that question was eliminated from the present study.

The presidents who validated the survey instrument also recommended some rewording of questions to eliminate ambiguities and, in three instances, revision of the answer categories to differentiate better between choices to be made by the respondents. In addition, a question on whether a college was private, not-for-profit, or proprietary was eliminated from the survey as a result of the field testing since all institutions participating in the study were not-for-profit institutions. Another question which asked whether a college was rural or urban was recommended for elimination since the question did not provide a definition of rural or urban and also had no useful relationship to the purposes of the study. Further, as a result of the comments made in the field-testing phase, terminology was made more consistent throughout the questionnaire. For example, executive development was referred to by several synonyms in the original draft such as management development and executive management programs.
Another question which related to the reasons each college had executive development programs was eliminated as a result of the field testing because it did not indicate anything about the executive development programs but attempted to elicit a response on causes for the implementation of such programs. It was recommended that the interviews were a better form for that type of question than the survey instrument.

The field testing of the survey instrument further supported the desirability of using the written survey instrument simply as a base for determining where to look further for in-depth information about existing executive development programs.

Sincere appreciation was extended to Rev. Raymond C. Baumhart, S.J., Sister Judith Cagney, Dr. Roger Fritz, and Dr. Rolf Weil for their assistance in field testing this survey.

In July and August of 1976, the revised survey instrument was mailed out to presidents of all fifty-one private colleges and universities in Illinois. (See Appendices I and III) Thirty-one educational executives (or 61%) responded to the survey. (See Appendix IV) The detailed results of those replies are reported in Chapter IV.
DETERMINING THE INTERVIEW SCHEDULE

From the literature and the initial survey, a number of questions emerged which were explored through in-depth interviews with chief executive officers of selected colleges and universities.

The seven institutions selected for interviews (Cf. Appendix V) were those who, through the initial survey instrument, suggested the presence of some portions of an active program for executive development, and who agreed to be interviewed.

The interviews were designed to accomplish two specific objectives. First, they were intended to develop, in some detail, information which had been obtained from the initial survey. Secondly, they were intended to uncover reasons why actual programs for developing executives within colleges and universities differed from an ideal program. These interviews were conducted between November 1, 1976 and March 15, 1977. The following questions were asked in each interview:

A. What efforts have been undertaken to discover management needs of the organization? How has the organization determined its management needs (use of consultants, auditors' reports, organization development efforts, etc.)?
B. Once having determined its management needs, has the organization assessed present strengths and weaknesses of its management? What gaps have been identified?

C. Has a training-needs analysis been conducted? What was done with the results? How was the needs analysis done? (Questionnaire, interviews, etc.)

D. What teaching methods were employed in the executive development programs? Which ones were viewed by respondents as most useful or productive?

E. Did the executive development program have a written statement of philosophy and objectives? (Samples of statements of objectives.)

F. How comprehensive were the topics covered by the program? Was the list of topics included in the program broad enough to cover all major areas of management responsibility? If not, why were some major areas left out of the program?

G. Was there a plan to evaluate executive development efforts? (Actual written evaluation instruments were appended to the study as part of Appendix IX)
H. Would a cooperative program with other collegiate institutions be desirable? If so, what obstacles have limited this cooperation?

I. What was the level of commitment of the chief executive officer to executive development?
High - These efforts were central to the management of the institution.
Moderate - Executive development is nice to do but not central to the institutional management effort.
Low - Programs viewed as relatively unimportant to the success of the institution.

Two additional interviews were conducted as part of the study to further support the data obtained and the recommendations which were made in Chapter V. Those additional interviews were with: Dr. Robert Lahti, President of William Rainey Harper College, author of Innovative College Management, and consultant to colleges across the country on executive development programs. Dr. Lathi was simply asked to react to the recommendations resulting from this study. His comments are noted in Chapter V. A fuller statement of his beliefs on this topic is included as Appendix VIII.

The other person interviewed was Admiral Alban Weber, Executive Director of the Federation of Independent Illinois
Colleges. Admiral Weber was interviewed to determine if his organization would support a state-wide executive development program. His comments are noted also in Chapter V.

Chapter IV of this study describes the results of both the survey and the interviews conducted in the course of this study.

Chapter V suggests conclusions which might be drawn from the study and proposed recommendations for further study and action.
CHAPTER IV

THE SURVEY RESULTS

REVIEW OF PREVIOUS CHAPTERS

In the preceding chapters, the study acknowledged first the historical evolution of more complex skills required by collegiate managers. Secondly, the purpose of the study was explained, which was to examine existing programs for executive development in private Illinois colleges and universities and to recommend a structure for executive development programs based on replies to surveys and interviews.

In the second chapter, pertinent literature was reviewed which established the need for programs to improve executive management in colleges and universities. The literature also suggested some management theories which have provided an underpinning for these programs, and recommended topics for inclusion in such programs.

Chapter III described the instruments which were used to elicit data for the study. First, a group of management experts was asked to comment on topics suggested by the literature for inclusion in programs for executive development within private colleges and universities in Illinois. Based on the responses to the initial survey,
a more detailed instrument was developed and mailed to presidents of fifty-one Illinois colleges and universities. The results of that survey are presented in this chapter. Following the written survey of collegiate presidents, interviews were conducted with presidents, or their delegates, of seven colleges and universities which had ongoing programs for executive development. An interpretation of the responses from those interviews is begun within this chapter and continues in Chapter V.

RESULTS OF THE WRITTEN SURVEY

As indicated previously, presidents of fifty-one Illinois colleges and universities were asked to participate in the written survey. Of those, thirty-one, or sixty-one percent, replied. Of those, four replies were received from two-year colleges, eighteen were from four-year institutions, and nine responses were received from institutions which offered education beyond four years. In size, these institutions varied greatly from a full-time equivalent enrollment of 170 to a complex university with a full-time equivalent enrollment of 10,433. In summary, replies were received from a diverse group of institutions which varied in both size and type of college. (See Table 02)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>College Code</th>
<th>College Type</th>
<th>Number of FT Equivalent Students</th>
<th>Total Number of Executives</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>4-Year</td>
<td>1140</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>2-Year</td>
<td>183</td>
<td>05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>2-Year</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>4-Year</td>
<td>2200</td>
<td>06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>4-Year</td>
<td>375</td>
<td>05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>4-Year</td>
<td>676</td>
<td>07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td>4-Year</td>
<td>850</td>
<td>06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H</td>
<td>4-Year</td>
<td>1150</td>
<td>07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>Univ.</td>
<td>1600</td>
<td>07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J</td>
<td>4-Year</td>
<td>750</td>
<td>08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K</td>
<td>4-Year</td>
<td>1251</td>
<td>08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L</td>
<td>Univ.</td>
<td>850</td>
<td>Not Stated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>Univ.</td>
<td>1030</td>
<td>04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>Univ.</td>
<td>4500</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O</td>
<td>4-Year</td>
<td>568</td>
<td>09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P</td>
<td>4-Year</td>
<td>800</td>
<td>08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q</td>
<td>2-Year</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R</td>
<td>4-Year</td>
<td>Not Stated</td>
<td>07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S</td>
<td>Univ.</td>
<td>4300</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T</td>
<td>4-Year</td>
<td>1043</td>
<td>05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U</td>
<td>Univ.</td>
<td>5000</td>
<td>Not Stated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V</td>
<td>4-Year</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W</td>
<td>Univ.</td>
<td>1150</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X</td>
<td>4-Year</td>
<td>740</td>
<td>04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y</td>
<td>4-Year</td>
<td>1700</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Z</td>
<td>2-Year</td>
<td>450</td>
<td>05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AA</td>
<td>4-Year</td>
<td>1150</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BB</td>
<td>4-Year</td>
<td>1050</td>
<td>08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CC</td>
<td>Univ.</td>
<td>Not Stated</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DD</td>
<td>Univ.</td>
<td>10423</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EE</td>
<td>4-Year</td>
<td>Not Stated</td>
<td>Not Stated</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Of the institutions from which replies were received, twenty one replies noted a budget for executive development programs. For those colleges which reported expenditures, both the expenditures and, apparently, the activity levels of those programs varied greatly as indicated throughout Chapter IV.

Of those institutions with no programs, some interesting and surprising comments were received. One president of a complex university stated that he found the questionnaire "disquieting" since his institution had no structured program addressing this problem. He added that executives of that institution were "encouraged" to "join and take part in appropriate professional organizations." Further, he expressed the hope that "such organizations will assist in the officer's development". The casual assumption that someone else will develop his executives as effective managers was believed to be capricious and irresponsible.

Another president expressed something of an apology when he stated that, "We need to conduct a program" while acknowledging that his institution did not have such a program in existence.

One president expressed a frustration that was evident throughout the literature when he stated, "We do
not have resources (time or money) to deal with this subject. I doubt if any small colleges do." He concluded his comments with, "I wish we did."

Another respondent without a formal executive development program, after indicating that his college did not have a formalized development program for administrators, stated that, "In-house concern and care for these areas (areas contained in the written survey) are uppermost in our minds. Institutes, seminars, etc. are the frequent avenue of development annually for administrators."

One other president who replied that his institution did not have an executive development program noted that "if they did" he would include "an intensive and continuing study of educational philosophy as the highest priority." That reply was puzzling since, if the area of educational philosophy was of such importance, it is inconceivable that a president could leave the matter unattended.

One president replied that, while the institution was without a formalized program for executive development, he used the President's staff meetings for development of his key executives as well as for a job self-assessment program for administrators.

Perhaps the most searching comment, or plea, received from those institutions without programs for ex-
ecutive development came from the president who stated, "Each day I must ask the question, what is appropriate for ______ College? Example: Electronic Data Processing, Title IX, Handicapped; all of these are worthwhile, but what is critical to ______ College? In short, too many demands for limited resources and time, but more important, what is appropriate?" The data from this study suggested some useful responses to the questions raised by that president.

In summary, those replies received from institutions which had no programs for executive development expressed a concern for the subject of this study and seemed to demonstrate interest but seemed to lack direction as how to go about improving executive management within those institutions. The interviews commented on later in this chapter suggested some ways which colleges have employed to begin executive development programs.

SUMMARY OF RESPONSES FROM INSTITUTIONS WITH PROGRAMS

In response to the question, What type of program(s) do you have for improving executive management within your institution?, sixteen presidents replied that they used institutes which were defined in the survey as one or two day, in-depth sessions on specified topics as part of their executive development programs. It was noted by two res-
ondents that they participated in institutes sponsored by external agencies. (See Table 03)

Eleven respondents, to the same question, listed short specialized courses and use of consulting firms as techniques which they used to develop executives within their institutions. Six presidents replied that they changed the assignments of key personnel as a means for improving the executive management within their institutions. Only one president replied that correspondence or home study efforts were used to improve management of executives within an individual college. No one selected programmed learning as a technique used for improving management. It is noteworthy that not one college president cited programmed learning as a technique used for this purpose since the American Management Association has spent a great deal of money marketing programmed learning devices for both supervisory and management development.

It was safe to assume that one or two day, in-depth sessions on specified topics was the most popular format for executive development among college presidents surveyed. This technique allowed for tailoring programs to fit the topic and the particular needs of executives as those needs related to the topic and did not commit institutional resources beyond the scope of the immediate program. Unfortunately, this disjointed approach to executive dev-
### TABLE 03

**METHODS EMPLOYED IN EXECUTIVE DEVELOPMENT PROGRAMS**

Priority Ranking: 1 = First Priority

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>College Code</th>
<th>Short Courses</th>
<th>Institutes</th>
<th>Correspondence Study</th>
<th>Consulting Firms</th>
<th>Programmed Learning</th>
<th>Change in Key Personnel</th>
<th>Other</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S</td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Z</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DD</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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elopment seemed to limit the scope of the program goals.

Also suggested in essay comments were: participation in workshops sponsored by the Advanced Management Institute of Lake Forest College, seminars sponsored by professional organizations, and participation in external management workshops.

The next question asked in the survey was, **Do you have an in-house department or officer responsible for executive development?** Out of the sixteen presidents who replied that they had executive development programs, only four listed officers of their institutions with specific responsibility for those programs. Those titles were: Director of the Office of Internal Education, President, Vice President for Administration and Development, and Executive Vice President. The other programs were conducted by the president's office directly or by someone with an ad hoc assignment or by external consultants. As discussed in Chapter V, persuasive argument has been made for keeping these programs under the direction of the chief executive officer if they are to be viewed as important or essential by the participants.

Presidents of institutions participating in the study were asked to, **List the total number of executive managers within your institution.** They were asked to in-
clude the President, Vice Presidents, Deans, Program Directors, Administrative Directors, and other key managers whom the president would include in his/her definition of executive managers. In smaller institutions, there were as many as 2.5 executives per 100 students identified by the respondents. In larger institutions, there were as few as one executive per 362 students. The number of executives per college among these respondents ranged from four to forty executives. (See Table 04)

The next question explained the reason the previous question was asked, and that was, How many people would your institution be willing to commit to be responsible for all facets of executive development programs in your institution? Here, even some presidents who did not have programs replied. Uniformly, they agreed that they would be willing to commit "one full-time professional or less" to this type of responsibility. No president replied that he/she would be willing to commit more than one full-time professional for this purpose. It was obvious from the replies that in institutions with as few as four executives, it simply would not be sound economically to devote the energies of one full-time person exclusively for this purpose.

The next question shed even more light on the willingness of collegiate presidents to devote resources to
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>College Code</th>
<th>Number of Executives</th>
<th>Annual Expenditure</th>
<th>Per Capita Expenditure for Executive Development</th>
<th>Willing to Spend per Executive Annually</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>$5,000</td>
<td>$417</td>
<td>$500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>06</td>
<td>$200</td>
<td>$33</td>
<td>Up to $50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>05</td>
<td>$1,200</td>
<td>$240</td>
<td>$201-300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>07</td>
<td>$500</td>
<td>$71</td>
<td>$201-300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H</td>
<td>07</td>
<td>$400</td>
<td>$57</td>
<td>$301-400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>07</td>
<td>$2,500</td>
<td>$357</td>
<td>$201-300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K</td>
<td>08</td>
<td>$5,000</td>
<td>$625</td>
<td>$101-200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>04</td>
<td>$1,500</td>
<td>$375</td>
<td>$301-400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O</td>
<td>09</td>
<td>$10,000</td>
<td>$1,111</td>
<td>$51-100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P</td>
<td>08</td>
<td>$1,000</td>
<td>$125</td>
<td>$101-200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R</td>
<td>07</td>
<td>$1,000</td>
<td>$143</td>
<td>$201-300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>$1,000</td>
<td>$25</td>
<td>Up to $50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T</td>
<td>05</td>
<td>$2,000</td>
<td>$400</td>
<td>$2,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U</td>
<td>06</td>
<td>$5,000</td>
<td>$823</td>
<td>$2,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V</td>
<td>05</td>
<td>$5,000</td>
<td>$1,000</td>
<td>$400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>$27,150</td>
<td>$2,468</td>
<td>$1,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X</td>
<td>04</td>
<td>$2,000</td>
<td>$500</td>
<td>$2,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>$5,000</td>
<td>$143</td>
<td>$101-200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Z</td>
<td>05</td>
<td>$1,000</td>
<td>$200</td>
<td>$101-200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CC</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>$30,000</td>
<td>$2,000</td>
<td>$201-300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DD</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>$13,000</td>
<td>$325</td>
<td>$301-400</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
executive development. The question was, **Estimate the total dollars (including salaries and allocations) expended in most recent academic year for executive development. (Not including faculty development.)** Of those institutions budgeting for this purpose, the average expenditure per executive was $563, with a range from $25 to $2,468. The range of total expenditures varied from a total of $200 to $30,000 annually for those institutions reporting expenditures for this purpose. (See Table 04)

It was surprising to learn the extensive, if frequently uncoordinated expenditure by several institutions for executive development. One president of a small institution who reported the existence of a program for this purpose noted that all services of consultants and other personnel were contributed to the institution. In that case, ingenuity and nerve were good substitutes for money. In most instances, however, it appeared that some expenditure of funds was required for executive development programs. The wide variance of expenditures did not contribute to any conclusion on appropriateness of specific amounts for this purpose.

The next question asked in the survey was, **How much would your institution be willing to spend annually per executive for executive management development?** Here, the answers varied greatly. Two presidents replied that they
would be willing to spend up to $50 per year. One president replied that he would be willing to spend $51 to $100 per year. Five presidents replied that they would be willing to spend $101 to $200 per year. Six presidents replied that they would be willing to spend from $301 to $400 per year for each executive. Of those willing to spend more than $400 per year, the average was $1,500 per executive per year. The highest amount per executive was $2,500. What was found surprising was that the majority of presidents who replied to the survey were willing to spend more than they were spending presently. This fact seemed to suggest that, if a worthwhile program were made available to their executives, these presidents would be willing to spend frequently scarce institutional funds for this purpose. Additionally, some colleges were actually spending considerably more than was indicated they would be willing to spend. One could only speculate that in those instances, expenditures for executive development had grown beyond the knowledge of the president or the presidents who were spending more than was considered desirable, were not receiving a sufficient return on their investment for this purpose. (See Table 04)

It was surprising that the most frequently selected response was not money but time. Of those responding, 66.6% replied that increased amount of time devoted to
executive development programs would help to make those programs more effective. 63.6% replied that a closer relationship between institutional goals and the purposes of the program would make these programs more effective. In third place, 53.3% replied that additional financial support would make their executive development programs more effective. Other replies: 20% replied that their executive development programs could be made more effective with better statement of program objectives; 13.3% noted that additional direction or contribution from top administrators would help their programs for executive management become more effective. One president of a small college noted that continuity of people was a major concern in small colleges. (See Table 05 for a tabular presentation which ranks factors which presidents indicated would improve their executive development programs.)

Of 24 institutions replying to this question, Has an organizational analysis (management structure, needed skills, etc.) been a part of your executive development program?, only eight presidents replied that an analysis had been conducted at their institution. Only 4 replied that a formal inventory of executive skills had been a part of their executive development program.

Only three presidents indicated that their institutions had a separate budget allocation for executive development.
### TABLE 05

**RANKING OF FACTORS WHICH PRESIDENTS BELIEVE WOULD IMPROVE EXECUTIVE DEVELOPMENT PROGRAMS**

Priority Ranking: 1 = First Priority

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>College Code</th>
<th>Increased Time</th>
<th>Additional Financial Support</th>
<th>Better Statement-Program Objectives</th>
<th>More Direction from Top Administration</th>
<th>Closer Relationship Institutional &amp; Program Goals</th>
<th>Other</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Z</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BB</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CC</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DD</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Twenty one responses indicated no separate budget allocation for this purpose. Only two of the 24 responding to this next question indicated that there was any space dedicated to the purposes of an executive development program.

Perhaps most disheartening was the response to another question that only three participating institutions had a written statement of philosophy and/or objectives for their executive development program. In fact, when this question was pursued further in the interviews with college presidents, it is doubtful that any institution had a sufficiently comprehensive statement of philosophy and/or objectives for these programs to serve as a useful guide to the reader. However, two such statements are included in Appendix VI.

On the topic of time which presidents would be willing to allow their key executives to devote to professional development (See Table 06), three presidents replied that they would be willing to have their executives devote three days or less per year to this purpose. Fourteen presidents replied that they would be willing to have their executives devote one week per year for this purpose. Another five presidents replied that they would authorize one day per month for this purpose. Three presidents replied that two days per month or more could be made available to executives for professional development as managers. One president noted
### TABLE 06

**TIME AVAILABLE FOR DEVELOPMENT OF KEY EXECUTIVES ACCORDING TO PRESIDENTS RESPONDING**

Time available is indicated with an "X"

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>College Code</th>
<th>Three Days or Less Per Year</th>
<th>One Week Per Year</th>
<th>One Day Per Month</th>
<th>Two Days Per Month or More</th>
<th>Other</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Vary with individual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Z</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BB</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>More time for new executives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DD</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
that for anyone moving up in the organization, he would authorize more time. He did not specify how much time. The data seemed to suggest that at least one week per year could be made available for executive development efforts in most colleges.

TOPICS FOR EXECUTIVE DEVELOPMENT PROGRAMS

As described in Chapters II and III of this study, the topics recommended to presidents for inclusion in executive development programs originated with the literature and were reduced to a more manageable number of topics through submission to management experts for their review and elimination prior to the survey of college and university presidents. Those topics which were recommended by the panel of management experts for inclusion in executive development programs were then submitted to college presidents. Presidents were asked to indicate which of these topics were included in their executive development programs. These topics were grouped into fifteen broad categories, which included:

- Category I The Role of Management
- Category II Tools of Management
- Category III Decision-Making
- Category IV Communication
- Category V Delegation
- Category VI Motivation
College presidents noted the inclusion of the following topics in their programs for executive development. The percentages in the column to the right of the page reflected the percentage of colleges having executive development programs whose programs included those topics in Table 07.

A complete tabular presentation of these data is included as Appendix X.

From Category I of the topics, it was learned that concrete topics, such as: Management Practice and Leadership Skills, were included in a majority of those programs which reported topics. Three other topics: Behavioral Science Concepts, Management Style, and Managerial Maturity, were included in fewer than 50% of the programs which reported topics. It seemed to this author that basic management skill topics were considered important more often than topics which related more to the style of management than to its basic substance.
TABLE 07

PERCENTAGE OF COLLEGES LISTING PROGRAM TOPICS THAT INCLUDE EACH OF THE FOLLOWING TOPICS IN THEIR EXECUTIVE DEVELOPMENT PROGRAMS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category I</th>
<th>The Role of Management</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A. Behavioral Science Concepts</td>
<td>15.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Management Practice (Techniques and Skills)</td>
<td>76.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Management Style</td>
<td>23.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D. Leadership Skills</td>
<td>61.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E. Managerial Maturity</td>
<td>15.4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category II</th>
<th>Tools of Management</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A. Management by Objectives</td>
<td>76.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Academic Leadership Goals</td>
<td>38.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Contingency Planning</td>
<td>23.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D. Qualification and Selection of Executives</td>
<td>7.6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category III</th>
<th>Decision-Making</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A. Decision-Making</td>
<td>69.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Problem-Solving</td>
<td>46.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Decision-Management</td>
<td>38.5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category IV</th>
<th>Communications</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A. Interviewing</td>
<td>30.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Listening Skills</td>
<td>38.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Questioning</td>
<td>15.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D. Communications - Written and Oral</td>
<td>46.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E. Pursuasion</td>
<td>7.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F. Interpersonal Communication</td>
<td>53.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G. Public Relations</td>
<td>46.2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category V</th>
<th>Delegation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A. Delegation</td>
<td>61.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Accountability</td>
<td>76.9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category VI</th>
<th>Motivation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A. Motivation</td>
<td>53.8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### TABLE 07 -- Continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category VII</th>
<th>Coaching &amp; Performance Appraisal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A. Employee Development</td>
<td>23.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Standards for Performance</td>
<td>46.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Appraisal for Performance</td>
<td>61.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D. Counseling and Coaching</td>
<td>7.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E. Self-Appraisal</td>
<td>46.2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category VIII</th>
<th>Organization</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A. Institutional Needs Analysis</td>
<td>69.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Organization Design</td>
<td>38.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Organizational Development</td>
<td>46.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D. Team Planning</td>
<td>53.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E. Group Dynamics</td>
<td>15.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F. Faculty Staffing</td>
<td>7.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G. Policy Formulation</td>
<td>30.8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category IX</th>
<th>Professional Development</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A. Self-Development</td>
<td>61.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Managing Time</td>
<td>46.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Conducting Meetings</td>
<td>30.8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category X</th>
<th>Personnel Skills</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A. Negotiation/Collective Bargaining</td>
<td>15.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Human Resources Utilization</td>
<td>30.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Interpersonal Relations</td>
<td>46.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D. Productivity</td>
<td>23.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category XI</th>
<th>Financial</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A. Budgeting</td>
<td>77.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Financial Control</td>
<td>46.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Fund Accounting</td>
<td>30.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D. Cost and Revenue Analysis</td>
<td>23.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E. Dealing with Economic and Financial Problems</td>
<td>30.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F. Setting Financial Objectives</td>
<td>77.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G. Fund Raising</td>
<td>38.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H. Cash Management</td>
<td>23.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I. Investments</td>
<td>23.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Category XII</td>
<td>Law</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A. Government Relations</td>
<td>62.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Labor Relations</td>
<td>23.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Affirmative Action</td>
<td>46.2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category XIII</th>
<th>Ethics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A. Personal Code of Ethics</td>
<td>30.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Professional Ethics</td>
<td>23.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Corporate Ethics</td>
<td>23.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D. Social Responsibility</td>
<td>46.2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category XIV</th>
<th>Long-Range Planning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A. Strategy Formulation</td>
<td>30.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Management Control Systems</td>
<td>38.5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category XV</th>
<th>Other</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A. Educational Philosophy</td>
<td>Not Ranked</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Job Self-Assessment</td>
<td>Not Ranked</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Church Management</td>
<td>Not Ranked</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
A similar finding was reported for the second category of topics. Management by Objectives was included in the programs of over 75% of the colleges reporting topics. Other topics from this category, entitled Tools of Management, included: Academic Leadership Goals, Contingency Planning, and Qualification and Selection of Executives, and were included in 38.4%, 23%, and 7.6% of programs respectively. Those results again supported the belief that basic skills are what collegiate managers sought from executive development programs.

From Category III, titled Decision-Making, only the general topic, also titled Decision-Making, was included in more than half (69.2%) of the programs. Other topics in the same category, Problem-Solving (46.2%) and Decision-Management (38.5%), were less popular in existing programs for executive development. It seemed, again, that the general or basic topic was considered the most useful of topics within that category.

From Category IV, titled Communications, only one topic of seven was included in more than 50% of those programs which reported topics. That result was considered somewhat surprising since communications is usually recommended as a basic ingredient in all programs for management development. Interestingly enough, interpersonal communication was listed most frequently of those topics.
It was included in 53.8% of the programs. In descending order of use, Communications - Written and Oral and Public Relations were listed in 46.2% of the programs. Next was Listening Skills with only 38.5%, followed by Interviewing with 30.8%, Questioning with 15.4%, and Persuasion with only 7.6%. No causes were suggested by the responses for the results of the data in this category. It was, however, interesting that Interpersonal Communications was viewed as the top priority in communications area among those institutions which reported topics.

Delegation, Category V, had only two topics within its group. The topics were titled Delegation and Accountability, which were included in 61.5% and 76.9% of the programs from which topics were reported. The results seemed to suggest that both of these topics were viewed as quite important for executives of colleges. The area of accountability has become a frequent topic of articles on management in higher education. Perhaps the popularity of that topic suggested the need for continuing emphasis of this area for management development.

From Category VI, titled Motivation, the topics of Motivation (53.8%) and Team Building (61.5%) were included in more than half of the programs. Interestingly enough, two closely related topics, Positive Reinforcement (23%) and Team Skills (23%) did not appear in many executive development programs. Once again, it appeared that the focus
of programs for executive development was on the basic management skill or tool.

Category VII was titled Coaching and Performance Appraisal. From this group of five topics, only one, Appraisal for Performance, was included in more than half of the reporting executive development programs (61.5%). Perhaps that reply suggested the trend toward appraisal of performance in universities. Other closely related topics did not appear to share in that trend. To some extent, however, Standards for Performance and Self-Appraisal were topics included in only 46.2% of the reporting programs. Employee Development was included in only 23% of the programs. That response might have suggested that employee development did not even enjoy the popularity of executive development. It was found somewhat ironic that colleges, which have education as their basic purpose, frequently did not utilize education for improving the effectiveness of staff. Least used of the topics within this category was Counseling and Coaching (7.6%). Again, that topic was less concrete than the Appraisal of Performance which was utilized by the largest percentage of institutions reporting program topics.

In the category entitled Organization, the most popular topic was Institutional Needs Analysis (69.2%). The extent to which that topic was included in programs
for executive development supported the inclusion of this type of analysis as a step in each executive development program. Another topic which is related to the prior topic was Team Planning, which was included in 53.8% of the programs. Within this category, Organizational Development was included in 46.2% of the programs. Other topics in this same category, which were part of one third or fewer of the programs which reported topics, included Policy Formulation with 30.8%, Group Dynamics with 15.4%, and Faculty Staffing with 7.6%. It appeared from these data that the more general topics were more widely used than the more limited or specific topics. No interpretation of those data was suggested except that it was interesting that Faculty Staffing was the least popular topic in this category, which is ironic since faculty staffing patterns are usually the single largest expense in a college.

For the next category, titled Professional Development, Self-Development was the most popular among colleges and was included in 61.5% of the programs. It was pleasing to note the popularity of the topic based in the belief that all development proceeds from the individual's desire to be developed. Surprisingly, slightly less than half (46.2%) of the programs included Managing Time as a topic. This result was surprising in view of the statement by college presidents that time was so limited. Even more surprising was the fact that Conducting Meetings was included
in only 30.8% of the programs, when meetings seem to occupy so much of executives' time.

Category X was titled Personnel Skills. None of the four topics was included in more than half of executive development programs. This result was particularly surprising, especially Negotiation/Collective Bargaining, which was included in only 15.4% of the programs, in view of the many colleges which have unionized faculty in recent years. It could be that colleges were hesitant to publicly acclaim their interest in this topic or even less willing to have executives discussing the topic in advance of a union problem.

From the category entitled Financial, only two of nine topics were included in over half of the reporting programs. Both of those topics, Budgeting and Setting Financial Objectives, were included in 77% of the programs. The next most popular topic was Financial Control, included in 46.2% of the programs reporting. Fund Raising surprisingly was included in only 38.5% of the programs. It may be that Fund Raising was regarded as a specialized skill rather than something in which all key executives were expected to participate. Certainly, Fund Raising would be expected to be of major importance to institutions having financial difficulty. Other financial topics which were not so popular, such as Cash Management (23%) and Investment (23%) could
have reflected the lack of concern by private colleges about handling or disposing of unused funds, a task with which many private colleges need not be concerned. Two other topics were included in fewer than half of the programs reporting, even though, in this author's view, they should have been of some importance to colleges experiencing financial difficulty. Those topics were Fund Accounting (30.8%) and Dealing with Economic and Financial Problems (30.8%).

It seemed that the basic accounting system of colleges would be a popular area of study for key executives in private colleges. Further, the relative lack of interest in the topic of Dealing with Economic and Financial Problems could suggest that college presidents surveyed were, in many instances, still keeping the institution's financial affairs fairly secret, even from key executives.

In the category of topics titled Law, only Government Relations was included in more than half of the reporting programs, and that topic was included in 62% of the programs. The popularity of the topic Government Relations could be an indicator of the pervasive influence of government over private colleges. The popularity of this topic might also suggest the need for a key executive within each college to become something of an expert in the topic of Government Relations.

The next most popular topic in this category was Af-
firmative Action, included in 46.2% of the programs. As mentioned in Chapter I of this study, colleges are required to develop and furnish evidence of programs of affirmative action to the federal government.

The least popular topic under the category titled Law was Labor Relations, which was included in only 23% of the programs reporting. That response was surprising since so many colleges and universities have been faced with interest from faculty and staff in unionization. It is suggested that it would be naive not to educate key college executives to understand the fundamental responsibilities of management for labor relations well in advance of an effort by faculty or staff to unionize.

Category XIII was entitled Ethics. None of the four topics included in that category were included in more than half of the programs which reported topics. In the post-Watergate era, it was shocking that such topics as Professional Ethics and Corporate Ethics were only included in 23% of the programs. This result was particularly unexpected because most of the colleges in the study were church-related institutions. Perhaps in church-related institutions, executives are expected to operate with an ethical code of behavior without formal training in the subject. The most popular topic in the category entitled Ethics was Social Responsibility, and that topic was included in only 46.2% of the programs. Perhaps some future study can deter-
mine whether interest in this topic will increase in the coming years. It might be reasoned that, at least in Catholic Church-related colleges, as dogma no longer serves to answer each moral question with some easy formula, interest in the subject of Ethics will increase markedly.

Category XIV, Long-Range Planning, included two topics; Strategy Formulation, which was only included in 30.8%, and Control Systems, included in 38.5% of the programs. The relative lack of interest in topics relating to long-range planning could support the belief that, where planning is not a major concern of the college, management will simply progress from crisis to crisis without much planned direction.

Other topics suggested by presidents of individual colleges which were not ranked in the study were: Educational Philosophy. One president felt it essential that his key executives shared a common educational philosophy as a base for further training as managers. Another president listed programs relating to Church Management as an important part of his program. One other president suggested Job Assessment as an important part of his executive development program. That topic might have been included in responses to Category VII, which was titled Coaching and Performance Appraisal.
The topics commented on above were included in the responses of thirteen colleges and universities which participated in the study. It might be assumed that the other institutions which did not report topics as part of their programs for executive development undertook only sporadic efforts to develop their executives.

It was simply learned what topics were included in programs for executive development in Illinois private colleges and universities. It was not learned what topics should have been included in such programs. That subject would be suitable for some future study.

THE INTERVIEWS

The purpose of interviewing some presidents of colleges with executive development programs was to elicit a somewhat more detailed response to questions treated in a brief fashion in the written survey. See Appendix V for The List of Institutions Participating in the Interviews. Presidents selected for interviews were those whose colleges had active programs for executive development, according to the earlier survey. Also, those interviewed expressed their willingness to be interviewed for the purposes of this study.

The seeming common denominator among all of the colleges which participated in the interviews was the desire to "professionalize" the management of their institutions,
to retain or regain viability of the institution, and to prepare for a possibly bleak future in which the population has been projected to offer fewer young adults of college-age in the coming decade.

The first seven questions asked in the interviews represented a synthesis of basic elements in a program for executive development. Question number 8 related to the financial reality that many institutions, particularly small colleges, could not afford to maintain individual programs for executive development.

Interview question number 9 seemed, to this author, to be the key question whose answer would determine whether or not administrative development efforts were successful or even worth doing. This question presents a good place to begin this discussion. That question was: What is the commitment of the chief executive officer to executive development? High - Moderate - Low. Consistently, the interviews have supported the contention that the chief executive officer must be the force behind improving the management of collegiate institutions. Of those seven institutions participating in the interview, only three institutions demonstrated written documentation of a specific plan for improving institutional management. In three institutions, Advanced Institutional Development Program Grants, from the Department of Health, Education and Welfare,
provided a means for a systematic effort to improve the management of the institution. In other institutions, the development efforts were sometimes peripheral, but not part of any continuing design to systematically improve the managerial performance of the institution. Executive officers of three colleges (those with Advanced Institutional Development Programs Grants), viewed their efforts as part of an institutional renaissance - a rebuilding, reshaping of the institution. In those three cases, the executive development program was viewed as one part of a larger package which included planning, management information systems, curricular development, organizational development, and change in organizational structure. Appendix VII contains a transcript of a taped interview with Mr. Thomas Dyba, Executive Vice President of Illinois Benedictine College, in which Mr. Dyba described the development of his college's efforts to improve management within that institution. That interview could serve as a guide to the reader who might be interested in beginning such a program.

Dr. Robert Lahti's text, *Innovative College Management*,\(^1\) provided another source for a total program for management improvement of which executive development is but one essential part. In addition to those colleges which had

Advanced Institutional Development Program grants, four other presidents interviewed agreed that the president of the college must regard the executive development program as central to the management of the institution if the program could be expected to have some major impact on the operation of the college.

It is worth noting here that presidents of private colleges seemed to be leaving their jobs in epidemic numbers. Of the seven executives interviewed, three colleges had new presidents within the past year, including one acting president. Two presidents interviewed were leaving their jobs shortly after the interviews were conducted. Two other college presidents who were interviewed had been in their positions more than five years and expressed no plans to leave their jobs.

If the college president's leadership is essential to effective programs for executive development, then those colleges with presidents coming into or going out of the presidency will certainly affect the continuity of the executive development program. One president who expected to be leaving office in the near future reported that his college had attempted to go outside of the institution to find well-prepared executives. Instead, he noted, that institution attracted "a lot of losers." He added that his college had since developed a policy of promotion from within
which would require more executive development efforts than his college had previously undertaken.

One president interviewed reported that for substantial change in managerial behavior, and change in organizational perspective, key executives had to be sent out for development to such programs as the Harvard Summer Program for Educational Executives. The problem with that concept, according to most respondents, was that, no matter how sophisticated the external development effort was, it must be supported by follow-up coaching and performance reviews within the organization. Further, sending individuals out for major development programs places them in isolation from others within the organization with whom they must communicate. One executive interviewed reported that of two executives sent to the Harvard Program, one left his job shortly after returning to the college since he learned how a college should be managed and no longer fit in his former organization.

One possible conclusion from the fact that almost half of those institutions surveyed did not have active executive development efforts was that those executive officers did not really believe that people's behavior could be changed by these efforts. This study does not purport that behavioral change is easy. However, it seems safe to assert that to deny the worth of education for administrative development was to deny the value of education: an incongruous
position for a collegiate administrator.

Dr. Robert Lahti also noted that behavioral change is not easy. He added that "if no administrative development is attempted, certainly no change will take place." (See Appendix VIII)

To be successful, executive development must begin at the top. Again, in Lahti's words, the president must not only lead the program but also must be a "participant" in the program.

The next question asked in these interviews was: What efforts have been undertaken to discover management needs of the organization? How has the organization determined its management needs (use of consultants, auditor's reports, organization development efforts, etc.)? Here, five of the seven executives interviewed reported the use of outside consultants to help them determine their management needs. One respondent stated that spending "X" dollars of their own money to have a consultant's report provided a base from which they were able to obtain an Advanced Institutional Development Program grant. Another respondent used a $5,000 Lilly Foundation grant to survey management needs. Another institution received the Advanced Institutional Development Program grant first and then hired the external consultant with Advanced Institutional Development Program funds. One president reported the development
of job descriptions for key managers as a step toward discovering management needs of the organization. Northern Illinois University provided a team of consultants to one college participating in the interviews. Kansas State University provided consultants to another college to assist with executive development. Both of the colleges using consultants from universities were funded by an Advanced Institutional Development Program grant. One president noted that the Council for the Advancement of Small Colleges in Washington, D.C. provides assistance to help small colleges determine their management needs.

In summary, it seems that some dramatic effort is essential as a base for planning a turn-around in the performance of a collegiate organization. Here again, Dr. Lahti of Harper College wrote\(^1\) of management by objectives as a tool for determining what the organization's major needs are and also\(^2\) as a systematic method for long-range planning. Another apparent finding from the interviews was that those colleges that received government grants to improve the management of their institutions were devoting the greatest amount of effort and time to effect such a change.

\(^1\)Dr. Robert Lahti, *Innovative College Management*, p. 53.
\(^2\)Ibid, p. 91.
The second question asked during the interviews was: Once having determined its management needs, has the organization assessed present strengths and weaknesses of its management? What gaps have been identified? Here, the respondents expressed widely differing motivation for similar actions. In two instances, the presidents personally and privately assessed existing management strengths. In another case, an executive committee, reporting to the president, conducted this assessment. In the other instances, no formal assessment was articulated but presumably simply perceived by the chief executive officer. In the case where this assessment was a participative process, it seemed that the organization and key individuals within that organization had a fairly clear-cut notion of how to compensate for the gaps or how to overcome these gaps. The most frequently mentioned gaps identified included preparing organizational objectives, marketing strategy, financial planning, and communication skill. One outgoing president replied that he did not have the faintest notion of what was going to occur at his college after he retired. The president of a large university commented that no systematic efforts were undertaken to assess the present strengths and weaknesses of the organization except the annual report from the auditors. The president who reported the development of job descriptions for key executives suggested that once completed, those descriptions could be compared to the in-
cumbents within each executive job as a means for determining strengths or weaknesses of their key executives. In response to this question, one president acknowledged that small colleges were the "minor leagues" and if they trained key personnel, those trained executives would move on to other larger colleges.

The third question asked in the interviews was: Has a training-needs analysis been conducted? What was done with the results? How was the needs analysis done (questionnaire, interviews, etc.)? This question was frequently perceived by those interviewed as a duplicate of the previous question. This writer's intent from this question was to obtain a specific list of methods employed to determine training needs.

The Training and Development Handbook\(^1\) provided a list of the following means for determining training needs. Those means were:

Analysis of Activity. The procedure for activity analysis is:

1. List aspects in a logical sequence the activities involved in producing a product or service, or part thereof. This calls for great attention to detail. Don't miss a single work, movement, or storage point.

---

2. Question each step ruthlessly. Is the step still needed? Can it be simplified? Is a new machine or less expensive material or a new process or procedure available? Under the impact of the creativity of those concerned, what activity can change from time to time? These changes can produce training needs. What new knowledge or skill is called for? Should present knowledge or skill be modified? If so, to what extent, when, and by whom?

While none of the respondents followed each of these steps in a systematic way, those three institutions with Advanced Institutional Development Program grants have, in a general way, analyzed the processes of key jobs (for example, the admissions office procedures, the planning processes) in order to improve the institution's performance. One other college president also used job descriptions as a base for determining training needs but had not yet determined those needs. The *Training and Development Handbook* suggested other ways to determine needs, including:

- Analysis of Problems
- Analysis of an Organization
- Appraisal of Performance
- Brainstorming
- Buzzing (Group Dynamic Technique)
- Card Sort (Forced Choice Procedure)
- Checklist
- Committee (Training Advisory Committee)
- Comparison (Of Performance of Another Similar Institution)
Consultants (Employment of Outside Consultants)

Surveys

Workshops

Those listed above were some of the techniques suggested within the Training and Development Handbook. They were listed here to suggest more fully to the reader what the author had in mind asking the question. Most of these techniques were fairly informal and could be used without the president actually being aware that a needs analysis (in any formal sense) had actually taken place. Among the techniques listed by those interviewed were: Use of external consultants; use of employee surveys; the annual external auditor's report; and trustee evaluations. In at least two of the seven colleges participating in the interviews, the presidents singly and privately determined the training needs of the organization and then persuaded their subordinates that what they had suggested was actually needed. Another president suggested, at this point in the interview, that an executive development program within the college only had value for basic skills topics. He added that newly appointed executives would have to be sent outside of the college to "learn an overall institutional perspective." That opinion was not shared by other presidents who participated in the interviews.

The next question asked in the interviews was: What
teaching methods are employed in the executive development programs? Which ones are viewed by respondents as most useful or productive? Among all of those interviewed, the lecture format was viewed as the least effective for changing behavior. In-house seminars or workshops were viewed as productive by all but one respondent. Particularly in those institutions which had Advanced Institutional Development Program grants, workshops or seminars were viewed as one part of the total effort for institutional renewal. In the interviews, as in the survey, no one favored programmed learning as a useful technique for training. It seemed that the interaction among participants was a key to the successful program for executive development. The one president who defined the scope of executive development in a narrower context than the other six respondents, noted that in-house seminars were satisfactory for providing executives with new basic skills. Four of the seven respondents believed it to be of major importance for executives to join together with their coworkers in problem-solving sessions so that the learning from the particular seminar or institute could be applied on the job and so that members of a management team would have the same learnings as a common base from which to improve the operation of the college. It seems reasonable to share the majority view that one of the major desirable side-effects of training sessions with several key executives from the same institution is that those sessions
provide a basis for shared communication among the participants.

Does the executive development program have a written statement of philosophy and objectives? In response to this question, six of the seven respondents gave a qualified "yes" answer. In its most general form, the philosophy and objectives statement described by the respondents were the philosophy and objectives of the institution. The training programs for executives were conducted within the general guidelines of the institutional purposes. In two instances, (two of those colleges with Advanced Institutional Development Program grants) the grant application itself contained the statement of philosophy and objectives for the management development program.

In view of the comment in the surveys that a closer relationship between institutional goals and goals of the executive development programs was important, these data suggested that specific program goals need to be developed for each executive development program. Two statements of program goals are included as Appendix VI to assist the reader in developing a statement of goals for an executive development program.

The next question in the interview was: How comprehensive are the topics covered by the program? Is the list of topics included in the program broad enough to cover all
major areas of management responsibility? If not, why are some major areas left out of the program? (Major areas were defined as the category headings from the survey list of topics.) Here, the tone of the responses was much different than was anticipated. None of the seven executives interviewed reported a comprehensive design for a program which would include all areas of management skills. Rather, the specific sessions held in the course of one academic year at these colleges seemed to relate more to the immediate needs of those executives participating in the program.

Management by Objectives techniques (or, in one institution to make that topic more palatable, Education by Objectives) was one major topic covered within the past year at two colleges. One institution reported a two-day (weekend) "Introduction to Management" seminar which it had conducted. (See Appendix VII) Three of those interviewed reported group sessions to help the institution decide its future directions. One respondent noted the need to educate executives in law or legal issues which these executives were likely to face in the near future. That same respondent described his executives as "rather innocent" in matters of law. Other topics included in the executive development programs were described in some detail throughout the earlier portions of the chapter. It seemed that a comprehensive list of topics could only be used as a menu from
which a group of executives within a college would select those topics viewed by those executives as most urgent for the moment. One program (see Appendix VI) included topics such as Physical Fitness for Executives and Management of Stress because of the president's belief that the personal needs as well as the organizational needs of individual executives should be included in such programs.

**Is there a plan to evaluate executive development efforts?** All respondents reported some efforts to evaluate executive development programs but these efforts differed widely in technique. The institutions with Advanced Institutional Development Program grants were required to make quarterly reports to the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare as one requirement of the grant. One respondent noted that the evaluations were done informally and orally by the president. Interestingly enough, no one was entirely satisfied with their techniques or instruments for evaluation. Several of those interviewed reported that written evaluation instruments frequently only evaluate how the participant felt about the program and not, as desired, how the individual participant is likely to transfer the learnings from the seminar or workshop to the work situation.

Several evaluation instruments were contained in Appendix IX for the reader's information and possible use. The problem with each of these evaluation instruments was
the fact that those instruments measured satisfaction with the program but did not measure any transfer of management skills to the actual management of the college.

The last question asked in the interviews was: Is a cooperative executive development program with other collegiate institutions desirable? If so, what obstacles have limited this cooperation? Responding to the first part of the question, the answer was a universal "yes". All seven officers of the institutions participating in the interviews reported that they would be happy to participate in cooperative efforts with other institutions. Closely following that reply were the following qualifications:

Each institution reported some programs which would have to be conducted individually, including: Processes of budgeting; Development of institutional policy statements; Institutional mission and purposes; and Marketing plan for the college.

When a further question was asked, "Would you be willing to participate in a statewide executive development program sponsored by the Federation of Independent Illinois Colleges and Universities?" the response was generally favorable but qualified based on cost of this type of program. Chapter V contained some specific recommendations to develop a cooperative effort in response to this question. One president suggested that actual implementation of a state-
wide program would meet some resistance relative to cost-sharing by the colleges. Another president suggested that the Federation of Independent Illinois Colleges and Universities would be ideally suited to coordinate such a state-wide program. Another president cautioned that the Federation of Independent Illinois Colleges and Universities was rightfully preoccupied with the task of attracting additional financial support to private colleges and universities in Illinois. As amplified in Chapter V, the Executive Director of the Federation of Independent Illinois Colleges and Universities believes that the perceived obstacles to a state-wide cooperative effort could be overcome if external funding were obtained.

SUMMARY ANALYSIS OF RESULTS

Though interpretive comments on the data are included throughout the present chapter, it seems appropriate to summarize here the interpretations of important data received from the study and to relate those results, where appropriate, to the related literature. Additionally, some further interpretive comments appear throughout Chapter V.

The data received from the study indicated that approximately half of the institutions surveyed had some major facets of executive development programs ongoing within their institutions. However, most of those responding, even if they did not have such programs underway,
acknowledged the need for such programs. Such acknowledgments were consistent with the literature review in which several educational leaders, including Reinert and Corson (Cf. Chapter II), recommended that collegiate management required improvement if colleges were to flourish, or in some cases, even to survive. The question then arises, why the discrepancy between what "ought to be" and what is, in actuality, within the colleges and universities participating in this study?

The following reasons were suggested or implied by the data.

1. Responses from small colleges suggested that executive development programs were too costly and were not done because of limited institutional means. The unspoken assumption behind that view seems to be that the programs would cost money without providing any commensurate financial return to the college. Table 04 supports the notion that these programs, done individually by each college, could have prohibitive costs. The literature, which supports the needs for such programs, does not deal with the issue of how colleges might pay for their executive development efforts. Therefore, it is impossible for this study to recommend a specific expenditure for executive development programs for all colleges because of the differences among these institutions in such variables as: purpose, size, number of executives and present level of development of
executives within each college.

2. Another possible reason for the gap between those institutions which say they should be doing executive development and those institutions which actually have such programs is lethargy. One scholar has suggested that collegiate management is best characterized by inertia. It may be that college presidents view themselves more as caretakers of what is, than as managers of what might be.

3. The Carnegie Commission\(^1\) studies suggested that, since World War II, colleges have accumulated numerous additional functions and purposes. It could be that executive development, while viewed as important by collegiate executives, is simply not high enough on priority lists of college presidents to warrant implementation in competition with other, more immediate, courses.

4. Another view expressed in the interviews was that private institutions frequently serve as training grounds for public colleges and universities. One administrator interviewed expressed hesitency to spend scarce funds to train executives who, once trained, would likely use those skills in public colleges which paid higher salaries.

Data from Table 04 indicates that presidents of colleges participating in the survey say they would be willing to spend more money for executive development than they were spending at the time of the survey. This partial datum might be invalidated by a president's desire to impress the surveyor or to provide a response that seemed to be expected by the interviewer.

The small number of colleges which set aside specific funds for executive development might be increased if trustees of the colleges were included in such programs. College presidents usually only recommend budget appropriations to a Board of Trustees. It is the Board which most frequently approves major categories for funding for a college. Involving Board members in executive development may result in additional appropriations for this purpose.

The interviews suggested that those colleges with Advanced Institutional Development Program grants tended to have more comprehensive programs for executive development than institutions without such grants. The terms of those grants require quarterly evaluation reports to the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare and even provide a government-paid employee within the college to assure that the terms of the grant were being met.

Concerning techniques for executive development employed by colleges participating in the study, the most
frequently selected technique was the institute, which was defined earlier as a one or two day intensive conference session. (See Appendix XI which further supports the view that participants rate such conference methods as most desirable.)

It is also possible that institutes were popular among colleges because they are compact and, therefore, easy to begin and end. A group of collegiate executives could be introduced to a topic such as management by objectives quickly and have periodic follow-up sessions to reinforce the earlier learnings or to evaluate implementation of principles or skills learned in an institute. Since the time of collegiate executives is costly and limited, the institute format seems to be the most cost-effective way to present such programs.

One third of the colleges participating in the study reported the use of outside consulting firms to help them improve the management of the college. The interviews further clarified this question by noting that external consultants were used for widely differing purposes. Some consultants were brought in to prescribe remedies to improve the management and/or financial condition of the college. Other consultants were hired to assess the strengths and weaknesses of existing management. Additionally, some consultants were employed to conduct training programs. Blake and Mouton, in a newly released
book,¹ categorized the types of interventions which consultants might be expected to provide to clients. Consultants may be hired to provide education, to help the clients resolve their problems, or even to furnish a prescription for problem solution.

Some reasons advanced in the interviews for hiring consultants included: lack of resources within the college, the need for "expert" opinion, seemingly with the term "expert" defined as someone from outside the college, and to make decisions for the institution which the college management chose not to make for itself. No one reported using consultants to save money but, if utilized effectively, consultants could be cheaper than hiring permanent resources for the college. Hiring consultants might also create some problems such as: jealousy by key executives, or lack of familiarity with the organization, or simply incompetence.

Another key question in the study was, who should run the executive development program within the college? Dr. Robert Lahti, of William Rainey Harper College, provides the most direct response to that question² in his book, *Innovative College Management*. Within those pages cited, Lahti drew support from such notables as Drucker, Odiorne, 


and the National Industrial Conference Board. Other sources, quoted earlier in Chapter II of this study, Paul Dressel, the Carnegie Commission on Higher Education, William Jellema, John Millett, imply the central role of the chief executive officer for the direction of the college or university.

If the president of a college is to be an effective leader in executive development, he must be a full participant in such programs. His subordinates will likely act on what the president does rather than on what he says. If the president of a college takes a leading role in learning new skills, applying new principles, utilizing new techniques, his subordinates are likely to follow the president's lead. If, on the other hand, the president tells his subordinates to learn something, but the president does nothing to utilize such learning, subordinates may quickly come to view development efforts as mere window dressing.

While the president's full participation in an executive development program is encouraged by the literature, that view is not inconsistent with the position contained throughout the Training and Development Handbook\(^1\) that a training professional coordinate the technical and mechanical aspects of such programs.

---

Concerning cooperative efforts among colleges to reduce the costs of executive development programs, a specific recommendation for such cooperation is made in Chapter V of this study. Presidents who were interviewed unanimously expressed an interest in cooperating with each other for executive development programs. One president even indicated his willingness to consider sponsoring such programs at the state-wide level, as did the Executive Director of the Federation of Independent Illinois Colleges and Universities. Such cooperation among private colleges in the state could reduce the cost of these efforts to a level where more colleges could afford to be active participants. Only an actual pilot offering of such an effort would help determine what other obstacles may emerge to make cooperation unworkable. Time, accessibility, cost, institutional ego, may emerge as issues which would make a state-wide program unworkable, though no such evidence was indicated by this study.

One other important aspect of this study was the development of a list of topics which were included in existing executive development programs. This list was to be used as a base for recommending specific topics for inclusion in other programs. The literature review in Chapter II of this study provided sources for the development of an initial topical list. Especially useful were the Management Development
Guidel and the Guide\textsuperscript{2} published jointly by the American Council on Education and the Academy for Educational Development.

The survey and interviews indicated, however, that the topics included in existing executive development programs followed no general pattern, though, as indicated in Table 07 and narrative following that table, some topics were more popular than others. It appears that more specific, immediately usable topics were included in more programs than general topics or topics about various principles of management. A case might be made for inclusion of topics which have an immediate applicability to short-term management needs of the institution. The long-range needs or theoretical topics seemed to be less popular among existing programs.

Further, it seems from the data that no completely common list of topics is desirable for all executive development programs. However, the topical list still has some value as a menu from which colleges or executives within the colleges can pick or choose those topics which they consider most important. Another factor which probably


reduces the likelihood of a universally acceptable topical list is the different level of executive development between colleges participating in the study. With the previous reservations noted, the topical list presented as Table 07 still could serve as a good beginning point for development of topics which might be offered in a statewide program.

Some further comment is in order on a few specific topics included in the survey as illustrative of the dichotomy between theory and actual practice. The area of communications is the key ingredient in management according to Rensis Likert. Yet, topics relating to communication are not among the most popular in existing programs for executive development. The results of the study seem to show little direct relationship between topics recommended by theory and those included in actual practice. This discrepancy might be due to the apparent emphasis on the immediate needs of management in existing programs rather than on management theory. Further, these results might indicate a lack of concern for a conceptual framework as a backdrop for such learning.

Another topical category which seems to require some

---

further comment is the category titled Financial. Of nine topics in that category, only two (Budgeting and Setting Financial Objectives) were included in more than half of the programs. One reason the other topics may not have been viewed as important is that many private colleges believe they do not have to concern themselves with such topics as investments since they may not have surplus cash to invest. Another possible reason for lack of interest in financial topics is that the college operates with little openness about financial information. Secrecy as a policy about financial information, if that were the case, could result in accountability for financial results only being exercised at the top, decisions being made based on miscalculations of the college's financial position, and a climate of mistrust based on lack of openness in this area. Financial secrecy could also compartmentalize the efforts of various key executives and prevent them from functioning as a team. Additional study is suggested in Chapter V on the impact of the chief executive officer's style on executive development programs.

The area of Labor Relations was also neglected in a majority of existing executive development programs. That result might have been obtained since colleges depend on their legal departments or retained counsel for handling such problems. However, as mentioned earlier in this study, this area is becoming an important issue for collegiate managers. Since most of the potential problems are resolved
by executives before litigation or collective bargaining, it would seem important for key executives to be fully aware of their responsibilities in this area.

Other interpretive comments were contained throughout Chapter IV. Additional comments of an interpretive nature are contained in Chapter V.

In summary, the picture for executive development was not all gloomy as supported by the selected interviews which followed the survey. Some institutions have addressed themselves seriously to improving institutional management. The three institutions participating in the Advanced Institutional Development Program grants seemed vitally alive, aware of their shortcomings, and intent on survival if not prosperity in the coming decade. It was impressive to learn that the institutions participating in the interviews were preparing to face the uncertain future and deal with it successfully.
CHAPTER V

CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

INTRODUCTION

In previous chapters of this study, the purpose of this paper was described, which was to examine existing programs for executive development within private colleges and universities in Illinois. In the second chapter, the literature was reviewed which suggested the need for improvement of the management of collegiate institutions and recommended topics for inclusion in such programs. Within the third chapter, the procedures were detailed for examining executive development programs in Illinois private colleges. In the preceding chapter, the results were reported for surveys mailed to fifty-one collegiate institutions in Illinois and of personal interviews with executives of seven of the institutions participating in the survey.

Within the present chapter are listed the conclusions from the study, and speculations about other possible conclusions suggested by the data. In addition, a suggestion was made for a plausible program for executive development. Further suggested was an outline of a grant proposal to a private foundation for a cooperative state-
wide program for executive development for private colleges. Following that proposal are recommendations for further investigation suggested by this pioneering study in the field.

CONCLUSIONS

From the survey of thirty-one college presidents, it appeared that approximately one half of the institutions surveyed have some systematic program for executive development. This conclusion was based on the response to the survey, particularly the listing of specific topical areas included within the programs. If no topics were listed in a response, then it was assumed that the programs were not developed sufficiently to list that institution's efforts as an organized program. This conclusion was further borne out by the response to another question in which only sixteen institutions specified the methods employed for conducting executive development programs. Three methods were listed by several institutions. Mentioned most frequently as a suitable method for executive development was institutes. Institutes were defined as one or two day, in-depth sessions on specified topics. Mentioned by eleven institutions was the use of consulting firms to develop and implement executive development programs and short courses, again directed at specific subjects. It was believed to be safe to assume that presidents of institutions participating in the study were not looking for any general man-
agement skills programs such as the Harvard Program or the program from the University of Nebraska, but instead sought to offer programs for executive development which addressed specific, defined needs of the moment within each institution.

Only four of the institutions surveyed, reported having an officer who had specifically delegated responsibility for executive development programs within a college or university. Dr. Robert Lahti, President of Harper College and a leading proponent and practitioner of administrative development programs, argued persuasively that program efforts must be directed by the president of the institution who should, from Dr. Lahti's view, be an active participant in the program as well as the program sponsor. One officer responsible for executive development within his university reported the disadvantages of being removed from day-to-day communication with the office of the president.

In response to the written survey instrument, twenty-three presidents indicated that they would be willing to commit the time of one full-time professional or less to be responsible for executive development within their institutions. It may be assumed that small colleges with as few as four executives simply could not afford to hire someone whose responsibilities would only be this type of program. The response of those same presidents supported the belief
that hiring an individual to handle executive development would be too costly since the average expenditure per executive, as determined from the study, ranged from $25 to $2,468.00 per year. It seemed that the only practical solution to the question of how small institutions can systematically improve their management if they cannot afford to hire someone for this purpose was for these institutions to join with other colleges in cooperative programs for this purpose. It seemed that, especially in the Chicago area or any area where colleges are clustered in relative close proximity to one another, that this suggestion could be quite practical. In the section on recommendations, more specific suggestions were made for such cooperative programs. Supporting the belief that colleges in Illinois would be willing to participate in cooperative efforts of this type was the response of all presidents interviewed that they would be willing to participate with others for this purpose.

It seems from the survey responses that time was even a more valuable commodity than money since presidents replied most often that increased amount of time devoted to these programs would improve them. It may have been that time was valuable because of the limited financial ability of colleges to buy the time of executives. Following close behind time as a response for what was needed to improve ongoing programs was money. One might assume that if ad-
ditional financial support were available from outside sources and, if the programs were scheduled at times convenient to key executives, that these program efforts might increase in volume and scope. The interviews with seven collegiate executives supported this contention since those interviewed uniformly indicated that they would support the development of a cooperative state-wide program for executive development.

From the survey, only eight presidents responded affirmatively to the question, has an organizational analysis been a part of your executive development program? It was impossible to draw any conclusive information from that response or from the interviews which followed the survey. Speculation might be made, however, that some systematic effort must be undertaken at the outset in a program's development if the executives within a college are to be convinced of, and agree to, the specific areas of need for improvement in the management of the institution. It can be reported that, in two institutions which conducted this type of organizational analysis, the resulting executive development efforts seemed far more cohesive and comprehensive than in institutions which did not begin with a systematic analysis of needs. Hence, in those two institutions which did an organizational analysis, the specific workshops and institutes which were part of the development program seemed to be viewed in the context of the larger
topic of general organizational needs and deficiencies. Since this paper dealt with needs of colleges and universities, some digression is in order to mention that the presidents interviewed reported that they learned something about the strengths of their colleges as well as their needs in the process of analyzing the organization. Such words as uniqueness, spirit, history, and tradition were used frequently to describe or characterize why the college was worth saving or improving.

If a cooperative program were to take place, the data from the written survey seem to suggest that one week per year or five one-day institutes might be acceptable to the greatest number of college presidents as the time which would be allotted for this purpose.

The survey responses to the topics for executive development programs did not provide a clear-cut pattern for concluding that some topics should be recommended for inclusion in executive development programs and others not included in such programs. Further, the interviews added little to support the development of a specific list of topics for general use. Those topics which were part of the greatest number of programs provided an initial reference for the development of a statewide cooperative program since those frequently listed topics seemed to be popular in a number of collegiate settings. Whatever lists
of topics were chosen as a base point from which to develop a state-wide program, that list would require further modification by the individual participants of such a program prior to implementation. The general topical list would only serve as a menu for readers who may be beginning an executive development program.

RECOMMENDATIONS FOR SPECIFIC ACTION

The initial recommendations from the present study were twofold: first, the development of an outline of essential elements of a sound executive development program. This recommendation was made from three bases: (a) existing programs; (b) the literature, and, in particular, the Training and Development Handbook; and (c) from an interview with Dr. Robert Lahti, the author of Innovative College Management. Dr. Lahti responded orally to the conclusions drawn by the author from the surveys and the interviews.

The second recommendation was an outline for a grant proposal to a private foundation which was developed with Admiral Alban Weber, Executive Director of the Federation of Independent Illinois Colleges and Universities, after Admiral Weber reviewed the results of the study.
RECOMMENDATION: DEVELOPMENT OF A PROGRAM FOR EXECUTIVE DEVELOPMENT

It is recommended that a program for executive development in colleges and universities should include the following elements.

A. Conduct an analysis of the organization's needs.

The first and one major and essential requirement in the creation of an executive development program would be some systematic attempt to determine the key issues, problems, and needs of the organization. One institution reported that this step was taken with the assistance of a Lilly Foundation grant. Another institution expended $10,000 of its own money to hire Peat, Marwick, Mitchell to conduct this analysis and has since obtained an Advanced Institutional Development Program grant in response to this initial expenditure. It seemed that an external evaluation of an institution's needs (like the prophet from another land) carried some weight with officers of an institution greater than similar efforts conducted without such outside help.

Another college which participated in the survey was conducting its organizational analysis by using what it had called "Trustees for a Time"; i.e. a cross-section of thirty-five educational experts and distinguished citizens who, by means of group process activity, forced the institution to
ask itself difficult questions and then proceed to respond to those questions. Mr. Murray served as a "trustee" of that college during the course of this study.

Another means of analyzing the organization was suggested by Dr. Robert Lahti in his book, *Innovative College Management*, in which he reported the initial development of a new college within a specific management and planning system – Management by Objectives. Auditing firms, such as Booze, Allen, Hamilton; Touche Ross and Co.; and Arthur Anderson Co., have been utilized to conduct similar organizational analyses. The Council for the Advancement of Small Colleges was another organization which has conducted such in-depth organizational studies. In addition, two independent Chicago-area consultants, Dr. Alan Fredian and Dr. Roger Fritz, among numerous others, have developed proposals for long-term organization development efforts for other Illinois colleges. Northern Illinois University furnished a team for assisting one private college in its executive development program efforts. These were obviously only a few of the organizations and individuals who might have been employed to help take the first step in the creation of an executive development program.

B. Establish primary responsibility for the executive development program. Among all of the institutions participating in the survey, only three had designated officers
other than the president as having primary responsibility for the conduct of executive development programs. Those titles were: Director of the Office of Internal Education, Vice President for Administration and Development, and Executive Vice President.

Testimony was persuasive that the president's active leadership was essential if these programs were to have a substantial impact on the organization. It is recommended, therefore, that the primary responsibility for such efforts should be based in the office of the president. The executive development program must be consistent with the goals of the chief executive officer or it will remain peripheral to the institutional mission and goals. If the president is a leader in these efforts, the topics of institutes or seminars are more likely to be related to solving the real problems which are most important to the institution. In addition, solutions proposed in these sessions are more likely to be consistent with the style of the chief executive officer. It is probably futile for executive development programs to prepare people for participative management if the president intends to operate in an authoritarian style.

C. Develop specific objectives for an annual program. Appendix VI lists the objectives of the current annual Administrative Development Program at Harper College, as well
as a rationale for the administrative development program at Loyola University. Ideally, objectives should be set collectively by the participants in the program, as was the case at Harper College. It may be that the needs of the institution will have dictated specific elements of the program for a term longer than one year. The list of topics on page 106 of this study suggested some possible areas for inclusion in the annual objectives of an executive development program.

D. Set aside a budget for the program. Setting aside a budget accomplished at least two objectives. First, budgeting for this program provided the presidents of the colleges with the opportunity to seek commitment from the trustees for this type of program. As a corollary result, it could mean that the trustees expect a report on the results of those efforts. Further, it would involve the trustees in a conscious commitment to expend funds for this purpose.

One index which is listed for the amount of the budget set aside is that the average college in Illinois with an executive development program set aside $563 for each executive for this purpose. One major determinant of cost, however, is the overhead which each program may require. In the institution with a separate office for the purpose of executive development, costs may be relatively high in
total, but because of the size of the institution, may be low per executive. One president suggested that for each new executive just being promoted into the executive ranks, a larger sum of money should be set aside than for someone who is already at the executive level. The median amount which presidents said they would be willing to spend for this purpose was between $201 and $300 per executive per year. These numbers were intended only to provide some general guidance to one contemplating a new program. The specific objectives of the individual program provide the most sound basis for determining the amount of money required for that program.

E. Determine the best methods for accomplishing executive development objectives. The Training and Development Handbook¹ suggested some possible methods for this purpose, including: Job Instruction, Coaching, the Lecture, Conference Methods, Case Method, Role Playing, Programmed Instruction, Human Relations Laboratory Training, Management Games, Related Reading, and Correspondence Study. Those persons interviewed suggested that the most valuable methods of executive development were Conference Methods in which the participants were actively involved in the learning process. Of the management experts surveyed and

mentioned in Chapter III of this study, only one recommended Programmed Learning as a valid technique. No one interviewed, nor any of the management experts surveyed, recommended Human Relations Training as a means for improving management.

One college surveyed did have an audio-tape library, which it circulated to managers, consisting of tapes prepared by leading management authorities across the country. Another college leader expressed the hope that his institution could prepare a "canned" presentation for new executives to bring them up to the level of the executives who had participated in earlier programs.

An unpublished paper\(^1\) by Stephen Carroll, Jr., Frank Paine, and John T. Ivancevich detailed the most effective alternative training methods for various training purposes according to a group of training directors whom they had surveyed. Essentially, their findings suggested that the best training method depended on the purpose of the training. Their research indicated that knowledge acquisition could be gained most effectively through Programmed Learning.

---

Changing attitudes, on the other hand, was accomplished best by sensitivity training. Problem-solving skills were attained best through use of the case study. Appendix XI lists the specific findings of their study.

F. Evaluate the programs. As mentioned earlier, where program evaluation was conducted, there was little overall satisfaction that the right things were being evaluated. At least, using instruments such as those contained in Appendix IX, one was able to evaluate how the participants felt about a program or seminar after they had participated in it. The difficulty was successfully evaluating how much of what was learned in a seminar was applied on the job after a seminar.

The Training and Development Handbook made a number of suggestions for evaluation of training programs. A couple of institutions evaluated their development programs through the performance of the institution. For example, one college evaluated the success of its efforts using increases in enrollment as a primary measure. Another college evaluated its administrative development programs using cost per credit hour as its primary measure. One president indicated that the cost per credit hour at his college had risen only 2.3% in total over the past six years. For all of these evaluations techniques, it was difficult to determine any cause and effect relationship between the executive develop-
ment programs and desired performance of the institution. This topic would make a useful study for another researcher.

RECOMMENDATION: OUTLINE FOR A PROPOSAL TO PRIVATE FOUNDATIONS TO SUPPORT A PROGRAM FOR EXECUTIVE DEVELOPMENT

It is recommended that the Federation of Independent Illinois Colleges and Universities sponsor a grant proposal to one or more private foundations to assist private colleges in Illinois in the task of improving the management of these institutions through the support of an executive development program. A three-year grant proposal is recommended which would provide funds to the sponsoring agency for the conduct of workshops and seminars and for a traveling team of consultants who could be made available to assist colleges and universities with such tasks as Organizational Analyses, Training Needs Analyses, and Design of Executive Development, or even broader Administrative Development Programs with resources shared, where practical, among neighboring institutions.

Dr. Robert Lahti, the President of William Rainey Harper College, expressed optimism at the prospect of such a cooperative venture among the private colleges in Illinois. He noted the existence of other similar consortia in Kansas.

1Dr. Robert Lahti, Interview with Thomas E. Murray, February 9, 1977.
City and in the State of Kansas. A three-year time period was recommended in the belief that it would take at least three years to implement a state-wide program whose efforts could be measured. The steps of organizational analysis and consequent training needs determination would probably take the major portion of the first year of the grant. The interview with Mr. Dyba of Illinois Benedictine College (See Appendix VII) illustrates the lengthy process of developing a successful program for executive development.

In a view shared by the Executive Director of the Federation of Independent Illinois Colleges, the proposal for funding from a private foundation should include funds for the following needs.

A. For a program coordinator and office;
B. For consultants to conduct on-site organizational analyses;
C. For attendance by collegiate executives at workshops and seminars; and
D. For continuing research in the field.

This funding recommendation is consistent with the data obtained from the interviews.

As indicated earlier, this grant should cover a period of at least three academic years which would provide sufficient time to implement workable programs for a significant number of colleges in the group and for measurable results,
in terms of such performance measures as enrollment increases over some base period, cost per credit hour, reduction of administrative costs, and other measures to be determined by the individual institutions.

RECOMMENDATIONS FOR FURTHER STUDY

A study of this type raised as many questions as it answered and provided a fertile base from which other studies might follow.

1. One crucial issue beyond the scope of the present study is the effect of a college president's management style on executive development programs. If a president's style is basically authoritarian, will even an excellent executive development program have any impact on the organization? It could be speculated that preparing executives to be good managers requires that they have the opportunity to use newly learned skills. If not, the programs would only succeed in producing frustration. This topic could be approached from a number of vantage points with a useful data resulting from additional research efforts.

2. Another area ripe for further study is evaluation of executive development programs. In the course of this study, a few techniques had been expressed for evaluating executive development programs, but none of these techniques
related directly to the goal of executive development programs; i.e. more effective management. Stated in another way, a good future study would be an attempt to measure transfer of learning from the classroom to actual management tasks.

3. The production of an annotated bibliography on the subject would serve as another valuable study. The bibliography for this study would provide a solid beginning for that type of effort.

4. One further approach to this topic would be an in-depth analysis of programs for executive development within one or perhaps two colleges, studying those elements of the program suggested earlier within this chapter. Appendix VII provides an example of an in-depth view of one program.

This study has covered a period of almost three years. Its conclusion provides the time and incentive for implementing this type of program now that the tasks of writing about the topic have been completed.
SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY


Baumhart, Raymond, S.J. Unpublished address to faculty of Loyola University, 1975.


Dressel, Paul L. "Innovation, Efficiency, and Effectiveness." An address delivered at the University of Akron, January 12, 1976.


Myers, F. Scott. Unpublished speech to the members of the Industrial Management Institute, Lake Forest College, 1968.


Walton, Clarence C. "The Future of Catholic Higher Education: Greater Needs and Greater Opportunities." Speech delivered to N.C.E.A. Published in monograph form by the Catholic University of America and the College and University Department, N.C.E.A. April 13, 1971.


APPENDIX I
APPENDIX I

LIST OF COLLEGES WHICH WERE ASKED TO PARTICIPATE IN THE STUDY

| Augustana College                  | Lewis University                  |
| Aurora College                    | Lincoln College                   |
| Barat College                     | Loyola University                 |
| Blackburn College                 | MacMurray College                 |
| Bradley University                | McKendree College                 |
| Central YMCA Community College    | Millikin University               |
| College of St. Francis            | Monmouth College                  |
| Columbia College                  | Mundelein College                 |
| Concordia Teachers College        | National College of Education     |
| DePaul University                 | North Central College             |
| Elmhurst College                  | North Park College                |
| Eureka College                    | Northwestern University           |
| George Williams College           | Olivet Nazarene College           |
| Greenville College                | Parks College of Aeronautical Technology |
| Illinois Benedictine College      | Principia College                 |
| Illinois College                  | Quincy College                    |
| Illinois Institute of Technology  | Rockford College                  |
| Illinois Wesleyan University      | Roosevelt University              |
| Judson College                    | Rosary College                    |
| Kendall College                   | Saint Xavier College              |
| Knox College                      | Schools of Art Institute          |
| Lake Forest College               |                                   |
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Shimer College
Spertus College of Judaica
Springfield College
Trinity College
Wheaton College
Felician College
MacCormac College
Mallinckrodt College
APPENDIX II
SURVEY INSTRUMENT A
SURVEY OF MANAGEMENT EXPERTS

The purpose of this study is to develop a model program for improving the executive management of private colleges and universities.

Listed below are several topics suggested in the literature as useful knowledge and skill areas for collegiate managers.

You are asked to rank these topics in a priority order of importance from your perspective and to indicate which methodology from the list below or others is most effective for accomplishing learning of a specific topic.

You are also asked to eliminate those topics which you believe to be of minimal value for improving the management of private colleges and universities in Illinois.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>C. Management Skills</td>
<td>C. Management Skills</td>
<td>C. Writing and Speaking</td>
<td>C. Listening and Speaking</td>
<td>C. Decision-Making</td>
<td>C. Decision-Making</td>
<td>C. Writing and Speaking</td>
<td>C. Listening and Speaking</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Priority Levels**

- **Priority 1 - Essential - Must be Included**
- **Priority 2 - Quite Important**
- **Priority 3 - Somewhat Important**
- **Priority 4 - Marginal Importance**
### VII. Coaching and Performance Appraisal

- **A** Employee Development
- **B** Standards for Performance
- **C** Appraisal of Performance
- **D** Counseling and Coaching

### VIII. Organization and Individuals

- **A** Institutional Needs Analysis
- **B** Organization Design
- **C** Characteristics of Work & Environment
- **D** Organizational Development
- **E** Team Planning
- **F** Group Dynamics
- **G** Faculty Staffing
- **H** Policy Formulation

### IX. Professional Development

- **A** Personal Skills for Managers
- **B** Self-Development
- **C** Managing Time

### X. Personnel Skills

- **A** Negotiation/Collective Bargaining
- **B** Human Resources Utilization
- **C** Improving Human Relations
- **D** Interpersonal Relations
- **E** Productivity

### XI. Financial

- **A** Financing, Budgeting
- **B** Financial Control
- **C** Fund Accounting
- **D** Cost Analysis
- **E** Dealing with Economic and Financial Problems
- **F** Setting Profitability Objectives
- **G** Fund Raising

### XII. Law

- **A** Government Relations
- **B** Labor Relations
- **C** Affirmative Action
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>B - Lecture</th>
<th>C - Role Playing</th>
<th>D - Simulation/Mgt Games</th>
<th>E - Programmed Instruction</th>
<th>F - Sensitivity Training</th>
<th>G - Conference/Small Group Discussions</th>
<th>H - Other (Please explain for each topic)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**XII. Ethics**  
A Development of a Personal Code of Ethics  
B Professional Ethics  
C Corporate Ethical Behavior

**XIV. Other**  
Please list other topics which you believe would contribute to the development of an effective program for developing effective managers of colleges and universities.

Priority 1 - Essential - Must be Included  
Priority 2 - Quite Important  
Priority 3 - Somewhat Important  
Priority 4 - Marginal Importance
June 3, 1976

Dear Sister Judith:

The purpose of this letter is to ask you to participate in field testing of my dissertation questionnaire. (cf. enclosed) Field testing means simply to obtain informed comment on the questionnaire before it is sent out to a total population which, in this case, will consist of presidents of all private colleges and universities in Illinois. Therefore, your comments will be used to assure that this questionnaire is valid in both its content and construction as these relate to the stated purposes of the study. (cf. enclosed)

Please write your comments directly on this questionnaire. You are not asked to respond to these questions, simply to comment on them and suggest further modifications of them as seem appropriate to you.

These modified questionnaires will then be mailed to presidents who are members of the Federation of Independent Illinois Colleges and Universities.

Your help in bringing this study to a happy conclusion is appreciated beyond my ability to put that appreciation in words.

Cordially,

Thomas E. Murray

Sister Judith Cagney
President
Barat College
700 E. Westleigh
Lake Forest, Illinois 60045
Events of the past decade have made the improvement of management of collegiate institutions imperative, in some cases for the welfare of the institution, in other cases for institutional survival.

I am asking that you and 45 other presidents of private colleges and universities in Illinois respond to the enclosed questionnaire. The data generated by the questionnaire will be used by this author to catalog efforts across the State to improve the executive management in private colleges and universities in Illinois. In addition, this study will result in several specific recommendations concerning executive development programs for collegiate administrators.

For the author of this study, this survey represents an essential step toward the conclusion of his educational experiences, as well as eight years of collegiate administration (following six years of secondary school teaching and administration). Your support is urgently sought and is essential to bringing this study to a successful conclusion.

You are asked to respond to the enclosed questionnaire and return it in the stamped, self-addressed envelope by August 31, 1976.

If you wish to receive summarized results from the study, without institutional identification, these will be returned to you by October 31, 1976.

Cordially,

Thomas E. Murray
QUESTIONNAIRE

PROGRAMS FOR EXECUTIVE DEVELOPMENT
WITHIN PRIVATE COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES IN ILLINOIS

1. Type of Institution
   A. Two-Year ___
   B. Four-Year ___
   C. More than Four-Year ___

2. Size (Number of full-time equivalent students) ___

3. Year in which institution was founded: ___

4. What type of program(s) do you have for improving executive management within your institution? (If more than one of the following, rank in order of importance to you with #1 being first priority, #2 being second, etc.)
   A. Short, specialized courses directed at very specific subjects ___
   B. Institutes-One or two day in-depth sessions on specified topics ___
   C. Correspondence or home study efforts ___
   D. Use of consulting firms to develop and implement executive development programs ___
   E. Programmed learning ___
   F. Change in assignment of key management personnel ___
   G. Other (Please Describe) ___

5. If you have an in-house department or officer responsible for executive development, please list name of department and title of officer responsible for this department.

   Department Name________________________________________

   Title of Responsible Officer_________________________________
6. What is the total number of executive managers in your institution? (President, Vice Presidents, Deans, Program Directors, Administrative Directors, and other key managers whom you would include in executive councils of the institution.)

   A. Definite Count __________
   B. Estimate __________

7. How many people would your institution be willing to commit to be responsible for all facets of executive development programs for your institution?

   A. One full-time professional or less __________
   B. One to three full-time professionals __________
   C. More than three full-time professionals __________

8. Estimate the total dollars (including salaries and allocations) expended in most recent academic year for executive development. (Not including faculty development.)

   Academic Year: July, 19___ to June, 19___ $_________

9. How much would your institution be willing to spend annually per executive for executive management development?

   A. Up to $50 per year __________
   B. $51 to $100 per year __________
   C. $101 to $200 per year __________
   D. $201 to $300 per year __________
   E. $301 to $400 per year __________
   F. If more than $400 per year, how much? $_________
10. What, in your judgment, would help your existing executive development program to become more effective? (Rank in order of importance to you with #1 being first priority, #2 being second, etc.)

A. Increased amount of time devoted to programs
B. Additional financial support
C. Better statement of program objectives
D. Additional direction or contribution from top administrators
E. Closer relationship between institutional goals and purposes of program
F. Other

11. Has an organizational analysis (management structures, needed skills, etc.) been a part of your executive development program?

Yes ____ No ____

12. Has a formal inventory of executive skills been a part of your executive development program?

Yes ____ No ____

13. Does your executive development program have:

A. A separate budget allocation

Yes ____ No ____

B. Space reserved for its uses

Yes ____ No ____

14. Is there a written statement of philosophy and/or objectives for your executive development program?

Yes ____ No ____
15. How much time are you willing to have your key executives devote to professional development as managers?

A. Three days or less per year  
B. One week per year  
C. One day per month  
D. Two days per month or more  
E. Other (Explain)  

16. Please check those topics which are included in your present executive development programs.

**Category I  The Role of Management**

A. Behavioral Science Concepts  
B. Management Practice (Techniques & Skills)  
C. Management Style  
D. Leadership Skills  
E. Managerial Maturity  

**Category II Tools of Management**

A. Management by Objectives  
B. Academic Leadership Goals  
C. Contingency Planning  
D. Qualification & Selection of Executives  

**Category III Decision-Making**

A. Decision-Making  
B. Problem-Solving  
C. Decision Management  

**Category IV Communication**

A. Interviewing  
B. Listening Skills  
C. Questioning  
D. Communications - Written & Oral  
E. Persuasion  
F. Interpersonal Communications  
G. Public Relations  

**Category V Delegation**

A. Delegation  
B. Accountability
**Category VI**  
**Motivation**

A. Motivation  
B. Positive Reinforcement  
C. Team Skills  
D. Team Building  

**Category VII**  
**Coaching & Performance Appraisal**

A. Employee Development  
B. Standards for Performance  
C. Appraisal of Performance  
D. Counseling and Coaching  
E. Self-Appraisal  

**Category VIII**  
**Organization and Individuals**

A. Institutional Needs Analysis  
B. Organization Design  
C. Organizational Development  
D. Team Planning  
E. Group Dynamics  
F. Faculty Staffing  
G. Policy Formulation  

**Category IX**  
**Professional Development**

A. Self-Development  
B. Managing Time  
C. Conducting Meetings  

**Category X**  
**Personnel Skills**

A. Negotiation/Collective Bargaining  
B. Human Resources Utilization  
C. Interpersonal Relations  
D. Productivity  

**Category XI**  
**Financial**

A. Budgeting  
B. Financial Control  
C. Fund Accounting  
D. Cost and Revenue Analysis  
E. Dealing with Economic & Financial Problems  
F. Setting Financial Objectives  
G. Fund Raising  
H. Cash Management  
I. Investments  

**Category XII**  
**Law**

A. Government Relations  
B. Labor Relations  
C. Affirmative Action
Category XIII  Ethics

A. Personal Code of Ethics
B. Professional Ethics
C. Corporate Ethics
D. Social Responsibility

Category XIV  Long-Range Planning

A. Strategy Formulation
B. Management Control Systems

Category XV  Other

Please list other topics which are included in your present executive development program but not listed above.

____________________________________________________________________
____________________________________________________________________
____________________________________________________________________
____________________________________________________________________

17. Comments

____________________________________________________________________
____________________________________________________________________
____________________________________________________________________
____________________________________________________________________

18. Name and title of person completing this questionnaire. (If you wish)

Name ____________________________________________
Title ____________________________________________

19. Name of Institution (If you wish)

____________________________________________________________________

A copy of the results of this questionnaire will be furnished to you within 90 days. No institution's response will be identified by name of institution in the published results.
APPENDIX IV

LIST OF COLLEGES WHICH PARTICIPATED IN THE STUDY

Loyola University
Lewis University
Lake Forest College
Knox College
Kendall College
Illinois Wesleyan University
Illinois College
Illinois Benedictine College
Eureka College
Elmhurst College
DePaul University
College of St. Francis
Bradley University
Barat College
MacCormac College
Trinity College
Spertus College of Judaica
Roosevelt University

Schools of Art Institute
Rockford College
Quincy College
Parks College of Aeronautical Technology
Olivet Nazarene College
North Park College
North Central College
National College of Education
McKendree College
Judson College
Augustana College
Mallinckrodt College
Felician College
Mundelein College
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LIST OF INSTITUTIONS WHOSE EXECUTIVES WERE INTERVIEWED IN THIS STUDY

Mundelein College
Mr. Daniel Cahill
Vice President for Development

Felician College
Sister Mary Bonita
President and Dean

Quincy College
Reverend Titus Ludes, O.S.F.
President

Eureka College
Dr. Ira W. Langston
President

Illinois Benedictine College
Mr. Thomas Dyba
Executive Vice President

Lewis University
Brother Vincent Neal, F.S.C.
Acting President

Loyola University
Reverend Raymond Baumhart, S.J.
President
I. PROGRAM

A. Understanding and Management of a Comprehensive College Personnel Program
   Dr. Bernard Ingster
   October 26, 1976

B. Faculty Unions On Campus
   Dr. Victor Baldridge
   November 16, 1976

C. Stress Intelligence for Managers
   Dr. Eugene Jennings
   January 5, 1977

D. Affirmative Action (Title IX)
   Dr. Norma Raffel (Tent.)
   February, 1977

E. Planning and Organization for Multi-Campus District
   March/April, 1977

F. Personalized Financial Planning
   May, 1977
II. OBJECTIVES

A. Understanding and Management of a Comprehensive College Personnel Program

As a result of attending this session, each member will:

1. Be able to identify and understand the components and functions of a comprehensive collegiate personnel office.

2. Understand the positive and negative effects of the impact of a collective bargaining environment on a comprehensive collegiate personnel program.

3. Understand how to manage a comprehensive personnel program in a collective bargaining environment.

4. Be able to more effectively interface with the personnel office and its staff on appropriate personnel matters.

B. Faculty Unions on Campus

As a result of participation in this session, each member will:

1. Have a basic understanding of each of the models of higher education governance.

2. Understand the factors contributing to, and the impact of collective bargaining on higher education.

3. Understand the impact of collective bargaining on personnel decision-making.

4. Understand the impact of collective bargaining on administration.

5. Understand the impact of collective bargaining on campus governance.

C. Stress Intelligence for Managers

As a result of participation in this session, each member will:

1. Understand the factors that exist in a work environment that could produce stress situations.

2. Understand how the managerial mind functions under stress.

3. Understand the types of stress to which the individual is vulnerable.

4. Understand the potential effects of stress on individual managers, their staffs, and their families.
D. Affirmative Action

As a result of participation in this session, each member will:

1. Understand the essential elements of Affirmative Action, Title IX, Equal Employment Opportunity, and equal pay.

2. Understand the impact of these regulations on personnel decisions.

3. Understand the problems that can be avoided by compliance.

4. Understand how these regulations can impact job performance.

E. Planning and Organization for Multi-Campus District

As a result of participation in this session, each member will:

1. Understand the functions of the district administration.

2. Understand the functions of the individual campus presidents.

3. Understand how the district administration interacts with the individual campuses.

F. Personalized Financial Planning

As a result of participation in this session, each member will:

1. Be able to recognize and understand the elements of effective estate planning.

2. Be able to apply the principles to their personal estate planning process.

3. Be able to better perform a personal family situation analysis.

4. Be able to do an inventory and lay out a long range estate plan.
I. Rationale

Loyola University, in its day-to-day operation, professes and adheres to certain organizational ideals.

1. Loyola is committed to the efficient and effective operation of the entire University as well as of its several components.

2. Loyola is committed to promoting orderly and effective change within itself.

3. Every individual faces the need for professional self development which, if addressed and fulfilled, benefits both the individual and the institution.

4. Because development of its personnel is closely linked to the development of the organization, Loyola is committed to both the growth and development of its personnel as well as to the improvement of the organization as a whole.

5. Personnel and organizational development is directed to the ends of improved teaching and service to students, alumni, patrons and the community as well as improved quality patient care.

However, the fact that Loyola University is a large and complex institution encompassing many campuses, each pursuing its own diverse missions, makes it difficult to achieve these ideals without planned, ongoing intervention.

Thus, as one means of striving to achieve these ideals, Loyola has decided upon and is committed to an ongoing program of University-wide inservice training and education.

II. Premises

For this inservice program to be effective, however, the following must be present.

1. The inservice program must have the commitment and support of the entire University community.

   a. It is especially important that the Board of Trustees and Corporate Officers of the University view the inservice role as vital to development of the organization.
b. A climate of acceptance and encouragement of and support for the inservice education program is the responsibility of all administrative personnel, and includes their participation in planning, implementing and evaluating various programs.

2. Unless the inservice program addresses the professional development needs of the individual and the University it will not reach its full value and potential.

a. While it is incumbent upon University personnel to contribute to improving their own effectiveness, the University itself also recognizes a responsibility to plan and administer programs to promote the continued development of all its personnel.

b. The environment and opportunities for learning afforded by an effective inservice education program are potent forces in stimulating the desire for individual self improvement which, consequently, improves the functioning of the University.

3. The University has, by and large, the personnel and resources within itself to assist in effecting both individual and organizational development.

4. To be effective, inservice programs must be based on a realistic appraisal of professional development needs related to University objectives, realistic setting of objectives to meet these needs, and must result in behavioral, structural or organizational changes to better meet these needs.

a. Those who can best explain the development needs to be addressed are the members of the University community itself. Therefore, mechanisms must be developed for effectively gathering information on what these needs are and for finding appropriate and effective ways of meeting them.

b. In formulating objectives to meet these development needs, there must be a coordinated effort, involving administrators in the area in which such needs are found. Therefore, the Director of the Office of Internal Education must be in regular contact with key University administrators.
III. The Office of Internal Education

The Office of Internal Education enters into the framework of the above rationale and flows from the outlined premises as the University-wide inservice department.

The role of the Office of Internal Education is to:

1. Coordinate the University-wide inservice training and education program for all campuses and components.

2. Encourage and foster a climate of acceptance of and support for the internal education role on the part of University administrators, faculty and staff.

3. Uncover professional development needs felt within the University for betterment of the organization through means such as interviews and surveys, and report these needs to appropriate administrators.

4. Provide in-house consultation and support in the areas of management, staff, and faculty development.

5. Continuously design and conduct seminars and workshops to present information, to develop and upgrade skills, and to develop awareness of or sensitivity to a particular topic.

6. Facilitate the presentation of programs for specific University publics by and with various University offices and components.

7. Uncover and utilize talents of University personnel in shaping and presenting programs and materials addressing professional and organizational development.

8. Cooperate with other University components in offering selected inservice programs on a "Continuing Education" basis.
OFFICE OF INTERNAL EDUCATION

FY '76 GOALS

I. UNIVERSITY-WIDE

1. Devise a method of periodically assessing professional development needs and assist in its implementation.

2. Develop and begin implementing an ongoing series of management sessions for LT/LSC non-academic administrators.

3. Sponsor one or more general interest seminars for Academic Department Chairmen.

4. Develop with the Dean of CAS at least two programs addressed to faculty development.

5. Conduct at least three "Human Relations Workshops" for LT/LSC staff personnel at each campus.

6. Sponsor three "Half Day Workshops" for administrators on pertinent topics, especially "Budget Preparation and Monitoring".

7. Determine the feasibility of developing an off-site workshop for selected Loyola University administrators.

8. Offer a pilot program on Pre-Retirement Planning for Loyola University employees 62 and over.

9. Plan and offer a "Key Issues" Workshop for Presidents of Private Colleges in the summer of '76.

10. Assist in developing and coordinating a two or three phase orientation program for LT/LSC staff personnel.

11. Assist in planning another Student Leader's Workshop for the fall of 1976.

12. Continue to monitor and evaluate training programs offered by the Office of Internal Education.

13. Explore feasibility of offering selected Office of Internal Education sponsored programs on a Continuing Education basis.

14. Hold periodic "Management Film Previews" for selected audiences.

15. Hold at least two meetings of each of the two Consultant groups to the Office of Internal Education.

16. Update the Loyola University 'Administrative List'.
17. Republicize the contents of the newly expanded "Management Tape Library".

18. Prepare summary outlines for all tapes in the cassette library.

19. Expand the cassette tape library, especially in the direction of presentations by Loyola University speakers.

20. Continue developing the Office of Internal Education "Speakers List".

21. Determine the feasibility and worth of continuing to publish the "Memo to Administrators".

22. Continue as a member of and as staff resource to the Academic Priorities Committee.

23. Continue serving as a member of the CAS Committee on Teaching/Counseling as well as a member of the Committee on Career Counseling.

24. Provide in-service consultation to various Loyola University components seeking such a service.

II. MEDICAL CENTER

1. Finish scripting and complete production of the videotape on the McGaw Hospital.

2. Conduct periodically the six-session "Effective Supervision Workshop" for new supervisors.

3. Devise and coordinate a series of follow-up sessions for first line supervisors who have completed the "Effective Supervision Workshop".

4. Devise and coordinate a follow-up series for Hospital Department Managers.

5. Initiate a series of "Human Potential Workshops" for selected Medical Center audiences.

6. Assist in organizing and implementing a workshop for top Loyola University Medical Center administrators on "Management by Objectives".

7. Offer two "Half Day Workshops" specific to the Medical Center: one on Performance Appraisal and the other on Health Care Legal Concerns.

8. Develop a Supervisory Workshop for supervisors in Physical Plant and Grounds.
9. Revise and reoffer once more the RN Leadership Workshop for nurses from other hospitals.

10. Assist the Personnel Department in updating their Orientation Program, by producing three sound/slide programs: 1) general information; 2) fire safety; and 3) security.

11. Provide in-service consultation to Medical Center departments seeking such a service.

PERSONNEL REQUIRED TO ACHIEVE THESE GOALS:

1. Director
2. Assistant Director
3. Secretary
I think that we started into the system four years ago, in 1972, the incentive for asking ourselves whether we were doing a good job of managing the institution came out of the grants area in the college. Wally Block, who was at that time our director of grants and now is Vice President of Institutional Resources, fund raising, so to speak, had discovered that there was an Exxon grant open or available to be applied for that dealt with management in education, developing better management techniques, and at that point, of course, the trustees thought it would be a good idea. There's a historical development there with the trustees. We have moved from a trustee body that was essentially an advisory group of lay people to, really, a controlling board of the institution. The corporations were separated back in 1971. That's how we became Illinois Benedictine College instead of St. Procopious College because St. Procopious Corp. was the monastary or abbey.

Murray: An that still exists?

Dyba: That still exists. Just like Bennett Academy became a separate corporation. Now, a very complicated structure, the monastary, the monastic community, still does have the final say in terms of the college closing down or dispersing of property or real assets. But the governing board, the Board of Trustees of the college, which is a mixture of lay and religious monastic people, really directs the institution and its future. So all that evolved about the same time, and I think that's why the board said at that point, "O.K. Let's see if we can find funding to do a self study." Whay they did though, and I think very correctly,
is they committed a number of dollars, with or without a grant, to commence a self study by bringing in a consultant. We brought in Peat, Marwick & Mitchell, and their simulation model, which I think is still called the Search Model. And, at that point, what they did is they took the top level administration, they took some faculty, some student input, they created a series of Task Forces and we started the self study. That was what the whole thrust was, to ask ourselves whether we're doing the job that we say we're supposed to be doing in the area of education and in the area of administration of the college. And that started to develop what I call a certain amount of sensitivity to the fact that there is a system of management that can be applied to higher educational institutions, instead of just praying a lot and hoping everything comes out. I think we quickly recognized the fact that most of us do not come out of management backgrounds. As a matter of fact, I think if we added up our total talents, I don't think we have anybody that had any business courses; maybe one or two people. The closest thing we came to management was from experience, that somebody had dumped us into a job. We had people who came out of a classroom, people who came out of admissions, people who came out of school without any prior experience. So we say that there were some shortcomings and we needed to start doing something about that. At the same time I think we began to realize that the enrollment picture was going to be shaky in the future. Some of those projections in the beginning of the 70's certainly told us that there was going to be a change in population, and all this. So all these things which are historical impacted upon us and we said, "Hey, we'd better make sure we're doing a top-level job with management." Faculty,
I think, in all schools, and certainly it's true here, have said, "You've got too many administrators." They're not happy about the term "management." I think they're growing to accept it now, but I know in 1972 when I got up and talked about marketing the college, I got a lecture by half the faculty telling me that if I ever get up and use those foul words again at a faculty meeting, that they would run me off the campus.

Murray: Then you started to use the word "administration" instead. To mask...

Dyba: Right. The word "management." Then we talked about management by objectives, for example. We were still meeting a great deal of resistance to that kind of concept, even by the administration we're meeting that resistance. So we softened that and called it "Education by Objectives." We haven't done a great deal in that area, but I think that's more acceptable. So language has a lot to do with what you're trying to sell in your own campus.

Murray: Did you have an accrediting visit as the primary motive for the self study?

Dyba: No, That was not the intention. We parlayed that very nicely into our ten-year continued accreditation. I think that the North Central people looked at that and were impressed with that fact that we were honestly looking at ourselves and seeing things that we didn't like, frankly, didn't know were there. But to make the story a lot shorter, that's where the drive came from. The Peat-Marwick people came in and said, "Here are the techniques, the tools that you might use to assess yourself." An then, of course, to develop various systems, to have a formal plan for long-range planning, to develop a planning management evaluation system,
we got into this. We invest a sizable sum of money, I think the
direct cash outlay the first year was about $10,000; and then
we looked at the contributed time and costs that went into that
and we estimated that at about $30,000, within a period of one
year. So we made a substantial commitment, dollars and cents,
to this. Timewise, for some of our people, it was almost a
full-time job for a period of about 9 or 10 months. Off the top
of my head I couldn't tell what the F.T.E.s would have been, but
I think we'd have been talking about probably four or five full-
time equivalents from the faculty and administration involved in
just that 1972-1973 activity called the Peat-Marwick Analysis
of Illinois Benedictine College. And it produced, as you might
well imagine, several large volumes of assessment information
about where the college was. It developed the concept that we
have to look at external environmental assumptions to see what
was going to happen to us five years down the road, that we need
a five-year planning cycle, and we cranked up one of those. Then
of course, everybody said, "Now we got this" and then we discovered,
as I think would be anticipated, that we weren't really very ex-
pert, had very little expertise in knowing how to use the information.
And we realized immediately that we had to find some kind of
funding source, because we would never be able to get a good
data-management base, for example. We just didn't have the money
to go out and find this hardware, software, or even to lease the
time and space. We we came back to the budget element, saying,
hey we need resources. This, of course, brought us to writing
proposals, and Mr. Block had started on that almost at the same
time he started on submitting the Exxon thing. We didn't get
funded, incidentally, from Exxon.

Murray: Neither did we.

Dyba: So we got shot off the wall, and we let that one go by. It was good experience, but I think the outcome was that we had kind of whetting our appetites to some degree.

So what we did, and we had now come to the conclusion, I think, not everybody was in agreement on that, that we started something and we had to see it through to the end because we saw a lot of good coming out of this. The trustees were very enthusiastic about this, so that the direction for this was coming down from the top. There was top-level administrative support. Fr. Daniel, of course, was president, thought that this was critical for the long-range development of the college. He, at the same time, along with the development team, was developing our first capital campaign, our first large fund-raising drive. And I think he saw that if we're going to go out and ask industry to support us, and anybody else to support us, that we had better make sure that we know who we are and where we want to go. So one of the very early activities was the writing of a goal statement, a mission statement for the college. Now I think most colleges have this in their catalog, but we actually have a whole booklet that talks about the primary goal of the institution, and this has been our basic tool. Now again, not everybody agrees with this, everybody feels that this should be expanded or extended upon, but this is one of the key documents that came out of the Peat, Marwick, & Mitchell thing.

Murray: Is a copy of it available?

Dyba: Oh, yes. I can give you a copy. So that we went through a whole system, with faculty, students, with administration, with
trustees, developing this statement of goals for Illinois Benedictine College. And this says pretty much what we are. There are some objectives in here. It's given us a basis to operate from; and it needs being gone through again by the Academic Senate. They're looking at it with the Goals Committee and they're reviewing this again, because it needs an updating. But it was a basic document that came out of the program. So all of those things were coming together at the same time. I started to say that Wally Block went after and had been going after, I think he tried three years and then finally succeeded, in seeking the Advanced Institutional Development Program fund, that program that HEW operates. Now I'm bringing that in because that has really become the basis for our management or administrative development program. Naturally, it's an institutional development, not just any one aspect, when we talk about it. We had proposed three elements in that program. We proposed the development of student life aspects, and then, of course, the third element is called the Optimal Resource Allocation Program. Now here's a really nice mouthful of high powered sounding words. Optimal Resource Allocation Program (ORAP). That is the element that deals with the management of the institution, the administration of the institution and in that there are several components. One component is the development of a data base. That's a single component, because everybody, all these consultants who came in including P.M. & M., told us that we're not going to be able to do long-range planning and predicting of what's going to happen to us unless we have a firm and accurate data base, something that's reliable. And that we need to have the transactional data, the profile data, and all
these other kinds of data in order to make intelligent long-range decisions, that we need a simulation model of some sort. The Search Model, we have not maintained it. We let it die on the vine, even though it was quite accurate for us. We found that we could do some nice predicting with it. So we're back in the process now of developing a new kind of simulation model. Getting back onto the track there that was one element of the ORAP. The second element was, and the philosophy was, you can have all the data in the world, but if people don't know how to use it, or understand why it's there, you're in trouble. So we developed the Administrative Refinement Program as a second element in this component (ARP). Now it is supposed to educate those people who are responsible for administering the institution. Now that might include faculty, it might include support staff, it might include anybody that we feel is going to have a direct bearing or impact upon the direction of the college. In that, the theory has been that we can send one or two people off to a workshop someplace, and we've done that continually over the years. They come back and they're all fired up. We've sent two people over to the Harvard Program for six weeks in the past. Our president was there this summer and one of our former vice presidents, and he came back in 1973 I guess, and he was all fired up and none of us know what he was talking about. So he was frustrated by that. Here was a man, he was up on the management system and all these other things, and man, we were in another world. So we took the approach in the ARP that we would try to immerse a lot of our people into skills development in management, theory in management, this type of thing, by having workshops. By having the experts here on our campus to talk to us and
having workshops on our own campus, so we wouldn't have to pay transportation costs. Just contributed time would be our biggest cost, and some supplies. The government, I think, saw that and said that's a good idea. Our original plans have been more than realized. We talked about, for example, sending three people off campus to a workshop, but because we've had some activity on the campus, there's kind of a growing interest in this, and now we've got, last year, instead of sending three people out to attend different workshops, we were able to actually expose some fifty different individuals to management conferences, techniques, and programs. That included department chairpersons, which I think is critical to any institution, as well as the administrative group, and faculty, who are teaching in classrooms, who are interested in this kind of thing. So we've used the money, I think, very wisely. We've got a growing feeling. At least the language is becoming...

Murray: What was the life of the grant?

Dyba: Three years. We've got a year and a half left to go. The first year of the ARP, which was last year 1975-1976, we did a number of things. We did assessment of ourselves. We called it an organizational analysis. We spent the year giving ourselves black eyes and bloody noses, asking people what they thought about the management of the institution, about the administration. Now there are not many tools which are very good for doing that, which we've learned as we've gone down the road. Many of the inventories are designed for industry. They are not designed for colleges and universities. The language is poor in them.

Murray: Organizational Analysis is a term developed by a fellow named Dan Tagliare. You didn't have his assistance, did you?
Dyba: No, it doesn't ring a bell.

Murray: He's developed an industrial model, etc.

Dyba: Well, we went to SRA and a couple of these other groups and bought packages that looked like they would be applicable to our needs. And I think they were, frankly. What we discovered, though, is that you don't give faculty a questionnaire that says do you like your supervisor, that implies an industrial thing. The one outstanding thing on the one inventory that we asked the faculty to take was that they thought it was a stupid tool. There was overwhelming response to that.

Murray: Was that the 78 questions in the SRA Attitude Survey?

Dyba: Yes, it was the attitude survey. And then we used the Institutional Functioning Inventory. We used a leadership opinion questionnaire. There were a couple of other tools, time studies and things. We're trying to get a basis of where we were at last year because we felt that we could not measure any kind of progress three years down the road unless we know where we were at the start of the program. We have found that while there was some resistance to taking these surveys, when the people saw the results of this, which we are now using in our workshops, they said, "Hey, we've got a couple of very sharp people on our campus, and we've tapped them and used them as internal consultants, from our Psychology Department, our Measurement Education programs, and what they've done is taken some of these tools and interpreted them to our particular needs, which has been satisfactory to most of us working here." It showed we have problems. That we knew before we started. It identified areas. It told us that there are difficulties with our management structure, that there may be some need to even look at our philosophy of management, which
has been pretty much very authoritarian. And I think you have to understand where that comes from. It comes out of the fact that this was a monastary, a seminary, and that's how we've operated. This is the first lay president the college has had. And he's only been on the job a couple of months, so there's a different kind of situation than we had in the past. That was not, incidentally, a byproduct of the management program, to have a lay president. That just happened because of another series of circumstances. But I think that it happened at a very interesting time because all of these things are being looked at, our whole direction in terms of management. We tried to look at how we were going to attack the question of analyzing ourselves, so we went out and asked the secretaries, the students, the faculty, the administration to tell us what they thought about themselves, about their relationships with the institution, all these things. We were told not to do that by a number of consultants. They said don't go out there and ask people questions because you're going to get them all upset. Well, I think they're upset anyway, so why not just go in and find out what's on their mind. And I don't think it's disrupted the institution to any great extent, but it's given us some valuable inputs about ourselves. We have, as a result of this, I think, we had come up with and met during the summer months. We took what we call our Level 1 Administration, which is not an official body within the institution, but its vice presidents and deans. There are nine people to whom everybody else in the institution reports. Now that's a pretty flat structure, management wise. We don't know if its a good one, incidentally. We may think there's some thinking that it's too
broad, it's too big for a school our size to have nine top-level administrators. There are three deans in that group, there is the Director of Continuing Education, a Director of the new MBA program, a business manager, the Treasurer of the institution, and the Vice President for Finance, the Vice President for Institutional Resources, not including myself (Executive Vice President) or the President, because they all report up to us. So we're talking about a pretty heavy bureaucracy.

Murray: They all report on a horizontal line, to you?

Dyba: Yes, to me. Excepting for the Vice President for Institutional Resources. He reports right to the President. So we're equals. We examined this thing very thoroughly over the summer, and, of course, there were specific recommendations made to modify that because we think it's just too heavy on top. It's been effective from the point of communication, because we meet every week, Wednesday mornings. That's where we were this morning. An we get an exchange of what's going on in all areas of the institution at one time, and they hear what's going on in the institution, which means they can go back and manage their individual areas. I think it could be modified and streamlined. I think we could have a taller structure. Now in the process of that, that group became the first participants in a series of workshops through the summer, where we start to analyze what we saw about ourselves. We thought it would probably make good sense to look at these things before we started talking all over the institution and don't know what we're talking about. So the group met to study that, the reaction of faculty to the administrative structure, the reaction of support staff to this, the reaction of students
to the whole picture. Or own reaction, because we were studying ourselves, and we went through a series of management games and exercises. We brought in "professionals" from other institutions to do this, because the grant provided that opportunity to hire people to come in and consult with us and assist us in the self-analysis. The second year, which is the year we're in right now, for the ARP is designed so that we start to work on correcting some of these things that we think need correcting, better communication, the obvious kinds of problems you have in any kind of management structure. We're doing that with a series of formal workshops. I have to tell you that we're meeting resistance from the faculty on holding the workshops. We started out, it's a pyramid. We started with the top level management, the president and his top managers. Then we included, we have had five workshops now, we included what we call the second level of managers and administrators, directors, some assistances, wherever the level 1 administrator thought that he had a key number of people who should sit in and develop some of these techniques. They've been brought in, and all department chairmen. Now immediately the department-chairmen problem. They have teaching responsibilities, and they don't fit the schedule very well. We're really trying to figure out how we can do this. How we can get them to participate. So we've had a series of workshops through the fall that have dealt with techniques of problem solving, that have dealt with the concepts of a data system, because we need to educate ourselves along those particular lines, and a number of other things that have to go on. Now we're going to the point of including all the faculty. That would come in the semester break. That will be in January. There will be several workshops then that will deal with
intergroup imaging. How do faculty perceive themselves, how do they perceive the administration, and vice versa, and what happens if we change roles. We're bringing in a team of people. There will be somebody from DePaul, University of Cincinnati, Northwestern University, a couple of places, that are going to work in this specialty. Because we think we have to get some communication with these people before we can start talking about skills. The first one will be a workshop in January on the mission, the goals, objectives, how do you do these things. How do you really write these things? And what are we doing with the ones we have? It's the start of the MBO concept. Then we will move down through the rest of the, we have a task force, or a committee, that looks at the needs of these workshops. What should they be about? Who should we bring in to conduct these things? What are our most urgent problems?

Murray: Is the task force all level 1 people?

Dyba: No, it's not. It includes consultants from other institutions, and it includes some of our level 1 people. So that we're looking at the various expertise of people, those who have resources, that they could tap individuals. When we wrote the original plan, which is this book here, Advanced Institutional Development Plan for the College. We put this thing together, it was written by a handful of us, this section on the Optimal Resource Allocation Program was put together by a handful of us. We had some feelings about what we needed in the way of management development, and we're not too far off. What had happened, though, when we did the first year analysis, we discovered the plan we had for the workshops wasn't going to hold. First of
all, we weren't going to be able to map out fifteen workshops at one time, because we saw the information we were getting out of the analysis was telling us we had problems we didn't recognize when we wrote the plan. They were discovered as part of the analysis. So we immediately went back to the government agency and say "Hey, we discovered something." which they were not unhappy about, because that's what the money was for, to analyze ourselves, and we want to change the structure. So what we did is we immediately broke down the second year planning of these workshops in the four sequences, and we're building each sequence as we see what develops in sequence. We constructed sequence 2. Now we'll see where we get in sequence 2 we'll go to sequence 3. I like things in equal packages. It's not as neat as I would like because I like to know what I'm going to be doing next May, but I think it's the way we're going to have to go, because we're dealing with a lot of interpersonal relationships here with people. And they're not all as ready as a handful of us are at the top to make sweeping changes, so there's got to be an education program going on, all these sorts of things.

And our grand plan is going to be achieved, but I can't say to the same degree that we thought it would be achieved when we put the plan together. The task force, I think, has a good feeling for this because it includes internal people, and some external people. In fact, we'll be meeting other aspects that have to be developed. So the second year of the ARP is supposed to be an education year, where we're learning some things about techniques, and what we're finding out is that in a number of these things, we know much of this. It's not a strange thing. But when you see it put together in a logical presentation and
you get to discuss it with your peers, or with those whom you supervise, a different kind of relationship develops. Now what is happening is, we're getting this response and I'm saying, oh, another meeting, another workshop, you can't do this to us, we're overburdened. We had this situation a week ago. We had it last Thursday. We had a workshop which dealt with problem solving. At a morning meeting with the faculty they came out and told us, "You guys can't impose any more meetings on us. We can't do it." Well, the faculty department chairmen, who were pretty loud about this kind of thing, showed up for the workshop in the afternoon. Now after every workshop we ask all the participants to evaluate it, to tell us what they think, and they don't have to sing it, so it's pretty free.

Murray: Do you have a copy of the evaluation instrument?

Dyba: Yes, right here. Pretty simple form. And I think it will have to be more complicated as we expand the group, or more detailed. But essentially it says that we stay on target, that the presentation meets your expectations and all this kind of stuff. The outcome of that, though, was, with exception of one person, all of the other responses were more favorable than they've ever been. In the morning we hear all these people complaining, including the administration, that they couldn't do these things. When they finished that 3½ hour workshop, first of all we couldn't shut it off. That's one of the things that happened. It ran until 4:30 in the afternoon, and it should have ended at 4:00. People were having a good time, educationally speaking. They got into something. Problem solving. They saw a structure. They said it wasn't anything new, but it was a different approach to what they were doing. So there were about
30 people.

Murray: Was Dr. Fritz the team leader?

Dyba: No, Roger's been out here and we may get him back to work on some of that. But what had happened is that these very same people now were saying positively, "Gee, we ought to do more things like this." Unfortunately, there were only thirty out of the hundred people that could have been involved. I shouldn't have said thirty. Theoretically there were about 48 people that should have been there and thirty were attending. We have not made it a compulsory activity. We haven't ordered them to participate. I think that our attitude here has been pretty much of the fact that this is important. This is a priority activity. Be there. But we haven't said we're going to fire you if you don't show up. And our participation has been pretty good. Our difficulty is with people who teach. In other words, they can't get to the programs. So that's why we're doing something at the semester break. But the responses, as each of these has gone by, depending upon who the leaders are and the topic, have been positive. We've been getting a positive response, that they feel it's worth the time and effort. Our major concern is that it's superficial. You can't teach a person about management psychology in a workshop. Maybe you can't teach them in a lifetime, but you certainly need at least a couple of months. We're looking at that problem. How do we make this a lasting activity.

Murray: Scott Meyers from Texas Instruments says that it takes ten years to convert someone from theory "X" to theory "Y".

Dyba: I believe that.
I think you have to look at it in terms of grades of success. You make small progresses, you progress in small amounts.

So that's where we're at. The third year of the program. Some of these activities will include the development of specific objectives for areas, even though we have objectives, but the refining of our ability to write an objective, and then to use it as part of the evaluation process. Now I think colleges generally are very poor on evaluation. We have acknowledged that here in everything we've written and said about ourselves in the last four years, that we haven't done a lot in developing good evaluative techniques or tools, or developing a system for making sure we're doing the things we say we're supposed to be doing. One of the most important things of the AID, if we never accomplish anything else, those who have been involved with this, is you have a series of quarterly milestones. It's probably the finest MBO I've seen, frankly, for an institution to get involved in without having to spend a lot of energy and time. We know we have to achieve certain functions, certain goals. We're constantly measuring ourselves against those. If we don't achieve them, we have to explain why we didn't achieve them in a logical fashion. The government doesn't slap our hands for not doing this. What they're trying to do is make us be our own taskmasters and they're achieving that. In fact, our whole development area is on an MBO. It's developed as a result of this. Block has just got the most magnificent tool you've ever seen for raising money.

Are you in contact with somebody at Region 5 who comes out with some regularity to monitor progress?
Yes, well, we only had one on-site visit from our director, our liaison person. We're reporting into those people on a quarterly basis, on an annual basis, and the process is pretty elaborate. We have their agent on our campus, it's one of our people, but the AID coordinator, he's going all the time to Washington or some place to get directions, to change directions, he serves as our, we have a very sharp guy on this campus doing that, Ralph Meeker. He's really their representative. They pay his entire costs to be here. And of course, he'll return to the faculty. He is on our faculty, a former department chairman, and has really been responsible for leading a lot of this material to reality. So that is what the activity will include, some of these things for the balance of this year. The third year is when we're going to study the effect of the second year to see whether there've been some changes. Now we set milestones down that we're supposed to come up with improved planning time, with better techniques for managing our offices, with this type of thing. I don't know whether we're going to make that or not. I have to admit it's a much bigger process than we thought, and ten years doesn't seem like a lot of time. Three years doesn't seem like any time, frankly. The idea of making this part of our daily operation is just starting to settle into this campus. Up until this year, the AID, even up until perhaps this day, in the minds of many people, the AID is a plan that's over there, and here's the college. And what I see now happening is that they're one and the same thing. We're no longer talking about the AID plan. We're saying Our Plan. And that's what it is. So it's being internalized very slowly, but it is being internalized. It was our plan. So I feel it's happening. Faculty
would disagree with that to some degree. They're still looking at this as an administrative toy. I heard them say that. However, the realization is sinking in there, because in that whole aspect of faculty development and instructional development, they now are able to go to workshops, conferences, they are able to do some creative course development. There's a whole package of that which exists. And its affecting more and more of them, and opportunity during the summer to create courses and get paid for it, you know, money in the paycheck, is always a great incentive for people. So we're seeing a flurry, we're seeing some hope now, and interest on the part of the faculty to go after grants. When we did this, Tom, it was like cutting everybody's head off in the institution. Even I, I'd come over here at night and I'd be swearing at the fact that I spent a summer doing that, and I mean a summer. We worked 14 hours a day, seven days a week a year ago in the summer to make this happen because we got the nod that we were going to be in, but we had to have a final refined plan. And there were at least fifteen or eighteen of us that worked six solid weeks without any time off, morning, noon, and night, to make this happen, with no extra compensation for anybody at the administrative level. In fact, there was no vacation time. We couldn't fit it in that year. So we've got a real sense of ownership for this kind of thing.
The first test, frankly, the first evaluation of whether or not what we're doing this year is going to have some impact on the institution. Our specific measurable (quantifiable) objectives that have been set down to determine whether we've improved our planning time, for example, whether we've improved our planning attitudes, whether we have developed any efficiencies, because the philosophical position, I think, the question that comes up here, does the executive development program have a written statement of philosophy objectives? Yes, it does. It has an objectives, of course, to become more effective and efficient. But we've put some quantifiers on that. To say that the administrative cost per an FTE student should not rise, but actually should go down. Now I don't know whether we're going to achieve that or not. We should become more efficient, cost efficient, and therefore, not have generated more dollars. Now, of course, there are two ways that can happen. You can eliminate people and programs, or you can increase the enrollment. And one of the objectives is to increase the enrollment. Their sole series of objectives about the kind of enrollment, adult education, minorities, this kind of thing. We're doing all that. We're very nicely on target from what I can see. And what will happen if we hold the personnel costs, I remember there was an increase of personnel costs because of the program being developed. We've hired some specialists to work with us. They're full-time employees. They're paid through that grant and through college funds. But even if we kept them all on, from where I'm sitting right now, I believe we will have achieved a reduction because our enrollment has grown. And
we're retaining people. I think we're producing a better service to our students. The student body seems to concur with that. From the attitude and the spirit of the student body right now, I'd say something has happened. I would like to attribute it to the effect of a resident life program, a health recreation physical fitness program. These are all other elements of the AID plan that we had constructed. These things are producing, I think, a student who feels a little bit more involved, better satisfied, being serviced better, this type of thing. Certainly in the instructional area we've been able to add a materials learning resource activity, which we've never had before, so that's improving the students' capability of using the library to some degree, and certainly, I think, sharpening up the faculty. We have been able to offer, I think, some more creative courses, or combinations of courses through a new liberal education corps that grew out of this program. So we're going to, if things go the way they're going right now, we are going to achieve that objective. I think we are talking about modestly a 5% reduction in the FTE cost administratively, and I see that happening. I think that's going to come out. I'm not quoting an objective quite properly, but I know that's the general essence of it, that we reduce the per capita costs per FTE student.

Murray: That's great because that should be the incentive for everyone in the college.

Dyba: That's right. That's what we are aiming toward. Now the third year of the administrative refinement program will probably find a need, I think at this point, for doing some additional in-house educational activities. The thrust is a continuing
program so that one of the objectives of the ARP is that when the grant ends, we can continue to refine our administration. We view it as a process, not as a specific activity. And part of the ARP is to build a library or a learning resource center for management so that people who step into administrative roles two years from now or five years from now will have some kind of a package that they can go into. We looked at a number of these, the American Management Association is saying they don't necessarily fit our particular needs. We feel that there is a definite need for somebody to put together a continuing education activity for college administrators. That applies to an individual institution. I would see, for example, a whole set of visuals where you would hire a secretary, and I would like for example, to see a 30-minute presentation and the person could sit down and watch a series of slides and listen to a tape on what is in the college operational manual. You know if you got into that a little bit, too. What is, you know, what are the normal operating procedures of the institution? What is the planning structure of the institution? If you get an idea, how do you get it to the Board of Trustees for approval? What's the governance structure of the institution? What is the faculty handbook, things that we produce in colleges every year and nobody knows that they even own a copy. I've gone to a number of meetings and I've said, "on page such & such:" They said, "What are you talking about. I never got one of those." And that happened last week and I pick out a book and I said, "See the cover." He said, "oh, yes. I got one of those." The guy's had it for six months and doesn't know what's
in it. And I say, "Boy, something's wrong someplace." So this is what we're talking about, the kind of an educational experience. We're trying to develop that in the third year. The continuing education for administrative refinement.

Murray: Your horizontal structure gives you one advantage. It's not difficult to get through several layers of management. You've avoided that.

Dyba: Right. Yes. We present other problems. So that that's the third year outcome that's being sought from the ARP activity. Now there's a third aspect of the Optimal Resource Allocation Program. The third aspect is called a PME, and the government is big on the PME, for a good reason, and I think that's the whole purpose of any administrative development program, any institution. That, of course, is the Planning Management Evaluation System. We will devote, and are having trouble with this right now because we are not good planners. We may be improving our management aspect, but the planning aspect is a tough one for anybody, because I think we tend to shoot from the hip rather than having a firm sequence. If somebody tells me I've to to know what I'm doing five years down the road, I like the idea but I don't know how I'm going to do that. So the PME system is the key. The data base, the refining of the administration, etc. are supportive of the PME. It is really the heart of the Optimum Resource Allocation Program. This is where we're going to be spending a lot of our time over the next six months. We're a little off schedule, as a matter of fact. We're supposed to be further down the road. Now, we have had a planning management system. Oh,
this is really super great. I don't understand it. I shouldn't admit that on tape. I helped put it together. There are about 5 or 6 pages here (in the manual) of how you do your long-range planning.

Murray: Is that from Peat Marwick?

Dyba: Yes, that's taken off the Peat Marwick Model. This tells you what to do. All the process you go through. We pick this up and look at this once in a while and I think we get confused by the time you get to page 3. We've talked about it. We know that it could work probably with a lot more development of our personnel, and we use the system somewhat. I don't know how well it's working. The evaluation aspect of this is where we're having our greatest difficulty, trying to find the right kind of tools and processes to determine whether we're successful or not. This is going to take a lot of education. We're working on whether we can really implement this specific activity or whether we have to go and find ourselves something else, or simplify it, until people become more sophisticated. You know, these PERT charts and all that kind of stuff are foreign language, we find here, to ourselves. We made great strides, for example, in developing the data base itself, we have two groups of employees on campus right now that are literally being brainwashed on a weekly basis on what data management is, how you develop it and everything else. We call them the user, the conversion, and the user group. The user group are the people who are on the front line. The registrar, the admissions office, the comptroller, the people who have to put the data together every day, and work with it,
the transactional data. The conversion team are the level one managers who are going to have to make the decisions whether a terminal goes in that room, whether this is data that should be collected or not collected, whether we have any use for this planning in management. So what we found out when we got started, everybody came together, we all sat down and somebody threw off a whole lot of words and we said, "What are they talking about." All right? Oh, we know that there's cobol, the basic language, and that there's a terminal, and a lot of things like that, but how do they work. What does this mean? So somebody says what kind of data do you need. Everybody said, "I don't know. Tell me." So that's what we're in. We've been immersed now for the last two months. Once a week we have a workshop with each of these groups. Sometimes we bring the groups together and we talk about this thing. But there's really a continuing education activity going on. That's what we did for two hours this morning. We sat there and looked at the various kinds of profile data that are generated that we might be able to use here, the kinds of things and how it's used in the management of the university in this case. This was our consultant from Northern Illinois University who was here today. Now we are contracted with NIU. In other words, their people do not get paid on a daily basis from us as if we would bring in a consultant from Loyola or someplace else. We have an actual contract with them as part of the grant. So they get paid, but they don't submit a bill for every day to us. They are paid back in their home institution. We give them a fixed amount of money and they are what we call our contractual agency. They supply us with a variety of regular
direction and consulting people in all our programs so that we tap their entire force for anything that we would need and they pick and choose the people and send them out here to work with us, with our approval. And that's helped us a good deal. And we have been very open. We admit that we don't know a lot of things about all this, and we start with that assumption. We're not going to tell you that we have all the answers because if we had we wouldn't ask you to be here. So tell us where we need to go. Push us if you have to. And they pushed us around quite a bit, but very much, I think, to our advantage. There is a little statement in education about the more you learn the less you know, and I think that's what's happening to us. We're looking at this saying, "My God, we never realized that there was all this knowledge that we don't have about our methods of operation." So we're being overwhelmed by that. I feel it to some degree. I've the deans coming in once in a while saying "Can't we just take this place back to what it was in 1960. It was nice." And they know that isn't going to happen. I feel that way once in a while myself and say, "When I first came out here we used to have time to play horseshoes on our lunch hour." We don't even go to lunch anymore. So that this has had another impact upon us. The North Central Association, when they came through here, Tom, and looked at us their response was, you guys are really overworking yourselves. Watch out. That was one of their concerns, one of the weaknesses. We're in up to our ears. And of course when they put that in the report that was a welcome statement. But people say "See, we told you we're overworked." Even the trustees on down because they're a pretty active group. So this is the element that we're working
on now, but the planning, is it good?

Let me just explain what this book is. This is called the College Operational Manual. It's an idea that we had a long time ago. Most secondary school systems and elementary school systems have a thing like this. It's their handbook, or whatever. We've always had handbooks, a faculty handbook, staff handbook. And what we've decided to do is to take the key policies of the institution and put them into some kind of a logical directory that every employee has. A registered copy of this goes to each employee. They sign a slip saying they've received their copy. There are of course, reasons for doing that. One is that somebody can't tell us that we are guilty of omission somewhere down the road, protecting ourselves legally.

Murray: You said each employee...

Dyba: Each employee gets this. Faculty. Now it looks different for each employee. All people get the general Introduction. There was a letter from the Chairman of the Board of Trustees which came out last year, and then there's a whole thing about history of the college, briefly, location, the primary educational goal of the college. In other words, they all have that goals handbook, but there's a kind of a short statement of what the primary goal of our institution is. Then we get down to the structures. Now that's the point I want to get to. The structure. We try to show people what the plan looks like in terms of its operation, you know, the flow charts that all places have and nobody ever follows. We're not happy with these because we discovered that they do not tell people what we're doing, that we drew them and we didn't draw them correctly, so they're in the process of being reviewed. But what we have
is a planning structure, a management structure, and together we call that the governance of the institution so that you could serve in both capacities. But on the planning side there are specific groups that are responsible for planning in the institution, welfare of employees, financial planning, student life planning, and academic planning. And they are all brought together in a body called the College Planning Council, which is made up of these chairpersons, plus alumni. There are no students on this group and that's part of the problem. We are reworking the structure. We discovered that in our analysis that this was not 100% effective. Then you go into a whole series of management. This has sat very poorly with the faculty. And even North Central Association said, "Hey, change that around because, image wise, you're coming off looking like a factory." They didn't put that in the report but they alluded to it, that this needs modifying because what we don't spend a lot of time on is the governance question. We show the whole management structure, which we're interpreting as the governance system. All these people input into the policy, the development of their institution in some way. We have a whole series of charts that point this out. Then we get on to the descriptions of various committees, organizations, the by-laws of the institution. That's in there so all employees can look to that if they have any questions. Then we have the policy section. And the policy section tells us all kinds of dumb things about when you get paid, nepotism, sick leave, all that kind of stuff. It includes the benefits, not a detailed description of the benefits, just which ones we have, the affirmative
action statement is in there, that type of thing. Then there's a section for procedures which we haven't developed. They don't have this yet. People have it in individual files. It hasn't been put in the handbook because we haven't agreed on the procedures and with the changes we're making as a result of the plan. This thing is just out of whack, so it's one of the weaknesses we're having with developing the procedures section. Then we get down to the element called needs and services. It's simply every employee has this, so if they're saying "Who do I go to talk to about affirmative action", there's an office that they can go to. I don't know how many people are using this, but for a new employee I think this is very important to look at. It's just a quick handy reference which every school probably has somewhere but we've made it part of our handbook, our operational manual.

Murray: Personally, I don't think every school does, or every business.

Dyba: They should.

Murray: Right.

Dyba: Then there are what we call the personnel handbooks. And we have a handbook for each group of employees, and that's another whole thing. I'd have to describe to you that we're working on and having problems with. But traditionally, the faculty handbook is in there. We don't have an administrative handbook as such as this point, but we will, though. That's in the process of being developed, the staff handbook, and then people have an opportunity of adding special handbooks. There's a handbook, for example, on evaluation. There's one here, miscellaneous handbooks, there's one on budget development.
Certain administrators, like department chairpersons, would get that handbook, to develop the budget. The idea behind the ring binder is, and that's what we're working on now, is part of the Administrative Refinement Program, is that we can change pages very nicely, you know. If we have a revision of this page, we don't have to throw the whole book out, because presently these things all exist in one of these bound things and to change it you can take it apart now. But you have to take the whole thing apart. We're going to ring binders. Every employee, hopefully, this year will have a ring binder like this. We'll have these subdividers and we'll be able to refer to this. Now the only time they go into this is when they have a problem. That's what seems to be the case.

Murray: But at least it's there.

Dyba: It's there. And I'll tell you this has been a lifesaver because our deans and other administration people, when they've had a run-in over some point and they can go to the shelf and pick that book up and open it up and they can say, "right there, the argument ceases" because every employee has a registered copy, so they can't come back and tell us, "I never saw it."

Murray: That's amazing!

Dyba: And it's worked. This has been one of the outcomes of the Administrative Refinement Program. Now we had the idea a long time but this wouldn't have happened, I think, without the AID taking place. So when we get down to the planning and management, this is going to be our vehicle for communicating that, they see the plan now. This thing, people have copies of this around the campus. We keep copies in the library. Everybody knows it's there, and if they want to go and refer to it, but nobody has
been following this as such, because we're just not that sophisticated. We're not that well educated and that's one of the things we're going to have to work on in the college, in this educational activity. That's what we're developing right now. I would expect this spring we'll spend a number of our workshops specifically viewing the techniques of long-range planning. Because the first round that we went through, everybody said, "Oh, I know how to do that." And then we got down to actually taking problems through the system, or an idea, and we're finding it is not working. Our structures are not correct. We have, for example, an academic senate which we're having some problems with. We shifted from a town-hall governance here where all the faculty went and everybody cast their vote, to a representative type governance structure, and we called it a planning system, which has caused more confusion. All this has come out, that we need to just sit down and go through our organizational structure and rework our committee definitions and those kinds of things, and we're working on that. It is a struggle that's going on at this particular point. Faculties, I think, universally are having some identity crises in institutions, especially in small ones. If you look at the unionization movements among the small colleges, because they can get together very easily and do something. I think their counterparts at the universities are looking at that very hard, too. Because they're saying "Where are we?" Because the students in the 60s certainly became the power, and management is the big thing on the college campus today and faculties are threatened by those two things. We've knocked them off their
pedestal. We've smashed up the pedestal. We just didn't knock them off, and we came to realize that last year in the analysis it became very evident that we have to be careful about that because we have always treated our faculty as equals, as peers, in our operation, but that's not how it is being read by the faculty. They're being looked at as subordinates. That's how they have looked at themselves. That's what they've told us.

Murray: Yes. That's the problem with an organization chart.

Dyba: And when we tend to talk about all this management, that is very threatening to them. Now the North Central timing was great because the North Central came in as an external evaluator, so to speak, and said "you have a problem here." We had recognized the problem. We told them. They didn't have to tell us. We told them. And they said, "Yes, your're right. Your faculty is very concerned about that and you had better focus on that." So that is what is going on right now. The element of a new president has slowed down the revision element here somewhat. In other words, the suggestions have been made and if I were the new president, I'd certainly want to spend time analyzing all the suggestions being brought to my desk before I start making decisions, because they're going to have a long-reaching impact. I think he trusts our judgment, but what I am saying is he's got to find out for himself whether what we're saying is correct, and I think we're appreciative of that. Had Fr. Daniels stayed on as president, through the result of this grant, I think we would have moved a lot of these things into operation at this point. I think that the rank and file, if I may use that term, at least the administration, is ready to make some of these changes. And I think what we are going to
have to do now is wait until the president is sure that that's the way we should do this. Because he wants to impose, I think, in the good sense of the word, his attitudes, his management philosophy. So his position has been essentially right now, our management philosophy right now is to operate as we have, not to make any changes, and we'll do that in the course of the year. So I see that we probably will lose maybe about six months in the timing that we are talking about in making some of the changes, but we seem to be adjusting to this pretty well. Our biggest headache, and I think that's going to be the problem, the evaluation. Whether we can honestly say that we know that we've changed and show data to prove that.

Murray: That's the big problem.

Dyba: It turns into a cooperative effort. In the AID plan, when we put it together, one of the elements was, in fact, one of the objectives is to increase our cooperative efforts with the college in the area in all fronts, not only instructional, but everything else, because we're in a formal consortium. As a matter of fact, that consortium of four colleges is going to be incorporated as a "not for profit" corporation right now. That's where it's at.

Murray: Who's in the consortium?

Dyba: Aurora, George Williams, North Central, and ourselves. And we have some fringe groups, or I shouldn't say groups, but they're not in the consortium, but they're working with us. Elmhurst, for example, is one that is actually sharing in some of the combined activities. Combined activities would include a student exchange program, a student here can take courses at the other three colleges with no additional charges excepting
for lab fees or something like that where there are hard dollar costs. We have a combined insurance program. Our health, life insurances are bought as a unit for the whole group. We've gone into that. We've done some other cooperative things, some faculty exchange is being worked on, cultural affairs are being combined, sports activities. There's some combination there, in fact, we just finished a tournament. There is a pretty good working relationship. It hasn't saved us any dollars. What it's done is give us more for our dollars. We're not really more cost efficient. We're much more effective, I think, than we were. So we built into our plan, greater cooperation, and as a matter of fact had thought that in the Administrative Refinement Activity what we would do is try to pick up the other personnel, but the government said no, no. Can't do that. You cannot spend this grant money and use it to sponsor consortium activities. That's out. There are certain guidelines and we couldn't use it for that. However, not using the federal money, we meet, we've got a parallel structure in the consortium, the Council of West Suburban Colleges is what it's called, where we do sit and exchange information. For example, one of the big things is what can be done but it's not being paid for by the grant. We have developed now, for three years, a unit cost study, for each institution on all instructional activities, and we compare them. We hold workshops on them to look as to not only how we're doing, but as to how everybody else is doing in relationship to us. The result of that is that we're talking about modifying some of our personnel needs and
combining efforts there. Instead of all of us having this kind of person, let’s have one individual or two individuals to handle this for the four schools. How successful they will be, it took a long time for the consortium to be born, it will take a long time to really be effective, but I think it is really the way to go. There’s a commitment to it by the trustees and by the president. The activities, in terms of the development programs, like you say here, we don’t have anything in a joint effort excepting what I call the casual byproduct of sitting down regularly with the other vice presidents, for example, the business managers getting together, and to me its an educational process because if you have to go to a meeting, you have your own little in-house, inbred ideas, and you have to share those with your colleagues in other institutions. It’s an educational program, a much finer one. And I pick their brains regularly when I go to those sessions, and we meet quite often. We talk about, for example, in terms of handbooks. We sat down and discussed our general policies concerning employees, and better ways of approaching this. We’ve talked about governance in the institutions. We’ve looked at the planning systems that are used in the four colleges. It hasn’t been done through a formal workshop. It’s been done through the informal meetings we have regularly, which are formal I suppose. So we’re in a cooperative area with what I would call management refinement and development. There is no formal program right now. However, as of last week, we are applying to the Kellogg Foundation for a grant for the consortium to develop a faculty development and an
administrative development program. All those books over there, and I've got a drawer full of them here dealing with all the various elements of this Administrative Refinement Program. But there is one, it's the development office's MBO System, a complete MBO for development. Wally Block put that together. He's the author. It's a really fine thing. And they do it. They do it in the professional way. Every week they meet to examine their objectives to see whether they're achieving them, what the alternatives are that they could choose from, and they have their annual assessment, they have their periodic assessment. Everybody has a fixed idea of where they're going. It's paying off. They're raising money that way. By MBO. And they're making a believer out of the rest of the institution. In other words, people are saying, "Hey, that must really work." Now Wally will tell you that they're missing on a lot of things, that they disappointed a lot of their achievements and success, but all the way up to the trustees they say, "Hey, that's a pretty neat idea that you guys have got working." So we got one unit of the college that's on an MBO, for their own choosing. And of course, Wally, because he's working on his MBA degree, he's going to have that shortly, and that's one of the things he got into there was MBO.

Murray: If you could just get people to focus on results rather than on activity.

Dyba: That's happening. Your question here, well to answer the point about cooperation. Well, we are now looking to a joint effort with the other three colleges in achieving a grant or funds to carry on a faculty development program, but
an administrative development program has two aspects to it, and it fits very nicely into what we're doing.

Our colleagues in the other three colleges are not involved to this degree with this activity. Some of them have gone through what they call their shake-ups or revisions or whatever they have, but then they settle down. I don't think it's a continuing activity, from what we can hear. I think they're interested in doing this from what I hear them doing. There's been a committee formed—one faculty member, one administrative person, and the deans—to put together this proposal. I guess we'll be sending somebody to Kansas City in January and try to get in on that grants program, because it's strictly for the consortium approach to developing people in administrative skills. They'll select, I think, 20 consortia, if I'm not wrong, to fund.

Murray: Cooperation among institutions is certainly one of the recommendations in my study.

Dyba: Yes, I think it would have to be. I think that's the next level to go to. I think you have to go beyond yourself to get some understanding of what's happening. Otherwise it's too narrow.

Murray: Just to be able to afford the variety of resources necessary to have a comprehensive effort.

Dyba: Well, we've got about, I should look to see what the total, what the bottom line, is for the Administrative Refinement Program, but the whole Optimal Resource Allocation Program itself, that budget's got to be worth a third of a million dollars or something like that. Now that includes hardware
and operational costs, salaries, and everything else for three years, but without that we'd be still looking for pencils and paper to start putting down ideas on the paper. And I don't know how well we've progressed with that. Your last point about what is the level of commitment of a chief executive officer to executive development. Very high. Our man just came off that Harvard Program for six weeks, and has come out of management. Dr. Becker is an interesting person. He is a manager and an educator, which is a real combination. His doctorate is in chemical engineering, but he has been with the Bunko-Ramey Corporation for 14 years as a manager, traveled the world in management. The president of his own corporation, which is a consulting firm on management or something along those lines, has been a trustee here for three years, had children going to the college, and just traded places. Our former president, Fr. Daniel, became Chairman of the Board of Trustees. Now there, I think, is a unique move in management development or personnel or administrative development. In fact, there's a grant proposal someplace in all these piles. The Association of Governing Boards is looking at unique ideas about dealing with governing boards. We think that's pretty unique that we pulled a trustee down to be a president and moved the president up to be a trustee.

Murray: With those two, who's the chief executive officer?
Dyba: Dr. Becker, the president. Fr. Daniel is the Chairman of the Board of Trustees and only functions in that capacity when he sits with the Board.

Murray: Not in the administration, just the college.
Dyba: Not in the college. He's in the administration of the college. Of course, the reason he went off to do that because of the capital funding raising campaign. We had to free somebody to do that that could devote all his energies. Fr. Daniel was the most logical person because he's got all the contacts.

Murray: Thank you, Mr. Dyba.
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I. Program Philosophy and Objective

An effective administrative development philosophy is characterized by concern for the development of individuals, a deep conviction as to the worth of every individual, and faith that people will make the right decisions for themselves and the organization if motivated by access to necessary information and support. Program should stress the importance of building an educative environment in an institution/organization, concern with helping people learn and grow professionally as they go about their jobs. Knowles suggests four basic conditions of an educative environment involved in the education of adults. They are:

1. Respect for personality
2. Participation in decision-making
3. Freedom of expression and availability of information
4. Mutuality of responsibility in defining goals, planning and conducting activities and evaluating.

II. Building an Educative Environment

One thing stands out about adult learning, that is that a self-diagnosed need for a learning process provides a greater motivation to learning than an externally diagnosed need. We have concluded that managers are self-directing adults who can best identify their best training needs. We perceive them as a source for designing an adult education program to meet
those needs. We recognize that as participants in the adult education process, it is essential that managers be involved in the development of the program from the very beginning. Exhibit 2 was designed as a self-diagnosis tool. It could be included as a check list of typical development needs to stimulate managers' thinking. Space must always be provided for managers to add more of their personal ideas.

III. Group Commitment

The questionnaire (Exhibit 2) serves an additional purpose. Final question on Exhibit 2 was to request their willingness to participate in further need clarification, prioritizing and refinement of a program responsive to those needs. Throughout this process, it is important that top management be kept informed of what is happening. Program success clearly depends upon the commitment, support and some sense of ownership. There should be little doubt in anyone's mind that a successful program must have the backing of the people who make the financial decisions as well as commitment from the people who will directly benefit from the program.

IV. Group Action Stage

During this stage, carefully selected committee members clarify, refine, prioritize and set individual program objectives for each session. In addition, they design the implementation program approach; that is, what necessary preparation is needed by each individual such as background reading, self-analysis, etc. Time frames, discussion periods, program approach, are finalized. The individual responsible is assigned for each
program session.

V. The Implementation Stage

Program notices printed and sent out, time blocks set aside, implementation of the program begins, critique of program approach follows each session, evaluation is undertaken immediately.

VI. Suggested Administrative Staff Development Topics

(See overlays)

VII. 1975-76 Administrative Staff Development Program - Harper College

(See overlays)
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ADMINISTRATIVE STAFF PROGRAM DEVELOPMENT

PRELIMINARY STAGE

1. Define Program Objectives and Philosophy
2. Lay Groundwork for Educative Environment: Need Identification
3. Develop Group Commitment to Process

GROUP ACTION STAGE

1. Clarify and Prioritize Needs Through Committee Action
2. Set Individual Program Objectives and Design Individual Program Approach

IMPLEMENTATION STAGE

1. Implement
2. Critique Program Approach
3. Evaluate Results

EXHIBIT 1
MANAGERIAL SKILL DEVELOPMENT

CHECK ITEMS WHICH INCLUDE YOUR NEEDS:

___ INCREASED SKILL IN CONDUCTING PERFORMANCE APPRAISALS AND PROVIDING SUGGESTIONS FOR YOUR EMPLOYEES' CONTINUED GROWTH AND DEVELOPMENT

___ MORE KNOWLEDGE ABOUT COMPENSATION PRACTICES AND PROCEDURES

___ A BETTER UNDERSTANDING OF PROMOTION AND PLACEMENT SYSTEMS

___ INCREASED ABILITY TO ASSIST YOUR EMPLOYEES WITH DETERMINING CAREER PATHS AND WITH DEVELOPING ACTION PLANS FOR ACHIEVING CAREER GOALS

___ IMPROVED DECISION MAKING AND PROBLEM SOLVING ABILITY

___ A BETTER UNDERSTANDING OF MANAGERIAL AND LEADERSHIP STYLES

___ GREATER SENSITIVITY TO OTHERS AND MORE EFFECTIVE INTERPERSONAL SKILLS

___ MORE KNOWLEDGE ABOUT TECHNIQUES FOR WORK PLANNING AND GOAL SETTING

___ INCREASED UNDERSTANDING OF TEAM BUILDING AND MOTIVATION TECHNIQUES

___ IMPROVED COMMUNICATION SKILLS INCLUDING ORAL, WRITTEN AND LISTENING ABILITY

___ MORE INFORMATION ABOUT THE FINANCIAL ASPECTS OF MANAGEMENT SUCH AS COST SAVINGS, MANPOWER PLANNING AND BUDGET REVIEWS

___ INCREASED KNOWLEDGE OF EMPLOYEE BENEFITS

___ IMPROVED INTERVIEWING, EVALUATING AND ASSESSMENT ABILITY

___ BETTER PLANNING AND ORGANIZATION SKILLS

___ EFFECTIVE PERSONNEL PRACTICES IN AN ORGANIZATION.

PLEASE INDICATE OTHER AREAS OF INTEREST AND NEEDS --

WOULD YOU BE WILLING TO WORK WITH OTHERS TO FURTHER DEFINE MANAGERIAL SKILLS NEEDS AND TO HELP DEVELOP A MEANINGFUL PROGRAM WHICH WOULD RESPOND TO THOSE NEEDS? (PLEASE CHECK ___ YES ___ NO).

NAME: ________________________________________________________________

EXHIBIT 2
ADMINISTRATIVE STAFF DEVELOPMENT TOPICS

I. The role and definition of a manager
II. Delegation of authority
III. Effective management of time
IV. Coaching and development
V. Interviewing and selection of personnel
VI. The appraisal process
VII. Management systems
   PBBS
   PERT
   MBO
   OD

VIII. Effective decision making
IX. Conflict resolution - problem solving
X. Organization vs individuals (diverse motivational forces)

XI. The reinforcement of creative behavior for building creative organizations

XII. Research and evaluation techniques
   Experimental Design, Methods of Research, Sampling, Effective Measurement Techniques, etc.

XIII. Effective wage and salary administration

XIV. Collective negotiations

XV. The long-range planning process

XVI. Effective budgeting procedures

XVII. The personnel functions - centralized

XVIII. Updating the appraisal process

XIX. Personalized financial planning

XX. The personnel function in a collective bargaining environment

XXI. Physical fitness for managers

XXII. Impact of state and federal regulations on higher education -- EEOC, OSHA, etc.

XXIII. Instructional delivery systems - present and future

XXIV. Techniques for analysis and response to community needs

XXV. Teaching faculty evaluation systems

XXVI. Changing patterns of governance on campus
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ADMINISTRATIVE DEVELOPMENT PROGRAM

1975--76 (Revised)

I. PROGRAM

A. The Long-range Planning Process

December 1975

B. The Role of a Manager and Its Relationships to the Harper Management Appraisal Program

Feb. 23, 1976
Norm Allhiser

C. Collective Bargaining and Contemporary Case Law Briefing

Mar. 30, 1976
Ted Clarke

D. Personalized Financial Planning

May 14, 1976
Jack Gallas, Executive Vice President
LaSalle National Bank
William Von Der Heide, Vice Pres., Trust Counsel
LaSalle National Bank

E. Planning a Personal Physical Fitness Program

May 24, 1976
Philip Wilson, Director
Human Performance Laboratory
LaCrosse Cardiac Rehabilitation Program
University of Wisconsin - LaCrosse

F. Understanding A Comprehensive College Personnel Program

June 3, 1976
John Martin
Vice President for Personnel, Rutgers Univ., New Brunswick, N.J.
II. OBJECTIVES

As a result of attending this session, each member will:

A. Long Range Planning Process
   1. Understand a common definition and purpose of long range planning,
   2. Understand the optimum management style and basic criteria essential to effective long range planning
   3. Understand and be able to apply basic guidelines to the implementation of long range planning process
   4. Review and discuss a long range planning model applicable to the management of Harper College.

B. The Role of a Manager and Its Relationships to the Harper Management Appraisal Program
   1. Have a clearer concept of professional management and the professional manager
   2. Be able to identify and understand the functions of a manager and relate their applicability to their Harper jobs
   3. Understand the consultative management approach and its applicability to the Harper educational environment
   4. Be able to relate managerial functions of their job and their direct application to the Harper management appraisal system

C. Collective Bargaining and Contemporary Case Law Briefing
   1. Hear a review of the status of collective bargaining in Ill.
   2. Hear a review of the most recent and significant state and federal case laws effective higher education
II. OBJECTIVES (cont.)

C. COLLECTIVE BARGAINING AND CONTEMPORARY CASE LAW BRIEFING (cont.)


4. Be better able to manage in non-union environment.

D. UNDERSTANDING A COMPREHENSIVE COLLEGE PERSONNEL PROGRAM

1. Be able to identify and understand the components of a comprehensive collegiate personnel office.

2. Develop a clear understanding of the role and function of the Personnel Director and his staff.

3. Be able to more effectively interface with the personnel office on appropriate personnel matters.


E. PERSONALIZED FINANCIAL PLANNING

1. Be able to recognize and understand the elements of effective estate planning.

2. Be able to apply the principles to their personal estate planning process.

3. Be able to better perform a personal family situation analysis.

4. Be able to do an inventory and lay out a long-range estate plan.
II. OBJECTIVES (cont.)

F. PLANNING A PERSONAL PHYSICAL FITNESS PROGRAM

1. Be more sensitive to the relationship of good physical fitness and effective managerial performance

2. Be better able to better evaluate their own physical fitness

3. Be better able to relate their physical fitness to the Harper management physical examination program

4. Be able to engage more effectively in a continuous physical fitness evaluation on himself and plan a physical fitness program designed to his status.
APPENDIX IX
**EVALUATION FORM**

**Presenter's Name** ___________  **Date** ___________  **Seminar** 261

**A. SUBJECT CONTENT**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TO MUCH</th>
<th>BALANCED</th>
<th>NOT ENOUGH</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Теоретическое</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Практическое</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Comments**

**B. SUBJECT LEVEL**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TOO ELEMENTARY</th>
<th>JUST RIGHT</th>
<th>TOO ADVANCED</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Comments**

**C. PRESENTATION**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EFFECTIVE</th>
<th>SOMEWHAT EFFECTIVE</th>
<th>NOT EFFECTIVE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Умение общаться</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Подчеркивание ключевых моментов</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Визуальные пособия (если использовались)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Материал в виде листовки (если использовались)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Comments**

**D. PLEASE RECORD YOUR OVERALL REACTIONS TO THIS SPEAKER BY PLACING AN "X" IN THE APPROPRIATE BOX ON THE SCALE**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Excellent</th>
<th>Good</th>
<th>Fair</th>
<th>Poor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**E. OTHER SUGGESTIONS FOR IMPROVEMENT WOULD BE APPRECIATED**

**F. OTHER COMMENTS**

---

PR & BD Fl: B74 328x MAR74
HARPER COLLEGE, PALATINE, ILLINOIS
# WORKSHOP EVALUATION

**Subject**

## 1. What was your attitude on the subject?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Before Session</th>
<th>After Session</th>
<th>Explanation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Enthusiastic</td>
<td>Very Well</td>
<td>Too Detailed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interested</td>
<td>Quite Well</td>
<td>Right Amount of Detail</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slightly Interested</td>
<td>Some-What</td>
<td>Not Enough Detail</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Interested</td>
<td>Very Little</td>
<td>Difficult to Follow</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## 2. Did leader illustrate & clarify important points?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Before Session</th>
<th>After Session</th>
<th>Explanation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Enthusiastic</td>
<td>Very Well</td>
<td>Too Detailed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interested</td>
<td>Quite Well</td>
<td>Right Amount of Detail</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slightly Interested</td>
<td>Some-What</td>
<td>Not Enough Detail</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Interested</td>
<td>Very Little</td>
<td>Difficult to Follow</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## 3. In your opinion was the subject matter important?

- Very Much
- Quite a Bit
- Some-What
- Very Little

## 4. Were the objectives stated clearly at the beginning?

- Completely
- Partially
- Not At All

## 5. Was the session interesting and informative?

- Very Much
- Quite a Bit
- Some-What
- Very Little

## 6. Did you feel free to ask questions?

- Completely
- Partially
- Not At All

## 7. Did the leader effectively summarize & relate material to the stated objectives?

- Completely
- Partially
- Not At All

## 8. List any subject matter that you feel could have been excluded, expended, or made more interesting or meaningful.

## 9. Describe the part of the session that you feel was most helpful to you as an individual.

## 10. What changes or additions to this part of your training would you suggest?
1. What is your overall rating of the program? (Program content)
   Excellent____ Very Good____ Good____ Fair____ Poor____
   Comments and suggestions for improving future programs of this kind:
   Add:
   Delete:
   Other Suggestions:

2. To what extent do you believe this program is useful to you as an administrator?
   Significantly____ Considerably____ Sufficiently____ Barely____
   How could the program be altered to better meet your needs and expectations?

3. The overall quality of instruction was:
   Excellent____ Very Good____ Good____ Fair____ Poor____

4. How would you rate the materials used in the program?
   Excellent____ Very Good____ Good____ Fair____ Poor____
   Comments on materials:

5. How would you rate the facilities used for the program?
   Excellent____ Very Good____ Good____ Fair____ Poor____

6. What other topics would you like to see addressed in future programs?

7. On the reverse side, give any other comments you care to make about the program.
APPENDIX X
APPENDIX X

TOPICS INCLUDED IN EXECUTIVE DEVELOPMENT PROGRAMS OF COLLEGES PARTICIPATING IN THE STUDY*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>College Code</th>
<th>I</th>
<th>II</th>
<th>III</th>
<th>IV</th>
<th>V</th>
<th>VI</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>XXX</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>XX</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K</td>
<td>XXX</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>XX</td>
<td>XX</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>XXX</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>XXX</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>XXX</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W</td>
<td>XXX</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CC</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DD</td>
<td>XX</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>XXX</td>
<td>XX</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*To read this table, refer to questionnaire included as part of Appendix III. The colleges are identified by letter code at the left of the table. The topics included in each program are identified by Roman Numerals and letters as stated in the questionnaire.
APPENDIX X -- Continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>College</th>
<th>VII</th>
<th>VIII</th>
<th>IX</th>
<th>X</th>
<th>XI</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>XX</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>XX</td>
<td>XX</td>
<td>XX</td>
<td>XX</td>
<td>XX</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>XX</td>
<td>XX</td>
<td>XX</td>
<td>XX</td>
<td>XX</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K</td>
<td>XXX</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>XX</td>
<td>XX</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>XX</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>XX</td>
<td>XX</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R</td>
<td>XXX</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>XX</td>
<td>XX</td>
<td>XX</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T</td>
<td>XX</td>
<td>XX</td>
<td>XX</td>
<td>XX</td>
<td>XX</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V</td>
<td>XXX</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>XX</td>
<td>XX</td>
<td>XX</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W</td>
<td>XX</td>
<td>XXX</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>XX</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y</td>
<td>XX</td>
<td>XX</td>
<td>XX</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CC</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>XX</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DD</td>
<td>XX</td>
<td>XX</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>XX</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### APPENDIX X -- Continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>College Code</th>
<th>XII</th>
<th>XIII</th>
<th>XIV</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X X X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X X X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T</td>
<td>X X X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
<td>X X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DD</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
RATINGS OF TRAINING DIRECTORS ON EFFECTIVENESS OF ALTERNATIVE TRAINING METHODS FOR VARIOUS TRAINING OBJECTIVES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Training Method</th>
<th>Knowledge Acquisition Mean</th>
<th>Changing Attitudes Mean</th>
<th>Problem Solving Skills Mean</th>
<th>Interpersonal Skills Mean</th>
<th>Participant Acceptance Mean</th>
<th>Knowledge Retention Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mean Rank</td>
<td>Mean Rank</td>
<td>Mean Rank</td>
<td>Mean Rank</td>
<td>Mean Rank</td>
<td>Mean Rank</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Case Study</td>
<td>3.56&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt; 2</td>
<td>3.43&lt;sup&gt;d&lt;/sup&gt; 4**</td>
<td>3.69&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt; 1**</td>
<td>3.02&lt;sup&gt;d&lt;/sup&gt; 4</td>
<td>3.80&lt;sup&gt;d&lt;/sup&gt; 2*</td>
<td>3.48&lt;sup&gt;e&lt;/sup&gt; 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conference Method</td>
<td>3.33&lt;sup&gt;d&lt;/sup&gt; 3**</td>
<td>3.54&lt;sup&gt;d&lt;/sup&gt; 3*</td>
<td>3.26&lt;sup&gt;e&lt;/sup&gt; 4</td>
<td>3.21&lt;sup&gt;d&lt;/sup&gt; 3</td>
<td>4.16&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt; 1</td>
<td>3.32&lt;sup&gt;f&lt;/sup&gt; 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lecture (with questions)</td>
<td>2.53 9*</td>
<td>2.20 8</td>
<td>2.00 9</td>
<td>1.90 8</td>
<td>2.74 8</td>
<td>2.49 8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business Games</td>
<td>3.00 6</td>
<td>2.73&lt;sup&gt;f&lt;/sup&gt; 5</td>
<td>3.58&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt; 2</td>
<td>2.50&lt;sup&gt;e&lt;/sup&gt; 5</td>
<td>3.78&lt;sup&gt;d&lt;/sup&gt; 3</td>
<td>3.26&lt;sup&gt;f&lt;/sup&gt; 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Movie Films</td>
<td>3.16&lt;sup&gt;e&lt;/sup&gt; 4</td>
<td>2.50&lt;sup&gt;f&lt;/sup&gt; 6</td>
<td>2.24&lt;sup&gt;g&lt;/sup&gt; 7</td>
<td>2.19&lt;sup&gt;g&lt;/sup&gt; 6</td>
<td>3.44&lt;sup&gt;e&lt;/sup&gt; 5</td>
<td>2.67&lt;sup&gt;h&lt;/sup&gt; 7*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Programmed Instruction</td>
<td>4.03&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt; 1</td>
<td>2.22&lt;sup&gt;h&lt;/sup&gt; 7</td>
<td>2.56&lt;sup&gt;f&lt;/sup&gt; 6</td>
<td>2.11&lt;sup&gt;g&lt;/sup&gt; 7**</td>
<td>3.28&lt;sup&gt;e&lt;/sup&gt; 7</td>
<td>3.74&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt; 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Role Playing</td>
<td>2.93 7</td>
<td>3.56&lt;sup&gt;d&lt;/sup&gt; 2</td>
<td>3.27&lt;sup&gt;e&lt;/sup&gt; 3</td>
<td>3.68&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt; 2</td>
<td>3.56&lt;sup&gt;e&lt;/sup&gt; 4</td>
<td>3.37&lt;sup&gt;f&lt;/sup&gt; 4**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sensitivity Training</td>
<td>2.77 8</td>
<td>3.96&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt; 1</td>
<td>2.98&lt;sup&gt;e&lt;/sup&gt; 5*</td>
<td>3.95&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt; 1*</td>
<td>3.33&lt;sup&gt;e&lt;/sup&gt; 6</td>
<td>3.44&lt;sup&gt;f&lt;/sup&gt; 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Television Lecture</td>
<td>3.10&lt;sup&gt;e&lt;/sup&gt; 5</td>
<td>1.99 9</td>
<td>2.01 8</td>
<td>1.81 9</td>
<td>2.74 9**</td>
<td>2.47 9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<sup>a</sup>More effective than methods ranked 2 to 9 for this objective at .01 level of significance
<sup>b</sup>More effective than methods ranked 3 to 9 for this objective at .01 level of significance
<sup>c</sup>More effective than methods ranked 4 to 9 for this objective at .01 level of significance
<sup>d</sup>More effective than methods ranked 5 to 9 for this objective at .01 level of significance
<sup>e</sup>More effective than methods ranked 6 to 9 for this objective at .01 level of significance
<sup>f</sup>More effective than methods ranked 7 to 9 for this objective at .01 level of significance
<sup>g</sup>More effective than methods ranked 8 to 9 for this objective at .01 level of significance
<sup>h</sup>More effective than methods ranked 9 for this objective at .01 level of significance.
*Lowest degree of agreement on effectiveness (highest standard deviation)

**Highest degree of agreement on effectiveness (lowest standard deviation)
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