This is to certify that the

dissertation entitled

Middle Management and the Small College: An Analysis of the Evolution, Organization, and Condition of Professional Administration at Seven Small, Independent, Liberal Arts Colleges in the Great Lakes Region

presented by

William Paul Potter

has been accepted towards fulfillment of the requirements for

Ph.D. degree in Education

Major professor

Date October 27, 1992

PLACE IN RETURN BOX to remove this checkout from your record.
TO AVOID FINES return on or before date due.

DATE DUE	DATE DUE	DATE DUE
JAN 2 4 1998 [illegible]		
MAY 2 5 1998		

MSU Is An Affirmative Action/Equal Opportunity Institution
c:\circ\datedue.pm3-p.1

MIDDLE MANAGEMENT AND THE SMALL COLLEGE: AN ANALYSIS OF THE EVOLUTION, ORGANIZATION, AND CONDITION OF PROFESSIONAL ADMINISTRATION AT SEVEN SMALL, INDEPENDENT, LIBERAL ARTS COLLEGES IN THE GREAT LAKES REGION

By

William Paul Potter

A DISSERTATION

Submitted to
Michigan State University
in partial fulfillment of the requirements
for the degree of

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

Department of Educational Administration

1992

ABSTRACT

MIDDLE MANAGEMENT AND THE SMALL COLLEGE:
AN ANALYSIS OF THE EVOLUTION, ORGANIZATION, AND CONDITION
OF PROFESSIONAL ADMINISTRATION AT SEVEN SMALL, INDEPENDENT,
LIBERAL ARTS COLLEGES IN THE GREAT LAKES REGION

By

William Paul Potter

The researcher's purpose in this study was to examine the extent to which, if any, small independent, liberal arts colleges have experienced growth in middle management administrative positions between 1970 and 1990. Included in this examination are the reasons for adding staff, the impact of staff growth on the institution, and the place of middle management among institutional priorities and policies.

Research about middle management growth was based on the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission's (Grassmuck 1990) definition of "other professionals" -- those who are employed for the purpose of performing academic support, student service, and institutional support activities and whose jobs require degrees but do not involve teaching or research as a primary responsibility. Moreover, the growth phenomenon was examined using the concept of the "administrative lattice" developed by Robert Zemsky and William Massy (1990). This theory attributes middle management growth to a variety of causes and suggests that the increased support staffing has expanded both vertically and horizontally along the table of organization so as to resemble a plant growing on a trellis or lattice.

Using the case-study method of research, the author visited the campuses of seven small, independent, liberal arts colleges in the Great Lakes region in order to collect data from institutional sources, develop a data base about middle management for each

institution, and interview key managers and faculty. The research results demonstrated that each of the seven colleges experienced growth parallel to the national rate portrayed by figures for all of higher education. Moreover, at all seven colleges, departments were both added and expanded in size resulting in the lattice effect of vertical and horizontal expansion. Finally, this research suggests that many small, independent, liberal arts colleges have not addressed the concerns of middle managers about contractual status, performance appraisal, involvement in governance, formal recognition for achievements, and provision of professional development opportunities.

To the 343,699 "other professionals."

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

If there is one thing to be learned from an undertaking such as this one, it is that nobody walks alone. And, although the dissertation is indeed lonely work, I would like to acknowledge here those who enabled me to do this work. First, I am greatly indebted to my supervisors, both past and present, at Alma College including Presidents Alan J. Stone and Oscar E. Remick, the late Provost Ronald O. Kapp, and especially to Provost Ann Stuart -- a true mentor and friend. Second, I would like to thank the graduate faculty in the College of Education at Michigan State University who raised my consciousness, my motivation, and my self-esteem by their guidance in and out of class. I am especially grateful to the members of my dissertation committee -- Dr. Max Raines, Dr. Samuel Moore, Dr. Keith Anderson, and director Dr. Marvin Grandstaff -- for their contributions to this work. Third, I appreciate the willingness of my seven case study sites to participate in this project and to provide the staff time and data necessary for the study. Fourth, I am most thankful for the hard work of Becky Everitt who typed this manuscript with great care and interest. And finally, I thank my wife, Nancy, and our four sons, for their support and understanding during the past two years.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

Chapter One

Overview of the Study

Statement of the Problem

"Big Increases in Academic-Support Staffs Prompt Growing Concerns on Campuses" blared the Chronicle of Higher Education in a recent front-page story. The ensuing article showed that during the fifteen-year period from 1975 to 1990, the employment of "other professionals" at American colleges and universities had increased by 106.4%, more than seven times the 15% growth rate for full-time faculty members (Grassmuck 1991). The fact that higher education's weekly regarded this item newsworthy represented the culmination of more than thirty years of speculation about the phenomenon of "administrative bloat," ranging from simple attribution to Parkinson's Law[1] to scholarly examinations of staffing trends.

As early as 1958, writing under an assumed name for the New York Times Magazine, John Q. Academesis observed that the

> most striking change in American higher education during the past generation has been not the increase in the proportion of young people going to college . . . , nor the increased number of imposing buildings and other physical facilities . . . , nor the proliferation of courses. . . . Towering over all has been the phenomenal growth of administrative personnel. This largely nonteaching bureaucracy which has shot up like a child with abnormal glands, today equals, at some institutions, the number and cost of the teaching staff (Academesis 1958).

---

1 C. Northcote Parkinson asserted that "Work expands so as to fill the time available for its completion. . . . Granted that work (and especially paperwork) is thus elastic in its demands on time, it is manifest that there need be little or no relationship between the work to be done and the size of the staff to which it may be assigned" (Parkinson 1957).

By the late 1960s, Jacques Barzun, Columbia's philosopher-provost, wrote: "Unsympathetic observers who have noted the recent mushrooming of officialdom in our universities have often concluded that the growth is but another illustration of Parkinson's Law" (Barzun 1968). Although attractive as a timely and catchy explanation for the addition of administrative positions throughout society in the 1950s and 1960s, the use of Parkinson's Law was really a deceptively simplistic (and perhaps cynical) argument which served only to call attention to a change. Absent was a careful analysis of the reasons for the change and the effects of the change on colleges and universities.

During the late 1960s and 1970s, however, the phenomenon had become easily recognized and was subjected to closer scrutiny. Robert Scott, a pioneer in the study of middle management in higher education, concluded in 1978 that administration, once presumed to support the major activities of the institution, had itself become one of the major activities with the emphasis shifting from service to control of budget, accounting, and personnel procedures (Scott 1978). A decade later, Robert Birnbaum observed that the "days of amateur administration when faculty temporarily assumed administrative positions and then returned to the classroom are long since over" as institutions become larger and more complex and require specialized knowledge about legal precedents, federal regulations, grant and contract administration, financial aid procedures, and management information systems (Birnbaum 1988). These studies helped explain the addition of administrative jobs at comprehensive universities with ever-expanding enrollments and missions, but left unexamined the movement of the phenomenon to smaller, more traditional colleges.

The declining enrollments and limited budgets of the past decade have encouraged one recent observer to begin to correct that oversight. Although the only available staffing statistics from the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission (EEOC) do not sort data according to institutional type or size, Robert Zemsky (1990) has inferred from the general results that even small colleges have increased professional staffs with no appreciable change in the size of the faculty. To date, however, there are no published studies about the growth of middle management at small, independent, liberal arts colleges. This dissertation is intended to fill that void.

Purpose of the Study

The researcher proposes to examine the extent to which small, independent, liberal arts colleges have experienced growth in middle management administrative positions during the past two decades. In the course of this examination, a number of related issues will be addressed. First, the researcher will review the likely reasons for the addition of these new positions. Second, the research results will be reviewed to show the impact of staff growth on student-to-staff ratios and budget ratios. Third, the data will be analyzed to show both when and where positions were added at the institutions under study. Fourth, the researcher will explore the ways in which the institutions have elected to incorporate the new class of professionals into the organization. And, finally, the researcher will assess the meaning of these changes for those colleges.

Exploratory questions to be addressed include those listed below:

1. How can the growth of small college middle management employees best be measured?
    a) By the raw number of appointments per academic year?
    b) By a ratio of students to administration?
    c) By a comparison of student-to-staff ratios?

d) By the proportion of budget dollars committed to middle management salaries?

2. Have small, independent, liberal arts colleges experienced growth in administrative staff positions since 1970?

   a) How much bigger are they?

   b) When did the growth occur?

   c) What kinds of positions have been added?

3. How has the middle management phenomenon manifested itself at small colleges?

   a) Has the level of job specialization increased?

   b) Have new areas of administration emerged?

   c) Did existing management areas expand or add layers?

   d) Has the level of training required changed?

   e) Has the amount of experience required changed?

4. How has the condition of small college administration changed since 1970?

   a) How are middle management staff classified by the institutions under study?

   b) Do the institutions under study provide explicit guidelines for the appointment, reappointment, and termination of middle management staff?

   c) Do the institutions under study provide funding and opportunities for the professional development of middle management staff?

   d) How are middle managers involved in institutional governance?

Conceptual Bases for the Study

In order to undertake this study in an effective manner, it is critical to establish 1) a clear definition of the concept of middle management, 2) a concise description of the institutional context of the small private college, and 3) an explanation of the "administrative lattice," the theoretical framework used for this study.

Middle Management. Early definitions of middle management can be found in literature from business and industry experts during the 1960s and 1970s. Pfiffner and Sherwood (1960) defined middle management as a generic term that "includes the echelons of leadership immediately below those of top production management." Fifteen years later, another business and industry expert, Emmanuel Kay, wrote that middle managers are those who basically manage other managers and supervisors (Kay 1974). Both of these definitions were adequate to address the middle management explosion in manufacturing-oriented industries and provided a solid foundation for consideration of such positions in colleges and universities.

In the initial study of middle management in higher education, Robert A. Scott asserted that mid-level collegiate administrators were "the deans and directors of support services to whom their assistants and first-line, most often non-exempt,[2] supervisors report, and who themselves report to or are an officer at the vice-presidential level" (Scott 1978). That Scott's definition closely paralleled the business definition offered by Kay is clear. Scott simply substituted the higher education labels of "dean" and "director" for the business and industry term "middle manager." Although this definition works well for large

---

[2] Non-exempt employees are those who are covered by the minimum wage and overtime provisions of the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938. They are typically hourly employees (Bouchard 1981).

universities with several layers of management positions in almost every department, it is not appropriate for small, independent, liberal arts colleges where deans and directors usually supervise exempt (or hourly) staff -- not other administrators.

In 1975, however, at about the time of Scott's analysis, the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission began to collect data and generate statistics about various staff categories in higher education. This research was conducted to check for compliance with Executive Orders 11246 and 11375 and the Equal Opportunity Act of 1972, all of which forbade agencies contracting with the federal government to discriminate on the basis of race, color, religion, sex, or national origin (Johnson and Hutchison 1990). The resulting reports, known as EEO-6 Reports, tallied the number of people employed in different job categories according to the named demographic categories as defined by the EEOC. Because of the great care taken to distinguish among those job categories and because of the uniformity of the categories from institution to institution, the EEOC definition for "other professionals" has been adopted to define middle management for the purposes of this study. **The Equal Employment Opportunity Commission has designated middle managers as those "other professionals" whose jobs require degrees but do not involve teaching or research as a primary responsibility.** This job category includes those who "are employed for the purpose of performing academic support, student service, and institutional support activities" (Grassmuck 1990).

Institutional Context. Also significant for the purpose of this study is an understanding of the institutional context in which the concept of middle management will be examined -- the small, independent, liberal arts college.

In higher education, **"small"** usually refers to student enrollment size. There are no generally accepted norms for the categorization by size of colleges and universities. It is a relative term. However, for this study, "small" shall be defined in terms of undergraduate enrollment equal to or less than 3,000 students.

American colleges and universities are categorized according to locus of control, public or private, as well as by size. Private or "independent" institutions are those which are operated by an independent board of control, not by local, state, or federal governments.

"Liberal arts" refers to an institutional type as categorized by the Carnegie Commission on higher education. Included here are those institutions which are classified by that body as Liberal Arts I or Liberal Arts II. While inclusion in either category is based on a subjective judgement by the Carnegie Commission, these schools typically include in their number those highly selective and selective, baccalaureate-granting colleges whose graduating classes consist primarily of students who major in the arts and sciences (Carnegie Council on Policy Studies 1976).

And finally, the geographical focus of the study is the Great Lakes Region. The pool of small, independent, liberal arts colleges in that area includes both Liberal Arts I and II, church-related and non-denominational, and a variety of enrollment sizes below 3,000 students. A group of seven institutions which were representative of the regional population and which would contribute to a meaningful examination of the subject was identified and permission to conduct research was secured.

Theoretical Framework. In "The Lattice and the Rachet" (1990), Robert Zemsky and William Massy attributed the phenomenal increase in middle management to four factors -- faculty abdication of traditional responsibilities, governmental regulation, the movement toward consensus management, and administrative entrepreneurism. The combined effect of these factors was the expansion of administrative and academic support staffing, both vertically and horizontally, along the table of organization so as to resemble a trellis or lattice.

Consider first the changing role of faculty during the past few decades. Prior to the 1960s, faculty were ubiquitous on the campus -- teaching, advising, coaching, recruiting, governing, and researching or performing. Since that time, faculty energies have tended to focus on the now conventional trinity of teaching, service, and research -- leaving many of the former responsibilities to non-faculty specialists (i.e., middle managers).

During the same period of time, state and federal dictates dramatically increased the paperwork, procedures, and staff needed to accomplish organizational goals. The advent of the alphabet soup of regulatory agencies including OSHA, EEOC, FERPA, and IPEDS has created a need for micromanagement and has not demonstrably affected program quality.

Administrative entrepreneurism (also known as empire building), although not a new phenomenon on most college campuses, was elevated to an art form as the expert specialists took ownership of the jobs abdicated by the faculty and created by governmental regulations, introduced a sense of professionalism to what had been amateur functions, and came to expect that their success would be rewarded with increased responsibilities and staff. Personal advancement, after all, necessitated a constantly expanding base.

Add to this mix the simultaneous transition to consensus management which assigned planning and decision-making to groups with representation from every quarter of the campus. Although this process helped assure satisfactory achievement of administrative objectives, it also guaranteed protection of the organizational status quo by its representative nature.

As Zemsky and Massy have observed, each of these factors alone probably contributed to increased organizational corpulence and costs. It is also the case, however, that each factor fed the others. The need to comply with state and federal statutes made obsolete the "ubiquitous" professor. The addition of a new class of professionals to the campus population necessitated their inclusion in the governance process. Greater attention by faculty to scholarship and service meant leaving even more mundane tasks to be absorbed by the increasing ranks of middle managers.

With each of these changes, jobs became more specialized, positions were added, staffs grew, and entirely new departments were created. The phenomenal growth in middle management in higher education was not the result of simple layering. Rather, the changes affected both the breadth and the depth of the organizational structure. For this reason, the administrative lattice is the appropriate theoretical framework from which to analyze the growth of middle management at small, independent colleges in the Great Lakes region.

Method of Inquiry

The case study method of research has been selected for this project. Given the objectives of the research, there are several reasons to support this approach. According to Robert Yin, case study is well suited to the consideration of 'how' or 'why' questions involving contemporary events over which the investigation has little control (Yin 1987). The subject of middle management in higher education is relatively new and so there is not very much data published or even available in raw form. Similarly, the relative absence of published studies about institutional policies and procedures regarding middle managers necessitates basic research in organizational publications. Thus, exploratory work regarding factual data is needed. Case study methodology permits such exploratory level research to describe or explain an event (Kerlinger 1964).

Program of Inquiry

The data for this study were gathered in three ways: archival work, development of institutional data bases, and interviews with faculty and administration.

Archival Research. In order to prepare responses to several of the exploratory questions posed in this chapter, it was necessary to collect information from various institutional sources. Included among those documents were personnel reports, enrollment reports, audited budget reports, tables of organization, job descriptions, and employee manuals or handbooks. To achieve reliable and comparable numerical data about staffing, enrollment, and budget, the research relied on reports filed with government offices -- especially IPEDS reports. Information regarding the structure and culture of the institutions was most usually available in their own publications.

Development of Data Bases. Upon completion of this basic research, a data base was prepared incorporating key elements to permit the calculation of the various ratios and growth rates. Another less quantitative data base was prepared to facilitate the comparisons of positions added, new areas of administration, changes in training and experience requirements, middle management classifications, terms of appointment, professional development programs, and governance issues. These data bases provided the framework for the third phase of research -- interviews.

Interviews with Faculty and Administrators. As soon as sufficient information had been collected and analyzed about an institution, an on-site visit was arranged in order to permit interviews with selected administrators and faculty. A prearranged list of questions was prepared and used with each interview and responses were recorded on the questionnaire. The purpose of the interviews was to gain narrative information to complement the statistical and institutional policy data gathered during phases I and II and thus achieve a better understanding of the staffing situation at each institution. Included on the interview schedule for each institution were administrators with 15 or more years of seniority, available faculty members with the same seniority, and the Human Resources Director or Institutional Research Director. In each case, the decision of the employee to participate in the interview was voluntary and the option to withdraw was available at all points throughout the study.

Summary

The theoretical concept of the administrative lattice is the key which will help achieve an understanding of the phenomenon of staff growth in American higher education. Middle management warrants this consideration for two reasons. First, the growth and impact of executive level positions has been studied ad nauseam at large and small institutions alike. Middle management, on the other hand, has received limited attention with regard to large, comprehensive universities and has been ignored so far as small, private, liberal arts colleges are concerned. Second, if growth has occurred, it is unlikely that expansion at the executive level alone could account for the increase in administrative numbers.

Similarly, there are several reasons to support targeting small, independent, liberal arts colleges as the context for the study. First, as asserted above, there are no adequate studies of the middle management phenomenon at such colleges. Second, the potential impact of this change is significant due to the number of colleges of this type which may have been affected by middle management growth. An understanding of what the addition of middle management positions means for small, independent, liberal arts colleges could be critical to the continued success of these institutions.

This study will begin that exploration. It is divided into five sections or chapters. This chapter, the first, serves as an introduction to the subject. Chapter Two reviews the literature which has already been published about middle management and administration in higher education. The detailed findings of the various case studies are reported in Chapter Three. Taken one case at a time, each analysis addresses the questions posed in Chapter One using the data gathered and reporting the insights acquired. In Chapter Four, the information from the case studies is analyzed in an effort to discern differences and similarities among the institutions and to identify general trends. The summary of this analysis will be applied to the concept of middle management in order to achieve a new understanding of the phenomenon at small, independent, liberal arts colleges. And finally, Chapter Five discusses that new understanding, critiques its shortcomings, and suggests directions for future research.

Chapter Two

Review of the Literature

This chapter surveys the existing literature about the origins, definitions, and analyses of middle management in American higher education. Some of the writers have examined the origins and evolution of middle management positions during the last century. Other discussants have defined middle management. Still others have analyzed the causes for administrative expansion. The first three sections of this chapter focus on each of those perspectives. The chapter closes with a section addressing the ways in which the literature has determined middle management to be a problem.

Origins of the Middle Management Phenomenon

One area in which the literature can be helpful to this study is to note the advent of administrative growth during different eras. As will soon become clear, higher education observers have noted the rise of middle managers on their campuses since the turn of the century.

David Starr Jordan, the first president of Stanford, called for a division of labor between instruction and administration which would enable faculty to accomplish their primary objectives of research and instruction in an article written for The Atlantic in 1900.

> The prime duty of the occupant of every college chair . . . is to give themselves unreservedly to research, to investigation, and to instruction. Their own success depends upon their being able to engage in this work without let or hindrance, to carry it without interruption, to give it their undivided attention without the slightest distraction. Hence, the general policy of the institution, its relations to the outside world, its connection with secondary or preparatory schools, the requirements for admission, the requirements for degrees, the discipline of students -- all fall within the executive department, to be determined by the president and the trustees; and a wise faculty will be glad to have these burdens taken from their shoulders. (Jordan 1900)

Jordan's era, of course, gave birth to the positions of librarian, registrar, dean of faculty, and dean of men or women as the administrative work of the college became specialized and assigned to particular individuals or departments paralleling the division of the faculty into departments by discipline.

According to Brubacher and Rudy (1958), the addition of middle management positions evolved during the last quarter of the 19th century following the schedule described below. First, as colleges increased enrollments, faculty, and programs, the professors organized themselves into committees to address routine matters such as discipline, admission, scheduling, and athletics with each committee specializing in one area of concern. Then, as procedures became routinized and enrollments grew, even the committees became overwhelmed with details and the faculty was relieved to shift these bureaucratic duties to the new class of administrative officer (see also, Scott 1978).

Indeed, the growth rate was so large that when economist Thorstein Veblen wrote The Higher Learning in America in 1918, he dedicated a chapter to commentary about the "academic administration and its policy." His view about the purpose of administration paralleled Jordan's, but the two men differed with regard to the relative importance of this new breed.

> In order to their best efficiency <sic>, and indeed in the degree in which efficiency in this field of activity is to be attained at all, the executive officers of the university must stand in the relation of assistants serving the needs and catering to the idiosyncrasies of the body of scholars and scientists that make up the university . . . Under this rule the academic staff becomes a body of graded subalterns, who share the confidence of the chief in varying degrees, but who have no decisive voice in the policy or the conduct of affairs of the concern in whose pay they are held (Veblen 1965).

In spite of his grudging acceptance of administration, Veblen expressed his true feelings about that type of work later in the chapter, claiming that it put "a premium on mediocrity and perfunctory work, and brings academic life to revolve about the office of the Keeper of the Tape and Sealing Wax" (Veblen, 1965). Accepting middle management as a "necessary evil," Veblen articulated two important issues: 1) the importance of separating administration from governance and 2) the need to focus on the primacy of academic work.

By 1933 Veblen's worst nightmare had been realized when, in fact, "the 17 per cent of titles which were noninstructional in the college catalog of 1883 had doubled" (Brubacher and Rudy 1958). At about that time, the Great Depression and World War II combined to curtail the growth of both American higher education and middle management positions for two decades. Three events in the 1950s, however, caused those growth trends to resume. First, the G.I. Bill of Rights included generous provisions for assistance to veterans who elected to enroll in college training programs after returning to civilian life from Europe, the Pacific, and later Korea. These veterans filled campuses across the country. Second, Soviet success in launching the satellite Sputnik inspired massive federal support for scientific research and training in what has become known as the "space race." Third, the matriculation of the generation known as "baby boomers" into the nation's educational system created a demand for primary and secondary educators and forecast much higher enrollments at the postsecondary level by the 1960s. The unprecedented growth that resulted from the introduction of federal dollars and large numbers of students created the need for specialists to manage the flow of money and paperwork on almost every campus.

As noted in Chapter One, a latter-day Veblen writing under the pseudonym of John Q. Academesis in the late 1950s, rated the post-war era increase in administrative personnel as the most striking change in a generation at American colleges and universities. Nonetheless, it appears that most of higher education's leaders accepted this period of extraordinary administrative expansion as necessary. There was very little commentary during the 1960s and 1970s about the burgeoning class of middle managers (see Barzun 1968 and Scott 1978). In fact, the impact of the change was ignored until recently as hard times in higher education prompted closer scrutiny.

The Chronicle of Higher Education affirmed this turn of events when it reported that current experts have noticed the problem of administrative bloat at institutions of all types and sizes across the nation, calling it "institutional layering" (Grassmuck 1990). That article cited data from the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission which showed the increase in higher education "other professionals" from 1975 to 1985 at 61.1% (EEOC 1985 and Grassmuck 1990). The most recent version of the same EEOC report put the increase for 1975 to 1990 at 106.4% (EEOC 1990 and Grassmuck 1991). While this level of change may be obvious at large universities, it is of special importance for this study to restate Zemsky and Massy's (1990) observation "that even small colleges have increased their professional staffs while holding the size of their faculties constant."

Defining Middle Management

The published literature about middle management provides an array of definitions which contribute to an understanding of the concept. Beginning with, and expanding upon, the early efforts from business and industry and working through definitions from higher education experts and the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission, this section will review the evolution of "middle management" definitions.

Pfiffner and Sherwood (1960) classified middle management as "the echelons of leadership immediately below those of top production management." Typically referring to department or division heads, this definition also included production-centered staff, technical, and engineering personnel. Although the production orientation of this definition is not well-suited for managers in higher education, Pfiffner and Sherwood also identified specific middle management traits which are useful. Middle managers, then, are those who: 1) have close contact with day-to-day results, 2) participate in operating decisions, 3) evaluate production results rather than programs, 4) evaluate personnel from the standpoint of immediate usefulness rather than future potential, 5) spend minimal time reading and reflecting due to the press of events, 6) give attention to solving urgent and immediate problems, 7) make plans to achieve the goals established at the corporate level, and 8) implement policy decisions within the limitations set by higher echelons (Pfiffner and Sherwood 1960).

One decade and a half later, Emmanuel Kay, another business and industry management expert, wrote that middle managers are those who basically manage other managers and supervisors who

> appear on organization charts as subfunctional heads, for example, manager, assembly operations; manager, engineering evaluation; manager, northeast region sales. In such professional organizations as engineering and information systems, the first-line supervisor who is supervising primarily exempt employees also should be included in the category of middle manager. First-line supervisors who primarily supervise nonexempt employees are excluded (Kay 1974).

Kay expanded upon Pfiffner and Sherwood's basic list of characteristics by including middle managers whose positions were not production centered. Unfortunately, the last line of Kay's definition excludes managers who supervise nonexempt staff -- the standard at most small colleges. So, both definitions, developed for use in business and industry, have some limited use for this study. Nonetheless, other, more directly applicable models, are available.

In the seminal study of middle management in higher education, Robert A. Scott defined mid-level collegiate administrators as "the deans and directors of support services to whom their assistants and first-line, most often nonexempt, supervisors report, and who themselves report to or are an officer at the vice-presidential level" (Scott 1978). Beyond defining middle management by classification, Scott explained further that middle management officials fulfill three functions: 1) liaison with external suppliers of resources, 2) allocation of resources and control of activities on campus, and 3) supervision of student activities. He specifically excluded presidents, provosts, academic deans, department chairpersons, and librarians from the definition. This definition approaches the ideal for the study at hand. It excludes academics and recognizes that middle managers in higher education are likely to supervise nonexempt staff. One weakness of Scott's definition, however, is that it continues to include vice-presidents in the middle management classification. Such executive-level positions do not fit comfortably in the middle management category due to significant differences in authority and responsibility.

Finally, and most recently, the federal government has classified middle management positions in higher education as "other professionals," a group which is defined as "college employees whose jobs require degrees but do not involve teaching or research as a primary responsibility" (Grassmuck 1990). This job category includes those who "are employed for the purpose of performing academic support, student service, and institutional support activities" such as librarians, accountants, counselors, systems analysts, athletic coaches, lawyers, and pharmacists according to the written description that the EEOC provides to colleges.

This definition is superior to the others reviewed in this section for many reasons. First, because it was developed to address the higher education environment, it avoids the problem of ambiguity which a definition borrowed from business and industry might create. Second, since it is a national definition provided by a federal agency and accepted by all colleges and universities, it provides a uniform context for the study of middle management from institution to institution. Third, because the EEOC definition isolates middle management from other professional positions in higher education such as executive officers, academic officers, department chairs, and faculty, the chance for confusion about classification within an institution is minimized. Similarly, this definition differentiates between middle managers and secretarial, paraprofessional, clerical, technical, and skilled personnel -- another potential area of confusion. One weakness of the EEOC definition, however, is that it includes librarians -- a classification which on most small college campuses is included with the faculty. But that group is easy to identify and segregate and should not interfere with this analysis.

For the purpose of this study, then, middle management will be defined according to the federal government's definition of "other professionals":

> College employees whose jobs require degrees but do not involve teaching or research as a primary responsibility and who are employed to perform academic support, student service, and institutional support functions.

Analyzing the Middle Management Phenomenon

The literature explains the increase in middle management positions in higher education according to three rationales. They are: Parkinson's Law, a real increase in workload, and the need for accountability. This section summarizes those analyses.

Parkinson's Law. A number of higher education pundits have attributed the growth of administration in higher education to Parkinson's Law which asserted that work, especially paperwork, expands so as to fill the time available for its completion so that there is "little or no relationship between the work to be done and the size of the staff to which it may be assigned" (Parkinson 1957). J.Q. Academesis was quick to illustrate this new concept when, writing one year later, he suggested that with no basic change in the service provided, American universities required "two administrators, three secretaries, one receptionist, and one teacher to do the work the last-named used to do all by himself" (Academesis 1958). This explanation for increased administrative positions was both cynical and simplistic. Yet, the apparent causal relationship between staff growth and paperwork seemed to lend credence to Parkinson's view.

Workload. In direct contradiction of Parkinson's model, other writers have explained the growth in administrative staff based on actual increases in both the volume and the specialization of higher education support work. One expert on the subject submitted that middle management exists in any industry because top management cannot cope with the workload caused by growth in numbers, functions, and/or variety (Kay 1974). Barzun agreed. What is needed, he wrote, is "a more numerous and knowledgeable group of aides to members of the cabinet, each of whom needs to have facts gathered, requests digested, replies drafted, and an eye kept on the maturing of pending matters" (Barzun 1968). A team of higher education observers summarized this line of thought quite well in a recent publication,

> As colleges and universities became increasingly complex and faculty members attempted to engage in all three traditional activities (teaching,

> research, and service), a separate group of academic workers emerged to handle the management of colleges and universities (Kuh and Whitt 1988).

Along these lines, Robert Birnbaum (1988) has argued that "the days of amateur administration when faculty temporarily assumed administrative positions and then returned to the classroom are long since over at most institutions." Birnbaum supported this assertion by arguing that increased institutional size and complexity necessitated staff who were expert about legal precedents, federal regulations, management information systems, student financial aid procedures, and administration of grants and contracts. Zemsky and Massy reached the same conclusion, attributing much of the recent growth of administrative staff to the addition and expansion of revenue-producing activities such as admissions, student services, development, and financial aid (Zemsky and Massy 1990).

Accountability. The third explanation for administrative expansion, especially since the 1960s, is the advent of government regulation and student consumerism. Some experts have attributed the addition of administrative layers to the need of colleges and universities to cope with state and federal laws, attend to the special needs of students, be competitive, enable the growth of computing activities, and solve internal management problems (Grassmuck 1990). Robert A. Scott (1978) claimed that a rise in "professionalization" had occurred due to increased competition for students and financial support coupled with increased government watchfulness.

> As institutions have grown in size and expanded their missions, new and greater supplies of money and students have had to be found, and more specialists have been required to do jobs that formerly were done more leisurely. New levels of accountability have been imposed by local, state, and federal government agencies (Scott 1979).

The demands of accountability are expressed best, perhaps, by Zemsky and Massy (1990) who observed that the growth in fixed and overhead costs constituted a response to "an environment of regulation and micromanagement."

The Problem of Middle Management in American Higher Education

Beyond the preceding review of middle management definitions and analyses, it is prudent to examine how the literature has determined middle management to be problematic. A number of themes -- including Parkinson's Law, goal displacement, fixation on growth, and bureaucracy and red tape -- emerge from that literature and merit closer attention.

Parkinson Realized. First, a concern expressed about the general trend of increasing numbers of middle managers in all industries was the increase in "adjective workers" while the substantive or direct jobs have remained constant (Pfiffner and Sherwood 1960). This change, later identified as institutional layering (Zemsky 1990), represents the crux of the problem first noted by Parkinson. Peter Sammartino, former Chancellor at Fairleigh Dickinson University, bemoaned these conditions in Demanage Higher Education!

> We have forgotten the primary purpose of education - to help the student grow. We have heaped a huge superstructure around the very simple teacher-student relationship with the result that too much of the money is going to extraneous activities, too much of the energy is wasted on maintaining this vast superstructure (Sammartino 1978).

As a result, Sammartino lamented, too many institutions became too large for rational management -- including private colleges and universities which overreach themselves in the creation of new administrative positions "with the result that the emphasis is now on empire-building, the issuance of padded reports that no one reads, the multiplicity of vacuous, time-wasting conferences that add nothing to the service of the student, and the issuance of thousands of memos and counter-memos that create an air of dispiriting confusion" (Sammartino 1978).

Goal Displacement. The substitution of means for ends is a second issue which has resulted from the increase in administrative numbers. Warren Bennis (1989) observed:

> The bigger any bureaucracy becomes, the more it is apt to yield to a kind of incestuous relationship with itself, with middle management devoting its time to justifying its existence to itself and losing touch with the outside world.

Robert Michels (Etzioni 1964) identified this tendency in his study of union and party leaders in Europe before World War I. He named the phenomenon the Iron Law of Oligarchy. Other writers observed the transition of administration from a provider of support services for academic functions to a competitor for resources with those major activities. T.F. Lunsford, for example, remarked that "an increasing number of university executives spend most of their time coordinating the work of other administrators and have little official reason for direct contact with either faculty members or students" (Lunsford 1970). Arguing along the same lines, Robert A. Scott (1978), a middle manager himself, noted that although administration was presumed to support the major activities of an institution, it had become one of the major activities with the emphasis shifting from service to control of budgeting and personnel. And, once again, the anonymous critic Academesis (1958) brought this view into sharper focus, "Many university teachers today are convinced that much, perhaps most, of this administrative plethora makes no contribution to the main business of a university, which is the teaching of young men and women."

These views are well grounded in organizational theory. They correspond to Philip Selznick's theory that organizations which have established procedures or means in order to obtain objectives come to confuse the means for ends and may concentrate on the proper functioning of procedures rather than the achievement of institutional goals (Selznick 1943 and Sills 1957). T.F. Lunsford (1970) noted that task specialization, restricted associations, high visibility, and responsibility for conveying bad news had "accentuated the separateness of 'the Administration' as a distinct and even alien segment of the university" and contributed to the development of "a classic ill of bureaucracy: displacement of organizational goals by 'the organization' itself" (see also Merton 1967).

Fixation on Growth. A third problem, the growth of fixed and overhead costs, is directly related to the displacement of organizational goals caused by administrative expansion. In The New University (1970), Burton R. Clark identified one of the problems associated with the development of a major administrative class with its own interests and ideologies. Because of the "boundary role" played by many administrators due to the high level of contact with outside influences and because of the emphasis on "day-to-day" concerns, persons in those positions become preoccupied with a "logic of growth" and a relegation of quality to secondary importance (see Pfiffner and Sherwood, 1960). Robert Birnbaum (1988) agreed, writing that administrators in professional organizations are in charge of secondary activities or the means to the major activity carried out by the professionals. As a result, Birnbaum claimed, the increased numbers and importance of managers at all levels have led to the "administered" university or college in which administrators are separated from the rest of the institution (Birnbaum 1988 and Lunsford 1970).

Named the "administrative lattice" by Zemsky (1990), this phenomenon has been attributed in part to 1) the disbursement of responsibilities which were at one time considered part of the faculty role, 2) increased revenue-producing activities including admissions, development, and financial aid, and 3) responsiveness to increased government regulation (Zemsky 1990 and 1991). But while these factors may have initiated staff additions for administrative support, the "lattice" took on a life of its own.

> With administrative status increasingly tied to the number of people who directly report to a given officer, personal advancement requires a constantly expanding empire of subordinates and an entrepreneurial base to extend one's own administrative lattice. Little wonder that so few managers, at any level, volunteer to reduce their ranks, even when staff functions have grown outmoded. . . . By definition, any new responsibility must entail additional resources; to accept less is to acknowledge inefficiency in past performance and a diminution of stature within the organization (Zemsky 1991).[3]

One additional consequence of the "lattice" is the increase in organizational complexity as "increases in staff size have been accompanied by a growth in separately organized functions, each with its own department or unit, often comprising fewer than four members" (Zemsky 1991).

Bureaucracy and Red Tape. Still another problem associated with administrative growth is the proliferation of rules and procedures known to most faculty and students as "red tape." Herbert Stroup (1966) advanced a three part definition for this concept including 1) the senseless employment of paper requirements for the conduct of the social bureaucracy, 2) unnecessary duplication and proliferation of forms, and 3) over-restrictiveness which cuts down on spontaneity and creativity. In support of this position, David Dill (1984) cited research which had discovered a parallel between the age and growth of an institution and both the size of its administrative staff as well as increases in the use of formal documents in the management of the institution. Beyond the factors of age and size, however, the factor of regulation must be taken into account. As Robert

---

[3] Zemsky (1990) uses the term "administrative lattice" to describe "the proliferation and entrenchment of administrative staff at American colleges and universities during the past two decades." In addition, the term is intended to connote its effects on an institution's operations and costs including, transfer of tasks formerly accorded to faculty, the growth of "consensus management," and the increase of costs and decline of efficiency due to the extension and solidification of administrative bureaucracy in the institution.

Zemsky (1990) put it, increased regulation by OSHA, EEOC, EPA, FISAP, IPEDS, A21, and OFCC together with external "micromanagement, principally by state agencies in the public sector . . . has had much the same result -- more paper, more procedures, more staff, without substantial increases in the quality of the product."

Summary

The literature reviewed here shows that American higher education has nearly a century of experience with middle management. The story begins with the creation of specialized positions to relieve faculty from routine matters and ends with the addition of management layers to deal with the enrollment cycles, resource needs, technological advances, and government regulation of the Twentieth Century world. During that time, moreover, the definition of middle management has evolved from a production-centered business and industry model to the current governmental classification of "other professionals." Finally, the literature has analyzed the likely impact of middle management expansion on the higher education enterprise itself. Included among those effects are 1) the unconscious addition of middle management positions which serve only to interfere with the efficient functioning of the institution (i.e., Parkinson's Law), 2) the displacement of organizational goals, 3) a fixation on growth, and 4) bureaucratic red tape.

Chapter Three

Case Studies

Overview of the Institutions

The case studies that follow examine the middle management phenomenon at institutions which are quite similar. All are independent or private colleges located in the Great Lakes region of the United States. None of the colleges enroll more than 3,000 students. All of the institutions are Liberal Arts I or II colleges according to the Carnegie system of classification. These characteristics given, it is clear that the case studies fit the description for small, independent, liberal arts colleges in the Great Lakes area described in Chapter One. It is the only description that is necessary to set the context for each case.

A Word About Anonymity

In spite of the similarities, the colleges under study have unique attributes such as location, actual enrollment size, budget amounts, and position titles so that certain measures are necessary to preserve institutional anonymity. For example, neither the name nor the location of these colleges will appear in the study. Instead, Greek letter pseudonyms (Alpha, Beta, Gamma, etc.) are used to refer to the institutions throughout the study. Moreover, rather than reporting identifiable data about budgets or enrollments in raw numbers only, the study will employ ratios, growth rates, and graphs. Similarly, because particular staff designations may be unique to an institution, the study will utilize standardized references for those titles. Finally, comments by individuals will be reported without reference to name or title. These safeguards should protect against the detection of individual and institutional identities without interfering with the reader's comprehension of the analyses.

Operational Definitions

Definitions for Vital Statistics. Of critical importance to this study is the reliability of the numerical indicators for change. Some of the statistics are industry standards with established methods of calculation. Others have been developed to address the special needs of this study. To this end, it is important to define the elements used and methods of calculation for those indicators at the onset of the study.

Student-to-Staff Ratios measure service loads for different types of professional staff on a per student basis to allow comparison.

1. The student-faculty ratio is calculated by dividing the full-time equated student count by the full-time faculty count for a given academic year. Part-time faculty are ignored in this study in order to obtain a more accurate assessment of full-time staff on campus.

2. The student-administrator ratio is modeled after the student-faculty ratio and computed by dividing the full-time equated student count by the full-time middle manager count (part-time middle managers are ignored) for a given academic year. It is a new statistic developed for this study.

Budget Ratios permit the comparison of resource allocations for particular cost centers. This is important, for internal comparisons, external comparisons, and comparisons over time.

1. Gross faculty salaries divided by the budget for educational and general expenses yields a <u>faculty salary ratio</u> for a given year.

2. Gross administrative salaries divided by the educational and general budget results in an <u>administrative salary ratio</u> for a particular year.

3. Due to the dramatic increases in institutional financial aid allocations during the period under study, however, the use of the standard educational and general budget as a divisor undervalues both ratios. In order to control for that effect, the ratios have been re-calculated using an adjusted E & G figure which excludes institutional financial aid.

Change Rates show the percentage of growth or decline for staff size or budget allocations during a given time period and are calculated by dividing the data for a given year by the data for the base year. Categories for which change rates are helpful include: FTE Administration, Administrative Salaries, Educational and General Budget, and Adjusted Educational and General Budget.

Categories for Administrative Positions. In addition to defining the numerical indicators, it is important to carefully identify the nominal categories of data in order to effectively examine the extent of change among various administrative divisions, offices, and positions. For the purposes of this study, they have been categorized according to the headings that follow.

1. Academic Affairs -- Registrar, Computer Center, International Education, Academic Support.
2. Student Life -- Housing, Counseling, Placement, Health, Chapel, Admissions, Financial Aid.
3. Institutional Relations -- Development, Annual Giving, Alumni, Corporate, Foundation, Church, Community, Public Relations.
4. Business and Athletics -- Accounting, Payroll, Personnel, Purchasing, Conferences, Athletic Director, Coaches, Trainers, Sports Information.

While acknowledging that these categories are arbitrary, the defense for the assignments rests on two factors. First, there is no one accepted scheme and therefore there is great variance in the organization of management in higher education. Second, a single system is necessary in order to measure the amount of change by these generally accepted divisions in a uniform or systematic way.

Analysis of Staff Structure. Beyond measuring administrative growth by the arbitrary units detailed above, it will also be important to examine the actual administrative structure at each of the institutions. A study of the table of organization at each of the institutions will reveal both differences and similarities in the evolution of their formal organizations. In addition, this kind of analysis should reveal the extent to which "layering" and specialization have occurred at each of the colleges.

Indicators of Organizational Culture. A review of the Manual of Operation or Administrator's Handbook for each college will help address the issues of administrator classification; guidelines for appointment, reappointment, promotion, and termination; provision of professional development programming; opportunities for recognition of accomplishments; and the role of middle managers in institutional governance. Interviews with middle managers at each of the campuses will supplement the policy and procedural information available in the manuals.

Definition of Middle Management Restated. In this study, middle management will be defined according to the now familiar federal government definition of other professionals: "College employees whose jobs require degrees but do not involve teaching or research as a primary responsibility and who are employed to perform academic support, student service, and institutional support functions" (Grassmuck 1990). Again, because most small colleges count librarians among the faculty, those positions have been excluded from this definition.

Case Study #1 - Omega College

Vital Statistics. All of the numerical indicators -- raw number of appointments, growth rates, student to staff ratios, and budget ratios -- show that Omega College experienced phenomenal growth in middle management positions between 1970 and 1990. Table 1 portrays both the census and the growth rate for this staff category.

Table 1 - Full-time Staff at Omega College, 1970-1990

	1970	1975	1980	1985	1990
# of Administrators	16	27	33	48	60
% Cumulative Change		69%	106%	200%	275%
# of Faculty	72	77	73	66	78
% Cumulative Change		7%	1%	-8%	8%

Omega's administrative staff nearly quadrupled during the 20-year period under study. The 122% growth rate for 1975-1990, moreover, exceeded the 106% nationwide figure reported by the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission (Grassmuck 1991). Faculty strength at Omega, on the other hand, remained almost constant, increasing by less than 2% since 1975 and by only 8% from 1970. Beyond this basic analysis, a comparison of staff-to-student ratios helps to shed some light on the magnitude of staff growth at Omega.

Table 2 - Comparison of Omega College Student-to-Staff Ratios

	1970	1975	1980	1985	1990
Students/Administration	75.2:1	41.7:1	35.1:1	20.1:1	19.2:1
Students/Faculty	16.8:1	14.7:1	15.9:1	14.6:1	14.7:1

Table 2 indicates that while the ratio of students to faculty improved only marginally over twenty years (and not at all during the past fifteen years), the ratio of students to administrators was reduced by a factor of 75%.

A third indicator, the budget ratio, provides perhaps the most telling statistic about middle management growth at Omega College. The basic budget ratios indicate only a small amount of growth in administrative salaries as Table 3 shows.

Table 3 - Omega College Staff Salaries as a Percent of E & G

	1970	1975	1980	1985	1990
Administration	13%	12%	15%	15%	15%
Faculty	39%	31%	27%	24%	23%

Table 4, however, suggests that the proportion of the adjusted educational and general budget (not including financial aid dollars) allocated to administration salaries grew rapidly during the 1970s and 1980s. Total faculty salaries on the other hand, declined as a percentage of the adjusted E & G budget during the same period.

Table 4 - Omega College Staff Salaries as a Percent of Adjusted E & G

	1970	1975	1980	1985	1990
Administration	14%	13%	16%	19%	20%
Faculty	42%	33%	30%	30%	30%

It is of interest to note that both ratios appear to have plateaued, administration at about 20% of E & G and faculty at 30% of E & G. Moreover, both charts show that the ratio of administrative salaries to faculty salaries increased from 1:3 to 2:3 during this time. Also worthy of mention is the decline for 1975 in the administrative salary share of adjusted E & G in spite of the addition of 11 positions to the middle management category between 1970 and 1975. These seemingly contradictory data suggest that the staff additions were low-salaried support positions, the initial wave of layering.

Growth Patterns of Omega. There are several ways to analyze the growth of middle management at Omega College: by sector, by department, and by level of classification. This section of the case study examines the impact of middle management growth from each of those perspectives.

Although the increases in middle management positions were continuous at Omega from 1970 until 1990, there were three growth spurts. The first jump took place during the early 1970s when the number of middle managers increased from 16 to 27 by 1975. As shown in Table 5, nearly all of the growth occurred in two sectors -- Student Life and Academic Affairs. A close examination of the added positions indicates that revenue generation and student services were the driving forces behind this surge. Five of the new positions were dedicated to recruiting and fundraising and four to counseling and placement.

Table 5 - Distribution of Omega College Middle Managers by Sector, 1970-1990

	1970	1975	1980	1985	1990
Academic Affairs	1	4	7	8	11
Student Life	10	16	18	19	21
Business/Athletics	2	3	3	14	18
Institutional Relations	3	4	5	7	10
Total	16	27	33	48	60

The second period of rapid growth occurred ten years later, between 1980 and 1985, during which time the number of administrators grew from 33 to 48. The increase in positions during this era can be attributed to the Institutional Relations sector (three positions) and to Business/Athletics (11 positions). The dramatic increase in Business/Athletics middle management positions was caused by the reassignment of coaching and athletic support jobs from the faculty to administration in 1985 due to a depressed teaching/coaching job market (and the resulting decline in enrollments) and to the shift of duties from teaching and coaching to recruiting, coaching, and management. A smaller growth spurt, representing a net gain of 10 positions, took place between 1985 and 1990. During that time, four positions were added to the Business/Athletics sector and two positions to each of the remaining three administrative areas.

A closer look at the data provides yet another way to regard the addition of middle management positions at Omega College. During the twenty year period under study, Omega created no fewer than ten new administrative departments which accounted for the addition of 27 new positions.

Table 6 - Departments and Positions Created at Omega College Since 1970

Department	# Positions in 1990
Counseling	3
Chaplain	1
Church Relations	1
Financial Aid	1
Computer Center	5
Health Center	1
Deferred Giving	1

Table 6 (cont'd).

International Education	3
Athletics	10
Personnel	1
Total	27

This analysis reveals several significant facts. First and foremost, several of the new offices accounted for a large number of the new positions with computing, international education, counseling, and athletics responsible for 21 new jobs. Second, many of these new departments entailed institutional responses to external stimuli (e.g., computing, international education, financial aid).

Beyond the addition of these new departments, three existing offices expanded during the period under study. Physical plant, accounting, and public relations all moved from one-person departments to units totalling three middle management positions each. And, admissions, in response to the competitive market for new students went from a staff of two professionals in 1970 to nine in 1990. This third point of view regarding staff growth concerns the addition of layers to existing offices. Table 7 demonstrates that Omega College experienced that form of growth too.

Table 7 - Distribution of Omega College Middle Managers by Level, 1970-1990

	1970	1975	1980	1985	1990
Directors/Deans	9	14	16	19	20
Assistants/Associates	2	2	6	20	29
Counselors/Coordinators	5	11	11	9	11
Total	16	27	33	48	60

The distribution by position level confirms the findings based on the creation of new departments by showing that the number of deans and directors more than doubled, from 9 in 1970 to 20 in 1990. The number of entry-level administrative positions doubled as well, increasing the number of resident hall directors and office coordinators from 5 to 11. The greatest growth, however, occurred at the assistant and associate level. There were only two such positions in 1970 (the associate dean of students and the assistant director of admissions). By 1990, there were 29 associate and assistant directors across the campus.

Middle Managers in the Organizational Culture. Having established that middle management growth occurred at Omega between 1970 and 1990, the issues of their place in and effect upon the organizational culture remain to be addressed. Included in this discussion are the questions of classification among other professional staff, terms of appointment and termination, opportunities for professional growth and development, and role in institutional governance.

Classification. Omega College has classified its middle managers in several ways, including category, sector, and level. First and foremost, the administrators at Omega were NOT faculty. The Manual of Operation (1990) included separate sections for the policies pertaining to appointment and contractual status for the two groups. The role of each group was clearly stated as well. The teaching faculty has "primary responsibility for determining the curriculum, academic standards, instructional procedures, . . . and recommendations relating to faculty status." In contrast to the fundamental duties of the faculty was the charge for middle managers to carry out "the administrative and management functions [of the college] as the President may appoint."

Second, middle managers at Omega were sorted by sector, with each sector supervised by an executive officer of the institution. At Omega, there were four sectors: Academic Affairs, Enrollment and Student Life, Business and Athletics, and Development. Although there was some variability in sector composition over the years, the current management array conformed to the model suggested at the beginning of this chapter. Academic Affairs included Registrar, International Studies, Computer Center, and Laboratory Coordination. Enrollment and Student Life consisted of Admissions, Financial Aid, Student Affairs, Counseling, Placement, and Chapel. The departments of Athletics, Physical Plant, Personnel, and Accounting made up the Business Sector. And finally, the Development area included Public Relations, Estate Planning, Alumni/Community Relations, and Corporate/Foundation Relations.

Finally, Omega classified its middle managers according to a three-tiered system. Deans or Directors supervised an operation such as the Computer Center, Admissions, Student Life, Personnel, Public Relations, or Athletics. This was the highest level of middle management. Next in the hierarchy were the associate directors and coaches. The individuals in these positions had responsibility for a limited aspect of the operation (e.g., the Associate Director of Placement oversaw only the career planning and placement functions of the Student Development Center or the Head Football Coach was in charge of football, but not all of athletics) and reported to a Dean or a Director -- not an executive officer of the sector. At the next level were the Assistant Directors and Coordinators. These were the entry-level positions in all sectors and were typically represented by recruiters, assistant coaches, residence hall directors, and computer programmers. None of these levels were defined or described in any of the literature. They were quite simply evident in the College table of organization.

Contractual Terms. A survey of the Omega College Manuals of Organization for the twenty-year period of this study revealed that the terms of appointment and the stipulations governing middle management contracts were not clearly defined until October, 1985. Prior to that time, institutional treatment of middle managers -- including issuance of contracts, salary increments, and fringe benefits -- simply paralleled the treatment of faculty. Absent were explicit guidelines for termination, resignation, or grievance. Nor were there provisions for performance appraisal or professional development programs. After 1985, however, the manual of organization addressed all of those concerns.

In 1985, the Omega Manual of Organization and Operation included a new section dedicated to the burgeoning class of middle managers. The new manual section identified policies for posting position openings on campus before advertising such openings in the journals. In addition, the manual detailed procedures for appointment, renewal of appointment, resignation, grievance, and termination. According to interviews with Omega middle managers, the codification of appointment and termination procedures has served to reduce anxiety about such matters. The grievance procedure, involving an appeal process to a committee of peers, has been invoked two times -- once regarding a vacation policy dispute and once for failure to follow established job-posting procedures -- between 1985 and 1990.

Performance Appraisal. Beyond the initiation of these procedures, Omega created a committee of middle managers, with representation from each of the four sectors, to "advise the President regarding administrative policies and procedures and to implement programs for the performance appraisal and the professional development of administrators" (Manual, 1990). While discharging those responsibilities, the committee developed a performance appraisal program based on the management by objectives (MBO) approach. The appraisal program called for each middle manager to be "appraised" by his or her supervisor on an annual basis each spring. While the appraisal process has been modified twice since its initiation, it is still in place and continues to operate on a formative rather than a summative basis.

Professional Development. The initiation of professional development opportunities seemed to be a significant focus for the advisory committee. Four distinct programs -- In-Service Training, On-Campus Internships, Administrative Leaves, and Administrative Small Grants -- were cited in the manual.

The purpose of the In-Service Training Program was to offer development sessions on campus to the administrative staff based either on suggestions from the staff or on results from the performance appraisal program. By means of this vehicle, the advisory committee has sponsored one or two speakers and/or workshops each year on topics such as risk-taking, the implications of racial and ethnic diversity, personality assessment, team-building, and stress management. According to the responses to interview questions, these in-service programs provide one of the few opportunities for inter-sector and inter-level contact among middle managers.

The On-Campus Internship program was designed to directly involve a middle manager in an administrative area outside the individual's immediate area of responsibility (e.g., job rotation) both to encourage exploration of alternate career tracks and to broaden the participant's understanding of total administrative operations. There was no record of any Omega administrator taking advantage of this program between 1985 and 1990.

The administrative leave program was intended to assist administrators to improve their performance by providing for a period of concentrated coursework, research, or other professional development activity. During the five years that the program had been available, two administrators had completed leaves. Both were office directors in the academic affairs sector (where the vice-president was accustomed to dealing with the logistics of covering such leaves due to extensive experience with faculty sabbaticals). One took a six-month leave at full pay to begin a doctoral program at a neighboring university. The other was approved for one year at half pay in order to permit the manager to accept a Fulbright Fellowship. A third leave has since been approved for one of the coaches to enroll in a graduate program and to intern as an assistant coach with a NCAA division I program.

The purpose of the Administrative Small Grant Program was to provide small amounts of money to support middle manager participation in personal and professional development opportunities such as conferences, research projects, or coursework -- especially when such activities extended beyond the scope of departmental budgets. Between 1985 and 1990, more than 30 awards averaging $300 per award were made to Omega middle managers who attended professional meetings, presented papers, or served in leadership roles for regional or national professional associations. No formal courses or research projects have been funded to date.

Recognition. Interviews on the Omega campus further revealed a somewhat unanticipated result. The shift toward explicit contractual terms, formalized performance appraisals, budgeted professional development programs, and the advisory committee was accompanied by the initiation of recognition ceremonies for middle managers. Although the public recognition of faculty promotion, tenure, and superior performance had occurred both at the annual honors convocation and at commencement for decades, there had been no vehicle for the recognition of middle managers or other staff. In 1986, the advisory committee suggested and planned a recognition reception for middle managers which was sponsored by the President. At this reception, awards for outstanding administrative performance were made for the first time in May of that year. Since that time, the reception agenda has been expanded to include service awards for longevity, announcement of promotions for the coming year, and recognition of non-exempt personnel.

Governance. Finally, the issue of middle management's role in institutional governance at Omega College remains to be considered. A comparison of the language from the 1970 and 1990 editions of the Omega Manual may serve as a helpful starting point.

> As immediate assistants to the President, the administrative staff has primary operational responsibility for the administration and management of the short-term and daily affairs of the College within the context of established policies; primary responsibility for planning non-academic programs which support the academic enterprise; and in conjunction with the Provost, responsibility for recommendations concerning resource allocation and general planning (1970).

This description clearly limits the administrative role to the execution of policies and procedures established by the faculty and the Board of Trustees under the direction of the President. Middle managers were involved in governance committees such as the Curriculum Committee, the Academic Review Committee, and the Student Life Committee only for liaison and service purposes. In 1970, students had only begun to have a "place at the table" in campus governance. Faculty were the key players at this time.

In spite of the tremendous growth in middle management numbers, there was only minimal change in the governance status of administrators at Omega College by 1990.

> The administrative and management functions are to be carried out by such officers and staff as the President may appoint. These officers shall serve as administrative affiliates to the various committees as hereinafter described (1990).

This revised language continued to define middle managers as extensions of the President as was the case in 1970. Between 1970 and 1990, however, the liaison role of middle management on the various community governance committees was codified. Although these references simply gave formal recognition to the traditional ex officio role of middle managers, they are worthy of note. The advisory committee of administrators created in 1985 provided some access to the decision-making process and the grievance committee formed in the same year permitted due process for the resolution of conflicts between middle managers and executive officers of the institution. Some things, however, did not change. The committee status was still by virtue of office, not election. Membership on committees permitted access to the floor, but not voting rights. And, unlike either faculty or students, middle managers continued to have no constitutional prerogatives and were not represented on the Board of Trustees (as were faculty and students).

Omega College Growth Summary. The data presented above demonstrate convincingly the extent of middle management expansion at Omega College during the past twenty years. The number of positions increased by 44, resulting in a growth rate of 275%. The ratio of students-to-administrators declined from 75:1 to 19:1 while the student-to-faculty ratio remained constant. The proportion of E & G budget dollars committed to middle management salaries increased from 14% to 20%. Moreover, the addition of middle managers occurred in all sectors and was marked by the creation of ten new departments. Finally, although middle management exhibited growth at every level of employment, the greatest change took place at the associate/assistant director level which increased from two in 1970 to 29 in 1990. It is also clear from the analysis of this case that the growth of middle management necessitated other changes which were implemented by 1985 including: explicit personnel policies, a performance appraisal program, a series of professional development programs, an annual recognition ceremony, and minimal change in the governance role.

Case Study #2 - Alpha College

Vital Statistics. As was the case for Omega College, the data from Alpha College all seem to point to tremendous growth in the middle management class of employees since 1970. Unlike Omega College, however, the count for middle managers at Alpha College excludes both athletic coaches (counted as faculty) and residence hall directors (poor data). Table 8 shows both the headcount and growth rate for middle managers and comparable figures for faculty.

Table 8 - Full-time Staff at Alpha College, 1970-1990

	1970	1975	1980	1985	1990
# of Administrators	31	38	54	82	85
% Cumulative Change		23%	74%	165%	174%
# of Faculty	148	131	139	155	155
% Cumulative Change		-12%	-6%	5%	5%

The number of middle managers at Alpha College nearly tripled. Moreover, the growth rate of 124% between 1975 and 1990 is almost identical to the rate experienced by Omega College during the same time period. Both exceeded the 106% national rate. In contrast, faculty strength at Alpha actually declined between 1970 and 1980 and increased only 5% by 1990 in spite of continuous enrollment growth which resulted in an overall increase of 25% in the student body during those twenty years. The relative staff to student ratios for this period reported in Table 9 show the differential effects of enrollment gains on respective workloads.

Table 9 - Comparison of Alpha College Student-to-Staff Ratios					
	1970	1975	1980	1985	1990
Students/Administration	63.9:1	53.6:1	39.1:1	27.9:1	29.2:1
Students/Faculty	13.4:1	15.5:1	15.2:1	14.8:1	16.0:1

These data confirm that while the ratio of students to faculty increased from 13 to 16 (or 23%) approximating the increase in enrollment, the ratio of students to middle managers dropped by 55%.

As one might expect, both the non-adjusted and adjusted budget ratios for faculty and middle management salaries at Alpha College show the relative shift of resources from instruction to administration and services during the twenty year period from 1970 to 1990.

Table 10 - Alpha College Staff Salaries as a Percent of E & G					
	1970	1975	1980	1985	1990
Administration Ratio	6%	11%	10%	10%	10%
Faculty Ratio	41%	29%	21%	19%	17%

The proportion of unadjusted educational and general funds assigned to faculty salaries steadily declined from 41% to 17% while the amount for middle management salaries increased or remained constant. When adjusted for the budgetary impact of the enormous growth in financial aid dollars, the differences between these ratios are even more striking as shown in Table 11.

Table 11 - Alpha College Staff Salaries as a Percent of Adjusted E & G					
	1970	1975	1980	1985	1990
Administration Ratio	8%	12%	13%	13%	12%
Faculty Ratio	54%	31%	27%	24%	22%

The adjusted figures reveal that the proportion of budget spent on middle management salaries increased by more than 50% while the budget ratio for faculty salaries declined by nearly 60%. And, as noted in the first case study, the ratio for middle management salaries (50%) did not increase in step with the rate of increase for positions (174%) because most of the newly created positions were at the entry-level.

Growth Patterns at Alpha. The data from Alpha College indicate continuous growth of middle management positions, with two major increases. The first large change occurred between 1975 and 1980 when 16 positions were added to the staff. The second spurt, a much larger one, took place between 1980 and 1985 and resulted in the net addition of 28 positions.

Table 12 - Distribution of Alpha College Middle Managers by Sector, 1970-1990					
	1970	1975	1980	1985	1990
Academic Affairs	4	8	14	29	30
Student Life	16	17	19	22	25
Business/Athletics	6	8	14	21	19
Institutional Relations	5	5	7	10	11
TOTAL	31	38	54	82	85

The data represented in Table 12 clearly demonstrate that the Academic Affairs sector experienced the greatest amount of growth prior to 1980. Most of this change was directly attributable to academic support functions including the computer center, Upward Bound, and science laboratories. The Business/Athletics area accounted for nearly all of the remaining growth as the physical plant staff expanded and as positions for personnel, administration, and public safety were created. The second spurt, taking place between 1980 and 1985, once again occurred primarily in the Academic Affairs sector as the offices responsible for supporting student academic progress increased their staffs from four to seven; the computer center increased again from five positions to nine; and six jobs were added to support the theater program. Staff additions in accounting, public safety, and human resources contributed to this spurt from the Business/Athletics area. The data show almost no growth between 1985 and 1990, but there was some shifting of position strength between Student Life and Business/Athletics.

Table 13 reflects the addition of offices at Alpha College in order to measure middle management growth by function according to technological, market, or programmatic needs.

Table 13 - Departments and Positions Created at Alpha College Since 1970

Department	# Positions in 1990
Academic Support	3
Upward Bound	3
Laboratory Coordinators	4
Theater Administration	3
Public Safety	3
Human Resources	2
Financial Aid	2

Table 13 (cont'd).

Physical Education Center	2
Word Processing Coordinator	1
Total	23

To be sure, most of the new offices and positions at Alpha College supported the academic sector (e.g., computer center, academic support, theater administration, laboratory coordination, etc.). And, a fair number of the academic support positions were initiated and funded on the basis of grant support. Nonetheless, it is also the case that many of the additional middle managers were appointed to revenue-generating positions (i.e., development, admissions, financial aid). Still others were added in order to respond to federal regulations including financial aid, human resources, and public safety.

In addition to these new departments, several existing departments grew rapidly during the past twenty years. The computer center, for example, exploded from one position to ten. Admissions officers increased in number from four in 1970 to nine in 1990. The physical plant staff grew by four positions and the development team increased from two to seven members over the same time period. Combining the new departments and their staff members to the growth of departments which had existed in 1970 accounts for 49 of the 54 additional middle management positions.

The phenomenon of staff layering also seems to have occurred at Alpha College, as shown in Table 14.

Table 14 - Distribution of Omega College Middle Managers by Level, 1970-1990					
	1970	1975	1980	1985	1990
Directors/Deans	16	21	25	25	27
Assistants/Associates	10	9	19	27	35
Counselors/Coordinators	5	8	10	30	23
TOTAL	31	38	54	82	85

When the staffing data are regarded from the perspective provided by Table 14, the following trends become apparent. First, the number of departments increased by a net figure of 11 (69%). Second, the ratio of all other middle-managers to deans and directors increased from 1:1 in 1970 to 2.1:1 in 1990 -- in spite of the increase in the number of departments. The resulting average of three middle managers per department is indicative of layering. Third, the increase in the number of associate and assistant directors employed at Alpha College, from 10 in 1970 to 35 in 1990, constituted the greatest growth for any level of middle management.

Middle Managers in the Organizational Culture. As was the case for Omega College, Alpha College experienced a dramatic increase in the ranks of middle management after 1970. Such an increase in the numbers of any employee category would seem to have demanded an institutional response. This section of the case study for Alpha College examines how the institution has addressed the change in composition of the professional staff.

Classification. The Alpha College Faculty Handbook stated that "The President shall be assisted in the administration of the College affairs by the administrative officers whose roles are summarized on the following pages." Aside from this reference to executive officers of the institution, the official personnel documents available from Alpha were silent with regard to the classification of middle managers. Moreover, an interview with a senior middle manager at Alpha resulted in the finding that no middle managers at Alpha had faculty status, although several senior managers were occasionally invited by certain departments to teach a class.

The 1990 Alpha College Table of Organization divided its management team horizontally into four sectors, each of which is directed by a separate vice-president: 1) Academic Administration, 2) Admissions and Student Life, 3) Business and Finance, and 4) College Advancement. Although there has been some shifting of departments from sector to sector during the past twenty years, the current alignment represented the traditional arrays outlined at the beginning of this chapter and does not warrant further consideration here.

Alpha middle managers were not formally categorized in a hierarchy below the executive level. That is to say, there was no prescribed hierarchy in the Administrative Staff Handbook which assured that all appointments at the level of Director necessarily entailed more responsibility or authority than an appointment at the associate or assistant level in another department or sector. Nonetheless, there appeared to be the following ranks at Alpha: Deans and Directors, Associate and Assistant Directors, Coordinators and other staff with function-specific titles such as "programmer" or "manager of accounts receivable." The visit to campus and interviews conducted while there all indicated that the arrangement was comparable to that described for Omega College in the first case study.

Contractual Terms. The Alpha College Administrative Handbook has been in existence since the late 1970s. The current edition did not include a section about hiring or initial appointment, but did address resignation and termination procedures for middle managers under "miscellaneous policies." There was no formal grievance procedure, but the Human Resources office is open for staff inquiries regarding the disposition of policy matters.

Performance Appraisal. According to the Administrator Handbook, Alpha College conducts an annual program of performance appraisals for middle managers for the purpose of "giving staff an idea of how the supervisor perceives their performance at the time and where improvement is needed." The two-page appraisal form asks the supervisor to rate the manager with regard to 10 behaviors which include quality of work, flexibility, job knowledge, cooperation, initiative, dependability, communication, creativity, ability to perform under pressure, and management skills. In addition, the form asks the rater to summarize the managers major contributions, indicate performance areas which need to be improved, and summarize goals and objectives for the following year. The performance appraisal program has been in effect since 1985.

Professional Development. With the exception of departmental budgets for attending professional meetings and conferences, Alpha College did not provide any formal or institutionally sponsored programs of professional development for its managers. Although the Human Resources department is currently working on plans for such programming, one manager observed that the absence of a policy and a formal program for middle management development was a major issue for the staff. The handbook was silent on the topic of professional development and the performance appraisal program was not tied to any mention of professional development alternatives to build strengths or remediate weaknesses. In-service workshops occasionally have been sponsored by a particular office or sector in order to bring staff up to date on current practices or issues, but such workshops do not typically cross departmental or sector lines.

Recognition. Since 1980, Alpha College has sponsored a Service Award Program which recognizes service longevity at five-year intervals with gift items of pewter, walnut, and jewelry. The recipients are honored at an annual banquet for all non-faculty employees. Retirees are presented with the official College chair. There were no performance-related awards made to middle managers at Alpha and no public recognition of achievements or promotions, except as one manager put it, "success results in additional responsibilities."

Governance. As was the case for Omega College, the middle managers at Alpha College have no role in institutional governance beyond ex officio involvement on various campus committees.

Alpha College Growth Summary. Although the letter from Alpha's president granting permission to conduct research about that campus stated that Alpha "had not had the kind of increase in administrative staff" suggested by the proposed study, the data provide clear evidence that such growth had, in fact, occurred. The number of positions increased by 54 and produced a growth rate of 174%. The ratio of students to administrators declined from 64:1 to 29:1 while the student-faculty ratio increased by 23%. Meanwhile, the proportion of budget dollars expended for middle management salaries increased from 8% to 12%. Although the addition of middle management positions was greatest in the Academic Affairs and Business/Athletics sectors, growth occurred in all four of the administrative divisions. Nine new departments were added between 1970 and 1990. Finally, the greatest growth in middle management took place at the levels below dean and director with associates and assistants increasing from 10 to 35 and counselors and coordinators from 5 to 23. In spite of the significant level of change represented by these data, the institution's response was limited to the development of a handbook to articulate general college personnel policies to staff members and the initiation of a modest performance appraisal program. By 1990, the issues of professional development, recognition of achievements, and role in governance had not been addressed with regard to middle management.

Case Study #3 - Gamma College

Vital Statistics. Gamma College has experienced growth in the ranks of middle managers and officials there have noticed it. The Human Resources Director wrote that "our college, as well as other small liberal arts colleges, is concerned with the growth of support staff over the last six years. In an effort to control cost and improve efficiency, we have reduced our support staff to 1986 levels." Because that policy was put into effect after 1990, the data in Table 15 do not reflect a reduction, but instead, show the usual pattern of growth.

Table 15 - Full-time Staff at Gamma College, 1970-1990

	1970	1975	1980	1985	1990
# of Administrators	18	32	48	61	75
% Cumulative Change		78%	166%	230%	317%
# of Faculty	78	75	70	88	87
% Cumulative Change		-4%	-10%	13%	12%

These data indicate that the number of middle managers (excluding coaches) increased by a factor of four between 1970 and 1990 while the number of faculty increased by only 12%. The 134% growth rate for Gamma middle management between 1975 and 1990 is higher than both the 106% national rate and the rates reported for Alpha (124%) and Omega (122%) colleges. And, like Alpha College, the enrollment at Gamma College increased until 1990 at which time there was a slight downturn. In spite of those enrollment gains, the ratio of students to administrators declined steadily, as portrayed by the data in Table 16.

Table 16 - Comparison of Gamma College Student-to-Staff Ratios

	1970	1975	1980	1985	1990
Students/Staff	85.6:1	46.1:1	38.8:1	32.5:1	23.6:1
Students/Faculty	16.5:1	19.7:1	26.6:1	22.9:1	20.3:1

In contrast, the student-faculty ratio at Gamma fluctuated widely throughout the twenty year period under study. This was due, in part, to the institution's transition from a teaching staff which consisted primarily of the "contributed services" from a religious order to a more conventional faculty. Nonetheless, it is clear that the real gains with regard to staff strength were achieved by middle management.

The problem of interpreting budget ratios at Gamma College was complicated by two factors. The first, a high historic proportion of "contributed services" on the faculty, has been mentioned above. The result of that staffing method was to devalue the budget ratio for faculty salaries by undetermined amounts in 1975, 1980, 1985, and 1990. Similarly, because Gamma College did not keep specific statistics about administrative salaries after 1980 except for the NACUBO survey (which tracks only those managers at the assistant director level or above), those ratios for 1985 and 1990 are also devalued due to the absence of entry level manager salaries from the database. Table 17 shows the reported ratios which ignore the effects of contributed services for faculty and missing data for entry-level middle management positions causing both ratio lines to appear low.

Table 17 - Gamma College Staff Salaries as a Percent of E & G

	1970	1975	1980	1985	1990
Administration Ratio	NA	5%	8%	7%	7%
Faculty Ratio	14%	16%	14%	17%	13%

Table 18 - Gamma College Staff Salaries as a Percent of Adjusted E & G

	1970	1975	1980	1985	1990
Administration Ratio	NA	6%	9%	8%	9%
Faculty Ratio	15%	19%	16%	19%	17%

Because of the special situation with the budget ratio data from Gamma College, the changes in salary ratios are not as striking as for the other colleges. Nonetheless, the increases in administrative salaries during the 1970 to 1990 period contrast sharply with the general decline in faculty salaries for the same time frame.

Growth Patterns at Gamma College. Although the growth of middle management at Gamma College was continuous, it differed from the other institutions examined thus far in that there are no unique periods of growth. Each five-year interval showed a similar increase in middle managers -- 14, 16, 13, and 14 -- as measured in raw numbers of net new positions. As shown in Table 19, moreover, there was significant growth in each of the four conventional administrative sectors.

Table 19 - Distribution of Gamma College Middle Managers by Sector, 1970-1990					
	1970	1975	1980	1985	1990
Academic Affairs	3	5	16	23	17
Student Life	9	13	16	19	28
Business/Athletics	5	9	12	13	20
Institutional Relations	1	5	4	6	8
Total	18	32	48	61	73

The initial growth spurt affected every sector except academic affairs. The second wave of change, however, tripled the staff in that area of administration. Student life and business increased the most during the last ten years of the study.

As might be expected, growth occurred both by the creation of new departments and by the expansion of departments which had existed in 1970. Table 20 identifies the new departments which were added to the Gamma table of organization by 1990 and the number of positions each office entailed.

Table 20 - Departments and Positions Created at Gamma College Since 1970	
Department	# Positions in 1990
Academic Advising	5
Development	4
Minority Affairs	2
Public Safety	3
Conference Coordinator	1
Child Development Center	1
Voice Communications Manager	1
Laboratory Coordinators	2

Table 20 (cont'd).

Summer School Director	1
Graduate Student Support Services	2
Director of Women's Center	1
Director of Weekend College	1
Total	24

In the case of Gamma College, it is clear that many of the new departments were created to meet the special programmatic needs of students from new markets including graduate students, weekend students, summer school students, minorities, and women. The Voice Communications Manager and the Laboratory Coordinators supported technological changes which occurred during the twenty year interim. Beyond these new offices and positions, several departments expanded between 1970 and 1990. The admissions function increased staffing from one counselor to a staff of eight professionals. Meanwhile, the supporting function of financial aid added two middle managers. In order to support the demand for computing services, the 1970 Director of Data Processing position was replaced by a staff of seven programmers and systems analysts by 1990. The staffing of the business office increased from one professional to four middle managers during the same time period.

It came as no surprise, given the numerical increase in middle managers, that the layering phenomenon appeared at Gamma College too. Table 21 shows that growth at the director level took place between 1975 and 1980. The creation of associate, assistant, and other supporting positions followed more slowly, but accounted for most of the staff growth during the 1980s.

Table 21 - Distribution of Gamma College Middle Managers by Level, 1970-1990					
	1970	1975	1980	1985	1990
Directors/Deans	16	13	28	30	30
Assistants/Associates	0	8	8	12	17
Counselors/Coordinators	2	11	12	19	26
Total	18	32	48	61	73

The number of departments at Gamma increased by a figure of 14 (131%) between 1970 and 1990. During the same time, the ratio of deans and directors to all other middle managers changed from 8.0:1 to 0.7:1. The average number of middle managers per department increased from 1.1 to 2.4, even though the number of departments had nearly doubled.

Middle Managers in the Organizational Culture. The middle management phenomenon had been noticed at Gamma College as early as the mid-1960s. At that time, the College conducted a survey of similar institutions in order to learn what might be done. The report of those survey results captured the essence of the problem, which remains unanswered at Gamma even today:

> The unresolved problem on many campuses is how to classify some of the staff. The situation becomes acute as the college develops and part time quasi-administrators give way to professionals. The first step, as a task becomes too large for a secretary, is to offer it to a faculty person as an "extra" job. The problem of definition now present is "should this job carry faculty status?"

In spite of this early recognition of the problem, the handbook and interview data from Gamma College indicated that the issue was current there.

Classification. The most recent edition of the Gamma College Employee Handbook addresses policies and procedures for all non-faculty, both hourly and salaried. There was no discernible definition of administration or middle management in the handbook, but the various policies which apply only to salaried staff were identified accordingly. The work schedule for salaried employees was defined as that "which meets the needs of the College as defined by the employee's supervisor." The expectation was for a minimum of 40 hours per week with additional hours the norm. Finally, middle managers at Gamma College were allowed to teach for compensation if the course was an overload and the overload did not interfere with regular duties.

The most recent Gamma college Table of Organization divided the administrative staff into five units, each headed by a vice-president: Business and Finance, Operations, College Advancement, Academic Affairs, and Enrollment Management. Gamma middle managers were divided into six pay grades, but the handbook did not indicate the criteria for any of the levels. Moreover, the table of organization seemed to indicate the following hierarchy: deans, directors, associate directors, assistant directors, counselors, coordinators, and managers.

Contractual Terms. The Gamma College Employee Handbook was silent on the search conditions for the initial appointment of a middle manager, but stipulated that openings would be posted in the campus newsletter for the information of staff who might wish to transfer. Voluntary resignation, according to the manual, required 30-days notice, but the institution need only give two-weeks notice for involuntary separation. Middle managers were subject to a developmental disciplinary system which, depending on the infraction, might include verbal warning, written warning, probation, suspension without pay, and/or dismissal. The college provided a "fair treatment procedure" under which staff members could appeal supervisor decisions or actions. The appeal route began with the supervisor and then proceeded to a joint meeting of the manager, the supervisor, and the human resources director. If the disagreement persisted, the matter would be presented to the manager's vice president, then to a "Fair Treatment Committee," and lastly to the President. Finally, Gamma College supported a variety of employee assistance programs to which middle managers might be referred for personal and work-related problems. This was the only assistance program discovered in the case study research.

Performance Appraisal. Beginning in 1982, Gamma College initiated a performance appraisal program for middle managers. This appraisal program, "designed to assist employees in understanding job responsibilities and performance standards." is conducted for each staff member on the anniversary of their initial appointment. Although the pre-evaluation conference form each manager must complete prior to the appraisal asks questions about developmental issues such as likes and dislikes, strengths and weaknesses, skill development, and long range career plans, the appraisal form itself focuses on managerial behaviors such as knowledge, work quality, planning, judgement, interpersonal skills, budgeting, communication skills, and cooperation. There was little evidence that attention is given to the completion of specific work goals and objectives.

Professional Development. The Human Resources Office at Gamma College administered a number of professional development programs. Most common were seminars for all staff which in recent years have addressed the issues of conflict management, AIDS awareness, personality assessment, and problem-solving. The College funds budget lines for travel, training, and development through the various professional associations, but interviews with several staff members indicated that the funding of these lines during the past decade had not been adequate for the purpose. In addition to these programs, Gamma College also provided managers with the option to enroll in master's level courses at Gamma with the amount of tuition waiver pro-rated according to the manager's years of service. Total waiver of tuition occurs after the seventh year of employment. Finally, Gamma offered middle managers the opportunity to take a two-month study leave at full pay. This program was not listed in the handbook, but a staff member mentioned that one person had taken advantage of the program to date.

Recognition. According to the Employee Handbook, Gamma College sponsors a service awards program each year in order to recognize middle managers and other employees for five-year intervals of employment at the College. The employees are given gifts of jewelry, desk items, or medallions. One administrator reported that Gamma did not formally recognize superior performance and that the absence of such recognition was a matter of some concern to many middle managers. Another middle manager noted that recognition of accomplishments had been difficult to implement due to philosophical differences between staff. The College had experimented with merit pay at one time, but that effort became recognized as a "popularity and lobbying contest" and had been discontinued.

Governance. The role of middle managers in the governance of Gamma College was manifested in several ways. First, some middle managers served on the constitutionally mandated community governance committees on an ex officio basis. Thus, for example, the Registrar served on the standards and curriculum committees. Beyond this somewhat limited and traditional role, since the 1960s, a number of Gamma middle managers (not to exceed 10% of the faculty) have been appointed each year by the President to serve as members of the faculty assembly -- with vote. Finally, an advisory committee of middle managers was formed in the mid-1980s to report to the former president about matters of mutual concern. Neither of the latter avenues cited in this section was listed in the Employee Handbook. Nonetheless, the quota system for middle management representation on the faculty assembly was the only such instance discovered during the course of research.

Gamma College Growth Summary. The staffing data from Gamma College corroborated the growth observed at the other research sites. The number of middle managers increased from 18 in 1970 to 75 in 1990, a growth rate of more than 300%. The ratio of students to administrators declined steadily from 71:1 to 24:1 while the student faculty ratio actually increased. And, although the budget data from Gamma College was somewhat murky, the shift of resources away from faculty salaries and toward administrative compensation seemed evident. It was no surprise that middle management expansion had occurred both horizontally and vertically. Gamma College was unique, however, in that many of the new positions were added in the academic affairs sector. In spite of this peculiarity, by 1990 growth was evident in every division and at every level of management in agreement with the experiences at other institutions. And finally, although Gamma College officials seemed to be aware of the middle management phenomenon at an early date, the institutional responses as denoted by the publication of a handbook, the initiation of a performance appraisal program, and the initiation of professional development supports, all emerged during the 1980s. This too followed the pattern established at Alpha and Omega colleges.

Case Study #4 - Zeta College

Vital Statistics. Although the growth of middle management at Zeta College appears to have occurred later in the 1970-1990 time period and in smaller proportions than was the case with the first three case studies, the impact was equally significant. For that reason, in Zeta's most recent re-accreditation report, the self-study team included a chapter about the issue which was prefaced by this statement: "Of growing concern to the faculty, along with this significant administrative turnover, is the overall increase of administrative positions in general, accompanied by a decrease in faculty positions." Or, as one faculty member remarked during an interview on campus, "the institution has shrunk, the faculty has shrunk, but the administration has grown. Some faculty think it has gone too far, but that nothing can be done about it." The data in Table 22 help explain the basis for those statements.

Table 22 - Full-time Staff at Zeta College, 1970-1990

	1970	1975	1980	1985	1990
# of Administrators	15	20	22	21	33
% Cumulative Change		33%	47%	40%	120%
# of Faculty	105	107	105	93	90
% Cumulative Change		2%	NC	-11%	-14%

These data show that while the growth of middle management at Zeta College was delayed -- the headcount remained nearly constant between 1975 and 1985 -- the now characteristic increase seems to have begun during the last five-year interval. And, although the administrative staff has doubled in twenty years, the rate of growth from 1975 to 1990 (65%) is about half that for the schools studied in the first three cases. Relative to the size of the student body and the faculty, however, it is clear that even this slower rate of growth is significant. The faculty did shrink, by 14%, and the student body was smaller by one-tenth. The comparative student-to-staff ratios show the shift in workload.

Table 23 - Comparison of Zeta College Student-to-Staff Ratios					
	1970	1975	1980	1985	1990
Students/Staff	102.3:1	73.4:1	68.0:1	56.0:1	42.0:1
Students/Faculty	14.6:1	13.7:1	14.2:1	12.6:1	15.4:1

Once again, while the student-to-faculty ratio fluctuated during twenty years of enrollment instability, the ratio of students to middle managers declined continuously (in spite of the absence of staff additions between 1975 and 1985) from 102:1 to 42:1.

It follows, of course, that the college budget would reflect this shift of staffing. Table 24 portrays the ratio for staff salaries as a percentage of the educational and general budget.

Table 24 - Zeta College Staff Salaries as a Percent of E & G					
	1970	1975	1980	1985	1990
Administrative Ratio	NA	NA	NA	8%	8%
Faculty Ratio	56%	NA	27%	27%	23%

Unfortunately, Zeta College was unable to provide complete salary data for middle managers and so only the most recent figures were obtained. In spite of this deficiency, the pattern of declining faculty salaries is evident for Zeta as it was in the other studies -- even when the ratio is computed using the adjusted E & G figure.

Table 25 - Zeta College Staff Salaries as a Percent of Adjusted E & G					
	1970	1975	1980	1985	1990
Administration Ratio	NA	NA	NA	10%	11%
Faculty Ratio	66%	NA	30%	33%	30%

The adjusted figures show some improvement in the status of faculty salaries. This leveling effect is attributable to the fact that Zeta College entered the institution-based financial aid race belatedly as well. Once the educational and general budget was adjusted to account for the effect of institutional gift aid, both ratios plateaued.

Growth Patterns at Zeta. Although Zeta College has only begun to experience the growth of middle management, the analysis of staffing by administrative sector indicates that growth had occurred mainly in the development and the academic affairs sectors.

Table 26 - Distribution of Zeta College Middle Managers by Sector, 1970-1990

	1970	1975	1980	1985	1990
Academic Affairs	1	2	3	3	8
Student Life	8	9	10	10	11
Business/Athletics	4	4	4	4	7
Institutional Relations	2	5	5	4	7
Total	15	20	22	21	33

The increase in the academic affairs area occurred in the most recent five-year interval and may be attributed to the addition of computing positions and an audio-visual technician. One full-time, non-faculty coach, an athletic trainer, and a security officer were added to the business/athletics sector during the same time span. And, the institutional relations area added three fundraising positions between 1985 and 1990 as well. The impact of all staff additions between 1970 and 1990 is portrayed in Table 27.

Table 27 - Departments and Positions Created at Zeta College Since 1970	
Department	# Positions in 1990
Audio Visual Services	1
Continuing Education	1
Financial Aid	1
Bookstore Manager	1
Director of Personnel	1
Computer Center	4
Communications	2
Annual Giving	1
Director of Research	1
Athletic Trainer	1
Health Services	1
Chief of Security	1
Total	16

These data indicate that Zeta College has experienced one aspect of middle management growth -- the addition of individual offices or positions for specific functions. As has been the case at the other institutions examined thus far, most of the new departments address changes in technology (computer and audio-visual), the increased competition for resources (financial aid, communications, and annual giving), and student consumer expectations (security, health, athletic trainer).

In contrast to the findings of the previous three case studies, however, was the relative absence of staff layering as portrayed in Table 28.

Table 28 - Distribution of Zeta College Middle Managers by Level, 1970-1990					
	1970	1975	1980	1985	1990
Directors/Deans	9	13	14	13	17
Associates/Assistants	6	7	8	8	16
Counselors/Coordinators	0	0	0	0	0
Total	15	20	22	21	33

The number of middle managers at the director level almost doubled, and was still greater than the number of associates and assistants in 1990. Moreover, there were no positions at the counselor/coordinator level at any point of the research period. That the layering phenomenon has begun, however, is also clear from these data. The number of middle managers below director level by 1990 was not yet equal to the number of directors, but the ratio was almost 1:1 for the first time. And, the growth rate for the associate/assistant level (100%) was three times greater than the growth rate for the director level (30%) for the most recent five-year interval. Finally, one aspect of layering which was not apparent from these data was the addition of an executive level at Zeta. In 1970, there was only the Academic Dean. By 1990, the President was surrounded by four vice-presidents.

Middle Managers in the Organizational Culture. Because of the relatively recent arrival of middle management at Zeta College, it was interesting to note that many of the trappings of middle management growth were evident on that campus. The College has had a Personnel Policies Handbook since 1986. A performance appraisal program was instituted at about the same time. Nonetheless, a number of issues remain underdeveloped.

Classification. The Personnel Handbook identified middle management as "exempt" employees whose status may be full-time, part-time, temporary, or consultant. This categorization differentiated Zeta middle managers from hourly, non-exempt employees only, not from faculty. The staff was divided into the usual four sectors -- Finance and Management, Academic Affairs, Development and Institutional Relations, and Student Affairs -- with each sector headed by a vice-president. The hierarchy for middle managers included directors, one associate director, assistant directors, and managers (similar to assistant directors). The absence of staff at the level of counselor and coordinator has been explained above.

Contractual Terms. The Personnel Policies Handbook for Exempt Staff was first published and became effective on July 1, 1986. It had not been revised by 1990, but did address the concerns of employee categories, compensation, fringe benefits, and "miscellaneous policies." With regard to hiring policies, the handbook included a section on internal posting for vacancies, but no procedure for conducting searches for candidates from beyond the campus. The handbook was silent on the issues of termination, both voluntary and involuntary. Zeta College did provide a grievance procedure which allows dissatisfied employees to go first to their immediate supervisor. If the problem cannot be resolved at that level, the employee may "present the issue" to the supervisor's supervisor. From there, the matter proceeds to the business manager and then to a committee of executive officers.

Performance Appraisal. Because the publication date of the Personnel Policies Handbook preceded the advent of the Zeta performance appraisal program, that document did not address appraisal. In 1988, however, the College initiated a behavioral appraisal form which asks each supervisor to rate their middle management subordinates on a Likert-like scale on the traits of community, professionalism, commitment, communication, availability, approachability, flexibility, and cooperation. There was no formal provision for assessing the accomplishment of performance objectives. While those middle managers interviewed consider the feedback from the appraisal program to be helpful, they expressed concern that the program was not implemented in all administrative areas and that there was no institutional support to address the weaknesses detected.

Professional Development. The Zeta administrative manual was also silent on the issue of professional development for middle managers. Interviews with staff revealed that the absence of an institutional policy has caused efforts in this area of concern to vary by sector as well. One manager reported that support for attending conferences had been adequate except during recent years due to budget difficulties. Another indicated that people in her area were usually allowed to attend one professional seminar per year. A third individual summed up the situation nicely when he observed that "there was no structured program, but that opportunities depended upon a combination of the job function and the vice president." Finally, in addition to the rather haphazard support for attendance at conferences and seminars away from campus, Zeta College has provided on-campus workshops for all staff to address current issues and to articulate new policies and benefits.

Recognition. Zeta College holds a recognition dinner each year at which employees are recognized for total years of service. This event was mentioned only in passing in the handbook with regard to the definition of length of service for benefit eligibility. An interview clarified that the longevity recognition began with the tenth year of service. Beyond this somewhat standard and generic form of recognition, middle managers at Zeta reported that their accomplishments might be noted by a pat on the back or by an announcement at a staff meeting or by a merit increase when the budget permitted, but that there was no institutional recognition of outstanding performance by middle managers akin to the awards and publicity given to faculty.

Governance. Prior to the administration of the current president, the governance role of middle managers at Zeta College was limited to the normal ex officio status on standing faculty committees. According to the 1990 accreditation self-study, however, the Zeta president established an Administrative Steering Committee of five administrators elected by their colleagues in the late 1980s "in order to provide a wider source of input." In addition to this measure, the same president formed a President's Advisory Council which included two elected middle managers in addition to vice-presidents, faculty, and students. And, based on the survey of middle managers conducted as part of the self-study, these changes have been appreciated, but were not without problems. More than half of the middle managers reported that the discussions held at meetings of all administrators were too limited in scope and (a somewhat contradictory finding) that many middle managers felt uncomfortable about expressing opinions. Interviews with middle managers on the Zeta campus revealed that the busy workload of the existing staff has precluded the development of programming for administrators there.

Zeta College Growth Summary. The data presented here show that middle management at Zeta College did not grow at the rate found at the other colleges surveyed thus far. Nonetheless, by 1990, the growth curve had begun with a net gain of 18 positions producing a 20-year growth rate of 120%. Most of the new positions were added to the Academic Affairs sector in computing, but there were additions in Institutional Relations and Business/Athletics too. Moreover, twelve new administrative departments were created between 1970 and 1990. Finally, the layering effect observed in the first three case studies was only beginning to appear at Zeta by 1990 as evidenced by the 1:1 ratio between directors and other middle managers.

In spite of the lower and later rate of change portrayed by these data, Zeta College responded in many of the standard ways to the addition of middle management positions by the late 1980s including 1) the publication of a handbook for exempt, non-faculty staff, 2) the initiation of a behaviorally-based performance appraisal program, and 3) the introduction of an administrative advisory committee and inclusion of elected middle managers on the president's advisory council. Most significant, however, was the recognition given to the changing nature of the Zeta professional staff by the 1990 accreditation self-study.

> The administration views this buildup as the repair of a heretofore deficient administrative plan of organization which would not have seen the College viably through the 1990's. Most of the significant economic progress which has been made at the College in terms of larger financial resources for operating budget, plant fund budgets, and significant catch-up salary treatment for faculty is the result of getting an administrative grip on the College and making the necessary decisions to recommend long overdue extraordinary tuition increases.
>
> The challenges of the 1990's will require that successful colleges become more active and professional in their administrative affairs. The administrative plan of organization now in place, with full Board support, reflects the participative success pattern of the new President in other institutions that have been well-administered. Procedures which have been put in place reflect the minimum basic controls which will need to be in place to see the College through the rough economic times which lie ahead of it. The administration believes it is incorrect to interpret this necessary emphasis on this area of the College's operation as any deviation from the College's mission statement.

The ad-hoc committee which examined the issue of administration used the information it had gathered for the self-study report to develop a series of recommendations which expressed the faculty's concern about administrative growth. Most telling was recommendation #4 which asserted that "if the trend of increased administrators with a fixed or smaller faculty size continues, then teaching and learning will not be improved. The College should establish a ratio between students and administrators just as it has between students and faculty."

On campus interviews helped to shed some light on the feeling behind these formal documents. One faculty member observed that "the faculty reaction to administrative growth was initially bafflement, followed by fury. Now they acknowledge the growth but don't like it because 'more administrators mean less pay for me'." The same individual noted that it would be helpful if the "faculty would recognize a broader definition of education; that the faculty is not the sole guardian of the educational process." Another faculty member attributed the dis-ease to "a distrust of the corporate model" in the higher education setting. A third person, this one a middle manager, commented that "faculty do not really see what is going on in administration. They do not really understand, but recent crossovers from faculty to administration have helped."

Case Study #5 - Beta College

Vital Statistics. While the rate of middle management growth at Beta College (107%) is the smallest of the case studies reviewed thus far, the number of positions added between 1970 and 1990 (30) place this institution in the middle ranks of the colleges under study.

Table 29 - Full-time Staff at Beta College, 1970-1990

	1970	1975	1980	1985	1990
# of Administrators	28	36	36	41	58
% Cumulative Change		29%	29%	46%	107%

Table 29 (cont'd).

# of Faculty	82	57	64	62	60
% Cumulative Change		-30%	-22%	-24%	-27%

Enrollment at Beta College declined steadily throughout the period of this analysis and by 1990 was 39% below the 1970 level. Table 29 shows that while the faculty was reduced almost in proportion (27%) to the shrinking student body, the size of the administrative staff doubled. The effect on comparative workload is demonstrated by the student-to-staff ratios provided in Table 30.

Table 30 - Comparison of Beta College Student-to-Staff Ratios

	1970	1975	1980	1985	1990
Students/Administration	49.5:1	29.6:1	25.2:1	20.0:1	14.5:1
Students/Faculty	16.9:1	18.7:1	14.2:1	13.2:1	14.0:1

These data show that the faculty load improved somewhat following a slight upward shift in 1975 while the student-to-administrator load improved markedly at each point of measurement. Moreover, by 1990, the ratio for middle managers was nearly equal to the ratio for faculty -- the only case in which parity has surfaced.

Unfortunately, the files at Beta College were not complete and, for that reason, none of the usual comparative data for salary ratios or staffing arrangements were available. Table 31, however, identifies the departments which were added to the Beta table of organization after 1970 which are still in existence.

Table 31 - Departments Created at Beta College Since 1970
Department
Personnel
Computer Center
Purchasing
Campus Security
Publications
Placement
Sports Information

In addition to the seven departments listed above, Beta College also added executive positions for student development, college advancement, administrative services, and academic services. The lack of hard data regarding assignment of positions by sector and by level, however, make it impossible to chart the expansion of middle management by specialty and layer.

Middle Managers in the Organizational Culture. In spite of the paucity of numerical data for Beta College, the documents and interview results which were obtained during a campus visit provided insights similar to those from other case studies.

Classification. The 1978 Staff Handbook (the most recent edition) identified three classifications for non-faculty professional staff. None of the classifications were defined by description or example. Instead, each level was denoted by a word or phrase with Level I comprised of "executives," Level II consisting of "directors," Level III made up of "assistant directors, managers, and other professionals." The 1990 Table of Organization assigned the various management levels among four vice presidents who are responsible for

Academic Services, Administrative Services, College Advancement, and Student Development.

Contractual Terms. No mention of initial appointment policies or procedures was made in the Staff Handbook, but Beta College does employ an explicit system for a probationary period and for notification of termination.

> Certain non-academic positions require a period of probationary service . . . after which time a decision will be made whether the employee shall be continued or terminated. After a person has completed an appropriate probationary period and is invited to continue, each individual is then guaranteed notice of termination.

Probationary Period	Notice of Termination	Classification
None	6 Months	I - Executive
None	3 Months	II - Directors
3 Months	3 Months	III - Asst. Directors and Professionals

This schedule was the most detailed among the institutions studied. Middle managers at Beta College are permitted to accept instructional assignments, if invited by an academic department. If the teaching assignment constitutes an overload, the administrator is paid a stipend equivalent to that paid to adjunct faculty for the same work. Finally, the handbook did not detail a formal grievance procedure.

Performance Appraisal. Unlike the performance appraisal programs at the other institutions examined in this study the Beta program was developmental and has been conducted on a semi-annual basis. The manager is requested to complete a self-appraisal form which asks each person to 1) list major accomplishments for the prior six months, 2) identify areas which need improvement, 3) note likes and dislikes, 4) comment about professional development activities undertaken during the prior year and those planned for the near future, 5) detail ways in which the manager's supervisor can help the individual improve job performance, and 6) list major accomplishments to be achieved during the following six month period. On the basis of the self-appraisal, the manager's supervisor completes a performance summary form which includes an overall rating selection from among exceptional, excellent, good, acceptable, and need to improve. This appraisal program was not mentioned in the manual (it appears to have been implemented after the 1978 publication date of the manual). The staff who were interviewed commented only that they were evaluated "once or twice per year."

Professional Development. Although the Staff Handbook included a lengthy section about a Faculty Development Program which included sabbatical leaves, membership allowances, and travel funds, there was no reference to similar programs for middle management. Interviews with staff on campus produced a number of responses. First, two staff members remarked that line items to support attendance at national professional meetings were available until the mid-1980s, but that institutional support had been reduced over the years as enrollment had declined. Both were quick to point out, however, that if a manager could demonstrate a compelling need for the training provided at such conferences, the College usually made funding available on a one-time only basis. On campus programs were scheduled for all staff on a weekly basis to keep employees up-to-date about College policies and concerns. In spite of the presence of a progressive appraisal program, the College has not been in a financial position to support the kind of programming that might make the appraisal program productive.

Recognition. Like each of the other colleges, Beta sponsors an annual dinner at which non-academic employees are recognized for length of service. And, like most of the other colleges studied, there is no institutional recognition of performance except for faculty. In fact, one manager observed that with the exception of a few supervisors, there was "very little stroking" on the Beta campus even though the middle managers there "had been the backbone of the College" during the period of enrollment problems.

Governance. The Beta Faculty Handbook explicitly addressed the role of middle managers on faculty committees as follows:

> Service by Administrators: Service by administrators, including those with faculty status, shall be limited to those committees for which their area of competence is clearly relevant.

Within the scope of that stipulation, there were three middle managers on the Academic Standing Committee, one administrator on the Artists and Lecturers Committee, one administrator on the Planning Committee. Staff members observed that, beyond these formal interactions and those due to working requirements, there was very little interaction between administrators and faculty at Beta.

Beta College Growth Summary. The degree of middle management growth at Beta College was significant, but did not compare to the growth rates at Alpha, Omega, or Gamma. The 1975-1990 growth rate of 61%, moreover, was similar to the 65% rate at Zeta College and was well below the national increase of 106%. Two factors help to put this lower growth rate in perspective. First, Beta College seems to have experienced the greatest amount of enrollment decline and financial stress of any of the colleges studied. Second, the addition of 30 middle management positions during those twenty years of decline contrasts sharply with the net elimination of 22 full-time faculty positions during the same period. The increase in middle management relative to the decline of enrollments and of faculty strength is significant. This was the only case for which the student-faculty ratio and the student-administrator ratio were equal in 1990.

Even though the number of middle managers at Beta has doubled during the past twenty years, with the largest growth surge occurring during the 1985-90 period, the institution had not formally addressed the needs of these staff members. The Staff Handbook had not been revised between 1978 and 1990. There was little or no effort to provide professional development opportunities, either on campus or off. Institutional recognition of staff accomplishments were limited to longevity awards, with little attention, either formally or informally to performance. And, with regard to involvement with institutional goals, planning, and governance, middle management did not seem to have a role.

Case Study #6 - Nu College

Vital Statistics. The middle management staff at Nu College did not quite double between 1970 and 1990. In fact, the 91% cumulative growth rate shown in Table 32 is the lowest of the six institutions examined to date. Like Beta College, the slower and smaller growth rate at Nu College may be attributed to a dramatic downturn in enrollment between 1970 and 1985. The 30% decline in enrollment the college experienced between 1970 and 1985 was reflected by a 34% reduction in faculty strength. Meanwhile, the size of the administrative staff increased by 68%.

Table 32 - Full-time Staff at Nu College, 1970-1990					
	1970	1975	1980	1985	1990
# of Administrators	22	25	30	37	42
% Cumulative Change		14%	36%	68%	91%
# of Faculty	65	56	51	43	60
% Cumulative Change		-14%	-22%	-34%	-8%

Because of the addition of several new programs, including a degree program in nursing and several academic support programs funded by grant dollars, by 1990 enrollment at Nu College had been restored to 1970 levels as was the number of faculty billets. Table 33, below, shows how the staff ratios changed during that twenty-year period.

Table 33 - Comparison of Nu College Student-to-Staff Ratios					
	1970	1975	1980	1985	1990
Students/Administration	50.1:1	34.0:1	27.4:1	20.9:1	27.6:1
Students/Faculty	17.0:1	15.2:1	16.1:1	18.0:1	19.3:1

These data indicate that the faculty load improved due to the dramatic decline in student numbers, not the addition of faculty positions, until the mid-1980s. The student-to-middle manager load, however, declined rapidly until the enrollment recovered in the late 1980s due both to shrinking enrollments and an expanded middle management staff. It is of interest to note that the ratios for both professional staff types were nearly equal in 1985. The ratio increase for middle management in 1990 was the first load increase observed in any of the cases.

Fortunately, budget data were available for staff salaries, faculty salaries, educational and general budget, and financial aid allocations at each interval of the study from Nu College.

Table 34 - Nu College Staff Salaries as a Percent of E & G					
	1970	1975	1980	1985	1990
Administration Ratio	13%	14%	12%	14%	10%
Faculty Ratio	36%	32%	24%	20%	23%

In contrast to the institutions studied thus far, the administrative salary ratio at Nu College remained relatively stable until 1990, when it decreased sharply. The ratio for faculty salaries, however, followed the typical pattern of decline relative to the unadjusted educational and general budget. Because of institutional policy limiting financial aid, the ratios computed with the adjusted E & G budget show a similar pattern but with higher ratios.

Table 35 - Nu College Staff Salaries as a Percent of Adjusted E & G					
	1970	1975	1980	1985	1990
Administration Ratio	14%	16%	14%	18%	12%
Faculty Ratio	39%	36%	28%	24%	28%

It was no surprise, therefore, to see that the ratios for faculty and middle management salaries approach each other until the 1990 interval when the gap actually expanded.

Growth Patterns at Nu College. Staff growth at Nu College was slow but steady. There were no significant growth spurts at Nu as had been the case at most of the other case study schools. And, although each of the administrative sectors was larger in 1990 than it had been in 1970, Table 36 clearly shows that the academic affairs and student life sectors benefitted most from the twenty-year period of expansion.

Table 36 - Distribution of Nu College Middle Managers by Sector, 1970-1990

	1970	1975	1980	1985	1990
Academic Affairs	3	4	8	15	13
Student Life	7	8	7	10	13
Business/Athletics	10	10	11	8	11
Institutional Relations	2	3	4	4	5
Total	22	25	30	37	42

In academic affairs, middle managers were added to provide academic support services for students and to staff the new nursing program. The increase in student life was due almost entirely to the addition of five admissions counselors and two financial aid positions. Most of these additions occurred during the 1980s. Table 37 identifies the positions which were added to the Nu College administration after 1970.

Table 37 - Departments and Positions Created at Nu College Since 1970

Department	# Positions in 1990
Academic Support	5
Financial Aid	2
Nursing	2
Placement	1
Sports Information Director	1
Audio-Visual	1
Campus Security	1
Grants Development	1
Total	14

The additions at Nu College were similar to those for the other colleges in the study with one exception. The 1970 Nu College staff included a data processing position and, unlike most colleges, the staff for computing did not expand beyond two positions.

Staff layering occurred at Nu College as well. The number of offices remained almost constant from 1970 until 1985 as shown in Table 38 by the number of positions at the director level. Horizontal expansion was evidenced by the increase in 1990 to 19 directors. Meanwhile, the number of positions below the director level increased from 10 to 23. Thus, while the ratio of directors to subordinates changed only slightly in twenty years, the layering phenomenon had begun as the data in Table 38 attest.

Table 38 - Distribution of Nu College Middle Managers by Level, 1970-1990

	1970	1975	1980	1985	1990
Directors/Deans	12	12	12	13	19
Assistants/Associates	10	13	9	10	14
Counselors/Coordinators	0	0	9	14	9
Total	22	25	30	37	42

Like Beta and Zeta colleges, the growth of middle management positions seems to have begun later and to have been retarded by enrollment difficulties. The 68% growth rate for 1975 to 1990 is the lowest observed thus far and considerably lower than the 106% national rate. Nonetheless, the data seem to have moved in the expected direction and the layering effect was evident by 1980.

Middle Managers in the Organizational Culture. At Nu College the evolution of the institutional response to the growing class of middle managers was still in the early stages of development. Several sections of the Faculty/Administrative Staff Handbook address the appointment and termination procedures to be observed and specified the role of middle management in institutional governance. Many issues were not addressed at all.

Classification. The Faculty/Administrative Staff Handbook did not define or describe middle management or administration in any way. The 1990 Nu College table of organization divided the administrative staff into eight sectors, with three of them (academic affairs, institutional advancement, and planning and research) led by vice-presidents and the remaining five (business, student development, plant, admissions, and athletics) each supervised by a middle management position. The table of organization made it clear that transition to a hierarchical model, with an executive officer of the institution in charge of each operation, had not been completed by 1990. For the same reason, the handbook did not identify the hierarchical status of any administrative positions except for the president and the academic vice-president.

Contractual Terms. The Nu College handbook was quite thorough in its coverage of policies and procedures related to middle management appointment and termination. Initial appointment at Nu is made by the president and is subject to annual renewal on the basis of satisfactory evaluation. While the handbook required each middle manager to give three months notice prior to resignation, the institution was obligated to give one month notice to employees with one year or less of service, three months for staff members who had been employed for at least one year, and six months notice for persons with at least two years full-time employment at the College. These conditions held except in case of emergency at which time sixty days notice would be given before a reduction in administrative staff would be made. This section of the handbook included a most interesting proviso which prohibited amendment by the faculty. There was no provision for a grievance procedure -- except for faculty.

Performance Appraisal. Prior to 1990, Nu College used a management-by-objectives style of performance appraisal system which was to be implemented three times per year. This system proved to be too time consuming and so a new model had been adopted. The Nu Faculty/Administrative Staff Handbook identified "minimum standards" for faculty and staff evaluations including the following criteria:

> effectiveness in the performance of the task delineated in the appropriate position description;
>
> effectiveness in establishing and maintaining positive professional relationships with colleagues, supervisors, students, and the community;
>
> effectiveness in maintaining a current competence in the particular discipline or field of specialization;
>
> adherence to policies, procedures, and regulations of the college and the Board of Trustees and
>
> the accomplishment of individual goals or objectives developed with supervisor(s).

The new appraisal program was scheduled to occur twice during the first year of employment and once per year thereafter. The appraisal form asks supervisors to rate the achievement of particular objectives as well as behaviors related to work, supervision, skill, and professionalism. This was the only appraisal program which formally assessed both performance and behavior.

Professional Development. In spite of the progressive form of performance appraisal used at Nu, there was almost no provision for professional development of middle managers. The handbook was silent on this matter, but interviews with middle managers produced the following results. Nu College provided no budget support for middle managers to attend professional meetings or conferences (and even faculty budgets for this purpose were modest). The College did attempt to send managers to local seminars which addressed topical issues such as sexual harassment or other supervisory matters. In addition, the College sponsored some on-campus programming which was open to all staff, but according to staff on that campus, middle managers typically did not have time to attend such programs.

Recognition. Similar to other schools in this study, Nu College has sponsored a banquet each May since 1987 to award pins to employees with stated periods of service. Interviews with staff made it clear that there was no institutional recognition for outstanding performance or merit pay. In fact, one staff member commented that "until 1990 even thank you's were hard to come by." Another manager observed that middle managers at Nu "were hard-working, often working sixty hours per week with no pay for overtime or compensatory time, but received minimal recognition."

Governance. According to the Nu College faculty by-laws, a large number of administrators are members of the "constitutional faculty" including middle managers such as the registrar, the director of management information systems, the director of athletics, the director of the nursing program, the counselor, the director of academic support services, and the director of audio-visual services. In spite of this unusual level of representation, only a few middle managers were ex officio members of standing committees and no middle managers from beyond the academic affairs area were included -- only their vice presidents.

Nu College Growth Summary. There was a net increase of 20 middle management positions at Nu College between 1970 and 1990. The 91% rate of growth was the lowest of the six colleges examined thus far in the study and the 68% growth rate from 1975 to 1990 was well below the 106% national average. Like other colleges with lower growth rates, Nu College had experienced a significant decline in enrollment which was accompanied by a proportionate reduction in the teaching faculty. Many of the new positions at Nu College were added to the academic affairs sector to support program initiatives designed to increase enrollment. Similar to other colleges, a large number of positions were added to the admissions and development functions of the college. And, although the institution had worked to include administration in the staff handbook provisions for hiring, evaluation, governance, and firing, the informal structure of the institution did not always reflect the formal structure. Moreover, special concerns such as recognition and professional development were not covered at all.

Case Study # 7 - Mu College

Vital Statistics. The administration at Mu College nearly tripled in size between 1970 and 1990, increasing by 171% during that time period. The faculty, meanwhile, remained quite stable during the first fifteen years, but increased by 16% over the base year by 1990 in response to a 48% growth of enrollment. Table 39 portrays the growth rates for each staff type.

Table 39 - Full-time Staff at Mu College, 1970-1990

	1970	1975	1980	1985	1990
# Administrators	17	25	31	36	46
% Cumulative Change		47%	82%	112%	171%
# of Faculty	79	87	76	76	92
% Cumulative Change		10%	-4%	-4%	16%

While the growth rate for middle managers at Mu College followed the typical pattern, the overall increase was supported by a considerable increase in enrollment. In spite of the larger enrollment, the student-to-staff ratios exhibit the now familiar decline for student-administration in contrast to an increase for student-faculty as shown in Table 40.

Table 40 - Comparison of Mu College Student-to-Staff Ratios

	1970	1975	1980	1985	1990
Students/Administration	47.8:1	38.8:1	33.4:1	27.9:1	26.2:1
Students/Faculty	10.3:1	11.1:1	13.6:1	13.2:1	13.1:1

These data demonstrate that the faculty workload increased by 30% between 1970 and 1980 and remained level after 1980. In the meantime, the administrative ratio declined by 45%.

Budget data for Mu College prior to 1980 were unavailable and the figures obtained for the last three periods of the study show the typical pattern for faculty salaries. No data for administrative salary ratios have been prepared at Mu.

Table 41 - Mu College Faculty Salaries as a Percent of E & G

	1970	1975	1980	1985	1990
Faculty Ratio of E & G	NA	NA	29%	23%	17%
Faculty Ratio of Net E & G	NA	NA	32%	28%	21%

Growth Patterns at Mu College. Middle management growth at Mu College occurred in two major spurts, the first taking place between 1970 and 1975 and the second between 1985 and 1990. The initial surge was led by the addition of six positions in the student life sector including five residence hall directors and an associate dean of students. The second major growth period was characterized by the addition of five positions in academic affairs including appointments in the computer center and the fine arts center. In the business and athletics sector, four positions were created including personnel and protection services with assistants appointed both in personnel and in physical plant. Table 42 shows staff growth by sector.

Table 42 - Distribution of Mu Middle Managers by Sector, 1970-1990					
	1970	1975	1980	1985	1990
Academic Affairs	1	2	5	5	10
Student Life	7	13	14	16	18
Business/Athletics	5	7	7	10	14
Institutional Relations	4	3	5	5	4
Total	17	25	31	36	46

These data reveal that while the greatest overall growth occurred in the Academic Affairs Sector, the Student Life and Business/Athletics sectors enjoyed substantial staff increases as well. Unlike previous case studies, however, there was no net change in the Institutional Relations sector. Table 43 indicates the departments and positions added to the Mu College staff after 1970.

Table 43 - Departments and Positions Created at Mu College Since 1970	
Department	# Positions in 1990
Computer Center	2
Placement	1
Financial Aid	1
Dean, Academic Administration	1

Table 43 (cont'd).

Resident Hall Directors	3
Coordinator, Freshman Forum	1
Director, Fine Arts Center	3
College Pastor	1
Director, Personnel	2
Director, Protection Services	1
Director, Minority Affairs	1
Director, Center Economic Development	1
Total	18

As was the situation in the other case studies, the new offices addressed student consumer needs (placement, protection services, and minority affairs), programmatic thrusts (freshman forum, fine arts center, and economic development), governmental regulations (financial aid and personnel), and technology (computer center).

In addition to the new departments and the middle management positions they added, a number of offices which existed in 1970 expanded by 1990 including admissions, student affairs, athletics, and physical plant. Remarkable for its absence in either of the growth categories summarized here was the Institutional Relations sector. In most of the cases examined heretofore, growth was delayed in this revenue-generating sector, but eventually occurred. Further evidence that Mu College experienced the staff layering phenomenon is provided by the data in Table 44.

Table 44 - Distribution of Mu College Middle Managers by Level, 1970-1990					
	1970	1975	1980	1985	1990
Deans/Directors	11	13	19	16	19
Assistants/Associates	6	6	7	16	20
Counselors/Coordinators	0	6	5	4	7
Total	17	25	31	36	46

Although slow in coming, the ratio of assistants and associates to deans and directors at Mu College reached 1:1 in 1985 and was maintained at that level through 1990. Growth in the third tier, however, has been quite limited, remaining constant since 1975. Nonetheless, since 1970 the rate of growth for positions below the level of dean and director was 350% compared to 72% for deans and directors.

Middle Managers in the Organizational Culture. In spite of the profusion of middle managers at Mu College, the institution had made little or no formal response to address the needs of these professionals. There was no handbook for administrators and one manager remarked that "they do not even get a copy of the faculty manual." The most recent copy of the faculty manual was the 1978 edition which was under revision at the time of the visit. For that reason, most of the observations below were based upon interviews with middle managers at Mu College.

Classification. The Mu College by-laws provide in Section 4 for the appointment of all non-executive administrative officers by the president of the college. That same section stipulates that administrative officers "shall be privileged to march in academic processions, and to attend faculty meetings, but shall not vote . . . unless they hold academic title and tenure." The most current Mu administration was divided into three areas, Academic Affairs, Development, and Business with most of the traditional student life departments reporting to the academic vice-president. And finally, although no formal hierarchy of middle managers was found, the catalog listing of staff displayed the usual assortment of deans and directors, associate and assistant directors, and a limited number of counselors, coordinators, and managers.

Contractual Terms. Aside from the aforementioned by-law provision that the president was responsible for the appointment of all administrative officers below the executive level, there were no provisions regarding the procedures for posting or advertising openings, resignation, termination, or grievance.

Performance Appraisal. The middle managers at Mu noted that while the College has adopted a performance appraisal program, "most people simply go through the motions since the results are never used for developmental or merit purposes." There was no appraisal form available for review.

Professional Development. Again, in the absence of a handbook or any other documentation, interviews provided the only source of information about professional development opportunities at Mu College. And, while the interview results were not contradictory, there were two distinct viewpoints on the subject. One middle manager remarked that professional development for middle managers was not a college-wide function. Rather, each department was responsible for budgeting to support attendance at national or regional conferences. There was no provision for the support of coursework. Moreover, when the college adopted a new computer system, it had been necessary "to use personal time to learn and master the new software." Another manager observed that "their right people are hand-picked for support and promotion, so institutional support is given to people whose work is valued." This manager added that "the President did not support 'conference junkies' and viewed conferences as a 'waste of time' or as 'job hunting junkets.'"

Recognition. Unlike every other institution studied, Mu College did not sponsor an annual banquet to honor employees for years of service. Instead, the middle managers interviewed commented that recognition at Mu most often took the form of thank you notes. There was no merit pay. Otherwise, recognition of even high visibility work was acknowledged in "subtle" ways, including nominations for positions at other institutions.

Governance. Although the College by-laws provided for the attendance of middle managers at faculty meetings, middle managers were not typically involved in committee work except as resource people and without vote. There was no advisory committee to the president to provide insights regarding middle management concerns.

Mu College Growth Summary. The middle management at Mu College grew significantly between 1970 and 1990. Twenty-nine positions were added and contributed to a 171% growth rate for the twenty year study period. The 84% growth rate for the fifteen years between 1975 and 1990 approached the national rate of 106%. Although enrollment increased by nearly 50% during this time, the ratio of students-to-administrators declined from 48:1 to 26:1, a 45% reduction in workload, while the student-to-faculty ratio increased by 30%. By 1990, twelve new departments had been created. In addition, the number of managers below the director level increased from six to twenty-seven. Not enough budget data was available to permit analysis from that perspective.

The institutional response to the increase in middle managers was minimal. There was no formal documentation regarding contractual status, performance appraisal, professional development, or recognition of middle managers. The most recent faculty handbook did not address administration except insofar as the by-laws acknowledged the prerogative of the president to make appointments and the right of administrators to participate in academic processions and to attend faculty meetings. Two comments, by different managers, were indicative of the status of middle managers at Mu. One manager remarked that middle managers were "a lost entity." Another observed that "whatever happens is designed, controlled, and offered or withdrawn by the president. It is a top-down organization and attention is very individualized."

Chapter Four

Summary of the Case Studies

Preface

While the information provided by each of the respective case studies individually is informative, an analysis of the aggregate data is critical to the study. To be sure, the findings in each of the case studies are unique. Nonetheless, there are a number of generalizations which can be made due to the commonalities among the experiences of the case study colleges. Following the format utilized with the case studies in Chapter Three, the chapter below reports and analyzes the statistical measures of middle management growth and paints a composite portrait of the vital statistics and organizational status and treatment of middle management at all seven institutions.

Vital Statistics

Overall Growth Rates. The data in Table 45 indicate that middle management grew at varying rates at each of the case study schools. The range of growth rates spanned from the low of 91% for Nu College to the high of 317% at Gamma College. To reiterate, the college with the lowest growth rate still nearly doubled its middle management staff while the staff at the school with the highest rate quadrupled. Growth was continuous at five of the case study schools for each of the five-year intervals studied. Of the remaining two colleges, one stalled between 1975-1980 and the other actually lost a position between 1980 and 1985 but each recovered and continued the upward spiral by the next measurement interval. These results demonstrate that, individually and collectively, the case study institutions were representative of the national growth trend for middle management in higher education.

Table 45 - Comparison of Middle Management Growth Rates					
College	1970	1975	1980	1985	1990
Omega	N=16	69%	106%	200%	275%
Alpha	N=31	23%	74%	165%	174%
Gamma	N=18	78%	166%	238%	317%
Zeta	N=15	33%	47%	40%	120%
Beta	N=28	29%	29%	46%	107%
Nu	N=22	14%	36%	68%	91%
Mu	N=17	47%	82%	112%	171%
Average (1970 as base)	N=147	38%	73%	122%	171%
Average (1975 as base)			25%	61%	97%
National Average (EEOC)			NA	61%	106%

The overall growth rates by interval are interesting as well. For each of the first two intervals, using 1970 as the base year, the cumulative change rates were nearly identical at 38% and 35%. And, in spite of that early growth, the expansion rates for the second two intervals were even higher -- 49% both times. The average growth rates for the seven colleges examined, moreover, were remarkably similar to the national rates reported by the EEOC for the periods 1975-1985 (equal at 61%) and 1975-1990 (only 9% lower for the case study institutions).

Student-to-Staff Ratios. It is important to note that growth occurred whether student enrollments increased or declined. In most cases, the number of middle managers increased while faculty strength either remained constant or decreased. In fact, every college experienced a reduction of the teaching faculty at one or more intervals throughout the study period and three schools finished the 1970-1990 period of study with fewer faculty. Overall, the faculties were reduced by 1%. Thus, while student-to-faculty ratios (or faculty workloads) increased, student-to-administrator ratios fell rapidly. The dramatic decline in student-to-administrator ratios portrayed in Table 46 is telling in that regard.

Table 46 - Comparison of Student-to-Staff Ratios			
College	1970 Ratio	1990 Ratio	% Change
Omega College	75:1	19:1	-75%
Alpha College	64:1	29:1	-55%
Gamma College	71:1	24:1	-66%
Zeta College	102:1	42:1	-59%
Beta College	50:1	15:1	-70%
Mu College	50:1	28:1	-44%
Nu College	48:1	26:1	-46%
Overall	66:1	26:1	-61%

Middle management workload declined by an average of 61%, from 66:1 to 26:1 during the twenty year period under study. The range of student-to-staff ratio reductions was -44% to -75%. By comparison, the student-to-faculty ratio increased at five of the case study sites with two colleges reporting reductions of -13% and -17%. The overall increase in faculty workload between 1970 and 1990 was 7%. Relative to any existing measure, faculty strength or student enrollment, middle management at these institutions grew dramatically.

Budget Ratios. The use of salary budget ratios as an indicator did not work as planned. A number of factors complicated the use of salary and budget data. First, the relative absence of salary data for middle managers (only three of the case study schools were able to provide such data) made generalizations impossible. Second, although the effect of increased institutional commitments to student financial aid could be accounted for by using an adjusted figure for the educational budget, it left unknown the increasing weight of fringe benefit costs, the introduction of executive level positions, and the shift of resources toward the purchase and maintenance of computing technology on every campus. Nonetheless, using the faculty salary ratio of educational and general expenditures, after adjusting for financial aid, was informative to the study at hand. Table 47 shows the extent to which faculty salaries declined as a percentage of the adjusted E & G budget.

Table 47 - Comparison of Faculty Salary/E & G Ratios

College	1970	1990
Omega College	42%	30%
Alpha College	54%	22%
Gamma College	15%	17%
Zeta College	66%	30%
Beta College	NA	NA
Nu College	39%	28%
Mu College	NA	21%

Although no data were available for Beta College and the data for the base year of 1970 was missing at Mu College, every other case study institution experienced a dramatic decline in faculty salary ratio. This assertion holds true for Gamma College as well, in spite of the reported figures, because the 1970 salary figure ignored more than half of the faculty who, as members of a religious order, contributed their services and did not appear in the budget. The data in Table 47 make clear that the relative value of faculty salaries declined from a norm of 40%-60% to 20%-30% of E & G -- after accounting for the impact of institutional financial aid on the budget. Given the simultaneous increases in middle management positions, it seems plausible that much of the difference was absorbed by those new jobs.

Sector Analysis. In order to show the degree of staff change by administrative sector and overall, Table 48 lists the titles which existed at four or more case study sites in 1970 and in 1990.

Table 48 - Modal Distribution of Titles in 1970 and 1990

	# of Schools With That Title	
Title	in 1970	in 1990
Registrar	7	7
Director, Computing	X	7
Computing Staff	X	7
Director, Academic Support	X	4
Academic Affairs Offices	1	4
Dean of Students	7	4
Asst. Dean of Students	4	5
Director, Residence Life	X	5
Chaplain	5	6
Director, Admissions	7	6
Asst. Director, Admissions	6	6
Director, Health Services	X	5
Director, Placement	X	7
Director, Counseling	X	5
Director, Financial Aid	X	7
Asst. Director, Financial Aid	X	4
Student Life Offices	5	11
Controller	6	6
Business Manager	6	X

Table 48 (cont'd).

Director, Accounting	X	4
Director, Physical Plant	5	7
Asst. Director, Physical Plant	X	5
Director, Personnel	X	7
Director, Public Safety	X	7
Director, Athletics	X	5
Asst. Director, Athletics	X	4
Coach	X	4
Business/Athletics Offices	3	9
Director, Development	4	X
Director, Alumni	6	6
Director, Public Inf./Rel.	7	5
Director, Planned Giving	X	5
Development Offices	3	3
Total Offices	12	27

The total number of positions at four or more colleges in 1970 was 12 and there were 41 total positions among the seven colleges in that base year. Twenty years later, there were 27 different positions listed among four or more of the seven case study schools, an increase of 125%. The grand total of titles listed for all seven colleges in 1990 was 97. This tally takes account of title changes such as Superintendent of Buildings and Grounds to Director of Physical Plant, Director of Religious Life to Chaplain, and Director of Public Information to Director of Public Relations.

It is of interest to note that the standard for the Academic Sector increased from one office (the registrar) to four with the additions being computing and academic support. The Student Life sector experienced the greatest number of additions including Health Services, Placement, Counseling, and Financial Aid. Meanwhile, the Business and Athletics division expanded from the initial troika of business manager, controller, and plant superintendent to the modern array of controller (with accountant), plant director (with assistant), personnel director, athletic director (and coaching staff), and public safety director. The composite tally for the development area changed minimally.

Table 49 - Composite Tally of Departments Created Since 1970							
Department	Omega	Alpha	Gamma	Zeta	Beta	Nu	Mu
Total Added	11	9	12	12	7	8	12

Table 49 indicates the net addition of administrative departments on each of the case study campuses. The number of new departments ranged from 7 to 12 with an average of 10 offices added per campus.

Analysis by Rank. The aggregate data regarding staff layering show that most of the staff growth resulted from the addition of associates, assistants, coordinators, and managers.

Table 50 - Comparison of Staff Growth Rates by Level					
	1970	1975	1980	1985	1990
Deans/Directors	N=73	18%	56%	59%	81%
Associates/Assistants	N=34	32%	68%	173%	282%
Coordinators/Counselors	N=12	200%	292%	533%	533%
Proportion of Directors	61%	51%	52%	41%	39%
Proportion of Support	39%	49%	48%	59%	61%

Table 50 shows that while the Dean and Director's rank grew steadily, reaching a final growth rate of 81% by 1990, the other middle management ranks expanded at significantly greater rates (282% and 533%) during the twenty year period of study. And, although it was beyond the stated purpose of this study, the case study research revealed that only one of the seven colleges had vice-presidents on staff in 1970 (the remaining six institutions did have academic deans). By 1990, however, the seven colleges boasted a combined total of 26 vice-presidents or an average of nearly four per school at this new and higher level. Finally, it is of interest to note that the ratios of directors to other middle managers shifted from 6:4 in 1970 to 4:6 in 1990. Parity between the ranks had been achieved by 1975 and remained stable through 1980. By 1985, however, the directors represented only 41% of all middle managers. As a result, the average staff size of 1.56 managers in 1970 was 2.56 in 1990 -- an addition of one professional staff member per director.

Analysis by Need. In general, all seven case study colleges responded to the demands of technology, student consumerism, and government accountability as they added administrative offices and middle managers. In order to exploit the educational and administrative advantages of the computer revolution, each college had added a computing department headed by a "director of computing" and staffed with at least one (and usually several) supporting positions by 1990. To meet the ever increasing demands of students and their parents for services, every one of the case study institutions had added a director of placement and a director of financial aid while most of the colleges added residence life directors, health center directors, and counseling center directors. Similarly, most of the colleges in this study had moved the athletic department from the faculty to administration and counted coaches and trainers as middle managers by 1990. Accountability demands were met by the newly created offices for financial aid, personnel, and athletics (Title IX). One surprise finding in the study was that six of these seven small schools had created departments of public safety by 1990. Also added at the majority of the case study institutions were academic support offices and planned giving offices.

Beyond the addition of the departments described in the paragraph above was the expansion of several departments which had existed in 1970. First and foremost among the growth departments was the admissions staff. The average admissions department among the case study schools in 1970 was between two and three professionals. By 1990, admissions was typically the largest professional staff on the campus and averaged about seven administrators per college. Also larger were the development staffs, which by 1990 included specialists for many of the constituent groups at each college including alumni/ae, corporations, foundations, community, and church. These expanded departments seemed to be concerned with generating revenue.

Middle Managers in the Organizational Culture

Although the statistics reported and analyzed in the first section of this chapter support findings at the national level and provide a solid foundation for the study at hand, it was the analysis of the place of the middle manager in the context of each case study institution that produced the most meaningful information. The middle management phenomenon was a relatively recent one for the small, independent liberal arts colleges considered here. The middle management class appeared and evolved at different times on the case study campuses. For this reason, most of the institutions in this study did not develop policies or procedures to deal with these professionals until the late 1970s or the early 1980s. Several colleges had published separate handbooks for administrators and two included special sections in the faculty manual to address middle management concerns. One college did neither. The scope of the policies and procedures included among the respective institutional middle management programs varied widely. Nonetheless, common to most, if not all, of the institutions were policies regarding classification, contractual status, performance appraisal, professional development, recognition, and governance. Each of those aspects are addressed below.

Classification. As a rule, middle managers at the case study colleges were considered extensions of the office of the president. In most cases, this status was denoted in the staff handbook as a section of the institutional constitution or by-laws. While many of the middle managers in 1970 were also tenure-track faculty who held dual appointments, by 1990 it was the case that middle managers were clearly not faculty and it would be unusual for any of them to teach. All seven colleges exhibited clear categorizations, however, both vertically and horizontally.

Only two of the colleges identified a formal administrative hierarchy. Gamma College assigned staff members to one of six pay grades while Beta College used a three-tiered classification system for purposes of defining probationary periods and severance procedures. Most of the colleges, however, exhibited an informal middle management hierarchy which included three categories below the executive level. First, each college had managers at the dean/director level throughout the twenty year period of the study. Most often, managers at this highest level of middle management supervised a department (i.e., the computer center, athletics, student affairs, or admissions). Next in the typical pyramid came the associate or assistant directors. Gamma College was the only institution without staff at this level in 1970, but each of the colleges employed a large number of assistants and associates by 1990. The individuals in these positions had responsibility for a limited aspect of the departmental operation (e.g., head football coach, associate director for academic computing, assistant director of physical plant in charge of housekeeping) and reported to a dean or a director, not an executive officer. At the third level were the specialist and technical positions. These appointments usually included computer programmers, resident hall assistants, assistant coaches, and transfer admission counselors,. Although several of the colleges used job descriptions, none of them defined or identified the general characteristics for the various levels of middle management.

Horizontal divisions of middle managers evolved as the number of managers increased. In 1970, most of the departments headed by middle managers reported directly to the President. Excluding Omega College, there were no vice-presidents in the chain of command. By 1990, however, all seven schools included a coterie of executive officers and divided the middle management staff into four sectors with each sector headed by one of the vice presidents. Although there was some variance, the standard arrangement called for a vice president and staff to be responsible for 1) business, finance, and plant; 2) student life and recruiting; 3) fundraising and public relations; and 4) academic affairs and support functions.

Contractual Terms. The appearance of manuals or handbooks to address the employment policies and procedures related to middle management was a recent phenomenon at six of the seven case study campuses. In fact, only Mu College had no administrative manual (or staff section of the faculty manual) by 1990. Alpha and Beta had introduced their manuals during the late 1970s and were followed in succession by Gamma (1983), Omega (1985), Zeta (1986), and Nu (1987). Although each of the handbooks identified basic personnel policies and procedures such as parking, keys, and fringe benefits, the remaining rules and regulations included varied greatly.

Only Omega College included a section about procedures to be followed in the hiring process for new middle managers. Instructions for position approval, posting, advertising, and interviewing were prescribed in some detail. Three other colleges provided instructions for the internal posting of position openings, but the remaining three institutions did not address this subject. The procedures to be observed for the termination of an appointment, whether voluntary or involuntary, were cited in most of the manuals and consisted primarily of the amount of notice each party was required to give before employment ceased.

Gamma College was the only institution to provide information regarding disciplinary process and also was the only college which offered employee assistance programs to support staff who had encountered difficulties with substance abuse, finances, or marital relations. Three of the case study school manuals made no mention of grievance procedures, but the remaining four colleges each employed a different plan. Employees at Zeta College could appeal to their supervisor, the business manager, and ultimately to a committee of executive officers. Gamma College provided for a Fair Treatment procedure and committee. Managers at Alpha College were entitled to take complaints to the Human Resources Office. Only at Omega College was there a formal grievance committee, elected by and composed of middle managers.

Performance Appraisal. None of the case study colleges used a performance appraisal or evaluation program for middle managers prior to 1980. Beta College introduced such a program in the early 1980s, followed by Gamma (1982), Omega (1983), Alpha (1985), Zeta (1988), and Nu (1989). The formats for the various appraisal programs were remarkably similar and focus on behavioral attributes (i.e., cooperation, initiative, dependability, communication, creativity, etc.) with very little formal attention given to the accomplishment of objectives and goals. All of the appraisal programs were conducted on an annual basis, although Nu College required new staff to be appraised twice during the first year of employment. Each of the appraisal programs was portrayed as formative or developmental rather than summative. None was connected to a system of merit pay.

Staff members at each of the campuses studied agreed that appraisal had the potential to be beneficial, but noted a number of problems which interfered with the success of an appraisal program. A meaningful appraisal program depended on the investment of the supervisor and such investment was unequal from department to department and from sector to sector. It was not uncommon to hear that appraisal was not systematic, but occurred in a haphazard manner. The amount of time involved was also a problem. Finally, the emphasis on behavioral attributes -- almost to the exclusion of goal attainment -- was troublesome to many of the managers interviewed.

Professional Development. In spite of the fact that the appraisal programs described above were intended to be developmental, most of the colleges involved in this study paid little or no attention to professional development opportunities which might address the weaknesses discovered by the appraisal process. Most common were in-service programs and line-item budget support for professional meetings, but several of the colleges offered some kind of professional development leave and one institution provided additional supports.

Six of the seven case study colleges offered in-service programs or workshops. The themes addressed by this type of programming included 1) the articulation of new organizational policies and procedures such as fringe benefit enrollment rules, sexual harassment policies, or college goals and objectives; 2) the explanation of state and federal laws and regulations affecting personnel, financial aid, or civil rights; 3) general information issues such as AIDS awareness and the status of women or minorities; and 4) personal or professional development issues including interpersonal relations, communication, and problem-solving. In most cases, however, the in-service programming was intended primarily to benefit the college by helping the institution comply with legal mandates or by introducing staff to new goals and policies. Moreover, many of the in-service programs were directed at a global audience (i.e., all staff), not just at middle managers. The scheduling of in-service programs varied widely, from the weekly sessions at Beta College to the annual back-to-school conference at Nu. Managers who were interviewed at several of the colleges indicated that their duties made it difficult to find time to attend in-service sessions.

Departmental budgetary support for staff memberships with professional organizations, attendance at national and regional professional meetings, and subscription to professional journals constituted the other common form of institutional promotion of professional development for middle managers. Although six of the seven case study schools claimed to provide this kind of support, interviews with managers made it quite clear that budget difficulties had limited the amount of funding available on an annual basis during the 1980s. As a result, funding practices were highly idiosyncratic. At Beta College, for example, the line items for professional activities had been severely curtailed, but managers there indicated that the president would provide funding if a compelling case for support of a particular activity could be made. At Nu College there were no such lines in the departmental budgets, but staff were encouraged to attend local conferences and seminars. And, while the budgets at Mu College included line item support for professional activities, the president there discouraged staff from becoming "conference junkies."

Three colleges purported to offer professional leaves of absence for middle managers. Only Omega College, however, listed this opportunity and explained the application procedures in their staff manual. Beginning in 1985, Omega administrators could apply to take six months off at full pay or twelve months off at half pay in order to take courses, conduct research, or participate in an internship which would help improve on-the-job performance. Between 1985 and 1990, two managers completed such leaves and a third had been approved for the following year. Interviews on the Alpha campus revealed that at least one manager had taken a professional leave with pay. The human resources director at Gamma College reported that managers there could apply for a two-month study leave at full pay and that one person had taken advantage of the programs by 1990. None of the remaining four case study institutions provided a paid leave program for the professional development of middle managers.

A few professional development programs were unique to one case study college or another. Gamma College, for example, permitted middle managers to enroll for graduate courses leading to the M.B.A. degree at Gamma at reduced or no tuition. Omega College supplemented the line items in departmental budgets with a "small grant" fund administered by a committee of middle managers to support the personal and professional development efforts by staff on a competitive basis. Finally, Omega's manual provided for on campus internship opportunities to enable managers with varied interests and talents to gain an extended experience in a different department. No one, however, had taken advantage of this program by 1990.

Recognition. Except for Mu College, each of the institutions studied recognized middle managers for length of service at an annual reception or banquet. Recognition for excellent performance or the accomplishment of departmental goals and objectives was in most cases limited to thank you notes, announcements at staff meetings, and an occasional "pat on the back" -- although even these inexpensive acknowledgements were given sparingly, if at all. Merit pay increments had been experimented at Gamma College, but dropped due to budget problems. Staff at Nu College might be favored with support for advancement at a different institution if they excelled at their work. Only at Omega College was there a formal program to recognize the professional accomplishments of middle managers with a public announcement and a nominal cash award. Interviews with managers on each of the campuses indicated that some kind of formal recognition for their efforts, especially their successes, would be welcomed.

Governance. The role of middle managers in institutional governance, as a rule, was quite limited. Each of the case study colleges involved managers on traditional governance committees for curriculum, standards, and student life as ex officio members to provide information and logistical support. At both Nu and Mu colleges, the inclusion of managers at even this level was limited. Among the remaining five colleges, only one permitted managers to vote in committee. Omega, Gamma, and Zeta involved managers as voting members of campus advisory committees with faculty, students, and executive officers. Omega and Zeta had developed special committees from which middle managers could explore issues and make recommendations to the president. Two institutions, Gamma and Nu, included middle managers with the faculty senate. At Gamma College, the constitution allowed the president to appoint a number of managers, not to exceed 10% of the teaching faculty, to serve on the faculty senate. The Nu College by-laws identified certain middle management positions (primarily those in the academic affairs area) as "constitutional faculty" who have access to the floor at faculty meetings. As a rule, however, middle management had almost no role to play in the governance of the colleges examined in this study.

Summary of Observations from the Case Studies

The preceding analysis suggests a number of general observations regarding the growth and status of middle management at small, independent, liberal arts colleges in the

Great Lakes Region. First, as suggested by the data reported by the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission in 1985 and in 1990, the number of middle management positions at small, independent, liberal arts colleges in the Great Lakes Region increased. The growth rate for the institutions examined here closely paralleled the national rates of 61% for 1975-1985 and 106% for 1975-1990. Moreover, the student-to-administrator ratio dropped in dramatic fashion at each of the colleges. This staff growth took place at different times for the seven colleges, but growth was continuous throughout the twenty-year period for each school. Meanwhile, the faculties at these institutions remained constant in raw numbers, experienced a heavier workload as portrayed by the increase in student-to-faculty ratio, and saw a decreasing proportion of the educational and general budget allocated for faculty salaries even after accounting for financial aid growth.

Second, the growth patterns varied, but not in significant ways. Many offices and positions were added to address technological needs (e.g., computer center staff and laboratory coordinators), accountability concerns (e.g., human resources officers, campus security officers, and financial aid staff), student consumerism issues (e.g., academic support, health, placement, and counseling services), governmental regulation (e.g., women's athletic positions and minority affairs officers), and revenue generation (e.g., larger admissions, fundraising, public relations staffs). Although a fair number of the new departments and officers were introduced on these campuses at the director level between 1970 and 1990, most of the new positions were added below the level of dean or director. Thus, the middle management staffs at these colleges both expanded and added layers. The combined effect of the vertical and horizontal expansion of middle management at these colleges closely resembled the concept of the "administrative lattice" suggested by Robert Zemsky.

Third, the case studies indicate that most small, independent, liberal arts institutions in the Great Lakes Region have struggled with the new class of professionals which has appeared on their campuses. It was unusual to find a college which had a classification system for managers to define their role and status in parallel fashion to the common ranking system for faculty. Similarly, the contractual concerns of middle managers were addressed minimally, if at all, by official policies and documents provided by the case study institution. Most of the colleges had developed provisions for termination of employment, but guidelines for appointment, promotion, and grievance were not common. Such procedures were usually well-defined with regard to teaching faculty. Finally, two of the colleges involved middle managers in institutional governance in limited ways, but most did not.

Fourth, the overall case study analysis suggests that small, independent, liberal arts colleges in the Great Lakes Region pay little attention to the belonging, self-esteem, and self-actualization needs of their middle management professionals. Performance appraisal programs were common, but seemed to be conducted as an annual ritual rather than as a developmental tool. None of the performance appraisal programs were linked in any way to professional development programming or recognition of performance. In fact, professional development programs were almost non-existent and, except for longevity awards, the same could be said about institutional recognition for superior performance. The relative absence of such programming for middle management contrasted sharply with the standard provisions for faculty in all areas -- evaluation, professional growth, and recognition.

Chapter Five

General Conclusions and Recommendations for Further Study

Conclusions Regarding Middle Management Growth

As noted in Chapter 1, case study research is well suited for exploration of new subject areas. This analysis certainly proved useful for the exploration of the middle management growth phenomenon at small, independent, liberal arts colleges in the Great Lakes Region. And, while the results of this effort did not answer all of the questions posed in Chapter 1, it certainly provided a solid foundation for 1) establishing institutional data bases about middle management, 2) supporting the notion that small, independent, liberal arts colleges have experienced middle management growth comparable to the national trend, 3) lending credence to the concept of the "administrative lattice" as advanced by Zemsky and Massy, and 4) demonstrating the rather haphazard treatment of middle managers at the targeted institutions.

Data About Middle Managers. Although it was never the case that data about small college middle management were readily available in usable and comparative form, such data could be found with varying amounts of effort. Once the raw data had been collected, analyzed, and checked against any available tallies, it became clear that only a few statistics were usable.

Of greatest significance was the statistic for growth rate (dividing the number of managers on staff during a given year by the number on staff during a selected base year. It was an easy matter to compare the growth rates at five year intervals to determine both overall and institution-specific trends. This is the statistic that colleges can use to measure staff growth for all ranks.

Second in importance was the statistic developed for this study, the student-to-staff ratio. This new figure permitted comparison of middle management growth relative to student enrollment and to the other professional staff at each campus, the faculty. The researcher has already been called by one of the case study institutions for information about computing a student-to-administrator ratio which will be used for institutional planning purposes. It seems an appropriate statistic for use throughout higher education.

The budget ratio statistics were much less useful than was initially expected because there were too many variables to control for with regard to salary ratios and the educational and general budget and because the data about administrative salaries was almost impossible to obtain for the years prior to 1980. Nonetheless, tracking the E & G ratios for faculty and staff salaries might be a good way to measure the effect of each group on institutional resources from this point on.

The Growth of Middle Management. Although the data show that the administrations at the various case study sites grew or evolved at different times and rates, one thing is clear: growth did occur, and it occurred in line with national trends. In fact, the overall growth rate for the case study institutions for the period 1975-1985 was identical to the 61% national rate and the rate for 1975-1990 was only a few percentage points lower.

More importantly, this research suggests that the expansion of middle management was not an aberration. It was substantial and permanent. That the studies substantiate each of the several hypothesized reasons for growth in the published literature supports this notion. Technology, accountability, consumerism, government regulation, and revenue enhancement all contributed to staff growth -- albeit in varying degrees -- at every one of the case study colleges.

The Administrative Lattice. Even at these small, independent, liberal arts colleges, growth occurred in two dimensions -- vertically and horizontally. To be sure, more departments were added to meet the needs described above. And, in every case, those departments expanded too. The one-person department of the 1960s was 1.56 persons by 1970 and 2.56 by 1990. As a result, there are more areas of administrative concern, more layers of management to contend with, and greater specialization of labor. In form, at least, Zemsky's lattice is thriving on the small college campus.

The findings of this study, however, contradict much of the conventional wisdom in the literature about middle management in higher education. The additions to staff have not been unconscious meliorations designed to interfere with the efficient functioning of the institution as Parkinson, Sammartino, Academesis, and Veblen would have us believe. And rather than displacing organizational goals a la Bennis, Lunsford, and Selznick, it seems more likely that the new middle managers -- especially those in the student life and academic affairs sectors -- contribute to the institutional objectives of education. That is where most of the growth occurred at the case study colleges. In fact, it seems clear from the case studies that the expansion of middle management positions made a significant difference in the ability of most of those colleges to survive or thrive into the 1990s.

The Status of Middle Management. The most surprising finding from this analysis was the relative lack of institutional effort at dealing with the growth of the middle management class. Given that the growth was real, significant, and long-term, it seems odd that organizations which have as their missions the training, education, and development of students; which have years of experience dealing with the needs of faculty for evaluation, professional growth, and recognition; and which have dealt with the involvement of both faculty and students in institutional planning and governance have been so slow to address the same needs among middle managers.

If these results are indicative at all of the larger picture, it is imperative that small, independent, liberal arts colleges immediately begin to address these concerns. The terms of appointment for middle managers should be as clear as those for faculty. Provisions for performance appraisal should be meaningful and should have some relationship with institutionally sponsored professional development opportunities which are offered on a regular and impartial basis. Every opportunity to acknowledge the achievements of middle managers -- by newsletter, by announcement, by formal awards, and yes, by the proverbial pat on the back -- should be seized by upper management. And finally, these findings seem to indicate that middle managers are stakeholders in the welfare of the institution. For this reason, their role in the planning and governance functions of the college should be increased commensurately.

Recommendations for Further Study

In this study, the researcher has demonstrated the paucity of information available regarding middle management at small, independent, liberal arts colleges. As the number of managers approaches the number of faculty on these campuses, it seems reasonable to assume that there will be a need for formal studies to fill the information void and provide guidance. There is much work to be done to improve the data base about these professionals, to better define the classification and contractual status of managers, to develop models for meaningful performance appraisal, professional development, and institutional recognition programs which will address the needs of these staff members, and to explore some questions which were raised during the course of this research.

Improving Middle Management Databases. None of the colleges which had agreed to serve as cases for this study had a database to provide information about the number of positions, the categories of positions, or the budget requirements for middle management positions. In almost every case, and even for data which were as recent as

1990, it was necessary to dig deep into archival records including academic catalogs, board of trustee reports, audited financial reports, or personnel records in order to obtain the desired data. No two institutions maintained such data in the same way except for the traditional listing of faculty and staff in the directory section of the academic catalog. It is likely that this state of affairs is the rule for small, independent, liberal arts colleges in the United States. Given the significance of middle management growth at such institutions during the past two decades, it is critical that some uniform method of listing, classifying, and budgeting for middle management positions be developed so that these professionals can be tracked and studied the way that faculty and students are tracked and studied.

Contractual Issues. In an age of litigation, it is folly for an organization to employ a significant number of professionals in management positions without addressing the issues of appointment, promotion, retirement, termination, and grievance formally in a staff handbook. Most of the efforts examined in this study were primitive, clumsy, and outdated. Some of the institutions had no formal policies about these matters. Research in the area of personnel policies and law might provide these small, independent, liberal arts colleges with the kind of guidance they need without the expense of hiring legal counsel or going to court or to union.

Professional Development and Recognition. This study suggests that there is a great need for the exploration, discovery, and development of models which will permit small colleges to address the needs of their middle managers for professional growth opportunities and for recognition of their efforts on behalf of the institution. The need to connect performance appraisal, professional development, and recognition seems clear. But sometimes, organizations, like individuals, fail to act because they do not know how.

Microanalysis of Small College Middle Management. In the course of this research, a number of questions came up which were not central to the study but which warrant observation in future studies. One example is the extent to which small college alumni/ae fill middle management positions at their alma maters. The relative proportion of graduates on staff at the case study institutions was striking. A second question surrounds the ability of institutions to accomplish affirmative action goals in middle management, if not in the faculty. In almost every case, it seemed as though institutions were able to hire women and minorities to fill management jobs while their faculties remained white and male. A third issue concerns a study of the formal training and experiential backgrounds middle managers bring to their positions. Although this had been one of the original research questions posed in chapter one, there was no realistic way to access this information on the various campuses.

Watching the Trend. Whether or not it is possible to develop the uniform database suggested above, it will be important to keep a scholarly eye on the phenomenon of middle management growth at small, independent liberal arts colleges. It is hard to believe that the momentum demonstrated here will stop and it will be important to show if the new growth contributes in meaningful ways to institutional goals or if it constitutes an unnecessary drain on institutional resources.

APPENDICES

MICHIGAN STATE UNIVERSITY

OFFICE OF VICE PRESIDENT FOR RESEARCH
AND DEAN OF THE GRADUATE SCHOOL

EAST LANSING • MICHIGAN • 48824-1046

May 1, 1991

Mr. William P. Potter
127 East End
Alma, MI 48801

Dear Mr. Potter:

Subject: Proposal Entitled, "Middle Management & The Small College: Analysis of the Evolution, Organization, & Condition of Professional Administration at Small, Independent, Liberal Arts Colleges in Michigan" IRB#91-129

The above project is exempt from full UCRIHS review. I have reviewed the proposed research protocol and find that the rights and welfare of human subjects appear to be protected. You have approval to conduct the research.

You are reminded that UCRIHS approval is valid for one calendar year. If you plan to continue this project beyond one year, please make provisions for obtaining appropriate UCRIHS approval one month prior to April 25, 1992.

Any changes in procedures involving human subjects must be reviewed by the UCRIHS prior to initiation of the change. UCRIHS must also be notified promptly of any problems (unexpected side effects, complaints, etc.) involving human subjects during the course of the work.

Thank you for bringing this project to our attention. If we can be of any future help, please do not hesitate to let us know.

Sincerely,

David E. Wright

David E. Wright, Ph.D.
Chair, UCRIHS

DEW/ deo

cc: Dr. Marvin Grandstaff

June 10, 1991 Appendix B

1~ 2~, President
3~
4~

Dear President 2~:

As a doctoral candidate in the College of Education at Michigan State University, I am in the midst of that final challenge known as the dissertation. For my subject I have selected a study of small college administration with this title:

Middle Management and the Small College:
An Analysis of the Evolution, Organization, and Condition
of Professional Administration at Small, Independent,
Liberal Arts College in the Great Lakes Region

To achieve that goal, I request your assistance in the form of permission to include 3~ in the study. My plan is to study relevant documents from your institution such as the manual of organization and operation, the employee handbook, tables of organization, budget ratio reports, and/or personnel rosters prior to an on-site visit. While on campus, I would like to utilize the college archives, interview selected staff members, and simply observe.

In the interest of total candor, I am obligated to inform you that I am currently employed as a middle manager at Alma College. Please rest assured, however, that your institution's identity will not be disclosed either in the study or otherwise.

If you are willing to help me, please send a letter of consent along with the name and telephone number of the appropriate contact person on your campus.

Thank you for considering this request. If you participate, I will be glad to share my results when the study has been completed. Please call me at 517/463-7175 during working hours if you have any questions about this proposal.

Sincerely,

William Potter
127 East End Street
Alma, MI 48801
517/463-4869

Enclosures

BIBLIOGRAPHY

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Academesis, John Q. 1958. "A.B. = 'Academic Bureaucracy.'" The New York Times Magazine (12 October): 10: 63-66.

Barzun, Jacques. 1968. The American University: How It Runs, Where It Is Going. New York: Harper & Row, Publishers.

Bennis, Warren. 1989. Why Leaders Can't Lead: The Unconscious Conspiracy Continues. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers.

Birnbaum, Robert. 1988. How Colleges Work: The Cybernetics of Academic Organization and Leadership. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers.

Bouchard, Ronald A. 1981. The fair labor standards act of 1938, as amended, and the equal pay act. Chap. in Federal Regulations and the Employment Practices of Colleges and Universities, Revised edition, WHP 1-12. Washington, D.C.: NACUBO.

Brubacher, John S. and Willis Rudy. 1958. Higher Education in Transition, An American History: 1636-1956. New York: Harper & Brothers Publishers.

Carnegie Council on Policy Studies in Higher Education. 1976. A Classification of Institutions of Higher Education, Revised Edition. Berkeley: The Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching.

Clark, Burton R. 1970. The new university. Chap. in The State of the University: Authority and Change. eds. C.E. Kruytbosch and S.L. Messinger, 17-25. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.

Dill, David D. 1984. "The nature of administrative behavior in higher education." Education Administration Quarterly 20: 69-99.

Equal Employment Opportunity Commission. 1985. "Higher education staff information (EEO-6)." Washington, D.C.: EEOC.

Equal Employment Opportunity Commission. 1990. "Higher education staff information (EEO-6)." Washington, D.C.: EEOC.

Etzioni, Amitai. 1964. Modern Organizations. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

Grassmuck, Karen. 1990. "Big increases in academic-support staffs prompt growing concerns on campuses." The Chronicle of Higher Education (28 March): 1:32-34.

Grassmuck, Karen. 1991. "Throughout the 80's, colleges hired more non-teaching staff than other employees." The Chronicle of Higher Education (14 August): 22.

Johnson, A.E. Jr. and Jerry E. Hutchison. 1990. "Executive order 11246 and the demographics of academic administrators." CUPA Journal 41 (Spring): 19-22.

Jordan, David Starr. 1900. "Perplexities of a college president," The Atlantic Monthly 85 (April): 483-493.

Kay, Emmanuel. 1974. The Crisis in Middle Management. New York: American Management Association.

Kuh, George D., and Elizabeth J. Whitt. 1988. The Invisible Tapestry. ASHE-ERIC Higher Education Report No. 1. Washington, D.C.: Association for the Study of Higher Education.

Lunsford, T.F. 1970. Authority and ideology in the administered university. Chap. in The State of the University: Authority and Change. eds. C.E. Kruytbosch and S.L. Messinger, 87-107. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.

Merton, Robert. 1967. Social Theory and Social Structure. New York: The Free Press.

Parkinson, C. Northcote. 1957. Parkinson's Law. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Co.

Pfiffner, John M. and Sherwood, Frank P. 1960. Administrative Organization. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall, Inc.

Sammartino, Peter. 1978. Demanage Higher Education! East Rutherford, NJ: The Crispen Company.

Scott, Robert A. 1978. Lords, Squires, and Yeomen: Collegiate Middle Managers and Their Organizations. AAHE-ERIC/ Higher Education Research Report Number 7. Washington, D.C.: American Association for Higher Education.

Scott, Robert A. 1979A. "A Beleaguered Yeomen: Comments on the condition of collegiate middle-managers." College and University 54 (Winter): 89-95.

Selznick, Philip. 1943. "An approach to a theory of bureaucracy." American Sociological Review 8: 47-54

Sills, David L. 1957. The Volunteers: Means and Ends in a National Organization. Glencoe, IL: The Free Press.

Stroup, Herbert. 1966. Bureaucracy in Higher Education. New York: Free Press.

Veblen, T. 1957. The Higher Learning in America. New York: Sagamore Press. (Originally published 1918.)

Yin, Robert K. 1987. Case Study Research Design and Methods. Applied Social Research Methods Series, forward by Donald T. Campbell, Vol. 5. Beverly Hills: Sage Publications.

Zemsky, Robert and William F. Massy. 1990. "Cost containment: Committing to a new economic reality." Change 22 (November/December): 16-22.

Zemsky, Robert et. al. 1990. Policy Perspectives: The Lattice and the Rachet. Philadelphia: Pew Higher Education Research Program.

Zemsky, Robert et. al. 1991. Policy Perspectives: The Other Side of the Mountain. Philadelphia: Pew Higher Education Research Program.

GENERAL REFERENCES

Austin, Ann E. and Zelda F. Gamson. 1983. Academic Workplace: New Demands, Heightened Tensions. ASHE-ERIC Higher Education Research Report No. 10. Washington, D.C.: Association for the Study of Higher Education.

Baldwin, Roger G., and Robert T. Blackburn. 1981. "The academic career as a developmental process: Implications for higher education." Journal of Higher Education 52 (November-December) 598-614.

Bensimon, Estela M., Anna Neumann and Robert Birnbaum. 1989. Making Sense of Administrative Leadership: The 'L' Word in Higher Education. ASHE-ERIC Higher Education Report no. 1. Washington, D.C.: School of Education and Human Development, The George Washington University.

Bess, James L. 1983. "Maps and gaps in the study of college and university organization." Review of Higher Education 6(4): 239-51.

Blake, Robert R., Jane S. Mouton and Martha S. Williams. 1981. The Academic Administrative Grid. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Blau, Peter M. 1956. Bureaucracy in Modern Society. New York: Random House.

Blau, Peter M. 1973. The Organization of Academic Work. New York: Wiley.

Blum, Debra E. 1989. "24-Pct. Turnover rate found for administrators; some officials are surprised by survey results." The Chronicle of Higher Education (29 March): 13-14.

Bolman, Lee G., and Terrence E. Deal. 1984. Modern Approaches to Understanding and Managing Organizations. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Chambers, Peter. 1975. "The squeeze on middle managers: The loss of executive authority." Management Review (September): 50-52.

Clark, Burton R. 1983. The Higher Education System: Academic Organization in Cross-National Perspective. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Clark, Burton R. 1972. "The organizational saga in higher education." Administrative Science Quarterly 17 (June): 178-84.

Cohen, Michael D. and James G. March. 1974. Leadership and Ambiguity: The American College President. Boston: Harvard Business School Press.

Corson, J.J. 1960. Governance of Colleges and Universities. New York: McGraw-Hill.

Gross, E. and Grambsch, P.V. 1974. Changes in University Organization, 1964-1971. New York: McGraw-Hill.

Herzberg, Frederick. 1973. Work and the Nature of Man. Revised Edition. Cleveland: World Publishing Company.

Kay, Emmanuel. 1973. "New alternatives for middle managers," Management Review (October): 4-10.

Keller, George. 1983. Academic Strategy: The Management Revolution in American Higher Education. Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins University Press.

Kerlinger, Fred N. 1964. Foundations of Behavioral Research. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston Inc.

Lindblom, Charles. 1959. "The science of 'muddling through.'" Public Administration Review 19 (Spring): 79-88.

Mintzberg, Henry. 1973. The Nature of Managerial Work. Harper & Row.

Price, William C. 1977. "Effective middle management in higher education." College and University 53 (Fall): 33-41.

Rourke, F.E. and Brooks, G.E. 1964. "The 'managerial revolution' in higher education." Administrative Science Quarterly 9: 154-181.

Scott, Robert A. 1977. "Middle-level collegiate administration in a period of retrenchment." College and University 53 (Fall): 42-56.

Scott, Robert A. 1979B. "Robots or reinsmen: job opportunities and professional standing for collegiate administrators in the 1980's." Current Issues in Higher Education Number 7. Washington, D.C.: American Association for Higher Education.

Scott, W.R. 1966. Professionals in bureaucracies: Areas of conflict. Chap. in Professionalization. eds. H.M. Vollmer and D.L. Mills, 264-275. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

Simon, Herbert A. 1946. "The proverbs of administration." Public Administration Review 6 (Winter): 53-67.

Simon, Herbert. 1958. Administrative Behavior. New York: MacMillan.

Simmons, Adele. 1983. Organizing and staffing a small college. Chap. in Management Techniques for Small and Specialized Institutions New Directions for Higher Education, no. 42. eds. A.J. Falender and J.C. Merson, 59-64. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Weber, Max. 1947. The Theory of Social and Economic Organization ed. by Talcott Parsons, London: Oxford University Press.

Whyte, William H., Jr. 1956. The Organization Man. New York: Simon & Schuster.