Principles of a Faculty Program

In the preceding chapter, current university problems were presented against the background of American and European developments. The view was taken that formal education, in this country and in others, may provide both mass opportunities and superior training for the gifted. The latter goal implies a selective process which can be first undertaken in the lower schools, but culminates in a university program devoted primarily to professional teaching and creative activities. Society may desire other contributions from higher education, such as the provision of mass opportunities or of community services, and these may well be emphasized by other institutions. But they should be provided by Pennsylvania only in so far as they do not interfere with the distinctive functions of a university.

The implications of this view, for varied aspects of a faculty program at Pennsylvania, will be discussed below within appropriate chapters. But before entering into such matters, it was well to consider further the general position of the University faculty and to make suggestions for its possible improvement. Specific suggestions, on such matters as appointments, teaching, and research, are contingent upon the formulation of more definite principles than have been presented up to this point. Pertinent, in this connection, are the relationships of the faculty to (1) the public and the community, (2) the trustees, (3) the administrators, and (4)
students and alumni. Last, but not least significant, are (5) the relations obtaining within the faculty itself.

The Faculty and the Public. The relations of the faculty to the public lie largely outside the area of the University's control. In a general way, the quality of men or women who seek a university career is influenced by the status of the academic profession in American society. This has been rated low in the past by both faculty members and outside critics. André Siegfried once remarked that "a certain amount of irony is attached in English" to the title of "professor." And H. L. Mencken referred to those who held it as "yokels," "boors," and "peasants in frock coats," who ranked socially somewhere between Methodist ministers and brickyard owners.

Public opinion polls of the last decade, however, have given "professors" high ratings within the professions and even among occupations as a whole. This is surprising in view of the uncertain status of teaching at large and of the tendency to look upon university professors simply as "college teachers." Hence, despite the polls, doubts are still expressed about the general standing of academic people. Mr. Folsom, Secretary of Health, Education and Welfare, recently declared (Nov. 3, 1957) that low salaries for college teachers reflect "the lack of respect accorded to teaching by the public." Abroad, in contrast, "professors" make up a small and select group. They have possessed, in some countries, official status and aristocratic connections.

High standing seems to have both advantages and disadvantages. It may isolate intellectuals from the rest of society with disturbing consequences. Yet, national instances can

---

1 America Comes of Age, N. Y., 1925, 95.
2 Prejudices: Third Series, N. Y., 1922, 249 ff.
be cited in which high status for professors (including high salaries) has been combined with superior intellectual achievements. Conversely, in American experience, popular disregard for pure scholarship and science (and for those who "professed" them) was long associated with a mediocre record in these areas.

The American problem is a difficult one. How can we reconcile the prestige which is needed (if universities are to enlist the best talent) with the national aversion to an intellectual élite? The aversion is not purely social: there are also anti-intellectual traditions in the background. It is usually said that Americans esteem men of action above men of thought. And if there has been some improvement in the reputation of professors, this does not necessarily indicate any change in attitude. The public may simply have the impression that more professors now qualify as men of action.

All that a university can do in the present situation, apart from improving salaries, is to insist upon the dignity of its faculties. This end is not served by such trustees as still view academic men as "employees," nor is it advanced by the somewhat casual attitudes of some students and alumni. There are, no doubt, a few academic men who do not serve their own interests in this connection. No one wishes the American university professor to be a "stuffed shirt" or even a Geheimrat. But he should be conscious of his own worth,

3 Vannevar Bush has reminded us (Oct. 15, 1957) that American professors receive 250 percent of laborer's salaries, while Russian counterparts are paid 800 percent.


5 American professors may be held inconsistent if they uphold egalitarian principles in general and yet desire superior status for themselves.
in a multitude of dealings with others—both on and off the campus.

The relations of academic men to the smaller public, known as the community, are more tangible than are those to society at large. One has in mind here what the community may offer faculties, rather than what they may do in turn for the community. Such matters as the campus environment, living conditions, transportation, and social opportunities all influence the staff member's mind—directly, or indirectly through his family.

Here Pennsylvania, like any large institution in an urban setting, faces certain disadvantages. It cannot provide the dramatic setting of an Ithaca or the idyllic surroundings of some "college towns." Even the neighborhood in which the University is located leaves much to be desired. On the other hand, the present program for enclosing and improving the campus is the most promising one since removal was made to West Philadelphia, and this will doubtless provide as attractive a setting as can be secured within the city.

If Pennsylvania were a non-residential institution, as are most European universities, a campus might be superfluous. But the University has many resident as well as non-resident students, and must plan accordingly. What, in this connection, about the faculties? Should they also have opportunities to live on the campus?

At present, the staff is widely distributed. Some live in the campus neighborhood, others have migrated to scattered suburbs. The latter must contend with what is called progress in modern transport, and may have few colleagues

(See S. M. Lipset, "The Egghead Looks at Himself," N. Y. Times Mag., Nov. 17, 1957, 22 ff.) But a desire to be taken seriously is not necessarily a demand for special privileges.
within reach. Most of them cannot enjoy the faculty social life which can be so pleasant in a small community.

It is unlikely that this pattern can be basically altered. Many faculty families prefer the suburbs for their schools and for other advantages. Incidental aid, such as the provision of adequate parking spaces, could be extended to them. Meantime, however, there are three elements in the faculty, among whom are some who would desire to live in apartments on or near the campus. These are individuals living alone, married couples without children, and those older couples whose children have moved out from under. The University might well consider, therefore, the construction of faculty apartments—particularly if federal aid were available in this connection. The groups mentioned would probably find these both convenient and congenial. Such buildings might also provide rooms for visitors who had a more or less official status.

The campus center which would do most for the staff's personal and professional life is already promised; namely, a faculty club. Here we are in the presence of an old friend, "the long-felt need." Such units exist in various forms and combinations throughout the country. At Minnesota, for example, the club is housed in the general "Union" and serves faculty only; while at Hopkins it has its own building and provides dinners for faculty, alumni, and their families. Luncheons, however, are reserved for the faculty, at which time the main dining room is sacred to men. In a day when domestic service is rare in faculty circles, there is a real advantage in a club which welcomes families in the evenings. But these and other possibilities will occur to administrators and staff who plan the Club at Pennsylvania.

It need hardly be added that the Philadelphia environment, in compensation for the disadvantages noted, offers
university men many advantages. The city is a great cultural center, and its numerous libraries, museums, clubs and other institutions are assets to university personnel. So, also, is the location of the city on the Atlantic seaboard axis. These circumstances have played a part in attracting men to or in holding them at Pennsylvania. The University may well call attention to such advantages, provided it does not depend upon them as substitutes for other values. And it will presumably continue to cultivate good relations with sister institutions to which its faculties have access.

The relationship of the faculty to the city as a whole, or to the state and to national affairs, is difficult to evaluate. Certainly, some professors are leaders in local and in nationwide professional circles. Others have done notable work for state or federal bodies, or have directed University agencies which provide community services. Such activities presumably enhance the reputation of the faculties “in town” or with the public at large. Least effective here, one would think, is the pedant, the cloistered scholar, or the intellectual snob; most effective, the professor who gives the impression of being a “good fellow” or a “practical” man.

By and large, however, the academic staff at Pennsylvania does not seem to enjoy a good “local press.” Indifference can be explained, in part, by the size of the city and by the attitude of the newspapers. The fact remains that the appointment of a professor is news in Baltimore, but not in Philadelphia. This matter may merit consideration in connection with the public relations of the University.

The Faculty and Trustees. Few studies have been made of the history or present role of college and university trust-

6 The Baltimore press also supports academic men in public affairs. See, e.g., editorial in Baltimore Sun, Nov. 5, 1957.
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tees, and the same is true of private boards in general. In Continental Europe, most universities, hospitals and other welfare bodies are under the ultimate control of Church or State and are in the hands of persons with some claim to expertness. But in England since the Reformation, and subsequently in this country, many such institutions have been placed under lay boards. Implicit in the arrangement is the concept of stewardship, which is said to be peculiar to Western society.

One may surmise that these boards filled the vacuum created when neither the English Church nor Government would take over; or they may, conceivably, have been deliberately set up to forestall official controls. Some person or persons must have final legal authority, provide funds, and maintain the administration of welfare organizations; and English-speaking peoples have often preferred that these persons should operate in a private capacity. They were able, in this way, to provide relative freedom for the institutions concerned.

Freedom from control by Church or State also could be achieved by placing institutions in the hands of their own experts—in those of the medical staffs of hospitals, for example, or in those of professors in universities. The latter arrangement actually took form, in considerable measure, at Oxford and Cambridge. But such professional autonomy also has its dangers. Even "private" universities have ultimate, public responsibilities; and it is well known that the British Government eventually felt it necessary to intervene in the affairs of the old universities. In the long run, there are valuable safeguards in requiring that experts justify—or at least explain—their stewardship to intelligent laymen. Herein lies the merit of the usual American board of trustees.

7 The Educational Survey study is not available as this is written.
Like most human institutions, however, the lay board also has its limitations. Most obvious is the apparent paradox involved in having an institution governed by men, most of whom know relatively little about it "from the inside." As noted, this situation is avoided in most countries by placing universities under the oversight of ministries of education—an arrangement which also meets the need for some degree of public responsibility. But usually, abroad, the State appropriates funds for universities and also accords them public prestige; whereas, in the United States, it is often the trustees who are needed to provide financial and/or moral support.

The seeming incongruity of lay control over universities has been recognized by American critics for well over a century, though early attacks on the system had little effect and have usually been forgotten.\(^8\) Some of the criticisms were directed against lay government in principle, but one senses that many were really motivated by a dislike for its administrative consequences. As noted before, lay authority almost automatically produces a powerful president, since trustees are too busy to deal with faculties on details and yet must have guidance from someone. Trusting in the president for advice, trustees naturally delegate to him—in effect—much of their own authority. This arrangement means, in turn, that most trustees have little part in the actual initiation or direction of university policies.

The limitations of lay government therefore point up the issue of the pros and cons of control by administrators. Here, again, one faces both advantages and disadvantages—as dis-

---

\(^8\) See, e.g., Jasper Adams, "On the Relations Existing Between the Board of Trustees and the Faculty of a University...", \textit{Introductory Discourse... Amer. Institute of Instruction}, Boston, 1838, 141 ff.; also J. F. Jackson, in the \textit{Knickerbocker Mag.}, XXVIII, July, 1846; and W. P. Rogers, \textit{Andrew D. White}, Ithaca, 1942, 145.
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cussed in the preceding chapter. Our opinion is that power in the hands of a president who is able, liberal and devoted can be most effective; but, in the hands of a man who lacks any one of these qualities, can be most unfortunate. In a word, we think the outcome is too vital to be entrusted to any single person. If so, then authority should be distributed more than it now usually is by any or all of the following procedures:

1) promoting better understanding of intra-university problems by trustees
2) providing more effective contacts between trustees and faculties
3) permitting faculties to share with administrators the powers delegated by trustees
4) placing a few experts (professors) among the trustees.

So much for general principles. A discussion of actual relations between American faculties and trustees is difficult because such relations are often non-existent. At Pennsylvania, trustee “boards” or committees are concerned with areas of instruction and may discuss the state of a field with certain professors therein. But this involves no mutual responsibility: procedures are entirely in the hands of the trustees. As far as we are aware, no faculty committees report directly to trustees, as at Princeton, nor are there joint committees of

9 The national picture of faculty-trustee relations was reported from 291 local, A.A.U.P. chapters for 1953; see A.A.U.P. Bull., vol. 39 (Summer, 1953), 62 ff. Summarized results indicated that:
   Faculty members served on Boards in 10 institutions.
   Trustees sat in Senates in 3.
   President reported faculty opinion, when different from his own, in 9.
   There were special, or standing joint committees in 35.
   Faculty went to board on own initiative in 44.
   There were only social contacts, or none in 185.
the two groups which work together on particular problems, as at Goucher and other colleges.\textsuperscript{10}

By and large, unless the situation has changed recently, the Pennsylvania trustees have seemed remote from the staff. On certain occasions in the past, trustees decided major issues in University policy without so much as hearing from the faculties. One possible explanation of trustee remoteness—the partial survival of the employer-employee outlook—has been mentioned, and doubtless other factors bear on the situation.

One of these factors may be the size of the University. It is easier for a relatively small institution to provide direct contacts between individual trustees and professors, as is done at Wesleyan University. Another is the size and make-up of the Board of Trustees. On any large board, there will be members who lack the background, the interest, or the time to participate actively in specific discussions with faculty groups. Some of them, moreover, live at too great a distance for this sort of thing.

A final objection to faculty-trustee contacts may lie in a fear that such contacts would short-circuit the authority and influence of the president. There is little reason, in our opinion, to believe that the operation of joint trustee-faculty committees, dealing with specific questions, would weaken the president's general position. This has not been the experience of institutions which use such groups. But if these are to be really "joint" committees, the faculty members should represent a body such as the senate and should not be selected by the trustees themselves.

Whether more ambitious contacts should be established,

\textsuperscript{10} Except possibly the committee on honorary degrees. See Charles P. Dennison, \textit{Faculty Rights and Obligations in Eight Independent Liberal Arts Colleges}, 1955, 56 ff.
as by the election of faculty members to the Board, is a matter of opinion. In the experience of Cornell University, this does not seem to have embarrassed the trustees, but if it does, some of the advantages of faculty representation may be secured by electing trustees who are professors at other universities. Such men would have no local, vested interest in decisions and could make known such viewpoints as are common to faculty members at large.

Our own view is that the experiment of faculty representation on the Board is worth a trial. The arrangement would add to the dignity of the faculty by bringing it into formal decisions on the highest level and by eliminating all vestiges of employee status. And it would enable American professors to approach the position, within their own institution, which is taken for granted in universities in other parts of the world.

Faculty representatives on the Board could be appointed by the trustees or president from a faculty-elected panel. Their number need not be large, and the presence of three or four of them—under these circumstances—would neither threaten the president’s authority nor change the complexion of the Board. Nor would the presence of this small number imply that the faculty shared responsibility for board actions. Such responsibility could be assumed only if a much larger ratio of professors were elected—an unwieldy arrangement unless lay membership were correspondingly reduced. And probably no American university would undertake so radical a change at the present time.

The important point, however, is not faculty representation as such. It is, rather, the desirability of making faculty viewpoints known to trustees as well as to administrators.¹¹

¹¹ For this same reason, the trustees might be invited to send several representatives to the Senate, or—less formally—to appoint several members to “sit in” on Senate meetings.
If, for any reason, the trustees will not admit faculty members, much may be accomplished by such other formal contacts as have been suggested. The ultimate goal is to instill in all groups concerned, from trustees to instructors, a sense of team work—of common associations and purpose in the service of the University.

The Faculty and Administrators: Within Departments. The most vital relationships of faculty bodies, as such, are usually those obtaining with administrators. This is true on all levels; as in the relations of department members to chairmen, of college faculties to deans, provosts or vice presidents; and of the all-university Senate to the President.

The faculties at Pennsylvania, as in other private universities, look to administrators and/or trustees for adequate salaries and facilities. Such dependence is taken for granted as part of the American scheme of things. But faculties desire more than these essentials. They cherish a sense of freedom in their own work; and many of them, at least, also wish to participate in the life and work of the University. The central problem in faculty-administrative relations is how to attain these values without, at the same time, losing those of effective, administrative leadership.

It would be relatively easy to seek one set of values in the absence of the other. Procedures can be relatively simple, for example, in a university placed almost entirely in the hands of its faculty or, conversely, in those of administrators. The reconciliation of these alternatives is more difficult but also more promising.

In some respects, the most significant level of faculty-administrative relationships is the lowest. Practices and policies within a department, concerning appointments, promotions, course offerings and the like, have the most direct impact.
upon its members. It is within the department that the staff member is most aware of freedom in his own work and of participation with others in a common program—or the reverse.\(^ {12}\) Here, moreover, the division between administration and faculty is least marked, since the chairman combines the roles of administrator and of professor. And here, finally, one sees—in microcosm, as it were—the essential problem of reconciling leadership with joint participation and with freedom.

Freedom, of course, is relative. American faculties rarely expect the almost complete *Lehrfreiheit* which obtains in some European universities. They expect, for example, to assume a certain “teaching load,” which, at Pennsylvania and most similar institutions, is more or less standardized by college or departmental practice. They also assume that course offerings are to be approved by departments; and that younger men, at least, may be assigned to certain teaching obligations.

These expectations relate largely to the undergraduate work of departments. On the graduate level, requirements are apt to be less formal. Here, then, is another illustration of complications inherent in the combined graduate-undergraduate function of American universities. At least minor annoyances may be experienced in graduate activities, in so far as they are subjected to requirements (as on credits or teaching hours) which are more appropriate to undergraduate programs. And the latter, conversely, may be denied as much control as is desirable, because university professors resent more than a minimum of regulation. Under the heading

\(^ {12}\) Departmentalization of American faculties has been a phenomenon of only the last 75 years. Critical studies on why and how this came about, together with comparative observation of foreign faculties, might provide a perspective on current structure and practice.
“Teaching,” for example, we shall later inquire whether there should not be more supervision of undergraduate teaching than is now commonly practiced at Pennsylvania.

Within the broad limits noted, however, university staffs expect to teach as they wish and to pursue such research as they desire. And in this accepted sense of the term, the faculties at Pennsylvania do enjoy a large degree of freedom. The great majority assert this unequivocally, and view such freedom as one of the chief attractions of the University for the academic staff. One should recall, in this connection, that the University’s regulations concerning tenure and dismissal apparently assure “academic freedom” as well. For this happy state of things, the faculties are indebted to prevailing attitudes among chairmen, administrators, and trustees.

The degree to which the faculty enjoys a corresponding sense of participation is difficult to measure. This is especially the case on the departmental level, since departments enjoy some autonomy and practices vary accordingly—even within the same college. Chairmen are appointed by administrators; but whether this involves initial action or simply approval of departmental nominees, depends on the unit concerned. And a departmental decision, on this or other matters, may express the view of a chairman, of an executive committee or group of senior men, or of the membership as a whole.

Although the election of chairmen is not unknown in this country, our opinion is that appointment by administrators

---

13 There were few exceptions to this view among the staff who were interviewed.
14 The 1953 reports (citation, No. 9, above) indicated that chairmen were:
   Elected by departments in 22 institutions.
   Appointed by administrators, without consultations with departments, in 114.
   So appointed, after consultations, in 136.
should be retained at Pennsylvania. Otherwise, the University will lose the best available leverage on units which need reorganization. Ordinarily, however, officers may be expected to receive and approve nominations originating within departments.

The question then arises: How should nominations be made within departments? Generally speaking, these units should determine their own procedures. But our view is that the entire department should share in such decisions, and a dean and college faculty might well require this. In a word, each department should be requested to decide (at a general meeting) how it wished to nominate a chairman. The dean, if he desired, could ask for a panel of two or three names, from which he would select one for recommendation to the President.

Certain departments may adopt, in this connection, what amounts to a "revolving chairmanship." The merit of this system is that it prevents any one professor from assuming a dominating position. (The phenomenon of the chairman as petty dictator is not unknown in American institutions.) On the other hand, unless a fairly long term is required, a revolving chairmanship does not provide continuity in leadership. Professors are apt to view the post as a chore which they give up gladly as soon as possible. In any case, the system usually brings all men of a certain rank into the chairmanship without regard for their qualifications.

For these reasons, we suggest that chairmen be proposed and approved on the basis of individual merit. This arrange-

---

15 Formally, at Pennsylvania, deans pass their recommendations up the administrative ladder to the president. The college committee on appointments and promotions is consulted in the process (Manual of Policies and Procedures, Art. VII, No. 6).

16 In theory, a college faculty—instead of the dean—could pressure a member department, but it will rarely do this in practice.
ment, also, could be required by the dean and the college faculty. In order to prevent domination by any one person, however, the term of office should be definitely limited. Duration could be, say, three or five years, with the possibility of reappointment for a second, consecutive term. It would then be possible to retain an effective chairman for a period of from six to ten years.

The chairman, as chief officer of a department, represents it in all formal communications—both on and off the campus. He deals with administrators primarily through the dean; and administrators, in turn, deal with the department through him. It is easy to ridicule "red tape" and "channels," yet a minimum formality in such matters is essential. Nothing will demoralize a department more rapidly than a situation in which president or dean deals directly with a staff member on salaries, promotions, or programs and so "short-circuits" the chairman and the department as a whole. The temptation to do this may be great, but it should be resisted as inconsistent with good administration.¹⁷

The same thing may be said of a situation in which an administrator deals with the chairman of only one department, when the question involved concerns another department as well.

When a chairman conducts official communications with men in other institutions, the degree of his authority should be clearly understood by all concerned. Invitations to accept appointment, with stipulations concerning rank, sal-

¹⁷ No attempt is made here to discuss principles of administration as such. A large literature exists in this field in terms of "public administration," "human engineering," and the older "efficiency expert" materials. Most of this literature relates to government, industry, labor relations, etc., or to public school administration, but there are points where it is applicable to university administration also. See, e.g., Robert H. Roy, The Administrative Process, Baltimore, 1958, passim.
ary, tenure, etc. are usually extended by presidents or deans; but lesser matters—teaching load, office facilities, future prospects, and so on—are often left in the hands of the chairman. The latter should know just what he may offer, so that there will be no danger of later administrative disclaimers.

What, meantime, of the relations of the chairman to the department? The principles here accepted imply that he would share decisions with other members. This is already done, but in varying degrees within different departments. One chairman talks only to individuals immediately concerned, another consults all professors, while a third may bring matters before all members above the rank of instructor.

In our opinion, procedures should be systemized to the point of requiring that chairmen share decisions with colleagues. Admittedly, it is not feasible to bring all matters before an entire department. The simplest device which is applicable here is that of a small executive committee, which would sit with the chairman in reaching decisions on such matters as appointments, promotions, budgets, and course programs or assignments. In most cases, agreement could be expected between the chairman and other members. But in the rare instances in which there were disagreements, the chairman would present both his own view and that of committee colleagues.¹⁸

The make-up of an executive committee and the method of selecting it had also best be left to the full department. Our preference would be to set up a committee of three (in addition to the chairman), one of whom would be an assistant professor who would sit in on all matters except those involving ranks above his own. Terms of office could be the

¹⁸ To the dean re appointments, salaries, etc., and to the department in strictly intra-departmental matters.
same as those of the chairman. Such a committee, if the
group desired, could be appointed by the chairman from a
panel elected by all members.

We would also hope that the chairman would bring be­
fore the entire department all items which could possibly be
handled in that way, and that there would be full freedom
of discussion in such meetings. The motive here is to assure
the junior ranks of a sense of participation, since both inter­
views and questionnaires indicate that this feeling is most
lacking on that level.\textsuperscript{19}

In very small departments, of course, an executive com­
mittee is unnecessary. At the other extreme, large depart­
ments may need even more machinery than this committee
provides. They may wish to relieve the chairman of various
burdens; for instance, from direction of “lab” programs or
contract research, supervision of teaching assistants, special
direction of either graduate or undergraduate studies, and
preparation of routine paper work.\textsuperscript{20} It is therefore common,
when circumstances warrant it, to appoint such officers as an
assistant chairman or “executive officer” and a director of
graduate work. Here terms of three or five years would be
appropriate. Most such personnel can be made responsible
to the chairman and executive committee and can be chosen
by them; but a director of either graduate or undergraduate
studies may be made a co-chairman of the department if the
members so desire and the dean approves.

A department can, of course, carry out some of the func­
tions mentioned through standing committees rather than
through single individuals, and experience will indicate

\textsuperscript{19} See, especially, M. E. Wolfgang, \textit{Wharton Faculty Attitude Survey},
\textit{passim}, concerning attitudes of assistant professors.

\textsuperscript{20} If the burdens of a chairman are too heavy despite such arrangements,
he can be relieved of part of his teaching load, presumably with the ap­
proval of the dean and of the department executive committee.
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which is the more effective procedure. Members will have to give some time to these matters, one way or the other. The number of *ad hoc* committees, meantime, should be kept to the minimum clearly necessary.

Indeed, all departmental structure should remain as simple as is consistent with good administration. At one extreme, a group of two or three may operate as a unit in nearly all matters: at the other, functions may be so complex as to call for written by-laws which are approved by the members and are consistent with college regulations.  

*Faculty Relations with Administrators: On the College and University Levels.* The relatively sharp distinction made between staff and administrators, above the departmental level, has already been mentioned. The distinction seems to have increased almost automatically with the growing size and complexity of universities. In the old arts colleges, presidents were the sole officials and served as professors as well. Today, they and their associates must abandon all or the greater part of professorial functions, and this sets them apart. Meanwhile, as noted, the growth of an administrative hierarchy made the division between officials and faculty more marked. The most divisive factor, however, was simply the fact that authority was vested to a greater degree in one group than in the other.

Institutional complexity, some of it related only indirectly to academic matters, seemed to justify the proliferation of administrative offices. The existence of undergraduate programs, for example, called for directors of admissions, of student affairs, and so on.  

21 An example of these is found in the regulations of the Department of Psychology.

22 Though why the old, academic title of dean was applied to personnel officers like “deans of women” or “of men” is not clear.
large funds had to be directed by responsible officials. And as more officials appeared on operating levels, the more was it necessary to increase the "top" administrative staff. Otherwise, presidents would have become responsible for an impossible "span of control."

Perhaps it is symptomatic of the division here discussed, however, that some professors took a dim view of the hierarchy. They believed that university administration imitated that of "big business" and was made more elaborate than was necessary. Suspicions were expressed that administration was organized for the sake of organizing, or to put up an impressive front. Particularly disturbing, to such men, was the influence sometimes exerted by non-academic officials at high levels.²³

Whatever the interpretation of origins, the division between administrators and faculties was reflected in campus attitudes as well as in formal relationships. One-time professors who accepted high academic posts seemed to enter a new order or profession. And it was said that some of them, hitherto critical of administrators themselves, rapidly acquired an authoritarian outlook.²⁴

The greater the authority exerted by administrators as a sharply distinct group, the more the campus attitudes mentioned are apt to prevail. Such attitudes will, at best, involve difficulties, and at worst are clearly unwholesome. Matters

²³ A university president recently announced that a new vice-president for fund raising possessed "a deep understanding of higher education," in consequence of a career in "management and personnel administration" of business corporations. See also remarks of L. C. Petry (prof. emer., Cornell), in Conference (note below), 10 ff.

²⁴ See, e.g., remarks of W. M. Wise, Teachers College, Columbia Univ., in Conference on Faculty-Administration Relations, Amer. Council on Education, May 5-7, 1957, 24 ff. This change of outlook has implications for faculty-administration relations if Dr. Paul Buck's statement is sound; i.e., that the wise administrator "thinks and acts like a professor," B. A. Cronkheit (Ed.), Handbook for College Teachers, 1950, 170.
are made worse, of course, if administrators are inept or lack candor, or if the faculties contain more than their normal quota of misfits, exhibitionists, and generally maladjusted persons.25

Our own view, already stated, is that these difficulties may be minimized if the sharp distinction between administrators and faculties can be overcome. Authority and the opportunity for decisive action must reside in some person or group, but the group in this case may include professors as well as administrators. Before suggesting specific means for implementing this suggestion at Pennsylvania, however, it were well to anticipate possible objections to such a program.

There is real fear that an attempt to bring faculties more fully into decision-making will confuse an already complex administration. Visions arise of more and more committees, conferences, and overlapping jurisdictions, with resulting delays or indecision. Would it not provide more effective management if, as in a business corporation, power were frankly concentrated in administrative hands along clearly defined lines of authority? All that would be needed, in addition, would be mutual good will and an inclination on the part of administrators to take seriously such advice as they requested of college faculties.

There is no question that good will is essential, but—given the academic tradition—it is not likely to be fostered by completely one-sided authority. There is also no question but that concentration of power in a few hands expedites de-

25 Remarks of President Logan Wilson, Univ. of Texas, Conference (note 24), 2-4. Cynicism about the academic profession sometimes appears within its own ranks as a reaction to administrative control; e.g., Prof. M. B. Visscher, Univ. Minnesota, declared in 1947 that faculties "constitute an amorphous mass of complaining, often confused employees... they are not in a position to demand anything... within the ranks of no profession are to be found so many disgruntled repenters-at-leisure as in the academic profession." (A.A.U.P. Bull., vol. 33, 496).
cisions—but gives no assurance that these will be wise deci-
sions. The view of an administrator may indeed be more
sound, at times, than that of the majority of the staff; but the
reverse can also be true. Why not, therefore, bring them both
into the picture?

Increased faculty participation may already have compli-
cated administration at certain points. But administration
will remain complex in any case, since the time is past when
institutions can be run simply on the basis of unstructured
amity among all concerned. Moreover, if faculty actions in-
volve difficulties at some points, the program can include
simplification at others. And while faculty participation may
at times delay decisions, it can on other occasions exert pres-
sure for action.

As a matter of fact, there are already indications at
“Penn” that an intimate merging of administrative and fac-
ulty thought will stir things up and produce chain reactions
in the policy field. During two earlier periods, those of Prov-
ost Smith at the beginning and of Provost Pepper in the late
nineteenth century, Pennsylvania provided national leader-
ship in higher education. During most of the present cen-
tury, however, its record was rather neutral. Long-run policy
seemed to be to “play safe.” There were few serious mistakes
and few original contributions, and the University’s general
reputation neither rose nor declined. Within the last few
years, in contrast, a spirit of intellectual adventure has be-
gun to pervade the campus—a willingness to take some risks
in order to break out of the “dead center” of the past.

Perhaps the most serious obstacle to greater faculty par-
ticipation relates to the attitudes of this group itself. One of
the University’s trustees, Dr. Katharine McBride, has pointed
out the innate contradiction here. Faculty members, many
of them, wish to share in determining policies but also de-
sire “tranquillity”—freedom of time for teaching and research. A few will emphasize only one or the other of these values, but the majority desire both in a diffuse sort of way. They wish to take a real part in decisions but are irked by the thought of more time spent in committees or other administrative settings. How can they have their cake and the penny too?

The answer is, presumably, that they can compromise on a bit of both. Professors who give much time to college or university affairs may have their teaching loads reduced. But faculties must face the fact that responsibilities will demand time and effort. If they are unwilling to give, there is no reason why they should receive.

The outcome of this issue is by no means assured. In some institutions, as in certain of the women’s colleges, faculties apparently take part earnestly in such policy decisions as are within their reach. In other institutions which grant professors considerable influence, there have been signs of faculty indifference.  

It is well to recall, however, that at least some supposed faculty aversion to committees is unreal: there are those who rather enjoy service on these bodies. Moreover, when the aversion is real, it may be directed against the time spent on trivia or routine rather than against administrative serv-


ice as such.\textsuperscript{28} To the extent that professors deal with significant issues, there seems a reasonable likelihood that most of them will rise to the occasion. The suggestions which follow are frankly based on this prospect.

\textit{The Consultative Program.} Granting that faculties are to share in policy decisions, there are two ways of bringing this about. These are not mutually exclusive, but one is more far-reaching than the other. The first procedure involves what may be called a consultative program, in which administrators ask the advice of faculty bodies in a more or less systematic manner. Such advice usually relates to appointments, general policies, and budgets—in about that order of frequency.

Consultative programs are commonly associated with faculty control of pedagogical matters. The Pennsylvania \textit{Statutes} grant college faculties authority over admissions, teaching, and degrees in course—subject to the approval of the Trustees' "Executive Board." The admissions clause, however, refers only to "subject requirements," and there is no reference to the control of admissions in practice.\textsuperscript{29} The college faculty should be represented on any body which makes and enforces rules in this area.\textsuperscript{30}

One may assume that faculty control over intra-college educational procedures, has long involved much exchange of

\textsuperscript{28} Two-thirds of the Wharton School faculty are entirely satisfied with their committee obligations, and only 5 percent expressed definite dissatisfaction with committee work (\textit{Faculty-Attitude Study}, 83). Efforts should be made, nevertheless, to lessen the burden of committees by reducing their size and (wherever possible) their number.

\textsuperscript{29} \textit{Statutes of the Corporation}, 1955, 13 ff.

\textsuperscript{30} The 1952 version of the \textit{Statutes} provided for a Dean of Admissions, with authority over the same except in certain professional schools. He sat in a committee with other members appointed by the president, and this body had power to form and enforce rules.
opinion between the dean and the related staff. \(^{31}\) It is on the University level that what is here called a consultative program assumes its most distinct features. Almost necessary, in such a program, is the existence of an all-university senate which can speak for the faculties as a whole.

The Senate at Pennsylvania, as set up in 1952, deals only with general university affairs. At some institutions, notably at the University of California, the senate exercises some oversight of individual colleges (e.g., of their admissions, curricula, etc.); but our own view is that each college faculty is the best judge in such matters. Conceivably, a senate with wide jurisdiction can do something to maintain standards throughout a university. But a weak college can also be checked on through upper administrative offices without—at the same time—limiting the autonomy of all member colleges.

The Senate at Pennsylvania enjoys complete freedom of discussion and similar freedom to make recommendations simultaneously to the President and to the Trustees. The President and other officers, meantime, are authorized to consult the Senate on any appropriate matters. \(^{32}\)

The *Manual of Policies and Procedures*, \(^{33}\) recently prepared in the President's office, makes the manner in which the Senate is to be consulted more specific. The Executive Board, for example, consults the Senate as well as other bodies in seeking nominations for the presidency. \(^{34}\) The Advisory Committee of the Senate, moreover, shares in nominating *ad

---

\(^{31}\) There have been deans who dominated their faculties, but this phenomenon has been rare at Pennsylvania in recent decades.


\(^{33}\) The status of this *Manual*—whether it has Trustee as well as administrative approval—is not yet clear. Presumably, it describes how things are, or will be, done.

\(^{34}\) *Manual*, Art. II, No. 4.
hoc committees which are consulted by the President before he recommends appointments to upper administrative posts.35

Such opportunities re the appointment of administrators, although indirect, are important to faculties.36 So, also, are opportunities to be consulted about general policies; but in the latter area the situation at the University is less clear. At the Trustee level, Advisory Boards appointed by the Chairman deal with subject matter areas or special institutions, and these Boards contain some "outside" specialists as well as Trustees. They keep in touch with their areas and may bring administrators or staff members into deliberations. The Boards are especially concerned with teaching and research, and are expected to develop "effective communication with the faculties." 37

Opportunities are thus provided for expressing the views of some professors to some Trustees—and vice versa. This is highly desirable. But since initiative and choice lie with the Boards, it is doubtful if systematic "communication with faculties" is achieved. Here is one point where, if experience has been encouraging, joint Trustee-Faculty boards could be created.

On the upper administrative level the University possesses an Educational Council,38 whose function is to formulate general educational policies. This is a relatively large body, made up of 33 deans or other officials appointed by the President, about 45 staff elected by various faculties, and 7 members chosen by the Senate. The officers are the Provost

35 Ibid., Nos. 4, 7, 8.
36 Parallel opportunities exist on the college level. The President, before nominating a dean to the Trustees, consults an ad hoc committee of the faculty involved.
37 Ibid., Art. IV.
38 One of a number of special councils; e.g., those on Athletics and on the Mask and Wig.
(chairman), Chairman of the Senate (v. chairman), and University Secretary (secretary). The Council may express opinions on any matters brought before it by Trustees, President, or Faculties, and may make its own proposals in return.

The Council elects, by rather elaborate procedures, such committees as those on Research, on Libraries, and on Educational Policy. The latter, which is most significant here, contains both administrators and faculty members. Presumably, this Committee suggests or passes on policies to the Council, which in turn recommends to any of the groups mentioned above.\(^\text{39}\)

The Council provides opportunities for the expression of staff opinion, and the principle of combined administrator-faculty membership is desirable from the present viewpoint. Consultation is worthwhile, however, only if it is taken seriously. A number of faculty members state that, prior to about 1952, actions desired by administrators were presented hurriedly and in such a manner that staff who were present could hardly oppose them. Such professors therefore wrote the Council off as a "futile" organization.

To the extent that this view was justified, genuine expressions of faculty opinion were more apt to come from the Senate. The latter was set up alongside the pre-existing Educational Council, presumably because the faculties did not think that the older body adequately represented them. In recent years, however, the President has consulted seriously with staff members of the Council's Committee on Educational Policy, so that faculty opinion now reaches him from both that Committee and from the Senate. Whether this dual arrangement will be helpful or confusing remains to be seen.

The Senate's advisory role \(re\) appointments and policies

\(^{39}\) Ibid.
has been noted. Its advisory functions, however, do not seem to extend to the area of specific University budgets. The Senate has no such legislative powers as inhere in college faculties but its committees have been active in making recommendations on important matters; for example, on athletics, appointments, and academic freedom. It has also cooperated with the administration on specific projects; for example, on the faculty club and on the preparation of the Manual herein cited.

Opinion varied, among staff members interviewed, as to the efficacy of the Senate. Some believed that, however useful at first, it had become an unwieldy body of doubtful value—despite its use of certain central committees. The majority thought, however, that the Senate had, in a general way, brought faculty opinion to bear on University problems in a new and promising manner.

Our own view is that, in terms of a consultative program, the emergence of the Senate, the present role of the Council's Committee on Educational Policy, and various other arrangements noted in the Manual indicate a great improvement in the administration of the University. Pennsylvania has been moving here in line with a national trend, and the resulting gain in morale has been obvious in most interviews with the staff.

Two qualifications of this favorable opinion, however, must be noted. The first is of a specific nature and has already been mentioned. Throughout the structure of consultative arrangements, no provision is made for the expres-

---

40 This trend has been irregular; i.e., in some universities faculty influence may have declined; see, e.g., Walter F. Wilcox, "Who Should Run the University?", Cornell Alumni News, vol. 59, No. 11, Mar. 1, 1957. But comprehensive A.A.U.P. studies of both colleges and universities indicate a slow, modest increase in faculty influence over the last two decades; see Paul Ward (Chairman), "Report of Committee T, 1953," A.A.U.P. Bull., vol. 41 (1955) 62-81.
sion of faculty opinion on budgets. One would hardly go as far as do some British authorities, in saying that a faculty which is not consulted on budgets is denied “academic freedom.” 41 But policies are often implemented, in the last analysis, in budgetary terms; and faculty members who remain ignorant on such matters are handicapped in bringing their opinion to bear on final decisions.

Methods for remedying this situation readily suggest themselves. Within a department, the suggested executive committee may advise the chairman on individual salaries. Something of this sort is already done in certain departments. Above this level, faculty committees could be set up to advise on budgets for each college and perhaps even for the University as a whole. At the University of California the latter function is regularly carried on by a committee of the senate. Such arrangements should be introduced with caution, of course, since difficulties such as “log-rolling” might be encountered. But the experiment merits a trial.

The second qualification relates to the limitations of a consultative program as such. The value of these arrangements turns largely on the attitudes of administrators. As long as they welcome suggestions from faculty bodies, consult them seriously, and frequently approve their nominations, the program enables faculties to exert considerable influence on educational policy. Just such happy relationships now seem to be the rule at Pennsylvania.

Yet there is little in the system itself which assures such rapport. The two groups, administrators and staff, may remain separated at the points—in administrative offices or at Trustee meetings—where decisions are finally made. And a régime which takes faculty opinion seriously may be re-

41 Sir Eric Ashby (I, note 21), 5. The British concept of such freedom is apparently broader than the American.
placed, through trustee or presidential action, by one which does not. The only remedy then available to the staff lies in pressures implicit in the attitudes of college faculties and of the Senate. Such pressures may be potent if faculties are really aroused. But this will not occur except in extreme cases, and even then, only if administrators are inept or if staff leaders are unusually aggressive. 42

**Faculty Participation in Administration.** In view of the limitations inherent in a consultative program, it is here proposed that faculty representatives should participate directly in decisions on policies and appointments. There is no thought here of “faculty rule,” as this is practiced abroad or even as it was demanded in this country a half-century ago. Such a proposal would be unrealistic, and perhaps even undesirable for reasons already mentioned. 43 But it is entirely realistic to envisage faculty representatives as sharing, with administrators, the responsibility for decisions on educational policy.

This arrangement is automatic at the departmental level, in the sense that the chairman combines administrative and staff roles in his own person. The principle can be extended there, as suggested, by having the chairman work within an executive committee—chosen as desired by the whole department. Here one has a model which can be applied to upper administrative levels as well. 44

42 Some observers, however, picture faculties as ready at any time for mass opposition to the administration. Thus, Beardsley Ruml states: “The faculty, departmentalized though it be, will form a defensive circle and moan to high heaven at any aggressive initiative by the administrative wolf.” (*Atlantic Monthly*, April, 1957, 49).


44 One or more college executive committees already exist in the University; e.g., in the School of Veterinary Medicine, where the chairmen make up the committee. Faculty election is not involved. H. J. Stafseth, *The School of Veterinary Medicine*. The Educational Survey, 1957, 55.
A dean, like a chairman, may be provided with an executive committee of staff members chosen as the college faculty wishes. Assuming that the committee is elected, it would seem best if the faculty chose a panel of 10 or 12 members—of whom the Dean would appoint half the number as the committee. This would permit the latter to choose those with whom he thought he could work most effectively. Except in relation to routine functions, such as that of a student discipline committee, the Dean would act only in the executive committee. He would bring before it all matters pertaining to appointments, promotions, budgets, pedagogical questions, and policies at large.

In the great majority of cases, the Dean and executive committee could be expected to agree. This has been the actual experience of such a committee, which has been operating in the arts college of the University of Michigan for some years. On the rare occasions when the Dean disagrees with the majority of the committee, he may make his own recommendations to the college faculty or up the administrative ladder—as the case may be. But he also will be expected to report the dissenting opinion of the group.

One of the advantages of an executive committee of this sort is the experience and understanding which they will share with the Dean. This will be obtained through their familiarity with all aspects of college affairs. They may decide about promotions, for example, in the light of their knowledge of budgets and of general policies—a possibility

45 At the first election. Preferably, each of the major subject-matter areas—natural sciences, social sciences, and the humanities—would be represented by two members.
46 Now assigned to a special committee.
47 Comments on the Michigan committee are based on discussions with the present Dean (Charles Odegaard); a former Dean (Dr. Keniston); Professor Dwight L. Dumond, who was chairman of the group which originally recommended the committee, and a number of Michigan staff members.
which does not exist if various matters are considered by various committees. In order to assure the experience of the committee, the terms of members may be staggered and should run for three or four years.

One of the criticisms made of the arrangement at Michigan is that “the faculty members of the executive committee really become administrators themselves.” Yet, from the present view, this very point is one of the program’s chief merits: the line between faculty and administrative status becomes less distinct.\textsuperscript{48} Professors who serve on such a committee must accept serious responsibilities and will probably cease, if they were ever so inclined, to make cynical remarks about administrators in general. For the duration of their terms, the committee will demand much time, and allowance may be made for this in a reduction of teaching schedules or of other university obligations.

Some administrators may object to executive committees, lest they lose a completely free hand. But unless an official wishes to exert autocratic authority, he will be more than compensated by the sharing of his responsibility. If necessary, he may still take his own stand. Meantime, in most cases, he cannot be solely blamed for decisions which are unpopular—either with individuals or with groups.\textsuperscript{49}

In concluding the discussion of a college executive committee, a final word may be said about one of the most significant functions which it could perform. This is the exercise of some oversight over departmental personnel. In the last analysis, it is the quality of such personnel which largely determines the reputation of the University. If this generaliza-

\textsuperscript{48} The same goal is reached, from the other direction, if deans or other administrators also act as professors; i.e., if they can find time to give one course or its equivalent.

\textsuperscript{49} It follows that much of the work of such a committee is of a strictly confidential nature.
tion is to be implemented and not remain a mere truism, specific procedures must be provided. It has already been noted that the executive committee and Dean would receive departmental recommendations re appointments and promotions, and that, in so doing, the members would benefit from their knowledge of college policies and budgets. But more than this is involved.

It would seem desirable, as is now done in certain colleges, to request chairmen to submit annual reports to the Dean and his committee. This would not only be good for the chairmen, but would also provide the Dean and his committee with material for an annual appraisal of each department—particularly of the personnel situation therein. Such appraisals could be simple in the cases of clearly strong departments, but searching in regard to those of doubtful status. In the latter situation, the Dean and his Committee—with the approval of the Provost, a vice-president, or a vice-provost—might well take the initiative in selecting a new chairman or in deciding on appointments or promotions. Such procedures are followed at Michigan and doubtless at other institutions.

There are, however, certain difficulties in this program. Most obvious is the amount of time that the Dean and his committee would have to give to these problems. They should, indeed, make an annual appraisal of departments; but what if, in the case of weak units, they must take the initiative in finding new staff? This will require that the Dean orient himself in the given field, and become in effect a “talent scout” in surveying national personnel. And the only way in which a Dean can do this will be to relinquish to others some of his major educational interests.

A second difficulty here relates to the role of the Dean of the Graduate School who may be as much concerned with
appointments and promotions as is the dean of an undergraduate college. The one might be more concerned with a candidate’s research, the other with a man’s teaching quality. In any case, it might be awkward for two deans and their respective committees to reach a joint decision on the same level of authority.

It has therefore been suggested that a superior officer be made primarily responsible for overseeing personnel situations throughout the University—with the possible exception of the advanced professional schools. Such an officer could be termed a “dean of faculties” as at Princeton, or could be made a vice-provost. In our opinion, however, the services he could render so large a university as Pennsylvania would be of uncertain value. He could hardly keep in touch with some fifteen colleges, and his presence would complicate administrative processes. It were probably better to let the deans deal as best they can with the difficulties mentioned.

The same reasoning which suggests the desirability of a college executive committee, also applies to the next higher administrative level—that of the Provost and of academic vice-presidents. On the latter level, however, the panel for executive committee members would be elected by the Senate or by the combined faculties of the colleges reporting to a vice-president. Whether one committee should be set up to work with the Provost or two with the two Vice-Provosts, could be left to the discretion of these officers. In any case, the purpose, nature, and procedures of these committees would be similar to those on the college level.\(^{51}\)

The logic which favors the creation of faculty-chosen ex-

\(^{50}\) This alternative suggestion is made by Dr. Keniston.

\(^{51}\) Structure would be simplified if the Provost and his executive committee were responsible for educational programs throughout the University. But it is not within our province here to express opinion on the present arrangements within medicine and engineering.
Executive committees does not apply to the highest administrative level, that of the presidency, since this office deals with many matters with which the faculty has little direct concern. The President, moreover, plays a symbolic role for the University as a whole, and should not be hedged about in this function by many formal requirements.

Despite this general rule, questions will arise about procedures when the President is expected to consult the Senate, or when that body makes formal recommendations to him. Under a consultative program, the President—if he disapproves such proposals—need take no further action concerning them. If such negative procedure is rare, consultation remains a reality. But if faculty suggestions are commonly overlooked, only the forms of consultation will survive.

It would be well, therefore, to assure the faculty of participation through certain formal procedures. The President might well extend to the Senate, after consultation, some explanation of any negative response on his part. Similar explanations should be given to Deans and their committees, in those cases in which the President or provosts disapprove their recommendations. Procedure of this sort would not be burdensome, since such instances are unusual.52

The question is sometimes raised: May a university president veto any action by any faculty? Theoretically, such a problem might arise if there was strong disapproval of legislation adopted by a particular college faculty. The Statutes at Pennsylvania (and doubtless at many other institutions) are not explicit about the matter.53 In practice the issue can nearly always be avoided. But if one must imagine an unprecedented situation in which neither a faculty nor the

52 There were cases at the University, before 1952, when the President disapproved recommendations of faculty committees and deans and declined any explanation.
53 See 5 f. in the 1955 Statutes.
President would give way, the matter might be resolved by the Trustees. Orderly procedure for this seems to be provided by the Pennsylvania Statutes, since a faculty can presumably appeal to the Senate and the latter is authorized to recommend to the Trustees as well as to the President.\textsuperscript{54}

Presidents usually find it necessary to consult an immediate advisory group—often of their own choosing. This “cabinet,” whether of formal or informal status, may include all Deans or it may be limited to “top” administrators. Where the latter are former professors, as is now the case at Pennsylvania, academic viewpoints will be more or less well represented.

At Pennsylvania, moreover, the President now consults closely with professors on committees of the Educational Council or in special groups. There are institutions, in contrast, in which only administrators seem to have direct access to the president. Such a situation is unfortunate.\textsuperscript{55}

\textit{Informal Relations Between Faculties and Administrators.}\n
In addition to the formal relations obtaining between administrators and faculties, various informal contacts exist or ought to exist. There is, for example, the obvious matter of communications. The situation is difficult if administrators are unaware of faculty thinking about University affairs; and, conversely, if the staff is “in the dark” about administrative actions and procedures. This state of things existed to a considerable degree at Pennsylvania until recent years.

The problem of communications, in a large and complex institution, is not an easy one even in the presence of the

\textsuperscript{54} Ibid., I1.

\textsuperscript{55} A few institutions, e.g., Princeton, Vassar, have top faculty advisory committees which report directly to the Board, or whose opinions are so reported by the President. This arrangement seems desirable if the President declines to appoint any professors among his advisors.
best intentions. Authorities on the subject point out that much of the meaning of a statement is lost or misinterpreted in the hands of recipients, particularly if there is no two-way transmittal. In past practice at Pennsylvania, minimal information was passed on via group meetings, correspondence, and the Gazette; but there was no systematic exchange of viewpoints between administrators and staff.

The situation has been improved under the present administration. The Senate, for example, is or can be a device for two-way communication. And such publications as News from Pennsylvania, the U. of P. Medical Bulletin, and the Almanac provide information which was hitherto rather inaccessible. The latter, moreover, affords opportunity for the expression of faculty opinion.

The origins of the Almanac were significant. It was established in response to a Senate resolution in 1952, in which a desire was expressed for:

> an effective channel of communication between the Faculty and other segments of the University, particularly those engaged in policy formation. This hope was based upon the belief that the minimal participation of the Faculty might appropriately be enlarged to the benefit of the University as a whole.

In making the above statement, however, Professor J. P. Horlacher recently declared that the Almanac has received little news concerning policy formation. He suggested that the fault here might be the faculty’s own, and viewed it as unfortunate if their silence resulted from “apathy and caution.” This diagnosis, if correct, emphasizes the need for a

---

56 Univ. of Penna. Almanac, III, No. 7, Mar., 1957, 3.
57 Chairman, Senate committees on the Almanac and on Communications with the Faculty.
lively concern about such matters on the part of the faculty itself.

Communications, broadly interpreted, include explanatory statements made available to faculties re standards and procedures. University policies on such matters\textsuperscript{58} should be made clear to faculties, and some institutions issue elaborate booklets for this purpose. Otherwise, there is uncertainty and danger of misunderstanding. Some information of this sort has been available in University catalogues or in special statements, and the new \textit{Manual} clarifies official procedures; but it might be well to pull many of these matters together in a single publication.\textsuperscript{59}

Communications also relate to a number of special situations or procedures. One of these concerns committees. When administrators request assistance from faculties, usually through committees, it is taken for granted that these groups will report in due time. The reception accorded the reports or notice of actions based thereon may or may not be communicated back to the committees. Yet such procedure is desirable in order to complete a two-way process. Even if it is impossible to act upon a committee's recommendations, some frustration will be experienced if the group puts time and effort into a report and never learns what happened to it.

Still another special phase of communication relates to the recognition of individual achievements of faculty members. A few of those interviewed urged that administrators, presumably because they symbolize the University, should take note of such achievements and express commendation to the men concerned. Several staff members went further in stat-

\textsuperscript{58} E.g., on appointments, promotions, tenure, teaching loads, leaves, research, patents, fringe benefits, and retirement.

\textsuperscript{59} Or in separate publications for the larger colleges. The School of Medicine now has such a booklet (\textit{Regulations Governing the Organization and Conduct of the Faculty}).
ing that administrators showed little pride in the faculty as a whole.

This matter does not lend itself to easy solutions. Most men can recall occasions when a word of praise, especially from someone in authority, provided potent encouragement. One cannot, of course, expect busy administrators to take note of every minor honor which comes a professor's way. Yet the implications for faculty morale are out of proportion to the small effort which usually would be involved. Hence, if this is not already done, we would suggest that somewhat systematic attention be accorded the matter. Chairmen could be requested to relay information up to whatever administrative level is appropriate, so that letters or other forms of recognition could be prepared.60

Faculty Relations with Students and Alumni. One is confronted, in discussing faculty-student relationships, with two quite different generalizations. We are told, on the one hand, that a great merit of American colleges is the existence of relatively friendly and informal contacts between staff and students. Since American professors are sometimes less remote and awe-inspiring than their European colleagues, American students are said to benefit accordingly.

On the other hand, complaints are made by undergraduates at Pennsylvania—as in other institutions—that they have little or no contact with those who instruct them. They assert that they do not "get to know" professors—that they are only "names" in large classes, if that.

Both of these generalizations are more or less true. The formality of European lecturers doubtless reflects their gen-

60 Such procedure is needed especially on behalf of those who are modest or retiring by nature. More assertive professors will see to these things themselves.
eral status; and, in any case, they deal only with those who are assumed to be mature persons. American undergraduates are supposed to need and do receive some personal guidance, but may declare that this is not enough.

Actual practice varies, of course, from college to college and from class to class. Small, independent colleges, with a high ratio of faculty to students, can provide relatively close contacts. So, also, can universities which distribute undergraduates in "houses," or in university colleges which employ tutorial systems. Such arrangements are considered desirable in terms of "individual attention," but are too expensive for many institutions.

In the absence of a tutorial program, the contacts obtaining between faculty and students are functions of (1) the size of classes, (2) the nature of classes, and (3) the attitudes of those teaching and of those taught. This is one of those truisms which needs to be kept in mind, and it will be discussed later under "Teaching."

Some college authorities desire contacts between teachers and students which go further than simple guidance in a course. Teachers are encouraged to know their charges as persons and even to take an interest in "college life." Where such interests are spontaneous expressions of a man's temperament, the results may be excellent, though this sort of thing cannot be made to order. Nor should it be expected, as a rule, of older men. The professor who retains undergraduate enthusiasms may be popular, but is apt to be one who never quite grew up himself.

No one doubts that adolescence is a time of stress for the individual. Most of us, without benefit of Stanley Hall, can recall such stress in our own experience. And it happens that undergraduates are going through—or have recently completed—this stage of personality development. Hence there is
considerable demand that colleges, in loco parentis, assist students with their personal problems. The point here is that this is not the obligation of a university staff. Spontaneous, individual associations may be helpful; but, in the main, functions of this sort belong to such extra-faculty agencies as personnel officers, chaplains, and student health services.

Most faculty members have very limited contacts with the alumni, unless they are graduates of the institution in which they teach and happen to keep up their class affiliations. Such affiliations, however, are valuable. Since it is not desirable to divorce the academic profession from society as a whole, an alumni association provides opportunities for academics and former classmates to continue associations on an equal footing.

Good alumni relations, moreover, are especially valuable to private institutions. Professors may be helpful here in addressing alumni groups when feasible, though the greater part of this load is usually carried by administrators.

The attitudes which students and alumni, meantime, take toward faculties, are usually pleasant enough. Only twenty-five years ago, there were still vestiges at Pennsylvania of an ancient if not honorable tradition, according to which large classes would “razz” a teacher if they could “get away with it.” Sessions were broken up after football victories, or upon other occasions which undergraduates felt merited such recognition; and, in extreme cases, classes were continuously demoralized.

Most such behavior is now a thing of the past. But large classes, if the subject is required, still view teachers with a detachment which is more notable for its indifference than for its objectivity. The professor may convince them that he is worth hearing but the burden of proof is upon him. Observers will differ as to whether this is as it should be, or
whether it simply reflects the general situation in undergrad­uate education.

On the other hand, the attitude of some staff members to­ward students is not all that it might be. A few of the faculty frankly view students as necessary evils, and occasionally there is extreme cynicism about them.\textsuperscript{61} How far such views are genuine, and how far they constitute a defense against indifference, is difficult to say. Our impression, however, is that most of the “Penn” faculty take at least a reasonable degree of interest in the undergraduates.

It may be impossible to assay alumni attitudes toward faculties, since these vary widely. The support which alumni now extend to universities doubtless expresses, in part, a nostalgia for “college days”; but it must also indicate some respect for present institutions and their staffs. Able alumni, like the educated public at large, are certainly aware that universities are assuming a more and more important role in American society.

Casual attitudes, on the part of a few alumni, may be viewed as vestigial—as reminiscent of student attitudes in “their day.” This is illustrated by the use of such partly-friendly, partly-condescending terms as “prof” or “doc.” (Imagine addressing a \textit{Herr Professor Doktor} as “prof”!) The antics of “Professor Quagmire” in the \textit{Pennsylvania Gazette} are intended as good, clean fun which the “profs” can “take,” but it is difficult to imagine such ridicule of professions which deal only with mature students.

\textit{Intra-Faculty Relationships.} A discussion of this theme in­volves one in the sociology and psychology of academic

\textsuperscript{61} Most students, declares one writer, are “either athletic, stupid, or mentally sick.” Robert Graves, “Diseases of Scholarship,” \textit{New Republic}, May 6, 1957 (vol. 136, No. 18).
personnel. To date, professors in these fields have given more attention to such professions as law and medicine than they have to their own guild; and the same comment may be made about historians. Many university histories describe institutional developments at length, but tell less of the evolution of the staff as such. “Student life” is more apt to receive a chapter than is that of the faculty. And histories of particular departments, enlightening as these could be, are rare indeed.

This seeming neglect may result from a tendency among professional men to serve or examine others rather than themselves. But there is also some question as to the object in this case: the academic guild is not as clearly identified as are some others. Is it really a single group as are lawyers and physicians? Or is it, rather, a collection of professions—chemists, historians, and so on—who are banded together for purposes of teaching and research? Does the clinical professor think of himself primarily as an academic man or as a physician?

Guild loyalties, no doubt, can be divided; hence it may be said that most academic men display some consciousness of kind. There is usually more of this in independent colleges, where most staff think of themselves as “college teachers,” and less among university men with highly specialized interests. Yet, even in the latter case, the institutional setting will make for a measure of common interests and behavior.

The personality of an academic man or woman is a significant factor, not only in teaching but also in terms of relations with colleagues. Both administrators and professors are familiar with extreme types among university personnel—from the prima donnas and exhibitionists at one end of the scale, to the self-effacing at the other. The American academic environment may not encourage egotism as much as
does the European, but this quality is by no means unknown. Watered down a bit, it becomes the individualism which is expected in academic circles. As the Germans used to say: "Ein Professor ist ein Mann der andere Meinung ist"; which, being translated, comes out as Carl Becker’s remark: “A professor is one who thinks otherwise.” Such persons may know their way around but are not likely to be “organization men.”

In other words, the university world is more tolerant of unorthodox or variant types than is the business world, and this is as it should be. Yet individualism—a heritage of the guild tradition—must be reconciled in American universities with a measure of corporate structure. Just because faculties are departmentalized, members must be able to “get along together.” Persons who are markedly eccentric may make cooperation almost impossible.

More common are men who are just minor handicaps or nuisances. Nearly every large department includes one person who is withdrawn and so contributes little to the dynamics of the group; and also one of the reverse type, who is so affable and talkative that time—including that of his colleagues—means nothing to him. Hence it is justifiable, within broad limits, to consider personality in making appointments. The more able the man, the more allowances can be made; but the academic world should not encourage the notion—said to obtain in some circles—that eccentricity is the mark of genius.

Superimposed on the inter-personal difficulties which appear within any organization (rivalries, cliques, favoritism) are those more or less peculiar to academic personnel. Harmony among them must depend more upon a shared sense of values than upon directives or regulations. But faculty members do not agree fully on values; one man is most devoted to teaching, another to research, and another to “community
service." Still others, since they share ambitions common to society at large, become most concerned about income, prestige, and "empire building" in their own departments or fields. Those devoted to one value may take a dim view of those entranced by another; for example, "teaching versus research."

Competition between academic men is apt to be less direct and overt than in many business areas. Ostensibly, everyone is cooperative, and there actually is much substance to this—between administrative units and institutions as well as between individuals.

The most obvious and unavoidable competition is that between individuals in the same field—chemistry, economics, etc.—who are located in different institutions. Such tensions as may result from this do not appear within any given university. Even this extra-mural rivalry, moreover, is not acute in this country. American faculties have great geographical mobility because there are so many openings, and they therefore escape the intense competition which exists in a country which has only a limited number of posts.

Intramural competition, meantime, is lessened by the variety of ways in which scholars can satisfy their inner drives. Even the man who is not particularly ambitious must achieve something which makes for self-respect. Promotions in rank and salary are one obvious means for this, and provide potent motivations.

There are other and more subtle means which are not mutually exclusive. Some men derive satisfactions from serving on important committees or in minor administrative posts, and the latter may lead to major administrative appointments. Others cherish recognition by students. More common is a desire for national recognition in a field, which in turn has implications for rank or salary. Rare but not un-
known is the wealthy scholar who seeks recognition, indirectly, by judicious entertaining. And even the subdivision of academic fields is, in effect, a device by which many scholars attain prominence. The more sub-fields there are, the greater will be the number who can be authorities on one subject or another.\textsuperscript{62}

In so far as scholars follow different routes to achievement, they do not get in one another's way. This is not to say that all tensions are removed. But there are better prospects of minimizing them if the circumstances mentioned are kept in mind—both by professors and by administrators.

Occasionally, for example, a man who aspires to recognition in a field is blocked by the staff situation: he cannot offer the courses he wishes. The solution may be to wait or to go elsewhere; but meantime his morale may be helped by suggesting the pursuit of other values. He may find his place, at least temporarily, in effective teaching or in providing some special service to the department.

Again, older men whose creative work has slowed down but who possess cumulative wisdom, may be diverted to administrative work—to their own profit and to that of the institution. This does not imply, of course, that a man should be given administrative functions simply because he proves incapable of original scholarship.

Professors have special obligations, in the interest of their departments, to promising young colleagues. They should make every effort to see that their juniors are not frustrated by over-heavy teaching loads, by delayed advancement, or by lack of participation in departmental affairs. (Recognition can come from colleagues as well as from administra-

tors.) Senior men are also in a position to advise juniors about professional risks and opportunities; for example, on the dangers of extra teaching and about prospects of financial aid for research.

Conversely, professors have an obligation to face facts in the cases of young men who do not merit advancement. It is kinder in the long run, as well as wiser, to inform such men—as soon as a judicious decision can be made—that they will not be reappointed.

Decisions on advancement will involve, however, the criteria which a particular department or college has in mind. If the local policy is to reward only one of the means by which individuals achieve self-respect—say, effectiveness in research—those who pursue other worthwhile goals will be frustrated. Hence it has already been suggested that there should be room in any large university department for occasional men who fail to live up to research promise but are unusually effective teachers.

Although the most intimate relations between staff are usually those within departments, there are cases in which a man has most in common with colleagues in departments other than his own. Such relations are usually friendly and, if so, something is done to break down the extreme departmentalization of knowledge. Individuals sometimes hold appointments in two or more departments, or even in two or more colleges; and the resulting cross-fertilization is to be welcomed. It is usually unwise for such a person to straddle budgets as well as administrative units, for he may then fall between two financial stools. But there is no law against appointing a professor without assigning him to any department, if circumstances warrant this.

Common interests within two departments or colleges occasionally produce friction, as when courses are duplicated.
When this is objectionable, cooperation will usually “iron things out”; if not, the situation must be resolved by administrative action.

Tensions may also result from the attitudes which one faculty assumes toward another. The second may be viewed as over-aggressive, as not maintaining adequate standards, or as devoted to values not respected by the first. An illustration of this is the old controversy between arts and education faculties, which has had national reverberations. Arts faculties have suspected the “content” of education programs, while professional educators have taken a dim view of arts college teaching. Fortunately, this issue has not been acute at Pennsylvania—presumably because of moderation in one or both camps.

Another and more subtle illustration at Pennsylvania is the disdain which some arts people are said to display toward the Wharton faculty. In so far as such disdain actually exists, it reflects a value conflict, since the arts group is devoted to “liberal education” and dislikes the other faculty’s supposed pursuit of “vocational training.” Tensions are not eased by the realization that the great shift in American undergraduate education over the last forty years has been from “liberal” to professional or vocational programs. Nor are matters simplified if the Wharton group, teaching large numbers of students, believes that it is helping to finance the arts faculty.

Such issues cannot be resolved by directives. Each faculty is entitled to its own opinions, but one can hope for open-mindedness. Mutual understanding can sometimes be promoted by what anthropologists call cross-cultural influ-

63 Except, possibly, when colleges might be eliminated or merged. An example at Pennsylvania is that of the long-term tensions between the School of Medicine and the Graduate School of Medicine.
ences; that is, by arrangements—formal or otherwise—which bring representatives of each faculty together on the campus.

Staff members also meet off the campus in the course of ordinary personal contacts. They and their families often have much in common, and faculty social life can contribute to morale. Just because opportunities for such life are relatively limited in a metropolitan setting, special attention should be given such matters as a faculty club, organizations for wives, and so on. The latter should always include a "newcomers" unit—a Middle Western idea—so that wives will not feel lost during their husbands' first years at the University.

Social relationships usually group themselves around certain foci (departments, clubs, churches) and radiate out therefrom. Superimposed on this pattern is that of age levels. Generations, like birds of a feather, tend to flock together. The habit usually reflects free choice, at least on the part of "the younger set." But rumor has it that there are certain old institutions where senior staff, as a matter of principle, do not entertain junior staff. Such rank distinction 64 may be akin to class distinction but, in any case, it seems unknown at Pennsylvania and is rare in other American universities.

*The Need for Studies in Higher Education.* The foregoing discussions may not cover all principles pertinent to a faculty program. But enough has been said to suggest the complexity as well as the significance of the various problems under consideration. These problems cannot be settled here or elsewhere for all time: there is need for a continuing study of faculty programs and of other aspects of higher education.

64 The *double entendre* here is not too subtle.
In the past, this subject lay in the province of college and university administrators, and—in a more diffuse way—in that of the faculties. Elementary and secondary education were long ago "taken over" by professional educators, but the latter's influence on colleges has been very limited. Only recently have universities taken what may seem a quite logical step, that of appointing "professors of higher education" in departments or schools of education.

A plausible case can be made for this arrangement. Professors, immersed in their disciplines, have little time to give to the study of higher education. Administrators are in contact with pertinent problems, but they also are too busy for actual research in this field. Why not assign it to professionals, who will concentrate on it and will also bring to it a knowledge of education in general?

This approach, however, may arouse opposition among college and university faculties. One must recall that the controversy between professional educators and arts faculties has been sharp at times. Rightly or wrongly, the former's standards as well as their methods have been questioned; hence they may not be accepted in academic circles as authorities on university matters.65

Faculty attitudes, in this case, cannot be ascribed entirely to prejudice. Professional educators (like any group) are apt to see a new field against the background of previous experience. And their background happens to be that of the public

65 In the past, even mild criticism of professional educators was sharply resented, and present criticism is anything but mild. Note, e.g., the following comments of Professor Samuel E. Morison of Harvard: "I venture to say that professional educators are the greatest enemies not only to academic freedom but to academic excellence in the United States today. No one who has not read the stuff printed in educational journals would believe the nonsense that these people write, or the horrible jargon in which they express themselves, or the shabby mediocrity of their minds"; Freedom in Contemporary Society, Boston, 1956.
school world, in which—despite a continuing invocation of "democracy"—teachers are allowed little or no role in determining policies. Educators may easily, perhaps unconsciously, project the assumptions of this world up on to the college level. They may expect university officials, as a matter of course, to determine policies and select staffs; and view the college faculty, meantime, as another group of "teachers"—to be trained, appointed, and directed as on the secondary level.

It is a nice question whether administrative domination is desirable even in the public schools. Many teachers, facing this situation, have abandoned the guild tradition altogether by joining labor unions. In any case, administrative roles characteristic of public schools are inappropriate in colleges. And by virtue of all that has been said here, such roles are even more inappropriate in universities. Hence, to the extent that educators envisage universities in public school terms, there is an implicit threat to academic tradition. Higher education should remain higher and not be absorbed into the lower.

Professors of higher education are, nevertheless, in a better position to do something with this area than are administrators or faculties at large. There are signs that they intend to make the most of this opportunity. The National Education Association, a public school oriented body, has promoted for some years an active section on higher education. Foundation officers and university administrators are listening.


more and more, to educators in this field, since the latter may seem better informed than anyone else available.\textsuperscript{68}

In a word, professional educators may “take over” this area by default, much as their predecessors took over secondary education a half-century ago. There is no intention here to suggest that this would be a total calamity: someone should take over. And professors of higher education may be credited with having had sufficient imagination to envisage possibilities and needs. The only question is: Are they, as a group, best qualified for this task in terms of all its subtleties and implications?

Since the issue here may become controversial, there is a responsibility to state one’s own opinion frankly. In view of previous statements, the present thesis is that specialists in higher education should be appointed in universities but that they should not be formally located in departments or schools of education. Nor should they be attached to administrative offices.

Faculties at large have a vital concern in the study of their own institutions; and, by the same token, an interest in the qualifications and independence of persons chosen for such posts. It is therefore suggested that the specialist in higher education need have no departmental location but should be made a member of the faculty of the Graduate School. Here he may serve as a resource person for faculties and administrators alike. If developments warrant, he can be provided with assistants or even with colleagues in a departmental unit. But all this need not be decided at the start.

The man appointed should have served as a member of an academic department, should have had some adminis-

\textsuperscript{68} Four research institutes in higher education, one at Teachers College, Columbia, were set up in 1956-57 alone—with support from the Carnegie Corporation.
trative experience, and should have exhibited an interest in university affairs. If he also has a broad knowledge of education in general, so much the better. And if all these qualifications are unavailable in one person, the nearest approximation of them might be acceptable. The post will not be easy to fill.

In searching for a candidate, various possibilities may be kept in mind. A scholar who has served on both arts and education faculties may prove promising, particularly if he has taught a so-called “content” subject in a school of education. The man who is already a professor of higher education might have some advantages, assuming that he is able, open-minded, and familiar with academic viewpoints. But various other fields could be tapped. Psychologists, social scientists, and even historians might bring perspectives to bear on higher education which would be revealing.

The separation of a staff member in higher education from traditional education faculties should not preclude cooperation between them. One would hope that individuals concerned would be willing to work together as occasion demanded and we believe that this would be the case at Pennsylvania. Colleagues in the School of Education could be helpful to a specialist in higher education, and the latter in turn might encourage good relations between that School and the other colleges.

The relations of this specialist should, indeed, extend to both faculties and administrators on a university-wide basis. He would represent no one group, but rather the interests of higher education in general and those of the University of Pennsylvania in particular.