

**PRESIDENT HERMANN DONOVAN TO THE BOARD OF TRUSTEES 9-15-42**

**AN APPRAISAL OF THE UNIVERSITY'S ADMINSTRATIVE ORGANIZATION**

It has now been over a year since I assumed the duties of the office of president of the University. I was appointed to this position following the passage of resolutions changing the form of the University's organization. This reorganization resulted in the abolishment of the Senate and the creation of a new policy-making body known as the Faculty of the University composed of the president, dean of the University, deans of the colleges and comptroller.

At the time I entered upon my duties as president, several members of the Board discussed these changes with me informally. It appeared to be the consensus of opinion at that time of many of the Trustees that I should study carefully the new organization, observe the manner in which it functioned, and make recommendations to the Board if I deemed it desirable to amend the new structure of the organization of the University.

I have diligently studied the professional literature on the control and administrative organization of universities during the period I have been your president. In my contacts with other university presidents I have discussed this subject with them. In addition, I requested Dr. Jesse Adams, of the College of Education, to make a study for me of the administrative set-up of other-universities. He assembled information on the administrative organization of 62 prominent universities of this country. I have attempted during the past year to appraise objectively the new administrative machinery of our university from my studies and observations.

As a result of these deliberations I have arrived at the conclusion that on the whole our present administrative organization is excellent, but that there are certain weaknesses in it that should speedily be corrected for the ultimate welfare of the University. The organization of the Department of Business Management and Control and the creation of the office of Dean of the University were constructive changes in our organization.

The establishment of what is known as the Faculty of the University, composed entirely of administrative officers of the University, has created machinery that can secure prompt results. It is a very efficient form of organization, somewhat similar to a board of directors of a corporation. From the standpoint of those of us who have made up the Faculty of the University this past year, it has worked successfully. From the viewpoint of the several hundred employees of the University who do not know what is going on in the Faculty of the

University I sometimes fear that there may be at times doubt, and even suspicion, in their minds about what is happening in this body.

A university is not a business. Business is concerned primarily with profits. A university is an educational institution. Its energies are devoted to the development of personality and the discovery of truth. The type of organization that works perfectly in business may not prove to be the best structure for the organization of a university.

One of the weaknesses of the present organization is in its name - the Faculty of the University. In university circles the word 'faculty' refers to teachers as well as administrative officials. Some of our able teachers here at the University have felt a sense of disappointment and frustration in that they are no longer officially recognized as members of the Faculty of the University. I fear that they do not have the same pride in their positions they once had. I would recommend that the name Administrative Council, a name in common use in other universities, be substituted for the name, Faculty of the University.

Another weakness of the present arrangement is that the president of the University is almost completely isolated from the members of the staff of the University. He comes in contact with administrative officers of the University daily, but practically his only contact with the teaching faculty is social. A faculty needs to know what manner of man the president is, and he should have the opportunity to see them in professional contact, how is a faculty ever to know the president or the president to know the faculty?

Deans and other administrative officials are selected for their positions because they are wise people, but they do not possess all the wisdom. In every university there are many men and women who possess great scholarship and constructive and original ideas about the university. Such faculty members should be encouraged and stimulated to share these ideas with those charged with the administration of the organization. Some machinery that will bring these men and women together to consider the problems of the University is essential if an institution is to take advantage of all the talent in the university.

A university is a cooperative enterprise. Trustees, administrators, professors and students can contribute something to its usefulness to society. Planning for the future, policymaking, is distinctly a cooperative enterprise in which professors as well as administrators and trustees should participate. A university organized on any plan that excludes the professor in helping to chart its course

will certainly fail to elicit the wholehearted, enthusiastic support of its staff.

A university is made up of a number of different colleges. These colleges have their objectives which differ considerably from college to college. Often there are conflicting aims and objectives. Each college is inclined to become independent or self-sufficient. There is always a tendency, perfectly natural, for each college to provide for all its services and thereby duplicate offerings in other colleges. Isolation breeds independence. Where no provision is made for professors and administrators of the various colleges to come together to consider the problems of the University as a whole, not the problems of a college, there will certainly develop suspicions and antagonisms that will have a disruptive influence on the University, I fear that under our present organization, in time colleges will be competing among themselves for funds, personnel and services. Members of their staffs are likely to think of their college, not of the University. My observations and deliberations lead me to the conclusion that our present administrative organization is lacking in one respect. It is too highly centralized. It does not provide for the full and complete utilization of our available human resources that have much to contribute to the general welfare of the University.

For this reason I desire, in addition to the Faculty of the University (Administrative Council) that another body be established that will be composed of both teachers and administrative officials of the University who will consider university policies study university problems and frequently carry on research for the purpose of discovering what are the best procedures and practices in the university administration. It may be desirable at present to make this body a Faculty Advisory Council, However, I should not object to its being a policy-making body with final authority with regard to curriculum, entrance, graduation, problems of faculty-student relations and other strictly professional problems of this character. The line of demarcation between administrative functions and policy-making should be carefully drawn. The Faculty of the University [Administrative Council) should deal primarily with problems of business administration, finance, personnel, buildings, grounds and other matters essentially administrative in character.

In my thinking I have conceived of three different approaches to this problem.

First, let the University establish a Faculty Advisory Council that would be composed of administrative officers, ex-officio members, and professors elected by the several faculties on a proportional basis. For example, one representative for each ten

faculty members, or major fraction thereof, from each of the colleges could make up the group. Such a body would constitute a representative form of government rather than a pure democracy. The elected faculty members would represent the faculties of the several colleges. If such a plan were worked out, it should be so arranged that there would be a rotation in office of those who were elected from the faculties of the different colleges. This in time would give every faculty member an opportunity to serve on this body.

A group of this size would be small enough to secure effective deliberation about problems that would come before it for consideration, and it would not be so large as to be unwieldy.

A number of larger universities of this country have a policy-making group somewhat on the order of this outline. The University of Florida is a good example of a university with a small policy forming group composed of the administrative officers and a group of faculty members elected by their colleagues. The President, John J. Tigert, with whom I have talked at length about this subject, reports that this group has worked splendidly in his institution, and that it has made a great contribution to the University of Florida. He highly commends a policy-making group of this character.

A second approach to this problem would be to retain our present Faculty of the University, but add to it two or three faculty members from each of the several colleges. If such a plan were accepted, these faculty members should be elected by their colleagues from the different colleges, and they should rotate in office so that from time to time different members of the faculty would have an opportunity to serve on this body. I find that in a few of the universities faculty members elected by their colleagues are on the administrative council. An arrangement of this character has the advantage of being a somewhat smaller group and' therefore, able to reach decisions with a degree of promptness that a larger body could never attain. It has the disadvantage of being a highly centralized form of control and, therefore, fewer members of the faculty have an opportunity to serve with the group deliberating on the problems of the University.

A third suggestion which I desire to offer would be that we return to the old-fashioned and long-established plan of a general faculty meeting each month, and that problems having to do with the welfare of the University be discussed in these meetings, and educational policies formulated and approved by the group. Some universities still have open faculty meetings where all members of the staff above that of instructor have a voice in determining educational policies. This is the most democratic procedure that can be suggested but it has the disadvantage of being a cumbersome and time-consuming body. Where the

faculty is large it often results in entirely too much debate on many issues that come before it. There is no assurance that the deliberations of the larger group are any sounder than those of a small representative group. The total faculty has far greater difficulty in arriving at a decision on any policy than a smaller group ever has. Where the faculty is very large this plan does not have much to commend it. I offer the suggestion as a possibility and not as a recommendation.

So far as I am concerned as president of the University, I should be glad to work under any one of the three arrangements which I have suggested, or some combination of these suggestions. I am quite convinced that the University should amend our present rules and regulations governing the formulation of educational policies and procedures. This conclusion has been arrived at after prolonged thought and study regarding the ultimate welfare of the University of Kentucky. The present form of control is of such a nature that it does not encourage men who possess ideas about a university to share them with those of us who are administering the institution.

I recommend that the Board of Trustees direct the president to appoint a committee of twelve or fifteen members of the staff of the University to study this problem for a period of several months and report its findings to the president and Board of Trustees for their consideration.