INFORMATION TO USERS

This material was produced from a microfilm copy of the original document. While the most advanced technological means to photograph and reproduce this document have been used, the quality is heavily dependent upon the quality of the original submitted.

The following explanation of techniques is provided to help you understand markings or patterns which may appear on this reproduction.

1. The sign or "target" for pages apparently lacking from the document photographed is "Missing Page(s)". If it was possible to obtain the missing page(s) or section, they are spliced into the film along with adjacent pages. This may have necessitated cutting thru an image and duplicating adjacent pages to insure you complete continuity.

2. When an image on the film is obliterated with a large round black mark, it is an indication that the photographer suspected that the copy may have moved during exposure and thus cause a blurred image. You will find a good image of the page in the adjacent frame.

3. When a map, drawing or chart, etc., was part of the material being photographed the photographer followed a definite method in "sectioning" the material. It is customary to begin photoing at the upper left hand corner of a large sheet and to continue photoing from left to right in. equal sections with a small overlap. If necessary, sectioning is continued again — beginning below the first row and continuing on until complete.

4. The majority of users indicate that the textual content is of greatest value, however, a somewhat higher quality reproduction could be made from "photographs" if essential to the understanding of the dissertation. Silver prints of "photographs" may be ordered at additional charge by writing the Order Department, giving the catalog number, title, author and specific pages you wish reproduced.

5. PLEASE NOTE: Some pages may have indistinct print. Filmed as received.

75-21,795

DAVIS, Dan Allen, 1934-
 THE INVOLVEMENT OF NONACADEMIC EMPLOYEES IN
 UNIVERSITY GOVERNANCE.

 The University of Oklahoma, Ed.D., 1975
 Education, higher

Xerox University Microfilms, Ann Arbor, Michigan 48106

THE UNIVERSITY OF OKLAHOMA

GRADUATE COLLEGE

THE INVOLVEMENT OF NONACADEMIC EMPLOYEES IN

UNIVERSITY GOVERNANCE

A DISSERTATION

SUBMITTED TO THE GRADUATE FACULTY

in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the

degree of

DOCTOR OF EDUCATION

BY

DAN A. DAVIS

Norman, Oklahoma

1975

THE INVOLVEMENT OF NONACADEMIC EMPLOYEES IN UNIVERSITY GOVERNANCE

APPROVED BY

DISSERTATION COMMITTEE

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

With most sincere appreciation to--

Sara, Jan, and Jay for their
patience and understanding,

Family and friends in Hugo, Ardmore,
Norman, and elsewhere for their
confidence and encouragement,

EEC officers and members for their
assistance and cooperation,

Dr. Glenn R. Snider and the members
of the Committee who not only gave
professional counsel but were
friends as well.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

LIST OF ILLUSTRATIONS

THE INVOLVEMENT OF NONACADEMIC EMPLOYEES

IN UNIVERSITY GOVERNANCE

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

For more than 50 years organized labor in business and industry

has sought to insure improved personnel practices, increased salary and

fringe benefits, and better working conditions for employees. In the

last decade an increasing number of governmental agency employees have

organized similarly and for the same reasons. This precedent has

encouraged a trend among employees of educational institutions toward

organizing and seeking comparable recognition.

In addition to their interest in fringe benefits and general

working conditions, employee groups in educational institutions have

in the past few years directed their efforts to gain increased parti-

cipation and involvement in the overall policy making processes of

their institutions. Through formal and informal agreements, unions,

so-called professional associations, and other organized groups,

employees have sought to become involved in the development of insti-

tutional goals and purposes.

Epstein spoke of the direction organizational activity has

taken and specifically in terms of collective bargaining:

> Collective bargaining can change the roles of professors
> and other staff members, and it can affect the powers of
> state officials, trustees, administrators, and students
> . . . . all staff members, not just the visible minority

1

of professors, are organizable employees. In particular,
nonfaculty professionals may have reason to turn to col-
lective bargaining for more than bread-and-butter gains.
They may want some of the independence that professors
have already secured by traditional means.[1]

Since they are public employees, permissive legislation is

usually required in order for public school teachers, higher education

faculties and staff members, policemen, firemen, and other governmental

employees to organize into collective bargaining units. Further, there

is evidence of federal legislation being considered which would pre-

empt existing state laws and affect future ones in respect to terms

and conditions of employment for public employees.[2]

With the development of the bargaining unit, interaction between

the employee group and its institution or agency becomes a highly

formalized arrangement. There is, however, an alternative to legis-

lated, formalized procedures for the involvement of employees in

institutional governance.

In institutions of higher education, there is a history of

governance involvement which includes university faculties. The

organization and procedure for governance participation by the faculty

is individualized according to the institution. There is no uniform

or prescribed model. In some institutions faculty members may be

extensively involved while in other universities the scope of faculty

activity in policy and decision-making may be on a smaller scale.

---

[1]Leon D. Epstein, Governing the University (San Francisco:
Jossey-Bass Publishers, 1974), p. 144.

[2]"State Bargaining Powers Could be Pre-empted by Federal Law,"
Phi Delta Kappan, Vol. LVI, No. 7 (March, 1975), pp. 504-5.

Observing the participation of faculty members and students in institutional governance and realizing the improved status of other organized employee groups, nonacademic employees of institutions of higher education have also become interested in seeking an expanded role in governance participation.

College presidents and governing board members are growing more aware of the role of nonacademic staff members in the university's operation. Their sensitivity is related to the quality of the staff. Former Provost and Dean of the faculty at Princeton University, J. Douglas Brown, observed:

> The effective progress of American universities in the coming years depends as much on the recruitment, development, and organization of highly competent and dedicated administrative staffs as on the development of strong faculties. Both require time and insight to attain. But the building of the framing organization will be more difficult because its importance has not yet been fully recognized by the other elements of the university--including the trustees, faculty and alumni--or by the staff members themselves. The supporting professions and specialized occupations in academic enterprise need to gain the status of dedicated and demanding callings. This will require sustained effort on the part of the universities which employe them.[1]

In this period of change, nonacademic employees are reviewing their position in the organizational structure of the institution, and they are exploring the opportunities and alternatives available to them to insure greater recognition and increased participation in the policy-making and decision-making processes of the institution.

---

[1]J. Douglas Brown, _The Liberal University_ (New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1969), p. 45.

Statement of the Problem

The problem of this study was to investigate the extent and characteristics of organizational structures involving nonacademic employees in the internal governance of universities and to examine their operational procedures and practices. It was also to identify existing models of nonacademic employee governance groups and to discover ways in which nonacademic employees can be involved in such organizations.

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of the study was to describe a model or models of university governance which might better serve the needs and objectives of nonacademic employees of a university and which would at the same time further the goals and purposes of the institution. The study sought to describe an organizational structure involving various constituent groups within the institution and to suggest guidelines and procedures for collaboration within the overall university governance system.

Limitations of the Study

The study included state-supported universities from throughout the United States. Initially, more than 200 institutions were polled to determine the presence of nonacademic employee involvement in their governance activities. The major part of the study was then directed to thirty-one universities which had such arrangements in their governance schemes.

The investigation examined the internal governance only of the institutions and the involvement of internal nonacademic employee groups in the decision and policy-making processes of the institutions. While external employee organizations such as unions were mentioned in terms of their influence and impact, the study did not delve into their organizational structure nor their activity.

Definition of Terms

University governance is the internal organizational pattern of the institution which outlines the exercise of authority. The pattern is one which has been duly recognized by the appropriate legal governing body for the institution. The organizational scheme provides for legislative commentary on the decision-making and policy-development processes of the institution by the administration, the faculty, nonacademic employees, and other constituencies of the university.

Nonacademic employees are staff members and employees of an institution who do not hold academic appointment or whose primary responsibilities are not instructional. An exception is that the president's immediate staff--vice-presidents for example--are not included.

Administrative staff are those nonacademic employees whose jobs are generally administrative in nature.

Professional staff are those nonacademic employees whose jobs require knowledge of an advanced nature and the exercise of independent judgement, and which normally require learning acquired by specialized study in an institution of higher education or its equivalent.

Classified staff are those nonacademic employees whose jobs
call for skilled or supervisory competencies and/or clerical and
service functions; normally, such employees are compensated on an
hourly basis.

The university community is considered as the collective con-
stituency of the institution and includes students, faculty,
nonacademic employees, and the administration.

Methodology of the Study

The study was conducted by developing two survey questionnaires
which elicited information from individuals who were involved with
nonacademic employees or nonacademic employee governance groups. The
results of the surveys led to the conclusions and recommendations of
the study.

The first questionnaire was directed to university personnel
officers who were knowledgeable regarding nonacademic employee groups
and organizations on their campuses. Printed documents and names of
nonacademic employee leaders were provided by the personnel officers.
This information furnished data for the classification and description
of nonacademic employee governance groups; information needed for the
preparation of the second survey was also received.

Individuals who were active members of nonacademic employee
governance groups were sent the second survey questionnaire. The
questionnaire items sought to ascertain the opinions of the group
members regarding the relationships of the group to the institution
and other constituent groups, to the goals and objectives of the group,
and to the operational aspects of the group.

Organization of the Study

Background for the study including a review of the literature comprises Chapter II. The interest of various constituent groups within the university in decision-making and policy-development processes is discussed. Further, the increasing effect of external groups such as unions and professional associations receives attention. Finally, the growing awareness by both administrators and employees to the need for participation in governance by nonacademic employees is established.

The complete methodology and procedures of the study are given in Chapter III. The first part outlines the steps taken to gather the initial information concerned with the identification of existing , nonacademic employee governance groups; classification and description of the groups follow. Next, the development process of the individual group-member questionnaire is presented along with the questionnaire verification process. The major portion of the chapter is devoted to a report and an interpretation of the individual group-member questionnaire.

Chapter IV provides the conclusions and recommendations of the study. Models for various nonacademic employee governance organizational types are outlined, and general guidelines for the development of nonacademic employee governance groups are provided.

CHAPTER II

BACKGROUND AND REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

As institution-employee relationships were reviewed, there were

implications that the same theories of human management which apply in

business and industry will also apply in education. As business and

industry changed from strict hierarchial control and division of labor

to more progressive theories of operation, a model was provided which

suggests direction for educational institutions. Provus said:

> State government and local boards as well as the
> major employee organizations generally agree on the
> value to the school program of formalized effec`''`-e
> employee-employer relationships. These relation-
> ships are held to be most productive when every
> employee has an internal apparatus available to him
> for the expression of personal and professional
> concerns.[1]

Institutions of higher education operate within policy guide-

lines and regulations which generally result from the authority of a

state agency or board. Each institution develops its own internal

system of governance, the exercise of authority. For each institu-

tion, there are many policies and regulations which come about through

policy-development and decision-making processes internal to the

institution.

An early historical perspective to university organization

gives attention to the collegium structure in which the faculty sat as

---

[1]Malcolm Provus, "Collective Action by Teachers," _Encyclopedia
of Educational Research_, 4th ed., p. 157.

peers with the administration and was totally, democratically involved in the academic activity and management of the institution. There was a "community of scholars."

A later viewpoint applied Weber's concepts of bureaucracy to the university. Indeed, there are many characteristics of a university which support this theory--application of rationality, hierarchial structure, chain of command, competency-based appointments, security, rank, style of life centered around the organization, etc.

Moran, in using a systems approach to his study of the university spoke of the complexity of the organization:

> Universities contain bureaucracies but are not merely bureaucracies. Other decision networks are present: committees and constituencies which exercise great influence on university behavior and decision-making. The notion that effective institutions commonly rely upon 'participative democracy' to the exclusion of bureaucracy is false. It is equally mistaken to deny the communal nature of a university and to try to place in the hands of university administrators the kind of power which accrues to military or corporate leaders. Affiliation with a university is not the same as affiliation with a federal agency or General Motors. University organizations are actually fragile combinations of bureaucratic and communal decision structures. These two entities interpenetrate and are inseparable. The relationship is essentially symbiotic.[1]

While the three broad goals of a university--instruction, research, and public service--are generally accepted, the goals and objectives within these major purposes are approached pluralistically through the multiplicity of divisions and sub-divisions within the

---

[1]William E. Moran, "A Systems View of University Organization," in Managing the University: A Systems Approach. ed. by Paul W. Hamelman. (New York: Praeger Publishers, 1972), p. 7.

total university system. Clark spoke of a trend toward a composite structure on the campus with many sub-cultures, an intense professionalism, and the growth of power centers.[1]

Not to be forgotten in the consideration and development of institutional goals and purposes are those elements or groups external to the campus who recognize the university's productivity, impact, and potential, and therefore, are interested in maintaining their interest in the university or in enlarging it. Professional associations and societies, alumni, parents of students, sports enthusiasts, legislators, taxpayers, and other special interest groups exercise their influence through the providing of funds, the setting of job and professional qualifications and standards, and the building of attitudes which support or hinder the institution.

Baldridge referred to the complex social setting within which university decision-making takes place.[2] The various special interest groups internally and externally are all pushing in different directions. Understandably, conflict often results.

Baldridge constructed a political model of university governance based upon the power of the various constituencies of the institution:

> If student riots cripple the campus, if professors form
> unions and strike, if administrators defend their tradi-
> tional positions, and if external interest groups and

---

[1]Burton R. Clark, "Faculty Organization and Authority," Academic Governance: Research on Institutional Politics and Decision Making, compiled and edited by J. Victor Baldridge (Berkeley: McCutchan Publishing Corporation, 1971), p. 242.

[2]J. Victor Baldridge, Power and Conflict in the University (New York: John Wiley & Sons, Inc., 1971), p. 23.

irate governors invade the academic halls, all these
acts must be seen as political . . . . These groups
articulate their interests in many different ways,
bringing pressure on the decision-making process from
any number of angles and using power and force whenever
it is available and necessary . . . . All this is a
dynamic process, a process clearly indicating that the
university is best understood as a 'politicized' insti-
tution--above all else the Political University.[1]

One major body of individuals in the university organization

has earlier been identified and alluded to in terms of governance.

From the days of the collegium system, the faculty, the "community of

scholars," has been involved to some degree in the academic affairs

of the institutions. Faculty control of academic concerns grew in the

nineteenth century and was further advanced upon the founding of the

American Association of University Professors in 1915. Presently,

most universities utilize an academic senate, council, or other

faculty oriented body which represents the thoughts and directions

of the faculty not only on academic programs and standards, but also

personnel policies regarding faculty members, academic budgets, and

other academic-related policies and practices. Of course, the

extent of faculty involvement varies considerably from institution to

institution.

Lieberman pointed out the inadequacies of the academic senate

system and employee councils in general.[2] These included the

dependency of the body upon the institution for operating funds, the

---

[1]Ibid., p. 20.

[2]Myron Lieberman, "Representational Systems in Higher Education,"
Academic Governance: Research on Institutional Politics and Decision
Making, ed. by J. Victor Baldridge (Berkeley: McCutchan Publishing
Corporation, 1971), p. 337.

necessity for approval by the institution of the groups organizational structure, the lack of time and facilities for members to act as representatives, and the lack of accountability of representatives to their constituency. Still, he acknowledged the persistence of senates and attributed it to a lack of faculty leadership and the faculty's misplaced support to nonacademic organizations and other pressures.

In addition to a representative academic senate, most institutions also include a larger number of faculty members in various standing and special committees, task-forces, or other sub-groups. Thus, the faculty is ultimately involved in at least those decisions relating to the instructional programs of the institution and some of the conditions of their tenure and welfare.

Commenting on the faculty member's view of himself in his relationship to the institution, Millett said:

> The academic professional expects that the system of organization and operation of his university will recognize the importance of the role of the faculty member and will provide him with a status of dignity and consideration.
>
> The college or university scholar does not think of himself as an employee of the university . . .[1]

In addition to the formal organization of the faculty with university governance, there are other organized groups which include faculty members which are not a part of the university's organizational structure. However, these faculty organizations may have great effect on policy decisions of the institution. In fact, it is such

---

[1]John D. Millett, _The Academic Community: An Essay on Organization_ (New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1962), p. 32.

external organizations of the faculty which ultimately becomes the

bargaining agent for the faculty at the conclusion of formal collec-

tive bargaining arrangements.

Writing in The Chronicles of Higher Educa⁺ᵢᵤn, Semas commented:

The passage of state laws granting collective bargain-
ing rights to public employees and the National Labor
Relations Board's decision in 1971 to assume juris-
diction over private colleges have encouraged many
faculty members to turn to unionization. The absence
of bargaining laws in such states as California,
Florida, Illinois, and Ohio is probably the major
reason why even more of the nation's professors are
not unionized.[1]

Examples of external faculty organizations are those groups

affiliated with the American Federation of Teachers, the National

Education Association, or the American Association of University

Professors. Local bodies of these groups speak in behalf of the

local institution's faculty, and further, local organizations are

able to bring to bear the additional impact of state and national

affiliations. Growing numbers of college and university faculty

members are delegating their negotiation rights to these organizations.

By election, the faculty selects the organization which will be the

bargaining agent.

A national report in the fall of 1973 indicated that bargaining

agents had been selected on 212 college campuses.[2] The affiliations

---

[1]Philip W. Semas, "A Special Report: Faculties at the Bargain-
ing Table," The Chronicle of Higher Education, Vol. VIII, No. 10,
Nov. 26, 1973, p. 9.

[2]"212 College and University Faculties with Collective Bargain-
ing Agents," The Chronicle of Higher Education, Vol. VIII, No. 10,
Nov. 26, 1973, p. 8.

by organizations were as follows: AAUP, 25; AFT, 48; NEA, 90; NEA-AFT
(Merged), 20; and independent agents, 29.

Another major group of university employees has also found
representation and support through organized labor. This is the
classification of employees which generally includes maintenance and
custodial crews, inventory and supply workers, food service and
housing personnel, clerical and office workers, and other nonacademic,
nonprofessional personnel.

As a result of the National Labor Relations Board ruling men-
tioned earlier, it is estimated that 95 per cent of the employees in
this classification who work in private institutions could be union-
ized. With permissive legislation, the same is true at state supported
institutions.

In discussing university management's concern with unionization,
Hilgert suggested that good personnel management and human relations
policies can take away the nonprofessional employees' interest in
unions. He listed seven conditions which diminish the union's appeal:

1) Wages are good and reasonably comparable to those
   paid in private industry. Fringe benefits also
   are ample and comparable.

2) Working conditions, including proper employee
   personal facilities, are generally satisfactory
   and/or improving.

3) A stable employment pattern has been followed;
   there have not been severe ups and downs in
   hiring and firing of large groups of employees.

4) Supervisors endeavor to treat their employees
   with dignity and respect. Communication lines
   are shared openly and willingly between super-
   visors and all sections of the work force.

5) Employees have been well trained, and they see
   opportunities for advancement to higher paying
   or upgraded positions.

6) Supervisors demonstrate a participative approach
   to management which allows employees to share in
   certain decisions surrounding their jobs and
   other working conditions.

7) Employees feel fairly treated. Typically this
   involves an opportunity for their grievances
   and complaints to be channeled upward through
   some form of grievance or problem-solving pro-
   cedure.[1]

Generally, other nonacademic employees of universities have
not sought unionization. Further, there is little information to
indicate that there is any considered movement for this large body of
nonacademic employees to organize into employee representative groups.
For the most part, these are professional, managerial, and administra-
tive personnel who, though not having academic status, are generally
more attuned to the academic climate of the university.

Employees in these professional, managerial, and higher staff
classifications are most often included in the broader expression
"administration" within the reference framework of the university
community. Indeed, the nonacademic employees would be in the broad
category of administration since they are not faculty and not students.
As administrators in the university the scope of their responsibili-
ties and duties are directly related to the purposes of the institution,
and their interests in the direction of the institution are no less
than that of the faculty and the student body.

_____

[1]Raymond Hilgert, "How to Work with Practically Everyone:
Managing with--or Without--a Union," College and University Business,
May, 1973, p. 52.

Balderston stressed that of necessity, there are growing needs

for developing formalized grievance procedures and other due process

machinery for staff employees over a wide range of issues.[1] He said

that many institutions in the late 1960's were finding out that they

had no regulations to cover many matters which had been handled by

generally understood customs which outlined boundaries for appropriate

conduct for the institution and its employees.

Policies pertaining to the higher nonacademic staff levels are

most often included in the faculty handbook of the institution.

However, the policies usually relate only to personnel practices and

employee benefits. Rarely are there provisions for the inclusion of

professional and administrative staff employees to participate in

decision-making and policy-making activities within or in cooperation

with the faculty senate or comparable body. The exception to this

would be the activity related to the individual employee's job respon-

sibilities; in that respect, he may play a part in the decision-making

processes of the institution.

In a survey of 1,769 institutions in the U.S., on membership,

organization, and operation of policy boards, Muston found that faculty

members were on standing or advisory committees of the boards in 184

places. Further, in thirteen institutions, students had actual

representation and participation on the boards. Other groups did not

fare so well as Muston reported:

> The relationship of faculty and student involvement
> with other institutional constituencies varied.

---

[1]Frederick E. Balderston, *Managing Today's University* (San
Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers, 1974), pp. 105-6.

> While some institutions recognized alumni with
> similar representation, others omitted both alumni
> and administrators entirely. It seemed signifi-
> cant that not one institution expressed concern
> for nonacademic staff representation in governance.[1]

Nonacademic employees are often neglected in long-range planning and development programs carried on by institutions. See reported that the University of Bridgeport, Connecticut, set up a university-wide council to develop a comprehensive, long-range planning program for the institution.[2] Included on the council were high administrative officers, faculty members, and students, but no other university employees.

Universities have been benevolently considerate of their employees. In a study by Greenough and King, it was found that all the institutions in the study, which included almost all public institutions and most private ones in the U.S., provided retirement benefits, sick-leave, vacations, and health and accident plans for their employees.[3] Further, most institutions offered savings plans, credit unions, disability programs, and other employee benefits. Understandably, there was a great variety of benefit plans available in the different institutions.

It is important to note, however, that most of the benefits provided were based on the allowances to academic employees. That is,

---

[1] Ray A. Muston, "Governance Changes are Catching Colleges by Surprise," College and University Business, July, 1969, p. 31.

[2] Harold W. See, "How One College Organized Itself for Planning," College and University Business, August, 1969, p. 33.

[3] William Croan Greenough and Francis P. King, Benefit Plans in American Colleges (New York: Columbia University Press, 1969).

faculty members received the most comprehensive benefits. Also,

there was little to indicate that the various employee groups other

than the faculty had opportunity to help develop these benefit plans

or be involved in the affairs and operations related to them. Again,

if there was participation, it was primarily by faculty members.

There is no denying the importance of the nonacademic supportive

staff which is needed in an institution of higher education. The

disparity of wages and salaries of university employees, particularly

blue-collar and skilled workers, and of employees in business and

industry has not gone unnoticed by college administrators as they try

to maintain the best possible staff.

There have been situations such as that mentioned in a report

of the Carnegie Commission on Higher Education in which, over a period

of time, the salaries of nonacademic employees grew at a greater rate

than those of academic employees.[1] There is evidence of other con-

cerns and improved working conditions for employees.

As they observe institutional changes, nonacademic employees of

higher education institutions are increasing their understanding of

university governance. Bucklew noted:

> In organizational terms, the staff employees have
> been silent members who have had little effect
> on the purpose or direction of the university. In
> most cases, staff employees are not involved in a
> function directly related to the goals of the
> organization. The university has tended to act
> "toward" this group and not "with" them . . . .
> The staff employees as an element of the university
> community are moving from their role as the silent

---

[1]The Carnegie Commission on Higher Education, The More Effective
Use of Resources: An Imperative for Higher Education (New York:
McGraw-Hill Book Company, June, 1972), p. 81.

member to one of assuming a place in the pluralistic arrangement.[1]

Many college administrators have relied on the familiar "open door" policy of personnel management. Ray has called it a relic, and he insists that the door must be open to collective participation as well.[2]

Nonacademic employees have seen the student protest movement of the 1960's lead to more student involvement in the governance of educational institutions, and they have watched the growing impetus of faculties calling for more involvement in institutional decision-making. It is understandable that the third constituency of the university community, the nonacademic employees, desires to be recognized and to become participants in institutional governance.

---

[1]N. S. Bucklew, "Employment Relations of Staff Employees in Institutions of Higher Learning." The Journal of the College and University Personnel Associations, Vol. 21, No. 3, August, 1970, p. 24.

[2]Jack N. Ray, "Coping with White-Collar Worker Demands to Participate," The Journal of the College and University Personnel Association, Vol. 23, No. 4, August, 1972, p. 699.

CHAPTER III

METHODOLOGY AND PROCEDURE

Two major surveys were conducted in the course of this study.
First, a questionnaire was directed to more than 200 colleges and
universities in the United States, both private and public, to identify
those institutions which had some form of nonacademic employee involve-
ment in their governance. Upon receipt of this information and after
the completion of a procedure insuring interest and cooperation on
behalf of leaders at the institutions, the second survey question-
naire was sent to nonacademic employee group members in thirty-five
groups at thirty-one state universities.

The Institutional Survey

The institutional survey began in the spring of 1973 and was
conducted over an eithteen month period. It was completed in associa-
tion with the staff of the University of Oklahoma Employee Executive
Council. The survey was sent to at least two state-supported univer-
sities in each of the fifty states plus several privately supported
institutions which were selected because of their size, their geogra-
phic location, and their reputations. The personnel officer of each
institution was contacted and asked to respond or to have a member of
his staff do so.

The questions on the institutional survey were concerned with the number of nonacademic employees at the institution, the classification system applied to nonacademic employees, the institution's legally charged governance body, and the extent of involvement of nonacademic employees in the institution's governance. The names of governance groups which included nonacademic employees were required as well as handbooks and other information in reference to nonacademic employees. A sample of this questionnaire letter is Appendix I.

Personnel directors not responding to the first letter were sent a follow-up letter requesting their attention and cooperation, and ultimately, 130 individuals representing their institutions returned the questionnaires. Of these, more than fifty institutions were identified which had a nonacademic committee, council, board, or other organization which was included in governance activities of the institution. In some institutions, there were two or more groups involved.

Based on the information received, the decision was made at this point to limit the study to state-supported universities. Only a few privately supported institutions responded to the questionnaire, and Federal regulations under the National Labor Relations Board were bearing on the continuance and establishment of councils or other internal employee organizations at private institutions. Also, other institutions dismissed from further inclusion in the study were those that referred to trade or craft unions in relation to nonacademic governance groups. Unions were in the study's definition of "external" organizations; the thrust of the study was directed at the institution's internal structure and organization.

A review of the organizational types in operation at the various institutions having nonacademic employee groups indicated four fundamental structures: 1) **associations** or **assemblies** in which members are self-representing, but with operational concerns designated to an executive committee, 2) **senates** with representatives elected on a numerical basis from sub-units of the institution, 3) **councils** ranging in size from eight to ten on upward to fifty or more members who are elected or appointed, and 4) **committees** generally with fewer members which are appointed or elected.

Using their charters, constitutions, by-laws, and other documents, the individual structure of each of the thirty-five groups in the study was examined. Information sought was in regard to the presiding officer of the group; number of members of the group and the manner of their selection; the constituency of the group; the purpose of the group; the scope of the group's activity; and other pertinent, unique data. Information about the institutional groups follows:

INSTITUTION AND LOCATION	NAME OF GROUP; PRESIDING OFFICER; MEMBERSHIP CONSTITUENCY; PURPOSE OF GROUP; SCOPE OF ACTIVITY; OTHER
The University of Alaska Fairbanks, Alaska	Classified Advisory Council; Chairman; nine elected members representing groups: 1) Research, 2) Extension, 3) Service, 4) Academic, and 5) Administration, with two administrative ex officio members--Coordinator of personnel and Manager of Business Affairs; classified employees only; advisory; personnel policies.
Ball State University Muncie, Indiana	University Staff Council; President; fifteen elected members from six groups: 1) Managerial and Technical, 2) Instructional Clerical, 3) Administrative Clerical, 4) Housekeeping, 5) Food Service, and

6) Services; administrative staff
only; liaison and communications;
standing committees: Fringe Bene-
fits, Traffic and Safety, Employee
Relations, Salary.

California State University
Fullerton, California

Staff Council; Chairman; thirty
elected representatives and Univer-
sity President, Chairman of the
Faculty Council, and the Personnel
Officer; all employees not repre-
sented on the Faculty Council;
communications and policy develop-
ment; any issue; Chairman is a
voting member on the Faculty Council
and the President's Cabinet; stand-
ing committees: Constitution,
Elections, Awards, Staff Affairs.

California State University
Long Beach, California

Staff Affairs Council; Chairman;
nineteen elected members and ex
officio members--Vice-President for
Administration, Director of Staff
Personnel, and President of CSEA
Chapter; classified and professional
staff; policy development, advisory,
and communications; any issue; five
council members also are members of
the Academic Senate.

California State University
Los Angeles, California

Staff Council; Chairperson; forty
elected representatives from twelve
campus divisions and ex officio
members--University President and
one administrator elected by the
Council; all nonacademic employees
and those not represented on the
Academic Senate; advisory and com-
munications; any issue; standing
committees: Personnel Policies,
Grievance, Services and Standards,
Joint Committee to Academic Senate,
Nominating.

Central Michigan University
Mount Pleasant, Michigan

Supervisory-Technical Council;
Chairman; nine elected members with
Director of Personnel ex officio;
technical and supervisory employees;
advisory and communications; any
issue.

Central Michigan University Mount Pleasant, Michigan	Administrative Personnel Assembly; Chairman; members are self-representing in Assembly; fifteen members are elected to the Administrative Personnel Council with ex officio members--Director of Personnel and a representative of the President's Council; administrative and professional employees except the President's immediate staff; policy development, advisory, and communications; any issue.
University of Idaho Moscow, Idaho	Staff Affairs Committee; Chairman; nine elected members representing groups: 1) Secretarial and Clerical, 2) Housing and Food Service, 3) Physical Plant Craftsmen, 4) Maintenance Men and Laborers, 5) Janitors, Farm Laborers, and Security Force, and 6) Professional Non-Faculty; classified and professional staff; advisory and communications; personnel policies.
Illinois State University Bloomington-Normal, Illinois	Civil Service Staff Council; Chairman; sixteen elected representatives from groups: 1) Administrative and Professional, 2) Office Services, 3) Trades and Occupations, 4) Services--Food, Security, Stores, Medical, 5) Services--Custodial, Grounds, Agriculture, 6) Secretariat, 7) Services--Supervisory, and 8) Laboratory Aides and Technicians; all nonacademic employees in the State Civil Service categories; advisory, communications, social and recreational activities; personnel policies; Appendix to Constitution includes classification coding for positions in the eight groups.
Indiana University Bloomington, Indiana	Staff Council; Chairman; thirty elected members representing general "districts" of the campus and Personnel Director ex officio; all nonacademic employees not designated administrative staff; advisory and communications; personnel policies.

Indiana State University Terre Haute, Indiana	<u>Office Personnel Council</u>; Chairman; twelve elected members from twelve designated divisions on the campus which are adjusted yearly for equitable representation; office employees only; advisory and communications; personnel policies.
Iowa State University Ames, Iowa	<u>Staff Council</u>; Chairperson; eighteen elected representatives from groups: 1) Office and Clerical, 2) Agricultural Farm Workers, 3) Trades and Crafts, 4) Security, Custodial and Housekeeping, 5) Food Service, 6) Laboratory and Technical, and an ex officio Consultant appointed by the University President: classified employees; policy development, advisory, and communications; any issue.
University of Maine Orono, Maine	<u>Classified Employees' Advisory Council</u>; Chairperson; thirty-five elected members proportionately representing job-coded employee classifications with two non-voting resource members appointed by the University President; classified employees; advisory; working environment of the University; standing committees: Committee on Committees, Membership, Constitution and By-laws, University Affairs.
University of Massachusetts Amherst, Massachusetts	<u>Professional Association</u>; Speaker; members self-representing in Association; Executive Board has ten elected members; professional employees; advisory; any issue; standing committees: Membership, Personnel Policies, Elections.
University of Montana Missoula, Montana	<u>Staff Senate</u>; President; sixteen members elected from groups: 1) Administrative, Professional, Administrative Assistants, and Technical, 2) Office and Clerical, 3) Craftsmen, Laborers, and Service Workers; all nonacademic staff; policy development, communications, promote higher education in the State,

improve working conditions; any
issue; Senate provides nonacademic
representatives for other University
committees.

Montana State University Bozeman, Montana	<u>Personnel Service Advisory Committee</u>; Chairman; nine elected campus-wide and two ex officio members--Director of Personnel and Chairman of Per- sonnel Board; classified personnel; policy development and advisory; personnel policies.
University of Nevada Reno, Nevada	<u>Staff Employees Council</u>; Chairperson; fourteen members appointed by Univer- sity President; classified and tech- nical employees; advisory and communications; personnel policies.
North Carolina State University Raleigh, North Carolina	<u>University Employee Association</u>; Chairman; members self-representing in Association, Executive Committee has twenty-four elected members; classified employees; advisory; personnel policies.
University of Northern Colorado Greeley, Colorado	<u>Classified Employees' Advisory Council</u>; Chairman; twenty-six elected members and Director of Personnel is ex officio; classified employees; advisory; personnel policies.
Northern Illinois University De Kalb, Illinois	<u>Operating Staff Council</u>; President; nine elected members from groups: 1) Operational Services, 2) Clerical and Secretarial, 3) Professional, Administrative and Technical; all nonacademic employees; advisory, communications, and social, recrea- tional and educational activities; personnel policies.
University of Northern Iowa Cedar Falls, Iowa	<u>Administration of Clerical Personnel Committee</u>; Chairman; eight members-- five elected classified employees and three from academic and adminis- trative personnel; advisory; person- nel policies.
University of Northern Iowa Cedar Falls, Iowa	<u>Physical Plant Committee</u>; Chairman; ten elected members; classified employees; advisory; personnel policies.

University of Northern Iowa Cedar Falls, Iowa	<u>Student Services Committee</u>; Chairman; nine elected members, majority classified employees; advisory; personnel policies.
Northwestern University Evanston, Illinois	<u>Staff Advisory Council</u>; fifteen members appointed by University President with Personnel Director ex officio; classified employees; advisory and communications; personnel policies; Council recommends to President names of staff members to serve on other University committees.
Ohio University Athens, Ohio	<u>Administrative Senate</u>; Chairman; thirty elected representatives; administrative staff; policy development, advisory, and communications; any issue.
University of Oklahoma Norman, Oklahoma	<u>Employee Executive Council</u>; Chairman; twenty-one elected members representing four organized groups 1) Council of Administrative Officers, 2) Administrative Staff Conference, 3) Association of University of Oklahoma Professional Employees, 4) Employee-Management Council; nonacademic employees; policy development, advisory, and communications; any issue; each of the four member groups has an organizational structure with elective representation.
Purdue University Lafayette, Indiana	<u>Clerical and Service Staff Advisory</u> Committee; Chairperson; twenty members representing four designated campus districts, members appointed by University President with Director of Personnel Administration and Business Manager as ex officio members; clerical and service classified staff; advisory and communications; personnel policies.
University of Rhode Island Kingston, Rhode Island	<u>Administrative Staff Association</u>; President; members self-representing in Association; eight members elected to be Executive Committee; administrative staff; advisory; personnel policies.

University of South Florida Tampa, Florida	<u>Career Service Senate</u>; Presiding Officer; fifty members elected representing four divisions: 1) Academic Affairs, 2) Administrative Affairs, and 3) Student Affairs on the Tampa campus, and 4) all career service staff on St. Petersburg campus; career service personnel as defined by State statute; advisory; any issue.
University of South Florida Tampa, Florida	<u>Administrative and Professional Committee</u>; Chairman; fourteen members elected from division: 1) Administration, 2) Educational Resources, 3) Instruction and Research, 4) Library, 5) Physical Plant, and 6) Student Affairs; administrative and professional employees; advisory; any issue "concerning areas of interest to the University community."
Southern Illinois University Carbondale, Illinois	<u>Civil Service Employees Council</u>; Chairman; fourteen elected members, two from each category: 1) Professional, 2) Secretarial, 3) Custodial, 4) Trades and Occupation, 5) Administrative, 6) Services, and 7) General; Civil Service employees according to State system; advisory; personnel policies, although not clearly defined.
University of Vermont Burlington, Vermont	<u>Non-Academic Employees Council</u>; Chairman; nine elected voting members and nine non-voting alternate members with Executive Vice-President and Director of Personnel as ex officio members; all non-academic employees; advisory; personnel policies; standing committees: Building and Grounds, Election, Fringe Benefits, Grievance, Internal Affairs, Rules.
University of West Virginia Morgantown, West Virginia	<u>Staff Council</u>; President; twelve members, two elected to represent each occupational class: 1) Junior Administrative, 2) Professional, 3) Semi-Professional, 4) Technical, 5) Clerical, and 6) Service; all nonacademic employees; advisory,

	communications, foster unity and cooperation, improve employment conditions and operating efficiency.
Western Illinois University Macomb, Illinois	Civil Service Employees Council; President; fifteen members--three elected from each group: 1) Administrative and Professional, 2) Clerical, Fiscal and Secretarial, 3) Services: Grounds, Security, Stores, Mail, Automotive, etc., 4) Crafts and Technicians, also local representative to University Civil Service Advisory Committee to the Merit Board is ex officio member; Civil Service employees in State classification system; policy development, advisory, communications, and social, recreational, and educational activities; personnel policies; standing committees: Recreation, Constitution, Education, Finance, Appeal, Safety, Public Relations.
University of Wyoming Laramie, Wyoming	Personnel Administration Advisory Committee; Chairman; nine members-- seven elected from groups: 1) Clerical, 2) Professional, and 3) Research and Service, plus two members appointed by the University President--one from academic staff and one from nonacademic staff, also, Director of Personnel is an ex officio member; nonacademic employees; advisory; personnel policies.

The Group Member Survey

In preparation for the questionnaire survey to individual group members, the researcher contacted the personnel officers at each of thirty-five institutions which had been identified in the earlier survey as having internal nonacademic employee governance groups. The purpose of the study was briefly outlined, and there was a pledge to keep the personnel officers informed on the progress of the study. In turn, the personnel officers were asked to provide the names and addresses

of the presiding officers of the nonacademic groups on their campuses. A sample of this letter is Appendix II.

The majority of the personnel officers responded to this first request, and several submitted suggestions or expressions of their interest in the study. Thirty-five personnel directors or their associates returned the needed information. Even after a follow-up request, no response was received from two personnel directors.

Within one week of receipt of the presiding officer's name and address, that leader was contacted and a request for assistance made. Again, the purpose of the study was briefly outlined. The presiding officer was asked to provide leadership in the distribution of a questionnaire to each member of the organization. A postal card was provided to the presiding officer who could elect to: 1) receive the questionnaire materials in bulk and personally distribute them to the membership, or 2) provide the researcher a list of the members with their campus addresses so that the questionnaire materials could be mailed individually. In both alternatives, the presiding officer was told by the researcher that a composite of the responses from his group would be sent as well as a composite of the responses from all institutional groups involved in the study. A sample of this letter to the presiding officers is Appendix III.

Generally, the presiding officers returned the postal cards promptly and expressed great interest in the study. Several made written comments on the cards or enclosed the card with a letter. The large majority of leaders were willing to distribute the question-naires to their memberships. Therefore, a bundle of questionnaire materials was sent to each presiding officer who wished to follow that

plan. For each member of the group, the materials included: 1) a questionnaire instruction sheet with the presiding officer's name mentioned as an endorsement of the study, 2) a questionnaire individualized by title for the particular group, and 3) a stamped, return envelope addressed to the researcher. For four groups, with information provided by the presiding officers, the questionnaire materials were mailed individually to group members. Samples of the Questionnaire Instruction Sheet and the Questionnaire are Appendices IV and V.

A questionnaire with twenty-five items was developed for individual group members' responses; it included seven categories of questions. The categories and question numbers were: 1) goals of the organization--Questions 1, 2, 11, and 25; 2) members' interest--Questions 3, 4, and 5; 3) use of time--Questions 6, 7, 9, and 10; 4) institutional influence--Questions 8, 15, and 18; 5) constituency needs--Questions 12, 13, 19, and 22; 6) communications--Questions 14, 16, 17, 20, and 21; and 7) personal development of members--Questions 23 and 24.

Two procedures were used to validate the questionnaire. First, several individuals who have been active in university governance organizations and personnel staff members at several universities were asked to review the questionnaire. Second, the questionnaire was administered to a pilot group.

Receiving the questionnaire for review were Mr. Kenneth Anderson, Director, Department of Independent Study, University of Oklahoma, currently Chairman of the Employee Executive Council; Mr. Clint Davidson, Director of Personnel Services, University of Oklahoma; Mr. Elton Davis, Director, Office of Financial Aids, University of

Oklahoma, Chairman of the group which wrote the Charter for the

Employee Executive Council at the University; Mr. Leonard Harper,

Director of Personnel, University of Oklahoma, Mr. Ben Hobgood,

Director of Personnel, Southern Methodist University; Mr. Mike Kent,

Personnel Officer, Southern Methodist University; Mr. Doug MacLean,

Director of Personnel, University of Houston; Mr. George F. McGregor,

Director, Personnel Services Office, University of Illinois Medical

Center; Mr. Gene Turner, Director of Personnel Services, Oklahoma

State University; and Mr. Jay Wilson, Personnel Officer, University of

Houston.

Several editorial comments and suggestions for improvement of

the questionnaire were received. A major modification was incorpor-

ated in the final questionnaire; one reviewer suggested that the

proposed rating-scale words be supported by a brief modifying state-

ment. Thus, "Always" as a response choice was changed to "Always--

almost all the time," and the other scale words were similarly

modified.

Two questionnaire reviewers expressed concern over the length

of the questionnaire suggesting that it was too long. However, the

time involved for response to the questions did not seem to be exces-

sive when the questionnaire was used with a pilot group; thus, the

twenty-five items remained on the final questionnaire.

A common concern expressed by two reviewers was that some of

the group members who were to receive the questionnaire would not

comprehend the questions. For example, it was suggested that repre-

sentatives from unskilled employee classification groups might choose

not to return the questionnaire because of their lack of understanding

of the questions. While this problem was recognized, further simpli-fication of the questions was not pursued since the questionnaire was to be distributed to such a wide range of employee groups the majority of whose members would understand the questions. One reviewer sug-gested that the percentage of response by those groups which were comprised primarily of employees in lower classification levels might be indicative of the lack of comprehension on the part of its indi-vidual members.

Validation of the questionnaire was continued by using it with a pilot group prior to its distribution to all the institutional groups in the study. The questionnaire, as revised after comments from the above reviewers, was given to members of the Employee Execu-tive Council of the University of Oklahoma. The members of EEC were asked to complete the questionnaire and make specific comments about questions that were unclear to them. Nineteen of twenty-one question-naires distributed were returned. Most individuals marked a response for every question, and the comments received suggested only slight modifications of the questionnaire. With these suggestions, the questionnaire was prepared for distribution to the other thirty-four institutional groups included in the study.

In late November, 1974, bundles or sets of individually addressed questionnaires were sent to twenty-eight institutional groups. At the same time, a follow-up letter was mailed to presiding officers of groups who had not responded. The latter group leaders were informed that if their group was to participate in the study, the questionnaire distribution information was needed.

Seven group leaders responded, and on January 2, 1975, question-naire materials for their memberships were mailed. These seven leaders and the presiding officers whose groups had already begun to return the questionnaires were sent a report showing the percentage of responses received by each group as of that date. A cover letter expressed appreciation for the cooperation and assistance earlier given and asked that the presiding officers request their memberships to return the questionnaire if they had not already done so. A copy of this letter and the report are Appendices VI and VII.

The tally of questionnaire responses was completed in early February, 1975. Upon completion of the count, a report indicating each individual group's responses to the questionnaire was sent to the presiding officer of the group and to the personnel officer of each group's university. Figure 1 on page 35 indicates the institutional groups in the study according to classification and also shows the percentage of members' responses to the questionnaire.

Review of Group Members' Questionnaire Responses

Responses to each item on the questionnaire have been reviewed, and the items grouped according to the seven general categories of questions on the questionnaire. The responses have been reported according to the organizational type of the nonacademic group.

While there were differences in the structures and procedures of the groups within each of the four organizational types, there was enough similarity of purpose and function for comparisons to be made. Further, the responses of any single group were not disproportionate to extreme in relation to the distribution of all responses in that

Figure 1.

CLASSIFICATION BY ORGANIZATIONAL TYPE OF THE INSTITUTIONAL GROUPS
AND PERCENTAGE OF RETURN OF INDIVIDUAL QUESTIONNAIRES

Assembly or Association	N	%
Central Michigan University Administrative Personnel Assembly	9	60
University of Massachusetts Professional Association	6	60
North Carolina State University Employee Association	10	42
University of Rhode Island Administrative Staff Association	7	88

Senate		
University of Montana Staff Senate	15	94
Ohio University Administrative Senate	23	77
University of South Florida Career Service Senate	21	42

Council		
University of Alaska Classified Advisory Council	7	78
Ball State University Staff Council	10	67
California State University-Fullerton Staff Council	22	73
California State University-Long Beach Staff Affairs Council	14	74
California State University-Los Angeles Staff Council	27	68
Central Michigan University Supervisory-Technical Council	6	67
Illinois State University Civil Service Staff Council	12	75
Indiana University Staff Council	17	57
Indiana State University Office Personnel Council	11	92
Iowa State University Staff Council	16	89
University of Maine Classified Employees' Advisory Council	22	63
University of Nevada-Reno Staff Employees' Council	11	79
Univ. of Northern Colorado Classified Employees' Advisory Council	21	81
Northern Illinois University Operating Staff Council	8	89
Northwestern University Staff Advisory Council	15	100
University of Oklahoma Employee Executive Council	19	90
Southern Illinois University Civil Service Employees' Council	12	86
University of Vermont Non-Academic Employees' Council	18	100
University of West Virginia Staff Council	9	75
Western Illinois University Civil Service Employees' Council	14	93

Committee		
University of Idaho Staff Affairs Committee	5	56
Montana State University Personnel Services Advisory Committee	8	89
Univ. of Northern Iowa Administration of Clerical Personnel Committee	7	88
Univ. of Northern Iowa Physical Plant Committee	9	90
Univ. of Northern Iowa Student Services Committee	7	78
Purdue University Clerical and Service Staff Advisory Committee	19	95
Univ. of South Florida Administrative and Professional Committee	11	79
University of Wyoming Personnel Administration Advisory Committee	9	100
Total	457	74

organizational type. Written comments by respondents were generally

distributed from among the groups in all organizational types.

The first category of questions reviewed related to the goals

and objectives of nonacademic employee governance groups. As Table 1

indicates, members of all organizational types think that their peer

members have an understanding of group goals and objectives most of

the time. There was evidence, however, that members of committees

had somewhat better understanding of goals than members of other

organizational types.

Table 1

RESPONDENTS' PERCEPTIONS OF FELLOW MEMBERS' UNDERSTANDING
OF GROUP GOALS AND OBJECTIVES, BY RESPONDENT GROUP TYPES

Frequency of Understanding	Association/ Assembly		Senate		Council		Committee	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Always	14	44	14	24	84	30	40	54
Often	10	31	25	42	117	41	23	31
Usually	6	19	19	32	66	23	10	14
Sometimes	2	6	1	2	13	5	1	1
Never	0	0	0	0	3	1	0	0
Totals	32	100	59	100	283	100	74	100

With the assumption that the opportunity for an individual to

serve on a governance group of a university is an implicit goal of the

group, the second item on the questionnaire related to election pro-

cedures for membership to the group. In the case of three institu-

tional groups in the study, members were appointed rather than elected.

A study of three organizations indicated that nonacademic employees

may still have some voice in the selection. For example, in one group a list of names was submitted by employees to the president of the institution who made the appointments. The appointed members could be selected to represent various divisions, employee classifications, or other units of the university.

Table 2 shows that the questionnaire respondents had strong confidence in the procedures for election of their members. Of the four organizational types, the association/assembly type appeared to have least confidence in this procedure.

Table 2

CONFIDENCE OF RESPONDENTS IN ELECTION PROCEDURES, BY ORGANIZATIONAL TYPE

Confidence Level	Association/ Assembly		Senate		Council		Committee	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Always	18	56	46	79	210	75	65	89
Often	8	25	10	17	44	16	7	10
Usually	5	16	2	3	14	5	1	1
Sometimes	1	3	0	0	5	2	0	0
Never	0	0	0	0	9	3	0	0
Totals	32	100	58	99	282	101	73	100

The election procedures for senate and council organizations were thoroughly detailed in most of their constitutions or by-laws. Regulations concerning nominating committees, eligibility, representative districts, voting procedures and other aspects of elections were clearly outlined. Some committee groups have comparable procedures. In the case of association/assembly organizations, officers

and executive committee members were usually elected at large from the membership without respect to any sub-division or sub-unit of the campus. In some cases, there were provisions for a nominating committee which could make recommendations for broad representation.

One question, Number 11, was related indirectly to group goals and objectives as it sought to identify the extent to which members posed topics or items for discussion which were not within the prerogative of the group's purpose. The tabulation of responses is shown in Table 3. Responses indicated that such topics are infrequently posed. The large percentage of responses indicating that the groups actually stay within the scope of their purpose suggested that the members understand the groups' limits. Also, the assumption was that those groups which have a broad range of issues within their prerogative would reflect the absence of limitations implied by the question.

Table 3

RESPONDENTS' PERCEPTIONS OF THE EXTENT TO WHICH GROUP DISCUSSIONS
SEEK TO GO BEYOND THE SCOPE OF THE GROUP'S PURPOSE,
BY ORGANIZATIONAL TYPE

Extension of Issues	Association/ Assembly		Senate		Council		Committee	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Always	9	9	2	3	18	6	4	5
Often	6	19	6	10	48	17	9	12
Usually	5	16	5	9	27	9	8	11
Sometimes	16	50	38	66	180	62	50	69
Never	2	6	7	12	16	6	2	3
Totals	32	100	58	100	289	100	73	100

Some members apparently direct attention to issues beyond the group's purpose; this could imply that those members wish to have an extension of the group's purpose, goals, and activities.

The final item on the questionnaire was also related to the goals and objectives of the group. The question sought the opinion of the respondent concerning the value of the group to the university. Assuming that the organization was developed to involve nonacademic employees in the governance of the institution, some value must be placed on this involvement, and that value would be implicit in the group's goals and purposes.

In many of the groups' constitutions, the purpose of institutional improvement was formally stated. In others, it was implied. For example, if a stated purpose was to improve the working conditions of nonacademic employees, a positive result would be the improvement of performance by employees which in turn would improve the services of the institution.

Approximately one-half of the respondents to the Question 25, as shown in Table 4, said that the institution was benefited "almost all the time" as a result of the groups' involvement. A less positive reaction came from association/assembly members, 26 per cent of whom said improvements "usually" or "sometimes" occurred. Likewise, council members placed 31 per cent of their responses in the "usually," "sometimes," or "never" categories.

This question received several written comments from respondents. One said, "I think the administration does not always understand fully the needs of the staff, and it takes longer than it should to get things settled. A sympathetic administration is of prime importance to

an effective staff council." Another wrote, "I believe you mean--'Is this a better place to work because of the council?' This would depend entirely upon the area in which you are employed. There are some administrators who, for some reason, feel very threatened by a staff council and oppose everything it works for." A member of a recently formed group remarked, "I think because of the short time we have been organized we have made some inroad in the working of our institution, and I am sure it will be better." Finally, one person said, "If I knew for sure how to answer that question I could certainly justify the time, effort, and agony that goes into this activity."

Table 4

RESPONDENTS' PERCEPTIONS OF THE VALUE OF THE GROUP TO
THE INSTITUTION, BY ORGANIZATIONAL TYPE

Value to Institution	Association/ Assembly		Senate		Council		Committee	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Always	13	42	31	56	137	50	35	49
Often	10	32	17	31	50	18	19	27
Usually	5	16	3	6	42	15	10	14
Sometimes	3	10	3	6	35	13	6	9
Never	0	0	1	2	9	3	1	1
Totals	31	100	55	101	273	99	71	100

The commitment of members for service on governance groups was explored in three questions, the first of which was directed to the interest of members. Table 5 shows that more than half of the respondents in association/assembly and committee organizational types said

that members almost always showed interest in serving the group; an

additional 31 per cent in each group type responded at the next highest

level. A majority, 58 per cent, of the senate members said that

members were interested most of the time, and an additional 29 per cent

indicated that interest was apparent almost all the time. Council

members expressed interest but less extensively than the other organi-

zational types. There were few negative interest responses.

Table 5

RESPONDENTS' OPINIONS OF THE INTEREST OF ELECTED MEMBERS IN
SERVING IN THE ORGANIZATION, BY ORGANIZATIONAL TYPE

Level of Interest	Association/ Assembly		Senate		Council		Committee	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Always	18	56	17	29	84	29	40	55
Often	10	31	34	58	125	44	23	31
Usually	3	9	7	12	70	24	10	14
Sometimes	1	3	1	2	7	2	0	0
Never	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0
Totals	32	99	59	101	287	100	73	100

As shown in Table 6, respondents to the questionnaire outlined

a difference by organizational type regarding the level of supportive

attitude expressed by group members toward the group's purpose. Mem-

bers of association/assembly, senate, and committee organizational

types noted a positive attitude on the part of their peers. For these

three group-types, positive responses in the "always" and "often"

ranges were 86 per cent and upward. On the other hand, 73 per cent of

the council members rated their peers' attitude in the upper ranges of responses. Negative responses were negligible.

Table 6

SUPPORTIVE ATTITUDE OF ELECTED GROUP MEMBERS AS
OBSERVED BY RESPONDENTS, BY ORGANIZATIONAL TYPE

Attitude of Support	Association/ Assembly		Senate		Council		Committee	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Always	14	44	20	34	88	30	37	50
Often	15	47	32	54	109	38	28	38
Usually	3	9	7	13	83	29	9	12
Sometimes	0	0	0	0	8	3	0	0
Never	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0
Totals	32	100	59	100	289	101	74	100

Observations concerning attendance of members at group meetings were fairly consistent among the four organizational types. As shown in Table 7, observations of the respondents indicate that most group members attend meetings regularly. It is important to note that in some organizations attendance regulations call for the removal of a member from the group if excessive absence from meetings occurs.

Most groups in the study had meetings at least once a month. Responses to the question about the groups' having enough time in its meetings to conduct its business are indicated in Table 8. The majority of responses fell in the upper ranges for each of the organizational types, indicating adequate time for conducting meetings. Comments from individuals did, however, point out some problems. One said, "Our group seems to get hung-up over insignificant problems or

Table 7

RESPONDENTS' OBSERVATIONS OF THE ATTENDANCE OF MEMBERS
AT GROUP MEETINGS, BY ORGANIZATIONAL TYPE

Regular Attendance	Association/ Assembly		Senate		Council		Committee	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Always	11	36	7	12	89	31	30	41
Often	18	58	34	58	145	50	37	50
Usually	2	7	16	27	46	16	7	10
Sometimes	0	0	2	3	7	2	0	0
Never	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0
Totals	31	101	59	100	288	100	74	101

Table 8

RESPONDENTS' ESTIMATIONS OF TIME USAGE IN GROUP
MEETINGS, BY ORGANIZATIONAL TYPE

Adequacy of Time	Association/ Assembly		Senate		Council		Committee	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Always	14	44	11	19	115	40	29	39
Often	10	31	26	44	88	30	28	38
Usually	7	22	20	34	52	18	13	18
Sometimes	1	3	2	3	25	9	2	3
Never	0	0	0	0	8	3	2	3
Totals	32	100	59	100	288	100	74	101

what some member regards as a problem. Meetings seem to go on for-
ever." Another said, "Our membership seems too large for effective
management. The 'business' conducted at the meetings could be handled

in one-third the time; by and large, the meetings are an enormous

waste of time, by everybody."

Closely related to the adequacy of the allotment of meeting

time, was the use of an agenda. Questionnaire item Number 9 asked if

a meeting agenda was announced in advance of the meeting. Responses

are shown on Table 9. The very high percentage of responses in the

two upper ranges of two organizational types, 100 per cent of senate

members and 84 per cent of council members, pointed out the extensive

use of advance agendas in these groups. On the other hand, the use of

advance agendas was not as widely practiced in associations and

committees.

Table 9

USE OF ADVANCE AGENDA AS ACKNOWLEDGED BY RESPONDENTS,
BY ORGANIZATIONAL TYPE

Advance Agenda Used	Association/ Assembly		Senate		Council		Committee	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Always	12	38	49	83	205	72	21	28
Often	5	16	10	17	34	12	15	20
Usually	2	6	0	0	19	7	18	24
Sometimes	11	34	0	0	18	6	16	22
Never	2	6	0	0	8	3	4	5
Totals	32	100	59	100	284	100	74	99

An initial reaction to this item might suggest that a group

either does or does not have an announced agenda. However, a review

of individual questionnaire responses for each individual group iden-

tified the fact that members from one group marked the full range of

responses. A similar distribution of responses occurred in several groups and may have been the result of inadequate communications within the groups' institutions, an inconsistency in agenda practices of the groups, or indifference on the part of group members with respect to information they have received about group activities.

There were a few pertinent comments about the use of an agenda presented by the respondents. One council member wrote extensively, "Any meeting, but especially a large one, must have an agenda . . . . It must be followed otherwise there will be a great deal of meandering, back-tracking, and so forth . . . . Under present operating procedures anybody can say or introduce anything, whether it is related to the subject directly, only distantly related or totally unrelated . . . . The meetings should be run in a business-like manner, under the firm control of a chairman, with an agenda that is adhered to, and with preparation on the part of those reporting." Another member of a newer council remarked simply, "An agenda and some form of modified parli-mentary procedure would help us."

The frequency at which group members add agenda items or suggest new business is reflected in Table 10. In this respect, members of committees appeared to initiate new business quite frequently, more so than members of the other organizational types. The responses of association or assembly group members was that such action is common practice but not too extensive. Senate and council members, however, implied more common occurrence saying that members bring up new business quite frequently. Only a few individuals said that group members rarely or never contributed to the announced agenda or sought to depart from it.

Table 10

EXTENT TO WHICH MEMBERS INITIATE AGENDA ITEMS OR NEW BUSINESS
AS DISCERNED BY THE RESPONDENTS, BY ORGANIZATIONAL TYPE

Members' Initiative	Association/ Assembly		Senate		Council		Committee	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Always	9	28	10	18	74	26	28	38
Often	9	28	21	37	101	35	24	33
Usually	9	28	11	19	49	17	14	19
Sometimes	5	16	13	23	59	20	6	8
Never	0	0	2	3	5	2	1	1
Totals	32	100	57	100	288	100	73	99

One respondent expressed frustration concerning the presentation of some items. His comment seemed to be associated with problems that were brought from the floor in meetings. He said, "Problems which were discussed and discarded a year or two ago will be deemed unnecessary to discuss again if brought up again--this despite the fact that economic and other circumstances may have changed substantially in the interim."

The opportunity for members to participate in the conduct of the group's meetings is an important part of the democratic process. Question 7 asked if members had an opportunity to express themselves on the issues being discussed. While the question had a philosophical base, it also had a practical base in terms of time available in the group meetings.

Several respondents added comments concerning the time factor in group meetings. One stated, "I have found that some members tend

to monopolize the floor and are determined to have their way or else, which is a waste of time for the other members who are taken from their work to attend meetings. Voicing an opinion and getting the opinion of other members is one thing, but trying to railroad one's own opinions through a meeting is something else." Consistent with that opinion, another wrote, "There are some old hands who attend every meeting, participate with obvious relish, and speak at length on every subject, without really contributing much except to the length of the meeting." Another respondent commented, "There are those who do not understand some of the issues, but are ashamed to say so and just sit there."

Responses on Table 11 imply that there is adequate opportunity for individuals to express themselves on issues. Whether responses were made on the principle of freedom of expression, or strictly the practical, time-wise viewpoint is uncertain. Most likely, it was a combination of these factors.

Both positive and negative institutional influence is a vital factor in the success of employee groups. The first of three questions in this respect sought to identify the extent of repressive influence on group members by the institution through its administration. Table 12 shows that a large majority of the members, three-fourths or more, noted negative influence only occasionally or rarely. However, 9 per cent of the respondents from association/assembly and senate groups and 8 per cent of the committee members expressed a high degree of repression. This could be interpreted as a reactionary response by these individuals due to isolated or limited incidences in which they were involved or which they observed rather than

Table 11

RESPONDENTS' OPINIONS OF THE OPPORTUNITY FOR MEMBERS TO
PARTICIPATE IN GROUP MEETINGS, BY ORGANIZATIONAL TYPE

Opportunity to Participate	Association/ Assembly		Senate		Council		Committee	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Always	27	84	41	70	216	75	66	89
Often	1	3	13	22	41	14	7	10
Usually	4	13	5	9	26	9	1	1
Sometimes	0	0	0	0	6	2	0	0
Never	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Totals	32	100	59	101	289	100	74	100

Table 12

RESPONDENTS' PERCEPTIONS OF THE EXTENT OF ADMINISTRATIVE REPRESSION
OF GROUP MEMBERS, BY ORGANIZATIONAL TYPE

Extent of Repression	Association/ Assembly		Senate		Council		Committee	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Always	3	9	5	9	9	3	6	8
Often	2	6	1	2	15	5	3	4
Usually	2	6	2	3	9	3	1	1
Sometimes	8	25	16	28	120	42	12	16
Never	17	53	34	59	133	47	51	70
Totals	32	99	58	101	286	100	73	99

widespread repressive attitudes on the part of the administration. If

such repression was extensive, it would be reflected by an increased

negative response on the part of other group members. There is,

however, the possibility that controls on the member's participation could be imposed through other university operations or structures, for example, his immediate supervisor might apply subtle pressures, or the individual may be "marked" as a troublemaker by the administration.

Written comments by respondents were provided concerning members' repression. One said, "They (the administration) try as much as possible to keep us under control. There are always the 'older people' who are afraid to try anything new, or take a strong stand." Another commented, "I have on two occasions noted that before asking a question or submitting a suggestion that fellow members looked at one of our number (who is on Dr. _____'s staff) as though wondering what was going to happen. Almost to the point of, 'Am I doing wrong and what will the punishment be?' I feel this is very, very wrong. I sometimes have the feeling he is just there to spy on us." A council member wrote, "Since our advisory committee was initiated by the administration, we probably get more cooperation, even though we are strictly advisory, than other groups. We find our strength in numbers--we outnumber the faculty and administration more than two to one--and that constant, gentle nudge is more effective than a violent thrust."

The quality and quantity of communications provided is one important way in which the administration exerts influence over an employee group. Table 13 indicates the extent of confidence members of nonacademic groups had in the information provided to them by their administrations. In all four organizational types, the confidence level was high with nearly one-third of the association/assembly and the committee members saying information received was appropriate. The widest range of responses came from respondents who were members

Table 13

CONFIDENCE IN ADMINISTRATION'S INFORMATION EXPRESSED
BY RESPONDENTS, BY ORGANIZATIONAL TYPE

Level of Confidence	Association/ Assembly		Senate		Council		Committee	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Always	10	32	10	17	43	15	21	30
Often	6	19	31	54	92	33	15	21
Usually	10	32	14	25	94	33	18	25
Sometimes	5	16	2	3	43	15	15	21
Never	0	0	0	0	10	4	2	3
Totals	31	99	57	99	282	100	71	100

of councils. Viewed alone, their responses indicate some discontent with administrative information.

One negative comment was directed to this question as a group member wrote, "I think the administration gives the amount of information it wishes to and only that. Example: What is the money paid by staff for parking stickers used for? They have not answered that. We have helped, but there are areas that our group cannot reach or does not." Another person noted, "In the past four years we have had four different administrations (Presidents) and as of December 1, 1974 we receive our fifth new president. So this question is hard to answer. A better answer would have to be 'sometimes yes--sometimes no.'"

Institutional influence can be implemented by the control of communications. Information can be parcelled out in such a way that it influences decisions that have been made and calls for their revision. Due to incomplete or inadequate information or misunder-

standing of goals and objectives, recommendations made by a nonacademic

group might need to be reviewed in light of more complete information

and better understanding of circumstances. Manipulation of informa-

tion and communications can take considerable time and cause frustration

among group members. Table 14 reflects the extent to which university

administrations return group recommendations for further study and

review. Nonacceptance of the recommendations is implied.

Table 14

RESPONDENTS' JUDGEMENTS OF THE EXTENT TO WHICH THE ADMINISTRATION
RETURNS GROUP RECOMMENDATIONS FOR FURTHER STUDY,
BY ORGANIZATIONAL TYPE

Referral Frequency	Association/ Assembly		Senate		Council		Committee	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Always	5	16	3	6	25	9	8	11
Often	5	16	17	33	56	20	20	27
Usually	7	22	8	15	51	19	15	21
Sometimes	15	47	20	38	119	43	28	38
Never	0	0	4	8	24	9	2	3
Totals	32	101	52	100	275	100	73	100

The respondents' judgements fell in all ranges of responses,

but in each organizational type, the greater percentage was in the

"sometimes" category. However, in senate and committee structures,

over one-third of the respondents indicated that recommendations were

returned a majority of the time or more. Regarding this practice,

one individual wrote, "Our personnel policies have been returned by

the President and re-worded by the Council several times over the

past three years." Speaking of positive administrative influences, a council member wrote, "We have a President who attends our meetings occasionally and comes to our social events, and we have some members of the administration usually at each meeting for questions and discussion involving policy for his area. I feel our administration is very responsive to solid thinking."

Apparently, members of the thirty-five groups in the study thought they were doing a good job of representing their constituencies, their fellow nonacademic employees. Items 12 and 13 on the questionnaire were directed to this concept.

Table 15

RESPONDENTS' ESTIMATIONS OF THE EXTENT TO WHICH THEIR GROUPS
INITIATE EFFORT BASED ON NEEDS AND OBJECTIVES OF GROUP
CONSTITUENCIES, BY ORGANIZATIONAL TYPE

Efforts Constituency	Association/ Assembly		Senate		Council		Committee	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Always	13	41	11	19	86	30	31	42
Often	14	44	32	56	137	48	30	41
Usually	4	12	10	18	40	14	9	12
Sometimes	1	3	4	7	21	7	3	4
Never	0	0	0	0	2	1	1	1
Totals	32	100	57	100	286	100	74	100

As outlined on Table 15, at least 75 per cent of the respondents in each of the organizational types thought that their groups initiated efforts and actions which were based on the needs and objectives of nonacademic employees at the institutions. The greatest

confidence in this opinion was indicated by association/assembly executive committee members with 41 per cent of them saying that interests of the constituency were kept in mind almost all the time. Further, an additional 44 per cent supported this belief a majority of the time. Committee members' responses were quite similar in that 83 per cent of the responses showed that efforts were consistent with nonacademic needs a majority of the time. It must be noted that of 449 responses to this question, only two individuals said that group members never or only rarely acted in accord with constituent needs. Not one of these two people but a council member, an individual offered this negative statement regarding the question, "In my opinion many members represent their own or some other member's viewpoint rather than their constituency. Some members tend to dominate the procedures. Many individuals serve (on the council) too often."

After items which are based on the needs and objectives of the constituency are posed, recommendations concerning them must be developed and subsequently passed on to the appropriate administrative official. Group members displayed consistency in their thought and action as they indicated that recommendations are based on the desires of their constituencies. The responses to the question concerning recommendations made by the groups were similar to those concerning the initiation of ideas and proposals by the group. Table 16 indicates again the concern that nonacademic employee group members have for their co-workers as 75 per cent or more replied that group recommendations were supportive of constituency needs a majority of the time if not almost all the time. The positivism of effort was also implied by the infrequency of negative responses. For committee

groups there were no responses in the two lower response categories,

and there were 5 per cent or less responding in the lower categories

for the other three organizational types. One council member men-

tioned a specific issue regarding recommendations, "Our council has

provided the nonacademic employee with yet another avenue in which he

or she can express their thoughts and feeling on the running of the

institution. This council has acted as representative for nonacademic

employees in many instances where decisions of great importance were

to be decided by the administrators. During our recent energy crisis

the staff council helped in trying to arrange policy and give advice

in some of the decisions made."

Table 16

RESPONDENTS' OPINIONS OF THE DEGREE TO WHICH GROUP RECOMMENDATIONS
ARE BASED ON THE NEEDS AND OBJECTIVES OF NONACADEMIC EMPLOYEES,
BY ORGANIZATIONAL TYPE

Recommendations for Constituency	Association/ Assembly		Senate		Council		Committee	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Always	14	44	15	26	96	34	33	45
Often	10	31	32	55	121	43	23	32
Usually	7	22	8	14	50	18	17	23
Sometimes	0	0	3	5	8	3	0	0
Never	1	3	0	0	7	2	0	0
Totals	32	100	58	100	282	100	73	100

The involvement of nonacademic employees occurs in a formal

sense with the sending of recommendations made by the nonacademic group

to the administration. In the case of the institutions in this study,

all being state supported universities, a governing board for each

institution was legally charged with the responsibility for the insti-

tution including its policies and rules. A president or other titular

head of each institution was the chief administrator for the governing

board and was the primary decision-maker in the university. His staff

and the various committees, councils, task forces, and other formally

organized groups were largely advisory in respect to major issues,

policies, and decisions.

Question 19 sought a judgement concerning the extent to which

the governing body, the president, or other decision-making adminis-

trators take into account the recommendations of the nonacademic

employee groups. Responses as shown in Table 17 were distributed

among the five categories for the four organizational types with more

even distribution in the middle categories. Thirty-nine per cent of

the association/assembly members said decisions reflected their

recommendations only some of the time. Committee members had 34 per

cent of their responses in the "sometimes" category and council mem-

bers 36 per cent. Expressing more positive results were senate

members who said that their recommendations were usually incorporated

44 per cent of the time and most of the time, 26 per cent. There were

other signs of positive results as 16 per cent of the association/

assembly members and 14 per cent of the committee members said their

recommendations were well received almost all the time.

One respondent alluded to an adversary situation which can

develop between nonacademic governance groups and administrators with

decision-making roles. He said, "If the University would recognize

the contributions made by the council and nonacademic personnel rather

than the labor/management concept, their fears would develop into an
appreciation of the council which could be molded into the intricate
workings of the University and the recognition and importance of every
single working body." Another respondent expressed optimism, "We are
an advisory committee only and cannot directly formulate policy con-
cerning nonacademic personnel. However, every recommendation passed by
the committee (not necessarily every recommendation presented) has been
favorably acted upon by the University." Another spoke of results,
"We do not represent the faculty and union staff, but after something
is implemented, the faculty and union persons all benefit if its
applicable. We recommend directly to the President. The staff is
represented on some University Senate Committees, and we are seeking
additional representation on more committees." One council member told
of frustration, "On most occasions when the council has made recommen-
dations concerning vacations, sick leave, or funeral leave, no answer

Table 17

RESPONDENTS' JUDGEMENTS CONCERNING THE EXTENT TO WHICH INSTITUTIONAL
DECISIONS REFLECT GROUP RECOMMENDATIONS, BY ORGANIZATIONAL TYPE

Decisions re: Recommendations	Association/ Assembly		Senate		Council		Committee	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Always	5	16	3	6	11	4	10	14
Often	7	23	14	26	67	24	22	30
Usually	7	23	24	44	90	32	13	18
Sometimes	12	39	12	22	99	36	25	34
Never	0	0	1	2	12	4	3	4
Totals	31	101	54	100	279	100	73	100

has been received for at least six months or more (unless it is a flat NO which we usually hear within a month). Since most of the office employees are aware of the council's problems in communicating with the administration, their morale and faith in the council leaves a lot to be desired." Finally, one member put it bluntly, "Our council is not always effective."

Item 22 on the questionnaire specifically asked about evaluative activities of the institutional groups. Such evaluation would be directed to an underlying goal of a group, the representation of non-academic employees in the university's governance. Earlier question-naire responses suggested that group members did seek to represent their constituencies and did make recommendations on the basis of the needs and objectives of their fellow workers. However, the responses to the evaluation question in these respects as shown in Table 18 indicated a diversity of opinion. For each organizational type, responses fell in each of the five categories. According to the response distribution, senate members were most inclined to evaluative efforts with 54 per cent of the respondents saying that group efforts were evaluated a majority of the time or almost all the time. Slightly less than one-third of association/assembly members, council members, and committee members indicated less frequency in evaluation acti-vities. Committee members showed considerable positive effort, how-ever, as 26 per cent of them noted evaluation almost all the time and an additional 20 per cent said it occurred a majority of the time. There were no written comments from respondents directed specifically to this question.

Table 18

RESPONDENTS' OPINIONS REFLECTING THE DEGREE OF GROUP EVALUATION
OF ITS EFFORTS AND ACTIONS, BY ORGANIZATIONAL TYPE

Extent of Evaluation	Association/ Assembly		Senate		Council		Committee	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Always	6	19	6	12	42	16	18	26
Often	6	19	22	42	71	26	14	20
Usually	10	31	12	23	72	27	14	20
Sometimes	7	22	11	21	64	24	16	23
Never	3	9	1	2	20	7	7	10
Totals	32	100	52	100	269	100	69	99

There were more items on the questionnaire related to communi-
cation than to other aspects of organizational procedures. Several
communication relationships were to be explored.

The first communication item concerned the general nature of
communication channels within the university. The lack of confidence
in institutional internal communications expressed by nonacademic
employees is shown on Table 19. As one respondent stated, "If this
applies to channels of communication from administration to nonacademic
employees, no." Most of the respondents reported that communication
channels were effective much of the time or a majority of the time.
Senate members placed 79 per cent of their responses in these ranges
while the other three organizational types' responses were in the
sixty percentiles. With the exception of committee members, the
respondents gave less than 20 per cent of the most favorable response
for their institutional communications; 26 per cent of the committee

members said that communication channels were satisfactory almost all the time. Only a small percentage of respondents expressed extreme dissatisfaction with institutional communications.

Table 19

SUFFICIENCY OF INSTITUTIONAL COMMUNICATION CHANNELS AS JUDGED
BY THE RESPONDENTS, BY ORGANIZATIONAL TYPE

Channel Sufficiency	Association/ Assembly		Senate		Council		Committee	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Always	9	19	8	14	41	14	19	26
Often	9	28	22	39	92	33	22	30
Usually	13	41	23	40	86	30	23	32
Sometimes	3	9	4	7	55	19	9	12
Never	1	3	0	0	8	3	0	0
Totals	32	100	57	100	282	99	73	100

Nonacademic employee governance groups can make decisions and recommendations only on the basis of the information available for their consideration. Item 16 on the questionnaire was directed toward an examination of the nonacademic group's ability to get the information it believes is needed from the administration. The responses on Table 20 suggested that group members felt reasonably confident that they can get the information they seek. Of the four organizational types, the senate members expressed the most confidence in their ability; 21 per cent of them said that information was gained almost all the time, while 61 per cent said the majority of the time. Moreover, senators gave no responses in the lower response categories.

Table 20

RESPONDENTS' PERCEPTIONS OF THE GROUPS' ABILITY TO GET NEEDED
INFORMATION FROM THE ADMINISTRATION, BY ORGANIZATIONAL TYPE

Information Gained	Association/ Assembly		Senate		Council		Committee	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Always	7	23	12	21	67	24	25	35
Often	15	48	35	61	121	43	24	34
Usually	4	13	10	18	54	19	14	20
Sometimes	5	16	0	0	37	13	7	10
Never	0	0	0	0	2	1	1	1
Totals	31	100	57	100	281	100	71	100

Another confident group-type was the committee. Committee members
placed two-thirds of their responses in the two higher categories
implying that they got needed information. Association/assembly and
senate members did not reflect extreme difficulty in gaining informa-
tion from the administration. Also, there was only limited negative
reaction on the part of council and committee members.

There were a few written comments from respondents about this
item including one which said, "There are occasions when a better
communication between administration and staff could accomplish more
effective results and sometimes I feel time and effort are wasted in
doing things over a second time because goals are not clearly under-
stood by one side or the other." A committee person remarked, "Our
committee is made up of three clerical people and three faculty
people. We also have a liaison member appointed by the President. I
feel the make-up of the committee is such that communication channels

are kept reasonably open with our administration." Another person said, "We unfortunately have a personnel director who will listen to nobody and whose method of personnel administration is solely based on the outdated theory of divide and conquer. He fails to recognize that that system no longer works, the employees are too smart for that."

When a group has prepared a recommendation it is generally forwarded to the appropriate administrative official. For example, a matter related to personnel policies might be sent to the personnel director or a concern regarding building safety might be forwarded to the director of physical facilities or the vice-president concerned with that responsibility. In some cases, recommendations go directly to the president of the university who re-directs them to members of his staff for study and response. When recommendations are made, the group making them should be informed that the recommendations have been received, and further, the group should be kept informed of the status of a recommendation as it is being considered by the administration.

Item 17 on the questionnaire concerned the extent of interaction with individuals to whom nonacademic employee group recommendations were presented. Table 21 shows that administrative officials were interacting favorably with nonacademic groups. Well over half of the respondents said that their recommendations were acknowledged at least a majority of the time. Forty-two per cent of the committee respondents said that they were kept informed about their recommendations almost all the time. Senate groups, however, had the most frequent interaction with 88 per cent indicating acknowledgement at least a majority of the time. The negative responses to the question were slight.

Table 21

RESPONDENTS' ESTIMATIONS OF THE EXTENT OF INTERACTION IN
RESPECT TO GROUP RECOMMENDATIONS, BY ORGANIZATIONAL TYPE

Extent of Interaction	Association/ Assembly		Senate		Council		Committee	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Always	10	31	21	37	73	26	30	42
Often	11	34	29	51	109	39	22	31
Usually	8	25	6	10	72	26	15	21
Sometimes	3	9	1	2	24	9	5	7
Never	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0
Totals	32	99	57	100	279	101	72	101

Having said that they kept their fellow workers in mind as they
planned and developed recommendations, nonacademic employee group mem-
bers expressed considerable disagreement regarding the extent to which
information concerning issues of importance and activities of the
employee group were shared with the constituency. Table 22 shows that
of the four group types, association/assembly members did a very good
job of keeping nonacademic employees informed as 74 per cent of the
members of this organizational type responded in the more positive
categories. Likewise, committee members showed positive efforts as
67 per cent of them marked the two higher categories. The greatest
range of responses was from senate members; 29 per cent of them said
that nonacademic employees were informed only sometimes or even rarely,
but on the positive side, slightly more than one-third of the senate
members said that employees were informed almost all the time. Council

members responded in the middle to upper categories with only 10 per
cent reflecting infrequency in communications with their constituents.

Table 22

RESPONDENTS' PERCEPTION OF THE EXTENT OF COMMUNICATION SERVICES
TO THEIR CONSTITUENCY, BY ORGANIZATIONAL TYPE

Constituency Communication	Association/ Assembly		Senate		Council		Committee	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Always	12	39	20	36	131	47	20	56
Often	11	35	8	15	54	19	8	11
Usually	5	13	11	20	43	15	10	14
Sometimes	4	13	13	24	43	15	10	14
Never	0	0	3	5	10	4	3	4
Totals	31	100	55	100	281	100	71	99

Several group members indicated the use of a newsletter as a
means of informing their constituencies, and other individuals expressed
the need for such publications. One member said, "At this point our
council is not funded by anyone so our communications in the form of
newsletters are very limited. Each group member receives minutes and
an agenda which we post on bulletin boards in our area. This is not
too effective." Another person wrote, "The university newspaper and
other campus media now carry individual items of interest to the staff.
Our proposed newsletter will be much more complete and informative.
It will go to each staff member." A council member said of his insti-
tution's newsletter, "The University Newsletter on campus covers little
if any of our actions."

A different communication technique was outlined by one respondent, "We are at present meeting with small groups of members to get a better sense of their concerns and how they view our committee and whether we are an appropriate body for representing them. With this kind of input, we hope to gain a better sense of where the association is or where it should be moving. With this kind of information base I think we can deal more effectively with the administration."

Table 23

SUFFICIENCY OF COMMUNICATIONS BETWEEN THE NONACADEMIC GROUP
AND A COMPARABLE FACULTY GROUP AS GAUGED BY RESPONDENTS,
BY ORGANIZATIONAL TYPE

Faculty Communications	Association/ Assembly		Senate		Council		Committee	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Always	3	10	13	23	45	17	16	23
Often	7	23	22	39	47	18	13	18
Usually	12	39	14	25	64	24	10	14
Sometimes	3	10	5	9	71	27	16	23
Never	9	19	2	4	38	14	16	23
Totals	31	101	56	100	265	100	71	101

It was assumed that faculty members at the institutions included in the study had some input into governance activities through their involvement in faculty organizations such as senates, councils, committees, and other bodies. Some nonacademic groups in the study indicated that faculty members held voting memberships in the nonacademic group or were liaison representatives for faculty groups, and likewise, nonacademic employees had representation on faculty bodies.

Item 21 on the questionnaire asked about the extent of communi-
cation between the nonacademic employee group and a comparable faculty
group. Table 23 indicates that only nonacademic senate groups main-
tained such communication to pronounced degree. Sixty-two per cent of
the senate members responded positively as 23 per cent of them said
that communications were carried on almost all the time, and an addi-
tional 39 per cent stated that communications occurred a majority of
the time. In contrast, only 33 per cent of the association/assembly
members, 35 per cent of the council members, and 41 per cent of the
committee members placed responses in the two higher response cate-
gories. Thirty-nine per cent of the association/assembly members
indicated that communications were usually maintained, but 41 per cent
of the council members and 46 per cent of the committee members said
that communications were less frequent or even rare.

One favorable note was provided by a respondent concerning
nonacademic employee-faculty communication, "Faculty Senate minutes are
available to all campus groups and the Faculty Senate Chairman is
included on the mailing list for the minutes of our group. Recently
an invitation was extended to the Faculty Senate to appoint one of
their members to attend our group meetings in an attempt to broaden
communications between the groups. Last year for the first time, a
classified person was appointed to serve on a Presidential Search
Committee--as a result of a Faculty Senate recommendation."

Members of nonacademic employee governance groups have learned
more about the overall university picture as a result of their partici-
pation in the group. In reference to their individual insights, over
one-half of the respondents from association/assembly, council, and

committee organizational types said that participation increased their

knowledge about the university almost all the time; senate responses

in this category were just slightly lower, at 45 per cent. If the two

upper response categories are considered together, over 80 per cent of

the responses were included in all four organizational types, and in

fact, 91 per cent of those from committee members. All responses are

shown on Table 24.

Table 24

RESPONDENTS' PERCEPTIONS OF THE INCREASE OF THEIR UNDERSTANDING
ABOUT THE UNIVERSITY AS A RESULT OF THEIR PARTICIPATION IN THE
GROUP, BY ORGANIZATIONAL TYPE

Increase of Understanding	Association/ Assembly		Senate		Council		Committee	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Always	17	53	25	45	154	54	45	63
Often	9	28	22	39	87	31	21	29
Usually	3	9	6	11	31	11	5	7
Sometimes	2	6	2	4	7	2	1	1
Never	1	3	1	2	5	2	0	0
Totals	32	99	56	101	284	100	72	100

There were several written comments from members relating to

this question. A council member wrote, "I have enjoyed being a member

of the staff council these past two years. Only through the council

can clerical workers understand and learn about decisions affecting

them. I have served on various committees which have benefited both

myself and I hope other clerical staff." Another individual commented,

"Because of my administrative position as an Assistant Vice-President,

I rarely encounter a situation about which I am unaware; I suspect other members do have a much better awareness of the University (due to their participation in the group)." Similarly, another person answered, "I have always been aware due to my administrative position. Members of our senate are the administration. Our recommendations go to the senior administrators or vice-president." A committee member remarked, "I have only been on the committee for a few months, but have really liked serving on it and feel better associated with University policies since then. I feel its a very worthwhile committee and is doing a fine job for all employees. I feel its helped both the clerical and service staff as well as the staff and administration." "Being a member of our council has helped me be informed of other departments within the University. There are problems which are more than I ever knew existed," one man wrote and added that he had been with the institution for seventeen years. Continuing, he said, "Our council is a good organization for nonacademic employees. I represent the farm workers group. Many of my fellow workers are very interested in what is going on." Another group member said, "I would never have believed the problems the nonacademic staff have in all departments. I was never aware of the employees' problems until I was elected to the council."

The effectiveness of an organization is contingent on the degree of involvement of its members. Item 24 on the questionnaire sought to determine the extent to which nonacademic employee governance group members thought that their time and energy was committed to positive use. As this question relates to the previous one, the quality of the

responses has a direct bearing on the individual professional growth

and development of the member.

Table 25

RESPONDENTS' JUDGEMENT OF THE VALUE OF GROUP MEMBERSHIP IN
TERMS OF THEIR PERSONAL DEVELOPMENT,
BY ORGANIZATIONAL TYPE

Personal Development	Association/ Assembly		Senate		Council		Committee	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Always	18	56	32	56	162	57	52	71
Often	9	28	17	30	61	21	11	15
Usually	3	9	6	10	33	12	7	10
Sometimes	2	6	1	2	20	7	3	4
Never	0	0	1	2	9	3	0	0
Totals	32	99	57	100	285	100	73	100

The majority of all respondent group members indicated the

experience was a positive one almost all the time. The responses

shown on Table 25 indicated the very strong feeling in this respect

by members of committees, 71 per cent of whom marked the highest cate-

gory of responses. Council members' responses had the greatest dis-

tribution with 10 per cent of them indicating that the experience was

less worthy of their participation. In association/assembly and

committee organizations, there were no totally negative responses, and

in council organizations only 3 per cent said they rarely felt partici-

pation was worth their while. In senate structures, one individual

expressed extreme negativism.

There were several written comments about this question including one individual who said, "I mailed my resignation last week. The brick wall was too much for my head." Another member suggested the same frustration but did not give up, "Yes, only you get discouraged when you come up against a stone wall." A council member explained, "I have been on the council since it was started in 1970, representing the clerical area. I have been completely frustrated and annoyed at the reaction to the council by the University. For example, I personally prepared a report on the status of clerical employees at the University and it was not only not acknowledged but the word came back to me through my boss, 'It's an excellent report, but it sure could cause us problems and money,' so they just put it aside and ignored it. I have strong interests in the council and what it could do." One person wrote, "I'm very much interested in our council involvement. I think it's helping us a lot. I'm a carpenter on campus and have been here six years." Another council member commented, "Occasionally we get bogged down with committees to investigate committees, which is probably common with a lot of organizations, but overall, the staff council is and has been a good thing."

CHAPTER IV

SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Summary and Findings

This study investigated the extent and examined the character-
istics of organizational structures which involved nonacademic employ-
ees in the internal governance processes of universities. Further,
the study reviewed the operational procedures and practices of exist-
ing nonacademic employee groups. Models of four types of employee
groups which provide for employee representation in governance pro-
cesses were identified.

In conducting research on the problem, an initial survey of
more than 200 institutions of higher education was completed. More
than fifty universities indicated that they had internal nonacademic
employee governance groups. Further communication led to the identi-
fication and selection of thirty-five employee groups at thirty-one
state-supported universities which were intensively studied. Based on
a review of these thirty-five nonacademic employee organizations and
the judgements and comments of their members, the more significant
findings have been provided.

Four basic organizational types were identified--association or
assembly, senate, council, and committee. Within each of these organi-
zational types, there were differences in purpose, authority, repre-
sentation, and operating procedures.

70

Organizational responsibility and authority could not normally be ascertained in the group's name or structure but rather in its statement of purpose. The group's organizational structure, however, had definite bearing on the way in which it discharged its responsibilities and exercised its authority.

Some of the groups in the study had a very small range of responsibility and little authority. In other groups, however, the scope of activity and power of the group was substantial.

The internal governance groups included in the study did not have extensive policy and decision-making authority. In the state-supported institutions, the basic function was advisory in nature, and recommendations were generally directed to the administration. The fundamental decisions and policies of the universities were made by the presidents and the legally constituted governing boards or agencies charged with that responsibility.

The election of members as representatives of various sub-groups or divisions of the campus was preferred by nonacademic employee group members rather than the appointment of members to groups by the university administration. Undesirable institutional influence was implied with the appointment of groups' members. Nonacademic employees expressed confidence that democratic elections could be conducted on their campuses.

Inference of institutional influence was also present when administrators were named as ex officio members of nonacademic employee groups. While such ex officio members presumably provided direction and information, they also appeared to pose a threat to freedom of expression for the nonacademic employees.

The committee organizational type used by the universities in this study had several limitations. First, the purpose or purposes of the committees were generally limited; in all but one of the committees in the study, the issues of the committee were limited to personnel policies. Committees had fewer members and, therefore, were not as broadly representative as other organizational types. More than in other types of groups, committee members were appointed to their positions rather than elected by their constituencies.

Association or assembly organizations had membership-identification problems. That is, members were not inclined to participate in larger association meetings held once or twice a year. Day-to-day operational tasks and decision-making deliberations were delegated to executive officers or an executive committee. With at-large elections - for committee members conducted at annual meetings, their selection was based on identification and popularity as much as on qualifications. In the case of smaller association, the reverse occurred as members "took their turn" in serving as officers and executive committee members.

Representative senate or council organizations were the most frequently used types of nonacademic employee governance groups. Senates and councils generally had more members than the other organizational types, and with larger membership there was broader representation of the constituency. The representatives were elected by and responsible to immediate peer groups identified among various sub-groups or divisions within the institution.

Lack of effective communication represented the most important identifiable problem common to all groups in the study. The quality

of informational communications between parties--those making the recommendations and those receiving them--was a major concern.

Another important communication facet was the acknowledgement and response in relation to recommendations that had been submitted by a group to its administration. Groups were pleased to see their recommendations incorporated in institutional decisions; however, the groups' members expressed the desire to know the reasons their recommendations were not used. There was evidence that the administration's reasons for its decisions and the information it provided to the nonacademic employee group were important in determining the quality of relations with the group.

The groups in the study did not extensively employ evaluative processes regarding the degree to which they were achieving organizational goals and purposes.

Members of nonacademic employee groups expressed a positive attitude about their participation and involvement in governance groups. The high percentage of returns of the group-member questionnaire indicated their interest, and the group members expressed the opinion that the group's involvement contributed to the goals of the institution and to the needs and objectives of nonacademic employees as well.

A trend toward the further involvement of internal nonacademic employee groups in university governance processes was evident. Many of the groups in the study were relatively new and were just beginning their activity. In the initial survey, several institutions were identified in which groups were in the process of development or were being considered.

The concern of university administrators in internal nonacademic employee governance groups was illustrated by the cooperative attitude of the personnel officers who assisted in the study. The increased activity in collective bargaining by public employees probably contributed to their concern.

Conclusions

There is still room in American institutions of higher education for the creation of internal nonacademic employee organizations since a significant majority of institutions initially contacted in this study reported that no such organizations existed on their campuses.

Internal nonacademic employee governance groups such as those in this study are not apt to be contributive and successful without a commitment to the concept and support from the university administration.

The success of nonacademic employee groups seems to parallel the degree of commitment and energy supplied by many nonacademic employees at the institution.

After an analysis of the organizational types of nonacademic groups in the study, the senate or the council organizational types appear to be the most productive and to provide more adequate representation of nonacademic employees.

While nonacademic employee groups such as those in this study provide participation to some degree in the governance processes of the institution, many nonacademic employees will not be satisfied with the advisory function limitation.

Because the movement in the establishment of nonacademic employee governance groups is progressing steadily, as shown in this study, university officials should encourage the formation of such groups as a necessary step in creating the most contributive and constructive relationship with these valued institutional employees. The development of internal governance groups may serve as a stopgap to the conflict which often accompanies collective bargaining which appears to be on the rise in institutions of higher education throughout the nation.

There appears to be little doubt but that many nonacademic employee groups in colleges and universities in the nation will soon be demanding collective bargaining agreements with their institutions. Such agreements will be developed either within the framework of existing organizations or through newly created groups organized for this specific purpose.

Recommendations

Recommendations are in two parts: 1) general recommendations in respect to the development of nonacademic employee governance groups, and 2) recommendations concerning organizational models for nonacademic employee governance groups.

General Recommendations for Developing Employee Organizations

These general recommendations are applicable to both the administration and the nonacademic employees of an institution considering employee governance groups. The recommendations are outlined in a series of steps leading to the implementation and operation of the group. The steps are as follows:

1. <u>Recognize that a group is needed</u>. As the study indicated,
   there is a trend toward the organization of nonacademic
   employees in institutions of higher education. If employees
   are not recognized by the administration and involved in
   institutional policy and decision-making through internal
   arrangements, they will seek external means to do so. The
   implementation of an effective internal governance procedure
   involving nonacademic employees decreases the emergence and
   impact of external individuals or organizations.

2. <u>Organize a planning group</u>. In order to clarify the purpose,
   to set goals and objectives, and to consider an organiza-
   tional structure, a planning group for a proposed nonacademic
   employee organization must be developed. As an indication
   of administrative recognition of the group's importance,
   members of the planning group should be named by the presi-
   dent. Members should be appointed from several classifica-
   tions and levels of the nonacademic staff. In some cases,
   existing groups of employees could be given the responsi-
   bility to serve as the development group. The administration
   should provide counsel to the development group in terms of
   the institution's operating procedures and any legal ramifi-
   cations or other details that might arise. A liaison with
   the president to report the group's progress would be
   helpful. However, too much administrative attention and
   input at this development stage can arouse suspicion of
   administrative influence and manipulation; the reaction of
   employees may negate the positive intentions of the

administration and the best efforts of the planning group.

3. Determine the Constituency of the proposed group. The
   planning group must identify early the constituency to be
   served by the proposed nonacademic organizations. One
   classification of level of employees at an institution may
   have quite different perspectives on some issues and find
   it difficult to participate in an all-inclusive employee
   organization. If one inclusive nonacademic group does not
   seem feasible, the developmental group may necessarily be
   disbanded or reorganized to direct attention to the organ-
   ization of sub-groups within the nonacademic employee
   population of the institution.

4. Establish goals, functions, limitations. Establishing the
   goals and objectives of the proposed group and determining
   its role in the governance processes of the institution
   represents the first major task of the development group.
   The group must have a clear understanding of the scope of
   its authority, of the limitations of internal governance
   activities, and of the relationship of the nonacademic
   employee group to the other constituent groups of the
   university. Without this understanding, members of the
   planning group may assume too much authority and seek to
   accomplish more than is their prerogative.

3. Develop an organizational model. The organizational model
   for the nonacademic employee group provides a base for a
   comprehensive constitution and by-laws outlining the
   group's purpose, goals and objectives, qualifications for

members and officers, election procedures, and operating criteria. The relationship of the group to the institution should be clearly outlined so that lines of communication and referral are established. The organization would be authorized upon its ratification by a vote of the constituency and the approval of its charter by the administration and the governing board or agency.

6. Obtain recognition and status for the group. Formal identification and status of the nonacademic employee group results in action by the administration and the governing board of the institution. However, the nonacademic constituency must also give the group credibility by its recognition and support of the group. Members of the planning group play an important role in this aspect of progress as their confidence in the new organization is shared with their fellow workers.

7. Don't expect too much from the new organization. Many members of the constituency will want immediate action and results. However, the new group needs time to become organized and to start functioning. Members will need to become oriented to institutional procedures and to learn to use communications related to the issues. Major institutional policies and decisions referred to advisory groups may take considerable time because of the complexity of the issues and because of the various constituencies who are involved in the considerations.

8. <u>Continually evaluate progress and organizational effective-</u>

<u>ness</u>. Evaluation is an important factor to a group's pro-

gress and even to its continuation. If a group is not

serving its constituency and the institution, there should

be cause for concern from both the administration and the

nonacademic employees. Within the framework of the goals

and purposes of the organization, a number of objectives

based on pertinent issues will be studied and acted upon by

the group. Moreover, the ongoing procedures, processes,

and activities of the group must be reviewed from time to

time. The group should develop a plan to insure evaluation;

such a plan might include an annual report by the presiding

officer to the constituency, the requirement of written

reports from committees and sub-groups, and occasional

studies of the group concerning the types of issues it has

encountered, its use of time, its service to the constitu-

ency, and its adherence to purpose.

Recommendations Concerning the Selection of an Organizational Model

Each nonacademic employee governance group should select an

organizational model according to the needs and circumstances of the

group and of the institution. There are many factors which bear on

the organization type of the group to be developed and on the internal

structure of the organization itself. The following observations and

recommendations are directed to the consideration of those factors.

It is unlikely that an organizational structure that is work-

able at one institution can be imposed in total upon a group of

employees at another institution and be effective. The process of

organizational development is an important one as individuals in their
deliberations gain greater understanding of the organizational prin-
ciples involved and anticipate problems and circumstances that might
arise in the future. The developmental process for the governance
group provides a beginning for decision-making discussion and action
by the nonacademic employees.

The constitution and by-laws or other procedural documents out-
line the structure and operation of an organization. The basic elements
included are: 1) a preamble or introduction which includes a statement
of purpose, 2) the name of the group, 3) the functions of the group--
its goals and objectives, its responsibilities and powers, 4) member-
ship--composition, qualifications, terms of office, 5) meetings--fre-
quency, quorum, 6) officers--election, duties, 7) elections--rules,
procedures, 8) committees--composition, duties, 9) rules of order,
10) rights of individuals, and 11) ratification and amendments. Some
of these elements may be rightfully placed in either the body of the
constitution or in the by-laws. Also, other elements or component
sections of the document should be added as appropriate for the par-
ticular group being developed.

As the planning group begins its considerations of the organi-
zational type to be implemented, the first order of concern should be
the development of a criteria for selection of the type. The organi-
zational structure chosen should provide for the best possible insti-
tutional climate in which the goals and objectives of the institution
and of the employees can be pursued. Since the fundamental concept
involved is representation--the representation of nonacademic employ-
ees in the institutional governance process--representation should be

of major importance within the group itself; the problem of represen-
tation will most likely be one of the major issues during the group's
developmental period. The means and degree of representation desired
has inference for the selection of the group's organizational type.

While replication of existing organizations is not recommended,
insights and guidelines can be gained by examining models of organi-
zational types. Working from basic organizational models, modifica-
tions can be developed according to the circumstances and particular
needs of individual institutional groups. Models are briefly reviewed
for each of the organizational types identified in the study. The
examples selected were chosen because they were typical of their
organizational type and because their documentation clearly specified
their organizational functions and procedures.

Committee Model The model selected for a committee organiza-
tional type was the Personnel Administration Advisory Committee at the
University of Wyoming. University Regulation 2, Change 6, the pro-
cedural document for this group, is provided as Appendix VIII. The
Committee is granted authority by the University of Wyoming President,
and an effective date is set for the Committee to begin. The document
next provides a rationale for the group, a statement of its functions,
an outline of its composition, and an election procedure. Continuing,
Committee officers are designated and meeting procedures outlined.
The approval date and the President's signature close the document.
Although brief, the document provides the essential organizational
elements for the Committee.

There are factors included in the document which indicate the
individual nature of the Wyoming group. One paragraph stipulates the

President's appointment of two members to the group and also names the Director of Personnel as an ex officio member to the Committee. The document in another section designates the individual to whom the group's recommendations are to be made.

The composition of a committee should be clearly defined in the organizational document. Since committees usually have few members, breadth of representation is an important consideration. Due to the smaller membership and usually limited scope of issues, committees are recommended for use only when members are all in the same employee classification level.

Assembly or Association Model In the assembly or association model, each member of the group represents himself in the annual or semi-annual meetings. Little deliberation of issues takes place in these meetings which for the most part include reports, resolutions, elections, and other general business. Most of the organization's authority is delegated to an executive committee or council which is elected by the membership at an annual meeting.

The Administrative Personnel Assembly of Central Michigan University serves as a model of this organizational type. The Assembly's Operating Procedures are included as Appendix IX. Three elements--preamble, membership, and purposes--precede the document's major Articles. The first and third Articles relate to the total Assembly; Article I is concerned with meetings of the Assembly, and Article III relates to the organization's officers and their duties. Article II deals with the Administrative Personnel Council, the executive group within the Assembly. Procedures for the Council outlined in seven Sections of the Article are directed to elections,

representation, vacancies, resignation of the entire council, rules and regulations, time of meetings, and committees.

Since so much authority is vested in the executive body of an association or assembly, the guidelines for this group must be clearly defined either in the principle body's constitution or in a separate document which needs the approval of the parent body.

Because of the power that an executive body of an assembly can achieve with little accountability to the membership that elected it, reservations are held regarding the assembly form of organization. Also, all-inclusive employee associations or assemblies would pose some dangers. More aggressive groups or factions could affect elections and other procedures to the detriment of other employees. Only very careful attention to organizational details at the time of the group's development limit this problem.

Senate Model   The Staff Senate of the University of Montana provides a model of the senate organizational type. The Constitution for this group is included as Appendix X. The Senate's purpose is outlined in the preamble, and the group's name is Article I. Article II includes membership requirements and also lists the officers and their duties.

In several Sections, Article IV presents the specific responsibilities and powers of the Senate. Section 1 stresses the comprehensive scope of the Senate by stating, "The Senate shall have the power to act and speak for the staff on all matters of concern to the staff." Several issues are mentioned in this part of Montana's constitution which may not be appropriate for another institution or which might receive different treatment in the documents for another

institutional group. For example, the right is outlined for 10 per cent of the membership to petition and call for a review of any Senate action. An annual general meeting of the staff is prescribed. Also, the Senate's authority to establish its own operating procedures is established. A major responsibility of the Senate is outlined in Section 5 which charges the Senate to establish and review the institutional grievance procedure for nonacademic employees.

Continuing the organizational framework for the Senate, Article V outlines the ratification procedures and the amendment process, and the By-Laws are stated. The By-Laws are primarily related to additional operational procedures. In particular, By-Law I states that members on the Staff Senate are elected on the basis of one member for each forty employees in designated categories; the categories are then listed.

Representation based on numerical membership is a major premise of senate organizational form. With the plan of representation, the size of the senate and its composition according to membership classification groups could change yearly reflecting institutional changes. To establish this representative structure, a means to identify and classify constituents into appropriate representative groups must be devised. If a classification system applying to nonacademic employees is not available in a state-wide or institutional plan, such a system would need to be developed and stated in the organization's constitution or by-laws.

To the extent that it represents the nonacademic constituency on a numerical basis, the senate organization is appealing and appropriate for all-inclusive nonacademic employee groups or groups which

are comprised of employees in the same classification level. However, the numerical factor may cause problems because of the size of the constituent groups; for broader representation for all constituent groups, the senate may require too large a membership therefore hampering its activity. Calculations regarding the size of the membership is a primary concern of any development group considering the senate form.

Council Model I   Two models of council organizational form are presented. One of the better examples of councils in the study was that of the West Virginia University Staff Council. The group's Constitution and By-Laws are Appendix XI. The Council's purpose is stated in the preamble with the group identified in Article I. The functions, goals, and objectives of the Council are outlined in Article II. Article III recognizes the individual rights of the University's employees to belong to other groups if they so choose. The membership composition of the Council is described in Article IV; the size of the Council is set at twelve members, two members representing each of the institution's six major occupational classes. Article V sets the term of office for members, and election procedures are detailed in Article VI. Officers and their duties are outlined in Article VII with the amending process given in Article VIII. The By-Laws provide additional procedures related to duties of officers, meetings, committees, and by-laws.

Council organizations base representation on employee classification groups. However, in the council structure, the size of the membership is set with the distribution of representatives according

to a plan agreed upon and written into the organization's constitution
or by-laws. Again, this representation factor is a major deliberation
of the developmental group.

Council Model II Another council model provides a different
approach for the involvement of nonacademic employees in governance
functions. In this model, council members are elected to represent
an organization of employees in each classification level of the
university. The Employee Executive Council of the University of
Oklahoma is representative of this type of structure. The EEC repre-
sentatives are elected from four nonacademic employee organizations,
each representing different employee classification levels. The EEC
Constitution is provided as Appendix XII.

The sub-groups or member groups of the EEC are organized separ-
ately with their own constitutions and operate independently from the
EEC. Administrators have a council organization; administrative staff
members use an association structure; professional employees also have
an association; and classified employees are organized in a council.

As stated in Article III of its Constitution, the EEC serves
in reference to all nonacademic employees of the University. However,
the EEC "neither supplants nor supersedes" other employee organizations.
Actions and recommendations of the EEC are on behalf of the total
nonacademic populations of the institution, but in case of conflict of
interest or separation of interests among the employee classification
member groups, the member groups may act independently by making their
own recommendations to the administration.

The representation of member groups on the EEC is not directly
proportionate to the number of employees in each member group.

However, the number of representatives from the groups vary with the larger member group having the most EEC representatives. Each member group outlines the election procedure and conditions of service for its EEC representatives.

This council form with member group representation provides an opportunity for more employees to become involved in governance activities at the institution because several organizations are included in the deliberations on issues. Through the EEC, the administration has a vehicle for sharing information with the member groups, and likewise, information can be channeled to the administration.

For most issues, there is common concern on the part of all employees. All nonacademic employees are interested in salaries, fringe benefits, and working conditions. They also share concerns about campus parking problems, the institutional calendar, awards programs, and special events that are planned from time to time. The all-inclusive council can provide communication and leadership for the member groups as considerations on these common issues progress.

In some cases, however, issues may draw the attention only of certain member group constituents. For example, policies relating to travel reimbursement would be of more concern to professional and other staff employees who do more traveling, while hourly employees may have concerns regarding time-keeping procedures and overtime. Through their member group, employees can call for a review of issues of importance to their members. The member group may proceed on its own or if desirable, seek the support and assistance of the council. Such cooperation calls for communication and understanding among the

member groups and the council. Through this arrangement, greater per-
spective on the issue is gained.

Recommendations to the administration may be made by the council
or a member group or groups acting separately. The more forceful
recommendation would be the collective action of the council or one
which had the endorsement of the council. The member groups would
have an opportunity in this arrangement to provide a minority report
on any recommendation presented to the administration by the council.

One disadvantage of this organizational structure is that it is
time consuming because the issues may need to be presented in each of
the member groups. Representatives to the council often need to gain
the insight of their constituent member group concerning the issues.
Proposals on complex issues may take several months to go through all
member groups before recommendations can be formulated and approved.

Some employees may feel that the member groups have little
power in light of the all-inclusive council. They may view the council
as an additional super-structure between the employees and the admin-
istration. Also, employees may have little empathy for council
members because the members were not elected by the general constitu-
ency but rather the member groups.

The advantages of this council form are viewed from both the
employees' and the administration's standpoint. All employees would
be organized according to their peer-classification level. In addi-
tion, all employees could collectively be recognized through the all-
inclusive council. From the administrative perspective, most employee
relations could be channeled through the council to the member groups

and ultimately to all nonacademic employees. As the situation developed, an issue relating to a specific employee group could be considered with that group alone.

Recommendations for Further Study

The emergence of nonacademic employee governance groups within institutions of higher education has been identified in this study, and a trend toward future development of this concept is apparent. Based on these conclusions, additional studies are in order.

The effectiveness of internal nonacademic governance groups deserves attention. The groups are susceptible to more intensive examination and evaluation in terms of their operating structure, processes, and procedures, and also of their role in the overall governance process of the institution.

Another aspect for future study would expand upon the concept of internal and external organizations of nonacademic employees and their involvement in institutional governance. The comparisons of goals and objectives of the two group-types and their means and manner of operation have implications for both university administrators and nonacademic employees as well.

APPENDICES

APPENDIX I   Initial Letter to Institutional Personnel
                    Officers

APPENDIX II   Letter to Personnel Officers Inquiring about
                    Nonacademic Leaders

APPENDIX III   Letter to Nonacademic Employee Group Leaders

APPENDIX IV   Sample Questionnaire Instruction Sheet

APPENDIX V   Sample Questionnaire

APPENDIX VI   Follow-Up Letter to Group Leaders

APPENDIX VII   Questionnaire Report Sheet Sent with Follow-
                    Up Letter

APPENDIX VIII   Committee Organizational Model - The Univer-
                    sity of Wyoming

APPENDIX IX   Association/Assembly Organizational Model

APPENDIX X   Senate Organizational Model

APPENDIX XI   Council Organizational Model I
                    West Virginia University Staff Council

APPENDIX XII   Council Organizational Model II
                    Employee Executive Council - The University
                    of Oklahoma

APPENDIX I

Initial Letter to Institutional Personnel Officers

Dear

As a member of the Employee Executive Council of the University
of Oklahoma, I am conducting a survey of the major state and
private universities in the U.S. to determine what nonacademic
employee organizations exist within each institution's organizational
structure. I am seeking the following information:

1. Are your employees civil service, state employees or
   employees of the university's governing board?

2. What internal classifications of employees exist within
   your university (i.e., administrators, professional, etc.)?

3. What state or private boards or agencies have the legal
   responsibility for the governance of your institution?

4. Does your university have an organization of nonacademic
   employees?

If your university has such an organization as in Question 4, we would
like to receive a brochure, constitution, or written description of
its purpose and structure. Also, we would appreciate receiving a copy
of your staff handbook.

For your information, I am enclosing a brochure describing our
Employee Executive Council. Your responses to these questions and the
materials you provide will be appreciated and will add to our resource
file. Thank you very much. Please let me know when I may be of
assistance to you.

Sincerely,

Dan A. Davis

Letter to Personnel Officers Inquiring about Nonacademic Leaders

Dear

Some time ago you were kind enought to respond to a questionnaire
sent in regard to the involvement of nonacademic personnel in the
governance of your institution. The study being done in cooperation
with the Employee Executive Council of the University of Oklahoma
continues.

The initial survey of more than 200 institutions elicted 130 responses.
Of these, 36 institutions indicated that they do indeed have
nonacademic employees involved in governance groups. This includes
your NAME OF GROUP.

The next step in the study is to send a brief questionnaire to
members of that body to ascertain their responses to such things as
the goals and purposes of the group, effectiveness of procedures,
communications, institutional relationships, and personal development.

Your earlier assistance was greatly appreciated, and I would now ask
that you provide me the name, address, and phone number of the current
PRESIDING OFFICER of your NAME OF ORGANIZATION. I will then make the
necessary contacts concerning the questionnaire.

While anonymity will be maintained in respect to individual questionnaires,
I will furnish you a composite report of the responses from your
institution.

If you have questions or concerns about the study, I would be pleased
to hear from you. Thank you very much for your help.

Sincerely,

Dan A. Davis

Letter to Nonacademic Employee Group Leaders

Dear

Your name and address has been provided to me by PERSONNEL DIRECTOR,
INSTITUTION. In association with the Employee Executive Council of
the University of Oklahoma, I am conducting a survey of colleges and
universities concerning the involvement of nonacademic employee
organizations in university governance. Your NAME OF ORGANIZATION
has been identified as one of these groups.

Briefly, here is what has been done. More than 200 institutions were
polled to see if nonacademic employees were involved in some way in
their governance schemes. More than 130 institutions responded; less
than 40 reported that they had such groups. This information is now
being classified as to the groups' structure such as committees, councils,
and senates, using materials furnished by and large by the personnel
staff of each institution.

The next step is a most important one and one in which we need your help.
We would like to provide a questionnaire to each representative serving
on the GROUP. The questionnaire will have approximately 25 questions
concerning organizational structure, procedures, communication channels,
and personal involvement in the group's activity.

If you would assist in this study, it would be greatly appreciated.
Here are two alternatives for the distribution and return of the
questionnaires. First, if you wish to provide me a list of the group's
members, I will then send each of them a questionnaire and a stamped,
addressed return envelope. The second alternative is for me to
send you enough questionnaires and return envelopes for your distribution
to the members. For your convenience, I have enclosed a postal card
for you to indicate the method to be used. The questionnaires will be
sent within two weeks of receipt of your directions.

You will be provided a composite report of the responses of your group.
Further, I will ultimately provide you the over-all report of all
institutions included in the study. There are many things calling for your
time and attention, I know. I think this will be worth your effort.

For your information, I have enclosed a brochure about the Employee
Executive Council here. We thank you for your assistance and look forward
to hearing from you soon.

Sincerely,

Dan A. Davis

Sample Questionnaire Instruction Sheet

EMPLOYEE EXECUTIVE COUNCIL

May 1974

The non-academic employees of The University of Oklahoma having sincere interest and concern for the continuing goals, purpose, and functions of The University, and seeking the active representation and involvement of non-academic employees in the affairs of The University, establish this forum for the Employee Executive Council.

JACQUELINE NEWTON, 5-3521
CHAIRWOMAN

TRAVIS MULLINS, 5-3042
VICE-CHAIRMAN

ARTIE HOWELL, 5-3124
SECRETARY

COUNCIL MEMBERS

Employee-Management Council

LEWIS FINDLEY	5-4421
CAROLYN SMITH	5-2961
DIANA HILL	Ext. 62, 321-6812
ANN HAMILTON	5-3441
JOHN HALE	5-5613
NADYNE LOUGHMILLER	5-1874
LOIS APPEL	5-6186
PAULINE KUHLMAN	5-1921

AUOPE

ESTELLE WAINTROOB	5-3760
OSCAR JACKSON	5-4521
DON HALE	5-5681
BOB WHITE	5-6411
KENNY ANDERSON	5-1921

Administrative Staff Conference

RACHEAL KEELY	5-3726
MARGARET BEAIRD	5-4521
DAN DAVIS	5-1061

Council of Administrative Officers

JOHN FREEMAN	5-3121
ELTON DAVIS	5-4521
ED SHAW	5-5111

TO: Members of the Career Service Senate
University of South Florida

FROM: Dan Davis, The University of Oklahoma

In association with the OU Employees Executive Council, I am conducting a national survey concerned with the involvement of nonacademic employees in university governance.

In a preliminary survey, officials at more than 200 universities and colleges were contacted. Forty indicated that nonacademic employees were involved in some way in governance at their institutions. Your Career Service Senate was one governance group named.

The present task is to contact the members of all groups at the forty institutions and have them complete this questionnaire. It seeks your reaction to the workings and activities of your group. I have promised to provide a composite report outlining your group members' responses and a similar report of all forty institutions as well.

Would you please take a few moments to complete and return the questionnaire in the enclosed stamped envelope. Your Presiding Officer, Jack Boyd, has indicated that your cooperation can be expected.

Your time and attention is appreciated. The study should provide information which will help improve our organizations and identify models for additional groups being considered at other universities.

Thank you very much.

94

Sample Questionnaire

This questionnaire has been sent to you as a member of the Committee. Thank you for taking a few moments to respond to it. Please mark the most appropriate response for each question. Use the bottom of the second page for any additional comments you might wish to make.

A	represents	Always---almost all the time
O	represents	Often---a majority of the time
U	represents	Usually---much of the time
S	represents	Sometimes---occasionally
N	represents	Never---rarely

---

1. Are the goals and objectives of the Committee understood by the members of the Committee?   A O U S N

2. Is election for service on the Committee democratically accomplished?   A O U S N

3. Do individuals elected to membership on the Committee seem to be interested in serving?   A O U S N

4. Do most members have a supportive attitude toward the purpose of the Committee?   A O U S N

5. Do most members attend meetings of Committee regularly?   A O U S N

6. Does the Committee have enough time in its meetings to conduct its business?   A O U S N

7. In meetings, does every member have an opportunity for expression on the issues being discussed?   A C U S N

8. Do any members act like their participation in the group is repressed in any way?   A O U S N

9. Is the agenda announced in advance of meetings?   A O U S N

10. Do members add items to the agenda or bring up new business during the meeting?   A O U S N

11. Are there items of interest concerning the institution brought up at meetings but which are beyond the scope of the Committee's purpose?   A O U S N

12. Does the group initiate ideas or proposals based on   A O U S N
    the needs and objectives of nonacademic employees?

13. Do members feel that Committee recommendations   A O U S N
    reflect the needs and objectives of nonacademic employees?

14. Are the communication channels satisfactory   A O U S N
    for receiving and reporting information?

15. Does the Committee have confidence in the information   A O U S N
    provided to it by the university administration?

16. Does the Committee call for and secure desired   A O U S N
    information from the administration?

17. Are recommendations made by the Committee sent to   A O U S N
    and acknowledged by the individuals to whom
    they were directed?

18. Are recommendations once made by the Committee   A O U S N
    to the administration later returned for possible
    review again by the Committee?

19. Do institutional decisions and policies reflect the   A O U S N
    considerations and recommendations of the Committee?

20. Are all nonacademic employees kept informed of the   A O U S N
    issues and activities of the Committee through regular
    distribution of minutes, notices, newsletters or
    other means?

21. Are communication channels between the Committee   A O U S N
    and a comparable faculty group maintained?

22. Does the Committee evaluate its efforts and activities? A O U S N

23. As a result of membership on the Committee are   A O U S N
    you more aware of the overall university picture?

24. Do you consider that your participation as a   A O U S N
    Committee member has been worth your time and energy?

25. Is this a better institution because of the involvement A O U S N
    of the Committee?

PLEASE RETURN IN THE STAMPED
ENVELOPE PROVIDED.   THANK YOU.

APPENDIX VI

Follow-Up Letter to Group Leaders

Dear :

Enclosed is a report showing the percentage of questionnaire
responses returned thus far in our study of the involvement of
nonacademic employees in university governance. You will see
that I made the extra notation in respect to your group's
response.

If you are to be in contact with your membership in the near
future, I would appreciate it if you would thank them and also
ask individuals to return their questionnaires if they have not
already done so. The tally will not be made until later this
month. Then, in early February, I will send the final report
of responses for your group. Sometime later I will send a
similar report indicating the responses of all groups included
in the study.

Your membership's return of the questionnaire is truly
appreciated, and I'm sure your leadership was contributive.
I have sent a carbon copy of this letter to PERSONNEL OFFICER
who is also interested in your group and in the study.

Thank you again.

Sincerely,

Dan Davis

Questionnaire Report Sheet Sent with Follow-Up Letter

RETURNS ON QUESTIONNAIRE SURVEY AS OF JANUARY 2, 1975

A Study on the Involvement of Nonacademic Employees in University Governance

Dan A. Davis, University of Oklahoma

Institution	Name of Group	Response
University of Alaska	Classified Advisory Council	78%
California State Univ.-Fullerton	Staff Council	73%
California State Univ.-Long Beach	Staff Affairs Council	16%
California State Univ.-Los Angeles	Staff Council	65%
Central Michigan University	Supervisory-Technical Council	67%
Central Michigan University	Administrative Personnel Assembly	46%
University of Idaho	Staff Affairs Committee	33%
Illinois State University	Civil Service Staff Council	50%
Indiana University	Staff Council	53%
Indiana State University	Office Personnel Council	91%
Iowa State University	Staff Council	78%
University of Maine	Classified Employees Advisory Council	46%
Montana State University	Personnel Services Advisory Committee	89%
University of Montana	Staff Senate	93%
University of Nevada	Staff Employees Council	78%
University of Northern Colorado	Classified Employees' Advisory Council	76%
University of Northern Iowa	Admin. of Clerical Personnel Committee	87%
University of Northern Iowa	Physical Plant Committee	80%
University of Northern Iowa	Student Services Committee	78%
Northwestern University	Staff Advisory Council	87%
University of Oklahoma	Employees Executive Council	90%
Purdue University	Clerical & Service Staff Advisory Comm.	64%
University of Rhode Island	Administrative Staff Association	87%
University of South Florida	Career Service Senate	32%
University of South Florida	Administrative and Professional Committee	71%
Southern Illinois University	Civil Service Employees Council	81%
University of Wyoming	Personnel Administration Advisory Comm.	60%

Six additional groups were sent the questionnaire; responses are pending.

APPENDIX VIII

Committee Organizational Model

THE UNIVERSITY OF WYOMING
Laramie, Wyoming

UNIVERSITY REGULATION 2, Change 6
Initiating Authority: President of the University

Subject: Change to University Regulation 2, Establishment of
                    University Administrative Committees

1. Purpose: To add Section 15, Personnel Administration Advisory
                    Committee

2. Amend University Regulation 2 by the addition of Section 15 which
   provides for the establishment of a Personnel Administration Advisory
   Committee, effective July 1, 1973.

   Section 15. Personnel Administration Advisory Committee.

        a. Rationale. The Personnel Advisory Committee is formed to
   provide an opportunity for all University full time nonacademic staff
   employees to participate in the establishment of personnel policies
   and procedures, and to create a body to review full time nonacademic
   staff employee grievances related to personnel policies or procedures.

        b. Functions. The Committee shall make recommendations to the
   Vice President for Finance on personnel policies and procedures reviewed
   by the Committee. The Committee may hear appeals of individual non-
   academic staff employees related to personnel policies or procedures,
   but only after all other provisions for appeal have been exhausted. The
   Committee may serve, when requested by the Vice President for Finance
   or his designee, as a review borard in the event of disagreement between
   department heads or deans and the Division of Personnel Administration
   over matters of personnel policies or procedures.

        c. Composition. The Committee shall consist of elected, appointed
   and ex officio members.

        All full time clerical, professional, research and service staff
   employees shall be eligible for elected membership to the Committee.
   Election of members to serve staggered three-year terms shall be by
   ballot in accordance with procedures established by each category of
   employees. No elected regular member who has served a full term
   shall be eligible to succeed himself. Staff employees shall elect seven
   regular members of the Committee and four alternates, one from each
   category of employees, in accordance with the following provisions:

(1) The regular members shall be elected by the following representation groups of the University staff personnel: full time clerical, professional, research and service employees. A representative ratio will be established initially by an ad hoc committee and each year thereafter by the Committee. The number of staff employees in each category meeting the criteria for the determination of apportionment shall be obtained from the Director of Personnel Administration.

(2) Elections shall be held during the academic spring term as required. Terms of service shall be effective July 1. Vacancies may be filled by special election by the affected representation group for the unexpired portion of the term vacated.

The President of the University shall appoint one member from the academic staff and one from the nonacademic staff. They shall be voting members on all matters except appeals of individual employees related to personnel policies or procedures. The Director of Personnel Administration shall be an ex officio member of the Committee with the same privileges as an elected or appointed member except the right to vote.

The Committee shall elect its Chairman and Secretary annually from among the voting members of the Committee.

d. Meetings. The Committee will meet monthly or on call of the Chairman. A quorum shall consist of a majority of the voting members. In the event that an elected member cannot attend a scheduled meeting of the Committee, representation by an alternate shall be allowed. The alternate shall have the same privileges as a regularly elected member. Written reports of all meetings of the Committee shall be submitted to the Vice President for Finance.

Approved: January 25, 1973

Association/Assembly Organizational Model

ADMINISTRATIVE PERSONNEL ASSEMBLY
OPERATING PROCEDURES
Approved By Administration Personnel Council
June 4, 1971

PREAMBLE:
The Administrative Personnel Assembly is a body formed to consider, recommend, and take such other actions as are proper relating to the common concerns of those personnel at Central Michigan University included in the administrative classification as defined below under "Membership". The Assembly was formed in the Spring of 1971 to meet a need felt both by those personnel included and the Administration of the University. Its primary goal and function will be to provide constructive assistance to its membership and to the University in establishing and maintaining the highest possible degree of equitable and harmonious relationships for all concerned.

MEMBERSHIP:
The Administrative Personnel Assembly at Central Michigan University will be composed of all full-time permanent administrative employees with an "A" classification at the University with the following exceptions:

      a. President
      b. Members of the President's Council
      c. Members of the Deans Council
      d. Executive Assistants to Vice Presidents
      e. Director of Personnel and Staff Relations

Changes to the listed exceptions may be made in the future as conditions warrant and by mutual consent of the Administrative Personnel Council, the University, and the persons concerned.

PURPOSES:
The Administrative Personnel Assembly shall through its council include in its area of concern and interest those matters listed below but not necessarily be limited to same:

A. To receive and consider matters concerning the conditions of employment and working conditions of administrative personnel.

B. To take such actions and to make such recommendations that it deems proper to appropriate divisions or persons of the University.

C. To provide information and guidance to the Administration and the Personnel Office

D. To make appointments to various committees and/or councils.

OPERATING PROCEDURES OF ADMINISTRATIVE PERSONNEL ASSEMBLY

ARTICLE I - MEETINGS OF ASSEMBLY

ANNUAL MEETING
Section 1. An Annual Meeting of the Administrative Personnel Assembly shall
be held during the first three months of each calendar year at a place on the
Campus of Central Michigan University and at a time to be designated by the
Administrative Personnel Council. Notice of the time and place of such meeting
shall be given by written notice to each Assembly Member at his place of work,
at least ten (10) days previous to such meeting.

SPECIAL MEETINGS
Section 2. Special meetings of the Assembly may be called at any time by the
Chairman of the Council. It shall also be the duty of the Chairman to call
such meetings whenever requested in writing to do so by a majority of Council
Members or by one-third of the Members of the Assembly. A notice of every
special meeting, stating the time, place and object thereof, shall be given
in writing to each Assembly Member at his place of work at least five (5)
days prior to such meeting.

If a meeting is called without such notice the validity of any action taken
thereat may be challenged by letter to the Assembly Chairman within thirty (30)
days signed by at least five (5) Assembly Members. Whereupon the Chairman
will conduct a poll of Assembly and must receive an affirmative majority
vote in writing to validate the actions taken.

QUORUM
Section 3. At all duly called meetings of the Assembly, those present shall
constitute a quorum

ARTICLE II - ADMINISTRATIVE PERSONNEL COUNCIL

ELECTION
Section 1. The administrative Personnel Council shall consist of nine voting
members who shall be elected by Administrative Personnel Assembly Members.
The Director of Personnel and a representative appointed by the President's
Council shall also serve as ex-officio, non-voting Members of the Council.
The nine voting members shall be elected to serve three year terms of
office. (The first Council elected shall have three members serving three
year terms, three members serving two year terms and three members serving
one year terms. This will be determined by drawing lots. Thereafter three
new members shall be elected to serve on the Council each year.) Such
election shall be held no later than May 1 and the term of office of those
elected will begin on July 1.

REPRESENTATION
Section 2. The manner of representation on the Council shall be determined
by the Council from time to time as necessary so that fair, equitable, and
insofar as possible equal, representation shall be provided to each Assembly
Member and each represented division of the University. It shall be the
responsibility of the Council to properly arrange the various divisions of
the University in groupings that will accomplish this purpose and present these
groupings to the Annual Meeting of the Assembly for approval.

VACANCIES

Section 3. Vacancies in the Council, occuring during the year shall be filled for that period remaining until the next regularly scheduled election by appointment by the Chairman of the Council and with approval of the Council.

RESIGNATION OF ENTIRE COUNCIL

Section 4. In the event the entire Council shall resign or for any other reason be unavailable to serve their terms of office, any Assembly Member may call a special meeting in the same manner that the Chairman may call such meetings, and Council Members may be elected to serve until the next regularly scheduled election at which time a new Council will be elected in the manner described hereinbefore.

RULES AND REGULATIONS

Section 5. The Council may adopt such rules and regulations for the conduct of their meetings and the affairs of the Assembly as they may deem appropriate which shall be consistent with the proper concerns and best interests of the Assembly.

TIME OF MEETING

Section 6. The Council shall meet upon the call of the Chairman or upon the request of any Member of the Council. Whenever any of the above parties wishes to call a meeting, he shall request the Secretary in writing to call such a meeting.

COMMITTEES

Section 7. All committees shall be appointed by the Chairman and approved by the Council and shall serve at the discretion of the Council.

ARTICLE III - OFFICERS

APPOINTMENT, TERM

Section 1. The Council shall meet as soon as possible after the annual election, and in no case later than June 1, and choose one of their number by a majority vote to be Chairman, and in the same manner to choose a Vice-Chairman and a Secretary and such other officers as the Council deems necessary. Each of such officers shall serve for the term of one year beginning July 1. Those eligible to vote in electing Council officers shall be those members serving continuing terms and the newly elected members.

DUTIES OF CHAIRMAN

Section 2. The Chairman shall preside at all meetings of the Council and of the Assembly and shall have the general direction of the affairs of the Council and Assembly and perform all the duties incidental to his office.

DUTIES OF VICE CHAIRMAN

Section 2. The Vice Chairman shall, in absence or incapacity of the Chairman, perform the duties of that officer.

DUTIES OF SECRETARY

Section 4. The secretary shall keep the minutes of meetings of the Council and the Assembly; he shall attend to the giving and serving of all notices of the Council and Assembly and shall attend to such correspondence as may be assigned to him and perform all the duties incidental to his office.

Senate Organizational Model

STAFF SENATE

CONSTITUTION

PREAMBLE:

To assure the orderly development of educational programs and policies; to facilitate communications and cooperation among officers of the administration and the nonacademic staff of the University of Montana; to promote the staff and continued improvement of higher education in the State of Montana; and to provide for improved working conditions and the professional welfare of the staff; we, the nonacademic staff members at the University of Montana do hereby subscribe to this document as a constitutional statement of our Organization and its various functions and responsibilities.

Article I - NAME

The organization herein defined shall be known as the Staff Senate to the University of Montana.

Article II - MEMBERSHIP

Senators shall be elected from the general nonacademic staff with the qualification that not more than one senator may serve from any one department or, in the case of Physical Plant, from any one shop. Senators whose terms in office have expired must be replaced by a senator from the same employment Group as defined in the By-Laws.

Section 1. Qualifications for Senators

Members of the Staff Senate shall be chosen from the nonacademic staff of the University of Montana subject to the following requirements:

    a.   The member shall have completed at least one year of continuous employment at the University of Montana

Section 2. Qualifications for Electors

For voting purposes the nonacademic staff shall be defined as those persons holding regular appointments or contracts with an FTE of .50 or greater at the University of Montana and whose salary is derived either from State or auxiliary monies (e.g. student fees, grants), and who do not hold academic rank.

Section 3. Credentials Committee

To implement Sections 1 and 2 of this article, the Staff Senate shall appoint from its own members a credentials committee consisting of 3 members to rule on questions relating to qualifications of electors and senators.

Section 4. Term of Service

Senators shall be elected for a term of two (2) years.

Section 5. Senate Officers

The Staff Senate shall elect from its membership a President, a Vice-President, and a combination Secretary-Treasurer for a term of one year each. The election shall be held after the first meeting of the year. The officers shall remain in office until successors have been duly elected. The President or, in his absence, the Vice-President shall preside over all meetings of the Senate and over all general staff meetings called by the Senate. The Secretary-Treasurer shall be responsible for the maintenance of all records and communications pertaining to the Senate.

Article III - ELECTIONS

Section 1. Dates

Regular elections shall be held annually during the second week in May, with elected senator's term starting the first working day in the fiscal year beginning in July.

Section 2. Elections Committee

To implement Section 1 of this article, the Senate shall appoint an elections committee consisting of 5 members to nominate candidates and to conduct all elections.

Article IV - RESPONSIBILITIES AND POWERS

Section 1. Representing the Staff

The Staff Senate shall be the representative body through which the staff shall normally exercise its powers. The Senate shall have the power to act and speak for the staff on all matters concerning the staff. Any actions of the Senate may be reviewed at a general meeting of the Staff upon written request signed by ten (10) percent of the nonacademic staff and submitted to the President of the Staff Senate

The Staff Senate shall provide for nonacademic representation on those University committees related to the welfare of the nonacademic staff. Representatives to the committees shall be appointed by the staff senate from the nonacademic staff each year.

Section 2. Meetings

The Staff Senate shall meet in regular session once per month. A simple majority of the duly elected members of the Senate shall constitute a quorum for a meeting. Further, the Senate may function either on request or on

its own initiative. There shall be at least one general meeting per year of the nonacademic staff.

Senators shall be released from normal work duties a minimum of two (2) hours each month for the purpose of attending Staff Senate meetings. In no way shall this release time be charged against an individual senator.

Section 3. Examining Policies and Consulting

The Staff Senate may examine all matters related to the general welfare of the University and nonacademic staff, and shall be charged with the responsibility of protecting the general and professional welfare of the nonacademic staff. The Senate shall be available to meet with the Faculty, administrative staff, and others for advice and consultation and as an agency for the dissemination of information.

Section 4. Formulating Procedures

The Staff Senate, within the framework of the constitution, shall formulate those by-laws, rules, and procedures needed to fulfill its responsibilities and exercise its powers.

Section 5. Grievance Procedure

The Staff Senate shall be charged to establish and periodically review an effective grievance procedure for the resolution of problems of individuals and groups in the nonacademic community of the University.

Article V - RATIFICATION AND AMENDMENTS

Section 1. Ratification of Constitution

This constitution shall be deemed ratified upon a vote of the nonacademic staff in which the affirmative votes shall constitute at least a majority of the total votes cast.

Section 2. Amendments to Constitution

    a.   Amendments may be proposed by either a majority of the Staff Senate or upon a petition signed by at least ten (10) percent of the nonacademic staff and presented to the President of the Staff Senate.

    b.   Within forty-five (45) days after an amendment has been proposed, it shall be submitted to the nonacademic staff for a vote.

    c.   Upon approval by two-thirds of the votes cast by the nonacademic staff, the proposed amendment shall become an effective part of the Constitution.

STAFF SENATE

BY-LAWS

By-Law I - MEMBERSHIP

The Staff Senate shall consist of one member for each 40 employees in each Equal Employment Opportunity Code rounded to the nearest 40. Nonacademic executives, (EEO Code 11) are excluded from Staff Senate membership. The Groups shall be defined as follows:

Group I	Code 12, Administrative
	Code 26, Professional
	Code 30, Administrative Assistants
	Code 40, Technical
Group II	Code 31, Office and Clerical
Group III	Code 50, Craftsmen
	Code 60, Laborers
	Code 70, Service Workers

By-Law II - TERM OF SERVICE FOR SENATORS

A Senator may be elected for up to a maximum of three (3) consecutive years.

By-Law III - INTERIM VACANCIES

The Staff Senate President shall fill vacancies on the Staff Senate by appointment subject to ratification by a simple majority of those senators present and voting at an official Staff Senate Meeting.

By-Law IV - FIRST ELECTION AND TERMS OF SERVICE

In the first election, the terms shall be for one or two years. Each year, one half (rounded to the next lower number) of the senators from each group shall retire from office. Those senators receiving the highest number of votes in each group shall serve two year terms.

By-Law V - NOMINATIONS BY PETITION

The elections committee must accept nominations by petition, provided the following conditions are met:

1. A nominating petition must bear the signatures of ten (10) qualified electors from an appropriate group as defined in By-Law I.

2. Said nominating petition must be accompanied by an agreement to serve if elected, signed by the nominee.

3. Nominating petitions must be presented to the President of the Staff Senate at least thirty (30) days prior to election.

By-Law VI - ABSENTEEISM

A Senator's position shall be deemed vacant upon failure to attend staff senate meetings over a four-month period.

By-Law VII - MINUTES OF STAFF SENATE MEETINGS

The minutes of Staff Senate meetings shall be available to any member of the nonacademic staff.

By-Law VIII - CONDUCT OF MEETINGS

In cases of questions, Robert's Rules of Order shall prevail.

APPENDIX XI

Council Organizational Model I

WEST VIRGINIA UNIVERSITY STAFF COUNCIL

Constitution and By-Laws

West Virginia University Staff Council is created for the purpose of promoting a means by which non-teaching employees of West Virginia University and its Branches may convey their thinking on employee-employer relations. Recognizing that all matters at West Virginia University are governed by state law, by the State Board of Regents, and by the administrative offices of the University, this Staff Council is formed. The Staff Council is to act in an advisory capacity and to administer such functions and powers that may be delegated.

CONSTITUTION

Article I

This Organization shall be known as the West Virginia University Staff Council

Article II

FUNCTIONS

This Organization shall serve the following purposes:

1. To provide a two-way medium for the exchange of information between employers and employees relative to problems of mutual concern.

2. To foster a spirit of unity and cooperation among all employees of the University.

3. To consider methods and means by which employment conditions may be improved and the operating efficiency of the University increased.

4. To recommend deserving employees to the President and Board of Regents so that they can be recognized for outstanding service.

Article III

The organization of the Staff Council shall in no way affect the right of the University employees to belong to other organized groups of their choice, nor shall it preclude the functioning of such organizations.

Article IV

1. The Staff Council will initially include a body of twelve (12) members. Two (2) members from each of the six (6) major occupational classes will be elected to comprise the twelve (12) member Staff Council. These occupational classes are: Junior Administrative, Professional, Semi-Professional, Technical, Clerical, Service

2. The Staff Council recognizes that the list of classes and make up are incomplete. It is contemplated that, additional Staff Council representative classes, other organizations, groups, and branches will be added.

Article V

TERM OF OFFICE

Employee representatives shall be elected to serve two-year terms. However, one of the original members from each group shall be elected to serve a one year term beginning, January 1, 1971.

Article VI

ELECTIONS

1. Elections shall be held once a year in the month of November. Staff Council members shall take office on January 1, of each year.

2. Staff Council members may not succeed himself or herself for more than two two-year terms.

3. Transfer of an employee from one group to another shall not affect his unexpired term on the Staff Council.

4. Vacancies during terms of office shall be filled by persons receiving the next highest number of votes in the same group. The vote count shall appear in the minutes of the January meeting.

5. Elections to the Staff Council shall be by secret ballot. Ballots shall be prepared by the Office of Personnel.

6. Vacancies shall be created by death, permanent incapacity, termination of services to the University, resignation or three consecutive unexplained absences from regular meetings of the Board.

7. Nominations will be made by written petition with a minimum of 10 or 1/5 of the total group of names from that employee group. Nominations will also be made by a Nominating Committee.

8. Ballots will be distributed by the Office of Personnel and will be submitted by that office to the elections committee of the Staff Council. Counting of ballots will be done by the members of the Election Committee

9. Each ballot shall be marked indicating the group to which the employee belongs. The ballot shall be addressed and mailed to each individual employee.

10. Nominations for the Staff Council shall be submitted before November 1, to the Office of Personnel.

Article VII

1. The officers of the Staff Council shall be: President, Vice-President, and Secretary-Treasurer.

   a. The officers of the council shall be elected by the members of the Staff Council from its membership at the first regular meeting in each year.

   b. Nominations shall be made by secret ballot and the two highest shall be voted upon by secret ballot.

2. The Staff Council by a 2/3 member vote may relieve any officer of this Staff Council of his duties.

Article VIII

AMENDMENTS

Amendments to the constitution may be made by a 2/3 vote of the Staff Council providing 10 members are present, at any regular meeting. A notice than an amendment is to be proposed must be given to all members of the Staff Council at least 10 days before the meeting at which the amendment is to be proposed. The notice shall contain the proposed amendment or the purport thereof.

BY LAWS

DUTIES

Section 1   The president of the Staff Council shall preside at all meetings
             and enforce all regulations and policies of the Staff Council.
             Staff Council Recommendations should be presented to the
             President of the Staff Council. The President has the power
             to pursue the recommendation to the highest authority and
             appoint any committee that he deems necessary in conjunction with
             the recommendation.

Section 2   The Vice-President shall preside in the absence of the President.

Section 3   In the event of the absence of both the President and Vice-
             President , a president protempore will be elected by the
             Staff Council to conduct the meeting.

Section 4   The Secretary-Treasurer shall take the minutes of the meeting.
             A copy shall be sent to each Staff Council member within 10
             days after that meeting. The Secretary-Treasurer shall also be
             responsible for all financial records of the Staff Council.

Meetings

Section 5   The meetings shall be conducted according to procedures set forth
             in Robert's Rules of Order Revised.

Section 6   Regular meetings of the Staff Council shall be held once a
             month. This meeting shall be held the first Tuesday of each
             month at a time and place to be designated.

Section 7   A quorum at a regular meeting shall be a majority of the member-
             ship, at least 7 members.

Committees

Section 8   The Staff Council shall have committees as it deems necessary.
             Unless otherwise specified the President shall appoint all
             committees and designate a chairman.

BY LAWS

PROCEDURES

Section 9   All members of the occupational groups that are represented
             by the West Virginia University Staff Council may present
             any ideas, opinions, and requests through their own represen-

112

tative to the Staff Council. The representatives will submit their thoughts to:

> President
> WVU Staff Council
> c/o University Post Office

Section 10 All approved proposals by the constituency of the occupational groups within the WVU Staff Council's jurisdiction will be properly submitted to the Office of the President of the University for consideration.

Section 11 It is the duty and responsibility of the President of the Staff Council to ensure that all members of the occupational groups, within the Staff Council's jurisdiction, will be heard and properly notified as to the disposition of their request.

APPENDIX XII

Council Organizational Model II

EMPLOYEE EXECUTIVE COUNCIL
THE UNIVERSITY OF OKLAHOMA

CHARTER

PREAMBLE

The nonacademic employees of The University of Oklahoma having sincere interest and concern for the continuing goals, purposes, and functions of the University, and seeking the active representation and involvement of nonacademic employees in the affairs of the University, establish this Constitution for the Employee Executive Council.

ARTICLE I - NAME

The name of the body shall be the Employee Executive Council of The University of Oklahoma, hereafter referred to as the Council.

ARTICLE II - AUTHORITY

The Council shall function under this Constitution as approved by the Board of Regents of The University of Oklahoma and shall continue to do so until such time as the Council dissolves itself or the Constitution is revoked by the Board of Regents.

ARTICLE III - PURPOSE

Section 1. The Council is organized to serve as a representative body for the nonacademic employees of The University of Oklahoma and to participate in such policy matters of the institution as may directly affect the non-academic employees.

Section 2. The Council shall function for the welfare of the University and for the employees it represents.

Section 3. The Council shall function as an advisory and policy referral body to the University administration and to the nonacademic employees of the University.

Section 4. The Council neither supplants nor supersedes any organization of employees now in existence or to be formed in the future.

ARTICLE IV - MEMBERSHIP

Section 1. The Council shall consist of representatives from all nonacademic employee classifications of The University of Oklahoma including, Classified, Professional, Administrative Staff, Administrative Officers, and any other employee classification group that may be created through provisions of University, state, or federal action.

Section 2. Each employee classification group shall be recognized through an organization within the employees of that classification, hereafter

114

referred to as the member group. The designation of the member group may be decided by vote of the employees of the classification group after a petition seeking such decision has been presented to the Council which bears the signatures of 20 percent of those employees within the classification group.

Section 3. The representation of the member groups on the Council shall be as follows: Administrative Officers, 3 members; Administrative Staff, 4 members; Professional, 5 members; and Classified, 9 members. The member group representatives on the Council shall be elected by the member group in such a manner as the member group shall prescribe.

Section 4. The term of office of a Council member shall be at the discretion of the member group; however, no term shall be less than one year or more than three years. Any Council member who changes employee classification shall be removed from his Council seat and a vacancy declared.

Section 5. There shall be no alternates for members of the Council. When a vacancy occurs, the member group shall name a replacement according to the Constitution and/or By-Laws of the member group.

ARTICLE V - OFFICERS AND MEETINGS

Section 1. The officers of the Council shall be: Chairman, Vice Chairman, and Secretary. These officers shall be elected from members of the Council and by members of the Council at the September meeting each year.

Section 2. The Chairman of the Council shall be the representative of the Council to the University administration. The Chairman shall be a nonvoting member of the Council except in case of a tie vote; then he may vote.

Section 3. The elected Council Chairman's member group shall designate an additional officer or representative as their representative to the Council.

ARTICLE VI - MEETINGS

Section 1. Regular meetings of the Council will be held on the last working Wednesday of each month at a time and place specified by the Chairman.

Section 2. Special meetings may be called by the Chairman or any seven members of the Council.

Section 3. All meetings shall be open to the public unless voted into executive session, but no person not a member of the Council may participate in discussion except by vote of the Council members present.

ARTICLE VII - QUORUM AND VOTING

Section 1. A majority of the members of the Council shall constitute a quorum authorized to transact business at any regular or called meeting of the Council.

Section 2. Voting by the Council membership shall be by voice except when deemed necessary by the Chairman; thereby, voting shall be by ballot.

Section 3. A majority vote by the members present shall carry a motion, except a motion to amend, alter, annul, or suspend the Constitution or By-Laws of the Council which shall be in accordance with Article VIII of the Constitution.

ARTICLE VIII - AMENDMENTS, ALTERATIONS, ANNULMENTS, SUSPENSION

Section 1. Amendments to, alterations to, or annulment of the Constitution or the By-Laws of the Council shall be made only at a regular or special meeting thereof by a two-thirds concurrence of the membership.

Section 2. A proposed amendment, alteration, or annulment, or a proposition to amend, alter, or annul the Constitution or the By-Laws of the Council shall be presented in writing to the Secretary who shall send copies to the members of the Council at least ten calendar days prior to the next regular or special meeting of the Council.

Section 3. The proposed amendment, alteration, or annulment, or proposition to amend, alter, or annul the Constitution or By-Laws of the Council shall be read and considered at the regular or special meeting referred to in Section 2, Article VII, and shall not be acted upon until the following meeting of the Council, but shall be acted upon before the adjournment of the third consecutive meeting following its original presentation to the Council.

Section 4. The By-Laws of the Council, or any part thereof, may be suspended by a two-thirds concurrence of the membership of the Council.

ARTICLE IX - RIGHTS OF THE INDIVIDUAL EMPLOYEE

Section 1. This Constitution shall not infringe on the rights and privileges of the individual University employee nor deny him the pursuit of actions he might deem necessary for his personal welfare.

BY-LAWS

ARTICLE I - OFFICERS

Chairman

Section 1. It shall be the duty of the Chairman to preside at all meetings of the Council and to enforce the obligations imposed by the Constitution and By-Laws relating to the administration of the work of the Council.

Section 2. The Chairman shall appoint all committees and shall designate a member thereof to serve as chairman.

Section 3. The Chairman shall serve as an ex-officio member of all special and standing committees.

Section 4. The Chairman shall conduct official correspondence relating to the Council as authorized by the Council.

Vice Chairman

Section 5. The Vice Chairman shall assist the Chairman and in the absence of the Chairman shall have all the powers and prerogatives of the Chairman.

Chairman Pro Tempore

Section 6. In the absence of the Chairman and Vice Chairman from any official meeting of the Council, members of the Council present shall select a Chairman who shall preside.

Secretary

Section 7. The Secretary shall record and maintain and distribute all resolutions and proceedings of meetings to Council members and Presidents (chairmen) or member groups.

Section 8. The Secretary shall conduct all official correspondence and issue all notices of meetings as directed by the Chairman and shall perform all duties pertaining to the office of Secretary.

Section 9. The Secretary shall keep the official roll of members of the Council and the attendance record of members at meetings of the Council. The Secretary, at the expiration of his term of office, shall turn over to his successor all records and pertinent data of the Council in his possession.

ARTICLE II - COMMITTEES

Standing Committees

Section 1. Any standing committees of the Council shall be established by Council action, and their chairmen and members shall be approved by the Council. Each standing committee shall select a secretary from its membership.

Section 2. All standing committees shall be subject to the call of their respective chairmen.

Special Committees

Section 3. Special committees of the Council shall be appointed by the Chairman and be approved by the Council. Each special committee shall select a secretary from its membership.

Section 4. All special committees shall be subject to call of their respective chairmen.

ARTICLE III - NOMINATION AND ELECTION OF OFFICERS

Section 1. The election of officers of the Council shall take place annually at the September meeting.

Section 2. Nominations for Council officers shall be made from the floor, and the election shall be by secret ballot.

Section 3. The term of office for officers of the Council and standing committee members shall be one year beginning on October 1.

Section 4. Officers of the Council may succeed themselves upon election; however, no term shall exceed 3 years.

Section 5. Members of standing committees may succeed themselves upon appointment and approval; however, no terms shall exceed 3 years.

ARTICLE IV - MEMBER GROUPS NAMED

Section 1. Until changed in accordance with Article IV, Section 2, of the Constitution, the member groups of each employment classification shall be as follows: the member group of the administrative officers shall be Council of Administrative Officers; the member group of the administrative staff shall be Administrative Staff Conference; the member group of the professional category shall be Association of University of Oklahoma Professional Employees; and the member group of the classified category shall be Employee-Management Council.

ARTICLE V - RULES OF ORDER

Section 1. The rules of parliamentary procedure, as laid down in Robert's Rules of Order, shall govern all meetings of the Council and of its standing and special committees.

Selected Bibliography

Books

Anderson, James C. Bureaucracy in Education. Baltimore:
          The Johns Hopkins Press, 1968.

Balderston, Frederick E. Managing Today's University.
          San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers, 1974.

Baldridge, J. Victor. Academic Governance. Berkeley:
          McCutchan Publishing Corporation, 1971.

Baldridge, J. Victory. Power and Conflict in the University.
          New York: John Wiley & Sons, Inc., 1971.

Brown, J. Douglas. The Liberal University. New York: McGraw-Hill
          Book Company, 1969.

Budig, Gene A., ed. Perceptions in Public Higher Education.
          Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1970.

Carnegie Commission on Higher Education. The More Effective Use
          of Resources: An Imperative for Higher Education.
          New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1972.

Christenson, Gordon A., ed. The Future of the University: A Report
          to the People by the Executive Planning Committee of the
          University of Oklahoma. Norman: University of Oklahoma
          Press, 1969.

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

Demerath, Nicholas J., Stephens, Richard W., and Taylor, R. Robb.
          Power, Presidents, and Professors. New York: Basic Books,
          Inc. Publishers, 1967.

Dennison, Charles P. Faculty Rights and Obligations in Eight
          Liberal Arts Colleges. New York: Bureau of Publications,
          Teachers College, Columbia, 1955.

Epstein, Leon D. Governing the University. San Francisco:
          Jossey-Bass Publishers, 1974.

119

Etzioni, Amitai. _Modern Organizations._ Englewood Cliffs, N.J.:
        Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1964.

Greenough, William Croan and King, Francis P. _Benefit Plans
        in American Colleges._ New York: Columbia University
        Press, 1969.

Hamelman, Paul W., ed. _Managing the University: A Systems Approach._
        New York: Praeger Publishers, 1972.

Hodgkinson, Harold L. _The Campus Senate: Experiment in Democracy._
        Berkeley: Center for Research and Development in Higher
        Education, University of California, 1974.

Ingraham, Mark H. _The Mirror of Brass: The Compensation and
        Working Conditions of College and University Administrators._
        Madison, Wisconsin: University of Wisconsin Press, 1968.

Ingraham, Mark Hoyt. _The Outer Fringe._ Madison, Wisconsin:
        University of Wisconsin Press, 1965.

Millett, John D. _The Academic Community: An Essay on Organization._
        New York: McGraw-Hill, 1962.

Perkins, James A. _The University as an Organization._ New York:
        McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1973.

Salmen, Stanley. _Duties of Administrators in Higher Education._
        New York: The MacMillian Co., 1971.

Savage, William W. _Interpersonal and Group Relations in Educational
        Administration._ Glenview, Illinois: Scott, Foresman and
        Company, 1968.

Stroup, Herbert. _Bureaucracy in Higher Education._ New York:
        The Free Press, 1966.

Thackrey, Russell I. _The Future of the State University._ Urbana:
        University of Illinois Press, 1971.

Wingfield, Clyde J., ed. _The American University: A Public
        Administration Perspective._ Dallas: Southern Methodist
        University Press, 1970.

Periodicals

Bucklew, Neil S. "Employment Relations of Staff Employees in
    Institutions of Higher Learning." Journal of the College
    and University Personnel Association, Vol. 21, No. 4 (August,
    1970), p. 26.

Buys, Larry M. "Collective Bargaining in Michigan Community
    Colleges." Journal of the College and University Personnel
    Association, Vol. 21, No. 3 (May, 1970), p. 47.

Chronicle of Higher Education. "212 College and University
    Faculties with Collective Bargaining Agents." Vol. VII,
    No. 12 (Nov. 26, 1973), p. 8.

Chronicle of Higher Education. "A Senate for Academic Issues, a
    Union for Economic Issues." Vol. VII, No. 12 (Nov. 26, 1973),
    p. 10.

College and University Business. "Collective Negotiations in
    Public Higher Education." (December, 1969), P. 44.

Dykes, Archie R., and Stimbert, E. C. "Decentralization of
    Administration." Phi Delta Kappan, Vol. 47 (October, 1964),
    p. 147.

Hilgert, Raymond. "Managing with-or Without-a Union." College
    and University Business, (May, 1973), p. 52.

Lorenz, Fred J. "Collective Bargaining in Higher Education."
    Journal of the College and University Personnel Association,
    Vol. 23 (December, 1971), p. 32.

Marchese, Theodore J. "Student Participation in Plans is No
    Longer a Question of Whether, but How." College and University
    Business, (August, 1969) p. 37.

McKean, F. L., and others. "Leadership Challenge for College
    Administrators." College and University Business, Vol. 46
    (Summer, 1971), p. 802.

Moore, William D. "University Organization in the Age of
    Discountinuity." Journal of the College and University
    Personnel Association , Vol. 21, No. 2 (February, 1970), p. 7.

Muston, Ray A. "Governance Changes are Catching Colleges by
    Surprise." College and University Business, (July, 1969),
    p. 29.

Perry, Charles R. "Group Conflict and School Organization."
    Phi Delta Kappan, Vol. 48 (February, 1966), p. 244.

Phi Delta Kappan. "State Bargaining Powers Could be Pre-empted
    by Federal Law." Vol. LVI, No. 7. (March, 1975), p. 504.

Ray, Jack N. "Coping with White-Collar Worker Demands to
    Participate." Journal of the College and University
    Personnel Association, Vol. 23 (August, 1972), p. 69.

Riegel, Paul Seasholtz. "Designing and Producing an Information
    Handbook for College or University Faculty and Professional
    Staff." Journal of the College and University Personnel
    Association , Vol. 19, No. 2. (February, 1968), p. 31.

See, Harold W. "How One College Organized Itself for Planning."
    College and University Business, (August, 1969), p. 33.

Semas, Philip W. "A Special Report: Faculties at the Bargaining
    Table." Chronicle of Higher Education, Vol. VII, No. 12
    (November 26, 1973), pp. 9.

Sutherland, E. "Nonacademic Personnel and University Governance."
    Journal of the College and University Personnel Association,
    Vol. 24, No. 12 (December, 1972), p. 11.

TenBoer, Marlin H. "A Study of the Extent and Impact of Organized
    Labor in College and Universities." Journal of the College
    and University Personnel Association, Vol. 22, No. 12
    (December, 1970), p. 27.