

will be distributed to each participant listing some appropriate questions for consideration.

10:30-11:30 a.m.—Working Groups, Assemble at Reese Hall

I. Dr. Keith McFarland, Director  
Resident Instruction in Agriculture  
University Minnesota, Chairman

Dr. J. Y. Terry, Head  
Agricultural Education  
Louisiana Tech, Recorder

II. Dr. Carroll Hess, Dean  
Agriculture  
Kansas State University, Chairman

Dr. John Schatz, Professor  
Horticulture  
Southwest Missouri State College, Recorder

III. Dr. Jack Stanly, Dean  
Applied Science  
Nicholls State College, Chairman

Dr. Murray Brown, Head  
Department Agriculture  
Sam Houston State College, Recorder

IV. Dr. Keith Justice, Head  
Department Agriculture  
Abilene Christian College, Chairman

Mr. Roger Truesdale  
Coordinator for Agriculture  
Wilmington College, Recorder

V. Dr. Howard Hanchey, Dean  
Resident Instruction in Agriculture  
Louisiana State University, Chairman

Mr. Willis Huddleston, Dean  
School Agriculture  
Tennessee Technological University, Recorder

11:30 a.m.-1:00 p.m.—Lunch (Dutch)  
Student Center  
Assemble as a group  
Address of President-elect

#### TUESDAY AFTERNOON Reese Hall — Room 207

1:30 p.m.-2:30 p.m.—Assemble for Reports of morning session on Introductory Agriculture. Summary—Dean Lloyd Dowler  
School Agriculture  
Fresno State College

2:30 p.m.-4:30 p.m.—Business Session  
Dr. Dan O. Robinson, presiding

4:30 p.m.—Business Session for New Executive Committee

5:30 p.m.-8:00 p.m.—Fish Fry  
Lake D'Arbonne, Farmerville, Louisiana

#### WOMEN'S PROGRAM

MONDAY, APRIL 8  
Tour of Hodges Gardens, Many, Louisiana

TUESDAY, APRIL 9  
Outing at Lake D'Arbonne

## QUESTIONS AN ADMINISTRATOR SHOULD ASK — OF HIMSELF

KEITH N. McFARLAND

*Assistant Dean and Director of Resident Instruction  
Institute of Agriculture, University of Minnesota*

There was laughter in the room when the student committee, after reviewing college efforts in evaluation of instruction, suddenly posed the unkindest question of all. "And on what basis," said the chairman, "should your work as a college administrator be judged?" Nor was the question an impertinency. While the quality of the contact between student and instructor is central to learning outcomes, the nature of the setting in which they interact is influenced by administrative behavior. And at a time when student councils everywhere are appraising instructor performance, and when new evaluation methods are applied to the student population, perhaps it is only fair that the college administrator receive similar attention.

Thus challenged by this delightful group, I sought to define those critical questions which, if posed, would suggest some measure of administrative success or lack thereof. Because my inquisitors were students in Agriculture, let us apply these questions to the typical agricultural college.

1. *Does the college and its component parts—schools, departments, individual instructors, students—have a clear understanding of what it is they seek to accomplish?*

The setting changes constantly. Student preparation at entrance is much improved. New developments in extension and continuing education influence the nature of demands on the college. Graduates of 1968 will enter types of employment demanding professional and social skills and abilities quite different from those expected of former

graduates. The structure of agricultural education is altered. European institutional types—the "diploma schools" of Great Britain, the higher schools of agriculture of The Netherlands and Sweden, and the three-year "Ingenieurschule fur Landbau" in southern Germany—find their counterparts in America in the post-high school area vocational-technical school, the two-year collegiate technical institute, and the community or junior college, in addition to the more traditional four-year and graduate programs. The "land-grant college concept" of comprehensive service is now shared by many institutions. And the so-called explosion of knowledge makes a wholly content-oriented curriculum increasingly impractical. Are these changes reflected in institutional, program, and course objectives?

2. *Does the college operate within a pervasive and productive climate of learning?*

Experienced educators suggest that the presence of a "student personnel point of view" can be easily detected; its absence is as quickly noted. Agriculture faculties long have had the reputation of being warm, friendly, and helpful to undergraduate students in advising and teaching relationships. Where this spirit is absent, it must be inaugurated; where it is weak it must be nurtured. The rapid increase in institutional enrollments and the growing pressures on facilities and staffs may make some changes in relationships unavoidable. Yet if the important aspect of student-faculty contact is its quality, rather than quantity alone, a desirable atmosphere may be maintained through conscious effort of members of the faculty and well oriented student leadership.

3. *Is there a readily discernable climate of expectation that applies to the performances of both students and staff?*

As a general rule, people in groups adopt the work standards of those about them. Where standards of expected performances are high, but are accepted as a matter of course by those who respect the objectives of the institution, high morale and high productivity follow. Where rationalization of inadequate preparation or poor performance is accepted, the program suffers.

4. *Does the institution show concern for the instructional setting?*

Where demands bear upon limited dollar resources, the needs of instruction must be forcefully presented. Are members of the faculty as aggressive in seeking instructional equipment as in requesting research support? Is the college successful in getting recognition of and response to its instructional needs from the university administration? Are members of the teaching faculty familiar with new instructional concepts and technology? Do college rules, regulations, and administrative arrangements serve the student well? Are they subject to periodic review, with assistance of student representation, in order that unnecessary or outdated regulations, limitations, or restrictions may be eliminated?

5. *Is "teaching potential" a major criterion for new staff appointments?*

Do candidates for staff positions sense administrative concern for the teaching program? Is there opportunity to observe the skill in instruction of teaching assistants and non-tenured members of the faculty who later may be

considered for permanent staff positions? Do department heads make hard decisions on individuals who have observable shortcomings in instructional technique or ability?

6. *How vital is the faculty in-service training program?*

The art of instruction is complex; its subtleties are many. Does the teaching faculty measure results in terms of stated objectives? Is it "professional" in its teaching?

7. *Are the characteristics of the student body known to the faculty?*

Changing high school curriculums, varied admissions thresholds, the origin of students—these and other factors make each student body differ from the next. Does the new staff member receive descriptive material and is the veteran instructor reminded on occasion of student body make-up? And is there an active program of institutional research relating to student mortality, morale, and breadth of student experience?

8. *Does the college have a system of priorities to guide departments and individuals in making choices from among many conflicting claims on time and resources?*

Administration is subjective. The impact of the college administrator is mingled with the inputs of the two primary groups in instruction—the teachers and the students. Yet if he is not to be lost in unceasing rounds of committee sessions, dinner meetings, budgets, and miscellaneous promotions, the administrator must have some criteria upon which to gauge his accomplishment. The questions above are not all-inclusive, but they highlight elements in the instructional program most susceptible to administrative influence. These are areas he must not neglect.

---

## The Departmental Administrator – The Man In The Middle

GEORGE A. GRIES  
*Head, Department of Biological Sciences  
(Formerly Head, Department of Plant Pathology)  
University of Arizona*

Professors and deans are frequently the target of good natured jokes. In the case of the former the punch line usually relates to absentmindedness; in the latter it is seldom complimentary and may concern any of a variety of idiosyncracies. No one ever tells a joke about departmental administrators collectively. This can be interpreted in one of two ways. Either they play such an unimportant role in the academic community that they deserve to be snubbed, or they are so variable as a class that no story could be applicable to the majority. As a department head, myself, I prefer to reject the first option leaving me no alternative but to accept the second.

It is true that department chairmen and heads do come in all sizes and forms, with all types of personalities and, unfortunately, the full spectrum of abilities. They range from the meek paper-shuffling clerk to the pompous dictator, from the efficient administrator to the iron-fisted tyrant. Although we can recognize a diversity of types in any institution, the administrative structure of the college does have a pronounced influence on the nature and effectiveness of the departmental administrator. It is usually the college or university that determines the means of election or selection and the tenure of the office. In hopes of simplifying terminology for this paper I shall define the chairman as one who is elected in a more or less democratic fashion by his peers to serve for a defined, but relatively limited, number of years. The department head, in contrast, is appointed, with or without faculty involvement and serves until either he resigns or the dean removes him.

*Head vs Chairman.* It's heresy to be against either motherhood or democracy and yet I must maintain that an entirely democratic college department is seldom a

progressive one, but then neither is one subjected to the whims of a dogmatic tyrant. There are a few instances in which the chairmanship system may work well. One of these is the case of the excellent department full of dedicated and creative individuals who are ready to accept new ideas and to experiment with progressive concepts. Another is the inconsequential department in an institution which has no desire to excel and a resolute goal to maintain the *status quo*. Unfortunately, in the first case, and fortunately, in the second, neither of these situations is common. Usually the higher administration is anxious that the department should be strengthened and should strive to excel within a framework defined by the nature of the institution. Whenever it is desired by the administration to alter the goals of or the speed of the attainment of their expectations for the department, they should have a major say in the selection of its administrator. The planning and development of long-term programs whether it be curriculum reform or research activities, demand that the term of office of the administrator and the authority which he has must be great enough to allow tangible results. By now, it should be obvious that I favor the system of department heads rather than of chairmen.

*Tenure.* It is probably true in all disciplines, but is definitely the case in science, that it is a full-time job for a person to "profess" his specialty. Administering a department, regardless of its size, can not help but diminish the competence of a man in his field. The time and efforts of a department head are directed toward other matters, and while, hopefully, he grows wiser and more experienced in his new responsibilities, he probably becomes less and less qualified to return to the classroom or his laboratory.