

UCLA

National Black Law Journal

Title

Personnel Function in the University and Affirmative Action

Permalink

<https://escholarship.org/uc/item/56f044rw>

Journal

National Black Law Journal, 4(2)

Author

Butler, John B.

Publication Date

1975

Copyright Information

Copyright 1975 by the author(s). All rights reserved unless otherwise indicated. Contact the author(s) for any necessary permissions. Learn more at <https://escholarship.org/terms>

Peer reviewed

WORKSHOP

Number 3

“Personnel Function in the University and Affirmative Action”

John B. Butler, Discussion Leader

Phyllis A. Wallace

Discussion Leader — John B. Butler, Director of Personnel, Harvard University

BUTLER: The title for this workshop is Personnel Function in the University and Affirmative Action. We are talking about society. We are talking about organizations and institutions in the society, all of which have been established for a purpose and within each of those organizations, as they carry out whatever particular purpose they have, they are a social system and they reflect society. Then there is the question of the responsibility that they have to contribute to the improvement of society. If you talk about colleges and universities, you have a special concern it seems to me. As James Perkins, the President of Cornell, once put it, institutions of higher education really are “engines of change.” That is what we are now with young people moving through these institutions. These institutions are recognizing their greater responsibility for continuing education. We have people moving through these institutions who serve them as faculty members and staff members. They come from somewhere, they stay varying periods of time, long or short, and then they leave, by resignation, death or retirement. You have that flow.

Let me introduce to you now Professor Phyllis Wallace who is visiting professor at the Sloan School of Management at M.I.T. She and I will try to hold the fort today. Professor Keller, who is an Assistant Dean in the Faculty of Arts and Sciences at Harvard could not be with us. Dr. Wallace.

WALLACE: I would like to begin by making what I consider to be an important addition to the official biography that is listed in the program. I will have a perspective today that is really based on three years that I spent at the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission, 1966-1969, as the Deputy Director of Research in a very new agency at a time when the focus was primarily on the private sector and employers in the private sector. But in a sense we started to identify some of the problems that I think academic institutions are now, state and local governments and other employers in the larger society face today. So, coming out of that experience of helping to formulate the research agenda and playing a very important role in the initial first testing guidelines or guidelines on personnel assessment—those guidelines that were upheld in the *Griggs* decision in 1971—I look at as giving me a very special perspective when I now continue in the academic

arena to examine some of these problems.

The first thing that I would like to emphasize is that we should look at academic institutions as employers. Essentially, we are talking about institutions that operate in certain kinds of labor markets. When we look at the private employers we talk about the kinds of workers in occupational categories that employers seek in certain market places. Now, we talk essentially about three broad categories of employees. Look at academic institutions as employers. You have essentially in most academic institutions a sizeable support staff. These would be clerical, dining room employees, maintenance employees, the same kinds of people that other private employers utilize their services. Therefore, the University as employer would have to pay the prevailing rate in the labor market; may have to deal with collective bargaining contracts; and in any way you have a flow of those people back and forth from the academic sector into the private or the public sector. Then you have a smaller group of personnel in academic institutions—the managers, so to speak. Unfortunately, the managers in academic institutions have historically been or traditionally been, faculty people who are just temporarily serving in some managerial capacity. They are unhappy doing this and may not do a good job. I would like to pay more attention today to the third group, the academic faculty. To talk about the personnel function and the academic faculty.

Essentially when I look at this function, and we define faculty, what I see is really a closed, internal labor market. A labor market where the entry groups have been closed because of really preferentially hiring. That is, traditionally faculty are hired at the junior level, they enter by way of some type of support from an informal—a very powerful—informal network. That network may very well be other professors in the department, professors in other schools, professors in the discipline, that is, by word of mouth, perhaps by some correspondence. But all the decisions are made most informally. Recommendations are made and the junior person enters this internal labor market at the bottom and is prepared to remain there hoping to receive tenure or a guarantee of employment. This as I see it and I am just now beginning to give more thought to the structure of this labor market, this system is really the guild system. The system that is based on apprenticeship and then some assessment by peers before you receive the stamp of approval so to speak and you are accepted as a journeyman in the trade. And I think to me it would be analagous to the craft unions in the construction industry today. If you want to be an electrician you go in an apprenticeship program for four or five years, you get your union card and essentially you move up and become a journeyman. So that for faculty this is the same procedure. Coming in by the preferential treatment route, maybe six or seven years serving a probationary apprenticeship period and then the validation of the abilities of the young professional done through peer assessment. So what you have is a system that was discriminatory in a sense long before minorities and women and others appeared. It was discriminatory in that essentially the older people, the journeymen, made an assessment of the potential for growth in the young people. So that many young white males didn't make tenure not because they lacked the qualifications. It might have been just a capricious thing; that was the wrong

time and someone didn't like them or their views or their lifestyles or what have you. Now if you have a system that functions in this way where essentially people put a premium on bringing into the system people who are like themselves, the older people, who have the responsibility for replacing the young professionals in the system, look about for people who are very much like themselves.

Now, with the great emphasis on equal employment opportunity, with the great activity by women's groups and by minority groups, what you find is new and different people. The minorities and the women are coming to this system and in a sense they are trying to make that entry route less preferential, more objective. They have insisted that search committees be established and widely advertised. They have insisted that the promotion process itself be specified in some great detail so that they will know the various steps. They have insisted on internal grievance procedures. Now, when I look at that closed internal labor market—and I am thinking that the labor economists see this as an internal labor market—I identify as the most powerful actors at least in this process of entry and promotion, the department chairman in the academic institution. From my view, the way I look at this labor market, the president of the University, the Chancellor, the people at the top in a sense, the powers, may articulate overall objectives but the decisions are made at the level of the department chairmen. So it seems to me, if we have some discussion a bit later about strategy for change in some of these academic institutions, the simple first step would be to get the university bulletin, identify all of the department chairmen, and then call upon the chairmen and engage in a dialogue about how his,—and I use the word advisedly because there are very few women chairmen—his search procedures, the way they go about identifying promising people, the way they go about active recruitment, the kinds of supports they provide once people are on board, the way they see them through this process. What is the locus of power? The locus of power in the academic institution—whether it is an institution such as Harvard and M.I.T., primarily research and teaching institutions, or small institutions with the emphasis on teaching only, whether it's state of the great public institutions or the private institutions—this locus of power happens to be at the level of the department chairmen. So that when you begin to talk about how to correct some of these deficiencies, I think one begins to talk about how you might interact with these people who really determine the characteristics of the internal labor market.

Briefly I might say that some of the tenure practices really have come under recent scrutiny mainly because at the same time we have had some movement in the area of affirmative action. You have had the rise of collective bargaining in academic institutions. Because academic institutions by and large are elitist there was a strong feeling until recently that collective bargaining was for janitors or for street cleaners, or for people who worked in the steel mill but not for university professors because university professors were about something else. I think that in 1972 when the American Association of University Professors for the first time agreed to have local chapters serve as collective bargaining units we have had a great expansion in collective bargaining activities, mainly in the public

universities. Between 1972 and 1973, just in terms of the AAUP chapters, I think they had at least 25 institutions where the AAUP chapters had acted as the collective bargaining agents. Collective bargaining would cover a variety of issues. One of the things I might just bring to your attention if you are not already familiar with it is that the AAUP chapter at Rutgers University was very instrumental in the Fall of 1972 in acting as the collective bargaining agent for a faculty of about 3600 members and graduate assistants. It successfully negotiated a procedure for remedying pay discrepancies within rank, a revision of maternity and the nepotism policy. So that in September, 1973, Rutgers University, a state university, paid about \$275,000 in compensatory payments to 182 women and 35 minority faculty. So, you have as I see it the collective bargaining instrument which could be perfected and could be used.

Now the American Association of University Professors is just one group. You have the American Federation of Teachers and the National Education Association so that there is great interest now in the collective bargaining procedure.

You also have an enormous amount of discussion by various professional groups about the tenure controversy, whether there should be quotas, whether once you have 50% of your faculty tenured, whether an alternative might be contracts to be renewed regularly. A number of questions have been raised about why university professors are so different that they need to be guaranteed a job for the next 30 or 35 years. So, as I would see the personnel function, just as it would apply to faculty, I see a decentralized activity. No coordination, no one place in a university where at a moment of time one could get all of the information that one would need in order to conduct the studies in order to make the comparisons.

I might just take a minute or two to tell you about my role with the A.T. and T. case. I left the Federal Government in 1969, but I continued as a consultant to the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission and was serving in 1970. They started the hearings before the Federal Communications Commission charging the company with primarily sex discrimination but employment discrimination across the board. Although you had two years of public hearing before an administrative law judge, essentially the lawyers rely heavily on an enormous amount of social science research that was prepared by a panel that I chaired. We had people who were economists and psychologists and sociologists who came together, who could apply the most sophisticated methodology in their discipline. If you want to demonstrate, let us say discrepancy in pay, the economists would do this in terms of multivariate regression analysis. You have to identify your variables; you have to get all of your information. Certainly for the Rutgers University case the local chapter of AAUP found a young male professor of economics who might have not been so convinced at the time, but he had the skills, and he did the regression analysis and I think probably in the process he learned something and demonstrated that you did have this discrepancy in salaries between people who were in the identical rank. You begin by saying you compare people who are matched in every way as far as you intend to compare them, so that based on solid science research you can hand this information to lawyers, and to people who "may be more

activist;" you may pass this information on to administrators at the top and through this way you can really bring about a significant amount of change because essentially what happened on the Bell Telephone case was that the company was not able to find any deficiencies in the social science research. Because the company could not find any deficiencies in that research it agreed in the consent decree to make the major payments initially of 38 million dollars which now has moved up to 50 million and with an additional consent decree this year, stands in the neighborhood of 80 million. But essentially this was based on some of the social science research that had been done by a very young economist who tried to specify what goes into an equation when you are talking about discrimination, what are the productivity variables and what are not, and then tried to quantify and to say how much would be due women in terms of compensation.

BUTLER: Thank you, Dr. Wallace. We are in the midst of change and talking about power and powerlessness in institutions and I do think you have to get back to what Dr. Groomes and Beverly Clark mentioned in Workshop 1 about organization, how it is put together, where the decisions are made, and how things come about.

To talk about the personnel function, if you want to stand back far enough to talk about whether the change is to fit people into the organizations as they now exist or whether it is the other way around, we are engaged now in a kind of fundamental change to change the organizations to fit the people, and by that I mean all people. Some interesting things are going on in the corporate world in this country. Henry Ford started out by making an automobile assembly line and Volvo is now going to start to produce automobiles without an assembly line because it is good business. They think it will make money. But it also relates the production of an automobile to the people who may be doing it. There is also a company out in the midwest that doesn't have any supervisors because they feel that they can make money in the dog food business without having people in the traditional hierarchy. What does that mean to universities? I am not quite sure but maybe we ought to talk about it a little.

Let me take you quickly through some other things that I think we should understand as we try to seek where the answers are organizationally because often universities, either Harvard or M.I.T., or Florida State are struggling and they don't know where all the answers are either in this area. If you are really sure you want to get the answer you go to General Motors or some big company like that.

The personnel function as you look at it in this country has been something that has evolved through a series of pressures on the institutions that it is a part of. You can go back to the 1920's or even earlier than that and find companies that were paternalistic, and some way or other thought the rest of the people would be concerned about this so that you got the traditional personnel department of that day. In the early depression you had to have somebody level with the people who were losing their jobs, so the personnel department became further strengthened. We went through the whole union movement. People started to act collectively. Public policy of the land encouraged that and companies had to meet that so there became industrial relations departments—the whole process of collective

bargaining brought that about.

In the 1930's, you also had much legislation—the Social Security Act, the Wagner Act, the beginning of the National Labor Relations Act, Fair Labor Standards Act, etc., and you had to have somebody to deal with this. In World War II we had to produce a lot so we had problems with finding people to do these tasks. We had War Labor Boards established, we had much regulation coming out of Washington and companies had to deal with that. So that brought more people into the personnel function.

This continued after World War II with the development of behavioral science application; the human relations work that was done at that time had begun earlier. There was a concern about “communications,” still a major problem. We went through the fads of the development of all kinds of things that presumably communicated. Now in business and industry you finally have concerns again about their survival. The questions are of productivity and creativity and how you develop this within the organization so that the institution survives. In business and industry of course that means that it is profitable.

Educational institutions, probably in part because of their structure, with trustees who come from business and industry always look to what is going on in the industrial world, although not really thinking about how that could apply in an educational institution at least have the information that is available to these people. Maybe there's also a longing for things to somehow be different. Maybe the colleges and universities shouldn't have the same problems that you have in business and industry and there are attempts to in a nostalgic way try to have things as they were, as you recall them.

Faculty members really aren't personnel in the sense that you would use that term generically in industry. It's interesting to see that Professor Wallace focuses on that population because organizationally in most colleges and universities somehow that is a separate group with separate traditions. You find in the development of affirmative action programs the easiest place to have action is with those people who are more in the area where there are people who are more traditionally those that one would find in other employee situations, whether one is working in an office or in a service position. But it becomes much more difficult in a faculty area.

The first organized personnel function in this country at a university of any size was at the University of Illinois and the name of that department, which I think is still the case today, is the Office of Non-Academic Personnel, clearly separating the concerns about faculty.

There is something new on the scene that will affect the part of the educational institution as an employer that in the past has been considered outside the range of “personnel policy.” So that organizationally, we are, I think, generally in higher education, proficient in having a way of really dealing with those kinds of concerns.

In the same way that the *Griggs* case may impact the selection of faculty the cases dealing with seniority coming before the Supreme Court may dictate some concerns in the area of tenure. For those as specific concerns, I think the thing that I would like to leave you with at this point—

the personnel function in business and industry is something still being wrestled with as to what it really is and how it should properly be a part of the organizational framework of the institution. Colleges and universities have a lag between what happens in industry and what happens on their campuses even if it is directly transferable. If it isn't then I think that same lag exists and it may take even longer for things to move from one sphere to the other.

We can talk about affirmative action officers, we can talk about personnel officers, you can talk about the goals of affirmative action, but if one is talking about moving from where we have been, dealing with the questions related to organizational development within these institutions, it seems to me that that is something we should address ourselves to.

Let me close this by telling you a little story that I mentioned to Professor Wallace the other day which I think also has something to say about the organizational difficulties within universities, again keeping the parallels of industry and universities before us. If you have decided that you want to make a career in higher education and all you need to do is press a button and then be in that particular position in higher education, what is the highest position that you can think of within a given educational institution? You each might have a different answer to that, but let me tell you a story about an acting president of a university whom I saw a few years ago at the time that he was acting president and he indicated a series of things that had brought him to where he was by not wanting to be at each point that he had moved in that progression. Where he really wanted to be was a full professor in the classroom teaching and he was at that point acting president of an institution. He had moved as Professor Wallace said, from a position as a faculty member, into a position with an administrative load. He was assistant department head at some time and then a department head and had moved up through the chairs, I guess you could say, to Dean and had ended up as acting president of this institution and didn't want to be there. He wanted to be in the classroom.

If I were to ask you the same question or if you were in let's say, automobile manufacturing since I brought that up, and asked you what position you would aspire to if you were in that industry, it seems to me that you wouldn't have any difficulty saying what the position would be, either *Chairman of the Board*, or the *President of the Company*. But I point this out because if that is true, then in colleges and universities—if you talk about power, if that is something that people somehow seek in a career in part, and maybe this is related to the tenure phenomenon—the curious situation exists where the most attractive position is not a position that is identified as a position where power really is at the head of the company or the president necessarily, but a spectrum across the institution that is listed on some chart or something—the employees. That is where the collective bargaining comes in. The issue comes up under the National Labor Relations Act as to whether faculty members are management or whether they are in fact employees. But, that may also say something to us as we begin a discussion about personnel function, where it is and where it may go and how we can move toward the goals that we have been talking about—opening up systems, opening up universities, so that the representation of

minorities and women throughout the institutions in all positions is related to the availability of people for those positions.

Phyllis, do you have anything you want to

WALLACE: Just one additional comment just to indicate how very difficult it is to begin to discuss this problem and to design strategies today because as all of you know, academic institutions are not growing, from whatever statistics I have seen, for at least the next five years and maybe close to a decade. You will have a smaller demand certainly for faculty and so at the present time the academic institutions that have been producing the young Ph.D.'s, many of whom have been trained to be, or when they started their training thought that they were going to be, teachers, will have to find jobs elsewhere in the economy. Certainly in my own profession, economics, the young economists who will attend the professional meetings in December will be looking for jobs in industry, in the federal government and in non-profit organizations because there are very few vacancies and openings. It becomes easier to initiate the kinds of change that we are talking about under affirmative action in an expanding economy generally and certainly in a growth industry and it would appear that for at least the four-year liberal arts colleges and the universities you have some contraction. Now at the same time your community colleges and junior institutions seem to be expanding, but we return to how the university professor perceives himself and one of the interesting things is that people feel that you have less status in the society if you have a Ph.D. and you teach at a community college. It's all right to have a Ph.D. if you teach at either an Ivy League school or a large state school or a four-year institution, but to have identical training and to teach at a community college, means that you are perceived by the people who are important to you in your profession as having inferior status. So that I think when we do get into discussion, if we do about personnel function as related to faculty, it has much to do with superior and inferior status, and how people are perceived, and what it is they want. Because essentially what you want is recognition by people in your profession, that you have attained journeyman status in your profession.

QUESTION: Do you think there is a significant difference between an educational community and an educational institution that sees itself as a service organization and if you do see a difference then would the personnel function in each instance be different, or not?

WALLACE: I would just think that all educational institutions see themselves providing both. I don't see it as an either/or, I think it is a combination.

The difficulty is when you say educational institution, it could be an employer, it is a training institution for the young people who go through the system and who are their final products coming out, at the same time the educational institution purchases goods and services in whatever area it happens to be located. I think that traditionally people have just seen educational institutions as providing education—as educating people and they have not seen these other functions which are really very important. I would say that I now work at an educational institution. My perception of

that institution is that it is primarily an industrial think-tank, but I don't think that it has perceived itself as an industrial think-tank. At the same time you have a segment of that academic institution that would fit this model of providing or turning out scholars for the future generation. So that you would have in one place several functions and it might just depend on a moment of time as to which one might be perceived to be the primary function. But in actuality at my institution, I think they have the largest number of federal contracts of any academic institution in the United States. So you have an enormous think-tank and a large number of people with Ph.D.'s who do research and never enter a classroom.

QUESTION: I would like to ask two questions. One is I think that I need, personally, your definition of personnel function. I am thinking in terms of a multi-university like we have; we are talking about roughly 80,000 people including students, employees, and faculty. When you say personnel function are you talking about personnel office or are you talking about individuals who actually make decisions about who has access to the university? When I talk about a personnel office, my first thought is faculty committees and seeing professors, etc. So I think that is one definition and if you have another I would like to have it.

BUTLER: May I answer that? It may help you with the next part of it. The experience that I come out of is labeled organizationally, the personnel department tradition. The "personnel function of the university" is talking about the resources of people within the institution, the entire institution, and those things that influence the recruitment, the hiring, the appointment of people flowing in—those things that deal with the working conditions while the people are there, the compensation that goes with that—which is much broader than the focus on "what has been traditionally personnel."

QUESTION: My problem is, I don't know what that means. Second of all I think we are operating, maybe operating under a fallacious assumption because I think that the industrial model is not applicable to the university model. We found that, particularly in terms of unionization. So when you talk about personnel functions you need to explain to me in terms of a university what it means, independent of the personnel office. I understand who makes decisions. I am not sure when I come to Harvard University or go to Columbia University. I can go to the personnel office or I know one thing for sure, I would never get a job if I go into the personnel office. When you say personnel function, what do you mean? I think that is very important to some of us who are working in an area of affirmative action and change in an institution.

WALLACE: May I give you my definition? I see personnel function—I would define it as the utilization and development of human resources which would include recruitment, hiring, promotion, training, and the development of human resources. Now, in the academic institution, this function is very fragmented so that the personnel office per se has nothing much to do with the personnel function for faculty. It may have nothing much to do with the personnel function for a large number of people. So that I see, instead of a centralized decision-making unit maybe designing an overall delivery system in the area of personnel activities—a series of independent actions frequent-

ly not explicitly noted. So, that if you as a young person looking for a job teaching arrive on a campus, you might spend two weeks of just moving around from office to office finding out who it is that you should talk to about whether you could be interviewed and meet people at a given department. Essentially, what I tried to say was at least for the recruitment and selection of academic personnel, the function lies in the office of the chairman of the department so that whoever sits elsewhere as the Director of Personnel may never have any interaction at all with these two. So that in academic institutions, unlike some other institutions, the function has not been centralized, it has not been defined, it has not been localized and for that reason it is sort of like walking blind in a forest.

COMMENT: I disagree with you. The function has been centralized for 300 years and it is centralized within the faculty.

WALLACE: Well, when I say the office of the chairman, I mean the Chairman of the Department as the senior person assumes the responsibility for peer assessment so he represents faculty and not administration.

COMMENT: I am from a very small private institution. It does seem to me that everyone, faculty, administrators and supporting staff are all employees of the institution. They all have to be recruited and hired, and evaluated and promoted or not and given tenure or long term contracts and finally terminated. These are functions that apply to all. It is merely true that the way these functions are carried out may be decentralized. But if one is going to be able under an affirmative action program to get the kind of utilization analyses, to get the salary equity analyses and so on, there has got to be some central record keeping otherwise you are just not in the business. It seems to me that the personnel office at least should be designated the central record keeper for all of these actions so that they can be easily retrieved, whether they be on computer or not. That's a function that I don't think the personnel office can escape.

In terms of where the power lies again I don't see where the problem is with faculty once we have an affirmative action plan that is going to be effective. It is clear that you cannot hire, and this should be mandatory, without the kind of thorough search that will produce a diverse multi-racial and bi-sexual list of qualified candidates, unless you can prove that they don't exist in the country. Now, if a department chairman knows that he is not going to get approval to hire an individual unless that search satisfies the affirmative action office—and that is the reason for the affirmative action office—if someone walk in who is a minority and says that I am interested in a job in physics, he is going to make a note of that man, he is going to find out his credentials, he is going to give him an interview because otherwise he won't get the next vacancy filled. It seems to me that you either have an affirmative action program or you don't. If you have one that means problems disappear.

COMMENT: I don't agree that it is that simple, because in the process of bringing in, you still have when you talked about faculties, a decentralized search process. Faculty will never look on the personnel office as other than one of technicians and record keeping and so forth for the actions that they

take in professional fields. So after they do the search then they do what the affirmative action officer says must be done in the process. In the search committee you have to make sure that they have the kinds of procedures necessary and are consistent, but you can't say at that point that you can tell them that the people you have successfully recruited get in, the process will actually come out of it with the minority or female being most qualified. Because the decentralization is going to be here, I think that it is the sort of thing that we have to accept. In colleges and universities the personnel office is not going to be the one that has the simple decision.

COMMENT: I agree that the personnel office does not impact in the way that the affirmative action office does in faculty recruitment. And the way that the affirmative action office impacts in my judgment is by very close scrutiny of those candidates. You can insist that the search committee be diverse and insist that women and minorities be on the search committee and if they don't get them from a particular department then you go outside and you get qualified people from outside to sit on this. We have recalcitrant departments, too. We said to them bring in outside assessors of the candidates if they continue not to produce minorities and women who are successful candidates. You can really put on a great deal of pressure if you have the support of the president.

QUESTION: I think that what we are missing here is that affirmative action is not consistent with the traditional mode. It's changed—it is doing things differently. You are absolutely right, it is not the industrial model. Traditionally institutions of higher learning have not been held accountable. You see, faculty don't fail, students fail. The power is vested in faculty because that 60% gets tenure and they stay there—you know, right or wrong they stay there and continue to decide. Administration, they say, come and go, students come and go, but I dare say if you incorporate the kind of policies which hold faculty accountable that you are beginning to get there. What is wrong with personnel and faculty relations? What is wrong with establishing qualifying policies which must be adhered to by not only the outstanding intellectual faculty but other administrators and hiring officials? I think that that is where we are going to have to go if we are serious. The faculty must be held accountable for what they do. We establish a set of guidelines which must be used by them, we go into the questionable area of establishing numerical goals and say of all new hires for instance, that 80% must come from the affected classes. Go out, faculty and find them. Use whatever you want for qualifications, but at least when you make the final decision you have to represent this kind of situation. That accountable faculty then will adhere to affirmative action. I don't think that you lower standards, but I think that you do change the traditional procedures and take some of the subjectivity away from faculty that they have had historically. And then you begin to evaluate as you do in the industrial model. It may not be such a bad idea. All of us must now be held accountable and that is what affirmative action suggests—good personnel-faculty relation practices.

BUTLER: I think that the accountability too comes out of the industrial and business world where it makes sense.

WALLACE: I wanted to indicate that there are mechanisms being developed to inculcate the faculty in this operational procedure of search. It isn't the epitome but it is a start. There are faculty committees who give a say, yes or no, on the manner of a search—not the candidate—we haven't gotten to that point, because that would produce a revolt immediately; but we are talking about whether or not the search is a valid search, whether or not it is a serious search. Now this has produced, at my university, an awful lot of backbiting in terms of more regulations, more paper work, more procedures, and all the rest. We do have a faculty committee composed of tenured faculty members. I find that a little difficult to deal with because we are dealing with the same power structure, but at the moment they are all tenured faculty. We have one department—she happens to be a chairwoman in this case, on this committee, and they meet regularly. They take time out, it's either breakfast, lunch or dinner, but they take time out once a week and they review these actions or proposed actions. Now therein lies the rub. We are talking about personnel procedures and we are trying to meld the dichotomy that is the university with regard to personnel function. One for everybody who is not a faculty member and one for faculty. The administrative committee in our university operates in a like fashion but it is not nearly as effective as the faculty committee because the administrators as Freddie points out come and go and they know that. Their actions and their thoughts are reflected and that is a fact of life. The senior faculty know that they are not going anywhere.

QUESTION: The question that Jim DeShields is raising seems to be though—isn't affirmative action and the whole personnel function just pouring people into the same paternalistic kind of operation? Is affirmative action going to change that? Can or will it just get more different kinds of people into the can? That's really I think where the cutting edge is. I think it's hard, it's a revolutionary question and economics being what they are now, revolution is expensive. But that is where the edge is and almost nothing else ultimately makes sense, unless you can deal with the cutting edge.

QUESTION: Freddie Groomes mentioned accountability across the board and I really would like some idea from those in affirmative action here. At how many of these colleges are all employers, all supervisors, all hiring officers at the institution held accountable to the president through the affirmative action office for every hiring that is done? It happens at Dartmouth, that if I am not satisfied that an appointment has been made by the process that has been set up and widely distributed, I go to the president. I can call the individual up to the Dean of the Faculty, before the affirmative action board and have a review of the case, and we now have that accountability to stretch to the evaluation of that officer's performance. This is the only way it is going to work.

WALLACE: Have you actually done that?

COMMENT: Yes, I have brought someone before them. In a case last year that I threatened to take to the affirmative action board, the recommendation to dismiss a faculty member was reversed. The Chairman was forced to reinstate that individual and this was in the faculty.

COMMENT: I think that you are right. Affirmative action is a revolutionary kind of idea. It goes against the grain of what we have known tradition to be—academic excellence in terms of higher educational institutions. They have to be held accountable and I think that you are right when you look at faculty and have expectations for them, administrators with expectations for them, as well as for career service people.

I had a different difficult problem when we first started our program because, how do you compare the work product of one faculty against the work product of another? Number one, it is a put down to ask for a job description—well a faculty position is not a job, number one. I said all paid employees, and they were offended by that. So anyway I asked it of people who work here and get a check, what is your job description? Write it. What are you supposed to do? Faculty, teach and do research, whatever. But define what portion of your time and what not and we are moving towards better definition of what faculty are supposed to be doing. I am not putting down faculty, I am also faculty and that is why I am a little bit sensitive to the kinds of things that go on. But we now have established procedures which not only administrative and professional career service must follow, but faculty must follow also. Certain kinds of expectations that are measured, the MBO kind of situation and we determine what they are supposed to do so that we can evaluate and determine whether X should get promoted opposed to B or whatever. It does require again the industrial type model which is inconsistent with the Harvard projection of what higher education is supposed to be all about, I do believe that faculty err, that faculty have to be held accountable. I do think that if we establish guidelines for hiring that you don't necessarily decide who the faculty will select but say, you must make the selection through the affected classes for a while. Look for the kind of criteria you want, but when the final decision is made—that is why I am not concerned about the composition of the search committee anymore—but when the final decision is made it must become a representative from the affected classes. And as soon as those types of things start happening, you get some change.

In the meantime, there is all kind of turmoil going on in our institutions. What are you doing? Are you trying to overthrow the whole educational system? You are going to put in all of these people who will lower the standards and we are going to have less or inferior than Harvard and all of the rest of them.

COMMENT: That's my initial question. We are still thinking about colleges as communities. As long as we do that we are going to play the game with committees that have to do with services. I don't think you can have it both ways and this is what we are constantly trying to do. We try to have a communitarian sense and at the same time an accountability of sense. They just don't go together. We are doomed.

COMMENT: I think that what we need to do, one of the things we are talking about here is to define maybe in three categories. He is talking about small private institutions. I am in a multi-versity. She is in a different system in Florida. And we have—and then there is Harvard—by itself. What I am saying is we are talking, hopefully trying to talk about something in a very

generic way when in fact when we get down to the real functions and problems, we are talking about separate institutions that are not uteristic, not a universal model, and we cannot talk about them in a general way because all institutions function differently.

BUTLER: Well, if you are talking—let's move to the Supreme Court or something—the things that are coming out of the system of government that we have are impacting these institutions at least at that point in a common way and that each of us has to finally have a way of handling the system.

COMMENT: This is an example. On our campus, the most impotent group on our campus are administrators because we are a public institution. That works to our advantage in many instances because when we have law students, we say all right go to court. But once they go to court they have to deal with Corporation Counsel over here from the legislature because we are the State, University of Massachusetts. What I am saying is that when we really get down to making decisions and we have a participatory democracy that is controlled by an entrenched tenure and faculty who for the most part feel rejection because they could not get tenured at Harvard. Okay. All that plays a part in terms of what we have to deal with. When we are looking for a person in Chemistry who can make a decision about whether this guy is qualified or not, or is capable of accepting this position—only his peers in chemistry and there are only five in the country by the way in that area who are considered excellent. I am saying personnel decisions have funny ways of operating from one institution to another and I think that is what we need to deal with.

BUTLER: All right, but in terms of the model of accountability—in that particular case if the person that is not selected wishes to move the matter forward, it seems to me that the process and the things that will be engaged there will be the same at Florida State or at Massachusetts or at Harvard under what we are now getting into.

COMMENT: Okay, it goes to MCAD's, it's three years before it comes to adjudication.

BUTLER: Okay. I am not talking about the time or the inefficiency of the system. I am talking about fundamentally though what is happening in institutions of higher education and is going to be more applicable across the board.

QUESTION: How do you define operation as divined by faculty, not by administration, and not by courts?

COMMENT: You continue to say the faculty is an elite group that doesn't answer to anybody and I am saying hold faculty accountable too. And let's find out how they are going about assessing whether the person is qualified that you mentioned. You say there are only five experts somewhere—what is the criteria used by those five? If it is defined, it can be adaptable to any institution. Because the truth of the matter is it has been all subjective.

COMMENT: I think not. I think the approach is naive.

COMMENT: It's workable though.

COMMENT: You have a vacancy in chemistry and you are going after a particular kind of chemist, and the faculty is going to make that appointment. I think your procedures can require number one that there be a search committee in which women and minorities sit. I think you can require that before any appointment is made, a report is given on recruitment which details the sources, the contacts, the advertisements, the letters written and the type of candidates produced with their qualifications. I think you can also require a short list of the top candidates and that short list would include minorities and women if they exist in your data bank analysis.

COMMENT: All I am saying is we have an acceptable plan for HEW, we have the search committees, but I can predict by the personnel on the search committee who is going to be selected because every search committee up there in our participatory democracy is stacked. I suggest that this takes place at most institutions.

BUTLER: I think we are dealing with something more fundamental than just what is required by HEW which is what Jim is getting at.

WALLACE: I would just make a comment here too. I do think that as you begin to think more about the academic institutions as employers that you do get the differences between the large state universities because certainly the Regents in California, at a time when they were very conservative really were primarily responsible for the fact that a lot of people who were teaching at Berkeley left and returned to the East and what have you. So that you do get the large private institution. Then you get smaller institutions where the emphasis is on teaching not research. That is at an institution where you are interested in just having good teachers, it may not be important if a professor has not produced 15 books and published extensively in the journals in the profession and what have you. At an institution where the emphasis might be on reasearch, you have such indicators as whether the person was a joint author, or published in the leading journal, or in the secondary journal or what have you. But I would agree with you that we need to think along those lines—what the differences are because Dartmouth is not the University of Massachusetts. I also think now it becomes very difficult to talk about the question that you raised about really revolution because essentially what has happened—it happened in affirmative action and in the implementaion of affirmative action in the private sector and I think universities will go the same way. That is, the employer soon learns how to play the game of making the good faith effort.

So, a search committee can come in with a stack of resumes and names. It doesn't mean anything. It just means that okay we have made the good faith effort but all along we knew who we really wanted, somebody else. In fact if I may I'll just tell you a personal thing that happened to me. I have a friend who is at a large university who called and who said I am on the search committee and we are looking for a dean of the graduate school, or something, and you know, would you send me your resume. I said, what if I am not interested and what have you. As we talked, it became clear to me that the search committee had an obligation to show that they had

approached so many minorities. I happened to be a minority person he knew and if I would send my resume he didn't care at all whether I met any other qualifications, he would submit my name and resume to show that the search committee had done its job. So that I really think that the good faith effort component becomes a game that the employer may play where you do the buying, presenting the materials, but the decisions have already been made.

Now going back, just commenting again on your revolution seems to me that as you bring these new people into the academic system whether they are minorities or women, that in many ways the first people in will be like the people who are already in so that they then strive to become like those who have the status and if you really set about to revolutionize the system then a major effort has to be made to bring in people who are quite different and who may not want the same thing from the system, who are able to stand a lot of pressure, who may not be unhappy if they are never promoted, who may not be unhappy about receiving all the benefits of operating within that system so I think that the revolution is very hard because you are now just bringing in people who will be very much like the white males who are already in the system.

COMMENT: It's not an unknown problem with us. There was one instance in the history department in which a vacancy was defined and we said when this job is described you are not going to be able to fill it with a minority. This is a large department with a lot of Black students taking courses and this is the Dean and the discussion is with the affirmative action officer—we feel your next appointment must be a minority so please redefine the job in order to improve the chances of getting a minority. It was redefined and we got a minority historian. We have to know tricks, we know this. We don't always win. You win some and you lose some. But I have two departments on notice now that I was not satisfied with the last recruitment and that the next time they recruit, I have told the deans if they don't come up with minorities in departments like sociology and economics then we are going to the affirmative action board. You have to lose the first to win the second but you can do it, presumably in a very small college where you know everybody.

BUTLER: Let's move to some experiences at some other institutions, I know there are some others here. I see Jim Corley over here. Identify your school.

COMMENT: Phyllis already did, University of California at Berkeley.

WALLACE: Did you move East?

COMMENT: No, I didn't. Although it takes a little longer to describe things sometimes in personnel and higher education than it does in the private sector, I believe it is about the same. I have to separate in my own mind discussions relative to academic appointments and non-academic appointments. In our structure, we have accountability in the academic side of things before an appointment is offered and we have a pretty good example of that in which one of the departments wanted to hire, went through the search procedure as many of you do and it was not satisfactory.

This comes up through our budget committee and up then to the provost and the provost withdrew the position because the department failed to go back and adequately search, withdrew the position, put it back into the pool, withheld an academic appointment for a full year. That's accountability. That takes a lot of guts. The same provost is the same individual that said his greatest concern is having to manage and he was afraid of having to manage, but you have never seen anybody strut harder when he had done it the first time.

I think you are right. I think you do win a few and you do lose a few but you have to set examples to do it. In the non-academic side of things, which I represent, it is very clearly a structure of industrial line and accountability is right up the chain of command. I said at the university when I first got there from private industry—I always could see that pyramid at the top, it looked like Egypt at the University of California, everybody has got their little pyramid out there. But indeed, I think that is a valuable thing. It has to be enhanced, but with accountability of supervisors and managers if possible and they can be held accountable providing you have a commitment. Now we don't believe at Berkeley that this so-called Czar model of affirmative action is effective. We have argued that with HEW for the last three years. It has to come out of some line manager's acceptance of responsibility. It just won't work otherwise. That's our own experience. Of course we don't have an approved program yet as you all know, and the 30th of September was our final date and we are now on a different cutting edge than you are talking about, we are waiting for HEW to be responsive. And I think it can. I think there is a greater parallel to private industry. I think it is possible to have accountability. As you all know, we have a very, very strong academic side, with extreme power delegated by the Regents and are not about to lose that. Because they have had major problems, they have to accept accountability. It is not easy to sell but it is growing.

QUESTION: Does any one here know what the legal obligations of the university are when a chairperson or department head makes an offer and then the personnel department says that it is not acceptable, search was inadequate, you cannot hire this person at this time or not at all? Can that person sue the university because the offer was in fact made, and what is the extent of our vulnerability?

COMMENT: In the State of Massachusetts, if in fact you made an offer, verbally, or in writing, that constitutes a contract. The person is in fact an employee, you can't turn it around at that point. At UMass what we do—a department head, chairman, anyone, cannot make an offer until they get approval from the Provost, the request for permission to make an offer. But if in fact, by telephone he leads that person to believe that he is making an offer that constitutes a contract.

BUTLER: The philosophy of the institution is if you made an offer that didn't comply with procedure then that person has a relationship in which they should be paid. You may still have a vacant position. You may have hired two people for the one position which is a rather expensive thing to do, you don't usually make that kind of mistake.

COMMENT: I heard someone say yesterday, I don't know who it was or from what institution the person came, but that that problem was faced and what they did was to make the person who made the offer pay the salary of the person that he offered the job to out of his own pocket.

COMMENT: That is assuming that there is a responsibility to get prior approval. If that doesn't exist, that doesn't hold at all.

COMMENT: What does happen indeed legally, as Jim has indicated, you are obligated. But what also I think sort of makes things happen as someone earlier said, is that it causes a certain amount of embarrassment on the person who really made the offer or who really effected the backdoor hiring. Indeed when that person really becomes acquainted with that, I think one of the greatest embarrassments to that person is to the person he or she has made the offer to.

COMMENT: In my institution last week an offer had been made to three people by the department head and indeed before the people could go on the payroll the offer was stopped. The people were compensated and they were let go and the positions are still open. Now, needless to say what we certainly have discovered by that was the kind of embarrassment that was caused to the person who made the offer. The news of this went through the institution just like it happened yesterday. It was all over and I don't expect that we will have many more such like that.

QUESTION: When you said that the three people were compensated, what do you mean? Do you mean for a year's salary, for a week, for the day they worked?

ANSWER: The people—and I think our policy is similar to Harvard's—I think Harvard has a policy of posting positions; a position must be posted and an offer must be made and an offer that is made by anyone in the institution must be made in cooperation with the personnel department. So the personnel director is a part of the process where the offer is made. In this case these three people were hired, brought on and were in departments working and the paper work came down to personnel to be processed for these people to be put on the payroll. Personnel said we don't have any such three people in this institution and the department head said yes we do, there she is over there, she is working. Personnel said she is not working, you are going to pick it up.

BUTLER: The question was how much did you pay the three people who had been caught in this administrative tangle?

ANSWER: It was negotiable. What we did do in one case, one person who had been there for three days was given a three day settlement of the actual hours and pay for those three days plus there was a severance pay. In that particular case, I think it was a week. The other people had just started that first day and they received a day's pay.

QUESTION: These were non-academic?

ANSWER: Yes, non-academic.

COMMENT: We had a similar instance and in one case we had to pay a

two-year contract. One was a five-year contract except the guy was at the University of Pennsylvania with all the credentials and so forth so I think we ended up paying something like \$60,000. It was tremendous, overall about \$100,000, but it depends on the contract.

COMMENT: I think we ought to come back to accountability. And I think accountability can be in many, many ways to the effect even I think to include these non-academic positions but you can include as a part of the formula for review of a staff person, his or her accomplishments in affirmative action. I was sickened the other night. I was at a dinner meeting and there was the play, "Adam and Eve," and at the table after the play there was a discussion at each table about what went on in the play because it deals with inequalities as they pertain to women. One person at the table who happens to work for a very large Boston bank indicated that they have incentive programs at this bank where vice presidents are compensated monetarily when they meet affirmative action goals. That was even incentives and this sort of thing being used in all kinds of ways to make it happen but I thought that was rather terrible when you bribe people to go through that.

COMMENT: But it is effective.

COMMENT: Very effective.

COMMENT: That's an interesting comment. I don't know whether you can transfer that to an academic setting.

WALLACE: I serve as a consultant to that bank and not only do they have incentives, but they have penalties also. That's a very hard statement.

COMMENT: That is what we were trying to say earlier. Affirmative action is good personnel practice and as a responsible administrator, be you a faculty-oriented administrator or non-academic administrator, if you are held accountable for the kind of hiring procedures that have been advanced, then—in your case where you were talking about an administrative blunder where they have offered a position to somebody that was not acceptable—that hiring administrator, faculty or not, should be held responsible by his immediate superior, (for lack of a better term). Therefore he or she may not be penalized then, but in terms of promotions and increase in salary and what not, you can impact on them.

COMMENT: I don't have any problem with that. My problem is that we keep using the term accountability or something else and in a functional way it is difficult to work. Let me just give you one example. One is that we don't have any problem in terms of controlling, or influencing, or shaping the behavior of deans and so forth, but we do have two groups of people on campus now that we close our eyes to—out of compliance with everything even in principle—one is the Everywoman's Center. We have a women's studies program that is more discriminatory now than the traditional white male has been for years. We have an Afro-Am Department which if we look at closely in a constructionist way, is out of compliance and of course, Cornell was cited for that. I am saying, so you look at accountability in very different ways depending on the situation but there is no general rule in

terms of overall accountability.

COMMENT: I beg to differ. You can hold them all accountable. The position at Florida State now is that every position, be it academic, non-academic or career service must be posted. Everybody has to know that the position is available. You cannot advertise, you cannot solicit applicants for it, until it is one, posted. You cannot fill it until there is written confirmation satisfying the objectives there outlined. We established what is now being greatly challenged as being numerical goals related to special qualities that are more often than not found in minorities and women. Subsequently when we established that 80% of all new hires must come from the affected classes we didn't dictate to the deans or that established faculty whom they had to hire. But we said they would be from the affected classes and they got out and made their own choices. The situation is changing. We are now in fact hiring more people from the affected classes. The non-faculty persons are held accountable in the same kinds of ways. All the persons who go on the payroll go on based on clearance whether they are academic or non-academic. It is very simple, I know, and maybe you are looking for something very complicated. But you can identify practices and we are concentrating on behavior now instead of action.

COMMENT: We have all the procedures and everything, the same thing, all of that is very basic. All I am saying is—take the University of California, Berkeley, the kind of people who tend to get the critical jobs hasn't changed much over the past fifteen years no matter what procedures you put in. That's all I am saying.

QUESTION: I want to bring this down to a very simple question. We say every job has to be posted, at least every academic or non-academic job. What does that say about internal promotions?

COMMENT: It does not dismiss internal promotion. I said they all have to be posted. That is, listed with personnel and faculty relations. In terms of internal promotion, you don't have to advertise outside of the institution but you must give appropriate consideration to minorities and women who are on board. We have promotion across departments, you don't have to limit the option for internal promotion to the given department. And when you post, everybody in the institution knows about the opportunity and certainly are given consideration within the new guidelines which say that we are going to hire from the affected classes. So then you know, there are those who feel that you don't have very many persons at the institution who are eligible in these areas, so part of our affirmative action program includes training, in-service training for the non-academic personnel and an opportunity for them to realize upward mobility and get into some of those positions.

QUESTION: But you do advertise internally?

COMMENT: Yes. That's part of what we call posting, it's known within the institution. Advertising is broader. It is outside, it's regional, it's national, in fact it is international.

QUESTION: Well now internally, is this simply an announcement?

COMMENT: We have official university bulletin boards that are strategically located all over the campus. We have a news letter or memorandum that comes out of personnel weekly which lists all positions. And you see you can't match up, you can't hire until a position has been posted for X number of days; for career service position, I think it is one through 9, I think it must be listed for a minimum of five days. For the upper level positions, I think they must be listed for a minimum of one month before you can even attempt to offer and we hold administrators responsible for adhering to the procedures as well as the final decision which must reflect responsiveness to the new numerical goals. And we are getting criticized for that, but we are also making a difference.

QUESTION: Well, I don't think I understand this at all. I don't understand what it says about internal promotions.

COMMENT: The people still have an opportunity to be promoted. We have some minorities and some women on campus to be eligible for promotion but if you don't have any there then you do have a problem. If you don't have a single one there to ever consider for internal promotion you have a problem. We do have some. In career service oriented kinds of positions—there are the non-academic, the greater majority of these people are from the affected classes, they are minorities and women. Most of the women are secretaries or in the clerical/sales kinds of positions; most of the Blacks are in the service-oriented or labor kinds of positions. We are providing opportunity for upward mobility for these people with these just added in-service training through continuing education. Secretaries are becoming administrative assistants, they are becoming managers in some of the units. The same thing happened to the minorities in terms of training for elevation. And on occasion it is just a matter of identifying their existing talent. We have secretaries with Master's degrees, they are eligible for internal promotion but they have not been considered. Working in the mail office we had one person with a degree in economics and had been there about six years and when we discovered what kind of talents he had, it was very easy to provide an internal promotion and he became responsive.

BUTLER: Let me intrude here. I think in terms of pursuing that further you might see Dr. Groomes after. I would like to move back to talking about the university as an organization and the industrial model and whether that is applicable or not in terms like accountability.

Going back to something that was said in the earlier meeting in this room, the basic thing has to do with the power within the institution and how that is influenced, not just with respect to particular things we are talking about here in terms of the hiring and promoting program but basically what that is and how you can influence that with respect to the personnel function.

COMMENT: Our experience has been that deans and that faculty chairmen can't give up any of that power unless it is taken away from them. So we have taken away the power of the deans and the faculty chairmen and given it to the affirmative action officer who has the power of veto before any appointment can be made. We all know what the guidelines are and

what the recruitment procedures are but our solution has been that the results are in direct relationship to the aggressiveness and the bull-headedness of the affirmative action officer. If you get an affirmative action officer who doesn't want to be a nice guy, who stands his ground, the results will be there. But unless you give the affirmative action officer the power to say no to a search committee who he knows has not done a good job you take away his responsibility.

BUTLER: Are you from a public or private college? A public institution? Dr. Groomes in the earlier meeting talked about the chief affirmative action officer was the president and that she isn't.

COMMENT: The president has to tell the deans, etc. As far as not including the processes, I inflict the responsibility of the affirmative action officer and if our goals are not met, he is fired. Accountability rests with the affirmative action officer. The deans and everyone else can go through the motions but

COMMENT: No, sir. The affirmative action officer is not the president of that institution and the president of that institution is held responsible. I don't think the affirmative action officer has to be as hard nosed as all that as long as he or she can articulate effectively to the president and he is a man or woman who is firm enough, an efficient administrator, and holds his staff, academic and non-academic, responsible. Affirmative action if effective, is everybody's business because one affirmative action officer in an institution such as ours with 5,000 employees cannot be in on every hiring decision and every institutional movement. But there is a full organizational structure of people who are being paid to operate that institution. Hold them responsible. That is what I am talking about—accountability. As one person—I don't dare perceive myself as so super that I can influence every action by being right there, but if we pay thousands, millions of dollars to people to do a job, I am saying hold them responsible for it. And we are saying that affirmative action objectives are incorporating everybody's job responsibility.

As a faculty person it is a faculty responsibility; as the dean it's the responsibility of the department, hold them responsible. Don't take it out of their hands. You see I started out like that. They told me, here is your job. You are responsible for affirmative action and we have developed a very comprehensive program. I provided the leadership for that bit. It did get accepted. Great, I felt pretty good about that. But then I was not making all of the decisions. I could not make them, it wasn't my responsibility. I didn't have all of the budgets. But the people who had the budgets, who were doing the hiring, were incorporated in such way that they had to do certain kinds of things and when the president insisted by articulating very directly to them that these were the expectations if they were going to maintain those positions there, they started responding properly. Promotions, increase in salaries are tied to the overall responsibility which includes affirmative action and it is now happening.

I can tell you what can make things happen in a public institution. I can tell you what I think makes it happen in an institution like Harvard. But

experience has taught me. I have seen things happen in an institution that started out as a woman's institution, moved to a co-ed institution and is now dominated by men, but nevertheless things are happening in a non-traditional way. People who said it would never happen—I am sorry, it can be made to happen. But not because of a Freddie Groomes, but because of the president and other administrators there who are doing their jobs and who have now accepted the responsibility of affirmative action as being a normal process in that institutional structure.

COMMENT: Well my point was not to substitute one for the other. My point was that on the bottom line unless you give the affirmative action officer or office some overriding judgment on search committees, department chairmen, and deans you are not going to get a top job.

COMMENT: I don't think that would work, sir. I don't think it will work to bring a person in and give him three or four persons on a staff and then tell them that for every employment action that comes through the university they are supposed to give a yes or no. I don't think that would work. I think that is very unrealistic.

COMMENT: You have to have power.

COMMENT: The point that I thought you were getting to was the relationship of the personnel function to the affirmative action function which we have skirted around and talked about in sort of a fragmented fashion because we have brought in faculty. We never talked about offices of research but we have talked a little bit about the unions and a little bit about supporting staff. But the personnel office exists as a function right now in the university, whether it is good or bad or indifferent, it does exist, it does have responsibilities. At Columbia we had never had a comprehensive personnel office, never had. Affirmative action produced a comprehensive personnel office, because we couldn't get the records out. We didn't know what the hell we were doing, we didn't know who was on first and who was on second. We had a very nice man in the office who was impotent. He was rendered impotent by the system. He was brought in to be a record keeper and that is exactly what he was (and also a benefits man, mainly a benefits man). Now we have someone who was brought in to do a comprehensive job. Affirmative action is part of his job and we talk about affirmative action. He also talks to the line managers directly so that there is some kind of accountability built into a system where the line officer does his job. There is no point in saying that some well-meaning individual is going to influence—how many decisions do we have—at least 40 decisions a week. Now what are we going to do. First of all, I don't think it would be accepted within the university, that's number one. The blame would be put on the affirmative action officer and he would be bounced out of the door. It would be a revolving door situation. But second of all, what about the time delay? Departments are going to be screaming like crazy; it takes you two weeks to get me somebody through this process. It won't work.

COMMENT: Until the man produces someone you want, you have got to hold it up.

COMMENT: I don't see a problem in having affirmative action carried

out. In the dean's office at Dartmouth there was an individual designated as affirmative action officer, to look after affirmative action interests. There is one in the medical school. The personnel office does it with the non-academic staff, and the reports come through the central affirmative action office. But there are people looking on and the minute they can catch a case which looks as if it is ducking the process we get to know about it immediately. I think at Maryland there were assistant provosts in each of the divisions identified as affirmative action officers for that division. It is just a matter of, you know, the kind of structure that you set up to go with the university.

I would like to ask in the last few minutes that we pay some attention to personnel functions in career development and in identifying particularly the non-academic staff who are underutilized, who have credentials much above the work they are given to do and what is being done about this because I think this is an area that really needs a great deal of attention.

BUTLER: Well I think it is in that area that the important part of the personnel function hasn't been addressed in institutions. The question of momentum here—you have organizations and they are doing whatever they are doing, and you are producing a change and then you want the change to continue and you have to build into that as part of the system, ways to keep the momentum going in terms of career development. I am going to ask someone who is here to comment on that subject.

WALLACE: I think that universities have a major responsibility to, when you do the utilization analysis, to identify the skills that are already available and in a sense to provide the appropriate training, whether it means sending people off to other academic institutions to pick up the skills they need or whether they take training on campus; they have a responsibility to provide training and to lay out for these people their career paths because frequently you get a lot of compartmentalization. I know at my institution that someone who works over in the chemistry lab may not know about any opportunities on the other side of the campus. In the campus newspaper, all of the jobs are posted, and I recently did a little analysis. We have had a lot of movement just as a result of posting jobs and people from one side of the campus apply for the job and on the other side of the campus the system has opened up. But also, I believe there is a rule that no person from the outside may be hired for some of these positions until you have examined people who are available, so you are not free to say, I'll just call the employment officer over in Boston and ask them to send me someone, a research assistant.

COMMENT: This is on the identification of under utilized skills. We thought at M.I.T. for quite a long time about maintaining a skills roster and decided against that in favor of five or six other things. The first obviously is posting. We can hire without posting if it's a minority person. There are exceptions. We can also hire without posting, a person who has been laid off, a long-time employee. But we decided to look at it from other points of view other than maintaining a skills roster which just drove us absolutely nuts. The computerization of it for a community of 14,000 people didn't quite work.

The first, as Phyllis said, career development reviews by every supervisor. Those reviews ideally covered what have you done well this year, what do you think you can improve, where do you think your job is going next year, where would you like to be in the next year, the next five years. So the first element was posting, the second was the supervisor supervising the discussions. The third is an elaborate tuition assistance program to help people find the kinds of courses outside the university they may want. There are internal training programs at the administrative level and of various other kinds. We have benefits for part-time people. We have instituted throughout the graduate school and undergraduate school provisions for part-time students. In fact more of our employees are now studying even at M.I.T., and when I say even I mean a field like electrical engineering, there has been an increase in internal folk taking our own stuff. The basic problem that we get for career development is of course that organizations are pyramids, so the further you go up the less chance there is on a statistical basis to go up in the same organization. But this last year over one-fifth of salary and wage employees were promoted internally. About another fifth received some kind of salary adjustment of some sort or other as a result of this.

COMMENT: One of the problems of internal promotion is that if the institution has traditionally excluded minorities and women, then you tend to reinforce that structure by keeping the non-minorities up in the higher echelons and opening up only the bottom lines for them. There must be some kind of balance of internal promotion when it will result in having the hierarchy of all white males.

COMMENT: I think it helps to do some benchmark analysis. For instance, we analyzed all promotions over a preceding period, about five years, men and women, minorities and non-minorities, to look at average age of promotion, average age of supervisors, average number of dollars supervised, salaries before and after promotion. Before the recent regime at M.I.T. the average salary before and after promotion for women, the wage gap had widened before promotion and the average woman was eight years older than the average male, and the average minority was some ten years older than the average non-minority. We have kept a close watch on these gaps so that we are not only looking at numbers and bodies, and minorities and women by grade but also the average characteristics of people getting promoted inside. Out of all of those indicators the figures have changed very swiftly. The gross salary now between men and women staff has narrowed sharply over the two year period.

BUTLER: Question from back here. We will have just two more then we will break for lunch.

QUESTION: I just wondered if someone would comment on the information systems that are used to support these kinds of activities.

BUTLER: Generally speaking, I think information systems in universities again lag behind the developments industry.

COMMENT: We keep minority resumes in a computer file, etc. We try

to search it

QUESTION: In private industry there is a tendency for management to identify potential candidates for promotions. Is this applicable to institutions of higher learning, is this being done?

BUTLER: I think it is done to some extent. We go back to the beginning of the problems in educational institutions in terms of organization because of product. Whatever it is whether you are building an automobile or a ship or a TV set or what have you, you focus things on that and education becomes more difficult. It is more diffused to talk about education, teaching and research and it just hasn't happened. Basically, one of the things that has to happen in order to get at accountability is to deal with the organization, understand the organization that you have to influence change in so that eventually some of the things that we have talked about, managers and their responsibility, are more clearly identified so that then the things that they do can be more clearly identified. It is part of the continuing change process.

COMMENT: Allow me to make this statement. I think those of us who are here—I am not a personnel officer, but those who are personnel officers and are dealing with affirmative action must realize that there is a total picture and that what you do in the day to day line operation influences the long run for one segment of university life. But you are the front door, you are the first person and a lot of people who come from communities that are contiguous to your campuses, who are invited in to apply for a job, enter, and you are the ones who set some kind of tone. With that I think you have a very great responsibility to affirmative action.